

Spring 6-14-2019

## **What Boundaries? Work-Family Boundary Management Style and the Impact on Black Entrepreneurs' Satisfaction and Well-Being**

Amber S.C. Rouse  
DePaul University, ASCJSU@GMAIL.COM

Follow this and additional works at: [https://via.library.depaul.edu/csh\\_etd](https://via.library.depaul.edu/csh_etd)



Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Rouse, Amber S.C., "What Boundaries? Work-Family Boundary Management Style and the Impact on Black Entrepreneurs' Satisfaction and Well-Being" (2019). *College of Science and Health Theses and Dissertations*. 290.

[https://via.library.depaul.edu/csh\\_etd/290](https://via.library.depaul.edu/csh_etd/290)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Science and Health at Digital Commons@DePaul. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Science and Health Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@DePaul. For more information, please contact [digitalservices@depaul.edu](mailto:digitalservices@depaul.edu).

What Boundaries? Work-Family Boundary  
Management Style and the Impact on Black  
Entrepreneurs' Satisfaction and Well-Being

A Dissertation

Presented in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The Department of Psychology

DePaul University

By

Amber S. C. Rouse

June 12, 2019

**Dissertation Committee**

Alice F. Stuhlmacher, Ph.D., Chairperson

Suzanne Bell, Ph.D.

Bernadette Sanchez, Ph.D.

Alyssa Westring, Ph.D.

Suzanne Fogel, Ph.D.

## Acknowledgements

To my advisor, Dr. Alice Stuhlmacher, I am so thankful for your guidance and mentorship over the last six years. You have helped me to become an organizational scholar and I am forever indebted to you for all of the time, patience, and assistance you have given me during my time at DePaul. I would also like to thank Dr. Suzanne Bell, Dr. Bernadette Sanchez, Dr. Alyssa Westring, and Dr. Suzanne Fogel for your insight and constructive feedback over the course of this project and for agreeing to serve on my dissertation committee. It is truly an honor to have worked with such distinguished faculty members. To my parents, there are not enough words to describe how grateful I am for all of the love and support you have given me over the years that served as the foundation for this accomplishment. Mom, your personal drive and academic excellence helped me to understand the value of education and paved the way for the genesis and completion of this work. Dad, your hard work and diligence showed me how to remain persistence in the pursuit of my goals, in spite of any adversity. To you both, I may never truly understand all of the sacrifices you have made for me, but I thank God daily for blessing me with amazing parents who helped to guarantee my success. To my friends and family, thank you for always being my personal cheerleaders. Your encouragement and support over the years has given me many boosts of energy along this journey. To my best friend since first grade, Jaleesa, thank you for always believing in me and encouraging me as your “smart friend”. Your friendship and support have been invaluable. To my husband, thank you for all that you have done to motivate, encourage and support me during this journey. From my decision to pursue my doctorate during college to its completion, you have been a constant reminder of God’s purpose and heart for me. I am forever thankful that our paths crossed almost nine years ago. Finally, I

honor and thank my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ for the completion of this chapter. For “He who began a good work in you will bring it to completion...”.

## **Biography**

The author was born in Chicago, Illinois, April 27, 1991. She graduated from Gwendolyn Brooks College Preparatory Academy in Chicago, in 2009 and received her Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology, graduating magna cum laude from Jackson State University in Jackson, Mississippi in 2013. She received her Master of Arts degree in Industrial Organizational Psychology from DePaul University in 2016.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Biography.....	iv
List of Tables .....	vii
List of Figures.....	viii
Abstract.....	1
Introduction.....	2
Work–Family Interface.....	4
The Negative Side of the Work Family Interface.....	5
Work-family conflict. ....	5
The Positive Side of the Work-Family Interface .....	7
Work-family balance. ....	9
Boundary Management.....	10
Border Theory.....	12
Boundary Theory .....	15
Boundary Strength and the Segmentation-Integration Continuum.....	18
Boundary Management Profiles .....	22
The Process of Entrepreneurship .....	25
The Context of Entrepreneurship.....	30
Entrepreneurship and Boundary Management.....	33
Work-Family Balance of Minority Entrepreneurs .....	34
Boundary Management Profiles and Work and Family Outcomes .....	35

Rationale .....	39
Hypotheses .....	40
Method .....	41
Results .....	48
Exploratory Analyses .....	59
Discussion .....	60
References .....	73
Appendix A. Participant Email .....	89
Appendix B. Debriefing Statement .....	91
Appendix C. Work–Life indicator (Boundary Management Characteristics Scale) .....	93
Appendix D. Work-Family Balance Satisfaction Scale .....	95
Appendix E. Work-Family Balance Effectiveness Scale .....	96
Appendix F. Career Satisfaction Scale .....	97
Appendix G. Life Satisfaction Scale .....	98
Appendix H. Social Support Scale .....	99
Appendix I. Implicit Negotiation Beliefs .....	101
Appendix J. Demographic Information .....	102
Appendix K. Key Themes and Representative Statements (Open Ended Question 1) .....	109
Appendix L. Key Themes and Representative Statements (Open Ended Question 2) .....	110
Appendix M. Key Themes and Representative Statements (Open Ended Question 3) .....	111



### List of Tables

Table 1. Participant Demographic Information .....	42
Table 2. Means, standard deviations and correlations of major study variables .....	51
Table 3. Description of clusters .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 4. Psychological characteristics of boundary management profiles ..	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Table 5. ANOVA Post Hoc Comparisons of Profiles and Work Family Balance Effectiveness .	55
Table 6. ANOVA Post Hoc Comparisons of Profiles and Career Satisfaction .....	56
Table 7. Demographics of clusters.....	57
Table 8. Multiple Regression Analyses of Social Support Predicting Career Satisfaction .....	58
Table 9. Multiple Regression Analyses of Social Support Predicting Life Satisfaction .....	59

**List of Figures**

Figure 1. Mean Differences by Cluster Membership.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

## **Abstract**

The appeal and interest in entrepreneurship as a viable career alternative has grown significantly in recent years. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the total number of U.S. firms has increased by 2%, from 27.1 million in 2007 to 27.6 million in 2012 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016). Further, the number of minority-owned firms in the U.S. has risen from 5.8 million in 2007 to 8.0 million in 2012. One perspective for the recent rise in entrepreneurship is that individuals may turn to self-employment to gain greater autonomy in how they manage the boundaries between their work and family lives. Boundary management is defined as the strategy an individual uses to delineate and adjust the boundaries between their work and family roles (Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, & Hannum, 2012). However, few studies have examined the boundary management styles and experiences of work-family balance among minority entrepreneurs. Therefore, the goal of this study was to examine the linkage between boundary management preferences on several work and family outcomes. Data were collected from 126 Black entrepreneurs. Cluster analysis indicated that these entrepreneurs grouped into five distinct boundary management profiles, with significant differences between profiles on work family balance effectiveness and career satisfaction.

## Introduction

Much about the context of work is changing. Once highly bureaucratic and structured organizations are beginning to shift to amorphous organizational structures. Further, technological changes including advancements in artificial intelligence and machine learning have led to significant shifts in how work is accomplished. For example, where employees choose to complete their work has shifted drastically with the increase in organizations who provide flexible work arrangements to their employees, (e.g., such as flextime, telecommuting, compressed work weeks). These organizational policies help to provide increased options to help employees more effectively manage both their work and nonwork roles.

Relatedly, there has also been a rise in entrepreneurship. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the total number of U.S. firms has increased by 2%, from 27.1 million in 2007 to 27.6 million in 2012 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016). Further, the number of minority-owned firms in the U.S. has risen from 5.8 million in 2007 to 8.0 million in 2012. This includes a 34.5 percent rise in the number of Black or African American-owned firms, from 1.9 million to 2.6 million. The number of Hispanic-owned firms over this period also increased to 46.3 percent, from 2.3 million to 3.3 million. Finally, the number of Asian-owned firms climbed from 1.5 million to 1.9 million, an increase of 23.8 percent.

Entrepreneurship has a significant role not only in the innovation process, but in the continued development and advancement of the economy and society through the creation of jobs (van Praag & Versloot, 2007). As entrepreneurship rises, individuals have also begun to communicate an increased desire to discover ways to manage and balance their work and nonwork roles (Bulger, Matthews, & Hoffman, 2007; Byron, 2005; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005; Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, & Hannum, 2012). Further, self-help

books, business periodicals and the associated press have begun to focus more attention on the relationship between work and family. In 2018, Jeff Bezos, CEO of Amazon is cited saying that work life balance is a ‘debilitating phrase’ and implies a strict tradeoff. He further discusses the philosophy that work and family are inherently linked. Similarly, in 2012, Anne Slaughter published an article titled, “Why Women Can’t Have It All”, in which she explores the challenges many women face in navigating between work and family (Slaughter, 2012). These viewpoints support the idea that individuals make many critical decisions about how to structure the boundaries between their work and home lives. For example, some individuals prefer to combine aspects of work and family, while others prefer to separate their work and family lives. Over several decades, organizational researchers have studied the work-family interface, examining its impact across a number of work and family variables including work family conflict, job satisfaction and psychological well-being (Byron, 2005). Further, previous research has increased our understanding of the work-family interface as well as developed prescriptions to aid individuals in their pursuit of determining effective strategies to ameliorate experiences of work-family conflict (Byron, 2005; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Individuals have turned to entrepreneurship in attempts to gain autonomy in the management of their work and family domains (Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk, & Beutell, 1996).

One stream of literature that illuminates how individuals employ different strategies in their attempts to effectively manage the roles and expectations of the work and family domains is boundary management. Boundary management is defined as the strategy an individual uses to delineate and adjust the boundaries between their work and nonwork roles (Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, & Hannum, 2012). Therefore, the goal of this study was to examine the effects of boundary management preferences on the work family balance and well-being of Black

entrepreneurs. Thus, the current study is organized into three core sections. First, a review of the work-family interface, including the positive and negative outcomes associated with the work-family domain is presented. Second, the theoretical frameworks of border and boundary theory are reviewed. These theories present the underlying theoretical underpinnings for how individuals manage the boundaries between their work and family. Third, an overview of the entrepreneurial context and its related outcomes within minority entrepreneurs is discussed. Finally, a discussion of boundary management profiles and their relationship to important work and family outcomes such as work family balance satisfaction and work family balance effectiveness, career satisfaction and life satisfaction is presented. Taken together, the current study aims to provide a starting point for a discussion of the experiences of Black entrepreneurs, their boundary management preferences and its impact on their quality of life.

### **Work–Family Interface**

There has been a proliferation of reviews, both qualitative and quantitative in the work-family literature. These reviews have greatly advanced the understanding of how work and family roles differ and intersect. Further, these reviews have helped scholars to more clearly define, theorize and measure aspects of the work and family domains (Byron, 2005; Eby et al., 2005). Much of the early work examining the work-family interface focused on the conflict that individuals experience as they enact both their work and family roles. For example, work stressors such as job involvement, schedule inflexibility, and job stress have been related to more increased experiences of work-to-family conflict (Byron, 2005; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992). However, in recent years, researchers have shifted towards gaining a deeper understanding of the concept of work-family balance, which explains how individuals negotiate and manage the role expectations within each domain. This study focused on the positive side of work-family

interface, examining work family balance satisfaction and work family balance effectiveness. However, to identify how and where this concept fits into the nomological network of the work and non-work literature, there must be a discussion of the concepts related to work-family balance including work-family conflict and work-family enrichment as well as how they differ despite their relatedness.

### **The Negative Side of the Work Family Interface**

**Work-family conflict.** Much of the early work in the work family literature centers around the idea of inter-role conflict (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Work-family conflict has been defined as a form of this type of conflict, in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect, such that the demands of one role make performance in another role more difficult (Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996). That is, participation in the work role is made more difficult by participation in the family role (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p. 77). Additionally, the concept of work family conflict has evolved over time. Work family conflict was initially conceptualized as a unidimensional construct, taking the perspective that conflict occurred only when work interfered with family (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). However, more recently, researchers have acknowledged the bidirectionality of this construct. That is, work to family conflict occurs when the demands of work spillover into the family domain. In contrast, family to work conflict occurs when the demands of the home domain interfere with demands of the work sphere. Both directions of work–family conflict have been found to be associated with work-related outcomes, such as low levels of job satisfaction (e.g., Perrewe, Hochwarter, & Kiewitz, 1999), organizational citizenship behavior (e.g., Netemeyer, Maxham, & Pullig, 2005) and organizational commitment (e.g., Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005). This is compared to high

levels of intention to quit (e.g., Shaffer, Harrison, Gilley, & Luk, 2001), burnout (e.g., Peeters, Montgomery, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2005), absenteeism (e.g., Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1999), and work-related strain (e.g., Netemeyer, Brashear-Alejandro, & Boles, 2004). Work-family conflict has also been correlated with family-related outcomes, such as low marital and family satisfaction (e.g., Cardenas, Major, & Bernas, 2004; Voydanoff, 2005), and high family-related strain (e.g., Swanson & Power, 1999).

The initial conceptualization of work-family conflict by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) identifies three forms of conflict including time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, and behavior-based conflict. Time based conflict occurs when the time pressures of one role cause interference in the fulfillment of role expectations in the other role. Strain based conflict occurs when experiences of strain or fatigue in one role impact role performance in the other role. Lastly, behavior-based conflict occurs when the behavioral expectations of one role are incompatible with the expectations of the other role. In a study conducted by Greenhaus and colleagues (2008), the authors adopted a person-environment fit perspective in determining the influence of boundary management on work-family conflict and positive spillover, exploring the level of congruence between individuals' segmentation preferences in the work and family domain. Results indicated that time-based and strain-based work family conflict were negatively related to segmentation preference congruence between domains. That is, when an individual's segmentation preferences were met, they experienced less time based and strain-based conflict. This suggests that different aspects of conflict (e.g., time-based conflict and strain-based conflict) may have differential impacts on experiences between and within the work and family domains.



## **The Positive Side of the Work-Family Interface**

In recent years, the positive impact of combining work and family roles has been identified within the work-family literature (Frone, 2003; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; McNall, Nicklin, & Masuda, 2010). Concepts such as work-family enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), positive spillover (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000), work-family facilitation (Grzywacz & Butler, 2005), and work-family balance (Casper, Vaziri, Wayne, DeHauw, & Greenhaus, 2018) describe the positive aspects of the interaction between work and family roles. Positive spillover is defined as the ‘transfer of characteristics from one domain to the other domain, resulting in similarities between the two domains’ (Hanson, Hammer, & Colton, 2006, p.250). Positive spillover can be further broken down into four type of spillover including affect, values, skills, and behavior. For example, affective positive spillover is expressed when there is congruence between the individual’s needs and the organization’s resources, such that when the work environment effectively supplies the individual with the resources they need, individuals experience more positive affect at work, which can spillover into positive affect in the family domain. Consequently, when the congruence between the organization’s resources and the individual’s needs is low, the individual may experience greater negative affect at work, which can further spillover into the family domain (Chen, Powell, & Greenhaus, 2009; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Instrumental or behavioral spillover occurs when positive work-related behaviors are transferred into the family domain, either directly or indirectly through the pattern of generally established behaviors (e.g., habits or scripts). Further, positive work behaviors may transfer to the family domain, particularly when the skill requirements of the work domain are similar to the skills required in the family domain (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Chen and colleagues (2009) found a positive relationship between work-to-family instrumental positive

spillover and the congruence between segmentation preferences, such that when an individual's segmentation preferences are honored in their work environment, additional resources spillover into the family domain and "apply" to improving their interactions with others in the family domain. Other researchers have also noted how constructs such as positive spillover and facilitation can be categorized under work–family enrichment (Carlson, Grzywacz, & Zivnuska, 2009; Hanson et al., 2006); thus, enrichment appears to be the most inclusive construct. Work family enrichment is defined as the degree to which experiences in one role improves the quality of life experienced in the other role (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

Greenhaus and Powell (2006) suggest several factors that impact work family enrichment. First, work and family experiences can have positive effects on well-being. For example, when individuals hold multiple high quality roles, they report experiencing higher physical and psychological well-being (Perry-Jenkins, Repetti, & Crouter, 2000). Second, participating in multiple roles can have a buffering effect on experiencing distress across domains. For example, Barnett and colleagues (1992) found that the negative relationship between family stressors and well-being was lower for individuals who reported higher job satisfaction. Further, this moderating effect is suggested to operate because of the ability to distribute the total distress among multiple roles. Finally, positive role experiences in one domain can create positive experiences and outcomes in the other role domain. For example, peoples' experiences as a parent in the family domain, particularly in handling disputes between siblings may help them to be a more effective mediator between employee disputes as a manager in the work domain. Additionally, previous studies have found that work-family enrichment and work-family conflict are distinct, independent constructs (Frone, 2003). Similar to work–family conflict, enrichment is bidirectional in nature. That is, benefits can be derived from work and

applied to family [(i.e., work-to-family enrichment (WFE)] or derived from family and applied to work [(i.e., family-to-work enrichment (FWE), with stronger effects found for work-to-family enrichment (Frone, 2003).

**Work-family balance.** Despite widespread use in the work-family literature, work-family balance remains an underdeveloped concept. Since the early 2000s, several conceptual definitions of balance have been used to describe work-family balance (Clark, 2000; Frone, 2003; Greenhaus, Ziegert, & Allen, 2012; Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007; Valcour, 2007). Work-family balance has been historically conceptualized as the level of intensity and frequency in which individuals experience work to family or family to work interference (Byron, 2005; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Other definitions of work-family balance have emerged as well. Greenhaus, Collins, and Shaw (2003) define work-family balance as the degree to which individuals are equally engaged and satisfied with their work and family roles. Drawing from person-environment fit theory, Voydanoff (2005) define work-family balance as “a global assessment that work resources meet family demands, and family resources meet work demands, such that participation is effective in both domains” (p. 825). Recently, Greenhaus and Allen (2011) define work-family balance as the level of compatibility between an individual’s life priorities and their satisfaction and effectiveness in work and family roles. However, Grzywacz and Carlson (2007) raise several issues with these previous conceptualizations. For example, the authors suggest that there is limited support for the idea that individuals view work-family balance as a result of how well domain relevant resources satisfy the demands of the work and family domains. Further, Grzywacz and Carlson (2007) suggest that satisfaction and effectiveness should be decoupled in defining work-family balance as individuals may have a level of satisfaction that differs from their level of perceived effectiveness. Work-family

satisfaction focuses globally on an individual's perceptions of their work-family balance, whereas work-family effectiveness involves an appraisal of how an individual and his/her role partners perceived their work-family balance. For example, an individual may report a high degree of work-family balance satisfaction but may report low work-family balance effectiveness. Therefore, work family balance is defined as 'the accomplishment of role-related expectations that are negotiated and shared between an individual and his/her role-related partners in the work and family domains (Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007, p. 458). Taking this into consideration, the current research examined both work-family balance satisfaction and work-family balance effectiveness, as an individual's experiences may differ across these concepts. Carlson and colleagues (2009) developed a measure of work-family balance effectiveness and provided evidence of the concept's discriminant validity from work-family conflict and work-family enrichment. Specifically, work-family balance explained unique variance above and beyond both work-family conflict and work-family enrichment. They also found that work-family balance was related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, family satisfaction, family performance, and family functioning, suggesting that work-family balance is related to both work and nonwork related outcomes.

### **Boundary Management**

In addition to scholarly research on the multiplicity of roles individuals hold, empirical research also investigates the characteristics of boundaries individuals place around each role domain (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000; Bulger, Matthews, & Hoffman, 2007; Clark, 2000; Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, & Hannum, 2012; Nippert-Eng, 1996). Much of this body of research has focused on the amount of conflict between work and family roles. Role conflict has been reported to negatively impact both individual and organizational outcomes, including life

satisfaction (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998), job satisfaction (Netemeyer et al., 1996), organizational commitment (Aryee et al., 2005), and other stress outcomes such as psychological stress, strain, and well-being (Frone et al., 1992). Also, research focuses on the possible benefits of managing roles to include the idea of positive spillover (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000) and work-family facilitation (Grzywacz & Butler, 2005). Marks and MacDermid (1996) discuss the management multiple roles, including both positive role balance and negative role balance. Positive role balance is “the tendency to become fully engaged in the performance of every role in one’s total role system, to approach every typical role and role partner with an attitude of attentiveness and care” (p. 421). Conversely, negative role balance is the propensity to become fully disengaged in the performance of every role. Furthermore, Marks and MacDermid (1996) examined the relationship between role strain and role balance, finding that some individuals reported experiencing both little to no strain in balancing multiple roles, while others experiencing role strain. This suggests that depending on how individuals actively organize roles and decide how roles are constructed, this mental organization will either positively or negatively impact their role balance (e.g., work-family balance). This seminal concept is supported by Nippert-Eng (1996), who conducted a case study of employees in a large organization. In this study, she describes the classification process that individuals use to construct and define the boundaries around their work and personal lives. She describes ‘boundary work’ as the strategies, principles and practices that individuals use to create, maintain, and modify socio-cognitive borders. Individuals vary along a continuum, which ranges from “integration” to “segmentation”. At one end of the continuum is integration, where no clear distinction exists between the home and work domain (e.g., when and where they are engaged). At the integration end of the continuum, no

conceptual boundary separates the tasks, responsibilities and meanings between what is expected behavior in the home domain and alternately what is expected in the work domain. All the factors that an individual would usually associate (e.g., tasks, obligations) with each domain is intertwined and understood as having no distinction. That is, when someone has fully integrated their work and family life, they do not clearly distinguish what aspects belong to the work domain and what aspects belong to the family domain. For example, an individual at the extreme end of integration would view all time and space as being multi-purposed and they would be characterized as individuals who almost always engage in multitasking (Bulger et al., 2007).

This, however, is a stark contrast to the segmentation end of the boundary management continuum, in which individuals clearly separate the aspects of the home and work domains. Here, the mental boundary between domains is clear (e.g., no physical or temporal overlap) and there is distinction between the characteristics of each sphere. Someone at the farthest end of the segmentation continuum is likely to create two distinct mental frameworks that guide their behavior. For example, an individual at this end of the continuum, symbolically alternates between their home and work selves, depending on his or her location and the demands of the respective domain. Adding to this initial work, Clark (2000) and Ashforth and colleagues (2000) propose theories, border theory and boundary theory, respectively, that relate to both the borders and boundaries that individuals define between domains. Both suggest that to understand the nature of the work-family interface, there must first be an understanding of how individuals manage the boundaries around their work and families.

### **Border Theory**

In addition to the idea that two distinct spheres exist, Clark (2000) identifies the core concept of borders, which shape the domain of relevant behaviors that are expected to be found within

each domain. As an extension of the groundwork laid by Nippert-Eng (1996), Clark (2000) identifies propositions about how both individuals manage and negotiate the borders between the work and family domain, including the nature and strength of the borders between work and family as well as other characteristics that influence the ability to balance work and family. The central concepts of border theory include 1) the work and home domains, 2) the borders between work and home, 3) border-crosser, and 4) border-keepers and other important domain members (Clark, 2000). A central tenet of this theory is that family and work are two distinct spheres that are interconnected, which ultimately influence each other. The extent to which the work and family sphere influence each other is determined by several key concepts, including permeability, flexibility, and blending. Work and home can be characterized as two distinct domains, which represent two worlds, each with its own set of rules, thought patterns and behaviors (Clark, 2000).

Borders define the lines that divide the beginning and end of what are characterized as domain relevant behaviors in each sphere. Three types of borders exist: physical, temporal, and psychological borders. Physical borders define the space and parameters of each domain. For example, the walls of a home or the walls of an office space define the where of domain-relevant behaviors. Temporal borders define when work is accomplished as opposed to when familial responsibilities are taken care of. An example of a temporal border is the number of hours set for work versus the number of hours set for time spent with an individual's family. Finally, psychological borders describe the emotional response and thought patterns that are determined to be appropriate in one domain but not the other. A psychological border in the home domain may include the greeting of one's spouse with a hug or kiss, however in the work domain this would be viewed as a less appropriate response.

Border theory suggests that the borders between work and home are characterized by four factors: degree of permeability, flexibility, blending, and border strength (Clark, 2000). Border permeability is the degree to which elements from the one domain (e.g., work) may enter the other domain (e.g., family) (Hall & Richter, 1988). Additionally, the valence of border permeation may be either positive or negative, depending on an individual's perceptions and preferences. For example, the doors and walls of an individual's home office may serve as a physical border around the designated space for their work. However, the permeability of this border may vary greatly based on the patterns of domain-relevant behaviors established. For example, an individual with a highly permeable border may experience frequent instances of family members entering their home office and having conversations intermittently throughout the day because of the permeability of the borders between the work and home domain. High border permeability may cause both positive and negative spillover (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). The spillover of attitudes and emotions is an example of psychological border permeation (Clark, 2000). Both negative and positive emotions can spillover. As previously defined, negative spillover is the negative impact of participation in one domain (e.g., work) on the participation in the other domain (e.g., family) (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Frone, 2003).

Another key characteristic of border theory is border flexibility. Flexibility is defined as the degree of contraction or expansion of a border based on the demands of the active domain (Hall & Richter, 1988). This border quality is typically expressed through the physical and temporal location of work. An example of a highly flexible physical border occurs when an individual may work in any location (e.g., their home or work office) compared to an individual whose border is less flexible, who may only work in one location (e.g., only in their home office or work office). Relatedly, the temporal border separating the work and family is flexible when



individuals who can decide the number of hours they work (e.g., shortened or a compressed work day) compared to individuals who must meet a specific daily requirement of the number of hours worked (e.g., a worker who must record their work entrance and exit time). Finally, border flexibility is also expressed as a psychological border. When the border is less flexible, individuals limit the thoughts, emotions, and ideas that flow between domains. Conversely, when a border is more flexible, individuals move more fluidly between the thoughts, ideas and emotions of the work and family domain. When permeability and flexibility are considered collectively, blending is said to occur when there is a high level of both characteristics. When there is high flexibility and permeability, the area around each domain border begins to meld together, blending the work and family domains as they can no longer be exclusively expressed as one domain or the other (Clark, 2000). For example, an individual who has the option to telecommute to work may take work-related calls in the morning while dropping their child off to daycare. Psychological blending occurs when individuals use their knowledge or personal experience from one domain to enhance their experience in the other domain. Finally, border strength is the total of a border's permeability, flexibility and blending characteristics. Taken together, when a domain border is similar, weak borders will facilitate work/family balance. However, when a domain border is different, strong borders facilitate work/family balance.

### **Boundary Theory**

As a complement to border theory, Ashforth and colleagues (2000) examine the influence of role transitions within and between domains as a key concept in developing our understanding of boundary management. Like border theory, boundary theory examines the interrelationships between role identity, role boundaries and the role segmentation integration continuum. Specifically, boundary theory argues that roles have defining characteristics (e.g., goals, beliefs,

norms, interaction styles) that specify the parameters that shape the identity of that role.

Additionally, each role is associated with a specific domain (e.g., work, home or other places), which create a role boundary around the circumference of each domain. That is, individuals build “mental fences” around social aspects including their ideas, thoughts, and geographic locations based on associations, to create and maintain order in their environment (Ashforth et al., 2000).

Roles are then able to be arranged along a continuum, varying from high segmentation to high integration. High segmentation involves high contrast between role identities as well as inflexible and impermeable role boundaries. In contrast, high integration consists of low contrast between roles that have both flexible and permeable boundaries. Segmentation and integration influence the degree of role blurring, ultimately impacting the magnitude of change between roles (e.g., role transitions). For example, when the segmentation between roles is high, (e.g., individuals separate the work and family roles), role blurring decreases as the role identities associated with each domain are more removed from each other. However, because these role identities are highly separated, the magnitude of change between roles increases, creating increased difficulty in transitioning from one role to the other.

Role changes (e.g., an exit from one role and entry into another) are identified by established patterns, (e.g., personal and collective rites of passages) that signal the transition in roles to the individual and other members of his or her role set(s). Alternatively, when the integration between roles is high (e.g., individuals combine the work and family roles), role blurring increases as the boundaries between the work and family domain become less permeable. This increased permeability decreases the magnitude of change between roles, subsequently leading to less difficulty in role transitions.

Matthews, Barnes-Farrell, and Bulger (2010) extend the definition of flexibility further to include both flexibility ability and flexibility willingness. Generally, boundary flexibility is defined as the degree to which an individual has the capacity to contract or expand a domain boundary in response to the demands from another domain (Ashforth et al., 2000; Clark, 2000). That is, boundary flexibility is typically viewed in terms of an individual's belief in their ability to change the location and timing of domain-relevant activities (Ashforth et al., 2000; Clark, 2000). Flexibility ability involves the cognitive appraisal of situational characteristics that impact an individual's ability to enter and exit domains (Matthews et al., 2010). Flexibility ability is the degree to which individuals perceive they can move easily between domains. An individual's perception of their flexibility ability is also impacted by the level of perceived control held by others such as a third party (e.g., organizational policies and norms) or by other contextual factors. This suggests that flexibility ability is less about an assessment of personal capabilities and more so about a personal evaluation of one's direct control. Extending this logic, in an entrepreneurial context, certain industries or business types will impact an individual's flexibility ability. For example, an entrepreneur who owns a construction business may have less flexibility ability (e.g., safety regulations) than an entrepreneur who owns an e-commerce website for a product-based business. Flexibility ability influences integration through the creation of increased opportunities to leave the domain. For example, flexibility ability is high when an individual perceives either limited external factors influencing their ability to leave the domain (e.g., child care responsibilities) or factors that allow the individual to leave the domain (e.g., a supportive spouse).

Flexibility willingness, however, is related to an individual's preference or motivation towards segmentation or integration. Flexibility willingness is a motivationally oriented

individual difference variable that contributes to actual levels of movement between domains (Matthews et al., 2010). Thus, flexibility willingness goes beyond the individual's ability to flex their domain boundaries and is related to their degree of willingness to do so. For example, as an entrepreneur, someone may have the ability to be more flexible with the boundaries between my work and family domains (e.g., high autonomy), but may prefer to have more structured boundaries (i.e., less willing to utilize the ability to be flexible). Empirical evidence indicates that flexibility ability and flexibility willingness are related but distinct constructs (Matthews, Barnes-Farrell, & Bulger, 2010).

Both border theory (Clark, 2000) and boundary theory (Ashforth et al., 2000) propose the idea that boundaries are typically examined in terms of their flexibility and their permeability. The flexibility and permeability of boundaries, in turn defines the strength of the boundary and characterizes the strategies that individuals engage in to manage the boundaries between their work and family domains (Nippert-Eng, 1996; Ashforth et al., 2000; Clark, 2000).

### **Boundary Strength and the Segmentation-Integration Continuum**

Kossek and colleagues (2012) extends the boundary management literature by further defining the psychological characteristics that influence our understanding of the diversity in boundary management approaches as well as how these boundary characteristics relate to work and family outcomes. Specifically, the authors examined the relationship between three core aspects of boundary management theory including cross-role interruption behaviors, identity centrality of work and family roles, and perceived boundary control.

One core aspect of boundary management involves an individual's boundary crossing preferences. Specifically, individuals vary in the degree of boundary crossing they prefer.

Boundary crossing can be further characterized as the amount of intrusions or interruptions that

occur from one domain to another (Ashforth et al., 2000; Clark, 2000). Some individuals prefer to minimize boundary crossings (e.g., the number of interruptions) by separating their work and family roles. For example, an individual who prefers to segment their work and family roles and to decrease the number of interruptions between domains, may only answer work emails on a designated computer or during a specific time of the work day. However, an individual who prefers to integrate their work and family roles may decide to add their work email to their phone so that they are more readily able to answer work-related emails while in the family domain.

Specifically, cross-role interruptions behaviors describe the experiences of the interruptions of one role to the role behaviors of the other domain. As boundary theory suggests, the boundaries between the work and non-work domain are “socially constructed” by individuals. Over time people begin to develop preferences for the strength of the boundaries between domains along the segmentation integration continuum. Boundaries that fall most closely to the segmentation end of the continuum are characterized as allowing for limited cross-interruptions. For instance, in situations where an individual’s boundaries are highly permeable, family members may be more accustomed to entering the entrepreneur’s home office location. Depending on the strength of an entrepreneur’s boundaries, the valence of these permeations may be viewed as either positive or negative. For some entrepreneurs, a highly permeable boundary may serve as a positive reminder of their work autonomy and flexibility. In contrast, more permeable boundaries may allow for the spillover of negative emotions from one domain to the other (Clark, 2000).

The second characteristic of boundary management is the identity centrality of work and family roles. The concept of identity centrality is rooted in role identity theory (Burke & Reitzes, 1991). A role is defined as the expected pattern of behaviors associated with members of a social

system (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Relatedly, identities are derived from the meaning that individuals ascribe to themselves in their enactment and/or occupation of the role. This definition is also comprised of the meanings that others ascribe to the role as well. This suggests that identities are related, in part, to the individual's self-concept of the role in question (Stryker, 1968; Stryker & Burke, 2000). Furthermore, identities are composed of three core characteristics. First, identities are social products that are formed, maintained, and confirmed through the following process. The self-concept is formed in the naming or locating of the self in socially recognized categories (e.g., husband, wife, employee, entrepreneur). After the self-concept is formed, it is then validated by others begin to interact with the individual in terms of these categories. These identities (e.g., self-concepts) then are confirmed and validated by engaging in self-presentation to negotiate and confirm the meanings and behavioral implications of the social categories (Burke, 1991; Burke & Reitzes, 1981, 1991). In addition to social products, identities are also self-meanings that are organized hierarchically and formed in particular situations (Burke, 1991; Burke & Reitzes, 1981, 1991). Thus, the meanings ascribed to an identity are acquired in specific situations and are based on the similarities and differences of a role in relation to its counter roles (Burke, 1991; Burke & Reitzes, 1981, 1991). Lastly, identities are symbolic and reflective, which means that one's identity is known and understood by one's interaction with others. From this logic, role centrality describes the relative value that individual's places on his or her different identities, connected further to the degree of time and energy invested in the role (Thoits, 1991). Generally, domain centrality refers to the degree to which an individual defines his or her self-concept in regard to a specific domain (Matthew, Barnes-Farrell, & Bulger, 2010). In the work-family context, work identity centrality refers to the salience of one's occupational career, such as an individual's identification as a professor at a university, a manager of a law

firm or a CEO of a start-up company. Conversely, family identity centrality is the extent to which individuals identify themselves based on characteristics of the family role. For example, someone may identify themselves as a daughter, wife and mother. The relative importance of each identity (e.g., work and family identity) will also vary depending on which identity the individual chooses to prioritize. Some individuals may have a more work centric identity, in which they prioritize the needs and demands of the work domain over the needs of the family domain. In contrast, individuals may have a more family centric identity, whereby they will prioritize the needs and demands of the family domain above those of the work domain (Kossek et al., 2012). Additionally, it is also plausible that an individual may express dual centrality, in which the individual prioritizes both work and family similarly (i.e., they view their work and family with equal identity salience (Lobel & St. Clair, 1991). Lastly, there may be individuals who exhibit low levels of both work and family centrality. For example, the roles enacted by these individuals may be viewed as being outside of the prototypical work or family realms such as athletes, church, or community volunteers (Kossek et al., 2012).

Perceived boundary control is the third characteristic of the boundary management typology. Perceived boundary control refers to the amount of control individuals have over boundary crossing between each domain (Kossek et al., 2012). Further, perceived boundary control is a psychological interpretation of the perceived control over one's boundary environment such that individuals may vary significantly in their level of perceived boundary control. Individuals who report high perceived boundary control believe that they are able to control the level of cross-role interruptions they experience, in terms of frequency, timing and direction to fit their role identities. For example, a single male entrepreneur may view himself as having both the ability and willingness to control (e.g., flex) the amount of cross-role

interruptions between the work and family domain. In contrast, a married female entrepreneur with young children may view herself as having lower perceived control of the amount of cross-role interruptions she experiences between domains (Matthews et al., 2010). Additionally, previous research has found that within an organization, the level of autonomy allowed in when, where, and how work was done was a stronger predictor of work-family conflict than formal boundary management policies (e.g., teleworking) (Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006).

Thus, these three boundary management characteristics (e.g., cross-role interruption behaviors, identity centrality and perceived boundary control), allowing researchers to take a person-centered approach to identify and examine the different styles of boundary management that may emerge (Kossek et al., 2012).

### **Boundary Management Profiles**

As an extension of boundary theory, different styles or preferences for the development of boundaries between work and family have been examined in the literature. Thus, boundary management is defined as the general approach that an individual uses to define and control the boundaries between their work and family roles (Ashforth et al., 2000; Bulger, Matthews, & Hoffman, 2007; Kossek & Lautsch, 2008). An individual's boundary management preferences are typically arranged along the separation integration continuum, with certain points denoting the boundary characteristics that an individual is likely to enact (Bulger et al., 2007).

Specifically, several studies have found support for several boundary management profiles, ranging between three to six profiles types (Bulger et al., 2007; Kossek & Lautsch, 2012; Kossek et al., 2012). For example, Kossek & Lautsch (2007) identify three main boundary management styles including, 1) the separation of work and family/personal life, 2) the integration of work



and family/personal life, and 3) a hybrid approach (e.g., alternating between separation and integration).

Bulger and colleagues (2007) utilized cluster analysis to determine the nature, strength and number of boundary management styles along the separation integration continuum. Boundary strength measures included flexibility ability, flexibility willingness, and permeability of both the work domain and family/personal life domain. The authors identified four clusters, varying from cluster 1 (integrators) to cluster 4 (work integrators/personal life segmenters). Individuals in cluster 1 consisted of integrators, those with high flexibility willingness and ability to flex the boundaries between the work and family domain as well as high permeability between domain boundaries. This cluster is the furthest left along the integration-segmentation continuum, suggesting that individuals who fall into this cluster have the highest desire to integrate their work and family roles. Cluster 2 individuals reported high flexibility ability and willingness to flex their work domain boundary, but lower work permeability. Individuals in cluster 2 also reported lower willingness to flex and allow permeation of their family/personal life domain, making these individuals difficult to place on the continuum as they somewhat integrate the work domain and somewhat segment the family/personal life domain. Cluster 3 included individuals who reported median scores on the boundary strength measures. Compared to cluster 1 and 2, these individuals fall in the middle of the segmentation-integration continuum, showing that these individuals may prefer to segment their work and family/personal lives in certain contexts but will have a desire to integrate in others. Individuals in cluster 4 reported high flexibility ability and flexibility willingness of the work domain boundary but reported low flexibility ability and willingness of the personal life domain boundary. Although, individuals in cluster 4 did not meet the criteria for being placed on the extreme end of the segmentation

integration continuum, they had the strongest segmentation preferences of the four groups (Bulger et al., 2007). Additionally, demographic differences were found between clusters. For example, Cluster 1 consisted of a little less than 50% woman as compared almost 75% women in Cluster 4, suggesting that women may prefer more segmented work and family/personal life boundaries than their male counterparts. Members of Cluster 1 had an average of approximately seven years work experience, whereas members of Cluster 4 had an average of a little less than five years of job experience. Those in Cluster 1 may have greater flexibility ability, as correlated with their number of years on the job, which in turn, may lead to higher integration of their work and family/personal life roles. Also, members of Cluster 2 who reported relatively neutral boundary preferences had the lowest percentage of children at home under the age of 18. Taken together, these findings suggest that demographic factors can significantly impact boundary management groupings.

Kossek and colleagues (2012) identified six boundary management profile clusters, and labeled these work warriors, overwhelmed reactors, family guardians, fusion lovers, dividers, and nonwork-eclectics. Work warriors included individuals with high work centrality, low boundary control and asymmetry between interruption behaviors, with high work to nonwork interruptions. Overwhelmed reactors were individuals who reported dual centrality, low boundary control and high work and nonwork interruption behaviors. Family guardians reported dual centrality, high boundary control and asymmetry between interruption behaviors, with high nonwork to work interruptions. Those individuals who report asymmetric behaviors, experienced more interruptions from nonwork to work. Fusion lovers reported high boundary control, dual centrality, and high levels of interruption behaviors in both directions, suggesting that they prefer integration of the work and family domain. Dividers included individuals with high boundary

control, dual centrality and low mean levels of interruption behaviors in both directions, suggesting that they prefer segmentation of the work and family domain. Finally, nonwork eclectics reported high boundary control, high integration behaviors, however they are characterized as other-centric (e.g., high work centrality as well as low family centrality).

Individuals who fall into this cluster view their primary identity as being outside of the work and family domain. For example, these individuals may be athletes, hobbyists, community or church volunteers.

The authors found that boundary management profiles differentially related to outcomes, including intentions to turnover, work-schedule fit, psychological distress, time adequacy and engagement (Kossek et al., 2012). Those who reported low boundary control (e.g., overwhelmed reactors and work warriors) experienced more negative work-family outcomes than high control profiles. This suggests that an individual's perceived level of boundary control over their environment will impact their experiences of work-family balance satisfaction and related outcomes (e.g., career satisfaction, psychological well-being). Further, these studies highlight the complexity within boundary management preferences and validate the examination of diverse boundary configurations. Given these findings, the current study proposed that different combinations of boundary profiles may also exist among entrepreneurs.

### **The Process of Entrepreneurship**

The field of entrepreneurship research emerges from an interdisciplinary approach including research from economics, strategy, and personality literature (Mitchell et al., 2002). Each perspective provides unique contributions to the understanding of the process of entrepreneurship. From an economic approach, entrepreneurship is one of the central vehicles for the creation of jobs as well as societal and economic advancement (Frese & Gielnik, 2014). Past

research in this area has focused on how entrepreneurship is defined, with emphasis on when entrepreneurship occurs and on the outcomes of new business creation (e.g., firm performance, sales and profit) (Ezzedeen & Zikic, 2017; Unger, Rauch, Frese, & Rosenbusch, 2011).

However, the economic perspective of entrepreneurship is limited in empirical exploration of theoretical propositions and does not account for how individuals enter the field of entrepreneurship (Bull & Willard, 1993; Eckhardt & Shane, 2003; Mitchell et al., 2002).

Another perspective of entrepreneurship stems from the strategy literature and has focused on the dynamics between the characteristics of the entrepreneur and the performance of the business venture. However, limited research in this area has successfully linked firm performance with an entrepreneur's individual characteristics (Mitchell et al., 2002). Much of the research in this area has been defined by the importance of linking mechanisms between strategic management and entrepreneurship, however limited empirical support has been found for this approach (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). One exception, however, is a study by Herron (1990) that found a positive relationship between entrepreneurial skill, skill propensity, and new venture performance.

The dominant stream of literature in entrepreneurship stems from a personality or trait-based perspective, which argues that personality characteristics are the defining aspects of new enterprise formation (Frese & Gielnik, 2014; McClelland, 1965). For example, individuals who were less risk averse were suggested to be more likely to become entrepreneurs as compared to individuals who were more likely to avoid highly uncertain and risky environments (Kihlstrom & Laffont, 1979). Recently, researchers have moved again towards a conceptualization of entrepreneurship that takes an individual's characteristics into account (Frese & Gielnik, 2014; Rauch & Frese, 2007). The empirical research findings in this area, however, has been mixed.

Some reviews have identified a positive relationship between personality traits, business creation, and business success (Cooper, Folta, Gimeno-Gascon, & Woo, 1992; Rauch & Frese, 2007), whereas earlier narrative reviews found no relationship (Gartner, 1985; Low & MacMillan, 1988). However, among a sample of entrepreneurs and managers, Zhao and Seibert (2006) found meta-analytic evidence for a relationship between the five-factor model of personality and new business creation. Entrepreneurs reported higher levels of conscientiousness and openness to experience than managers, whereas entrepreneurs reported lower levels of neuroticism and agreeableness (Zhao & Seibert, 2006).

Additionally, recent meta analytic evidence supports the relationship between personality characteristics in entrepreneurial research, particularly when specific traits are matched to task-related outcomes. That is, entrepreneurial tasks will be more strongly related to personality traits that map onto those tasks. For example, self-efficacy, need for achievement, need for autonomy, proactive personality, and stress tolerance were also positively correlated with business creation and business success (Rauch & Frese, 2007). Additionally, a small, positive relationship was found between entrepreneur's openness to experience and subsequent business performance (Hao Zhao, Seibert, & Lumpkin, 2010). These findings suggest that although, personality characteristics do not tell the complete story, there is support for the influence of personality on business creation and success.

This study defines entrepreneurship as “the process of the discovery, evaluation, and exploitation of profitable opportunities” (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000, p. 218). An entrepreneur then is an individual who engages in a process of discovering, evaluating, and capitalizing on opportunities in the market for the development of products, goods, or services. Low and MacMillan (1988) discuss the importance of taking an integrated approach to the study of

entrepreneurship which considers the entrepreneurial process, context, and outcomes in developing the theoretical understanding of entrepreneurial success. Relatedly, in alignment with this definition, the process by which entrepreneurs progress from the initial detection of profitable opportunities to a successful, established enterprise involves several phases. Therefore, the process of entrepreneurship is considered to have (at minimum) three phases: the prelaunch or opportunity identification phase, the launch or development and execution phase, and the post launch phase (Frese & Gielnik, 2014). In the first phase, an individual identifies a worthwhile and feasible business opportunity. In the second phase, the entrepreneur begins to gather the necessary resources to begin the business venture. Finally, in the third phase, the entrepreneur begins to manage and grow the new venture to a place of sustainability and viability in the market of interest (Baron, 2007; Frese & Gielnik, 2014). Consequently, each phase of this founding process is characterized by several concerns.

First, the budding entrepreneur must have an awareness of the existence of entrepreneurial opportunities. Carson (1982) defines entrepreneurial opportunities as ‘situations in which new goods, services, raw materials, and organizing methods can be introduced and sold at greater than their cost of production’. Once the entrepreneur is made aware of the existence of entrepreneurial opportunities, the individual must then identify the specific opportunity that they believe that they can exploit. During this phase, entrepreneurs must acquire a variety of resources to begin to develop their business. Specifically, nascent entrepreneurs must gather three types of resources: human capital, financial capital, and social capital resources (Aldrich & Martinez, 2001). Human capital resources include the knowledge, skills and abilities individuals must obtain to effectively develop their business idea. Human capital resources can be gathered from previous work experience, formal education, and informal research. Financial capital is also

necessary as entrepreneurs will need to acquire a variety of inputs (labor, raw materials, information, etc.) to produce their goods or services. Lastly, social capital is necessary for entrepreneurs to develop social connections to gain access to additional information, knowledge, financial capital and other resources that they do not possess (Aldrich & Martinez, 2001). This phase may be characterized by high levels of uncertainty as individuals may have difficulty in obtaining access to both breadth and depth of these three resources, causing significant barriers to entry. For example, obtaining financial capital and developing a diverse social network may prove to be difficult for some entrepreneurs.

Once the entrepreneur has identified the opportunity and gathered sufficient resources, the entrepreneur must decide how to exploit the entrepreneurial opportunity that they have discovered. It is during this phase that the individual can now launch their business venture. During this phase, however, individuals must deal with environmental factors that influence their ability to achieve market sustainability. Environmental factors can significantly influence the survival of business ventures. One such factor is population density. Population density refers to the number of organizations in a population, including the population's size and mass (Aldrich & Martinez, 2001). For example, in high density populations, entrepreneurs may experience more difficulty in establishing their business due to high levels of competition. However, high density populations, also provide nascent entrepreneurs with more opportunities to develop deeper knowledge of market trends and networking opportunities (Aldrich & Martinez, 2001). In the final phase of the entrepreneurial process, once the business venture has fully launched, the entrepreneur must continue to sustain the business, leading to its establishment as a full enterprise. However, many of the above-mentioned factors may impact when and if a business

will have long term viability. Therefore, it is important to examine the contextual factors that influence the entrepreneurial process.

### **The Context of Entrepreneurship**

In addition to the process entrepreneurs must navigate, there has been a significant rise in the general interest in entrepreneurship. Recently, more individuals have decided to take on the responsibility of building a business independently as compared to the engaging in the traditional model of employment. In traditional organizations, employees enter a psychological contract with their employers to provide organizational loyalty in exchange for job security. This work context in many ways greatly differs from the context of entrepreneurship. Previous research cites the desire for autonomy and flexibility as a reason that individuals launch out into the world of entrepreneurship (Parasuraman & Simmers, 2001). In this study, the authors examined the relationship between work family characteristics, work-family, and psychological well-being among individuals who are both self-employed and organizationally employed. Results found that compared to organizationally employed individuals, those who were self-employed experienced greater autonomy, flexibility, and psychological involvement in the work role (Parasuraman & Simmers, 2001). Additionally, the authors found that self-employed individuals experienced higher levels of job satisfaction than individuals who worked within organizations (Parasuraman & Simmers, 2001). Taken together, this suggests that experiences of conflict between the work and family roles may be expressed in an individual's desire to leave the organization and in turn, some individuals may view entrepreneurship as a possible solution to their experiences of high work family conflict, low job satisfaction, and low psychological well-being.



The entrepreneurial context is characterized as having high uncertainty and rapid change (Ezzedeen & Zikic, 2017; Parasuraman et al., 1996). Specifically, entrepreneurs are likely to experience work overload and higher levels of personal responsibility for others in founding and operating new ventures, which can lead to high levels of stress (Baron, Franklin, & Hmieleski, 2016). In a recent study, Baron and colleagues examined the relationship between psychological capital, perceived stress and life satisfaction (as measured via subjective well-being) among entrepreneurs. Results showed that an entrepreneur's level of psychological capital (e.g., a combination of self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience) is negatively related to their experiences of subjective well-being as mediated by perceived stress. This suggests that an entrepreneur's life satisfaction is directly impacted by their level of psychological capital resources, which ultimately impacts their levels of stress. These results indicate that the negative consequences for work-to-family conflict are vast and can have significant implications on an individual's psychological health.

Another difference between the traditional work context and the entrepreneurial work context is related to how work roles are defined. For example, within traditional organizations, the tasks and responsibilities of a role are identified within the overall structure of the organization. Further, in most organizations, guidelines are outlined typically in the form of a formal job description. However, for an entrepreneur, tasks, roles and responsibilities may or may not be clearly outlined. The entrepreneur, particularly in the beginning stages of the venture must have multiple competencies, as they are likely not to have a team or department to delegate responsibilities among. For example, if an entrepreneur has limited financial resources, they may not have the option to dispense work to others, leading to a greater workload for the entrepreneur

as compared to an individual who can delegate roles and responsibilities among other team members or individuals within the organization.

The entrepreneurial work context and the traditional work context also differ in the level of autonomy experienced. Autonomy is defined as the amount of freedom, independence and discretion in the procedures for how work is conducted and how work-related activities are scheduled (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Further, autonomy is related to an individual's feelings of personal responsibility for work outcomes. In a traditional organization, a job with high autonomy allows an employee increased decision-making latitude in how they complete and schedule their work. For example, an employee with a highly autonomous job within a traditional organization (e.g., an office manager) would be able to decide when to complete certain tasks throughout the day (e.g., responding to emails or developing a presentation). Conversely, a job with low autonomy would have more prescribed task requirements that require strict adherence to the job procedures (e.g., plant assembly worker). Autonomy can be increased through adjustments in job design. For example, job crafting allows individuals to modify aspects of their jobs to improve the fit between the characteristics of the job and their own needs, abilities, and preferences (Berg, Wrzesniewski, & Dutton, 2010). However, the level of autonomy an employee can experience will cap at the level of autonomy the organization is willing and able to provide. In contrast, entrepreneurs have significant flexibility in how they schedule and conduct work-related tasks. As compared to a traditional organization, the highest levels of autonomy are given to top level management (e.g., CEO and other members of the board of directors). However, entrepreneurs are their own bosses, which provides significant autonomy, particularly in privately held organizations. As such, entrepreneurs cite the need for

autonomy as a chief motivator in starting their own businesses (Ezzedeen & Zikic, 2017; Parasuraman & Simmers, 2001).

### **Entrepreneurship and Boundary Management**

Limited research has examined the relationship between boundary management preferences and entrepreneurship. One exception, however, is a recent review by Ezzedeen and Zikic (2017), which explored several research questions related to contextual factors that impact an entrepreneur's boundary management strategies and their perceptions of work life balance. In their review, the authors discussed key differentiators of entrepreneurial careers from the more traditional careers of organizational employees. Additionally, the role of an entrepreneur can be described as boundaryless, that is, the context of entrepreneurship provides high levels of flexibility and permeability. High flexibility and permeability create the potential for both conflict and balance. For example, the "flexible-resource perspective" holds that role blurring serves as a resource that allows individuals to deal with conflicting demands, helping them to avoid or minimize work family conflict or to aid the transition between roles (Ashforth et al., 2000). As an entrepreneur, individuals have the agency to determine their work schedules, which allows them to make necessary adjustments to accommodate family and nonwork responsibilities (Ezzedeen & Zikic, 2017).

Conversely, the "greedy-role perspective" suggests that blurring the boundaries between roles may increase the likelihood that the expectations and responsibilities of work will have a negative spillover into the nonwork domain, leading to increased work family conflict (Ashforth et al., 2000; Glavin & Schieman, 2012). Entrepreneurs have increased work pressures as they are responsible for establishing, growing and maintaining their new business ventures. In a qualitative study conducted by Blair-Loy (2009), the results indicated that stockbrokers who

worked for brokerage firms that provided schedule flexibility experienced greater levels of work-family conflict than brokers who worked for firms that provided less schedule flexibility.

### **Work-Family Balance of Minority Entrepreneurs**

Despite the pervasive research on the work family interface, there is a general scarcity of research particularly within the context of examining the work life balance of racial and ethnic minorities (Casper, Eby, Bordeaux, Lockwood, & Lambert, 2007). Although limited, previous research has examined factors that influence the experiences of minority entrepreneurs. Canedo and colleagues (2014) provide a theoretical model of individual factors that affect entrepreneurs in the Hispanic community. Using Baron and Henry's (2010) existing model of entrepreneurship, the authors posit that several unique factors such as their cultural values, skill levels, and social networks will influence the motivation, opportunity recognition, and resource acquisition for Hispanic entrepreneurs. For example, within the Hispanic community, individuals have been found to have strong ethnic identities which are tied closely to their cultural values.

Subsequently, these strong kinship ties lead to the creation of business ventures that are directly related to their communities of origin (Dana, 2007). Additionally, family members play a significant role in the business development process such that many individuals seek the counsel of members of their family rather than seeking professional advice (Dana, 2007). This implies that distinct factors may influence the experiences of minority entrepreneurs and suggests that a “one size fits all model” of entrepreneurship may not explain unique factors for diverse populations.

Puryear and colleagues (2008) examined both demographic and business characteristics of minority entrepreneurs (e.g., African-American, Korean-American, and Mexican-American) as compared to non-minority entrepreneurs including age, gender, health-status, education and

years in the United States. For example, female owned businesses were more prevalent across all three minority groups than for White-owned businesses. One reason suggested for this difference is that, traditionally, minority women have played a more centralized role in contributing financially to the well-being of their families and business ownership is one vehicle that provides this opportunity (Purveyar et al., 2008). Additionally, Heilman and Chen (2003) posit that women and minorities may decide to take the leap into entrepreneurship as a response to a lack of opportunities for career advancement in corporate America. These experiences may “push” these individuals out of organizations and attract them to entrepreneurship as an alternate route to both personal and professional success. Taken together, it is predicted that unique demographic and business factors will influence the different configurations of boundary management approaches among Black entrepreneurs.

### **Boundary Management Profiles and Work and Family Outcomes**

Boundary management preferences may affect entrepreneurs’ work and family related outcomes. For example, achieving work-life balance for entrepreneurs may present significant challenges as the work context of entrepreneurship requires greater depths of independent responsibility for the success of the business (Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk, & Beutell, 1996). As an entrepreneur, the individual is responsible for securing and maintaining their clients and/or customer base. This heightened level of responsibility may lead to more extreme, nonnegotiable, and on-call schedules (Winn, 2004). Additionally, if entrepreneurs are solely responsible for this endeavor, although they may have boundary management preferences (e.g., preference for segmentation or integration), the entrepreneur may be constrained by their stage in the business venture development. This can thus impact both their level of work-family balance satisfaction and effectiveness.

Previous research has related work-family balance satisfaction to work family balance effectiveness, suggesting that work-family balance is comprised of both aspects of satisfaction and effectiveness. However, it is recommended that each construct be measured separately (Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007). First, an individual's boundary management preference may differentially impact their work-family balance satisfaction such that individuals will be satisfied to the degree that their boundary preferences are honored. Individuals may prefer to segment their work and family roles, however, their ability to flex their domain boundaries will be affected by the constraints placed on the individual by norms, rules, or others in that domain. For example, the "others" (e.g., spouses or children) in the family domain may infringe on their preferences by the frequency and intensity of their cross-role interruptions. If the individual experiences more cross-role interruptions than aligns with their boundary management preferences, they may report lower work-family balance satisfaction than individuals who experience less cross-role interruptions (Bulger et al., 2007; Clark, 2000; Kossek et al., 2012; Valcour, 2007). In the same way, boundary management preferences may influence an individual's perceptions of their work-family balance effectiveness. For example, entrepreneurs who have high boundary control may report higher levels of work-family balance effectiveness as high control over their environment may be viewed as a significant factor directly influencing their level of effectiveness. However, entrepreneurs experiencing lower boundary control, may be more likely to report lower levels of work-family balance effectiveness. Parasuraman and colleagues (1996) argue that businesses that are client centered may involve more scheduling conflicts, which can increase work-role pressures, subsequently reducing the amount of time available for the family domain. For example, the industry's work scheduling norms may influence the level of flexibility an entrepreneur can sustain. Nationwide studies indicate that

women-owned businesses tend to be concentrated in the retail and personal services industries (e.g., Survey of Business Owners). The retail industry is well known for its prescribed and inflexible hours of operation. Although the personal services industry may offer greater autonomy over work schedules, it is clearly client centered in nature. Thus, for example, an entrepreneur who has their own construction company will have higher constraints on their work schedule flexibility as their hours will be impacted by environmental factors (e.g., weather conditions) than an entrepreneur in the beauty industry who may have more flexibility to schedule their clients (e.g., during nights and/or weekends).

Relatedly, entrepreneurs may experience varying levels of career satisfaction across the spectrum of boundary management preferences. The level of career satisfaction among entrepreneurs will be influenced by the alignment between their role identities. Entrepreneurs who report high work centrality will subsequently report high career satisfaction as there is less role contrast between the work role and the family role. Specifically, the entrepreneur defines for themselves what they view as successful for their business based on their own vision and mission which will inherently be more aligned with their family role as aspects of their life and family experiences will impact the development of their business. For an entrepreneur, the development of a new business is highly labor intensive, however, entrepreneurs may be more deeply invested in the success of the business endeavor because of this. Subsequently, entrepreneurs are likely to view their work as a career, rather than a job, leading to higher career satisfaction.

Similar to how an individual's boundary management preferences can impact their experiences of work-family balance satisfaction, effectiveness, and career satisfaction, these preferences can also impact outcomes in the family domain. Specifically, nonwork related outcomes such as life satisfaction, social support, and psychological well-being may be impacted

by how individuals manage the demands of the work and family domain. For example, the role of social support has also been explored as a buffer against negative work-family outcomes (Carlson & Perrewe, 1999; Kossek, Pichler, Bodner, & Hammer, 2011). Generally, this research has found a negative relationship between informal social support, both at home and work, and work-family conflict (Kossek et al., 2011). Social support has also been positively related to outcomes such as job satisfaction (Parasuraman, Greenhaus, & Granrose, 1992), sleep quality and quantity (Crain et al., 2014), and mental health (Lee, Sudom, & Zamorski, 2013). This highlights the importance of developing strong social support networks both at home and at work, as individuals may perceive fewer stressors in their organizational and family life.

Additionally, Kossek and Ozeki (1998) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction, life satisfaction and work-family conflict, finding a negative relationship between all forms of work-family conflict and both life and job satisfaction. Using a person-environment fit approach, Edwards and Rothbard (2000) explored the relationship between segmentation, work and family stress, and well-being. Their results indicated that when the boundaries between the work and family domains were more segmented than they desired, they experienced decreases in their well-being. For example, Kossek and colleagues (2012) found support for different boundary management clusters on several outcome measures including work-family conflict, family-work conflict, intention to turnover, work-schedule fit, psychological distress and time adequacy. The authors found that individuals who fell into low control clusters reported lower work-schedule fit and time adequacy and higher work-family conflict, family-work conflict, and psychological distress. This suggests that individuals who experience less boundary control may report lower levels of life satisfaction and psychological distress than individuals who report high levels of boundary control. Overall, this suggests that both work and family variables can



significant influence the work-family interface (Byron, 2005; Eby et al., 2005; Kossek et al., 2012).

### **Rationale**

Therefore, the current study sought to contribute to the understanding of work-family balance in several ways. First, a goal of the current study was to integrate the literature on the work-family interface and entrepreneurship, helping to expand our understanding of the full spectrum of work. Limited research exists that examines the experiences of work-family balance as it relates to the context of entrepreneurship. As a unique work context, the study of entrepreneurship and work-family balance help to broaden the scope of our understanding of the experiences of individuals whose work-family interactions may differ from individuals who work for traditional organizations. Additionally, among organizations that encourage the utilization of family-friendly work policies, the agency that entrepreneurship provides may have varying influences on individuals' experiences of work-family balance. Further, this study bridges the gap in the literature of the experiences of entrepreneurs but also takes it a step further to examine the relationship between work-family balance among minority entrepreneurship. Limited attention is often brought to the intersection of multiple identities (e.g., women and men who are minorities) and how their experiences may differ from those of their White counterparts. Therefore, it is the goal of the present study to focus on a subset of minority entrepreneurs (e.g., Black entrepreneurs) to provide insights into their unique experiences in managing the responsibilities of both work and family. Second, this study seeks to broaden our understanding of the operation of boundary management styles and its linkage to work and family outcomes. Most studies depict individuals as either work- or family-centric, overlooking that growing numbers of individuals may have configurations that are dual-centric (Kossek & Lautsch, 2008).

Therefore, the current research takes a person-centered approach that allows for a deeper examination of the unique boundary configurations of work and family boundary management that are expected to emerge within a unique work context (e.g., entrepreneurship) among Black entrepreneurs.

### **Hypotheses**

Hypothesis I. Black entrepreneurs will differentially cluster into distinct boundary management profiles with varying patterns of cross-role interruption behaviors, work and family identities, and perceived boundary control. Five specific profiles are expected:

- a) Work centric, high boundary control, and asymmetric interruption behaviors with high work to nonwork interruptions
- b) Family centric, high boundary control, and asymmetric interruption behaviors with high nonwork to work interruptions
- c) Dual centric, low boundary control, and symmetric interruption behaviors in both directions (e.g., high work to nonwork and high nonwork to work) (integration)
- d) Dual centric, high boundary control, and symmetric interruption behaviors in both directions (e.g., low work to nonwork and low nonwork to work) (separation)
- e) Dual centric, low boundary control, and asymmetric interruption behaviors with high work to nonwork interruptions

Hypothesis II. Profiles of Black entrepreneurs with high boundary control (e.g., profiles a, b & d) will experience higher work-family balance satisfaction than profiles of Black entrepreneurs with low boundary control (e.g., profiles c & e)

Hypothesis III. Profiles of Black entrepreneurs with high boundary control (e.g., profiles a, b & d) will experience higher work-family balance effectiveness than profiles of Black entrepreneurs with low boundary control (e.g., profiles c & e)

Hypothesis IV. Profiles of Black entrepreneurs with high boundary control (e.g., profiles a, b & d) will experience higher career satisfaction than profiles of Black entrepreneurs with low boundary control (e.g., profiles c & e)

Hypothesis V. Profiles of Black entrepreneurs with high boundary control (e.g., profiles a, b & d) will experience higher life satisfaction than profiles of Black entrepreneurs with low boundary control (e.g., profiles c & e)

Hypothesis VI. Profiles with non-traditional Black entrepreneurs (e.g., new/nascent, women, parents of young children) will report more negative work and family outcomes compared to traditional Black entrepreneurs (e.g., older/established, men, parents of older children and/or non-parents).

Research Question: What is the relationship between type of social support (e.g., spouse, friends, family, church/community) and well-being (as measured by career satisfaction and life satisfaction) for Black entrepreneurs?

## **Method**

### **Participants**

Data was collected from a total of 151 participants, however not all data were usable. Twenty-five cases were excluded due to participants either not answering key survey questions (e.g., racial identification, entrepreneurship status) or not completing all study measures. Participants for this study were recruited in several ways. First, participants were recruited through a variety of organizations and associations that provide access to minority

entrepreneurs. Examples of these organizations include the Chicago Urban League and the Minority Business Owner Association. Second, participants were also recruited by visiting local Black owned businesses in the Chicagoland area as well as networking events and conferences in Chicago that target Black entrepreneurs. Finally, recruitment for participation in this study involved snowball sampling in which the contact information of Black entrepreneurs (e.g., email addresses) was gathered from a variety of sources (e.g., personal contacts, LinkedIn) and these individuals were emailed directly with the link to the survey. There were 18 men and 103 women who participate in this study. Mean participant age was 36.4 years ( $SD = 8.96$ ). Average number of hours worked per week was 52.7 ( $SD = 19.69$ ). 63.9% (76) participants reported as being full time entrepreneurs. 36.1% (43) participants reported as being part time entrepreneurs. 39.7% (50) participants reported as being single. 33.3% (42) participants reported as being married. 11.9% (15) participants reported as living as married (e.g., in a long-term relationship). Average years in business was 5.06 ( $SD = 4.40$ ). 78.6% of participants (99) reported 1 person owning the business. Table 1 below presents full participant demographic information.

Table 1. *Participant Demographic Information*

Variable	N	% of sample
Sex	<b>121</b>	
Male	18	14.9
Female	103	85.1
Entrepreneur Status	<b>119</b>	
Full Time	76	63.9
Part Time	43	36.1
Business Structure	<b>126</b>	

Freelancer/independent contractor	12	9.5
General corporation	16	12.7
General partnership	3	2.4
Limited liability corporation (LLC)	58	46.0
Limited partnership	2	1.6
Not yet determined	5	4.0
Sole proprietorship	13	10.3
Sub-chapter S corporation	17	13.5
<b>Number of Business Owners</b>	<b>126</b>	
1 person	99	78.6
2 people	14	11.1
3 people	2	1.6
4 people	1	0.8
Business is owned by a parent company, estate, trust, or other entity	3	2.4
Don't know	6	4.8
<b>Education</b>	<b>126</b>	
Associate degree	5	4.0
Bachelor's degree	41	32.5
Doctorate or professional degree (e.g., JD, MD)	16	12.7
High school graduate - Diploma or GED	6	4.8
Less than high school graduate	1	0.8
Master's degree	42	33.3

Some college, but no degree	9	7.1
Technical, trade, or vocational school	5	4.0
<b>Relationship Status</b>	<b>126</b>	
Divorced	14	11.1
Living as married (e.g., in a long-term relationship)	15	11.9
Married	42	33.3
Single	50	39.7
Widowed	2	1.6
<b>Number of Children</b>	<b>121</b>	
Yes	65	53.7
No	56	46.3
<b>Region</b>	<b>126</b>	
Outside U.S.	1	0.8
U.S. - Midwest	47	37.3
U.S. - North	14	11.1
U.S. - South	54	42.9
U.S. - West	8	6.3
<b>Industry</b>	<b>126</b>	
Customer service	1	0.8
Finance	4	3.2
Health, education or social services	13	10.3
Insurance	1	0.8
Business consulting or service	38	30.2

Communications	7	5.6
Construction	3	2.4
Beauty or cosmetics	10	7.9
Other	28	22.2
Real estate	6	4.8
Restaurant, tavern, bar, or nightclub	2	1.6
Retail store	6	4.8
Transportation	1	0.8

---

*Note.* Percentages may not total to 100% due to rounding.

### **Procedure**

A survey was administered to all research participants via email. Respondents received an email invitation (Appendix A) to an online survey. The survey contains a brief introductory message, followed by measures of each variable of interest. Additionally, a marker variable (e.g., Implicit Negotiation Beliefs Scale) was included to assess the degree of common method variance (Kray & Haselhuhn, 2007; Lindell & Whitney, 2001; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2012). The survey concludes with demographic information and a debriefing statement (Appendix B), which discusses the purpose of the study and included further contact information for the principal investigator (PI). Additionally, participants who completed the survey in its entirety were eligible to win one of two \$100 VISA gift cards. After completing the survey, participants were redirected to a survey that collected their name and email address. Two winners were selected from those who completed the survey after all data were collected. The winners were selected using a random number generator (<https://www.random.org/>) that

identified the winners based on their participant identification numbers. The winners were contacted, and the gift cards were distributed electronically.

## Measures

**Boundary management characteristic measures.** Boundary management characteristics were measured using a modified version of the 17-item Work-Life Indicator Scale by Kossek and colleagues (2012) (See Appendix C). Participants were asked to indicate, on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), their level of nonwork interrupting work behaviors, work interrupting nonwork behaviors, boundary control, work identity and family identity. A sample item is, “When I work from home, I handle personal or family responsibilities while working.” Item 3 was reverse coded such that higher scores indicated a greater degree of nonwork interrupting work behaviors. For the purposes of the cluster analysis, subscales were created for each boundary management characteristic (e.g., nonwork interrupting work, work interrupting nonwork, boundary control, work identity and family identity). Alpha of each subscale were 0.77, 0.64, 0.82, 0.67, and 0.68, respectively. Please note that the subscales for work identity and family identity are both two item measures, which may explain the lower alpha levels.

**Work-family balance satisfaction.** Work-family balance satisfaction was assessed using a modified version of Valcour’s (2007) five-item satisfaction with work–family balance measure (See Appendix D). Respondents were asked to indicate, on a scale from (1) very dissatisfied to (5) very satisfied, their level of satisfaction with the following five items: “the way you divide your time between work and personal or family life,” “the way you divide your attention between work and home,” “how well your work life and your personal or family life fit together,” “your ability to balance the needs of your work with those of your personal or family



life,” and “the opportunity you have to perform your work well and yet be able to perform home-related duties adequately.” Responses were averaged to form an overall measure of work-family balance satisfaction. Alpha of the scale was 0.87.

**Work-family balance effectiveness.** Work-family balance effectiveness was measured using a modified version of the six-item work-family balance effectiveness scale developed by Carlson, Grzywacz, and Zivnuska (2009) (See Appendix E). Participants were asked to indicate, on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), their level of work-family balance effectiveness. A sample item is ‘I do a good job of meeting the role expectations of critical people in my work and family life.’ Responses were averaged to form an overall measure of work-family balance effectiveness. Alpha of the scale was 0.81.

**Career satisfaction.** Career satisfaction was assessed using a five-item Career Satisfaction scale developed by Parasuraman, Greenhaus, and Granrose (1992) (See Appendix F). Respondents were asked to indicate, on a scale from (1) very dissatisfied to (5) very satisfied, their level of satisfaction with their career progress and success. A sample item is ‘How satisfied are you with the progress you have made toward meeting your overall career goals?’ Responses were averaged to form an overall measure of career satisfaction. Alpha of the scale was 0.82.

**Life satisfaction.** Life satisfaction was measured using a modified version of the five-item Satisfaction with Life Scale developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985) (See Appendix G). Sample items include “In most ways, my life is close to my ideal” and “If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.” Responses were averaged to form an overall measure of life satisfaction. Alpha of the scale was 0.67.

**Social support.** Social support was measured using a modified version of the 16- item scale developed by Caplan, Cobb, French, Van Harrison, & Pinneau (1980) (See Appendix H).

Participants responded to questions related to their relationships with their spouse, family and friends, and people from their church or community on a scale of 1 (not at all) to 4 (very much). An example item is, “How easy is it to talk to each of the following people?” An aggregate measure of overall social support was also created by averaging across all sources of social support. Alpha for the measure of overall social support was 0.81. Subscales were also created for each source of social support (e.g., significant other, family, church and work). Alpha of each sub-scale were 0.97, 0.78, 0.91, and 0.89, respectively.

**Implicit negotiation beliefs.** Implicit negotiation beliefs were assessed using a seven-item measure developed by Kray and Haselhuhn (2007) (See Appendix I). Participants were asked to indicate, on a scale from 1 (very strongly agree) to 7 (very strongly disagree). An example item is, “Good negotiators are born that way.” Items was reverse coded such that higher scores indicated a stronger belief in the malleability of negotiation skills. This measure was included as a marker variable to measure and control common method bias (Lindell & Whitney, 2001; Podsakoff et al., 2012). Responses were averaged to form an overall measure of implicit negotiation beliefs. Alpha of the scale was 0.79.

**Demographics.** Participant background information (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, mean age, educational background, number of children) were collected using a demographic questionnaire. See Appendix J for the complete list of items.

## Results

As a first step, the data was checked to examine outliers, missing data, descriptive statistics, and reliability statistics for all study variables. Items that required reverse coding were recoded prior to analysis and an alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests. Reliability analyses on the sub-scales of the Work-Life Indicator (i.e., nonwork interrupting work behaviors,

work interrupting nonwork behaviors, boundary control, work identity and family identity), the work family balance satisfaction items, the work family balance effectiveness items, the career satisfaction items, life satisfaction items, social support items, and implicit negotiation belief items showed Cronbach's alpha acceptable scores for each scale, therefore all scales were included in relevant hypothesis testing. Means, standard deviations, descriptive statistics, intercorrelations and internal consistency were calculated for all study measures and are displayed in Table 2. The hypotheses and research questions for this study were evaluated using the following statistical analysis techniques: hierarchical and K-means cluster analysis, one-way analysis of variance, and multiple regression.

Hypothesis I predicted that Black entrepreneurs would differentially cluster into distinct boundary management profiles with varying patterns of cross-role interruption behaviors, work and family identities, and perceived boundary control. To test Hypothesis I, an exploratory hierarchical cluster analysis was conducted using SPSS to help identify the number and nature of possible boundary management profiles for subsequent K-means clustering (Breckenridge, 1989; Chapman & Goldberg, 2011; Steinley, 2006). Prior work-family research utilizing cluster analysis to identify patterns of boundary management approaches with similar variables has found both four cluster solutions (Bulger et al., 2007) and six cluster solutions (Kossek et al., 2012) to be the most interpretable. Therefore, four, five and six cluster solutions were assessed. In examining the structure of the cluster analysis, the five-cluster solution was determined to be the most appropriate for this data set based on the distribution of participants in each group and the unique characteristics of each group (see Table 3 for cluster descriptions).

Based on the results and interpretation from the hierarchical cluster analysis, a five-cluster solution was specified in K-means clustering to test Hypothesis Ia-Ie, which predicted the specific nature of boundary management profiles. K-clusters scores on the study variables of

Table 2. Means, standard deviations and correlations of major study variables

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1 Nonwork Interrupting Work Behaviors	2.80	0.97	<b>0.77</b>																	
2 Work Interrupting Nonwork Behaviors	2.91	0.89	0.26**	<b>0.64</b>																
3 Boundary Control Scale	2.96	1.13	0.10	-0.10	<b>0.82</b>															
4 Work Identity	2.59	1.26	0.23**	0.32**	0.08	<b>0.67</b>														
5 Family Identity	2.92	1.10	0.20*	0.15	0.23*	0.33**	<b>0.68</b>													
6 Work Family Balance Satisfaction	3.42	0.78	-0.02	0.08	-0.15	-0.02	-0.01	<b>0.87</b>												
7 Work Family Balance Effectiveness	3.14	0.84	0.32**	0.14	0.28**	0.16	0.39**	-0.11	<b>0.81</b>											
8 Career Satisfaction	3.01	0.92	0.13	0.14	0.15	0.19*	0.05	-0.04	0.25**	<b>0.82</b>										
9 Life Satisfaction	2.97	0.77	0.14	0.06	0.10	0.06	0.05	-0.16	0.17	0.33**	<b>0.67</b>									
10 Total Social Support	3.29	0.72	0.03	-0.15	-0.13	-0.15	-0.09	0.19*	-0.13	-0.13	-0.16	<b>0.81</b>								
11 Significant Other Social Support	3.13	1.74	-0.03	-0.07	0.10	-0.02	-0.02	0.05	-0.05	0.02	-0.09	0.59**	<b>0.97</b>							
12 Family Social Support	4.15	0.72	0.17	-0.03	-0.08	-0.04	-0.02	0.30**	-0.06	-0.08	-0.03	0.51**	0.03	<b>0.78</b>						
13 Church Social Support	2.55	1.31	-0.03	-0.18*	-0.18*	-0.15	-0.19*	0.14	-0.11	-0.09	-0.10	0.68**	0.08	0.30**	<b>0.91</b>					
14 Work Social Support	3.30	1.21	0.03	-0.04	-0.22*	-0.16	0.03	0.06	-0.10	-0.18*	-0.12	0.48**	-0.17	0.24**	0.23**	<b>0.89</b>				
15 Implicit Negotiation Beliefs	2.85	0.93	0.08	0.02	0.10	0.10	0.07	-0.02	0.09	0.00	0.08	0.07	0.14	0.02	0.04	-0.11	<b>0.79</b>			
16 Age	36.39	8.96	0.11	0.12	0.00	0.14	0.09	-0.04	0.07	0.13	0.01	-0.17	-0.18*	-0.11	-0.03	-0.03	0.02			
17 Gender	1.85	0.36	0.08	0.05	-0.05	0.07	0.07	0.08	-0.03	0.01	0.01	-0.06	-0.14	0.14	0.05	-0.06	-0.09	-0.07		
18 Children	1.46	0.50	0.03	-0.13	0.03	-0.15	0.12	-0.06	0.13	-0.04	0.28**	-0.06	-0.12	0.03	0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.36**	0.02	

Note:  $n = 126$ , \*  $p < .05$ , 2-tailed \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed, Cronbach's alpha reported on the diagonal where applicable. Scales: Nonwork Interrupting Work Behaviors (1-5), Work Interrupting Nonwork Behaviors (1-5), Boundary Control (1-5), Work Identity (1-5), Family Identity (1-5), Work Family Balance Satisfaction (1-5), Work Family Balance Effectiveness (1-5), Career Satisfaction (1-5), Life Satisfaction (1-5), Social Support (1-5), Implicit Negotiation Beliefs (1-7) Gender (1 = male, 2 = female), Age (Continuous), Gender (1= Yes, 2 = No)

boundary management characteristics (e.g., nonwork interrupting work behaviors, work interrupting nonwork behaviors, boundary control, work identity and family identity) were designated by cluster scores above the mean on a dimension as high and those below the mean on a dimension as low. The mean and standard deviations of the five clusters on boundary management measures are provided in Table 4. A graph of the mean differences by cluster membership is also provided in Figure 1.

Table 3. *Description of clusters*

Cluster	Profile	Description
1	High boundary control, dual centric, asymmetrical interruption behaviors with higher work to nonwork interruptions	This cluster reports high boundary control ( $M = 3.59$ ). They are considered dual centric with high scores on both work identity ( $M = 3.69$ ) and family identity ( $M = 3.61$ ). This group tends to exhibit lower nonwork interrupting work behaviors ( $M = 2.83$ ) but engages more in work interrupting nonwork behaviors ( $M = 3.17$ ).
2	Low boundary control, family centric, asymmetrical interruption behaviors with higher work to nonwork interruptions	This cluster reports low boundary control ( $M = 1.93$ ). They are considered family centric with higher scores on family identity ( $M = 3.00$ ) than scores on work identity ( $M = 1.23$ ). This group tends to exhibit the lowest nonwork interrupting work behaviors ( $M = 1.93$ ) but engages slightly more in work interrupting nonwork behaviors ( $M = 2.15$ ), indicating they separate work and family.
3	High boundary control, family centric, asymmetrical interruption behaviors with high nonwork to work interruptions	This cluster reports high boundary control ( $M = 3.33$ ). They are considered family centric with higher scores on family identity ( $M = 3.30$ ) than scores on work identity ( $M = 1.76$ ). This group tends to exhibit lower work interrupting nonwork behaviors ( $M = 2.83$ ) but engages more in nonwork interrupting work behaviors ( $M = 3.17$ ).
4	High boundary control, dual centric, asymmetrical interruption behaviors with higher work to nonwork interruptions	This cluster experiences the highest degree of boundary control ( $M = 3.62$ ). They are relatively low on both work identity ( $M = 1.38$ ) and family identity ( $M = 1.76$ ). This group tends to exhibit moderate levels of both nonwork interrupting work behaviors ( $M = 2.02$ ) and work interrupting nonwork behaviors ( $M = 2.27$ ), suggesting that they tend to separate work and family.

5	Low boundary control, work centric, asymmetrical interruption behaviors with higher work to nonwork interruptions	This cluster reports low boundary control ( $M = 1.55$ ). They are considered work centric with higher scores on work identity ( $M = 3.25$ ) than scores on family identity ( $M = 2.16$ ). This group tends to exhibit lower nonwork interrupting work behaviors ( $M = 3.09$ ) but engages in the highest work interrupting nonwork behaviors ( $M = 3.53$ ).
---	---	--

Figure 1. Mean Differences by Cluster Membership



Although a five-cluster solution was determined to be the most interpretable solution, the nature of the profiles that emerged did not map onto those hypothesized. Therefore, partial support was found for Hypothesis I. However, Hypothesis Ia - Hypothesis Ie were not supported.

Table 4. Psychological characteristics of boundary management profiles

	Cluster 1 n = 45	Cluster 2 n = 13	Cluster 3 n = 25	Cluster 4 n = 21	Cluster 5 n = 22
Nonwork Interrupting Work Behaviors	2.83 (0.97)	1.93 (0.78)	3.61 (0.49)	2.02 (0.85)	3.09 (0.63)
Work Interrupting Nonwork Behaviors	3.17 (0.80)	2.15 (0.65)	2.83 (0.57)	2.27 (0.80)	3.53 (0.90)
Boundary Control	3.59 (0.56)	1.33 (0.82)	3.33 (0.67)	3.62 (0.60)	1.55 (0.73)
Work Identity	3.69 (0.53)	1.23 (0.56)	1.76 (0.75)	1.38 (0.63)	3.25 (1.12)
Family Identity	3.61 (0.53)	3.00 (1.44)	3.30 (0.71)	1.76 (0.80)	2.16 (1.06)

Note. Means are outside of the parentheses. Standard deviations are inside the parentheses

To test Hypotheses II - V, several analysis of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted and post-hoc mean comparison tests were used to determine how the clusters differed in terms of outcomes (e.g., work-family balance satisfaction, work-family balance effectiveness, career satisfaction, life satisfaction).

Hypothesis II predicted that profiles of Black entrepreneurs with high boundary control would experience higher work-family balance satisfaction than profiles of Black entrepreneurs with low boundary control. To test Hypothesis II, a one-way ANOVA was conducted with boundary management cluster profile membership as the independent variable and work-family balance satisfaction as the dependent variable. There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ( $p = .214$ ). There was no statistically significant difference in work family balance satisfaction between boundary management cluster profiles,  $F(4, 120) = .114, p = .977$ . Therefore, Hypothesis II was not supported.

Hypothesis III predicted that profiles of Black entrepreneurs with high boundary control would experience higher work-family balance effectiveness than profiles of Black entrepreneurs with low boundary control. To test Hypothesis III, a one-way ANOVA was conducted with boundary management cluster membership as the independent variable and work-family balance effectiveness as the dependent variable. The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ( $p = .001$ ). There was a statistically significant difference in work family balance effectiveness between boundary management cluster profiles, Welch's  $F(4, 44.54) = 6.053, p = .001$ . Work family balance effectiveness scores differed based on cluster membership as follows: cluster 3 ( $M = 3.48, SD = 0.58$ ), cluster 1 ( $M = 3.43, SD = 0.63$ ), cluster 5 ( $M = 2.90, SD = 1.02$ ), cluster 4 ( $M = 2.70, SD = 0.90$ ) and cluster 2 ( $M = 2.62, SD = 0.84$ ). Games-Howell post hoc analysis revealed mean



differences between cluster 1 and cluster 2 (0.81, 95% CI [0.04, 1.58]),  $p = .004$ ), cluster 1 and cluster 4 (0.73, 95% CI [0.10, 1.36],  $p = 0.02$ ), cluster 3 and cluster 2 (0.86., 95% CI [0.08, 1.65],  $p = 0.03$ ), and cluster 3 and cluster 4 (0.78, 95% CI [0.13, 1.44],  $p = 0.01$ ). Although the results were significant, they were not as hypothesized, therefore partial support was found for Hypothesis III.

Table 5. ANOVA Post Hoc Comparisons of Profiles and Work Family Balance Effectiveness

Cluster Number		Mean Difference	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	0.81*	0.25	0.04	1.58
1	4	0.73*	0.22	0.10	1.36
3	2	0.86*	0.26	0.08	1.65
3	4	0.78*	0.23	0.13	1.44

Note. \* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Hypothesis IV predicted that profiles of Black entrepreneurs with high boundary control would experience higher career satisfaction than profiles of Black entrepreneurs with low boundary control. To test Hypothesis IV, a one-way ANOVA was conducted with boundary management cluster membership as the independent variable and career satisfaction as the dependent variable. There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ( $p = .110$ ). There were statistically significant differences in career satisfaction between boundary management cluster profiles,  $F(4, 120) = 7.24$ ,  $p = .001$ . Career satisfaction scores differed based on cluster membership as follows: cluster 5 ( $M = 3.25$ ,  $SD = 0.95$ ), cluster 1 ( $M = 3.20$ ,  $SD = 0.70$ ), cluster 3 ( $M = 3.07$ ,  $SD = 0.78$ ), cluster 4 ( $M = 3.40$ ,  $SD = 0.89$ ) and cluster 2 ( $M = 1.85$ ,  $SD = 1.10$ ). Tukey post hoc analysis revealed that mean differences from cluster 1 and cluster 2 (1.35, 95% CI [0.62, 2.09]),  $p = .001$ ), cluster 3 and cluster 2 (1.23, 95% CI [0.43, 2.02],  $p = .001$ ), cluster 4 and cluster 2 (1.19, 95% CI [0.37, 2.01],  $p = .001$ ), and cluster 5 and cluster 2 (1.40, 95% CI [0.58, 2.21],  $p = .001$ ) were statistically

significant. Although the results were significant, they were not as hypothesized, therefore partial support was found for Hypothesis IV.

Table 6. ANOVA Post Hoc Comparisons of Profiles and Career Satisfaction

Cluster Number		Mean Difference	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	1.35*	0.27	0.62	2.09
3	2	1.23*	0.29	0.43	2.02
4	2	1.19*	0.30	0.37	2.01
5	2	1.40*	0.29	0.58	2.21

Note. \* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Hypothesis V predicted that profiles of Black entrepreneurs with high boundary control would experience higher life satisfaction than profiles of Black entrepreneurs with low boundary control. To test Hypothesis V, a one-way ANOVA was conducted with boundary management cluster membership as the independent variable and life satisfaction as the dependent variable. The assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ( $p = .032$ ). There was not a statistically significant difference in life satisfaction based on boundary management cluster profile membership, Welch's  $F(4, 45.12) = .781$ ,  $p = .544$ . Therefore, Hypothesis V was not supported.

Hypothesis VI predicted that profiles with non-traditional Black entrepreneurs (e.g., new/nascent, women, parents of young children) would report more negative work and family outcomes compared to traditional Black entrepreneurs (e.g., older/established, men, parents of older children and/or non-parents). Descriptive statistics were used to better understand the demographic composition of the data (see Table 7 for demographic information by cluster) and to test Hypothesis VI. Due to the fact that mean differences were only found for work family balance effectiveness and career satisfaction, demographic information will only be assessed for

these variables. A significant effect was found for work family balance effectiveness and cluster membership, such that clusters 1 and 3 reported higher mean values than clusters 2 and 4.

However, cluster 1, 2, 3 and 4 all have over 70% female Black entrepreneurs. Close to 50% of the individuals in cluster 1, 4 and 5 report having at least one child under the age of 18 living in the home. Additionally, members in cluster 3 and 2 reported the highest average number of years in business, respectively ( $M = 7.40, SD = 6.07$ ;  $M = 5.58, SD = 4.44$ ), compared to individuals in cluster 1 ( $M = 4.40, SD = 4.00$ ), cluster 5 ( $M = 4.12, SD = 2.03$ ), and cluster 4 ( $M = 3.95, SD = 3.27$ ). Taken together, the results indicate a lack of support for Hypothesis VI.

Table 7. *Demographics of clusters*

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Cluster 5
	n = 45	n = 13	n = 25	n = 21	n = 22
Percentage of women	88.6%	90.9%	91.7%	71.4%	81.0%
Percentage married/in a long-term relationship	48.9%	30.8%	40.0%	52.4%	45.5%
Percentage with children under 18	44.4%	23.1%	32.0%	47.6%	45.5%
Mean age	36.36 (9.34)	35.77 (6.65)	38.35 (9.83)	33.3 (5.11)	36.68 (10.36)
Average work hours	51.64 (20.45)	53.46 (17.34)	56.15 (11.35)	59.81 (24.58)	42.21 (18.66)
Average years in business	4.40 (4.00)	5.58 (4.44)	7.40 (6.07)	3.95 (3.27)	4.12 (2.03)

Research question 1a assessed the relationship between difference sources of social support (e.g., spouse, friends, family, church/community) and well-being (as measured by career satisfaction) for Black entrepreneurs. To explore research question 1a, a multiple regression was run to predict career satisfaction (e.g., proxy for well-being) from significant other, family, church and work support. There was linearity as assessed by partial regression plots and a plot of studentized residuals against the predicted values. There was independence of residuals, as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.11. There was homoscedasticity, as assessed by visual inspection of a plot of studentized residuals versus unstandardized predicted values. There was

no evidence of multicollinearity, as assessed by tolerance values greater than 0.1. The assumption of normality was met, as assessed by a Q-Q Plot. The multiple regression model did not predict career satisfaction,  $F(4, 120) = 1.11, p = .36, \text{adj. } R^2 = .004$ . Therefore, support was not found for research question 1a. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found below in Table 8.

Table 8. *Multiple Regression Analyses of Social Support Predicting Career Satisfaction*

Variable	B	SE <sub>B</sub>	β
Constant	3.65	0.53	
Significant Other Social Support	0.00	0.05	-0.01
Family Social Support	-0.03	0.12	-0.02
Church Social Support	-0.03	0.07	-0.05
Work Social Support	-0.12	0.07	-0.16
Adj. $R^2$		0.004	
$F$		1.11	

Note.  $N = 125$ .  $\text{adj. } R^2 = .004, p = .36$ .  $B$  = unstandardized regression coefficient.  $SE_B$  = standard error of the coefficient.  $\beta$  = standardized coefficient. \* =  $p < .05$ ; \*\* =  $p < .001$ .

Research question 1b assessed the relationship between different sources of social support (e.g., spouse, friends, family, church/community) and well-being (as measured by life satisfaction) for Black entrepreneurs. To explore research question 1b, a multiple regression was run to predict life satisfaction (e.g., proxy for well-being) from significant other, family, church and work support. There was linearity as assessed by partial regression plots and a plot of studentized residuals against the predicted values. There was independence of residuals, as assessed by a Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.01. There was homoscedasticity, as assessed by visual inspection of a plot of studentized residuals versus unstandardized predicted values. There was no evidence of multicollinearity, as assessed by tolerance values greater than 0.1. The assumption of normality was met, as assessed by a Q-Q Plot. The multiple regression model did not predict life satisfaction,  $F(4, 121) = .97, p = .43, \text{adj. } R^2 = -.001$ . Therefore, support was not

found for research question 1b. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 9.

Table 9. *Multiple Regression Analyses of Social Support Predicting Life Satisfaction*

Variable	B	SE <sub>B</sub>	β
Intercept	3.36	0.44	
Significant Other Social Support	-0.05	0.04	-0.11
Family Social Support	0.03	0.1	0.03
Church Social Support	-0.04	0.06	-0.07
Work Social Support	-0.08	0.06	-0.13
Adj. $R^2$		-.001	
$F$		0.97	

Note.  $N = 125$ . adj.  $R^2 = -.001$ ,  $p = .43$ .  $B$  = unstandardized regression coefficient.  $SE_B$  = standard error of the coefficient.  $\beta$  = standardized coefficient. \* =  $p < .05$ ; \*\* =  $p < .001$ .

### Exploratory Analyses

In addition to collecting quantitative responses, several open-ended questions were also included to provide participants with an opportunity to further elaborate on their work and family life experiences as Black entrepreneurs. The first open ended question asked participants to describe the top three reasons they decided to become an entrepreneur. Several key themes emerged and are listed along with representative statements in Appendix K. Entrepreneurs in this sample cited a number of reasons for pursuing entrepreneurship including a passion for the work, a desire for flexibility, independence, autonomy, and aspirations to obtain wealth while building a legacy. The second open ended question asked participated to discuss the three biggest challenges they have experienced as a Black entrepreneur. A list of key themes and representative statements can be found in Appendix L. Participants indicated limited funding opportunities, lack of support from others, and mentorship as significant challenges they have faced as Black entrepreneurs. Lastly, the third open ended question asked participants to describe the resources they believe Black entrepreneurs need specifically to achieve better balance

between their work and family/personal life. A list of key themes and representative statements can be found in Appendix M. Participants indicated that increased training and education, mentorship, and assistance in building a team as important factors in helping Black entrepreneurs achieve better work life balance.

## **Discussion**

The current study explored the effects of boundary management preferences on the work family balance and well-being of Black entrepreneurs. A person-centered approach was taken to identify the nature of different boundary management characteristics as well as to examine differences on work and family outcomes based on cluster profile membership. Overall, the results of this study did not support for the initial predictions. However, several interesting results did emerge. First, it was hypothesized that Black entrepreneurs would differentially cluster into distinct boundary management profiles with varying configurations of work and family identities, symmetry of cross-role interruption behaviors, and perceived boundary control. Several boundary management profiles emerged (Bulger et al., 2007; Kossek et al., 2012). Kossek and colleagues (2012) found evidence of several clusters with members who reported both high and low boundary control with different patterns of identities and cross role interruption behaviors. Consistent with this research, varying configurations were found in this study as well.

Members of cluster 1 are dual-centric with high boundary control. Individuals in cluster 1 also exhibited lower nonwork interrupting work behaviors than nonwork interrupting work behaviors. Thus, cluster 1 members place equal importance on their work identity and family identity, while allowing more interruptions from work. Although members of this group are dual centric, they may allow more interruptions from work than nonwork because of the level of

personal responsibility entrepreneurs tend to have in both the success and failure of their businesses (Baron et al., 2016) and may have to deal with interruptions from work more often because of this.

In contrast, individuals in cluster 2 are family centric (e.g., higher scores on family identity than on work identity) with low boundary control. Members of cluster 2 also reported low levels of work interrupting nonwork behaviors as well as nonwork interrupting work behaviors. This suggests that Black entrepreneurs in this group generally prefer to separate their work and family domains, while placing more importance on their roles in the family domain. These findings present a departure from previous literature which suggests that individuals who are family centric with high boundary control would be more likely to engage in nonwork interrupting work behaviors than work interrupting nonwork behaviors (Kossek & Lautsch, 2008; Kossek et al., 2012).

However, consistent with this research, individuals in cluster 3 are family centric (e.g., higher scores on family identity than on work identity), however they report high boundary control. This group tends to exhibit lower work interrupting nonwork behaviors but engages more in nonwork interrupting work behaviors. This pattern is consistent with past research that suggests that individuals with high boundary control will allow more interruptions from the domain that aligns with the identity they prioritize. For example, Black entrepreneurs in this cluster may allow more nonwork interrupting work behaviors than work interrupting nonwork behaviors because they perceive a high level of control over the boundaries between the work and family domains and prioritize their family role, leading them to allow more interruptions from the family domain.

Individuals in cluster 4 are dual-centric with the highest level of boundary control. Although cluster 4 members placed similar importance on their work identity and family identity, their scores were relatively low. Additionally, members of cluster 4 allowed more interruptions from work than nonwork. Previous research has found support for individuals who report low scores on both work and family centrality. As prior research suggests, these individuals may identify more highly with their identities outside of the work and family domain (e.g., church or community volunteering) (Kossek et al., 2006; Matthews et al., 2010). For these individuals, entrepreneurship may provide the flexibility to pursue other life passions, which may be more difficult to do as an employee in a traditional job.

Individuals in cluster 5 are work centric (e.g., higher scores on work identity than on family identity) with low boundary control. Members of cluster 5 also exhibited in the highest level of work interrupting nonwork behaviors but allowing slightly less interruptions from nonwork. Black entrepreneurs in this group may prefer to integrate their work and family domains, while placing more importance on their roles in the work domain. These findings also present a slight depart from previous research, which suggests that individuals who identify as work centric will engage in higher work interrupting nonwork behaviors than nonwork interrupting work behaviors if they also report high boundary control (Kossek & Lautsch, 2008; Kossek et al., 2012). However, individuals in this cluster reported low boundary control, suggesting that entrepreneurs may have different levels of perceived boundary control even if they also experience high levels of autonomy.

The cluster profiles also differed on a number of demographic characteristics including relationship status, parental status, age, number of hours work and number of years in business. Given the small number of responses obtained from Black male entrepreneurs ( $N = 18$ ), all five



clusters include high percentages of Black female entrepreneurs. Individuals in cluster 4 reported the highest percentage of individuals married or in a long-term relationship, whereas individuals in cluster 2 reported the lowest percentage of individuals married or in a long-term relationship. Members of cluster 2 and 3 reported the least number of children in the home under the age of 18. However, approximately fifty percent of individuals in cluster 1, 4 and 5 reported having more than one child under the age of 18 living with them. Mean age was relatively stable across clusters, ranging from thirty-three (cluster 4) to thirty-eight (cluster 3). Individuals in cluster 4 averaged sixty hours of work per week, followed by fifty-six (cluster 3), fifty-three (cluster 2), fifty-one (cluster 1), and forty-two hours of work per week (cluster 5). Individuals in cluster 3 reported seven average years in business, followed by five and a half years (cluster 2), and approximately four years in business (cluster 1, 4 and 5).

Overall, the cluster profiles that emerged in this study partially replicate those found by Kossek and colleagues (2012). For example, two clusters were identified as including individuals who reported low boundary control (e.g., cluster 2 and cluster 5), whereas the remaining clusters included individuals who reported high boundary control (e.g., cluster 1, 3 and 4). Cluster 5 in this study directly maps onto the cluster that the authors described as Job/Work Warriors (cluster 1), which includes individuals who also reported low boundary control, work centric, asymmetrical interruption behaviors with higher work to nonwork interruptions. However, in this study, the other profile with members who indicated low boundary control (cluster 2) also identified as family centric (e.g., higher scores on family identity than on work identity), while allowing slightly more interruptions from work than interruptions from nonwork. As suggested by previous research, individuals who report high identity salience in one domain (e.g., work or family) may allow more boundary permeability around that particular domain (Kossek et al.,

2012). In contrast, only one of the two low boundary control profiles that emerged followed this pattern.

Further, four out of the five cluster profiles allowed more interruptions from work than those from nonwork, with varying levels of identity centrality. Individuals who reported as work centric, family centric and dual centric allowed more interruptions from work than from nonwork. The qualitative data gathered may provide further insight into these findings. When asking participants to discuss their reason for becoming an entrepreneur, many respondents indicated that they had a desire to establish a legacy for their families and to build wealth within their community. Individuals who cited these reasons for becoming entrepreneurs are likely to significantly identify with their business endeavors. Further, research supports this idea, suggesting that entrepreneurs strongly identify with their ventures (Jennings & McDougald, 2007; Kreiner, Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2006). However, strongly identifying with their business may increase the likelihood that work will interfere with their personal life (Glavin & Schieman, 2012), but provides a potential explanation for why Black entrepreneurs in the current study generally allowed more interruptions from work than nonwork.

The current study explored the relationship between boundary management characteristics with several work and family outcomes, including work family balance satisfaction, work family balance effectiveness, career satisfaction and life satisfaction. Specifically, Hypothesis II predicted that profiles of Black entrepreneurs with high boundary control would experience higher work-family balance satisfaction than profiles of Black entrepreneurs with low boundary control. No significant differences were found between clusters on their level of work family balance satisfaction. Members of all five clusters reported slightly

above average levels of work family balance satisfaction, which could suggest that Black entrepreneurs in this sample may feel generally satisfied with their work family balance.

However, the results for Hypothesis III were mixed. It was predicted that profiles of Black entrepreneurs with high boundary control would experience higher work-family balance effectiveness than profiles of Black entrepreneurs with low boundary control. As specific profiles of boundary management were hypothesized, only partial support was found for Hypothesis III. However, it was found that members of cluster 1 reported higher work family balance effectiveness than members of cluster 4 and 2, however individuals in cluster 2 also reported low boundary control. Additionally, individuals in cluster 3 also reported higher work family balance effectiveness than members of cluster 4 and 2, with cluster 4 indicating high boundary control and cluster 2 individuals indicating low boundary control. These results suggest that for Black entrepreneurs, their perception of their ability to manage the boundaries between the work and family domain may not fully explain their level of effectiveness in managing these boundaries. One concept that might provide further insight as to how boundary control influences work family balance effectiveness is flexibility willingness (Matthew et al., 2010). Flexibility willingness goes beyond the individual's ability to flex their domain boundaries and is related to their degree of willingness to do so. Flexibility willingness has been found to be a distinct concept from flexibility ability (Matthews et al., 2010). For entrepreneurs in this sample, whether an individual has high or low perceptions of their boundary control may not directly influence their level of work family balance effectiveness but how willing an individual is to flex their domain boundaries may vary depending on the salience of their identities in each domain. For example, members of cluster 4 may be less willing to flex the

boundaries between work and family because they identify as family centric as compared to members of cluster 1, who identify as dual centric.

Similar to Hypothesis III, the results were mixed for the relationship between boundary management cluster membership and career satisfaction. It was hypothesized that profiles of Black entrepreneurs with high boundary control would experience higher career satisfaction than profiles of Black entrepreneurs with low boundary control. The specific boundary management profiles that were predicted did not emerge, however of the profiles that were identified, individuals did significantly differ in their level of career satisfaction. Members of clusters 1, 3, 4 and 5 all reported higher career satisfaction than members of cluster 2. Individuals in cluster 2 indicated low boundary control, higher family centrality than work centrality, and allow more interruptions from work to nonwork than interruptions from nonwork to work. This group of entrepreneurs may experience more difficulty in managing role expectations between domains. Although these individuals identify higher with their family role than their work role, they tend to allow interruptions from both domains as evidenced by their low level of boundary control. Therefore, low boundary control may have a more negative impact on the career satisfaction of those who identify as family centric, compared to those who identify as work centric or dual centric.

A significant effect for life satisfaction and boundary management cluster membership was predicted, such that profiles of Black entrepreneurs with high boundary control would experience higher life satisfaction than profiles of Black entrepreneurs with low boundary control. This hypothesis was not supported, no mean differences were found between clusters on life satisfaction. Similar to work family balance satisfaction, all cluster members reported

average satisfaction with life scores. Due to the high level of autonomy entrepreneurs tend to experience, they may also experience generally positive levels of life satisfaction.

The current research also sought to understand how different sources of social support (e.g., spouse, friend, colleague) would impact the career satisfaction and life satisfaction of Black entrepreneurs. No significant differences were found in career satisfaction or life satisfaction based on the source of social support. One possible explanation is that Black entrepreneurs may expect more difficulty in gaining support from members within and outside of their communities. Previous research has found that Black entrepreneurs may have difficulty in establishing the legitimacy of their businesses. In a study examining consumer perceptions of legitimacy, attitudes and intended patronage among Black and non-Black entrepreneurs, the results found that both Black and non-Black entrepreneurs associated most successful businesses with non-Black entrepreneurs (Ogbolu, Singh, & Wilbon, 2015). Thus, making it difficult for Black entrepreneurs to establish and thrive in certain businesses (Bristol, 2004; Ogbolu et al., 2015). Thus, a lack of support may not directly impact the career satisfaction of Black entrepreneurs as these entrepreneurs generally may not expect to receive as much support as non-Black entrepreneurs. Also, although no significant differences were found between the sources of social support and well-being (e.g., career satisfaction and life satisfaction), a lack of support was indicated in a review of the qualitative responses from many of the sources of support quantitatively measured. Many participants identified a lack of support from family, friends and their community as one of the challenges they experience, specifically as a Black entrepreneur. This could suggest that social support may be related to other work and family outcomes; however, there may not be a direct relationship between social support and career satisfaction and/or life satisfaction among Black entrepreneurs. Future research should examine social

support as a moderator of the relationship between work life balance and career and life satisfaction to help better understand the role of social support and its relationship to work and family outcomes.

The interdependencies between the work and nonwork domains can have a significant influence on the experiences that individuals have in attempting to manage the boundaries between each domain. The current research identified groups of Black entrepreneurs with distinct configurations of boundary management characteristics: cross-role interruption behaviors, centrality of work and family identities, and boundary control. This study also demonstrated that these clusters are differentially linked to work–family outcomes, specifically work family balance effectiveness and career satisfaction. study.

This study was developed with the best of intentions, however, as with all research, it is not without its limitations. These limitations as well as directions for future research are discussed below. The current study utilized a cross-sectional research design and therefore a causal relationship between boundary management characteristics and work and family outcomes cannot be establish. Future research could utilize a longitudinal research design to assess causality. For example, studies could incorporate experience sampling methodology (ESM), which requires individuals to provide descriptions of their thoughts, feelings, and behaviors at multiple times across situations as they happen (Uy, Foo, & Aguinis, 2010). Incorporating ESM allows researchers to capture dynamic person-by-situation interactions as well as between-and within-person processes, improve the ecological validity of results, and minimize retrospective biases. Also, all data was self-reported. However, the correlations between independent variables were modest. Also, when examining the intercorrelations between the marker variable (e.g., Implicit Negotiation Beliefs Scale) and other substantive

variables, the correlations were low, indicating that common-method variance was not a major issue (Lindell & Whitney, 2001; Podsakoff et al., 2012). Future studies could include the use of more objective data or other sources of data to even further reduce the possibility of response bias. For example, data from other founding business partners could be collected to provide data from multiple perspectives. Additionally, the sample consisted largely of Black female entrepreneurs. Therefore, caution should be taken in generalizing these results to other populations of interest. Future research could broaden the comparison of the work family experiences of entrepreneurs to include members of other racial and ethnic groups to understand if different configurations of boundary management profiles would emerge.

Despite these limitations, the results of the current study indicate that this is a promising avenue of research. Exploring the boundary management preferences of Black entrepreneurs provides a unique opportunity to directly study this population. Previous research in the work family literature has generally focused on a homogeneous group of individuals, working in a traditional job context. Organizational scholars have called for research examining “demographic and psychological linkages to the profiles and how they vary across gender, race, age, occupation, national and organizational cultures, personality, family background, and use of wireless technology” (Kossek et al., 2012, p. 124). The current research is an answer to this call. As our understanding of work and life continues to expand, future research should examine the experiences of those who care for individuals who are not their children. Little attention has been paid to care given to children by other individuals, such as, siblings, grandparents, other relatives, or family friends. Likewise, relatively little attention has been given to care of the elderly, the disabled, or those with chronic illnesses (Kelliher, Richardson, Boiarintseva, 2019).

The caregiving experiences of these individuals could influence them to pursue entrepreneurship as an attempt to gain greater schedule control and flexibility.

Additionally, the relationship between the profiles and work and family variables suggests that it may be beneficial to develop targeted interventions tailored to different groups. For example, members of cluster 2 might benefit from interventions that would increase their sense of boundary control, as this group reported low boundary control and lower career satisfaction than members of the other clusters. Also, in reviewing the qualitative data, study participants indicated having faced many challenges in establishing their ventures consistent with previous findings on the experiences of minority entrepreneurs (Shelton, Danes, Eisenman, 2008). For example, when asked to describe the three biggest challenges they experienced as a Black entrepreneur, many participants cited access to capital as a barrier. A lack of financial resources for these entrepreneurs may also have an impact on their ability to manage the boundaries between work and family. For Black entrepreneurs, a lack of funding may cause them to rely more heavily on their personal funds (e.g., bootstrapping) to help grow and maintain their businesses. This could require these individuals to find other funding sources such as part-time or temporary contract work, which could exacerbate their attempts to foster work life balance.

Additionally, when asked to identify what resources might help Black entrepreneurs achieve better balance between their work and family/personal life, participants identified access to business mentors as a desired resource. Black entrepreneurs could benefit from programs such as *SCORE*, which provide free business mentoring and education through the U.S. Small Business Administration. Future research could also explore both the awareness and utilization of these resources among Black entrepreneurs to understand how to best meet the needs of this group of entrepreneurs.



Further, participants also indicated a strong desire to receive education and training as a response to this question. The boundary characteristic measures could be useful in promoting self-awareness. Assessments such as the WorkLife Indicator could be provided to individuals and used as a baseline to help entrepreneurs better understand how they currently manage the boundaries between work and family as well as whether they are enacting boundaries to help them feel more or less in control. For entrepreneurs, it is important for them to learn how to better communicate their preferred boundary management approach to their clients, coworkers, and families in order to better set and manage expectations and to identify solutions. Finally, as our understanding of the complex nature of work and nonwork life continues to expand, it is important to move beyond a simple distinction between those who prefer to integrate and those who prefer to segment domain relevant behaviors (Bulger et al., 2007). People differ not only in terms of the amount of interruptions between the work and family domains but also in terms of the symmetry and direction of allowed interruptions, the psychological centrality of different role identities, and perceived psychological control over boundaries.

Overall, the current research had several goals. First, a goal of this study was to integrate the work-family and entrepreneurship literature, using both border theory (Clark, 2000) and boundary theory (Ashforth et al., 2000) as an underlying theoretical framework. Both theories converge on the idea that people actively construct a boundary around each domain that relates to their preferences in organizing the boundaries between work and family and other nonwork roles. Second, a goal of the research was to bridge the gap in the literature concerning the lack of research about the work-family experiences of minorities, specifically Black entrepreneurs. Limited attention is brought to examining individuals who hold multiple identities; therefore, the current research examined their experiences within a unique work context. Finally, a person-

centered approach was taken to examine the different boundary profiles that may emerge among Black entrepreneurs. This approach provided a more in-depth way of conceptualizing work–family identities, capturing the direction and symmetry of cross-role interruption behavior to enhance our understanding of varying configurations of boundary management.

## References

- Aldrich, H. E., & Martinez, M. A. (2001). Many are called, but few are chosen: An evolutionary perspective for the study of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(4), 41–56.
- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 278–308. <https://doi.org/10.1037//1076-8998.5.2.278>
- Aryee, S., Srinivas, E. S., & Tan, H. H. (2005). Rhythms of life: Antecedents and outcomes of work-family balance in employed parents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 132–146. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.132>
- 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>
- Barnett, R. C., Marshall, N. L., & Pleck, J. H. (1992). Men's multiple roles and their relationship to men's psychological distress. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 54(2), 358–367. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353067>
- Baron, R. A. (2007). Behavioral and cognitive factors in entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurs as the active element in new venture creation. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1(1-2), 167–182. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.12>
- Baron, R. A., Franklin, R. J., & Hmieleski, K. M. (2016). Why entrepreneurs often experience low, not high, levels of stress: The joint effects of selection and psychological capital. *Journal of Management*, 42(3), 742–768. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313495411>

- Baron, R. A., & Henry, R. A. (2010). How entrepreneurs acquire the capacity to excel: Insights from research on expert performance. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 4(1), 49–65. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.82>
- Berg, J. M., Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2010). Perceiving and responding to challenges in job crafting at different ranks: When proactivity requires adaptivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(2–3), 158–186. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.645>
- Blair-Loy, M. (2009). Work without end?: Scheduling flexibility and work-to-family conflict among stockbrokers. *Work and Occupations*, 36(4), 279–317. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888409343912>
- Bristol, D (2004). From outposts to enclaves: A social history of black barbers 1750–1915. *Enterprise and Society*, 5(4), 594–606.
- Brett, J. M. (2001). Negotiating globally: How to negotiate deals, resolve disputes, and make decisions across cultural boundaries. San Francisco, CA, US: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, S. P., Westbrook, R. A., & Challagalla, G. (2005). Good cope, bad cope: adaptive and maladaptive coping strategies following a critical negative work event. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 792-798.
- Bulger, C. A., Matthews, R. A., & Hoffman, M. E. (2007). Work and personal life boundary management: Boundary strength, work/personal life balance, and the segmentation-integration continuum. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(4), 365–375. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.4.365>
- Bull, I., & Willard, G. E. (1993). Towards a theory of entrepreneurship. *Special Theoretical Issue*, 8(3), 183–195. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026\(93\)90026-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(93)90026-2)

- Burke, P. J. (1991). Identity processes and social stress. *American Sociological Review*, *56*(6), 836. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2096259>
- Burke, P. J., & Reitzes, D. C. (1981). The link between identity and role performance. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *44*(2), 83–92. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3033704>
- Burke, P. J., & Reitzes, D. C. (1991). An identity theory approach to commitment. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *54*(3), 239–251. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786653>
- Byron, K. (2005). A meta-analytic review of work–family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *67*(2), 169–198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.08.009>
- Canedo, J. C., Stone, D. L., & Black, S. L. (2014). Individual factors affecting entrepreneurship in Hispanics. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *29*(6), 755–772. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-11-2012-0333>
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French, J. R., Van Harrison, R., & Pinneau, S. R. (1980). Job demands and worker health: Main effects and occupational differences (Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, Ann Arbor, MI). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan.
- Carlson, D. S., Grzywacz, J. G., & Zivnuska, S. (2009). Is work—family balance more than conflict and enrichment? *Human Relations*, *62*(10), 1459–1486. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267093336500>
- Carlson, D. S., & Perrewe, P. L. (1999). The role of social support in the stressor-strain relationship: An examination of work-family conflict. *Journal of Management*, *25*(4), 513–540.
- Carson, C. R. (1982). How GE grows entrepreneurs. *Management Review*, *71*(2), 29. Retrieved from

[https://ezproxy.depaul.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true  
&db=bth&AN=6032100&site=ehost-live&scope=site](https://ezproxy.depaul.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=6032100&site=ehost-live&scope=site)

Casper, W. J., Eby, L. T., Bordeaux, C., Lockwood, A., & Lambert, D. (2007). A review of research methods in IO/OB work-family research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 28–43. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.28>

Casper, W. J., Vaziri, H., Wayne, J. H., DeHauw, S., & Greenhaus, J. (2018). The jingle-jangle of work–nonwork balance: A comprehensive and meta-analytic review of its meaning and measurement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 103*(2), 182–214. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000259>

Chen, Z., Powell, G. N., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2009). Work-to-family conflict, positive spillover, and boundary management: a person-environment fit approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 74*(1), 82–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.10.009>

Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations, 53*(6), 747–770. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700536001>

Cooper, A. C., Folta, T., Gimeno-Gascon, J., & Woo, C. Y. (1992). Entrepreneurs' exit decisions: The role of threshold expectations. *Academy of Management Proceedings, 1992*(1), 75–79. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.1992.4977477>

Crain, T. L., Hammer, L. B., Bodner, T., Kossek, E. E., Moen, P., Lilienthal, R., & Buxton, O. M. (2014). Work-family conflict, family-supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB), and sleep outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 19*(2), 155–167. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036010>

Dana, L. P. (2007). *Handbook of Research on Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurship*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781847209962>

- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71–75. Retrieved from <https://ezproxy.depaul.edu/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=6385463&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. A. (1991). Gender differences in work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(1), 60–74.
- Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., 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(1), 124–197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2003.11.003>
- Eckhardt, J. T., & Shane, S. A. (2003). Opportunities and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management*, 29(3), 333–349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630302900304>
- Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 178–199.
- Ezzedeen, S. R., & Zikic, J. (2017). Finding balance amid boundarylessness: An interpretive study of entrepreneurial work–life balance and boundary management. *Journal of Family Issues*, 38(11), 1546–1576. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X15600731>
- Fabrigar, L. R., & Wegener, D. T. (2012). Exploratory factor analysis. New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.
- Frese, M., & Gielnik, M. M. (2014). The psychology of entrepreneurship. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 413–438. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091326>

- Frone, M. R. (2003). Predictors of overall and on-the-job substance use among young workers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 8*(1), 39–54.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*(1), 65–78.
- Gartner, W. B. (1985). A conceptual framework for describing the phenomenon of new venture creation. *Academy of Management Review, 10*(4), 696–706.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/258039>
- Glavin, P., & Schieman, S. (2012). Work–family role blurring and work–family conflict: The moderating influence of job resources and job demands. *Work and Occupations, 39*(1), 71–98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888411406295>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work–family balance: A review and extension of the literature. In *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology*, 2nd ed. (pp. 165–183). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review, 10*(1), 76–88. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258214>
- Greenhaus, J. H., Callanan, G. A., & DiRenzo, M. (2008). A boundaryless perspective on careers. In the *SAGE Handbook of Organizational Behavior: Volume I - Micro Approaches* (pp. 277–299). SAGE Publications Ltd.  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849200448.n16>
- Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work–family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*(3), 510–531.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(02\)00042-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00042-8)



- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(1), 64–86. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256352>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72–92. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.19379625>
- Greenhaus, J. H., Ziegert, J. C., & Allen, T. D. (2012). When family-supportive supervision matters: Relations between multiple sources of support and work–family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 266–275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.10.008>
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Butler, A. B. (2005). The impact of job characteristics on work-to-family facilitation: Testing a theory and distinguishing a construct. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(2), 97–109. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.2.97>
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Carlson, D. S. (2007). Conceptualizing work—family balance: Implications for practice and research. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 9(4), 455–471. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422307305487>
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 111–126.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250–279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(76\)90016-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7)

Hall, D. T., & Richter, J. (1988). Balancing work life and home life: What can organizations do to help? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 2(3), 213–223.

<https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1988.4277258>

Hanson, G. C., Hammer, L. B., & Colton, C. L. (2006). Development and validation of a multidimensional scale of perceived work-family positive spillover. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(3), 249–265. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.11.3.249>

Hao Zhao, Seibert, S. E., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2010). The relationship of personality to entrepreneurial intentions and performance: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Management*, 36(2), 381–404. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309335187>

Heilman, M. E., & Chen, J. J. (2003). Entrepreneurship as a solution: the allure of self-employment for women and minorities. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13(2), 347–364. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(03\)00021-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(03)00021-4)

Jennings, J. E., & McDougald, M. S. (2007). Work-family interface experiences and coping strategies: Implications for entrepreneurship research and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 747-760.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. Oxford, England: Wiley.

Kelliher, C., Richardson, J., & Boiarintseva, G. (2019). All of work? All of life? Reconceptualising work-life balance for the 21st century. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 29(2), 97-112.

- Kihlstrom, R. E., & Laffont, J.-J. (1979). A general equilibrium entrepreneurial theory of firm formation based on risk aversion. *Journal of Political Economy*, *87*(4), 719–748.  
Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1831005>
- Kirchmeyer, C., & Cohen, A. (1999). Different strategies for managing the work non-work interface: A test for unique pathways to work outcomes. *Work & Stress*, *13*(1), 59–73.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/026783799296192>
- Kossek, E. E., & Lautsch, B. A. (2012). Work–family boundary management styles in organizations: A cross-level model. *Organizational Psychology Review*, *2*(2), 152–171.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386611436264>
- Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2006). Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: Correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work–family effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*(2), 347–367.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.07.002>
- Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(2), 139–149.
- Kossek, E. E., Pichler, S., Bodner, T., & Hammer, L. B. (2011). A workplace social support and work-family conflict: A meta-analysis clarifying the influence of general and work-family specific supervisor and organizational support. *Personnel Psychology*, *64*(2), 289–313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01211.x>
- 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>

- Kossek, E., & Lautsch, B. (2007). *CEO of Me: Creating a Life That Works in the Flexible Job Age (First)*. Wharton School Publishing.
- Kray, L. J., & Haselhuhn, M. P. (2007). Implicit negotiation beliefs and performance: Experimental and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(1), 49–64. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.1.49>
- Kreiner, G. E., Hollensbe, E. C., & Sheep, M. L. (2006). Where is the “me” among the “we”? Identity work and the search for optimal balance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(5), 1031-1057.
- Lee, J. E. C., Sudom, K. A., & Zamorski, M. A. (2013). Longitudinal analysis of psychological resilience and mental health in Canadian military personnel returning from overseas deployment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(3), 327–337. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033059>
- Lindell, M. K., & Whitney, D. J. (2001). Accounting for common method variance in cross-sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 114-121.
- Low, M. B., & MacMillan, I. C. (1988). Entrepreneurship: Past research and future challenges. *Journal of Management*, 14(2), 139–161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638801400202>
- Marks, S. R., & MacDermid, S. M. (1996). Multiple roles and the self: A theory of role balance. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58(2), 417–432. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353506>
- Matthews, R. A., Barnes-Farrell, J. L., & Bulger, C. A. (2010). Advancing measurement of work and family domain boundary characteristics. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(3), 447–460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.05.008>

- Maxwell, A. L., Jeffrey, S. A., & Lévesque, M. (2011). Business angel early stage decision making. *Journal of Business Venturing, 26*(2), 212–225.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2009.09.002>
- McClelland, D. C. (1965). N achievement and entrepreneurship: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1*(4), 389–392. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0021956>
- McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M., & Masuda, A. D. (2010). A meta-analytic review of the consequences associated with work–family enrichment. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25*(3), 381–396. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9141-1>
- Mitchell, R. K., Busenitz, L., Lant, T., McDougall, P. P., Morse, E. A., & Smith, J. B. (2002). Toward a theory of entrepreneurial cognition: Rethinking the people side of entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 27*(2), 93–104.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-8520.00001>
- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work–family conflict and family–work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(4), 400–410.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Brashear-Alejandro, T., & Boles, J. S. (2004). A cross-national model of job-related outcomes of work role and family role variables: A retail sales context. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 32*(1), 49–60.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070303259128>
- Netemeyer, R. G., Maxham, J. G., & Pullig, C. (2005). Conflicts in the work–family interface: Links to job stress, customer service employee performance, and customer purchase intent. *Journal of Marketing, 69*(2), 130–143.  
<https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.69.2.130.60758>

Nippert-Eng, C. (1996). Calendars and keys: The classification of “home” and “work.”

*Sociological Forum*, 11(3), 563–582. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/684901>

Ogbolu, M. N., Singh, R. P., & Wilbon, A. (2015). Legitimacy, Attitudes and Intended

Patronage: Understanding Challenges Facing Black Entrepreneurs. *Journal of*

*Developmental Entrepreneurship (JDE)*, 20(1), 1-19.

Parasuraman, S., Greenhaus, J. H., & Granrose, C. S. (1992). Role stressors, social support, and

well-being among two-career couples. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(4), 339–

356. Retrieved from

<https://ezproxy.depaul.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true>

[https://ezproxy.depaul.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true](https://ezproxy.depaul.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=5156550&site=ehost-live&scope=site)

Parasuraman, S., Purohit, Y. S., Godshalk, V. M., & Beutell, N. J. (1996). Work and family

variables, entrepreneurial career success, and psychological well-being. *Journal of*

*Vocational Behavior*, 48(3), 275–300. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0025>

Parasuraman, S., & Simmers, C. A. (2001). Type of employment, work-family conflict and well-

being: a comparative study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22(5), 551–568.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.102>

Peeters, M. C. W., Montgomery, A. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2005). Balancing

work and home: How job and home demands are related to burnout. *International*

*Journal of Stress Management*, 12(1), 43–61. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.12.1.43>

Perrewe, P. L., Hochwarter, W. A., & Kiewitz, C. (1999). Value attainment: An explanation for

the negative effects of work-family conflict on job and life satisfaction. *Journal of*

*Occupational Health Psychology*, 4(4), 318–326.

- Perry-Jenkins, M., Repetti, R. L., & Crouter, A. C. (2000). Work and family in the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(4), 981–998. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1566720>
- Pett, M. A., Lackey, N. R., & Sullivan, J. J. (2003). Making Sense of Factor Analysis: The Use of Factor Analysis for Instrument Development in Health Care Research. SAGE.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539-569.
- Pruitt, D. G. (1998). Social conflict. In *The handbook of social psychology*, Vols. 1-2, 4th ed. (pp. 470–503). New York, NY, US: McGraw-Hill.
- Purveyar, A. N., Rogoff, E. G., Lee, M.-S., Heck, R. K. Z., Grossman, E. B., Haynes, G. W., & Onochie, J. (2008). Sampling minority business owners and their families: The understudied entrepreneurial experience. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 46(3), 422–455. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2008.00251.x>
- Rauch, A., & Frese, M. (2007). Let's put the person back into entrepreneurship research: A meta-analysis on the relationship between business owners' personality traits, business creation, and success. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16(4), 353–385. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320701595438>
- Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., Gilley, K. M., & Luk, D. M. (2001). Struggling for balance amid turbulence on international assignments: work–family conflict, support and commitment. *Journal of Management*, 27(1), 99–121.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217–226. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259271>

- Shelton, L. M., Danes, S. M., & Eisenman, M. (2008). Role demands, difficulty in managing work-family conflict, and minority entrepreneurs. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship, 13*(3), 315-342.
- Slaughter, A. M. (2012, August). Why Women Still Can't Have It All. The Atlantic. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2012/07/why-women-still-cant-have-it-all/309020/>
- Steinley, D. (2006). K-means clustering: A half-century synthesis. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 59*(1), 1–34.  
<https://doi.org/10.1348/000711005X48266>
- Stemler, S. (2001). An overview of content analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 7*(17), 137-146.
- Stryker, S. (1968). Identity salience and role performance: The relevance of symbolic interaction theory for family research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30*(4), 558.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/349494>
- Stryker, S., & Burke, P. J. (2000). The past, present, and future of an identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 63*(4), 284–297. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2695840>
- Swanson, V., & Power, K. G. (1999). Stress, satisfaction and role conflict in dual-doctor partnerships. *Community, Work & Family, 2*(1), 67–88.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13668809908414250>
- Thoits, P. A. (1991). On merging identity theory and stress research. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 54*(2), 101–112. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786929>



- Unger, J. M., Rauch, A., Frese, M., & Rosenbusch, N. (2011). Human capital and entrepreneurial success: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Business Venturing, 26*(3), 341–358.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2009.09.004>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2016, February). Survey of Business Owners. Retrieved from  
<https://www.census.gov/data/developers/data-sets/business-owners.html>
- Uy, M. A., Foo, M. D., & Aguinis, H. (2010). Using experience sampling methodology to advance entrepreneurship theory and research. *Organizational Research Methods, 13*(1), 31-54.
- Valcour, M. (2007). Work-based resources as moderators of the relationship between work hours and satisfaction with work-family balance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(6), 1512–1523. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1512>
- van Daalen, G., Willemsen, T. M., & Sanders, K. (2006). Reducing work–family conflict through different sources of social support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*(3), 462-476.
- van Praag, C. M., & Versloot, P. H. (2007). What is the value of entrepreneurship? A review of recent research. *Small Business Economics, 29*(4), 351–382. Retrieved from  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40229578>
- Voydanoff, P. (2005). Consequences of boundary-spanning demands and resources for work-to-family conflict and perceived stress. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*(4), 491–503. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.491>
- Winn, J. (2004). Entrepreneurship: not an easy path to top management for women. *Women in Management Review, 19*(3), 143–153. Retrieved from  
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/213157547/abstract/60A0028C1AA940EAPQ/2>

Zhao, H., & Seibert, S. E. (2006). The Big Five personality dimensions and entrepreneurial status: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(2), 259–271.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.2.259>

## **Appendix A. Participant Email**

Hello,

I am a doctoral candidate from DePaul University in Chicago, Illinois and I am conducting research on the work and family experiences of Black entrepreneurs. You are eligible to participate in this research if you meet the following requirements:

- (a) Over the age of 18
- (b) Identify as African-American or Black
- (c) Are currently an entrepreneur, which is defined as an individual who founds, manages and operates a business or enterprise, assuming all the risks and rewards of the venture

Completion of this survey will take approximately 35-45 minutes and your responses will be completely unidentifiable. Participation in this study is strictly voluntary and participants may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

**If you are aware of other individuals who meet the criteria for this study, please feel free to forward this email to them.**

**[CLICK TO PARTICPATE IN THE SURVEY](#)**

If you choose to complete this survey, you are welcome to enter a drawing for 1 of 2 \$100 VISA gift cards. Your response to this questionnaire, which will record your name and email address, is in no way related to the responses to the research survey above. Please follow this **[LINK](#)** to enter.

I deeply appreciate your time and participation!

Best wishes and thank you,

Amber Rouse

[acotton4@depaul.edu](mailto:acotton4@depaul.edu)

## Appendix B. Debriefing Statement

Dear Participant,

Thank you for your completion of this study investigating the work and family life of Black entrepreneurs. If you have any further questions, comments, or concerns, please contact the PI, Amber Rouse, (773) 318-1866, [acotton4@depaul.edu](mailto:acotton4@depaul.edu), or Dr. Alice Stuhlmacher, (773) 325-2050, [astuhlma@depaul.edu](mailto:astuhlma@depaul.edu).

As a reminder, if you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact Susan Loess-Perez, DePaul University's Director of Research Compliance, in the Office of Research Services at 312-362-7593 or by email at [sloesspe@depaul.edu](mailto:sloesspe@depaul.edu).

Once you click the arrow to continue past this page, your responses will be anonymously recorded, and the window will indicate that you have fully completed the survey. If you wish to enter for a drawing for 1 of 2 \$100 VISA gift cards, please refer to the link provided in the original recruitment email. If you chose to do so, **please proceed to the next page to save your responses.**

Again, thank you for your time and participation in this study.

Sincerely,

Amber Rouse

### **Appendix C. Work–Life indicator (Boundary Management Characteristics Scale)**

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements on a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Nonwork interrupting work behaviors (Family/personal life interrupting work)

1. I take care of personal or family needs while working.
2. I respond to personal communication (e.g., emails, texts, and phone calls) while working.
3. I do not think about my family, friends, or personal interests while working so I can focus. (R)
4. While I work, I handle personal or family responsibilities.
5. I monitor personal-related communications (e.g., emails, texts, and phone calls) when I am working.

Work interrupting nonwork behaviors (Work interrupting family/personal life)

6. I regularly work outside of the time I initially allocated.
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.

Boundary control

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.

Work identity

14. People see me as highly focused on my work.

15. I invest a large part of myself in my work.

Family identity

16. People see me as highly focused on my family.

17. I invest a large part of myself in my family life.

Note. R indicates items that are reverse scored.



### **Appendix D. Work-Family Balance Satisfaction Scale**

On a scale of 1 (Very Dissatisfied) to 5 (Very Satisfied), please indicate your level of satisfaction to the following statements:

1. The way you divide your time between work and personal or family life
2. The way you divide your attention between work and personal or family life
3. How well your work life and your personal or family life fit together
4. Your ability to balance the needs of your work with those of your personal or family life
5. The opportunity you have to perform work-related tasks well and yet be able to perform home-related responsibilities adequately

### **Appendix E. Work-Family Balance Effectiveness Scale**

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements on a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

1. I am able to negotiate and accomplish what is expected of me in my work and in my family
2. I do a good job of meeting the role expectations of critical people in my work and in my family.
3. People who are close to me would say that I do a good job of balancing work and family
4. I am able to accomplish the expectations that I set for myself and my family have for me.
5. Members of my team and members of my family would say that I am meeting their expectations.
6. It is clear to me, based on feedback from my team and family members, that I am accomplishing both my work and family responsibilities.

### **Appendix F. Career Satisfaction Scale**

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements on a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

1. I am satisfied with the success I have achieved in my career.
2. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my overall career goals.
3. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for income.
4. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for advancement.
5. I am satisfied with the progress I have made toward meeting my goals for the development of new skills.

### **Appendix G. Life Satisfaction Scale**

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements on a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

1. In most ways, my life is close to my ideal.
2. The conditions of my life are excellent.
3. I am satisfied with my life.
4. So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life.
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

## Appendix H. Social Support Scale

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements on a scale of 1

(Not at all) to 4 (Very much)

\*Note: 0 (Don't have any such person) will be included

1. How much does each of these people go out of their way to do things to make your work life easier for you?
  - a. Your spouse/significant other
  - b. Your family, friends, and relatives
  - c. Members of your church and/or religious community
  - d. Other people you work with (e.g., team members, temporary/contract workers)
2. How easy is it to talk with each of the following?
  - a. Your spouse/significant other
  - b. Your family, friends, and relatives
  - c. Members of your church and/or religious community
  - d. Other people you work with (e.g., team members, temporary/contract workers)
3. How much can each of these people be relied on when things get tough at work?
  - a. Your spouse/significant other
  - b. Your family, friends, and relatives
  - c. Members of your church and/or religious community
  - d. Other people you work with (e.g., team members, temporary/contract workers)
4. How much is each of the following people willing to listen to your personal problems?
  - a. Your spouse/significant other
  - b. Your family, friends, and relatives

- c. Members of your church and/or religious community
- d. Other people you work with (e.g., team members, temporary/contract workers)

### **Appendix I. Implicit Negotiation Beliefs**

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements on a scale of 1

(Very strongly disagree) to 7 (Very strongly agree)

1. The kind of negotiator someone is is very basic and it can't be changed very much.
2. All people can change even their most basic negotiation qualities (R)
3. Good negotiators are born that way.
4. People can approach negotiation differently, but the important part of how they handle conflict can't really be changed.
5. Everyone is a certain kind of negotiator and there is not much that can be done to really change that.
6. Everyone, no matter who they are, can significantly change their basic negotiation characteristics. (R)
7. In negotiations, experience is a great teacher. (R)

Note. R indicates items that are reverse scored.

### Appendix J. Demographic Information

1. Are you currently an entrepreneur? Yes No
2. If no, please select which statement applies best.
  - Full-time employee for another business or organization and a part-time entrepreneur
  - Part-time employee for another business or organization and a part-time entrepreneur
  - Not an employee for another business or organization and a part-time entrepreneur
3. How many hours do you work per week on average? \_\_\_\_\_
4. What form best describes your business?
  - Freelancer/independent contractor
  - Sole proprietorship
  - General partnership
  - Limited partnership
  - Limited liability corporation (LLC)
  - General corporation
  - Sub-chapter S corporation
  - Not yet determined
5. In 2018, how many people owned this business?
  - Do not combine two or more owners to create one owner
  - Count spouses and partners as separate owners.
    - 1 person -- 10 % or More Ownership
    - 2 people -- 10 % or More Ownership
    - 3 people -- 10 % or More Ownership
    - 4 people -- 10 % or More Ownership



- 5-10 people — 10 % or More Ownership
  - 11 or more people
  - Business is owned by a parent company, estate, trust, or other entity
  - Don't know
6. Does this business currently have any other employees?
- If yes, approximately how many employees does this business have? \_\_\_\_\_
    - i. Of these employees, how many are temporary or part-time? (e.g., independent contractors) \_\_\_\_\_
7. How did you initially acquire ownership of this business?
- Founded or started
  - Purchased
  - Inherited
  - Received transfer of ownership or gift
8. What year did you found and/or acquire ownership of this business?
- Year \_\_\_\_\_
9. Has a business plan been prepared for this business? Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_
- If yes, what is the current form of this business plan?
    - i. Unwritten
    - ii. Informally written
    - iii. Formally prepared
10. What is your highest degree or level of education?
- Less than high school graduate
  - High school graduate – Diploma or GED

- Technical, trade or vocational school
- Some college, but no degree
- Associate Degree
- Bachelor's Degree
- Master's, Doctorate, or Professional Degree

11. Does this business serve as your primary source of personal income?

- Yes, all of my total income comes from this business
- No, I have other sources of income

12. For 2017, did this business have profits, losses, or break even? (Please select one)

- Profits
- Losses
- Break even
- I have been in business less than one year

13. What was your total income in 2017?

- Less than \$10,000
- \$10,000 to \$19,999
- \$20,000 to \$29,999
- \$30,000 to \$39,999
- \$40,000 to \$49,999
- \$50,000 to \$59,999
- \$60,000 to \$69,999
- \$70,000 to \$79,999
- \$80,000 to \$89,999

- \$90,000 to \$99,999
- \$100,000 to \$149,999
- \$150,000 or more

14. What is your gender? Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_

15. What is your age (in years)? \_\_\_\_\_

16. What is your current marital and/or relationship status?

- Single
- Living as married (e.g., in a long-term relationship)
- Married
- Divorced
- Widowed

17. Do you primarily identify as Black/African American? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

- If no, please describe your ethnic background \_\_\_\_\_

18. Do you have children? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

19. If yes, how many children are living with you between the ages of:

- 5 and under**                      0 1 2 3 4 5+
- 6 to 10 years of age**              0 1 2 3 4 5+
- 11 to 18 years of age**              0 1 2 3 4 5+
- 18 to 25 years of age**              0 1 2 3 4 5+
- 25 and older**                      0 1 2 3 4 5+

20. How many people are currently living with you, excluding your spouse, your significant other and/or your children?

- 0

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5+

21. Please select your place of residence

- U.S.
  - i. Midwest (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin)
  - ii. Northwest (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont)
  - iii. South (Arkansas, Alabama, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington DC)
  - iv. West (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming)
  - v. Puerto Rico or other US territories
- Outside U.S.
  - i. Please indicate \_\_\_\_\_

22. What is your primary work location?

- Home office
- One physical/or business office location
- Several physical/or business office locations

- Traveling office/client work site (s)
- Other \_\_\_\_\_
  - i. (If other, please describe the work location) \_\_\_\_\_

23. Have you received formal entrepreneurship education or training? Yes\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_

- If so, select all that apply
  - i. College/university courses
  - ii. Workshops/seminars
  - iii. Online courses
  - iv. Business coaching/mentorship
  - v. Other \_\_\_\_\_

24. Which of the following best describes your business?

- Retail store
- Restaurant, tavern, bar, or nightclub
- Customer service
- Health, education or social services
- Manufacturing
- Construction
- Agriculture
- Wholesale distribution
- Transportation
- Utilities
- Communications
- Finance

- Insurance
- Real estate
- Business consulting or service
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

i. If other, please describe below

25. In the space below, describe the top three reasons you decided to become an entrepreneur?

26. What are the three biggest challenges you have experienced as a Black entrepreneur?

27. What resources do Black entrepreneurs need specifically to achieve better balance between their work and family/personal life?

### Appendix K. Key Themes and Representative Statements (Open Ended Question 1)

Key Themes	Representative Statements
Passion for work	"No restrictions on fulfilling my passions" "I was passionate about the idea..." "Hair was always a passion of mine..."
Flexibility and freedom	"Wanted to work for myself, freedom to make my own choices" "Freedom, flexibility, unlimited income potential" "I want flexibility and believe I have a skill that can help others"
Independence and autonomy	"Take control of my career and my time.." "Independence, flexibility, control over my career aspirations" "Ownership of time, control of income, self-satisfaction"
Wealth and legacy building	"Wealth, legacy, freedom" "Freedom to create solutions, financial ownership, wealth building" "Control by destiny, build wealth, self-fulfillment"

### Appendix L. Key Themes and Representative Statements (Open Ended Question 2)

Key Themes	Representative Statements
Access to capital	<p>"Fewer funding resources. Fewer funding resources at the pre-seed round of fundraising. And people assuming that we will bootstrap the product instead of introductions it to a market."</p> <p>"Underfunded, underestimated, no access to resources."</p>
Support from network	<p>"Funding and opportunities plus social capital"</p> <p>"Lack of support from my own community..."</p> <p>"Lack of consistent income, can be lonely, hard to rely on others"</p> <p>"People taking me serious and using my services"</p> <p>"Lack of support from peers"</p>
Mentorship	<p>"Finding a mentor, getting loans, finding a community of others like myself."</p> <p>"Funding, mentoring, resources"</p>
Marketing assistance	<p>"Funding, lack of black mentors in this space, lack of support from peers"</p> <p>"Funding, capital, mentorship"</p> <p>"Trust, marketing and pricing"</p> <p>"Financial support, Successful marketing, Clear understanding of taxes."</p> <p>"Time management and early on I struggled finding clients. I also have a challenge promoting myself."</p> <p>"Marketing, time management, balancing books"</p>



### Appendix M. Key Themes and Representative Statements (Open Ended Question 3)

Key Themes	Representative Statements
Education and training	<p>"To understand how to set boundaries and manage their time."</p> <p>"A guide. Possibly one explaining ways to achieve said balance and personal life. Workshops."</p> <p>"Entrepreneurship workshops on mental health and time management"</p> <p>"Time management resources, consulting/business coaching'</p>
Mentorship	<p>"Better mentors to help navigate the journey and provide a blueprint that can help newbies avoid pitfalls."</p> <p>"Mentorship to show that balance is possible; access to time management tools out of the gate; resources for family/friends to explain."</p> <p>"A mentor program would be great, in my niche there aren't too many people doing the same thing so it can be hard to know what prices to set and what to expect when crossing over from it just being a hobby to becoming a business"</p> <p>"A better mindset. There is no such thing as balance. It's about flow. Balance looks differently depending on so many factors. As blacks, we need to create businesses where we can rest if we desire. Many are building large hustles."</p>
Help with team building	<p>"Being able to trust someone to delegate work to, expressing stress or concerns to their family and asking for support"</p> <p>"Access to talent, connections, professional development"</p> <p>"The need of investors. mentors/coaches, team members they can delegate more tasks to."</p> <p>"Capital and teams"</p> <p>"Access to capital so we can hire a team"</p>