

The Influence of Psychological Boundary Management on Work Satisfaction: The Moderating Role of Personality Traits Among Working Professionals

Sarah Divyapreethi¹, Ms. Lakshmipriya E²

¹Department of Psychology, Kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous), Bangalore

²Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous), Bangalore

Abstract

With the growing shift toward remote and hybrid work models, managing boundaries between work and personal life has become increasingly important for employee well-being and satisfaction. This study examined the relationship between psychological boundary management (PBM), working professionals' work satisfaction, and the moderating influence of personality traits found in both the Boundary theory and the Big Five Model. Utilizing standardized measures like the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, the Work-Life Indicator, and the Big Five Inventory-10, 137 professionals aged 25 to 55 who worked in remote, hybrid, and on-site settings provided data to investigate the problem using a quantitative, cross-sectional design. The results showed a significant positive link between PBM and job satisfaction, suggesting that those who manage their work and non-work boundaries well had high levels of job satisfaction. While neuroticism showed a negative association and other qualities showed no meaningful relationship, agreeableness and PBM showed a positive correlation but not a negative one. Additionally, none of the personality qualities had a significant moderating effect on the association between PBM and work satisfaction, nor did there exist any discernible variations among organizational settings. Overall, the findings show that PBM is a reliable indicator of job satisfaction that is independent of personality and working conditions.

Keywords: Psychological boundary management, work satisfaction, personality traits, work–life balance, working professionals

1. INTRODUCTION

Overview

In present-day, the workplace has undergone substantial transformation due to various reasons like rapid technological advancements, globalization, and the adoption of flexible work provisions. Due to the escalation of digital communication platforms, various modes of work settings like remote work systems, and hybrid settings, employees' performance in their roles and the way they interact with organizational structures has significantly reformed. These developments, while offering increased flexibility and autonomy, have simultaneously blurred the traditional boundaries between work and personal life. After

the normal office hours, employees still be connected to their work which can be causing them to be psychologically disengaged from the responsibilities related to the work.

In this context, psychological boundary management has emerged as a critical construct in organizational research. Psychological boundaries refer to the mental and behavioral mechanisms individuals use to distinguish between work and non-work roles (Kossek et al., 2012). Effective boundary management is essential for minimizing role conflict and maintaining overall well-being. When employees struggle to manage these boundaries, they may experience increased stress, emotional exhaustion, and reduced work satisfaction.

Work satisfaction, defined as an individual's overall affective evaluation of their job, remains a central indicator of employee well-being and organizational effectiveness (Agho et al., 1992; Jex & Britt, 2008). High levels of work satisfaction are associated with positive outcomes such as organizational commitment, enhanced performance, and lower turnover intentions. However, employees differ significantly in how they respond to boundary-related challenges. One important explanation for these differences lies in stable personality traits.

The Five-Factor Model of personality developed by Costa and McCrae (1992) identifies openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism as core dimensions of personality. These traits influence how individuals perceive stressors, regulate emotions, and manage role demands. Meta-analytic findings suggest that conscientiousness and extraversion are positively associated with job satisfaction, whereas neuroticism is negatively related (Judge et al., 2002). Despite this evidence, limited research has examined personality traits as moderating variables in the relationship between psychological boundary management and work satisfaction, particularly within modern flexible work environments.

The present study seeks to explore how psychological boundary management influences work satisfaction and how personality traits shape this relationship among working professionals. By integrating boundary theory and personality theory, this research aims to provide a more nuanced understanding of employee experiences in contemporary work settings

Background of the Study

Over the past few decades, the nature of work has evolved from rigid, location-bound structures to more fluid and technology-enabled systems. Advances in digital technology have enabled constant connectivity, allowing employees to perform tasks across time zones and outside traditional office environments. While such flexibility offers advantages—including autonomy, improved accessibility, and work–life integration—it has also weakened the structural barriers that once separated work from personal life.

Boundary theory provides a useful framework for understanding how individuals navigate multiple life roles. According to Kossek et al. (2012), individuals differ in their preferences for segmentation (maintaining clear separation between work and personal roles) versus integration (allowing overlap between roles). These preferences shape how employees structure their time, manage interruptions, and transition between roles. Importantly, psychological boundaries extend beyond physical space and working hours; they involve cognitive processes that enable individuals to mentally disengage from one role and engage in another.

Ineffective boundary management can lead to work–family conflict, a form of inter-role conflict in which demands from work and family domains are incompatible. Research indicates that prolonged

role conflict contributes to emotional exhaustion, stress, and decreased job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2014). Conversely, effective boundary management has been linked to improved well-being, enhanced role clarity, and higher levels of work satisfaction.

Work satisfaction has long been studied as a central outcome in organizational psychology. It reflects an employee's overall emotional response to their job and work environment (Agho et al., 1992). Satisfied employees are more likely to exhibit positive attitudes, organizational commitment, and discretionary effort, making job satisfaction critical for both individual and organizational success (Jex & Britt, 2008).

Although psychological boundary management plays a crucial role in shaping work experiences, not all individuals benefit equally from boundary management strategies. Personality traits—defined as enduring patterns of thoughts, emotions, and behaviors (Costa & McCrae, 1992)—help explain these differences. The Five-Factor Model suggests that individuals high in conscientiousness are organized and disciplined, which may support effective boundary setting. Extraverted individuals, characterized by sociability and positive affect, may utilize social support to manage work-related stressors. In contrast, individuals high in neuroticism tend to experience heightened anxiety and emotional instability, potentially impairing their ability to regulate work–life boundaries effectively.

Meta-analytic evidence by Judge et al. (2002) demonstrates consistent relationships between personality traits and job satisfaction. However, most studies have focused on direct effects rather than examining how personality moderates the relationship between work processes and outcomes. In increasingly boundaryless work environments—characterized by flexible schedules, remote work, and digital connectivity (Farivar et al., 2024)—the role of personality may become even more significant.

Despite growing scholarly attention to work–life boundaries, notable gaps remain. Many studies examine boundary management and job satisfaction separately, without integrating personality as an interactive factor. Furthermore, limited research has focused on working professionals operating within contemporary flexible work contexts, particularly across diverse occupational settings.

Given these gaps, there is a clear need for research that integrates psychological boundary management and personality traits within a unified framework to better understand their combined impact on work satisfaction. By examining personality as a moderating variable, this study aims to explain why similar boundary management strategies may produce different outcomes for different individuals. Such understanding is essential for developing tailored organizational interventions that promote sustainable work practices and enhance employee well-being in the modern workplace.

Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in two primary theoretical perspectives: Boundary Management Theory and Trait Personality Theory.

Boundary Management Theory posits that individuals actively construct and negotiate boundaries between work and non-work roles based on their preferences and environmental demands (Kossek et al., 2012). The theory distinguishes between segmentation and integration strategies and emphasizes the role of individual agency in managing role transitions. Effective boundary management promotes psychological detachment, reducing role conflict and enhancing well-being.

Trait Personality Theory, particularly the Big Five personality traits framework (Costa & McCrae, 1992), provides the foundation for understanding stable individual differences. The five dimensions—openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism—capture broad

patterns of behavior and emotional regulation. These traits influence coping strategies, stress responses, and workplace attitudes.

Integrating these frameworks, the present study proposes that personality traits moderate the relationship between psychological boundary management and work satisfaction. For instance, conscientious individuals may benefit more from structured boundary strategies, whereas individuals high in neuroticism may struggle to detach from work demands even when boundaries are established.

Statement of the Problem

Despite increasing scholarly attention to work–life boundaries, existing research has largely examined psychological boundary management and work satisfaction as independent constructs. While personality traits have been studied in relation to job satisfaction, their moderating role in boundary management processes remains underexplored.

In flexible and digitally connected work environments, employees are granted greater autonomy but also greater responsibility for managing role boundaries. However, individuals differ in their ability to navigate these demands effectively. Without understanding how personality traits influence boundary management outcomes, organizations may overlook critical individual differences when designing work–life balance interventions.

Therefore, the central problem addressed in this study is the limited empirical understanding of how personality traits moderate the relationship between psychological boundary management and work satisfaction among working professionals

Aim and Objectives of the Study

- To examine the influence of psychological boundary management on work satisfaction and to determine the moderating role of personality traits among working professionals.
- To examine the relationship between psychological boundary management and work satisfaction among working professionals.
- To examine the relationship between personality traits on psychological boundary management.
- To investigate whether personality traits moderate the relationship between work satisfaction and psychological boundary management.
- To explore the differences in psychological boundary management and work satisfaction among individuals working in different organizational settings.

Hypotheses

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between psychological boundary management and work satisfaction among working professionals.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between personality traits and psychological boundary management.

Ho3: Personality traits do not significantly moderate the relationship between psychological boundary management and work satisfaction.

Ho4: There are no significant differences in psychological boundary management and work satisfaction among individuals working in different organizational settings.

Significance of the Study

This study holds both theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, it contributes to the integration of boundary management theory and personality psychology by examining personality traits as moderators rather than solely as direct predictors of work satisfaction. This expands existing literature by offering a more comprehensive framework for understanding employee well-being in modern work contexts.

Practically, the findings may inform organizational policies related to flexible work arrangements, employee support systems, and personalized work–life balance interventions. Recognizing the moderating role of personality traits can help organizations design targeted strategies that accommodate individual differences, thereby enhancing employee satisfaction, retention, and overall well-being.

Definitions of Key Terms

Psychological Boundary Management

The cognitive and behavioral strategies individuals use to regulate, separate, or integrate work and personal roles (Kossek et al., 2012).

Work Satisfaction

An individual's overall affective evaluation of their job and work experiences (Jex & Britt, 2008).

Personality Traits

Enduring patterns of thoughts, emotions, and behaviors that influence how individuals respond to environmental demands (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

Big Five Personality Traits

A widely accepted model of personality comprising openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

2. Review Of Literature

Overview

According to current published research, personality traits, methods for managing boundaries, work-family enrichment, and outcomes related to employee well-being are closely linked. In various professional contexts, ongoing research consistently shows that being conscientious is associated with better work-family enrichment, more effective boundary management, and increased job satisfaction (Gardner et al., 2021; Kang & Malvaso, 2023). Conversely, neuroticism is generally linked to poorer wellbeing outcomes and reduced job satisfaction. Moreover, studies indicate that boundary control and boundary fit play a significant role in shaping employee outcomes, as flexibility alone is insufficient when work and nonwork boundaries are not effectively managed (Kossek et al., 2012; Meng et al., 2025; Boccoli et al., 2023). Moreover, studies on interventions suggest that training in boundary management can enhance psychological detachment and recovery, while reducing work-family conflict and emotional exhaustion (Binnewies et al., 2020).

A key mechanism that connects personality traits and boundary preferences to career and life satisfaction is work-family enrichment (Premchandran & Priyadarshi, 2018; Daniel & Sonnentag, 2015; Choi et al., 2017). Oseghale et al. (2024) presents one of the rare grounded theory approaches conducted in a crisis context; however, qualitative insights remain limited in most research, which typically depend on quantitative cross-sectional methods using advanced statistical techniques. Although the amount of research has been growing, the literature remains fragmented, with very few integrative and long-term

models that simultaneously consider personality, job-related context factors, and evolving hybrid work environments. This clearly shows that more comprehensive and diverse research approaches are needed.

Empirical Review

Meng et al. (2025) also investigated the association between work-family border fit and employee well-being using polynomial regression and response surface analysis. The two-wave results of 420 employees in Chinese consulting businesses showed that work satisfaction and depression-enthusiasm well-being were positively predicted by the fit between the enactment and preference of the boundaries. Work-family conflict mediated this association.

Oseghale et al. (2024) looked into how academics' personality traits and methods to boundary management were affected by the required work-from-home (WFH) policies during the COVID-19 pandemic. 41 interviews and the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) questionnaire were used in a two-step coding process and qualitative grounded theory technique to collect data. The findings demonstrated that introverted and conscientious students were better at balancing their job and personal lives by using integration strategies, while extroverts frequently used the volleying technique of boundaries but also used family-based segmentation.

Boccoli et al. (2023) used the latent transition analysis to examine the psychological job control and boundary control characteristics of 1,423 employees at an Italian bank. The flexible dividers showed the highest levels of engagement, job happiness, and work-life balance across four flexibility profiles. The findings showed that flexibility enhances wellbeing to the degree that it is reinforced by a high degree of boundary control.

The relationships between several facets of job satisfaction and personality factors were examined by Kang and Malvaso (2023). 6,962 respondents' data from the British Household Panel Survey were used. Based on their analysis, neuroticism was associated with lower job satisfaction in categories such as hours worked, job content, security, and remuneration. On the other hand, in a number of job satisfaction domains, conscientiousness and agreeableness were linked to increased satisfaction.

Gardner et al. (2021) investigated the connection between an individual's boundary management style and their personality traits and work characteristics. Conscientiousness was linked to a better grasp of boundary control, family identification, and fewer job interruptions, according to the findings of a survey that involved 498 participants. Conversely, neuroticism was associated with fewer disruptions in other areas outside of work.

The authors of the study Binnewies et al. (2020) investigated their hypothesis regarding the impact of boundary management techniques on recovery and well-being with the aid of a cross-sectional survey (N = 889) and randomized waitlist-control intervention research (N = 74). There were behavioral, verbal, physical, and temporal techniques. While communicative techniques were linked to increased work-nonwork conflict and emotional exhaustion, most tactics were favorably correlated with psychological detachment and relaxation. The intervention demonstrated the effectiveness of boundary management training in reducing conflict and improving wellbeing.

Premchandran and Priyadarshi (2018) looked into how proactive personality traits, work-family self-efficacy, and boundary preferences predicted job satisfaction as it was influenced by work-family enrichment (WFE). 508 married Indian IT professionals with at least one child made up the sample. The results showed that personalities affected people's enrichment experiences and that WFE was a significant predictor of job satisfaction.

Choi et al. (2017) investigated the relationship between South Korean navy sailors' life happiness, work-family enrichment, psychological capital, and calling. The study's findings, which were based on cross-sectional survey data, showed that those who saw their work as a vocation were more resilient, optimistic, and self-sufficient, which improved work-family enrichment and life satisfaction.

Daniel and Sonnentag (2015) examined the relationship between job happiness, work-family enrichment, and boundary management among 222 employees with children. Regression analysis led them to the conclusion that permeability preferences and perceived flexibility were positively correlated with work-to-family enrichment and job satisfaction.

A variable-centered and person-centered study approach was used by Kossek et al. (2012) to ascertain the work-nonwork border management characteristics of working professionals. The findings showed that perceived control was crucial in managing boundaries and that those with low boundary control profiles experienced negative job and family outcomes.

Synthesis of Literature

Personality qualities, boundary management techniques, work-family enrichment, and employee well-being results are strongly correlated, according to the analyzed studies. Personality traits like conscientiousness consistently predict stronger boundary control, better enrichment experiences, and higher job satisfaction in a variety of settings, including academia during COVID-19, IT professionals in India, banking employees in Italy, and consulting firms in China (Gardner et al., 2021; Kang & Malvaso, 2023). Conversely, neuroticism is typically associated with worse outcomes and a lower level of job satisfaction.

The focus on boundary fit and border management is one notable trend in the literature. Studies by Meng et al. (2025), Boccoli et al. (2023), and Kossek et al. (2012) emphasize how crucial it is to align behaviors with desires. They stress that if limitations cannot be effectively regulated, flexibility is insufficient. Furthermore, intervention-based research indicates that learning to manage one's boundaries can help people recover more quickly and experience less emotional weariness (Binnewies et al., 2020).

Another recurrent finding is the moderating role of work-family enrichment (Premchandran & Priyadarshi, 2018; Daniel & Sonnentag, 2015; Choi et al., 2017). Enrichment acts as a link between personality and boundary management and job and life satisfaction. This suggests that enrichment-based frameworks are replacing conflict-centered perspectives in the literature.

The methods used in the literature vary widely. While most studies employ quantitative cross-sectional surveys and regression-based analyses, some employ more complex techniques such as ordinal regression (Kang & Malvaso, 2023), latent transition analysis (Boccoli et al., 2023), and response surface analysis (Meng et al., 2025). Few qualitative approaches are accessible; one of the few grounded theory investigations in a crisis context is offered by Oseghale et al. (2024).

Although the importance of personality and boundary control is widely acknowledged, there are still gaps. First, the relative lack of experimental and longitudinal studies limits the ability to draw conclusions about causality. Second, the majority of research focuses on organizational or individual results independently, with few integrative models that incorporate personality, contextual job factors, and cultural variances. Third, further empirical research is required on new hybrid work environments outside of the pandemic scenario.

The literature generally agrees that personality has a significant impact on boundary management strategies, which in turn have an impact on recovery, enrichment, job satisfaction, and overall wellbeing.

However, longitudinal, cross-cultural, and intervention-based approaches should be prioritized in future research to enhance understanding of boundary dynamics in evolving work contexts.

Research Gap

Although substantial research exists on psychological boundary management, personality traits, and work satisfaction, the integration of these constructs into a single moderated framework remains underexplored. The current literature is informative but fragmented, leaving a significant conceptual and empirical gap.

3. Method

Overview

This study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional method to explore the relationships between psychological boundary management, work satisfaction, and the Big Five personality traits among 137 working professionals aged 25 to 55 from various industries and work settings (remote, hybrid, and on-site). The convenience sample opted for working employees who had at least six months of experience, excluding freelancers, contractors, interns, and individuals with major psychological disorders. Data was collected using Google Forms, ensuring informed consent and maintaining confidentiality and anonymity. Among the measures used were the Big Five Inventory-10 (Rammstedt & John, 2007; 10 items, α 0.450.70), as well as the Work-Nonwork Boundary Management Scale (Kossek et al., 2012; 16 items, α > 0.70), and the General Job Satisfaction Scale (Agho et al., 1992; 6 items, α > 0.80).

Descriptive statistics (including means and standard deviations), normality tests (such as Shapiro-Wilk and skewness; data was regularly distributed), correlations to examine variable relationships, moderation analysis and Welch's ANOVA were all conducted using Jamovi software. Participants' physical, mental, and emotional well-being was not at risk, and ethical guidelines strongly focused on their voluntary participation, secure data handling, and adherence to privacy regulations.

Research Design

This study adopted a quantitative, cross-sectional, research design to examine the relationships among psychological boundary management, work satisfaction, and personality traits among working professionals. This design is suitable because it enables the use of numerical data to test hypotheses and explore patterns without manipulating variables.

Participants

The sample consists of 137 participants including males and females within the age range of 25 to 55. The participants include working professional across various industries and organizational settings (e.g., remote, hybrid, and on-site employees).

Sample

The study employed a convenience sampling method to collect data because of practical challenges such as time constraints, financial resources, and accessibility for people working in various industries. Relevant data was successfully gathered from available participants using this non-probability sampling method. To ensure adequate coverage of workplace boundary requirements, the sample included working professionals aged 25 to 55 who had been continuously involved in their jobs (whether remote, hybrid, or in-person) for a minimum of six months. The participants were required to operate within formal

organizational settings that featured structured job expectations, such as business, education, or service-oriented industries. Individuals such as consultants, contractors, freelancers, or interns, who do not follow a fixed or organized work schedule, were excluded because their boundary dynamics can be quite different from those of official employees. Furthermore, to minimize possible effects on boundary management and work satisfaction, which were beyond the scope of the study, individuals with serious psychological issues were excluded

Measures

1. Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) – 1977

The University of Minnesota's Vocational Psychology Research unit created the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) in 1977 to gauge employees' levels of satisfaction with various aspects of their jobs. By examining both the intrinsic and extrinsic components of work and overall satisfaction, the MSQ aims to gauge an individual's level of job satisfaction.

A five-point Likert-type scale is used to rate 20 items in the MSQ Short Form, which are Very Dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, Satisfied, and Very Satisfied. The respondents indicate how satisfied they are with a number of aspects of their current job, such as the ability to work autonomously, pay, management, working environment, promotion, recognition, and sense of accomplishment. The degree of job satisfaction increases with a higher score. Three main dimensions are scored by the MSQ: intrinsic satisfaction (such as the use of skills, achievement, independence, and accountability), Extrinsic satisfaction (e.g., working conditions, compensation, supervision, and business policies), A general assessment of the work is called general satisfaction.

In a number of occupational groupings, the MSQ has demonstrated strong psychometric performance. Internal consistency reliability coefficients (Cronbachs alpha) for the general satisfaction scale range from 0.80 to greater than 0.90, indicating strong reliability. With a strong degree of connection between MSQ scores and other relevant variables in terms of organizational commitment, turnover intentions, job performance, and work motivation, the scale has also shown good construct and criterion-related validity. Its validity and wide use in organizational and vocational research are also supported by its well-established factorial structure.

2. Work–Life Indicator – Kossek et al. (2012)

The Work-Life Indicator was developed by Ellen Ernst Kossek, Marian N. Ruderman, Phillip W. Braddy, and Kelly M. Hannum (2012) and published in the *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. By assessing three key characteristics—cross-role disruption behaviors (work interrupting nonwork and nonwork interrupting work), importance of identity (work and family identity), and perceived boundary control—the scale was created to address work-nonwork boundary management methods. 17 items on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, will form the basis of the most validated version.

Two management samples have demonstrated the validity and reliability of the Work-Life Indicator. Internal consistency is acceptable, as evidenced by the alpha coefficients of the interruption behavior scales, which range from 0.74 to 0.84, boundary control from 0.88, job identity from 0.75 to 0.76, and family identity from 0.77 to 0.85. Confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated that a five-factor structure characterized by appropriate model fit indices (CFI \approx .92; RMSEA \approx .06–.07) was detected, establishing factorial validity. Convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity was demonstrated

by significant associations with work-family conflict, psychological job control, engagement, time adequacy, work-schedule fit, psychological distress, and turnover intentions. Overall, the tool is a reliable and useful tool for managing work-life boundaries and their impact on employee outcomes.

3. **Big Five Inventory-10 (BFI-10) – (Rammstedt et al. (2007))**

The Big Five Inventory-10 (BFI-10) was developed by Beatrice Rammstedt and Oliver P. John (2007) which is a brief personality assessment that measures the five key dimensions of personality: neuroticism, agreeableness, extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness to new experiences. The test consists of ten items in total, with two items included for each personality characteristic. Each item is evaluated using a Likert-type scale. When time limitations make it impossible to use longer inventories, the BFI-10 was developed as a reliable method for assessing personality traits.

Due to its short length, internal consistency measures (Cronbach's alpha) for different traits range approximately from 0.45 to 0.70, which is considered acceptable for very brief scales. The BFI-10 demonstrates strong convergent validity and shows high correlations with more extensive assessments such as the Big Five Inventory-44 (BFI44), although it has lower alpha values compared to the larger inventory. In line with established Big Five research, personality traits are able to predict relevant behavioral and organizational outcomes, showing that the scale has acceptable criterion-related validity.

Procedure

Primary data was collected for this study, and a diverse group of participants was contacted. The sample included 137 participants aged between 25 and 55, comprising men and women. The participants represented a range of working professionals of organizations and work settings. The data for the study was collected via Google Forms. Before taking part, participants were told about the study's purpose and assured that their responses would remain confidential and be used only for research. The Google Forms's online format allowed participants to complete it at a time that suited them best, making it particularly suitable and easy to access for working professionals.

Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using Jamovi software. Descriptive statistics like the mean and standard deviation were used to summarize and describe data. Normality test (Shapiro Wilk P and Skewness) was done to check whether the data was normally distributed, and it was found that the data was normally distributed. Correlation analysis was conducted to analyze the relationship between different variables was performed to examine the influence of the other variable. Moderation analysis was also performed to determine whether the connection between the predictor and outcome variable depended on a moderating variable. Welch's ANOVA was also used to compare the group means.

Research Ethics

Each participant was reached out to online and provided with a detailed explanation of the study prior to being asked to take part. A consent form provided as part of the online survey was used to obtain informed consent, ensuring that participants were fully aware of the study's objectives, procedures, and their right to participate voluntarily. They were clearly informed that their involvement was entirely voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time, without needing to provide an explanation or facing any consequences. Prior to and while completing the online form, participants were encouraged to ask questions regarding the study. No personal details, such as names or email addresses, were collected, and

all responses were kept confidential and used exclusively for academic research. Anonymity and confidentiality were strictly maintained. The participants' privacy was strongly safeguarded, particularly given the sensitive nature of the topic related to mental health. The study participants were not in danger physically, psychologically, or emotionally. In line with data protection regulations, all collected data were securely stored and only accessible to the researcher. Furthermore, the study adhered to ethical and transparent guidelines by clearly disclosing any possible conflicts of interest, sources of funding, or biases, and the findings will not be shared with external parties for non-academic purposes.

4. Results and Discussion

Overview

The aim of the study is to examine the influence of psychological boundary management on work satisfaction and to determine the moderating role of personality traits among working professionals. Working professionals' who effectively maintained boundaries between their work and personal lives generally experienced higher work satisfaction, as there was a significant positive link between Psychological Boundary Management (PBM) and work satisfaction. Ho1 was rejected because the normality assumptions were met and a statistically significant relationship ($p = .002$) was confirmed through Pearson's correlation analysis. PBM showed a strong negative relationship with neuroticism and a strong positive relationship with agreeableness, but there was no significant link with extraversion, conscientiousness, or openness. Moreover, since all interaction factors were non-significant ($p > .05$), leading to the retention of Ho3, the moderation analysis indicated that none of the Big Five personality traits significantly influenced the relationship between PBM and work satisfaction. Additionally, Ho4 was supported by Welch's ANOVA, which indicated no noticeable differences in PBM or work satisfaction across different organizational settings.

No matter the differences in personality or the organizational setting, the findings show that managing psychological boundaries effectively plays a major role in enhancing job satisfaction. According to boundary theory, individuals who successfully manage their role boundaries may experience greater feelings of control and reduced role conflict, which can improve their work attitudes. The links to neuroticism and agreeableness highlight the significance of interpersonal focus and emotional stability when it comes to managing boundaries. The absence of moderating effects indicates that PBM's positive impact on job satisfaction remains consistent regardless of personality type. Taking everything into account, the findings emphasize PBM as a valuable and broadly applicable factor in enhancing the job satisfaction of working professionals.

Presentation of Results

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Psychological Boundary Management and Work Satisfaction

		N	Missing	Mean	SD	Shapiro-Wilk	
						W	p
Psychological Management	Boundary	137	0	70.8	12.14	0.989	0.320
Work Satisfaction		137	0	62.6	7.55	0.991	0.528

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics and tests of normality for psychological boundary management (PBM) and work satisfaction. The mean score for PBM was $M = 70.8$ ($SD = 12.14$), and the mean score for work satisfaction was $M = 62.6$ ($SD = 7.55$). The Shapiro-Wilk test revealed that PBM ($p = 0.320$) and job satisfaction ($p = 0.528$) were both normally distributed because the p-values were greater than 0.05. Since the assumption of normality was met, Pearson's correlation analysis was performed.

Table 2

Correlation Analysis of Psychological Boundary Management and Work Satisfaction

Variable	1	2
Psychological Boundary Management	—	
Work Satisfaction	0.27**	—

Note. N = 137. Values represent Pearson's r . $p < .01$

In table 2, Pearson product-moment correlation was used to examine the relationship between psychological boundary management and work satisfaction. The results demonstrated a substantial positive correlation between PBM and work satisfaction ($p = 0.002$). This implies that higher levels of job satisfaction among working professionals are associated with improved psychological boundary management. The connection's strength varied from weak to moderate. According to the null hypothesis (H_{01}), there is no significant relationship between psychological boundary management and work satisfaction among working professionals. Because of the statistical significance of the association ($p = .002 < .05$), the null hypothesis is rejected. There is therefore evidence of a considerable positive correlation between psychological boundary management and job satisfaction.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Psychological Boundary Management, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness

	PBM	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness
N	137	137	137	137	137	137
Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	70.8	3.18	3.43	3.28	2.91	3.04
Standard deviation	12.1	0.787	0.849	0.727	0.818	0.636
Skewness	-0.386	0.240	0.147	0.232	-0.120	-0.0438
Std. error skewness	0.207	0.207	0.207	0.207	0.207	0.207
Shapiro-Wilk W	0.989	0.939	0.948	0.952	0.955	0.935
Shapiro-Wilk p	0.320	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics and normality tests for the Big Five personality traits and psychological boundary management (PBM). The average PBM score was 70.8 (SD = 12.1). The highest average among all personality traits was agreeableness (M = 3.43, SD = 0.849), followed by neuroticism (M = 2.91, SD = 0.818), extraversion (M = 3.18, SD = 0.787), conscientiousness (M = 3.28, SD = 0.727), and openness (M = 3.04, SD = 0.636). The Shapiro-Wilk test, indicated that PBM follows a normal distribution (W = .989, p = .320). Statistically significant Shapiro-Wilk test results (p < .001) for the personality variables suggested deviations from a normal distribution. Nevertheless, the skewness values remained within the acceptable range of ±1, varying between -0.386 and 0.240, indicating a roughly normal distribution suitable for parametric analysis (Field, 2018). Therefore, Pearson's correlation was used.

Table 4
Correlation Analysis of Psychological Boundary Management, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
PBM	—					
Extraversion	-0.08	—				
Agreeableness	0.20*	0.02	—			
Conscientiousness	0.10	0.15	0.36***	—		
Neuroticism	-0.20*	-0.01	-0.17*	-0.18*	—	
Openness	0.08	-0.06	0.09	0.01	-0.03	—

As shown in Table 4 by the Pearson product-moment correlation analysis, PBM exhibited a notable negative relationship with neuroticism (p = 0.022) and a statistically significant positive association with agreeableness (p = 0.019). Extraversion (p = 0.342), conscientiousness (p = 0.267), and openness (p = 0.387) were not significantly associated with PBM. Thus, the null hypothesis, (Ho2) there is no significant relationship between Big Five Personality Traits and Psychological Boundary Management, is partially rejected. Neuroticism and agreeableness were found to be highly associated with PBM, while extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness were not.

Table 5
Moderation Analysis of the Big Five Personality Traits on the Relationship Between PBM and Work Satisfaction

Table 5.1
Extraversion as a Moderator

Model Fit Measures		
Model	R	R ²
1	0.383	0.147

Note. Models estimated using sample size of N=137

Model Coefficients - Work Satisfaction

Predictor	Estimate	SE	T	p
Intercept	62.5245	0.6038	103.551	<.001
PBM_C	0.1587	0.0509	3.115	0.002
Extraversion_C	-2.5136	0.7781	-3.230	0.002
PBM_Extra_Int	-0.0397	0.0567	-0.700	0.485

In Extraversion as a moderator (Table 5.1), with $R = 0.383$, $R^2 = 0.147$, the overall model was statistically significant and accounted for 14.7% of the variation in job satisfaction. Key factors identified were extraversion ($b = -2.51$, $p = 0.002$) and PBM ($b = 0.16$, $p = 0.002$). However, the interaction term was not statistically significant ($b = -0.04$, $p = .485$), indicating that extraversion did not influence the relationship between PBM and job satisfaction.

Table 5.2
Agreeableness as a Moderator

Model Fit Measures

Model	R	R ²
1	0.317	0.101

Note. Models estimated using sample size of N=137

Model Coefficients - Work Satisfaction

Predictor	Estimate	SE	T	p
Intercept	62.55755	0.6266	99.843	<.001
PBM_C	0.18645	0.0526	3.543	<.001
Agreeableness_C	-1.55944	0.7459	-2.091	0.038
PBM_Agree_Int	0.00576	0.0496	0.116	0.908

In Agreeableness as a moderator (Table 5.2), $R^2 = 0.101$ suggests that the model explained 10.1% of the variance. Key predictors were agreeableness ($b = -1.56$, $p = 0.038$) and PBM ($b = 0.19$, $p < .001$). However, there seems to be no balancing effect, as the interaction effect was not statistically significant ($b = 0.006$, $p = 0.908$).

Table 5.3

Conscientiousness as Moderator

Model Fit Measures

Model	R	R ²
1	0.325	0.105

Note. Models estimated using sample size of N=137

Model Coefficients - Work Satisfaction

Predictor	Estimate	SE	T	p
Intercept	62.5189	0.6185	101.09	<.001
PBM_C	0.1549	0.0539	2.87	0.005
Conscientiousness_C	-1.7369	0.8579	-2.02	0.045
PBM_Consci_Int	0.0675	0.0571	1.18	0.239

In Conscientiousness as a moderator (Table 5.3), R² = 0.105 suggests that 10.5% of the variability was accounted for by the model. Conscientiousness (b = -1.74, p = 0.045) and PBM (b = 0.15, p = 0.005) both served as significant predictors. No evidence of moderation was found since the interaction term did not reach statistical significance (b = 0.07, p = .239).

Table 5.4

Neuroticism as Moderator

Model Fit Measures

Model	R	R ²
1	0.284	0.0809

Note. Models estimated using sample size of N=137

Model Coefficients - Work Satisfaction

Predictor	Estimate	SE	T	p
Intercept	62.4279	0.6357	98.204	<.001
PBM_C	0.1729	0.0531	3.257	0.001
Neuroticism_C	0.1420	0.7947	0.179	0.858
PBM_Neuro_Int	-0.0726	0.0604	-1.202	0.231

In Neuroticism as a moderator (Table 5.4), 8.1% of the variation (R² = 0.081). Although neuroticism (p = 0.858) and the interaction term (b = -0.07, p = 0.231) did not reach statistical significance,

PBM remained a significant predictor ($b = 0.17, p = 0.001$). Thus, the relationship was not influenced by neuroticism.

Table 5.5

Openness as Moderator

Model Fit Measures

Model	R	R ²
1	0.301	0.0906

Note. Models estimated using sample size of N=137

Model Coefficients - Work Satisfaction

Predictor	Estimate	SE	T	p
Intercept	62.6177	0.6228	100.54	<.001
PBM_C	0.1529	0.0530	2.88	0.005
Openness_C	-1.1336	0.9861	-1.15	0.252
PBM_Openness_Int	-0.0881	0.0664	-1.33	0.187

In Openness as a moderator (Table 5.5), 9.1% of the variation ($R^2 = 0.091$) in transparency as a moderator. Openness ($p = 0.252$) and the interaction term ($b = -0.09, p = 0.187$) did not serve as significant predictors, whereas PBM was a significant predictor ($b = 0.15, p = 0.005$).

None of the interaction terms reached statistical significance ($p > .05$) in any of the five models. The relationship between psychological boundary management and job satisfaction was not moderated by personality traits, so Ho3 remains unchanged.

Table 6

Welch’s One-Way ANOVA Results for Psychological Boundary Management and Work Satisfaction Across Organizational Settings

Table 6.1: Psychological Boundary Management Across Organizational Settings

One-Way ANOVA (Welch's)

	F	df1	df2	P
PBM	0.704	2	46.6	0.500

To determine whether psychological boundary management (PBM) differed based on the organizational context, Welch's one-way ANOVA was used. (Table 6.1) The results indicated that PBM was not statistically different across the three organizational settings ($p = 0.500$).

Table 6.2: Work satisfaction Across Organizational Settings

One-Way ANOVA (Welch's)

	F	df1	df2	p
WS	2.23	2	45.8	0.119

In Table 6.2, Welch's ANOVA was also utilized to assess differences in work satisfaction across various organizational settings. The study found that there was no statistically significant variation in work satisfaction among the groups ($p = 0.119$).

The results indicate that there are no significant difference in psychological boundary management or work satisfaction between different organizational contexts, since in both the tables p-values are higher than 0.05. As a result, the null hypothesis, there are no significant differences in psychological boundary management and work satisfaction among individuals working in different organizational settings is accepted

Interpretation of Findings

In Table 1 and Table 2, the findings indicate that working professionals who effectively manage their psychological boundaries tend to experience greater job satisfaction. Boundary theory (Ashforth et al., 2000) supports the idea that individuals who effectively manage the boundaries between their personal and professional lives tend to achieve better psychological outcomes. Effective boundary management can reduce role conflict and enhance perceived control, leading to greater job satisfaction.

The positive relationship also aligns with other research indicating that boundary management strategies can enhance employees' perspectives on their jobs and overall well-being (Allen et al., 2014). Even though the effect size is relatively small, it suggests that managing psychological boundaries plays an important role in accounting for variations in job satisfaction. To better understand this relationship, future research could explore additional mediating or moderating variables.

Ho2: The findings indicate that individuals who are more pleasant generally report better psychological boundary management, whereas those who are more neurotic tend to report poorer psychological boundary management. This aligns with personality theory, specifically the Five-Factor Model (McCrae & Costa, 1997), which suggests that individuals with lower levels of neuroticism and higher emotional stability are more capable of managing stress and handling the boundaries of their roles effectively. Moreover, sociable individuals might employ adaptable social strategies that facilitate transitioning between personal and professional contexts.

Boundary management might be more strongly connected to emotional stability and interpersonal focus than to sociability, achievement motivation, or openness to new experiences, as shown by the absence of significant links between PBM and extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness. These findings contribute to the growing body of research connecting personality traits with work-life interface processes and offer partial support for trait-based theories of boundary management behavior (Allen et al., 2014).

Ho3: Personality traits do not significantly moderate the relationship between psychological boundary management and work satisfaction. The results indicate that none of the Big Five personality

traits influenced the connection between psychological boundary management and job satisfaction, even though certain traits like conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extraversion were important direct predictors of work satisfaction in some models. This indicates that the positive connection between psychological boundary management and job satisfaction operates consistently across different personality types, implying that the benefits of managing boundaries effectively remain steady despite variations in individual personalities.

These findings indicate that, irrespective of individual traits, psychological boundary management could act as a broadly useful method for enhancing job satisfaction. While personality influences attitudes and behaviors in the workplace (McCrae & Costa, 2008), the present results suggest that PBM contributes uniquely to job satisfaction, separate from differences based on personality.

Ho4: The results suggest that there are no significant differences in PBM or work satisfaction among employees across different organizational settings. Boundary theory suggests that, in theory, individuals actively establish and preserve boundaries according to their personal preferences and shifts in roles, rather than depending solely on the organization's structure (Ashforth et al., 2000). This method is backed by the existing data, which indicate that boundary management practices might be more influenced by culture than by individual preferences.

Research suggests that psychological elements such as perceived autonomy, support, and individual coping strategies have a more substantial influence on job satisfaction than organizational structure by itself, which aligns with the observed minimal variations in work satisfaction among different organizational environments (Judge et al., 2001). These findings indicate that while the organizational environment might affect some work conditions, it cannot on its own account for major differences in boundary management or job satisfaction within the current group.

5. Summary and Conclusion

Overview

The research examined the relationships among psychological boundary management (PBM), job satisfaction and the Big Five personality traits of working professionals. The findings indicated a significant positive relationship between PBM and work satisfaction, implying that individuals who effectively manage the separation between their personal and work life are more prone to feeling content in their jobs. PBM showed no significant relationship with extraversion, conscientiousness, or openness, but it was positively linked to agreeableness and negatively linked to neuroticism. Moreover, the link between PBM and job satisfaction remained unaffected by any personality factors, suggesting that boundary management positively influences satisfaction irrespective of an individual's personality. PBM and job satisfaction remained largely unchanged across different organizational settings.

In general, the findings emphasize the importance of psychological boundary management as a key factor that influences work satisfaction beyond individual personality traits. The results back up the Five-Factor Model and boundary theory by showing that PBM enhances work satisfaction independently, even though certain traits are associated with boundary management behaviors. The research highlights the value of boundary management strategies and employee well-being initiatives for organizations. To gain a clearer understanding of these relationships, future studies should use longitudinal approaches and

explore additional mediating and moderating factors, as indicated by limitations such as the cross-sectional nature of the design, reliance on self-reported data, and restricted generalizability.

Summary of Findings

The present study examined the relationships among psychological boundary management (PBM), their work satisfaction, and the Big Five personality traits of working professionals. The findings indicate a strong positive relationship between PBM and job satisfaction, with both variables following a normal distribution. This implies that individuals who are more skilled in managing their psychological boundaries tend to experience higher levels of job satisfaction. The initial null hypothesis was dismissed because the relationship was statistically significant, although its intensity ranged from weak to moderate.

In terms of personality characteristics, PBM showed a positive association with agreeableness and a strong negative link with neuroticism; however, extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness were not significantly related to PBM. This resulted in a partial rejection of the second null hypothesis. Moreover, moderation analysis revealed that the relationship between PBM and work satisfaction was not significantly influenced by any of the Big Five personality traits. In some models, specific characteristics (such as conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extraversion) emerged as direct factors influencing job satisfaction, although the interaction effects were not statistically significant. The third null hypothesis was consequently retained.

Finally, Welch's ANOVA showed no noticeable differences in PBM or work satisfaction across different organizational contexts. The fourth null hypothesis was therefore accepted, suggesting that work satisfaction and psychological boundary management in this group were not notably influenced by the organizational environment by itself.

Conclusion

- There is a considerable positive correlation between Psychological Boundary Management and Work Satisfaction.
- There is a significant relationship between Psychological Boundary Management and Big Five Personality Traits.
- The relationship between Psychological Boundary Management and Work Satisfaction was not moderated by Personality Traits.
- There are no significant differences in Psychological Boundary Management and Work Satisfaction among individuals working in different organizational settings.

The findings highlight the importance of psychological boundary management in enhancing work satisfaction among working professionals. According to the boundary theory by Ashforth et al. (2000), individuals who effectively manage the boundaries between their personal and work lives are more likely to experience positive psychological outcomes. The results suggest that PBM makes a unique contribution to work satisfaction beyond personality-related factors.

The Five-Factor Model, developed by McCrae and Costa (1997) align with the partial links between PBM and specific individual personality traits. It highlights the significance of being agreeable and emotionally stable (having low neuroticism) in managing boundaries effectively. Nevertheless, the absence of moderating effects indicates that PBM and work satisfaction maintain a consistently positive relationship regardless of personality type. This suggests that maintaining psychological boundaries might be a broadly beneficial approach to enhancing work satisfaction.

In addition, consistent with Judge et al. (2001) study, the absence of notable differences between organizational environments indicates that psychological factors at the individual level might influence boundary management and work satisfaction more than structural organizational elements.

Implications

The findings carry substantial theoretical and practical implications. By approving perspectives rooted in trait-based approaches and boundary theory, the study contributes to the growing field of research examining the work-life interface and the management of boundaries. It indicates that PBM can predict work satisfaction independently, even though personality factors are associated with tendencies in boundary management.

In practice, companies may benefit from implementing workshops, training programs, or guidelines that help employees develop effective border management strategies. No matter the personality types of employees, interventions focused on enhancing work-life balance, managing stress, and regulating emotions may lead to higher overall job satisfaction. Managers should also recognize that promoting mental health support and independence can enhance employees' capacity to effectively balance their work and personal lives.

Limitations

Although the study has several strengths, it also has a number of weaknesses. The ability to draw causal conclusions is limited by the cross-sectional design. It cannot be determined from the observed associations whether effective boundary management leads to greater job satisfaction or if job satisfaction contributes to better boundary management. Second, relying heavily on self-report measures can introduce social desirability effects and common method bias. Third, although the sample size ($N = 137$) was adequate, the findings may have limited generalizability, as they might not effectively represent broader occupational groups or different cultural settings. Moreover, parametric interpretations could be slightly affected by the non-normality observed in some personality traits, even when skewness levels are within acceptable ranges.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should explore the causal links between psychological boundary management and work satisfaction using experimental or longitudinal methods. Investigating potential mediators such as emotional exhaustion, work-family conflict, or perceived autonomy could offer additional insight into the underlying mechanisms.

Moreover, examining other moderators such as business culture, leadership approach, remote work setups, or job expectations might reveal contextual factors that the current study overlooked. The research's generalizability could be enhanced by expanding it to various industries and cultural settings. Using qualitative methods can also offer more in-depth understanding of how employees perceive and apply boundary management in their everyday work-life contexts.

References

1. Agho, A. O., Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1992). Discriminant validity of measures of job satisfaction, positive affectivity and negative affectivity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65(3), 185–195. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1992.tb00496.x>
2. Allen, T. D., Cho, E., & Meier, L. L. (2014). Work–Family boundary dynamics. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 99–121. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091330>
3. Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a Day’s Work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472–491. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3363315>
4. Barnett, R., & Brennan, R. (1997). Change in job conditions, change in psychological distress, and gender: A longitudinal study of dual-earner couples. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 253–274.
5. Basile, K. A., & Beauregard, T. A. (2020). Boundary Management: Getting the Work-Home balance right. In Springer eBooks (pp. 35–46). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60283-3_3
6. Binnewies, C., Haun, V. C., Törk, J., Brauner, C., & Haun, S. (2020). The effects of Boundary Management Strategies on Employees’ Recovery and Well-Being. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2020(1), 17134. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2020.17134abstract>
7. Boccoli, G., Tims, M., Gastaldi, L., & Corso, M. (2024). The psychological experience of flexibility in the workplace: How psychological job control and boundary control profiles relate to the wellbeing of flexible workers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 155, 104059. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2024.104059>
8. Campbell, D. (2024, June 17). Hybrid working makes employees happier, healthier and more productive, study shows. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/business/article/2024/jun/16/hybrid-working-makes-employees-happier-healthier-and-more-productive-study-shows>
9. Choi, Y. E., Cho, E., Jung, H. J., & Sohn, Y. W. (2017). Calling as a Predictor of Life Satisfaction: The Roles of Psychological Capital, Work–Family Enrichment, and Boundary Management Strategy. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 26(4), 567–582. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072717723092> (Original work published 2018)
10. Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53, 747–770.
11. Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). The Five-Factor model of personality and its relevance to personality disorders. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 6(4), 343–359. <https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.1992.6.4.343>
12. Daniel, S., & Sonnentag, S. (2015). Crossing the borders: the relationship between boundary management, work–family enrichment and job satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(4), 407–426. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1020826>
13. Eby, L., Casper, W., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980–2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66, 124–197.

14. Eng, I., Tjernberg, M., & Champoux-Larsson, M.-F. (2024). Hybrid workers describe aspects that promote effectiveness, work engagement, work-life balance, and health. *Cogent Psychology*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2024.2362535>
15. Farivar, F., Eshraghian, F., Hafezieh, N., & Cheng, D. (2024). Constant connectivity and boundary management behaviors: The role of human agency. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 35(7), 1250–1282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2023.2271835>
16. Field, A.P. (2018) *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*. 5th Edition, Sage, Newbury Park.
17. Gardner, D. M., Lauricella, T., Ryan, A. M., Wadlington, P., & Elizondo, F. (2021). Managing boundaries between work and non-work domains: Personality and job characteristics and adopted style. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 94(1), 132–159. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12339>
18. Hall, D. T., & Richter, J. (1988). Balancing work life and home life: What can organizations do to help? *The Academy of Management Executive*, 3, 213–223.
19. Jex, S.M. and Britt, T.W. (2014) *Organizational Psychology: A Scientist-Practitioner Approach*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 706.
20. Jex, S. M., & Britt, T. W. (2008). *Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
21. Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376–407. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376>
22. Kang, W., & Malvaso, A. (2023). Associations between Personality Traits and Areas of Job Satisfaction: Pay, Work Itself, Security, and Hours Worked. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(6), 445. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13060445>
23. Kossek, E. E., Ruderman, M. N., Braddy, P. W., & Hannum, K. M. (2012). Work–nonwork boundary management profiles: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81(1), 112–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.04.003>
24. McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (2008). The five-factor theory of personality. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 159–181). The Guilford Press.
25. McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist*, 52(5), 509–516. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.52.5.509>
26. Meng, Y., Li, H., Qu, Y., & Yu, G. (2025). Work–Family Boundary Fit and Employee Well-Being: The Mediating Role of Work–Family Conflict. *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(8), 1122. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15081122>
27. Nippert Eng, C. (1996). *Home and work: Negotiating boundaries through everyday life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
28. Oseghale, O. R., Pepple, D., Brookes, M., Lee, A., Alaka, H., Nyantakyiwaa, A., & Mokhtar, A. (2024). Covid-19, working from home and work–life boundaries: the role of personality in work–life boundary management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 35(21), 3556–3592. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2024.2422013>
29. Premchandran, R., & Priyadarshi, P. (2018). Do boundary preferences, work-family self-efficacy and proactive personality predict job satisfaction? The mediating role of work-family enrichment.

Evidence-based HRM a Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship, 7(2), 198–212.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/ebhrm-07-2018-0042>

30. Rammstedt, B. (2007). The 10-Item Big Five inventory. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 23(3), 193–201. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.23.3.193>
31. Rammstedt, B. (2007). The 10-item Big Five Inventory: Norm values and investigation of sociodemographic effects based on a German population representative sample. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 23(3), 193–201. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.23.3.193>
32. Rammstedt, B., & John, O. P. (2007). Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41(1), 203–212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2006.02.001>
33. Rothbard, N., Phillips, K., & Dumas, T. (2005). Managing multiple roles: Work–family policies and individuals' desires for segmentation. *Organization Science*, 16, 243–258.
34. Simply Psychology. (2025, March 20). Big 5 Personality Traits: The 5-Factor Model of Personality. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/big-five-personality.html>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT

RESEARCH SUBJECT INFORMATION SHEET

This informed consent form is for the participants, who have been invited to participate in research on the title “The Influence of Psychological Boundary Management on Work Satisfaction: The Moderating Role of Personality Traits Among Working Professionals”.

NAME OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR & DEPARTMENT: Sarah Divyapreethi, Department of Psychology

RESEARCH SUPERVISOR: Ms. Lakshmi Priya E.

NAME OF ORGANIZATION: Kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous)

I am Sarah Divyapreethi, studying as a postgraduate student in the Department of Psychology at Kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous), Bangalore. I am researching the influence of Psychological Boundary Management on Work Satisfaction: The Moderating Role of Personality Traits Among Working Professionals. I will give you adequate information and invite you to be a part of this research. You can decide whether or not you will participate in the research. Before you decide, please feel comfortable talking to me about the research.

This consent form may contain words that you do not understand. Please ask me to stop as we go through the information and I will take time to explain. If you have questions later, you can ask them, I will be providing my contact details for the same.

Purpose of the research:

To examine the influence of psychological boundary management on work satisfaction and to determine the moderating role of personality traits among working professionals.

For demographic factors:

- Age, Gender and socio-economic status.

You are being invited to take part in this research because we feel that your responses will aid as a very important tool to help us identify the factual details of the concerned experiment.

Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. It is your choice whether to participate or not. The choice that you make will have no bearing on your role here. You may change your mind later and stop participating even if you agreed earlier.

The information recorded is confidential, your name will not be included in the data collected, and no one else except me and my supervisor will have access to the form. Nothing that you share today or with me will be made public with anybody outside the research, and nothing will be attributed to you by name.

Participation in this study does not pose any risks. There will be no direct benefit to you, but your participation will help us identify the factual details of the concerned experiment.

I am now available to answer any questions.

If you have any questions, you would like to ask later, you may contact me at

Email ID:

24mpsy50@kristuyayanti, Department of Psychology

This research proposal has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Psychology that includes the research scholar and the supervisor at Kristu Jayanti College (Autonomous), Bangalore the rights of the research participants are protected.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) - 1977

Response Format

1 = Very dissatisfied

2 = Dissatisfied

3 = Neutral

4 = Satisfied

5 = Very Satisfied

Items:

On my present job, this is how I feel about

1. Being able to keep busy all the time
2. The chance to work alone on the job
3. The chance to do different things from time to time
4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community
5. The way my boss handles his/her workers
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions
7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience
8. The way my job provides for steady employment
9. The chance to do things for other people
10. The chance to tell people what to do
11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities
12. The way company policies are put into practice
13. My pay and the amount of work I do
14. The chances for advancement on this job
15. The freedom to use my own judgment
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job
17. The working conditions
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other
19. The praise I get for doing a good job
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job

Work–Life Indicator – Kossek et al. (2012)

Response Format

- 1 = Strongly disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly agree

Items:

1. I take care of personal or family needs during work.
2. I respond to personal communications (e.g., emails, texts, and phone calls) during work.
3. I do not think about my family, friends, or personal interests while working so I can focus. (R)
4. When I work from home, I handle personal or family responsibilities during work.
5. I monitor personal-related communications (e.g., emails, texts, and phone calls) when I am working.
6. I regularly bring work home.
7. I respond to work-related communications (e.g., emails, texts, and phone calls) during my personal time away from work.
8. I work during my vacations.
9. I allow work to interrupt me when I spend time with my family or friends.
10. I usually bring work materials with me when I attend personal or family activities.
11. I control whether I am able to keep my work and personal life separate.
12. I control whether I have clear boundaries between my work and personal life.
13. I control whether I combine my work and personal life activities throughout the day.
14. People see me as highly focused on my work.
15. I invest a large part of myself in my work.
16. People see me as highly focused on my family.
17. I invest a large part of myself in my family life.

(R) Reverse-scored items

Big Five Inventory-10 (BFI-10) - Rammstedt et al. (2007)

Response Format

1 = Disagree strongly

2 = Disagree a little

3 = Neither agree nor disagree

4 = Agree a little

5 = Agree strongly

Items:

I see myself as someone who ...

1. ... is reserved
2. ... is generally trusting
3. ... tends to be lazy
4. ... is relaxed, handles stress well
5. ... has few artistic interests
6. ... is outgoing, sociable
7. ... tends to find fault with others
8. ... does a thorough job
9. ... gets nervous easily
10. ... has an active imagination

Scoring the BFI-10 scales (R = item is reverse-scored):

- Extraversion: 1R, 5
- Agreeableness: 2, 7R
- Conscientiousness: 3R, 8
- Neuroticism: 4R, 9
- Openness to Experience: 5R, 10

DATA SET

ID	Organizational Settings	PBM	WS	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness
1	1	3	74	68	4	3.5	2.5	2.5
2	2	3	74	61	3	3	4	2.5
3	3	2	78	58	2.5	4	3	4
4	4	1	91	75	1	2.5	3	1
5	5	1	81	67	3.5	4.5	3	2
6	6	3	58	53	1.5	5	3.5	3
7	7	1	73	59	2.5	5	3	5
8	8	3	79	64	2.5	4	3	2.5
9	9	1	57	56	4	4.5	2.5	3
10	10	1	89	56	3.5	4	4	2
11	11	1	69	56	3.5	3	2.5	3.5
12	12	1	75	63	2.5	4	3.5	3
13	13	1	55	62	2.5	4	4.5	3
14	14	1	73	50	3	3	2.5	4.5
15	15	2	61	58	4	2	3.5	2
16	16	1	74	59	5	5	5	1.5
17	17	1	78	70	3	4.5	3.5	2.5
18	18	1	94	71	3	5	4.5	1.5
19	19	1	70	60	3.5	4.5	4.5	4
20	20	1	79	54	2.5	3.5	2	2
21	21	1	83	70	3.5	3.5	2.5	4
22	22	3	72	55	3	3	2.5	4
23	23	3	61	68	3	3	3	3
24	24	3	88	58	4	5	4.5	2
25	25	3	87	76	3.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
26	26	1	26	41	4	5	5	3.5
27	27	1	60	57	2.5	5	4	2.5
28	28	1	79	58	4	4	4	2
29	29	1	67	50	3	3.5	2	3.5
30	29	1	67	50	3	3.5	2	3.5