

# **Work-Life-Balance? The Challenge of the Assessment of Prospective Teachers using the Example of Work-Life-Balance**

**Petia Genkova**

Department Economics and Social Sciences, Faculty of business psychology, University of applied Sciences Osnabrück, Email: p.genkova@hs-osnabrueck.de

DOI: 10.6007/IJARBSS/v5-i11/1891 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v5-i11/1891>

## **Abstract**

Psychology and Psychology teachers are requested to more actively take part in the assessment and teacher education. One of the basic research-questions concerns the qualification, capability and resilience of future teachers. To investigate under these aspects, health behavior and work-related patterns are consulted and Work-Life-Balance and stress-coping are discussed. In the paper at hand, three studies with heterogeneous methods, qualitatively and quantitatively, are presented that compare prospective teachers and teachers with regard to health- and work-related patterns of behaviour. The Fragebogen zur Erfassung des allgemeinen Wohlbefindes [Questionnaire for the assessment of general well-being] (FEW) by Bongartz (2000) and the Landauer Fragebogen zum Arbeitsstil [Landau questionnaire for work-style] (LFA; version for companies and universities) (Braun, 2000) have been used. The frame conditions of Work-Life-Balance are analysed. The results show that prospective teachers are more burdened than teachers and other working graduates. Furthermore, prospective teachers show lower work-satisfaction. Referring to the qualitative results, the tendency becomes obvious that prospective teachers strive for a security-orientation.

Key words: work-life-balance, teacher, stress coping, health behavior, work related behavior

JEL Codes: I12, I23

## **1. Introduction**

Work-Life-Balance is nowadays established as a trend not only in research, but also in Human Resource Management and in the societal and economic change of values. This leads to the impression that Work-Life-Balance as concern or compensation between the demands and strains in the vocational and private life is absolutely new, however it only came to the foreground and is much more emphasized than before. This can not only be explained by the increasing vocational demands and increasing complexity and ambivalence in nowadays working life and the therewith connected stressors, but also because the cases of exhaustion and Burn-Out significantly increased. Due to the practice-related orientation, there is a lack of differentiation for this term.

In the literature, it is often criticized that the term Work-Life-Balance opposes the life domains of work and life and separates them. Working life is however “a central part of life” (Ulich, 2007). More reasonable would be a term basing on the life-domains (compare Ulich’s suggestion of Life Domain Balance). Also the term of balance has to be critically regarded, due to, for example, full-time employees are not able to apply the same amount of time for family and work. Hence, Guest (2001) proposes as a solution to regard balance as a kind of “stability” between the domains that is different for every individual-adjusted to individual values and interests- and to refrain from the normative notion that balance is automatically good. One always has to remember in the context of all these thoughts that personal happiness is to be individually defined and that there is no objective Work-Life-Balance. Overall, it can be said that the term of Work-Life-Balance is indeed handy, but not precise (Resch & Bamberg, 2005).

There are several models for the concept of Work-Life- Balance that often base on the image of a scale (unidimensional) (Kastner, 2004) or a spinner (multidimensional) (Thiehoff, 2004) to illustrate the act of balancing the demands from the work- and life-area. The images show a too strong emphasis on normative notions (balance is good, etc.) and the idea of the equally-weighted distribution; of course, in contrast, it can be said that one not only could eliminate this deficit e.g. with the help of the adjustment of the scale, but also with the help of the adjustment to individual preferences. Other models resign the image of a scale and especially picture effect- and impact-directions within the by Work-Life-Balance affected spheres (Moser, 2007).

The models of non-causality indeed affirm a connection between the life spheres of work and life, but not a direct, causal relationship is assumed. For this, the following models have to be mentioned: 1. Segmentation-model (also neutrality- or autonomy- model): Neither work nor life have an influence on the particular other domain; they coexist as two different worlds and do not touch each other. Segmentation is a hypothetical construct and should not appear in reality. 2. Congruency model: This model suggests a similarity of both domains that emanates from the fact that a third, mostly personal variable is existent that can influence well-being (e.g. stress overall affects work and private life).

The models of causality suggest a direct relationship between work and life. Thereby interdependencies can develop from private- to working-life or from working- to private-life. Additionally, positive and negative interdependencies are existent (facilitation and conflicts, respectively). 3. Compensation models: Compensation theories assume two different possibilities of effect. As complete compensation are processes understood that in the case of negative experiences in one area facilitate the retreat in the other area, to live out there the suppressed behavior patterns or to experience the desired reactions. The reactive compensation bases on the assumption that negative experiences of a life domain can be balanced via regeneration. According to the Effort- Recovery- Theory, in this case, the quality and quantity of regeneration is of importance. 4. Resource-Depletion-Model: Scarce goods (time, attention and energy amongst others) are only limitedly existent. Thus, a good that is invested in one domain, is consumed at the cost of the other domain: Here, as a consequence, it is no more available. 5. Cross-Over-Model: Crossover-phenomena interpersonally occur, that means that the experiences of one partner affect the other partner and also influence his/her

well-being; these phenomena strongly depend on the quality of the relationship. 6. Spillover-Model (also Transfer-Model or generalization): This model deals with “positive or negative developments (own satisfaction, skill enhancement, strengths or abilities; or inversely excessive demands, stress, discrepancies, insufficient concentrativeness, tardiness or absence behavior that intrapersonal spill from one domain to the other.

This leads to the fact that we are exposed to an increased pressure in all domains that is, paired with changed frame conditions and increased demands on ourselves, felt (Guest, 2001). In this context, the increasing pursue of performance and higher life-demands (Resch & Bamberg, 2005), the pressure to be “flexible, visionary und innovative” in working life (Ballou, 2007), to foster an increased health awareness, to be able to materially and immaterially support the family, to build up a social network and many other aspects are mentioned. The non-vocational activities are seen as obligations (Schobert, 2007) and are subordinated to an efficiency-cult and are downright “managed”: The target in the sense of a “target achievement-measurement” is meaning in private life and “personal satisfaction” in working life (Joshi et al., 2002). The intensity of the strains in both spheres is increasing (Badura & Vetter, 2004). Further pressures concern the mobility and flexibility during life-design (referring to change of residence also connected with the loss of the social network) and the always stated time pressure. All these demands are valid up to old age.

Nevertheless, the approaches differ referring to whether the construct can be neutrally or judgmental formulated. One of the research approaches is manifested from the point of view of the organizational sciences and Organizational Psychology. This one questions the established positive relationship between room for maneuver, well-being and health. The well-being of employees is seen as an organizational success factor by means of the absence of health impairments like psychosomatic pain, bad temper, resentfulness, self-worth doubts and anxiety and was up to now disregarded in the German-speaking area (Eckardstein & Lüger, 1996; Genkova, 2008).

However the understanding of Work-Life-Balance is criticized by Organizational Psychology due to this balance is only desirable for the company, to get more efficient and more working employees instead of primarily happy employees. This is in turn a kind of violation of Work-Life-Balance. This also counts for the balance as compensation between work and private life. Empirical investigations over longer periods of time that deal with life-satisfaction show that Zeroism, a zero state without bad and good incidents and experiences, however is not seen as a state of happiness (e.g. Fordyce 1972, according to Genkova, 2008).

Well-being and life-satisfaction are however rather a subject to research of Social Psychology and are seen as the consequence of satisfied needs and motives; a kind of balance between positive and negative experiences. The organism reacts in the case of negative experience to a stronger extent than in the case of positive experiences firstly (in the short-term) with mobilization and in the long-term with extenuation (Taylor, 1991 & 1989). This is known as the so called Mobilization- and Extenuation-Hypothesis (Taylor, 1991). Life-satisfaction means the experience of what is founded by a cognitive process, as the evaluation of the own life is centered. The evaluation is e.g. the comparison between a subjective experienced actual state with a subjectively defined target-state on the basis of selected, potentially relevant

information relating to the own life. A subjectively defined target state is influenced by expectations, needs, goals, idealization as well as sociocultural norms and values of a person (Genkova, 2008).

The relativity position of actual and target-state emphasizes the meaning of the subjective choice of the standard of the target measurement for the extent of self-reported life-satisfaction (Standard-Theory of Multiple Discrepancy) (Michalos, 1985). The higher this standard is, the more a perceived discrepancy between target- and actual-measurement is experienced that impairs life-satisfaction. Thereby the balance of exchange-processes and the aspiration level play a role. A diffuse dissatisfaction after the reduction of the aspiration level can lead to a resigned (work-) satisfaction, whereas a retention of the aspiration level according to the perception of the situation and attempts to solve problems can lead to a pseudo (work-) satisfaction or fixation, as well as to a constructive (work) satisfaction (Bruggemann et al., 1975; Semmer & Udris, 1995).

Well-being develops from an individual aspiration level that is achievable with a high probability. This is also a comparison that does not relate to satisfaction, but to the probability of satisfaction. Especially the arbitrariness of cognitive experience is a personal and subjective dimension of life-satisfaction and conditions the great research difficulties (Genkova, 2008).

Additionally, the experiences of globalization bring new or tightened patterns of experience of the working world: Change of values and value overlaps, loss of identity and pressure to change on life course, bicultural identities. Such experiences can lead to the fact that the frame conditions, the social change itself are perceived as macrosocial stressors (Silbereisen & Pinquart, 2008). Also without the occurrence of unemployment, its possibility strains the organizational climate and subjective well-being (Albani et al., 2008; Berth et al., 2008; Jäger, 2007). Referring to the teacher profession, there are actual several discussions about increasing demands in the globalized world, the handling of new media and intercultural competence, in addition to the increased Burn-Out discussions. Now the concept of Work-Life-Balance is primarily used for free economy and at first for managers. In the circles of well-endowed managers, one rarely talks about Burn-Out due to a only partially reduced performance ability is already very critically perceived and regarded. On the other hand, the private healthcare, when a manager suffers from Burn-Out, what in the case of life tenure-receiving teachers rather triggers a societal discussion because of the maintenance system, due to teachers are paid by the state. Often, it is then forgotten that many demands have been increased or as well that many chose this profession not because of interest, but due to a secureness orientation. This is also proven by large-scale studies like Schaarschmidt et al. (2001; AVEM) which evaluate this as a personality-psychological relationship. These patterns have to be rather seen as dispositions and an explanation for relationship between the choice of profession and personality is searched. Additionally, one could culture-specifically analyze these results in context of the European integration and globalization, due to in other countries the profession of a teacher is not connected to a governmental safeguarding and thus no similar results and statistics as a public problem are known.

Due to Work-Life-Balance is in fact desirable, but not directly brings negative effects in the short-term (e.g. illness, Burn-Out), three components have been tested: well-being; work-

satisfaction (scales like goal clarity, organizational orientation, mean clarity, intention generation/planning, satisfaction, tendency to change) and health behavior.

## **2. Question and hypotheses**

In the case of this investigation, it is about “work in progress” that investigates the frame conditions of Work-Life-Balance. The interdependencies between Work-Life-Balance, well-being and work-satisfaction, the differences relating to gender, age and occupational groups shall be investigated. Furthermore, different aspects are highlighted with the help of heterogeneous research methods to more precisely define and validate the construct.

The questionnaire for the topic of Work-Life-Balance was composed from two questionnaires that contains the four-stage scale of 1=very rare to 4=very often. This refers to the “Fragebogen zur Erfassung des allgemeinen Wohlbefindes [Questionnaire for the assessment of overall well-being] (FEW) by Bongartz (2000) and the “Landauer Fragebogen zum Arbeitstil [Landau questionnaire for the assessment of work-style]” (LFA) (version for companies and universities) (Braun, 2000). The questions relate to well-being and life-satisfaction, as well as the behavioral strategies for their improvement in the psychical and physical area (health-oriented behavior, amongst other aspects).

The surveyed sample consists of 322 probands (men 154; women 168). Due to the question of this study, the following groups have been surveyed: elderly care nurses 21 (6.5%), bank employees 21 (6.5%), teachers 20 (6.2%), prospective teachers 69 (21.4%), students of BA Media and Communication 100 (31.1%) and trainee teachers 91 (28.3%). The age mean value is 26.86 years (SD= 7.76), whereas the youngest person was 19 years old and the oldest 60 years. Overall, this is a young sample.

The central question is: to what extent differ prospective teachers, trainee teachers and teachers in Work-Life-Balance? Are there differences to other groups? Is the securement orientation (scale of change tendency) a predictor for work- and life-satisfaction?

The following hypotheses have been tested. Hypothesis 1: There are group differences relating to the three areas of well-being, work-satisfaction and health-behavior, whereas prospective teachers show lower values. Hypothesis 2: What do teachers do that others don't? The teachers differ in relation to health behavior from the other groups. Hypothesis 3: The change tendency and mean clarity predict well-being. Hypothesis 4: Well-being is predicted by the areas of work-satisfaction and profession-specific characteristics. Hypothesis 5: The areas of well-being predict work-satisfaction.

## **3. Results and discussion**

To test the first two hypotheses, a variance analysis according to the Scheffe procedure was conducted. Hypothesis 1: There are group differences relating to the three areas of well-being, work-satisfaction and health-behavior. As table 1 shows, the investigated groups of elderly care nurses, bank employees, teachers, prospective teachers, trainee teachers, students of BA Media and Communication significantly differ in relation to well-being, goal clarity,

organizational orientation, mean clarity, satisfaction change tendency and intention/planning. However, the Scheffe procedure shows that homogeneous groups in relation to well-being, goal clarity and intention/planning are existent. Differences are identifiable for mean clarity, in relation to this dimension, students of BA Media and Communication show the lowest mean value (2.85; SD=.056,  $F = 22.381$ ,  $df = 5; 313$  und  $p = .000$ , Scheffe- procedure). Relating to change tendency, the students (prospective teachers 2.13, SD= .74 and BA 2.35, SD= .68) and teachers (1.81; SD= .44,  $F = 9.726$ ;  $df = 5; 312$ ;  $p = .000$ ) built a homogeneous group with higher mean values. This refers to the fact that these groups have a stronger dissatisfaction with their tasks and want to change their job or subject.

Relating to students, this would be explainable with the orientation phase during studies, however in the case of teachers, such a tendency refers to strains and dissatisfaction. Furthermore it becomes obvious that relating to organizational orientation two homogeneous groups emerge: students (prospective teachers 2.89; SD= .89; trainee teachers 3.43; SD=.63 and students of BA Media and Communication 2.85; SD= .56;  $F = 24.141$ ;  $df = 5; 312$ ;  $p = .000$ ) and the group of working persons (elderly care nurses 3.75; SD= .67; bank employees 4.17; SD= .49 and teachers 3.83; SD= .95). This on the one hand refers to the dependency of the working style on the kind of the task, and on the other hand to the fact that the group of prospective teachers does not differ from the other students. Furthermore, it becomes clear that teachers do not differ from other occupational groups. This is similar for work-satisfaction- the students (prospective teachers 3.50; SD= .66; Media and Communication 3.03; SD= .51 and trainee teachers 3.16; SD= .81) build a homogeneous group in comparison to the working persons (elderly care nurses 3.70; SD= .98; bank employees 3.77; SD= .68 and teachers 3.85; SD=.74;  $F = 11.563$ ;  $df = 5; 313$ ;  $p = .000$ ). To detect the relationships for health behavior (hypothesis 2), further variance analyses have been conducted.

<<<PLEASE INSERT TABLE 1 HERE>>>

Hypothesis 2: What do teachers that the others don't do? Teachers differ from the other groups in relation to health behavior. The following areas of well-being have been investigated: work/profession; marriage/partnership. In these areas, however no significant results have been detected.

For health behavior, the following areas have been investigated (What in the last four weeks had a negative impact on your well-being?): negative: profession-oriented work; negative: gathering with the partner; negative: gathering with family/children; negative: gathering with friends; negative: rest, relaxation; negative: adventure, travelling; negative: sport, dancing; negative: sociality and negative: culture/education (see table 2).

<<<PLEASE INSERT TABLE 2 HERE>>>

As table 2 shows, trainee teachers constantly show the highest values. Here, all areas have a strong negative impact on well-being. In the case of a scale from 1 to 4, values in the area of 3,5 are relatively high when comparing this to the remaining values (trainee teachers negative profession-oriented working 2.60 SD=1.03- lowest value elderly care nurses 1.60; SD= .82  $F = 5.628$ ;  $df = 5; 276$ ;  $p = .000$ ; negative gathering with partner 3.44; SD= .90- lowest value bank employees 1.60, SD= .99,  $F = 40.888$ ;  $df = 5; 276$ ;  $p = .000$  ; negative gathering with family/children

3.67 SD= .60- lowest value bank employees 1.30, SD= .47 F= 76.192; df 5; 276; p= .000; negative gathering with friends 3.69; SD= .51 lowest values prospective teachers 1.40, SD= .69 F= 81.024; df 5; 276; p= .000; bank employees 1.40, SD= .59; negative rest/ relaxation 3.73, SD= .51- lowest value bank employees 1.30, SD= .65 F= 86.900; df 5; 276; p= .000; negative adventure/travelling 3.57; SD= .78- lowest value teachers 1.10, SD= .31 F= 59.422; df 5; 276; p= .000; negative sport/ dancing 3.66; SD= .64 lowest value teachers 1.15, SD= .37, F= 84.697; df 5; 276; p= .000; negative sociality 3.67; SD = .62- lowest value bank employees 1.30; SD= .65, F= 68.525; df 5; 276; p= .000 und negative culture/ education 3.71 SD= .57- lowest value teachers 1.10, SD= .31, F= 76.704; df 5; 276; p= .000).

These results show the great demands and strains that persons subjectively experience during teacher traineeship. Because in this investigation no other comparison group of entrants was considered, the results cannot be further interpreted. The teacher traineeship is the entrance phase and qualifying period for the teacher's profession. Additionally, the pressure is existent to further learn from the necessity to master the second state examination. This leads to the pressure to be at the same time a person of authority and a learner. Due to this, it comes to high strains and this serves as an evidence that the teacher traineeship itself is an adequate assessment for the teacher's profession, whereupon also work-motivation and the choice of profession and orientation are proved.

Relating to the health behavior strategies of nutrition and sleep, no significant results can be detected, what in turn indicates no selection effects. To investigate the dependency of satisfaction on a secureness orientation, regression analyses for the testing of hypothesis 3 have been conducted. Hypothesis 3 states: The change tendency and mean clarity predict well-being. The analysis has been separately conducted according to groups, so that due to the different distribution of probands in the single groups a comparison is not secured. It becomes obvious that in the case of prospective teachers, teacher trainees and the Bachelor degree program media and communication there are no significant results. Thus, this hypothesis is not affirmed. In the case of elderly care nurses, mean clarity ( $\beta = -.624$ ;  $p = .004$ ;  $\Delta R^2 = .417$ ) and change tendency ( $\beta = -.631$ ;  $p = .003$ ;  $\Delta R^2 = .417$ ) predict well-being. In contrast, in the case of bank employees, only change tendency is a predictor for well-being ( $\beta = .508$ ;  $p = .025$ ;  $\Delta R^2 = .234$ ) and in the case of teachers only mean clarity ( $\beta = -.520$ ;  $p = .027$ ;  $\Delta R^2 = .200$ ). Thus, the hypothesis could not be proven. Similar results were achieved referring to the testing of hypothesis 4: Well-being is predicted by the areas of work-satisfaction and profession-specific characteristics. Here, no significant results could be achieved in the single groups.

Whether the areas of well-being predict work-satisfaction, was tested with the help of hypothesis 5. The following environmental conditions were investigated: Mutual support in the family; appreciation of own interests via other possibilities in the context of the profession; tolerance towards different value orientations; nearness to nature, well-being impairing noise; pleasant weather and climate conditions, manifold recreational opportunities; manifold cultural offers, landscape beauty; Living quality and economic secureness. The regressions were separately conducted, to be able to consider the differences between the single groups. In the

case of the groups of teachers and prospective teachers and elderly care nurses, there were no significant results. In the case of teacher trainees ( $\beta = .445$ ;  $p = .001$ ;  $\Delta R^2 = .427$ ) and bank employees ( $\beta = .616$ ;  $p = .040$ ;  $\Delta R^2 = .360$ ) the opportunities in the context of the professions predict work-satisfaction. In the case of the students of BA Media and Communication, the mutual support from the family ( $\beta = .282$ ;  $p = .043$ ;  $\Delta R^2 = .130$ ) predicts work-satisfaction. Due to the unequal distribution of the probands, no comparison has been conducted.

Due to the prospective teachers have no more unfavorable values for Work-Life-Balance than other groups, no selection effect can be assumed. This also becomes obvious through the comparison with students from the BA program Media and Communication. Thus, this could not be related to a subject-specific selection. Striking are the high negative values of the trainee teachers for Work-Life-Balance in comparison to prospective teachers. This relationship could be regarded as an indicator of actual strain. The strains result from the double pressure of orientation in a new area as a person of authority for pupils and in the position of a still learning entrant, who is tested. The results rather indicate that Work-Life-Balance could be used as a selection criterion for prospective teachers. However the results provide definite hints that the teacher's traineeship is a good assessment. Admittedly, in this investigation, another group of entrants was missing, to test and analyze these effects more in detail. The relationship between profession and personality was already highlighted by Schaarschmidt's results (2004), however the results of the study at hand provide no hints for that Work-Life-Balance can be used as a selection criterion. That a secureness orientation (scale of change tendency) however is a predictor for well-being, indicates that the choice of profession eventually is connected with this. This however requires a more differentiated consideration, what could not yet be ensured due to the person distribution in this sample. Due to this study has to be seen as work in progress, this will be considered in later investigations. For well-being and work-satisfaction, the evaluation of actual and target state is crucial, so that, if one has achieved the secureness of workplace like in the teacher's profession, other factors become important, like the opportunities and liberties in the profession context or within the financial situation. Proven indicators for strain and demands are e.g. self-induced subjective demands (e.g. ambition, perfectionism), physical strains like noise, temperature, pollution, etc, task demands, but also the over- or under-regulation or the position and role in a profession. This also became obvious through the results of the teacher trainees. Relating to the construct of Work-Life-Balance, here, the two parallel traditions of the research of Social and Work and Organizational Psychology are reflected. The strong dependency of the results on the goal setting of research has to be traced back to the heterogeneous tendencies and the missing precision of the construct definition. However, it became obvious that prospective teachers are exposed to high strains being entrants and this would be an argument to more introduce similar profession situations and internships also in earlier phases of education, in which the pressure to complete an apprenticeship is indeed lower, but the subjectively perceived freedom of profession selection and orientation are stronger shaped.



## References

- Albani, C., Blaser, G., Geyer, M., Hendrik Berth, Brähler, E., Schmutzer, G., et al. (2008). Psychische Gesundheit und Angst vor Arbeitsplatzverlust. In BDP (Ed.), *Psychische Gesundheit am Arbeitsplatz in Deutschland. Psychologie Gesellschaft Politik - 2008* (pp. 16-20). Berlin.
- Badura, B., Vetter, C. (2004). Work-Life Balance' Herausforderung für die betriebliche Gesundheitspolitik und den Staat. In: Badura, B., Schellschmidt, H., Vetter, C. (Ed.), *Fehlzeiten-Report 2003, Wettbewerbsfaktor Work-Life Balance* (pp. 1-18). Berlin.
- Ballou, B., Godwin, N. H. (2007). Quality of Work-Life. In: *Strategic Finance* 4/2007 (pp. 40-43).
- Berth, H., Friedrich, B., Albani, C., Förster, P., Brähler, E. & Stöbel-Richter, Y. (2008). Psychische Gesundheit und Arbeitslosigkeit. In BDP (Ed.), *Psychische Gesundheit am Arbeitsplatz in Deutschland. Psychologie Gesellschaft Politik - 2008*. (pp. 21-26). Berlin.
- Bongartz, N. (2000). *Wohlbefinden als Gesundheitsparameter. Theorie und treatmentorientierte Diagnostik*. Landau: Verlag Empirische Pädagogik.
- Braun, O. L. (2000). *Ein Modell aktiver Anpassung: Berufliche Zielklarheit, Organisationsorientierung, Mittelklarheit und Vorsatzbildung/Planung als vorauslaufende Bedingungen von Arbeitszufriedenheit, Wechseltendenz und Leistung*. Landau: Verlag Empirische Pädagogik.
- Bruggemann, A., Groskurth, P., Ulich, E. (1975). *Arbeitszufriedenheit*. Huber: Bern.
- Eckardstein, D.v., Lüger, G. (1996). Wohlbefinden von Mitarbeitern als betrieblicher Erfolgsfaktor. In: Bruch, H., Eickhoff, M., Thiem, H. (Ed.), *Zukunftsorientiertes Management. Handlungshinweise für die Praxis* (pp. 119-136). Frankfurt am Main.
- Fordyce, M.W. (1972). *Happiness, its daily variation and its relation to values*. California: United States International University.
- Genkova, P. (2008). Work-Life-Balance: Methodische Probleme beim Erforschen eines Konstrukts am Beispiel von Geschlechtsunterschieden. In: *Produkt- und Produktions-Ergonomie- Aufgabe für Entwickler und Planer* (pp. 777-781). München.
- Guest, D. E. (2001). *Perspectives on the Study of Work-Life Balance*. Social Science Information, 2/2002, pp. 255-279.
- Jäger, R. (2007). *Arbeitsmarkt und psychische Gesundheit. Zusammenhänge zwischen der Arbeitsmarktsituation und einem personenbezogenen Indikator für Beschäftigungsfähigkeit unter Beachtung von Merkmalen der Arbeitssituation*. Lengerich: Pabst Science Publishers.
- Kastner, M. (2004). Verschiedene Zugänge zur Work Life Balance. In: Kastner, M. (Ed.), *Die Zukunft der Work Life Balance. Wie lassen sich Beruf und Familie, Arbeit und Freizeit miteinander verbinden?*. Kröning: Asanger Verlag.
- Michalos, A.C. (1985). *Multiple discrepancies theory (MDT)*, Social Indicators Research, 16, p. 347-413.
- Moser, K. (Ed.) (2007). *Wirtschaftspsychologie*. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer Verlag.
- Resch, Marianne/Bamberg, Eva (2005): Work-Life-Balance – ein neuer Blick auf die Vereinbarkeit von Berufs- und Privatleben?. *Zeitschrift für Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie*, 04/2005, Hogrefe Verlag, Göttingen, pp. 171-175.

- Schaarschmidt, U. & Fischer, A. W. (2001). *Bewältigungsmuster im Beruf*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Schobert, D.B. (2007). Grundlagen zum Verständnis von Work-Life Balance. In: Esslinger, A., Schobert, S., Deniz, B. (Ed.) (2007). *Erfolgreiche Umsetzung von Work-Life Balance in Organisationen. Strategien, Konzepte, Maßnahmen* (pp. 19-34). Wiesbaden.
- Semmer, N. & Udris, I. (1995). Bedeutung und Wirkung von Arbeit. In: H. Schuler (Ed.), *Lehrbuch Organisationspsychologie*, 2. edition (pp. 133-165). Bern.
- Taylor, S.E. (1991). *Asymmetrical Effects of Positive and Negative Events: The Mobilization-Minimization Hypothesis*, Psychological Bulletin, 110, pp. 67-85.
- Taylor, S.E. & Brown, J.D. (1988). Illusion and Well-Being: A Social Psychological Perspective on Mental Health, Psychological Bulletin, 103, pp. 193-210.
- Thiehoff, Rainer (2004). Work Life Balance mit Balanced Scorecard: die wirtschaftliche Sicht der Prävention. In: Kastner, M. (Ed.) (2004). *Die Zukunft der Work Life Balance. Wie lassen sich Beruf und Familie, Arbeit und Freizeit miteinander verbinden?* (pp. 409-436). Kröning.
- Ulich, E. (2007). *Von der Work Life Balance zur Life Domain Balance*, zfo, 4/2007, pp. 188-193.

Tables

Table 1: Mean values of the well-being areas for the investigated groups

|                  |                     | Mean value | SD  | F     | df | significance |
|------------------|---------------------|------------|-----|-------|----|--------------|
| Wellbeing        | elderly care nurses | 2.5        | .11 | 6.31  | 5; | .000         |
|                  | Bank employees      | 2.5        | .07 |       |    |              |
|                  | teachers            | 2.5        | .06 |       |    |              |
|                  | Prospect.           | 2.5        | .12 |       |    |              |
|                  | Teachers            | 2.5        | .08 |       |    |              |
|                  | Teacher trainees    | 2.6        | .15 |       |    |              |
|                  | M.& C students      | 2.5        | .12 |       |    |              |
| Goal clarity     | elderly care nurses | 3.3        | .47 | 22.23 | 5; | .000         |
|                  | Bank employees      | 2.9        | .39 |       |    |              |
|                  | teachers            | 2.8        | .50 |       |    |              |
|                  | Prospect.           | 2.9        | .32 |       |    |              |
|                  | Teachers            | 2.6        | .43 |       |    |              |
|                  | Teacher trainees    | 3.3        | .51 |       |    |              |
|                  | M.& C students      | 3.0        | .51 |       |    |              |
| Org. orientation | elderly care nurses | 3.7        | .67 | 24.14 | 5; | .000         |
|                  | Bank employees      | 4.1        | .49 |       |    |              |
|                  | teachers            | 3.8        | .95 |       |    |              |
|                  | Prospect.           | 2.8        | .89 |       |    |              |
|                  | Teachers            | 3.1        | .78 |       |    |              |
|                  | Teacher trainees    | 2.7        | .44 |       |    |              |
|                  | M.& C students      | 3.1        | .83 |       |    |              |
| Mean clarity     | elderly care nurses | 3.7        | .98 | 22.38 | 5; | .000         |
|                  | Bank employees      | 3.7        | .68 |       |    |              |
|                  | teachers            | 3.9        | .49 |       |    |              |
|                  | Prospect.           | 3.7        | .80 |       |    |              |
|                  | Teachers            | 3.4        | .63 |       |    |              |
|                  | Teacher trainees    | 2.8        | .56 |       |    |              |
|                  | M.& C students      | 3.4        | .78 |       |    |              |
| satisfaction     | elderly care nurses | 3.5        | .84 | 11.56 | 5; | .000         |
|                  | Bank employees      | 3.9        | .61 |       |    |              |
|                  | teachers            | 3.8        | .74 |       |    |              |
|                  | Prospect.           | 3.5        | .66 |       |    |              |
|                  | Teachers            | 3.1        | .81 |       |    |              |
|                  | Teacher trainees    | 3.0        | .51 |       |    |              |
|                  | M.& C students      | 3.3        | .73 |       |    |              |

|                           |                     |     |     |      |    |      |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-----|-----|------|----|------|
| Change tendency<br>nurses | elderly care        | 1.7 | .54 | 9.72 | 5; | .000 |
|                           | Bank                | 1.7 | .61 |      |    |      |
|                           | employees           | 1.8 | .44 |      |    |      |
|                           | teachers            | 2.1 | .74 |      |    |      |
|                           | Prospect.           | 1.7 | .66 |      |    |      |
|                           | Teachers teacher    | 2.3 | .68 |      |    |      |
| Intention/<br>Planning    | elderly care nurses | 2.0 | .71 | 6.90 | 5; | .000 |
|                           | Bank                | 3.6 | .85 |      |    |      |
|                           | employees           | 3.7 | .72 |      |    |      |
|                           | teachers            | 3.7 | .76 |      |    |      |
|                           | Prospect.           | 3.0 | .86 |      |    |      |
|                           | Teachers teacher    | 3.3 | .91 |      |    |      |
|                           | trainees            | 2.9 | .95 |      |    |      |
|                           |                     | 3.2 | .93 |      |    |      |

Table 2: Negative effects on well-being: How often had incidents from the following areas in the past four weeks a negative impact on your well-being?

|  | What profession do you work in? | Mean value | SD   | df        | F          | p    |
|--|---------------------------------|------------|------|-----------|------------|------|
| W-B 100<br>Prof.-orient.<br>working          | elderly care nurses             | 1.60       | .82  | 5;<br>276 | 5.62<br>8  | .000 |
|  | Bank                            | 1.65       | .87  |           |            |      |
|  | employees                       | 2.15       | .89  |           |            |      |
|  | Prospect. Teachers              | 2.15       | 1.05 |           |            |      |
|  | teacher trainees                | 2.60       | 1.03 |           |            |      |
|  | M.&                             | 1.97       | 1.14 |           |            |      |
|  | Overall                         | 2.15       | 1.08 |           |            |      |
| W-B 101<br>gathering with<br>partner         | elderly care nurses             | 1.95       | 1.05 | 5;<br>276 | 40.88<br>8 | .000 |
|  | Bank                            | 1.60       | .99  |           |            |      |
|  | employees                       | 1.57       | .90  |           |            |      |
|  | Prospect. Teachers              | 1.71       | .95  |           |            |      |
|  | teacher trainees                | 3.44       | .90  |           |            |      |
|  | M.&                             | 1.64       | .98  |           |            |      |
|  | Overall                         | 2.17       | 1.23 |           |            |      |
| W-B 102<br>gathering with<br>family/children | elderly care nurses             | 1.80       | .89  | 5;<br>276 | 76.19<br>2 | .000 |
|  | Bank                            | 1.30       | .47  |           |            |      |
|  | employees                       | 1.31       | .47  |           |            |      |
|  | Prospect. Teachers              | 1.65       | .84  |           |            |      |
|  | teacher trainees                | 3.67       | .60  |           |            |      |
|  | M.&                             | 1.80       | .99  |           |            |      |

| Overall                                |                             | 2.22                | 1.21    |           |            |      |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|---------|-----------|------------|------|
| W-B 103<br>gathering with<br>friends   | elderly care nurses         | 1.80                | 1.00    | 5;<br>276 | 81.02<br>4 | .000 |
|  | Bank employees              | 1.40.59             |         |           |            |      |
|  | Prospect. Teachers          | 1.40.69             |         |           |            |      |
|  | teacher trainees            | 3.69.59             |         |           |            |      |
|  | M.& C_students              | 1.83                | 1.03    |           |            |      |
|  | Overall                     | 2.20                | 1.23    |           |            |      |
|  | W-B 104<br>rest. relaxation | elderly care nurses | 1.40.68 |           |            |      |
| Bank employees                         | 1.30.65                     |                     |         |           |            |      |
| teachers                               | 1.15.37                     |                     |         |           |            |      |
| Prospect. Teachers                     | 1.36.80                     |                     |         |           |            |      |
| teacher trainees                       | 3.73.51                     |                     |         |           |            |      |
| M.& C_students                         | 2.09                        | 1.09                |         |           |            |      |
| Overall                                | 2.24                        | 1.27                |         |           |            |      |
| W-B 105<br>Adventure.                  | elderly care nurses         | 1.80                | 1.19    | 5;<br>276 | 59.42<br>2 | .000 |
|  | Bank employees              | 1.45.94             |         |           |            |      |
|  | teachers                    | 1.10.31             |         |           |            |      |
|  | Prospect. Teachers          | 1.38.66             |         |           |            |      |
|  | teacher trainees            | 3.57.78             |         |           |            |      |
|  | M.& C_students              | 1.97                | 1.08    |           |            |      |
|  | Overall                     | 2.20                | 1.26    |           |            |      |
| W-B 106 negative:<br>Sports. dancing   | elderly care nurses         | 1.20.52             |         | 5;<br>276 | 84.69<br>7 | .000 |
|  | Bank employees              | 1.25.55             |         |           |            |      |
|  | teachers                    | 1.15.37             |         |           |            |      |
|  | Prospect. Teachers          | 1.38.73             |         |           |            |      |
|  | teacher trainees            | 3.66.64             |         |           |            |      |
|  | M.& C_students              | 1.85                | 1.10    |           |            |      |
|  | Overall                     | 2.13                | 1.27    |           |            |      |
| W-B 107 negative:<br>sociality         | elderly care nurses         | 1.50.94             |         | 5;<br>276 | 68.52<br>5 | .000 |
|  | Bank employees              | 1.30.65             |         |           |            |      |
|  | teachers                    | 1.31.47             |         |           |            |      |
|  | Prospect. Teachers          | 1.46.76             |         |           |            |      |
|  | teacher trainees            | 3.67.62             |         |           |            |      |
|  | M.& C_students              | 2.13                | 1.11    |           |            |      |
|  | Overall                     | 2.27                | 1.25    |           |            |      |
| W-B 108 negative:<br>Culture/Education | elderly care nurses         | 1.90                | 1.25    | 5;<br>276 | 76.70<br>4 | .000 |
|  | Bank employees              | 1.30.65             |         |           |            |      |
|  | teachers                    | 1.10.31             |         |           |            |      |
|  | Prospect. Teachers          | 1.60.78             |         |           |            |      |
|  | teacher trainees            | 3.71.57             |         |           |            |      |

|                |      |     |      |  |  |
|----------------|------|-----|------|--|--|
| M.& C students | 2.89 | .98 |      |  |  |
| Overall        | 2.57 |     | 1.23 |  |  |