



Universidad del Desarrollo
Facultad de Economía y Negocios

SERIE WORKING PAPERS

Comparing entrepreneurs, organizational employees, and the double profile:

Satisfaction with work-family balance, resources and demands
Katherina Kuschel

December 2014

Working Paper 05



SERIE WORKING
PAPERS UDD

Comparing entrepreneurs, organizational employees, and the double profile:

Satisfaction with work-family balance, resources and demands

Abstract

This study wants to question the increasingly “popular” notion that self-employment represents a solution to conflict between work and family by comparing the levels of satisfaction with work-family balance and subjective well-being among three samples: organizational employees, entrepreneurs, and the double profile. Based in the job demands-resources framework, this study compares job demands, job resources, and key personal resources among the three groups of workers. Results show that entrepreneurs experience higher levels of satisfaction with work-family balance and subjective well-being, and enjoy greater job resources and key personal resources than organizational employees. Particularly, job autonomy, work-family climate and job security (withdrawal chances) were the greater differences. Interestingly, the double profile share more similarities with the employees group than with the entrepreneurs.

Keywords: entrepreneurs; satisfaction with work family balance; subjective well-being; job resources; job demands

Introduction

Work-life balance is one of the most difficult issues families face in the 21st century. Women and men try to balance care responsibilities (primarily young children but increasingly aged parents, as well) and work obligations. Indeed, the desire for a flexible work schedule is one of the main reasons women say they leave their companies and are attracted to entrepreneurship (Heilman & Chen, 2003). Moreover, literature has documented how to start a new business is a work decision highly

influenced by family factors (Boden, 1996; Brown, Farrel, & Sessions, 2006), mainly driven by the need for more flexibility to meet family demands and responsibilities (Loscocco, 1997). Until now, very few empirical studies of the work-family (WF) interface exist within the entrepreneurship literature.

Lately, some studies have asked whether self-employment might be the solution to achieve a better work-life balance. This is congruent with a larger trend in society, in which happiness and freedom are becoming more important than rewarding. But up to date, there is no research comparing the levels of satisfaction with work-family balance between entrepreneurs and those who are not. The existing literature has focused on describing the costs and benefits of being a self-employed.

As seen among organizational employees, self-employed work-life conflict may impact negatively on their productivity, job-satisfaction, life-satisfaction, well-being and quality of life. Those consequences may impact on the decision of continuing with the business, making it relevant this research.

This study aims to compare the satisfaction with work-family balance among organizational employees, entrepreneurs and the double profile (employed and self-employed workers at the same time). It will compare job resources, key personal resources (e.g., subjective wellbeing) and job demands trying to elucidate some explanation to the difference, if there is any, in levels of satisfaction with work-family balance.

The work-family literature

Work-life balance is a metaphor that conveys the equilibrium between mainly two (but can be more) spheres of life. In most individuals' lives the two central domains are work and family. That is why the research efforts are focused primarily on the work-family interface. The challenge of balancing work and family demands is one of the current

concerns for individuals, organizations and public policy. The construct is still complex, as it is hard to define work, life and balance (Eikhof, Warhurst, & Haunschild, 2007; Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007; Kalliath & Brough, 2008).

According to Frone (2003) scholar efforts have developed a four-fold taxonomy in the work-family literature related to the direction and type of effect: the work-to-family and family-to-work both conflict and facilitation/enrichment. Conflict approach considers three types of interrole conflict: time based, strain based, and behavior based conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), while -grounded in the positive psychology approach- facilitation and enrichment is the positive effect of the interaction between work and family. At a resource-level analysis, Powell and Greenhaus (2006) suggested that work-family enrichment is either unrelated or negatively related to work-family conflict (WFC) depending on the specific process under consideration by which experiences in one role may affect experiences in the other role. While WFC may well be inversely related to satisfaction with WF balance, research does not support the argument that the two constructs represent opposite ends of a continuum (Aryee et al., 2005; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000), although it is commonly accepted the untested assumption that people who perceive low WFC automatically feel satisfied and successful at managing work and family demands. It was found that each of the four taxonomies have different antecedents and outcomes.

Why is WFC undesirable? Reviews report several WFC negative outcomes. Work-related outcomes are lower job and career satisfaction, lower manager-rated and self-rated performance, organizational withdrawal behavior and higher turnover (Allen, Herst, Bruck & Sutton, 2000; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998, 1999; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). Non-work related outcomes of WFC are lower life and marital satisfaction, greater emotional exhaustion and a higher number of non-work stressors

(Allen et al., 2000; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998, 1999; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005). WFC is also linked to negative health outcomes such as greater general psychological strain, increased somatic and physiological symptoms, and heightened vulnerability to depression and burnout (Allen et al., 2000; Mesmer-Magnus & Viswesvaran, 2005).

The work-life interface has mainly studied among organizational employees and there is scant literature about the work-life situation of entrepreneurs (Annink & den Dulk, 2012; Loscocco, 1997; Parasuraman & Simmers, 2001) and to our knowledge, less literature about the work-life situation of the double profile.

Satisfaction with work-family balance

Academics from the WF field have argued that workers want to be able to fulfill their commitments to both work and family and to experience satisfaction and success (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000; Rapoport, Fletcher, Pruitt, & Bailyn, 2002). Therefore, for the purpose of this study, satisfaction with work-family balance is defined as “an overall level of contentment resulting from an assessment of one’s degree of success at meeting work and family role demands” (Valcour, 2007: 1512). Personal definitions of work–family balance may vary widely; entrepreneurs who emphasize their work role are likely to have a very different definition of what constitutes work–family balance than those who emphasize their family role. If entrepreneurs set the goal to achieve work–family balance, this goal will be met if they are satisfied with the level of balance that they achieve, no matter how they define the construct (Eddleston & Powell, 2012).

Theoretical framework

The job demands-resources (JD-R) perspective has mainly been influenced by two job stress models: demand-control model (Karasek, 1979; Karasek & Theorell, 1990) and the effort-reward imbalance model (Siegrist, 1996). The JD-R model of Demerouti et al.

(2001) predicts that high or unfavorable job demands (i.e. physical workload, time pressure, recipient contact, shift work and physical environment) lead to exhaustion and dissatisfaction, whereas job resources (i.e. feedback, rewards, job control, participation, job security and supervisor support) are negatively related to disengagement and may enhance contentment. Recently, evidence suggested that job resources only work when they are needed (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

This study will broaden the variables' scope, because older models "have been restricted to a given and limited set of predictor variables that may not be relevant for all job positions" (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007: 309). This framework is especially important to understand why organizational employees, entrepreneurs and the double profile may have different levels of satisfaction with work-family balance, as they may have particular demands and resources in their work domains.

The job demand-control (JDC) model (Karasek, 1979; Karasek & Theorell, 1990) and the effort-reward imbalance model (Siegrist, 1996) are models of job strain and describe how job characteristics create/exacerbates stress and other mental and physical health outcomes. Johnson and Hall (1988) include social support to the demand-control model, creating the job demand-control-support (JDC-S) model.

Recently, Ertel, Koenen and Berkman (2008) incorporated the home demands into the models of job strain. They found that the association between job strain and depressive symptoms were moderated by social support at work (job resource) and the presence of a child at home (home demand). Moreover, a qualitative study (Annink & Den Dulk, 2012) found that being a breadwinner (home demand) might cause pressure to entrepreneurs because of those responsibilities. It was found that job and home demands (measured symmetrically as quantitative, mental and emotional demands) affect work-

to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict, and that affect in turn burnout (Peeters, Montgomery, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2005) among organizational employees.

Specifically, Frone, Yardley, and Markel (1997) have measured the impact of family overload and parental time commitment (home demands) and spouse support and family support (home resources) and showed that home demands were positively related to family-to-work conflict, while the work related variables were positively related to work-to-family conflict, confirming the hypotheses of antecedents of domain-specific distress. Negative relation of spouse and family support to family distress were all significant (Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997). Lately, ten Brummelhuis and Bakker (2012) built the work-home resource model (W-HR), an integral theoretical framework based on the perspectives above and the Conservation of Resources theory (COR; Hobfoll, 1989, 2002). They suggest that people who have key resources (self-efficacy, self-esteem, optimism and social power) which are personal and more structural (not temporal) resources, cope better with stressful situations such as work-home conflict (any direction).

According to the JD-R framework, job characteristics may be distinguished as demands and resources.

Job demands

Several studies have investigated the relationship between work time (job demand) and WFC (e.g., Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991; Major, Klein, & Ehrhart, 2002; Wallace, 1997). They conclude that the longer hours at work, the less time left to fulfill family commitments, and therefore, the lower levels of perceived WF balance. To work long hours is associated with lowered job and life satisfaction (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). But, when longer work hours are associated with more complex and enriched work (Jacobs & Gerson, 2004), which, in turn, promotes

the development of skills and psychological resources that enhance people's ability to meet work and family demands (Ruderman et al., 2002), these longer work hours are associated with greater career satisfaction (Eby, Sorensen, & Feldman, 2005), which may spill over to satisfaction with work–family balance through an affective channel. Additionally, the higher earnings often provided by longer work hours may enable people to pay for services, such as house cleaning, restaurant meals, and lawn care, that make it easier to meet family demands while also handling heavy work demands. But the hypothesis of a positive relationship between work hours and satisfaction with work-family balance was not supported (Valcour, 2007). Working hours (the time-based conflict) is the most frequent and powerful argument of WFC. Perceived work overload (job demand), which is the perception that one has too much to do (Leiter & Schaufeli 1996; Schaufeli et al. 1995), is associated with higher levels of WFC (Frone et al. 1997; Parasuraman et al. 1996), and has a strong influence on work exhaustion (Moore, 2000), which has more to do with the strain-based dimension of WFC. As this is a more subjective variable, this could explain better the levels of WF balance (Kuschel, 2011). Literature provides evidence that entrepreneurs have higher job demands than organizational employees, as they may work longer hours (Paoli & Merllie, 2001), have heavier workloads (Rau et al., 2008), and higher job complexity, as they own their enterprise and control how work is organized and how resources (e.g., time, money, assets) are distributed at their workplace (Rau et al., 2008).

H1: Entrepreneurs have significantly higher job demands than organizational employees.

Intuitively, the double profile could have greater job demands than entrepreneurs and employees.

H2: Double profile has significantly higher levels of job demands than organizational employees.

H3: Double profile has significantly higher levels of job demands than entrepreneurs.

Job resources

Lately, it was found that some work resources such as control over working time and job autonomy are related to the WF interface. Control over work time is especially critical to the ability to meet multiple role demands (Thomas & Ganster, 1995) as workers may, for example, interrupt work when family demands arise. Previous research showed that control is associated with lower WFC (Adams & Jex, 1999; Duxbury, Higgins, & Lee, 1994; Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Additionally, studies have demonstrated the impact of flexible work arrangements offered by the organization (e.g., flex time and telecommuting) on WFC (Anderson et al., 2002; Hill et al., 2001; Thompson et al., 1999) and on employee perceptions of organizational work-life support (Valcour, Ollier-Malaterre, Matz-Costa, Pitt-Catsouphes, & Brown, 2011). Generally, workers who report lower control over work time have less capacity to respond to family demands, particularly when those demands are unexpected.

Job autonomy is “the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence and discretion in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out” (Hackman & Oldham, 1975: 162). It allows workers to manage their own work and family loads more effectively and in a way that makes sense for them personally, given their personal constraints. Lee and Ashforth (1996) demonstrate a relationship between perceived work overload and lack of autonomy. Moore (2000) also found that autonomy was correlated with perceived work overload.

This result was confirmed by Ahuja et al. (2006) but they did not find a negative relationship between autonomy and WFC, as Thomas and Ganster (1995) did.

Although, it seems that entrepreneurs may have greater job resources because they enjoy more flexibility and have greater autonomy to do their work, and have greater opportunity for self-fulfillment (Parasuraman & Simmers, 2001; Prottas & Thompson, 2006; Rau et al., 2008) than organizational employees.

H4: Entrepreneurs have significantly higher job resources than organizational employees.

H5: Entrepreneurs have significantly higher key personal resources (e.g. subjective well-being) than organizational employees.

Type of Employment and the work-family interface

Similar to Parasuraman and Simmers (2001) we will examine two types of employment: organizational employment and self-employment, and we will add the “double profile” (employed and self-employed workers at the same time).

Objectively, literature indicates that entrepreneurs have higher job demands but also higher job resources, which raises the question whether the level of satisfaction with work-family balance may be different between entrepreneurs and employees.

H6: Entrepreneurs have significantly lower levels of satisfaction with work-family balance than organizational employees.

Research on the work-family interface is mainly based on samples of employees working at organizations, and mainly professionals and managers. But we know very little on the WF settings of entrepreneurs.

The JD-R theoretical framework provides rationales for the argument that WFC levels may vary according to some occupations, because the job characteristics of an organizational employee and an entrepreneur represents both different resources and

demands for them. The relevance of this study lies in the fact that the majority of “organizational employees” is typically dissatisfied with their work-life balance and would consider alternative employment options because of their inability to balance home and work roles (Posig & Kickul, 2004). Self-employment, either as owner or independent, may allow individuals to achieve greater autonomy than would be available to them as organizational employees (Prottas & Thompson, 2006). As shown, self-employed individuals enjoy greater autonomy and schedule flexibility at work, and report higher levels of job involvement and job satisfaction than those employed in organizations. However, they also experience higher levels of WFC, and lower family satisfaction than organizational employees (Parasuraman & Simmers, 2001).

Method

Procedure

A pilot study was carried out for the purpose of pre-testing the quantitative survey.

The data were collected via an on-line survey supported by Qualtrics.

Two Chilean associations of entrepreneurs (*Mujeres Empresarias* and *Asociación de Emprendedores de Chile –ASECH*) participated by distributing the survey to their networks. The link was posted on LinkedIn and Facebook page and sent by email. The first page of the survey presents the goals of the project and the consent form. The participants took on average 22 minutes to complete the survey.

Sample

The sample includes 503 participants. 204 were organizational Employee, 187 were entrepreneurs, and 112 have the double profile (i.e., are employees and entrepreneurs at the same time). The majority works in Santiago de Chile (77.6%) and the rest work in other regions of Chile. Participant characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE.

Variables

Satisfaction with work-family balance (SATWFB) was measured with a scale adapted from Valcour (2007). Respondents will be asked to indicate, on a scale from (1) very dissatisfied to (7) very satisfied, their level of satisfaction with three selected items. All variables are shown on table 2. The coefficient alphas for the majority of the measures were excellent.

Variables of job demands include:

Working hours is measured by the following single item: How many hours average do you work in a typical week? At the office or other workplace and at home.

Quantitative work overload. Respondents will be asked to indicate, on a scale from (1) very dissatisfied to (7) very satisfied, their level of satisfaction with 6 items taken from French and Caplan (1972), Osipow and Spokane (1992), and Moore, (2000).

Qualitative work overload consisted in 5 items adapted from Sverke et al. (1999), French and Caplan (1972), and Osipow and Spokane (1992).

Variables of job resources include:

Control over working time Scale from Thomas and Ganster (1995), adapted by Valcour (2007). Individuals indicate, on a scale of (1) none to (7) a great deal how much control they have over aspects of work time.

Job autonomy scale from Beehr (1976). Indicate the extent to which these statements reflect their feelings about their current job.

Coworker support (JCQ, Karasek et al., 1998)

Job Security perception assesses the degree to which an organization provides stable employment for employees, and will be measured by two items adapted from Oldham, Kulik, Stepina, and Ambrose (1986) on a scale of (1) “unlikely” to (4) “very likely”.

Work-family climate or WF culture is measured by a 20-item scale developed by Thompson, Beauvais, and Lyness (1999). It assesses 3 dimensions: family supportiveness of management (e.g. see item 8), career development (e.g. see item 13), and working hours (e.g. see item 4). The items in each scale were assessed on a 7-point (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) rating scale.

Variables of key personal resources include:

Subjective well-being is measured by the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) created by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985).

Goal pursuit: Developed by Riediger, Freund, and Baltes (2005). For the goal of concealing work and family, participants responded to 5 items on a 7-point rating scale.

Self-efficacy for the management of work family conflict from Cinamon (2006), split into two subscales according to the direction of the conflict (WIF & FIW).

Self-esteem was assessed using Rosenberg (1965) Self-Esteem Scale (RSE), an instrument designed to provide a measure of global self-esteem. The original scale has 4 options, while Jordan, Spencer, Zanna, Hoshino-Browne, and Correll (2003) uses a 7-point scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agreed (7) as a measure of explicit self-esteem.

Optimism is measured by the Life Orientation Test Revised (LOT-R) (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994), which is a brief measure of dispositional optimism. The filler questions in this scale were omitted to leave a 6-item scale which were answered using a 7-point scale of agreement or disagreement.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE.

Data Analyses

First, Kolmogorov-Smirnof test was performed to assess whether the data is normally distributed. As it does not distribute normally, we conducted only nonparametric tests.

Second, Spearman's rho correlations were computed to examine the general relationship among the study variables per each type of employment (Table 3 and 4).

Third, to analyze the existence of significant differences between organizational employees, entrepreneurs and the double profile, the Kruskal-Wallis test was performed. It is nonparametric replacement for the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) when the assumptions of one-way ANOVA are not met (i.e., normal distribution) and it compares three or more independent samples.

And finally, to explore where the differences were, we performed the Mann-Whitney U test to compare medians of two samples (each pair at a time).

Results

Tables 3 and 4 presents the intercorrelations among the study variables based on their employment type. In general, results indicate low to moderate correlations. There is no evidence of multicollinearity (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983). Moreover, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was tested and found tenable.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE.

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE.

Table 5 shows the mean, median and standard deviations of each variable in the total sample. Asterisks on the mean column of the total sample section represent significance of differences in means among groups, determined by the application of Kruskal-Wallis test. Therefore, the table shows the same information split into the three types of employment, as well.

Summarizing, there are significant differences of means according to the type of employment in the following variables: satisfaction with work-family balance, subjective well-being, goal pursuit (the goal of work-family balance), self-efficacy

(WIF), optimism, work-family climate, job security (both the probability of getting fired and withdraw the job), colleague support, job autonomy, and control over working time.

INSERT TABLE 5 HERE.

The Mann-Whitney U test was performed in order to explore where exactly the differences are. This test was conducted for each pair of groups. Results of this procedure are shown in Table 6.

INSERT TABLE 6 HERE.

All variables that were found to be significant in the step before (Table 5) are also significant for the pair between organizational employees versus entrepreneurs.

Table 5 shows that quantitative work overload and qualitative work overload –both measures of job demands– were not significantly different between any groups.

Therefore, “H1: Entrepreneurs have higher job demands than organizational employees” cannot be accepted.

According to the job resources measured; entrepreneurs score statistically significantly higher than the organizational employee work-family climate ($U = 7627$, $p = .000$), job security “firing” ($U = 14286$, $p = .000$), job security “withdrawal” ($U = 12656$, $p = .000$), colleague support ($U = 15004.5$, $p = .000$), job autonomy ($U = 8906$, $p = .000$) and control over working time ($U = 18463$, $p = .020$). “H4: Entrepreneurs have higher job resources than organizational employees” is accepted. All job resources variable measured were significantly different between entrepreneurs and employees (see Table 6), and entrepreneurs score higher (see Table 5).

According to the key personal resources measured; entrepreneurs score statistically significantly higher than the organizational employee in subjective well-being ($U = 16445$, $p = .018$), goal pursuit ($U = 15180.5$, $p = .040$), self-efficacy WIF ($U = 15665.5$, $p = .018$) and optimism ($U = 13688.5$, $p = .000$). “H5: Entrepreneurs have higher key

personal resources than organizational employees” is partially accepted. The variables self-efficacy in managing FIW and self-esteem have no differences between any groups. Satisfaction with work-family balance in the entrepreneur group was statistically significantly higher than the organizational employee ($U = 13772$, $p = .000$). This evidence rejects “H6: Entrepreneurs have significantly lower levels of satisfaction with work-family balance than organizational employees”.

But regarding the pair of entrepreneurs versus the double profile, only were significant the differences of means in the following scales: satisfaction with work-family balance, work-family climate, job security (both the probability of getting fired and withdraw the job), colleague support, and job autonomy. In other words, the double profile differs with entrepreneurs in levels of SATWFB and all job resources with the exception of control over working time. The pair of employees and the double profile resulted to have non-significant differences, but optimism is the exception. The double profile reported significantly more (see means and medians in table 5) levels of optimism than employees ($U = 9284.5$, $p = .026$). “H2: Double profile has significantly higher levels of job demands than organizational employees” and “H3: Double profile has significantly higher levels of job demands than entrepreneurs” cannot be accepted, because double profile shows no difference in job demands with the other two groups.

Discussion

This study aimed to compare the levels of satisfaction with work family balance, job demands, job resources and key personal resources among three groups of workers: organizational employees, entrepreneurs, and the double profile.

Summarizing, entrepreneurs have higher satisfaction with work family balance, score higher on most of the job resources and most of the key personal resources, and have quite the same job demands as the other two groups. Consistent with prior research,

results confirm the popular notion that self-employed individuals enjoy greater autonomy, and schedule flexibility in their work role than organizational employee (Parasuraman & Simmers, 2001). Although, we did not find enough evidence to sustain the statement of the trade-off of entrepreneurs of having higher job resources and higher job demands, than employees (Parasuraman & Simmers, 2001). More additional investigation is needed among the type of entrepreneurs (business owner and independent contractor) and the emotional demands (strain) which could be the trade-off element.

This study challenges the popular belief that entrepreneurs have lower job security than organizational employees. This suggests that entrepreneurs feel secure and stable even in times of crises. They probably perceived they cannot be fired and they will continue their activity with less turnover intention than employees.

Results show that the double profile has more similar characteristics with the group of employees than the group of entrepreneurs, and that the three groups share similarities of high levels of job demands.

Significant differences in levels of satisfaction with work family balance and subjective well-being were not found by gender or age.

Limitations and future research opportunities

The current research has limitations. First, the present study is cross-sectional, and thus the postulated relationships cannot be interpreted causally. The causal ordering of the variables was based on theoretical reasoning (JD-R, JDC, JDC-S, W-HR models).

Longitudinal studies and/or quasi-experimental research designs are needed to further validate the hypothesized causality of the relationships.

Second, the sampled population was constrained within mainly one local area by convenience sampling; therefore the generalizability of this study is limited.

Further research should consider the directional measure of conflict or enrichment. The question of whether SatWFB is affected more by conflict or enrichment, or work-to-family or vice versa, remains unanswered.

And finally, this study is not looking to motivators for entrance into self-employment. This work only compares satisfaction with work-family balance based on the type of employment, and the results will not answer the question whether the pursuit of work-family balance is a “push or pull” motivator for becoming an entrepreneur (Hughes, 2003). Further qualitative research may shed light on that debate.

We hope that the present study will stimulate scholars in the work-family field to address different type of employment relevant to gaining deeper understanding of the job determinants on the work-family interface.

References

- Adams, G. A., & Jex, S. M. (1999). Relationships between time management, control, work-family conflict, and strain. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4(1), 72-77.
- Ahuja, M.K., C. Chudoba, C. Kacmar, D.H. McKnight, & J. George, (2007). IT Road Warriors: Balancing Work-Family Conflict, Job Autonomy, and Work Overload to Mitigate Turnover Intentions. *MIS Quarterly*, 30(1), 1-17.
- 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.
- Anderson, S. E., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 28(2), 787-810.
- Annink, A. & den Dulk, L., 2012. Autonomy: the panacea for self-employed women's work-life balance? *Community, Work & Family*, 15(4), 383–402.

- 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, 132-146.
- Bakker, A.B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 309-328.
- Beehr, T. (1976). Perceived Situational Moderators of the Relationship between Subjective Role Ambiguity and Role Strain. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61, 35-40.
- Boden, R.J. Jr. (1996). Gender and self-employment selection: an empirical assessment. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 25(6), 671–682.
- Brown, S., Farrel, L., & Sessions, J. G. (2006). Self-employment matching: An analysis of dual earner couples and working households. *Small Business Economics*, 26, 155–172.
- Cinamon, R. G. (2006). Anticipated Work-Family Conflict: Effects of Gender, Self-Efficacy, and Family Background. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 54(3), 202–215. doi:10.1002/j.2161-0045.2006.tb00152.x
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499-512.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of personality assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
- Duxbury, L., Higgins, C., & Lee, C. (1994). Work-family conflict: A comparison by gender, family type, and perceived control. *Journal of Family Issues*, 15, 449-466.
- 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.
- Eddleston, K. A., & Powell, G. N. (2012). Nurturing Entrepreneurs' Work–Family Balance: A Gendered Perspective. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(3), 513–541. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2012.00506.x
- Eikhof, D.R., Warhurst, C., & Haunschild, A. (2007). Introduction: What work? What life? What balance?: Critical reflections on the work-life balance debate. *Employee Relations*, 29(4), 325-333. doi:10.1108/01425450710839452

- Friedman, S. D., & Greenhaus, J.H. (2000). *Work and family-Allies or enemies?* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Frone, M.R. (2003). Work-Family Balance. In James Campbell Quick and Lois E. Tetrick (Eds.) *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology*. (143-162). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Frone, M.R., Yardley, J., & Markel, K. (1997). Developing and Testing an Integrative Model of the Work-Family Interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 145-167.
- Greenhaus, J.H. & Beutell, N.J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-88.
- Greenhaus, J.H., Calahan, G.A., & Godshalk, V.M. (2000). *Career management* (3rd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Dryden Press.
- Greenhaus, J.H., & Parasuraman, S. (1999). Research on work, family, and gender: Current status and future directions. In G.N. Powell (Ed.). *Handbook of Gender and Work* (391-412). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 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. doi:10.1177/1523422307305487
- Grzywacz, J.G., & Marks, N.F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 111-126.
- Gutek, B.A., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 560-568.
- Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, (60), 159-170.
- 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. doi:10.1016/S1053-4822(03)00021-4
- Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., Ferris, M., & Weitzman, M. (2001). Finding an extra day a week: The positive influence of perceived job flexibility on work and family life balance. *Family Relations*, 50(1), 49-58.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44, 513-524. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513

- Hobfoll, S. E. (2002). Social and psychological resources and adaptation. *Review of General Psychology*, 6, 307-324. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.6.4.307
- Hughes, K.D. (2003). Pushed or pulled? Women's entry into self-employment and small business ownership. *Gender, Work and Organisation*, 10(4), 433-54.
- Johnson, J.V., & Hall, E.M. (1988). Job strain, work place social support, and cardiovascular disease: A crosssectional study of a random sample of the Swedish working population. *American Journal of Public Health*, 78(10): 1336-1342.
- Jordan, C. H., Spencer, S. J., Zanna, M. P., Hoshino-Browne, E., & Correll, J. (2003). Secure and Defensive High Self-Esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(5), 969-978. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.5.969
- Kalliath, T., & Brough, P. (2008). Work-Life Balance: A review of the meaning of the balance construct. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 14(3), 323-327. doi:10.5172/jmo.837.14.3.323
- Karasek, R.A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: implications for job design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(2), 285-308.
- Karasek, R. & Theorell, T. (1990). *Healthy work: stress, productivity, and the reconstruction of working life*. New York: Basic Books.
- 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.
- Kossek, E.E. & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for OB/HR research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 139-149.
- Kossek, E.E. & Ozeki, C. (1999). Bridging the work-family policy and productivity gap: A literature review. *Community, Work, and Family*, 2(1), 7-32.
- Kuschel, K. (2011). *The work-family interface in a flexible workplace: How academics deal with workload and family/home demands*. Doctoral dissertation. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona.
- Lee, R.T., & Ashforth, B.E. (1996). A Meta-Analytic Examination of the Correlates of the Three Dimensions of Burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(2), 123-133.
- Leiter, M.P. & Schaufeli, W.B. (1996). Consistency of the Burnout Construct Across Occupations, *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, 9(3), 229-243.

- Loscocco, K.A. (1997). Work–family linkages among self-employed women and men. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50(2), 204–226.
- Major, V. S., Klein, K. S., & Ehrhart, M. G. (2002). Work time, work interference with family, and psychological distress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 427–436.
- Mesmer-Magnus, J.R., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). Convergence between measures of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict: A meta-analytic examination. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67(2), 215-232.
- Moore, J.E. (2000). One Road to Turnover: An Examination of Work Exhaustion in Technology Professionals. *MIS Quarterly*, 24(1), 141-168.
- Oldham, G. R., Kulik, C. T., Stepina, L. P., & Ambrose, M. L. (1986). Relations between situational factors and the comparative referents used by employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 599-608.
- Paoli, P., & Merllie, D. (2001). *Third European survey on working conditions 2000*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- 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. doi:10.1002/job.102
- Parasuraman, S., Purohit, Y., Godshalk, V., & Beutell, N. (1996). Work and Family Variables, Entrepreneurial Career Success, and Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48(3), 275-300. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1996.0025
- Parasuraman, S., Singh, R., & Greenhaus, J.H. (1997). The influence of self and partner family variables on career development opportunities of professional women and men. In P. Tharenou (Ed.), *Best Paper and Abstract Proceedings of the Australian Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference*, 125-129.
- Peeters, M.W.C., 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.
- Posig, M. & Kickul, J. (2004). Work-role expectations and work family conflict: gender differences in emotional exhaustion. *Women in Management Review*, 19(7), pp. 373-86.
- Powell, G.N. & Greenhaus, J.H. (2006). Is the opposite of positive negative?: Untangling the complex relationship between work-family enrichment and conflict. *Career Development International*, 11(7), 650-659. doi: 10.1108/13620430610713508

- Prottas, D.J., & Thompson, C.A. (2006). Stress, satisfaction, and the work-family interface: A comparison of self-employed business owners, independents, and organizational employees. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(4), 366-378. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.11.4.366
- Rapoport, R., Fletcher, J. K., Pruitt, B. H., & Bailyn, L. (2002). *Beyond work-family balance: Advancing gender equity and workplace performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rau, R., Hoffmann, K., Metz, U., Richter, P. G., Roesler, U., & Stephan, U. (2008). Gesundheitsrisiken bei Unternehmern [Health risks of entrepreneurs]. *Zeitschrift für Arbeitsund Organisationspsychologie*, 52, 115-125.
- Riediger, M., Freund, A. M., & Baltes, P. B. (2005). Managing life through personal goals: Intergoal facilitation and intensity of goal pursuit in younger and older adulthood. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 60(2), 84–91.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Leiter, M.P., & Kalimo, R. (1995). The General Burnout Inventory: A Self-Report Questionnaire to Assess Burnout at the Workplace. In *Proceedings of the Work, Stress and Health '95: Creating Healthier Workplaces*, Washington, DC, 10-23.
- Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (1994). Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A re-evaluation of the Life Orientation Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 1063-1078.
- Scott, C.E. (1986). Why more women are becoming entrepreneurs. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 24(4), 37-44.
- Siegrist, J. (1996). Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1(1), 27-41.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1983). *Using multivariate statistics*. New York: Harper & Row.
- ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). A Resource Perspective on the Work-Home Interface: The Work-Home Resources Model. *American Psychologist*, 67(7), 545–556. doi:10.1037/a0027974

- Thomas, L.T., & Ganster, D.C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 6-15.
- Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When workfamily benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54, 392-415.
- 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. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.6.1512
- Valcour, M., Ollier-Malaterre, A., Matz-Costa, C., Pitt-Catsoupes, M., & Brown, M. (2011). Influences on employee perceptions of organizational work–life support: Signals and resources. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(2), 588–595. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2011.02.002
- Wallace, J. E. (1997). It's about time: A study of hours worked and work spillover among law firm lawyers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 227–248.
- Zedeck, S. (1992). Introduction: Exploring the domain of work and family concerns. In S. Zedeck (Ed.) *Work, families and organizations* (1-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Table 1

Sample Characteristics

	Total	Organizational Employee	Entrepreneur	Double Profile
N	503	204	187	112
Age (mean)	41.50	39.69	43.68	41.13
Gender (% male)	46.9%	36.8%	53.5%	54.5%
Education (% college degree)	75%	80.9%	67.9%	75.9%
Family income (% medium-high and high)	71.2%	79.9%	61.5%	71.4%
Married or living with a partner (%)	66%	62.8%	67.4%	71.4%
Children (%)	67.6%	57.4%	75.3%	72.3%
Organizational tenure (% > 3 years)	51.6%	40.2%	57.1%	48.6%
Work full time (%)	70.6%	87.3%	54.5%	67%
Working hours outdoor (\geq 46 hours per week)	32.4%	39.2%	23%	35.7%
Working hours at home (\geq 26 hours per week)	12.2%	1.5%	25.2%	9.9%

Table 2
Study variables, their items and reliability coefficients.

	Variable (n° items)	Items	Cronbach's Alpha	
	Satisfaction with Work Family Balance (3)	1) The way you divide your time between work and personal or family life. 2) Your ability to balance the needs of your job with those of your personal or family life. 3) The opportunity you have to perform your job well and yet be able to perform home-related duties adequately.	.899	
Key Personal Resources	Subjective Well-being (5)	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.	.885	
	Goal Pursuit (5)	1) How much do you do for this goal? 2) How often do you think about this goal? 3) How much time do you invest in this goal? 4) How much does this goal determine your everyday life? 5) How much do you invest yourself into the realization of this goal?	.928	
	Self-Efficacy in managing WIF (4)	1) Attend to your family obligations without it affecting your ability to complete pressing tasks at work. 2) Fulfill your family role effectively after a long and demanding day at work. 3) Succeed in your family role although there are many difficulties in your work. 7) Invest in your family role even when under heavy pressure due to work responsibilities.	.874	
	Self-Efficacy in managing FIW (4)	2) Fulfill all your work responsibilities despite going through having a trying and demanding period in your family life. 4) Invest in your job even when under heavy pressure due to family responsibilities. 6) Succeed in your role at work although there are many difficulties in your family. 8) Focus and invest in work tasks even though family issues are disruptive.	.882	
	Self-Esteem (10)	1) On the whole, I am satisfied with myself. 2) At times, I think I am no good at all. (R) 3) I feel that I have a number of good qualities. 4) I am able to do things as well as most other people. 5) I feel I do not have much to be proud of. (R) 6) I certainly feel useless at times. (R) 7) I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others. 8) I wish I could have more respect for myself. (R) 9) All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. (R) 10) I take a positive attitude toward myself.	.764	
	Optimism (6)	1) In uncertain times, I usually expect the best. 2) If something can go wrong for me, it will. (R) 3) I am always optimistic about my future. 4) I hardly expect things to go my way. (R) 5) I rarely count on good things happening to me. (R) 6) Overall, I expect more good things to happen to me than bad.	.677	
	Work-Family Climate (20)	1) In this organization employees can easily balance their work and family lives. 2) In the event of a conflict, managers are understanding when employees have to put their family first. 3) In this organization it is generally okay to talk about one's family at work. 4) Employees are often expected to take work home at night and/or on weekends. (R) 5) Higher management in this organization encourages supervisors to be sensitive to employees' family and personal concerns. 6) Employees are regularly expected to put their jobs before their families. (R) 7) To turn down a promotion or transfer for family-related reasons will seriously hurt one's career progress in this organization. (R) 8) In general, managers in this organization are quite accommodating of family-related needs. 9) Many employees are resentful when women in this organization take extended leaves to care for newborn or adopted children. (R) 10) To get ahead at this organization, employees are expected to work more than 50 hours a week, whether at the workplace or at home. (R) 11) To be viewed favorably by top management, employees in this organization must constantly put their jobs ahead of their families or personal lives. (R) 12) In this organization employees who participate in available work-family programs (e.g., job sharing, part-time work) are viewed as less serious about their careers than those who do not participate in these programs. (R) 13) Many employees are resentful when men in this organization take extended leaves to care for newborn or adopted children. (R) 14) In this organization it is very hard to leave during the workday to take care of personal or family matters. (R) 15) This organization encourages employees to set limits on where work stops and home life begins. 16) Middle managers and executives in this organization are sympathetic toward employees' child care responsibilities. 17) This organization is supportive of employees who want to switch to less demanding jobs for family reasons. 18) Middle managers and executives in this organization are sympathetic toward employees' elder care responsibilities. 19) In this organization employees who use flextime are less likely to advance their careers than those who do not use flextime.	.733	
	Job Resources	Job Security - Firing (1)	How likely is that you will say that you will lose your job during the next 12 months? (R)	.466
		Job Security - Withdrawal (1)	How likely is that you will say that you will leave voluntarily your job during the next 12 months? (R)	.466
		Colleague Support (6)	1) coworkers competent 2) coworkers interested in me 3) Hostile coworkers (R) 4) Friendly coworkers 5) coworkers work together 6) coworkers helpful	.862
Job Autonomy (4)		1) I control the content of my job. 2) I have a lot of freedom to decide how I perform assigned tasks. 3) I set my own schedule for completing assigned tasks. 4) I have the authority to initiate projects at my job.	.825	
Job Demands	Control over Working Time (4)	1) when you begin and end each workday or work week. 2) the number of hours you work each week. 3) when you can take a few hours off. 4) when you take vacations or days off.	.856	
	Quantitative Work Overload (6)	1) I have too much work to do in too little time (French & Caplan, 1972, Osipow & Spokane, 1992). 2) I feel that the amount of work I do interferes with how well it is done. (Moore, 2000) 3) I feel that my job responsibilities are increasing. (Osipow & Spokane, 1992). 4) My (own) working list is too long to complete. 5) I work overtime in order to complete my tasks. 6) My working hours often change with the works demand (Unstable working hours).	.806	
	Qualitative Work Overload (5)	1) My work contains elements that are too demanding intellectually. 2) I may not have the required knowledge to complete the works satisfactorily. 3) I may not have the required abilities to complete the works satisfactorily. 4) I may not have the required skills to complete the works satisfactorily. 5) I perform tasks that are too complex.	.654	

Table 3

Correlation Matrix among study variables of organizational employees and entrepreneurs.

Entrepreneurs (N=187)	Organizational Employees (N=204)																							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
1. Gender		-0.073	-0.086	-0.027	0.109	-0.083	0.062	.161(*)	0.041	0.115	0.052	0.061	-0.043	-0.042	0.021	-0.034	-.148(*)	-0.040	0.049	-0.032	-0.055	-0.106	0.077	-0.073
2. Generation	-0.023		0.023	-0.100	-.532(**)	-0.092	-0.080	-0.038	-0.126	-.175(*)	-0.097	-.162(*)	-0.062	0.057	-.331(**)	0.062	-.306(**)	-0.044	-.144(*)	-.528(**)	-0.117	-.155(*)	0.023	-0.064
3. College Degree	0.067	.213(**)		.409(**)	0.081	-0.005	0.109	-0.032	-0.075	-0.097	-0.105	-0.018	-0.089	0.061	-0.006	0.113	.195(**)	0.047	0.002	0.000	0.026	0.089	0.113	0.052
4. Family Income	0.033	-0.063	.304(**)		.199(**)	0	.188(**)	-0.066	-0.065	-0.052	-0.037	-0.008	0.099	0.107	0.064	0.079	.223(**)	0.012	0.134	.180(*)	-0.016	-0.004	0.045	0.017
5. Org. Tenure	-0.067	-.313(**)	0.030	0.071		.164(*)	.217(**)	0.090	.206(**)	.163(*)	.174(*)	.152(*)	0.059	0.062	.243(**)	0.121	.352(**)	0.076	.213(**)	.381(**)	0.011	0.059	0.020	0.124
6. Satisfaction with WFB	0.123	-0.096	0.084	.273(**)	0.067		.571(**)	.263(**)	.429(**)	.259(**)	.326(**)	.326(**)	.475(**)	.190(**)	.154(*)	.338(**)	.353(**)	.411(**)	0.100	0.024	-.226(**)	-0.044	-.291(**)	-0.090
7. Subjective Well-being	0.110	-.157(*)	0.136	.306(**)	.190(*)	.607(**)		.277(**)	.315(**)	.210(**)	.506(**)	.493(**)	.385(**)	.142(*)	.151(*)	.277(**)	.426(**)	.374(**)	.261(**)	0.089	-.220(**)	0.006	-.139(*)	0.034
8. Goal Pursuit	.224(**)	-0.004	0.026	0.027	0.063	.288(**)	.305(**)		.379(**)	.254(**)	0	.198(**)	.206(**)	0.049	0.089	.179(*)	0.117	.277(**)	.196(**)	0.130	-0.031	-0.045	0.064	0.038
9. Self-Efficacy in WIF	0.133	-0.144	-0.115	.152(*)	0.112	.466(**)	.389(**)	.378(**)		.703(**)	.507(**)	.276(**)	.304(**)	0.126	0.067	.227(**)	.269(**)	.402(**)	0.072	0.106	-0.043	-0.011	-.339(**)	-.228(**)
10. Self-Efficacy in FIW	0.062	-.167(*)	-.156(*)	0.070	0.079	.321(**)	.292(**)	.252(**)	.804(**)		.428(**)	.331(**)	0.127	0.108	0.128	0.102	.203(**)	.356(**)	0.079	0.106	-0.004	0	-.250(**)	-.151(*)
11. Self-Esteem	0.125	-0.135	-0.009	.148(*)	0.109	.367(**)	.440(**)	.232(**)	.399(**)	.383(**)		.615(**)	.319(**)	.195(**)	0.095	.267(**)	.319(**)	.317(**)	.161(*)	0.090	-0.123	-0.029	-.267(**)	-.206(**)
12. Optimism	0.145	-0.039	-0.051	0.031	.189(*)	.301(**)	.368(**)	.164(*)	.316(**)	.302(**)	.573(**)		.225(**)	.176(*)	0.103	.170(*)	.315(**)	.238(**)	.165(*)	.150(*)	-0.035	0.003	-0.115	-0.072
13. Work Family Climate	.190(*)	0.004	0.130	.195(*)	0.118	.429(**)	.370(**)	.350(**)	.338(**)	.217(**)	.360(**)	.364(**)		.285(**)	.238(**)	.369(**)	.293(**)	.433(**)	0.025	0.096	-0.120	-0.104	-.284(**)	-0.127
14. Job Security Firing	0.031	-0.074	-0.137	.166(*)	.244(**)	.205(**)	.268(**)	0.061	0.107	0.116	.225(**)	.316(**)	.253(**)		.193(**)	.327(**)	.272(**)	0.017	-0.006	-0.099	-0.077	-0.088	-.146(*)	
15. Job Security Withdrawal	-0.080	-0.127	0.038	0.091	.251(**)	.201(**)	.292(**)	0.001	.156(*)	0.139	.340(**)	.289(**)	.289(**)	.412(**)		.164(*)	.251(**)	0.106	0.104	.290(**)	-0.044	0.013	-0.131	-0.023
16. Colleague Support	0.130	0.018	0.074	.183(*)	0.048	.366(**)	.377(**)	.193(**)	.232(**)	.202(**)	.328(**)	.248(**)	.491(**)	.271(**)	.274(**)		.204(**)	.253(**)	0.009	0.084	-0.129	0.042	-0.058	-0.089
17. Job Autonomy	0.046	0.040	0.054	0.088	0.063	.430(**)	.407(**)	.169(*)	.334(**)	.340(**)	.397(**)	.357(**)	.433(**)	.195(**)	.196(**)	.310(**)	.319(**)	.217(**)	.224(**)	-0.059	.146(*)	-0.039	.162(*)	
18. Control over working time	.197(**)	-0.043	0.070	.254(**)	0.059	.522(**)	.395(**)	.233(**)	.466(**)	.396(**)	.398(**)	.347(**)	.407(**)	.193(**)	.184(*)	.244(**)	.421(**)	0.099	.160(*)	-0.081	-0.007	-.286(**)	-0.102	
19. Married or with Partner	0.009	-.150(*)	-0.038	.200(**)	0.078	.172(*)	.217(**)	0.085	0.057	-0.030	0.092	0.086	.157(*)	0.134	0.121	.162(*)	0.115	.215(**)	.373(**)	-0.057	-0.006	-0.060	0.044	
20. Children	0.107	-.502(**)	-.156(*)	0.056	.222(**)	0.110	.182(*)	.160(*)	.280(**)	.211(**)	0.120	0.142	0.072	0.076	0.093	-0.051	0.071	0.086	.244(**)	0.007	-0.022	-0.029	0.022	
21. Working Hours Outdoor	-.256(**)	0.110	0.055	0.106	0.021	-0.060	0.022	-.157(*)	0.061	0.144	0.072	-0.007	0.040	-0.024	0.067	0.101	0.081	0.055	-0.023	-0.079	0	.162(*)	0.053	
22. Working Hours Home	-0.016	-0.082	-0.041	-.251(**)	-0.066	0.019	-0.043	.147(*)	-0.006	-0.052	0.082	0.126	-0.054	0.002	0.030	-0.133	-0.040	-0.122	-0.050	-0.013	-.383(**)	.216(**)	.254(**)	
23. Quantitative Work Overload	-0.094	.159(*)	-0.010	-.197(**)	-0.111	-.316(**)	-.212(**)	-0.102	-.167(*)	-0.061	-0.101	-0.105	-0.126	-0.096	-0.020	-0.125	-0.072	-.257(**)	-.153(*)	-.226(**)	0.102	.227(**)	.492(**)	
24. Qualitative Work Overload	-0.139	0.028	-0.050	-.159(*)	0.016	-.166(*)	-0.064	-0.110	-0.030	0.077	-.160(*)	0.012	-0.143	-.165(*)	-0.016	-0.105	-0.001	-0.130	-0.083	0.027	-0.026	0.081	.382(**)	

** = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), and * = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
 Correlations below the diagonal are for entrepreneurs (N=187), and above the diagonal are for organizational employees (N=204).

Table 4

Correlation Matrix among study variables of the double profile.

	Double Profile (N=112)																								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
1. Gender	1																								
2. Generation	-.201(*)	1																							
3. College Degree	0,012	0,079	1																						
4. Family Income	0,023	-0,006	,383(**)	1																					
5. Org. Tenure	-0,107	-.228(*)	-0,016	,211(*)	1																				
6. Satisfaction with WFB	0,158	0,077	0,020	,194(*)	-0,120	1																			
7. Subjective Well-being	,229(*)	,203(*)	0,073	,258(**)	-0,139	,591(**)	1																		
8. Goal Pursuit	0,142	0,170	0,063	0,051	-0,057	,369(**)	,311(**)	1																	
9. Self-Efficacy in WIF	0,106	0,046	0,018	0,095	-0,084	,567(**)	,361(**)	,445(**)	1																
10. Self-Efficacy in FIW	0,105	-0,016	-0,004	-0,072	-0,011	0,131	0,110	0,175	,568(**)	1															
11. Self-Esteem	0,173	0,063	0,158	0,184	0,058	0,130	,371(**)	,279(**)	0,112	0,151	1														
12. Optimism	,282(**)	-0,040	0,102	0,073	-0,003	0,168	,314(**)	,312(**)	0,168	0,041	,394(**)	1													
13. Work Family Climate	0,023	0,093	-0,051	0,118	-.205(*)	,557(**)	,444(**)	,264(**)	,346(**)	0,099	0,066	,212(*)	1												
14. Job Security Firing	0,050	0,002	,227(*)	0,155	0,060	,266(**)	0,134	-0,058	0,096	-0,058	0,069	0,160	,302(**)	1											
15. Job Security Withdrawal	0,001	-0,149	-0,045	-0,007	-0,012	,271(**)	,186(*)	-0,044	-0,006	-0,059	0,058	0,097	,414(**)	,262(**)	1										
16. Colleague Support	0,120	0,067	0,101	,308(**)	-0,127	,472(**)	,433(**)	,224(*)	,320(**)	0,089	0,154	,224(*)	,633(**)	,280(**)	,271(**)	1									
17. Job Autonomy	0,009	-0,018	0,158	,223(*)	-0,004	,437(**)	,447(**)	0,164	,303(**)	,215(*)	0,148	0,187	,411(**)	,313(**)	,408(**)	,354(**)	1								
18. Control over working time	0,130	0,011	0,091	,187(*)	0,005	,472(**)	,493(**)	0,142	,355(**)	0,123	0,136	,194(*)	,400(**)	0,142	,198(*)	,389(**)	,312(**)	1							
19. Married or with Partner	-0,176	-0,167	-0,033	0,125	,229(*)	0,133	0,141	0,087	0,132	0,024	0,073	0,025	0,064	-0,069	0,107	0,042	0,126	,300(**)	1						
20. Children	0,045	-.633(**)	-0,115	-0,038	,277(**)	-0,009	-0,077	0,067	0,036	0,004	0,032	0,034	-0,035	-0,090	0,118	-0,133	0,046	0,071	,404(**)	1					
21. Working Hours Outdoor	-0,091	-0,051	0,165	0,112	0,094	-.267(**)	-0,093	-0,138	-0,155	0,005	0,056	0,041	-0,170	0,051	-0,096	-.205(*)	-0,082	-.203(*)	-0,087	-0,070	1				
22. Working Hours Home	-0,125	-0,078	0,123	-0,103	0,073	-0,055	-0,039	-0,087	-0,133	-.211(*)	-0,065	0,011	-0,133	0,036	0,177	-0,066	0,093	0,110	0,060	0,096	-.233(*)	1			
23. Quantitative Work Overload	0,014	-0,113	0,171	-0,009	0,033	-.402(**)	-.264(**)	-0,079	-.188(*)	0,041	-0,020	0,017	-.326(**)	-0,180	-0,091	-0,133	-0,132	-.237(*)	-0,115	0,057	0,110	,209(*)	1		
24. Qualitative Work Overload	-0,024	-0,154	-0,002	-0,101	0,073	-0,035	0,046	-0,108	-0,138	0,110	-0,080	0,107	-0,006	-0,124	-0,018	-0,138	0,065	0,034	0,032	0,160	0,097	0,179	,203(*)	1	

** = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), and * = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 5

Means, medians, standard deviations and univariate test results of study variables.

Variables	Total			Org. Employee			Entrepreneur			Double Profile		
	Mean	Median	SD	Mean	Median	SD	Mean	Median	SD	Mean	Median	SD
SATWFB	4,685***	4,834	1,440	4,397	4,336	1,438	5,037	5,334	1,380	4,625	4,662	1,431
Subjective Well-being	5,104*	5,400	1,227	4,980	5,200	1,296	5,287	5,600	1,116	5,027	5,200	1,248
Goal (WFB) Pursuit	5,374*	5,600	1,285	5,211	5,400	1,251	5,493	5,800	1,340	5,477	5,800	1,230
Self-Efficacy WIF	5,477*	5,750	1,114	5,336	5,500	1,149	5,602	5,750	1,081	5,525	5,750	1,085
Self-Efficacy FIW	5,506	5,575	1,082	5,449	5,500	1,126	5,485	5,750	1,113	5,645	5,750	0,935
Self-Esteem	6,030	6,200	0,786	5,948	6,100	0,821	6,087	6,300	0,782	6,087	6,200	0,720
Optimism	5,694***	5,833	0,918	5,492	5,500	0,939	5,880	6,000	0,916	5,755	5,667	0,808
Work-family Climate	4,742***	4,800	1,074	4,391	4,450	1,029	5,322	5,400	0,841	4,449	4,475	1,103
Job Security Firing	3,369***	4,000	0,871	3,211	3,000	0,941	3,626	4,000	0,687	3,232	3,000	0,920
Job Security Withdrawal	2,942***	3,000	1,109	2,716	3,000	1,135	3,385	4,000	0,945	2,616	3,000	1,084
Colleague Support	5,466***	5,667	1,119	5,378	5,500	0,991	5,712	6,000	1,106	5,219	5,333	1,280
Job Autonomy	5,515***	5,750	1,299	5,027	5,250	1,400	6,195	6,500	0,838	5,270	5,500	1,260
Control over working time	4,873*	5,250	1,420	4,737	5,000	1,442	5,047	5,250	1,424	4,833	5,000	1,350
Quantitative Work Overload	4,529	4,667	1,324	4,534	4,667	1,375	4,484	4,667	1,259	4,597	4,500	1,342
Qualitative Work Overload	3,274	3,250	1,226	3,196	3,250	1,230	3,377	3,500	1,288	3,243	3,125	1,108

Note. Asterisks indicate significance of differences in means: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

Table 6

Significant differences in means of study variables and effect size, by pairs of type of employment.

Variables	Org. Employee - Entrepreneur			Entrepreneur - Double Profile			Org. Employee - Double Profile		
	n	U	Sig.	n	U	Sig.	n	U	Sig.
SATWFB	391	13772***	0,000	299	8605*	0,010			
Subjective Well-being	391	16445*	0,018						
Goal Pursuit	383	15180,5*	0,040						
Self-Efficacy WIF	382	15665,5*	0,018						
Optimism	384	13688,5***	0,000				310	9284,5*	0,026
Work-family Climate	354	7627***	0,000	265	4486***	0,000			
Job Security Firing	391	14286***	0,000	299	7848***	0,000			
Job Security Withdrawal	391	12656***	0,000	299	6186,5***	0,000			
Colleague Support	391	15004,5***	0,000	299	8071,5**	0,001			
Job Autonomy	391	8906***	0,000	299	5761***	0,000			
Control over working time	391	18463*	0,020						

Note. Asterisks indicate significance of differences in means: *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001.