An Experimental Study of Online Boundary Management Behaviours and Their Effects on

Employees' Attitudes

Charlotte A. Tammes

s4200020

ca.tammes@student.ru.nl

+31 6 16 36 76 34

Abstract

In today's online social networks it appears that employees' borders between private and work lives are becoming vaguer than they used to be. Due to the collision of professional and personal lives online, it seems unclear how employees should present themselves. The purpose of this study was therefore to gain more insights into the effects of how employees represent themselves in online social networks. Two sets of online boundary management behaviours were examined. These two sets of behaviours differed in how employees manage their personal and professional identities on Facebook. Results indicated that people do not seem to make a distinction between how a colleague represents himself online. An explanation for this could be the shift from offline to online interaction. This shift has prompted people's professional and private lives to overlap, and as a result, colleagues may not be perceived differently than any other contacts on Facebook.

Keywords: online, boundary management behaviours, employees

An Experimental Study of Online Boundary Management Behaviours and Their Effects on Employees' Attitudes

The ubiquity of online social networks is astonishing. As of today, over two billion people have an online social media account (Kemp, 2015). From all social networking sites, Facebook is by far the largest with a number of 1.3 billion users every month (Facebook, 2015, p.5). Since its start-up in 2004, Facebook has become a place in which millions of people are interacting socially on a daily basis (Wilson, Gosling & Graham, 2012). Because of the shift from offline interaction to online interaction, social networking sites, such as Facebook, have initiated a change in the way information is shared and with whom it is shared (Schoon & Cain, 2011). One of the differences is the amount of information disclosure. In offline interactions, disclosure is fairly limited and tailored because conversations are usually held between small numbers of participants. In online interactions, however, information is accessible to a much broader audience (Boyd, 2007).

Several advantages have been attributed to the use of online social networks. An important advantage of Facebook is for example the formation and maintenance of relationships (Ellison, Steinfield & Lampe, 2007). Facebook has been found to be a useful tool to stay connected with people. With regard to the use of social media for work purposes, it was found that colleagues made use of Facebook to strengthen their ties with other colleagues resulting in more efficient communication (Skeels & Grudin, 2009). Another study in the insurance industry found that employees using social media for work purposes were also more productive (Leftheriotis & Giannakos, 2014). It can, therefore, be understood that social networking sites can be beneficial for both private and professional purposes. Nevertheless, there are some pivotal concerns about the use of social network sites. Privacy issues and tensions between personal and professional life are concerns that may occur more often in online interactions than in offline interactions (Skeels & Grudin, 2009; Ollier-Malaterre, Rothbard & Berg, 2013; Wilson, et al., 2012; Frampton & Child, 2013). However, to date little is known about how employees try to manage boundaries between their personal and professional identities in online social networks and how this impacts the way their professional contacts perceive them (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). Should one keep their personal and professional domains separate when being active on social network sites? Or should those two domains be integrated with one another? These questions are posed more often, because it seems that employees' borders of private and work are

becoming vaguer than they used to be. Seemingly, not everyone is conscious of the consequences of one's online presentation. Therefore, it is important to gain more knowledge regarding the impact of how an individual represents himself in online social networks. The following study is focused on exploring the effects of employees' online boundary management behaviours.

A study that recently attempted to explore this new phenomenon of online boundary management is the study of Ollier-Malaterre, Rothbard and Berg (2013). They have extended the traditional theory of boundary management into a framework that consists of four typical sets of online boundary management behaviours that employees tend to adopt when presenting themselves in online social networks. The framework is developed to explain the motivational drivers of online boundary behaviours and consequences. However, before the model is further explained, it should be noted that it is merely a theory. Thus, although it has been very valuable, it has never been tested yet. The purpose of this study is, therefore, to shed more light on this under-researched area. As the model is beyond the scope of this study, two of the four sets of online boundary behaviours will be explored. The two sets are *content boundary management behaviours*, where someone wishes to integrate his personal and professional identities, and *hybrid boundary management behaviours,* where someone wishes to keep his personal and professional identities separate. Moreover, similarity, which is the idea that people have a tendency to like others who are similar to themselves, is a new concept that will be introduced to the model of Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013).

Conceptual Framework of Online Boundary Management Behaviours

Employees' answers to two fundamental questions form the base of the framework. These questions are "*with whom they communicate*" and "*what they communicate in their online social networks*" (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013, p. 649). In the study of Ollier-Malaterre and her colleagues (2013) it is firstly argued that the answers of employees to the question with whom they communicate depends on how employees structure their social worlds. They can either segment their personal and professional identities, or they can choose to integrate both of their identities. It is argued that the preference of segmentation or integration of personal and professional identities is an essential determinant of whom employees are encouraged to

communicate with in their online social environment. Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) believe that if employees wish to segment their identities, it is more probable that they classify their contacts in different domains. Thus, they will keep their contacts separated just as they probably also would in their offline world. On the other hand, if employees wish to integrate their personal and professional identities, they will probably not manage their contacts as actively as segmentors would. In other words, employees who prefer to segment their online contacts will have more strict boundaries between their contacts than employees who prefer to integrate their professional and personal identities (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013).

Secondly, the employees' answers to the question of what they communicate in their online social networks, depends on how employees wish to present themselves. They can present themselves in a way which is called *self-enhancement*. This means that people "present themselves to others in a positive and socially desirable manner" (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013, p. 651). When an individual self-evaluates, information is selectively chosen in a way that will have positive consequences for oneself. As self-enhancers wish to present themselves in the most favourable manner, they are likely to regulate the information they disclose in a strategic manner (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013).

Based on the motivational driver of self-enhancement and segmentation versus integration strategies, two corresponding sets of typical online boundary management behaviours were developed by Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013). As can be seen in figure 1, the model originally consists of four archetypal sets of online boundary behaviours. Current study specifically explores two sets of online boundary behaviours that are related to self-enhancement, namely *content boundary management behaviours* and *hybrid boundary management behaviours*. The consequences of these two sets of boundary behaviours will be specifically examined.

Preferences for segmentation versus integration
of professional and personal identities

	Integration	Segmentation
Self-verification	**Open boundary management behaviors** • Decrease average respect • Decrease average liking	**Audience boundary management behaviors** • Protect but do not increase average respect • Decrease average liking
Self-enhancement	**Content boundary management behaviors** • Increase average respect • Increase average liking	**Hybrid boundary management behaviors** • Increase average respect • Increase average liking

Self-evaluation motives

Figure 1. A conceptual model of online boundary management drivers, behaviours, and consequences (Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013).

Content boundary management behaviours. When employees wish to integrate their personal and professional identities, it is expected that they will employ content boundary management behaviours, which is defined as "managing their identities primarily through actively controlling what information they disclose – but not the people to whom they disclose – in online social networks" (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013, p. 653). Thus, employees engaging in content behaviours will aim to present themselves in the most favourable manner to an extensive set of personal and professional contacts (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013).

Hybrid boundary management behaviours. When employees do not wish to integrate their personal and professional identities, but prefer to keep those two domains separate instead, they are likely to use hybrid boundary management behaviours, which is defined as "the concurrent management of audience and content boundaries such that employees divide their professional and personal contacts into separate audiences and tailor the content they disclose to

each audiences" (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013, p. 654). Employees engaging in hybrid behaviours will thus aim to tailor their content to their audience in order to create a positive image to both their personal and professional contacts (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013).

Effects of Online Boundary Management Behaviours on Respect & Relatedness

The next step in the framework is to explore to what extent different boundary management behaviours influence the level of respect that employees' professional contacts have of them. Respect is defined as "the response which reflects high regard of and deference to a person" (Wojciszke, Abele & Baryla, 2009, p. 974). It is argued that respect judgements are based on the appropriateness of the information that employees share with their contacts (Wojciszke et al., 2009). Respect is likely to make a contribution to cooperation, group commitment and favourable interpersonal relationships of employees (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). It is, therefore, important for employees to manage the information they share online cleverly.

Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013) attribute consequences of content and hybrid behaviours with regard to respect. As content behaviours allow employees to carefully monitor the information they share and the information that is being shared by others, it enables them to broadcast information that is of self-enhancing nature to a broad set of audiences. It is because of this that content management behaviours are expected to increase the level of respect among employees' professional contacts (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013).

Hybrid behaviours do not only allow employees to carefully monitor the information they share, it also enable employees to keep their personal and professional contacts separate in online social networks. It is the combination of disclosure of tailored information to specific audiences and the management of positive professional impressions (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). Therefore, it is expected that hybrid boundary management behaviours will increase the level of respect among employees' professional contacts too (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013

Thus, the way in which employees manage their behaviours online has an effect on how they are perceived by their colleagues. As employees that adopt hybrid behaviours create different subgroups and tailor the information they share according to the characteristics of the subgroup, it is likely that they will be more respected by their colleagues than when employees

use content boundary behaviours. For these reasons, it is also expected that when an employee adopts hybrid boundary behaviours and is therefore more likely to receive respect from his colleagues, it is also more probable that he will be accepted as a friend on Facebook by other colleagues, than when an employee uses content boundary behaviours.

Moreover, it is assumed that when colleagues are connected with each other on Facebook, this may result in feeling more related to one another. This feeling of relatedness is defined as the feeling of connectedness with others (Ryan & Deci, 2000). It is therefore expected that employees using hybrid management behaviours are more likely to feel related to other colleagues, than employees adopting content management behaviours. Altogether, this leads to the first hypothesis:

H1: Employees adopting hybrid boundary management behaviours are more likely to (1) generate respect from professional contacts; (2) be accepted as a friend on Facebook by professional contacts; and (3) feel more related to professional contacts than employees adopting content boundary management behaviours.

Similarity

How one is perceived by his/her professional contacts in online social networks is also influenced by similarity. The notion of similarity, which is derived from social psychology, is that people have a tendency to like others who are similar to themselves (Gilovich, Keltner, Chen & Nisbett, 2006; Gleitman, Gross & Reisberg, 2011, p. 536). An example of evidence that supports this proposition is the study of Newcomb (1956), in which students who did not know each other lived together for an extended period of time. These students were instructed to fill in a weekly questionnaire, answering questions which indicated how much they liked each of their housemates. It was found, after a certain period of time, that students' linking of one another was based on how similar they were. Thus, similarity is a factor that may influence how employees are perceived by their professional contacts in online social networks. Based on the idea of similarity, it can be assumed that people that use a certain style of boundary management behaviours will be valued more positively by people that use a similar style of boundary behaviours too. Taking this into consideration, it can be expected that employees who adopt

hybrid boundary management behaviours are more likely to be respected by their professional contacts that have a preference for segmentation too. As a result, the next hypothesis is the following:

H2a: Employees adopting hybrid boundary management behaviours are more likely to generate respect from professional contacts that have a preference for segmentation than from professional contacts that have a preference for integration.

Likewise, based on the notion of similarity, it is assumed that employees employing content boundary management behaviours are likely to be respected more by professional contacts that have a preference for integration as well. Accordingly, the hypothesis is:

H2b: Employees adopting content boundary management behaviours are more likely to generate respect from professional contacts that have a preference for integration than from professional contacts that have a preference for segmentation.

Method

Research design. For the experiment of this study a 2 (Hybrid vs. Content) x 2 (Segmentation vs. Integration preference) design was used. There were two levels of modification resulting in two versions of a text; one version adopting the content boundary management behaviours, and one adopting the hybrid boundary management behaviours. For this study, a between-subject design was used in which each participant was shown one of the two versions of the text. The study's purpose was to test whether these two versions had an effect on respect towards the employee, relatedness towards the employee, and on the willingness to accept the employee's friend request on Facebook. Additionally, this study examined the effect of the interaction between online boundary management behaviours and the participants' preference of integration or segmentation on the dependent variables.

Materials. The independent variable in this study was the type of online boundary management behaviours. Two different texts and Facebook pages were developed. The two texts

and Facebook pages were different with respect to the type of online boundary management behaviours. These types of boundary management behaviours were based on Ollier-Malaterre and colleagues' (2013) framework of online boundary management behaviours. The texts described a colleague's Facebook profile and the Facebook pages contained distinctive characteristics of two types of online boundary management behaviours. The developed text according to hybrid boundary management behaviours is the following:

> "Imagine the following situation:
>
> Tom is your colleague and works in the same team as you. Below you can see Tom's Facebook profile. Amongst his Facebook friends are his friends, family, acquaintances, as well as his colleagues. Tom divided his contacts into different groups. The page you are shown is only visible for his colleagues.
>
> Look at the Facebook profile and read Tom's messages carefully. Hereafter questions will be asked with regard to his Facebook profile."

The full manipulation of hybrid boundary management behaviours can be found in the questionnaire in Appendix A. The developed text according to content boundary management behaviours is as follows:

> "Imagine the following situation:
>
> Tom is your colleague and works in the same team as you. Below you can see Tom's Facebook profile. Amongst his Facebook friends are his friends, family, acquaintances, as well as his colleagues. The page you are shown is visible to all his contacts.
>
> Look at the Facebook profile and read Tom's messages carefully. Hereafter questions will be asked with regard to this Facebook profile."

The full manipulation of content boundary management behaviours can also be found in the questionnaire in Appendix A.

Participants. In total, 130 participants took part in this study. Of the 130 participants, 70% were female. The ages of the participants ranged between 18 and 61 ($M = 31.19$, $SD = $

12.39). The educational level of the participants ranged between VMBO/MAVO/LBO and WO, with HBO being the most frequent (VMBO/MAVO/LBO = 4; MBO = 16; HAVO = 20; VWO = 15; HBO = 40; WO = 35). Of all the participants, 42.3% were still following any type of education. The participants worked in several employment types (Full-time = 39.2%; Part-time = 56.9%; Entrepreneur = 3.8%). Participants worked within various branches of employment. The main four branches were Commercial Services (25), Healthcare (24), Hospitality Industry (23) and Government (13). The duration of employment for the current organization varied (Less than one year = 30.8%; One to three years = 34.6%; Four to six years = 10%; Seven to ten years = 10.8%; Eleven years or longer = 13.8%). The duration of employment within the current function varied as well (Less than one year = 35.4%; One to three years = 33.1%; Four to six years = 15.4%; Seven to ten years = 7.7%; Eleven years or longer = 8.4%). Moreover, 83.1% of all participants worked under a supervisor, 23.8% were a supervisor themselves, and 89.2% worked within a team. In total, 65 participants were shown the Content boundary management behaviours condition and 65 participants were shown the Hybrid boundary management behaviours condition.

Instruments. For this study a moderator was used to measure the effect of the interaction between online boundary management behaviours and the participants' preference of integration or segmentation on the dependent variables. The moderator participants' preference of integration or segmentation was measured with two different scales, namely "Integration/segmentation preference A" and "Integration/segmentation preference B". Integration/segmentation preference A was measured with four items on a 5-point Likert scale, for which respondents were asked to state the degree to which (from "*not at all*" to "*completely*") their private and professional contacts were integrated with one another. The measure of this scale was based on Fieseler, Meckel and Ranzini's (2015) online personae overlap scale and consisted of items, such as "*To what extent do your private and work-related social media profiles overlap?*" The reliability of Integration/segmentation preference A, which comprised of four items, was acceptable (α = .72).

Integration/segmentation preference B was measured with six items on a 7-point Likert scale based on the personae overlap scales of Clark (2000) and Kossek, Lautsch and Eaton (2006). Respondents were asked to state the degree to which (from "*totally disagree*" to "*totally*

agree") they agreed with items, such as "*I prefer to not talk about my family issues with most people I work with*". The reliability of Integration/segmentation preference B, which comprised of six items, was unacceptable ($\alpha = .54$). As the reliability of this scale was unacceptable ($\alpha = .54$), Integration/segmentation preference B was excluded as a variable from the analyses. All items of different scales can be found in the questionnaire of Appendix A.

The dependent variables in this study were: *respect towards the employee* (Tyler & Blader, 2002; Bartel, Wrzesniewski & Wiesenfeld, 2012), *relatedness to the employee* (Richer & Vallerand, 1998), and *willingness to accept the employee's friend request on Facebook*. All dependent variables were measured with seven-point Likert scale items, ranging from "*totally disagree*" to "*totally agree*". Cronbach's α was used to calculate the reliability of the scales consisting of more than one item.

Respect towards the employee consisted of two dependent variables, namely Respect A and Respect B. The dependent variable "Respect A" was measured with eight items based on the autonomous respect scale of Tyler and Blader (2002) and consisted of items, such as "*I believe Tom has a good reputation in the organization*". The reliability of Respect A, which comprised of eight items, was good ($\alpha = .89$). The dependent variable "Respect B" was measured with four items based on the perceived respect scale of Bartel et al. (2012) and included items, such as "*I would value Tom's ideas and efforts at work*". The reliability of Respect B, which comprised of four items, was good ($\alpha = .88$).

The dependent variable "Relatedness to the employee" was measured with ten items based on the need for relatedness scale of Richer & Vallerand (1998), commencing with the sentence "*In my relationship with my colleague, I feel*", preceded by items, such as "*supported*", and "*as a friend*". The reliability of relatedness to the employee comprising of ten items was good ($\alpha = .94$).

The dependent variable "Willingness to accept the employee's friend request on Facebook" was measured with a single item "*I would accept Tom Hendriks as a friend on Facebook*". For all items of the different scales, see the questionnaire in Appendix A. Composite means were calculated for all scales where α was .70 or higher.

Procedure. An online experiment was developed and potential participants were invited to take part. The researchers invited employees within their own network to participate in the study. Moreover, an invitation was posted on a variety of Internet forums (e.g. Facebook) and invitations were sent in personal email messages. Participants were shown an introductory text describing the focus and the approximate length of the survey. Then, participants were asked to give consent to participate in the study and were told that their answers would stay anonymous. After this, participants were asked whether they had a job and a Facebook account. If they answered no to either one of these two questions, they were automatically excluded from the survey. Subsequently, they were shown either one of the two versions of the manipulations (randomly assigned). Afterwards they were asked to fill in the scales measuring respect towards the employee, relatedness to the employee, and willingness to accept employee's friend request on Facebook, Facebook intensity, and integration or segmentation preference. The survey ended with various general questions such as age, gender, education, branch of employment, etc.

Results

Main effects. The first purpose of this study was to test whether employees adopting hybrid boundary management behaviours are more likely to generate respect from colleagues, be accepted as a friend on Facebook by colleagues, and feel more related to colleagues than employees adopting content boundary management behaviours.

A one-way analysis of variance showed no significant effect of type of online boundary management behaviours (Content or Hybrid) on both Respect A (F (1, 128) < 1) and Respect B (F (1, 128) = 2.30, p = .131). In addition, a one-way analysis of variance showed no significant effect of type of boundary management behaviours (Content or Hybrid) on Relatedness (F (1, 128) = 2.16, p = .144) or on the Willingness to add Tom Hendriks as a friend on Facebook (F (1, 128) = 1.76, p = .187). As no main effects of type of online boundary management behaviours on either respect towards the employee, relatedness towards the employee or willingness to add the employee as a friend on Facebook was found, hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Interaction Effects. Another purpose of the study was to test whether employees adopting hybrid boundary management behaviours were more likely to generate respect from

colleagues that have a preference for segmentation than from colleagues that have a preference for integration. Likewise, it was tested whether employees using content boundary management behaviours were more likely to generate respect from colleagues that have a preference for integration than from colleagues that prefer segmentation. In order to test this, participants with a score below the median of segmentation (*Mdn* = 3.00) were categorized as having a preference for segmentation and participants with a score above the median were categorized as having a preference for integration.

Respect A. A two-way analysis of variance with a Segmentation/integration preference and type of Online boundary management behaviours (Content or Hybrid) as factors showed a non-significant main effect of Segmentation/integration preference on Respect A (F (1, 126) = 1.10, p = .295). Type of Online boundary management behaviours was not found to have a significant main effect on Respect A (F (1, 126) < 1). The interaction effect between Segmentation/integration preference and Online boundary management behaviours was not statistically significant (F (1, 126) =1.76, p = .187).

Respect B. A two-way analysis of variance with a Segmentation/integration preference and type of Online boundary management behaviours (Content or Hybrid) as factors showed a non-significant main effect of Segmentation/integration preference on Respect B (F (1, 126) <1). Type of Online boundary management behaviours was not found to have a significant main effect on Respect B (F (1, 126) = 2.06, p = .154). The interaction effect between Segmentation/integration preference and Online boundary management behaviours was not statistically significant (F (1, 126) <1).

Relatedness. A two-way analysis of variance with a Segmentation/integration preference and type of Online boundary management behaviours (Content or Hybrid) as factors showed a marginal significant main effect of Segmentation/integration preference on Relatedness (F (1, 126) =3.54, p = .062). Therefore, there is tentatively evidence that participants having a preference for integration (*M* = 4.09, *SD* = 0.91) were shown to have a higher score on relatedness towards Tom Hendriks than participants having a preference for segmentation (*M* = 3.85, *SD* = 0.83).

Type of Online boundary management behaviours was found to have a marginal significant main effect on Relatedness as well (F (1, 126) = 3.22, p = .075). This means that there is tentatively evidence that participants who were shown the content manipulation (*M* = 4.07, *SD*

= 0.77) had a higher score on relatedness towards Tom Hendriks than participants that were shown the hybrid manipulation ($M = 3.84$, $SD = 0.95$). The interaction effect between Segmentation/integration preference and Online boundary management behaviours was not statistically significant (F (1, 126) <1).

Friend Request. A two-way analysis of variance with a Segmentation/integration preference, type of Online boundary management behaviours (Content or Hybrid), and the interaction of online boundary management behaviours and segmentation/integration preference as factors showed a significant main effect of Segmentation/integration preference on the Willingness to accept Tom Hendriks as a friend on Facebook (F (1, 126) = 7.65, p = .007). Participants having a preference for integration ($M = 5.53$, $SD = 1.33$) were shown to have a higher willingness to accept Tom Hendriks as a friend on Facebook than participants with a preference for segmentation ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 1.71$). Type of Online boundary management behaviours was not found to have a significant main effect on the Willingness to accept Tom Hendriks as a friend on Facebook (F (1, 126) < 1). The interaction effect between Segmentation/integration preference and Online boundary management behaviours was not statistically significant (F (1, 126) = 1.83, p = .179).

As no interaction effects were found, both hypotheses H2a and H2b were not supported.

Conclusion

The present study adds to the body of research that attempts to understand how professionals are perceived online by their colleagues. Contrary to the study's expectations, no effect of the two types of online boundary management behaviours was found on respect and relatedness towards the employee, and on the willingness to accept the employee's friend request on Facebook (H1). Moreover, expectations that when someone adopts a certain type of online boundary management behaviours, one will be more likely to be respected by a colleague that prefers using the same type of boundary management behaviours (H2a, H2b) were not met either.

This study is the first attempt to test the theory of online boundary management behaviours proposed by Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013). Although the hypotheses were not specifically answered, some interesting results were found. First, findings suggest that people

that have a preference for integration are more willing to accept a colleague's friend request on Facebook than people that prefer segmentation. Even though this finding was not in accordance with the first hypothesis, a plausible explanation that can be found is someone's preference for using a certain type of online boundary behaviours. As people who prefer to integrate their work and private domains on online social networking sites, it is likely that they are more willing to accept a colleague on Facebook than people who prefer to keep those two domains separate. This is also in line with Ollier-Malaterre and her colleagues' (2013) theoretical paper, in which it is claimed that people preferring segmentation have strict boundaries between their contacts. The likelihood of accepting a colleague on Facebook seems therefore rather doubtful for segmentors.

Second, it can be arguably claimed that people preferring integration felt more related towards a colleague than people that prefer segmentation. This finding could also be related to Ollier-Malaterre et al.'s (2013) theory of online boundary management behaviours. Employees who adopt content boundary behaviours appear to manage their boundaries not as strictly as employees adopting hybrid behaviours (Ollier-Malaterre et al., 2013). As their boundaries between private and work are more loosely, people preferring integration might be more probable to feel related towards their colleagues than people who wish to keep their private and work domains strictly separated.

Another marginally significant finding is that employees adopting content boundary behaviours (where personal and professional identities are integrated with one another) were more likely to generate a feeling of relatedness from colleagues than employees using hybrid behaviours (where employees segment their private and work domains). In other words, with caution we can conclude that content behaviours create more relatedness with colleagues than hybrid behaviours, despite colleague's preference for integration or segmentation. This finding is, again, not in line with the first hypothesis, but could be explained by the fact that it seems fairly plausible that people who do not make a distinction between personal and professional contacts, are more likely to feel easier related towards a colleague, than someone who wishes to keep his private and professional lives strictly separate. Also, it seems that people prefer personal information over professional matters, but only if it is of a self-enhancing nature.

With regard to the first hypothesis of this study, it seems that no distinction has been made between the two types of online boundary management behaviours. One of the reasons that could explain the lack of differences between the two sets of boundary behaviours is the shift of

interactions in our society. Due to the recent shift from offline to online interactions, the way information is shared and with whom it is shared has changed (Schoon & Cain, 2011). Compared to offline interactions, where information is fairly limited and tailored because conversations were usually held between a few members, in online interactions, such as on Facebook, information is accessible to much more people (Boyd, 2007), ranging from 100 to over 1000 contacts. This may have had an influence on people's private and professional lives. Facebook has made it possible for people to share their everyday lives online. As a result, many people integrate their private and professional lives on social networking sites, and this overlap seems to become more and more present in today's society (Fieseler et al. 2015). This development may have affected the way people perceive others on Facebook. As many people's professional lives became an extension of their personal lives on social networking sites, no distinction is made between colleagues and friends on Facebook. Therefore, colleagues are not perceived differently than any other contacts on Facebook and this could explain the fact that this study did not find any differences between the two sets of boundary behaviours.

Based on above-mentioned findings, it thus appears that it may not really matter how employees behave on their Facebook profiles (either content or hybrid). It is apparently more important who is looking at your profile (either someone that prefers integration or segmentation). The respondents' preference of integration or segmentation seems important but has not been incorporated in the theoretical model of Ollier-Malaterre et al. (2013). The preference of integration or segmentation should therefore be further explored in follow-up research.

As this study has been the first to test the theoretical model of online boundary management behaviours, a number of limitations can be attributed to the present study. Firstly, results seemingly showed that sharing information on private and professional matters may not make a difference, but whether this information on these matters is positive or negative was not tested. This study has only looked at Facebook profiles that contained self-enhancing messages. A self-enhancer aims to create a positive image, and will, therefore, only share information that is of a self-enhancing nature. Since both content and hybrid behaviours employed self-enhancement, this may have had an influence on how employees were evaluated by colleagues. Employees may be perceived differently by their colleagues when they share information that is not only positive, but also negative. This could therefore be of importance for future research.

Moreover, the length of the questionnaire might have been too long and participants may have lost concentration after a certain period. A study showed that the longer a survey is, the less time participants spend answering each question (Brent, 2011). This may have affected the reliability of this study's data. Future research could take this into account by creating an optimal survey length. Additionally, for the experiment of this study, the materials consisted of the same person for all versions, namely a blond man called Tom Hendriks. Although a person' attractiveness is subjective, Tom Hendriks can be considered to be relatively attractive. Consequently, Tom's appearance might have had an influence on participants' perceptions. In order to explore whether one's appearance may have an effect on the way he is perceived by his colleagues, follow-up research should make use of different persons.

References

Bartel, C.A., Wrzesniewski, A., & Wiesenfeld, B. M. (2012). Knowing where you stand: Physical isolation, perceived respect, and organizational identification among virtual employees. *Organization Science*, *23*(3), 743-757.

Boyd, D. (2007). Social network sites: Public, private, or what? *Knowledge Tree*, *13*(1), 1-7.

Brent, C. (2011). How much time are respondents willing to spend on your survey? Retrieved from https://www.surveymonkey.com/blog/2011/02/14/survey_completion_times/

Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human relations*, *53*(6), 747-770.

Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2007). The benefits of Facebook "friends": Social capital and college students' use of online social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *12*, 1143-1168.

Facebook (2015). *Facebook Q4 2014 Results.* Retrieved from http://files.shareholder.com/downloads/AMDA NJ5DZ/3907746207x0x805520/2D74EDCA-E02A-420B-A262-BC096264BB93/FB_Q414EarningsSlides20150128.pdf

Fieseler, C., Meckel, M., & Ranzini, G. (2015). Professional Personae – How organizational identification shapes online identity in the workplace. *Journal of Computer – Mediated Communication, 20*, 153-170.

Frampton, B.D., & Child, J.T. (2013). Friend or not to friend: Coworker Facebook friend requests as an application of communication privacy management theory. *Computers in Human Behavior, 13*, 2257-2264.

Gilovich, T., Keltner, D., Chen, S., & Nisbett, R. E. (2006). *Social Psychology*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Gleitman, H., Gross, J., & Reisberg, D. (2011). *Psychology*. New York: W.W. Norton &

Company.

Kemp, S. (2015). Digital, Social & Mobile Worldwide in 2015 [Online article]. Retrieved from

http://wearesocial.net/blog/2015/01/digital-social-mobile-worldwide-2015/

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.

Leftheriotis, I., & Giannakos, M.N. (2014). Using social media for work: Losing your time or

improving your work? *Computers in Human Behavior, 31,*134-142.

Newcomb, T. M. (1956). The prediction of interpersonal attraction. *American Psychologist*, *1*,

575-586.

Ollier-Malaterre, A., Rothbard, N.P., & Berg, J.M. (2013). When worlds collide in cyberspace:

How boundary work in online social networks impacts professional relationships.

Academy of Management Review, *13*(4), 645-669.

Richer, S.F, & Vallerand, R.J. (1998). Construction et validation de l'Échelle du sentiment

d'appartenance sociale (ÉSAS). *Revu Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée*, *48*(2),

129-137.

Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic

Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 68-

78.

Schoon, E., & Cain, C.I. (2011). Facebook's boundaries. *Context*, *10*(2*)*, 70-71.

Skeels, M., & Grudin, J. 2009. When social networks cross boundaries: A case study of

workplace use of Facebook and LinkedIn. *In GROUP '09: Proceedings of the 2009*

International ACM Conference on Supporting Group Work: 95–104. New York: Association of Computing Machinery.

Tyler, T.R, & Blader, S.L. (2002). Autonomous vs. comparative status: Must we be better than others to feel good about ourselves? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *89*, 813-838.

Wilson, R. E., Gosling, S. D., & Graham, L. T. 2012. A review of Facebook research in the social sciences. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *7*, 203-220.

Wojciszke, B., Abele, A.E., & Baryla, W. (2009). Two dimensions of interpersonal attitudes: Liking depends on communion, respect depends on agency. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*, 973-990.

Appendix A. Questionnaire

Beste deelnemer,

Allereerst willen we u vriendelijk bedanken voor het deelnemen aan dit onderzoek. Voor onze bachelor scriptie aan de afdeling Communicatie- en Informatiewetenschappen van Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen doen wij onderzoek naar social media gebruik onder collega's. U zult worden gevraagd om uw mening te geven over het gebruik van social media. We zijn geïnteresseerd in uw persoonlijke mening, dus geen enkel antwoord is fout. Het deelnemen aan het onderzoek zal ongeveer 15 tot 20 minuten duren. U doet vrijwillig mee aan dit onderzoek en kunt ten alle tijden stoppen met het onderzoek. Uw antwoorden zullen anoniem worden verwerkt.
Mocht u een vraag hebben over het onderzoek, dan kunt u contact opnemen met een van de onderzoekers: Charlotte Tammes, ca.tammes@student.ru.nl

Vriendelijke groet,
Malou Bouwmans, Anouk Hollander, Ellen Raijmakers, Maayke Scherpenhuijzen en Charlotte Tammes

Toestemming
Door te kiezen voor de optie 'Ik ga akkoord' geeft u aan dat u:
- bovenstaande informatie gelezen heeft.
- vrijwillig meedoet aan het onderzoek.
- 18 jaar of ouder bent.
Als u niet mee wilt doen aan het onderzoek, kunt u op de knop 'Ik ga niet akkoord' klikken.
❍ Ik ga akkoord (1)
❍ Ik ga niet akkoord (2)
If Ik ga niet akkoord Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Heeft u momenteel een baan?
❍ Ja (1)
❍ Nee (2)
If Nee Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Heeft u momenteel een Facebook account?
❍ Ja (1)
❍ Nee (2)
If Nee Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

De volgende vragen gaan over een scenario waarin u een Facebook profiel van Tom Hendriks te zien krijgt. Vervolgens wordt u gevraagd om vragen te beantwoorden over Tom's Facebook profiel. Lees daarom de volgende situatie aandachtig door.

Manipulatie Hybrid

Stelt u zich de volgende situatie voor:

Tom is uw collega en werkt in hetzelfde team als u.

Hieronder kunt u het Facebook profiel van Tom zien. Tom heeft zowel zijn goede vrienden, als zijn familie, collega's en kennissen op Facebook. Tom heeft zijn contacten opgedeeld in verschillende groepen. De pagina die u ziet is alleen zichtbaar voor zijn collega's. Bekijk het Facebook profiel en lees de berichten van Tom aandachtig door. Hierna zullen er een aantal vragen gesteld worden over dit Facebook profiel.

Manipulatie Content

Stelt u zich de volgende situatie voor:

Tom is uw collega en werkt in hetzelfde team als u.

Hieronder kunt u het Facebook profiel van Tom zien. Tom heeft zowel zijn goede vrienden, als zijn familie, collega's en kennissen op Facebook. De pagina die u ziet is zichtbaar voor al zijn contacten. Bekijk het Facebook profiel en lees de berichten van Tom aandachtig door. Hierna zullen er een aantal vragen gesteld worden over dit Facebook profiel.

De volgende vragen gaan over uw mening na het zien van de Facebook pagina van Tom Hendriks.

Respect schaal A
Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen.

	Zeer oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje eens (5)	Eens (6)	Zeer eens (7)
Ik denk dat Tom een goede reputatie heeft in de organisatie. (1)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Ik denk dat andere collega's goed zouden reageren op Tom. (2)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Ik denk dat Tom een goede indruk zou maken op anderen. (3)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
De meeste collega's zouden Tom leuk vinden. (4)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
De meeste collega's zouden Tom respecteren. (5)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Tom zou zich soms nutteloos voelen in de organisatie. (6)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
Andere collega's zouden	O	O	O	O	O	O	O

Tom's ideeën waarderen. (7)							
Andere collega's zouden Tom's werk waarderen. (8)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Respect schaal B

Geef wederom aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen.

	Zeer oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje eens (5)	Eens (6)	Zeer eens (7)
Ik zou Tom's ideeën en zijn inzet op het werk waarderen. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik zou Tom's werk respecteren. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik zou Tom waarderen als een lid van de organisatie. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik zou goed reageren op Tom en zorgen dat hij voelt dat hij erbij hoort. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Er volgt nu een lijst met stellingen over hoe u zich zou kunnen voelen over uw collega Tom. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen.

Relatedness schaal
Stelt u zich wederom voor dat Tom Hendriks uw collega is. In mijn relatie met Tom, zou ik mij:

	Zeer oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje eens (5)	Eens (6)	Zeer eens (7)
Gesteund voelen (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Dicht bij hem voelen (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Begrepen voelen (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Met hem verbonden voelen (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Door hem gehoord voelen (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Gebonden voelen aan hem (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Gewaardeerd voelen (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Aan hem gehecht voelen (8)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Veilig voelen (9)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Voelen als een vriend (10)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Accepteren als vriend

De volgende vraag gaat over of u een vriendschapsverzoek van uw collega Tom Hendriks zou accepteren op Facebook.

	Zeer oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje eens (5)	Eens (6)	Zeer eens (7)
Ik zou Tom Hendriks accepteren als vriend op Facebook. (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

De volgende vragen gaan over uw eigen social media gebruik.

Hoeveel vrienden heeft u in totaal op Facebook?
- ❍ 10 of minder (1)
- ❍ 11 - 50 (2)
- ❍ 51 - 100 (3)
- ❍ 101 - 150 (4)
- ❍ 151 - 200 (5)
- ❍ 201 - 250 (6)
- ❍ 251 - 300 (7)
- ❍ 301 - 400 (8)
- ❍ meer dan 400 (9)

Kunt u een schatting geven van hoeveel van uw Facebook vrienden collega's zijn?

Kunt u een schatting geven van hoeveel van uw Facebook vrienden collega's zijn van uw eigen afdeling?

Kunt u een schatting geven van hoeveel van uw Facebook vrienden collega's zijn van een andere afdeling?

Hoeveel tijd (in minuten) besteedt u gemiddeld per week op Facebook?
- ❍ 10 minuten of minder (1)
- ❍ 10 - 30 minuten (2)
- ❍ 31 - 60 minuten (3)
- ❍ 1 - 2 uur (4)
- ❍ 2 - 3 uur (5)
- ❍ meer dan 3 uur (6)

Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen.

	Zeer Oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje eens (5)	Eens (6)	Zeer eens (7)
Facebook-en maakt deel uit van mijn dagelijkse bezigheden. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik ben trots om mensen te vertellen dat ik een Facebook account heb. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Facebook is een deel geworden van mijn dagelijkse routine. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik heb het gevoel dat ik contact verlies als ik een tijdje niet op Facebook ben geweest. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik voel me onderdeel van de Facebook community. (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik zou het jammer vinden als Facebook ophoudt te bestaan. (6)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Geef wederom aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen.

	Zeer Oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje eens (5)	Eens (6)	Zeer eens (7)
Mijn direct leidinggevende heeft er weinig moeite mee als ik hem/haar toe zou voegen op Facebook. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Mijn directe collega's hebben er weinig moeite mee als ik ze toe zou voegen op Facebook. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Mijn direct leidinggevende heeft er weinig moeite mee als ik collega's toe zou voegen op Facebook. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Een groot deel van mijn collega's zijn Facebook vrienden met elkaar. (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Integratie/Segmentatie schaal A

Geef aan in welke mate de volgende vragen op u van toepassing zijn.

	Helemaal niet (1)	Niet (2)	Een beetje (3)	Enigszins (4)	Helemaal wel (5)
In welke mate overlappen uw privé en werkgerelateerde social media profielen? (1)	○	○	○	○	○
In welke mate overlappen uw privécontacten (vrienden/familie) met werkgerelateerde contacten (collega's/leidinggevenden) op social media? (2)	○	○	○	○	○
In hoeverre overlappen uw sociale contacten op uw zakelijke (bijvoorbeeld LinkedIn) en persoonlijke (bijvoorbeeld Facebook) sociale media profielen? (3)	○	○	○	○	○

Integratie/Segmentatie schaal B

Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen.

	Zeer oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje eens (5)	Eens (6)	Zeer eens (7)
Ik bespreek liever geen familie kwesties met de meeste mensen waarmee ik werk. (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Gedurende de werkdag deal ik met zowel persoonlijke als zakelijke kwesties op het moment dat ze zich aandoen. (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik lees zelden werk-ongerelateerd materiaal op mijn werk. (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik heb de neiging om werk-en familierollen te integreren tijdens mijn werkdag (met andere woorden; wie ik thuis ben en wie ik op mijn werk ben loopt door elkaar). (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik probeer werk-gerelateerde kwesties niet met mijn gezin te	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

bespreken. (5)							
Ik streef ernaar om werk en privé gescheiden te houden. (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Wat is uw geslacht?
- ❍ Man (1)
- ❍ Vrouw (2)

Wat is uw leeftijd in jaren?

Wat is uw hoogst afgeronde opleiding?
- ❍ Geen (1)
- ❍ Lager- of beroepsonderwijs (2)
- ❍ VMBO / MAVO / LBO (3)
- ❍ MBO (MTS, MEAO) (4)
- ❍ HAVO (5)
- ❍ VWO (6)
- ❍ HBO (HTS, HEAO) (8)
- ❍ WO (7)

Volgt u momenteel een opleiding?
- ❍ Ja (1)
- ❍ Nee (2)

In welk dienstverband werkt u?
- ❍ Parttime (1)
- ❍ Fulltime (2)
- ❍ ZZP (3)

In welke sector bent u momenteel werkzaam?
- ◯ Overheid (1)
- ◯ Zorg (2)
- ◯ Commerciële dienstverlening (3)
- ◯ Horeca (4)
- ◯ Detailhandel (5)
- ◯ Groothandel en transport (6)
- ◯ Bouw (7)
- ◯ Industrie (8)
- ◯ Landbouw (9)
- ◯ Anders, namelijk: (10) _____

Werkt u momenteel onder een leidinggevende?
- ◯ Ja (1)
- ◯ Nee (2)

Geeft u momenteel zelf leiding?
- ◯ Ja (1)
- ◯ Nee (2)

Werkt u momenteel in een team?
- ◯ Ja (1)
- ◯ Nee (2)

Hoelang werkt u al voor de organisatie waar u momenteel voor werkt?
- ◯ Minder dan 1 jaar (1)
- ◯ 1 tot 3 jaar (2)
- ◯ 4 tot 6 jaar (3)
- ◯ 7 tot 10 jaar (4)
- ◯ 11 tot 15 jaar (5)
- ◯ 16 tot 20 jaar (6)
- ◯ Langer dan 20 jaar (7)

Hoe lang werkt u al binnen uw huidige functie?
- ◯ Minder dan 1 jaar (1)
- ◯ 1 tot 3 jaar (2)
- ◯ 4 tot 6 jaar (3)
- ◯ 7 tot 10 jaar (4)
- ◯ 11 tot 15 jaar (5)
- ◯ 16 tot 20 jaar (6)
- ◯ Langer dan 20 jaar (7)

Bij welke organisatie werkt u? (niet verplicht)

Hartelijk dank voor uw deelname aan het onderzoek!

Mocht u interesse hebben in de resultaten van het onderzoek, dan kunt u hieronder uw e-mailadres invullen.

Indien u een vraag heeft over het onderzoek, dan kunt u een bericht sturen naar ca.tammes@student.ru.nl