Explaining Workaholism's Effects on Work-Family Conflict: A Boundary Theory Approach

by

Michael Andre Rotch

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Auburn University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

> Auburn, Alabama August 7, 2021

Keywords: workaholism, work-family conflict, boundary management, Segmentation, Integration

Copyright 2021 by Michael Andre Rotch

Approved by

Jesse Michel, Chair, Associate Professor of Psychology Ana Franco-Watkins, Professor of Psychology Gargi Sawhney, Assistant Professor Daniel Svyantek, Professor of Psychology

Abstract

This research examines the linking mechanisms and conditional processes underlying the workaholism and work-family conflict relationship. Based primarily on the boundary management literature, it was hypothesized that work boundary enactment would mediate the relationship between workaholism and work-family conflict, and that this indirect effect would be moderated by work boundary preference. To test these hypotheses, data were collected from working adults and tested through mediation and moderated-mediation bootstrapping procedures. findings suggest that boundary enactment mediates the relationship between workaholism and work-family conflict; additionally, I found support for the moderating effect of boundary preference on this indirect effect. Individuals with high segmentation preference experienced more conflict when integrating their roles than individuals low in segmentation preference. This study establishes boundary theory and the segmentation-integration model as an important explanation for the relationship between workaholism and work-family conflict. It also suggests that future research examine if establishing a healthy work-family organizational culture and performing interventions focused on boundary management may serve to mitigate some of the negative effects of workaholism. Overall, this study demonstrates the importance of boundary management in explaining the impact of workaholism on the work-life interface.

Acknowledgements

There are many people I would like to thank for supporting me through this process and before. I would like to thank Dr. Jesse Michel for always having my back, for the quality feedback, and the light prodding when I needed to get going on a project. I greatly appreciate his understanding and flexibility as a mentor. I would like to thank the other members of my committee and university reader for their support and feedback: Dr. Ana Franco-Watkins, Dr. Gargi Sawhney, Dr. Daniel Svyantek, and Dr. Jeremy Mackey. I am appreciative of all the educators whose hard work allowed me to make to this point. I would particularly like to thank Dr. Valerie Morganson among this group.

I would like to thank the wonderful friends I have made at Auburn, of which there are too many to name in their entirety, for their emotional support and guidance throughout my time here. I am especially grateful for Nicole Shifrin, Taylor Willits, Ryan Bird, Hayden Hickey, Ana Kriletic, and Austin Cunningham. My family deserves a lot of recognition for their unending support throughout my life. I would like to particularly thank my parents, Barry and Patti Rotch, as well as my sisters, Jacqie and Morgan Rotch, for their constant stream encouragement. Most of all I would like to thank my fantastic wife, Rachel Whitman Rotch for continually being a source of inspiration, comfort, and companionship. I would also like to thank my cat, Jean-luc, for always providing me company and an excellent background for zoom calls.

Table of Contents

Abstract2
Acknowledgements
List of Tables5
List of Figures
List of Abbreviations7
Chapter 1 (Introduction)
Workaholism and Work-Family13
Boundary Management as the Explanatory Mechanism16
Boundary Fit23
Chapter 2 (Method and Results)
Method
Results
Chapter 3 (Discussion)
Theoretical Implications
Practical Implications41
Limitations and Future Directions43
Conclusion47
References
Appendix A (Study Items)

List of Tables

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities	60
Table 2. Study Variable Means and Standard Deviations by Education Level	61
Table 3. Study Variable Means and Standard Deviations by Work Sector	62
Table 4. Mediation and Moderated-Mediation Estimates	64

List of Figures

Figure 1. Theoretical model summarizing the predicted relationships between constructs	56
Figure 2. A plot of the indirect effect of workaholism on work-family conflict versus the	
moderator (work segmentation preference) with confidence bands	57

List of Abbreviations

WFC - Work-to-family conflict

FWC- Family-to-work conflict

COR- Conservation of resources

W-HR - Work-Home Resources

IER- Insufficient effort responding

Chapter 1

Introduction

As organizations have grown and flourished, they have sought out archetypical "ideal workers". These individuals display a readiness to perform their tasks exactingly and to perfection without interference from the home domain (Davies & Frink, 2014; Williams, 2000). In many cases, this ideal worker has perpetuated a standard for comparison in which the working professional is expected to put in longer hours with superior performance, sporting this increased workweek and overtime as a true symbol of organizational dedication and honor (Fry & Cohen, 2009). This culture and standard for ideal workers has led to an increase in workaholism, even manifesting in a term that translates to "death from overwork" in Eastern cultures (i.e., karoshi; Fry & Cohen, 2009). According to Andreassen et al. (2016), the prevalence rate of workaholism in their sample of 16,426 employees was 7.8%. Aziz and Moyer (2018) predict that workaholism is likely to persist or increase as the world becomes more interconnected due to increasing global connectivity and technological advances. These technological and connectivity causes of workaholism are likely to increase with the greater acceptance of telework resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. Thus, workaholism is an increasingly important research topic for the current moment.

An increasingly researched and popular term in the literature, workaholism has suffered general confusion over its definition, conceptualization, and measurement (Clark et al., 2016). While commonly understood as an addiction to work, the term workaholism has multiple different conceptualizations and definitions that have contributed to a general absence of agreement on exactly what workaholism means (Sussman, 2012). Despite the absence conceptual consensus, there are general agreements about the core components of workaholism.

While first coined by Oates (1971), many researchers recognize two core components of workaholism. These include working excessively hard and possessing a strong inner desire or drive to work (McMillan et al., 2003). This definition is in accordance with meta-analytic research that states that workaholism should be considered an addiction to work that involves a compulsive need to work, the presence of persistent thoughts of work when not working, and working beyond reasonable expectations (Clark et al., 2016).

Although workaholism has been conceptualized as a behavioral pattern and a syndrome, the majority of the workaholism literature has considered workaholism an addiction (Clark et al., 2016). Clark et al. (2016) through an examination of commonality in the workaholism literature define workaholism as "an addiction to work that involves feeling compelled or driven to work because of internal pressures, having persistent and frequent thoughts about work when not working, and working beyond what is reasonably expected despite potential negative consequences" (p. 1840). The authors leave out affective components due to disagreement in the literature whether high or low enjoyment should be considered a defining feature of workaholism. This is appropriate given that their meta-analysis found that the studies that examined workaholism in relation to affect were mostly cross-sectional and that the relationships between workaholism and affective variables were largely mixed (positively correlation with enjoyment of work, uncorrelated with positive affect, and significantly negatively related to job satisfaction, state negative affect, and trait negative affect). The positive relationship to enjoyment may be attributable to the "rush" that workaholics experience when working, as mentioned by Sussman (2012). For this study, the Dutch Work Addiction Scale developed by Schaufeli et al. (2009) was used since it measures working excessively and working

compulsively—which are theorized to be the common threads between the different definitions of workaholism without the controversial affective component.

In a qualitative analysis of the workaholism literature, Ng, Sorensen, and Feldman (2007) mention three perspectives in the literature on the origin of what causes workaholism: dispositions (i.e., low self-esteem, and achievement-related personality traits), socio-cultural experiences (e.g., vicarious learning of workaholism during childhood or at work, greater efficacy at work compared to non-work, and peer competition) and behavioral reinforcements (e.g., organizational rewards for excessive work, a focus on work input as opposed to work output, and very engaging work environments). It is unclear whether behavioral reinforcements should be considered a *cause* of workaholism or if workaholics self-select into organizational environments that embrace workaholic behaviors which subsequently increase the occurrence of these behaviors (Clark et al., 2016).

It is important to distinguish workaholism from conceptually related constructs. Engagement, which is thought of as extensive involvement with work, is a construct that is sometimes confused with workaholism (Sussman 2012). In a review of the workaholism literature, Sussman (2012) states that both workaholism and engagement are related to greater involvement in work and may seek to achieve benefits from work activity such as a "rush" or "loss of a sense of time". What differentiates these constructs is that engagement is typically viewed as a positive or beneficial behavior whereas workaholism is typically conceptualized as negative or counterproductive. Aziz and Moyer (2018) note that workaholism is a type of heavy work involvement associated with negative outcomes, whereas engagement is a type of heavy work involvement associated with positive outcomes. The authors note that the difference in outcomes is the result of a difference in the reason for the heavy work involvement: engaged

workers are involved because they enjoy or are passionate about their work, and workaholics are involved because they feel compelled to work or feel guilty when they aren't working. Similarly, Clark et al. (2016) suggest that the excessive work of both engagement and workaholism is driven by an internal drive to work (as opposed to external forces such as financial problems), but the distinguishing feature is that engagement is the result of a passion or love of work whereas workaholism is the result of a compulsion or feeling that one should work. Workaholics may feel compelled to work excessively despite not enjoying it or even in the absence of organizational demands. This may occur due workaholism initially inducing pleasure only to later induce burnout (Sussman, Lisha, & Griffiths, 2011). Di Stefano and Gaudiino (2019) performed a meta-analysis in which they found that workaholism and work engagement appear to be distinct constructs with some overlap in components.

Although some have argued that workaholism may have beneficial outcomes (Baruch, 2011; Ng et al, 2007), workaholism is primarily associated with negative correlates and outcomes. Workaholism is sometimes viewed positively because excessive work is typically beneficial for individuals and organizations in the short term, but the long-term consequences are more negative (Di Stefano & Gaudiino, 2019). A meta-analysis by Clark et al. (2016) found that workaholism was associated with higher role overload, role conflict, hours worked, overtime, and time commitment to the job as well as low job control. Workaholism is related to negative outcomes such as higher job stress, counterproductive work behaviors, marital disaffection, and work-life conflict as well as lower job satisfaction, life satisfaction, physical health, and mental health (Clark et al., 2016). Many links have been found between workaholism and poor mental and physical health (Andreassen, 2014; del Libano, 2011; Kanai et al., 1996; Shimazu et al., 2010; Taris et al., 2005). Additionally, workaholism is positively associated with burnout (Nagy

& Davis, 1985), which could lead to increases in organizational turnover (Harrington et al., 2005; Huang et al., 2003). Aziz and Zickar (2006) found that workaholics were more likely to have lower life satisfaction and higher work-life imbalance. Nearly every conceptualization states that workaholics work longer and harder than other workers (Clark et al., 2016). This excessive work contributes to a tendency to not meet the demands of life or family domains: missed family events, no off days, and bringing work home with them. When these individuals do manage to engage in recreational activities they tend to advance or complement their work (Bonebright et al., 2000). Taken together, workaholism seems to be a compulsive behavior that results in a variety of negative outcomes for individuals and organizations (Porter, 1996).

These outcomes have real human and economic costs. Reported estimates for the death toll in Japan from overwork are close to 10,000 individuals, and up to one million white-collar employees report working over 80 hours of overtime per month (Meek, 2004). While overwork has not been directly linked to deaths in the United States (U.S.), Goh et al. (2015) estimated that in the U.S. more than 120,000 deaths per year and approximately 5-8% of annual healthcare costs are associated with the following workplace stressors: unemployment, lack of health insurance, exposure to shift work, long working hours, job insecurity, work-family conflict, low job control, high job demands, low social support at work, and low organizational justice. This suggests that workaholism is associated with real costs in terms of human lives and economic output. Worryingly, workaholic culture is becoming an increasingly expected reality that portends a dark future for the rest of the world (NowThis News, 2017). In order to better address the outcomes of workaholism, we must better understand the process through which it impacts the lives of workers.

Workaholism and Work-Family

While advances have been made in understanding the definition, measurement, and consequences of workaholism, further exploration into its relationship with work-family constructs is merited since the mechanism between workaholism and work-family conflict is not adequately explained in the literature (Clark et al., 2016). Work-family conflict is defined as an incompatibility between work and family domains in which the pressures from one role interferes with the other (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). This conflict can further be divided by directionality based upon which role is causing conflict in the other role. Work-to-family conflict (WFC) refers to when pressures from work interfere with the family domain. For example, if an individual is unable to meet the demands of one's family (e.g., a family reunion) due to demands at work (e.g., an impending project deadline), this individual has experienced WFC. Family-towork conflict (FWC) refers to when pressures from family interfere with the demands of work. An example of FWC would be if an employee must leave an important meeting due to an issue with their child at school. If an individual is working excessively hard for numerous hours, is unable to stop thoughts of work from interfering with one's life, and feels a compulsive need to work rather than spend time at home, these individuals should experience subsequent decreased performance in their family role (i.e., WFC; Schaufeli et al., 2008).

The relationship between workaholism and WFC has empirical support and theoretical justification. There are many studies linking workaholism to WFC (e.g., Andreassen et al., 2013; Aziz & Zickar, 2006; Bonebright et al., 2000; Burke, 2008; Taris et al., 2005). Russo and Waters (2006) tested this relationship between workaholism and WFC given different worker types (i.e., workaholics, enthusiastic workaholics, relaxed workers, and uninvolved workers), finding that individuals who are workaholics and enthusiastic workaholics experience significantly more

WFC than other types of workers. FWC has been shown to be less strongly related to workaholism than WFC (Hauk & Chodkiewicz, 2013). WFC may be more of an issue since workaholics tend to prioritize their work over their family due to their addiction to work. Snir and Harpaz (2006) found that work centrality, which is the importance that work has in one's life, is positively related to workaholism. Conversely, Snir and Harpaz (2004) found that individuals that report higher family centrality are less likely to engage in workaholic behaviors. A meta-analysis of Michel et al. (2011) found that work centrality was positively related to WFC.

The link between workaholism and work-family conflict has been explained through various theoretical frameworks. Schaufeli et al. (2009) argue that workaholism is related to WFC through human capital theory. Human Capital theory states that workers have access to a limited amount of resources (e.g., time and energy) that they must choose to spend (Becker, 1991, 1993). This theory is similar to conservation of resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1988, 1998). COR theory proposes that individuals are motivated to acquire new resources and protect existing resources. In COR theory, resources are anything that an individual personally values. Hobfoll (2001) argues that acquired resources are invested in order to obtain additional resources. COR theory has been used as an explanation for the positive relationship between work engagement and WFC (Halbesleben et al., 2009). The authors argue that since engaged individuals are likely getting a high return on investing resources into work, that employees do not have resources to adequately address the family domain. The same reasoning holds for the related construct of workaholism, albeit with a likely lower benefit from resource investment in work. Workaholics are likely to choose to spend their limited resources in the work domain since that is their prioritized domain, leaving too little resources to allocate to the home domain.

This idea is further elaborated upon in the Work-Home Resources (W-HR) Model, which is in part an application of COR theory to the work-home interface (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). The WH-R model attempts to identify the process through which the work and home domains influence each other; it thus distinguishes between causes, consequences, and linking mechanisms. The W-HR model proposes that contextual demands (e.g., working overtime, writing a report) will result in the depletion of personal resources (e.g., time, energy, and attention), which result in diminished outcomes for the other domain (e.g., relationship quality, availability at home). Workaholic behaviors, such as working compulsively and excessively should have a net negative impact on resources and should therefore be considered contextual work demands in the W-HR model. According to the W-HR model the linking mechanism between workaholism and WFC is through a reduction of personal resources. In summary, there are theoretical and empirical reasons to believe that workaholism is primarily related to WFC rather than FWC. Accordingly, this paper will focus on the more established relationship between workaholism and WFC.

Consistent with the human capital theory, COR theory, and WH-R model explanations of the relationship between workaholism and WFC, workaholism is related to several negative outcomes which suggest an absence of resource investment. Workaholism is associated with poor family relationships and marital dissatisfaction (Bakker et al., 2009; Robinson & Post, 1995). Individuals who are unable to leave work at work, who obsess over the amount of time and effort they expend on their job, and who disregard the family domain for the work domain experience unsatisfactory relationships with those at home (Schaufeli et al., 2008). It appears that these workaholics may prize the relationship that they have with work over that of their spouse and/or family members and therefore devote all their resources to work. Due to this compulsive

behavior with the work role, workaholics have been found to experience loss of emotional attachment and positive feelings for the spouse, and reduced physical attraction (Robinson et al., 2001). Subsequently, workaholics may experience significantly lower levels of family satisfaction (Burke, 1999). All these factors taken together do appear to indicate that the relationship between workaholism and WFC is harmful, resulting in less satisfaction, poorer relationships, and increased stress and tension for an individual. It is important to delve deeper into the relationship between workaholism and WFC to see if boundary theory can further our understanding of the relationship.

Boundary Management as the Explanatory Mechanism

The explanatory mechanism proposed by this study is based on boundary theory —more specifically, the segmentation-integration model. Ashforth et al. (2000) refer to boundaries as "physical, temporal, emotional, cognitive, and/or relational limits that define entities as separate from one another" (p. 474). Individuals may consciously or unconsciously construct boundaries (Ammons, 2013). Ashforth et al. (2000) suggest that individuals vary in the extent to which they create and maintain boundaries between their domains and that this continuum ranges from segmentation to integration.

Segmentation is characterized by having impermeable and inflexible boundaries between work and home, whereas integration is characterized by having permeable and flexible boundaries between work and home. According to boundary theory, there is less contamination between both domains, less role blurring, and fewer interruptions when work and home are segmented (Ashforth et al., 2000). When work and home are integrated, however, individuals can deal with problems in any domain and require less effort to transition between domains (Ashforth et al., 2000). The difference in behavior between integrators and segmenters is quite substantial. Nippert-Eng (1996) found that some individuals keep separate calendars and sets of keys, while not discussing and trying to not think about the domains that one is not currently in. Others, meanwhile, display pictures of family at work, bring coworkers home for dinner and talk about the roles that they are not currently in. Most people exist in a midpoint between the extremes of Integration and Segmentation (Kreiner et al., 2009). Ashforth et al. (2000) argue that the extent to which individuals enact boundaries depends on what level of segmentation or integration minimizes the difficulty of managing their work and nonwork roles.

When discussing integration and segmentation, it is important to further divide these constructs into boundary preference and enactment. Rothbard et al. (2005) called for examination of boundary preferences in addition to the focus on what boundaries are enacted (e.g., Ashforth et al., 2000; Kossek et al., 1999; Nippert-Eng, 1995). Early research seems to have implicitly assumed that the way individuals create and maintain boundaries is aligned with their preferences. This preference for certain boundaries is important to decouple from the actual enactment of boundaries because there may be misalignment between the two constructs. Conditions in the workplace such as norms and available policies can affect the degree of alignment in preference and enactment (Ammons, 2013). Organizational norms, climate, and manager and peer expectations are aspects of the workplace that promote either integration or segmentation; this is referred to as boundary supplies (Kreiner, 2006; Kubicek & Tement, 2016). Due to the unpromising results of the impacts of policies on work-home management, research has moved towards a "socially constructed approach" that treats the individual as an active cocreator of boundaries with others rather than as a passive responder to environmental conditions (Kreiner et al., 2009). According to Allen, Cho, and Meier (2014), boundary preference refers to the "extent that individuals wish to keep their work and family roles separate," whereas

boundary enactment refers to the "extent that an individual actually keeps work and family roles separate" (pp. 104-105). Enacted segmentation refers to boundaries that are impermeable and inflexible (also referred to as strong boundaries; Allen et al., 2014). Rothbard, Philips, and Dumas (2005) established that boundary preference to segment or integrate their roles has also been shown to be relatively stable across time. Research on boundary enactment stability is limited, but there is evidence that enacted boundaries are stable over time (Ammons, 2013; Hecht & Allen, 2009).

It is also important to keep in mind that boundary management is bidirectional and can be asymmetrical in strength. Eagle et al. (1997) found that work and family domains are asymmetrically permeable. That is, work demands are permitted to impact the family domain more than the family domain is permitted to impact the work domain. In a review of the boundary management literature, Allen et al. (2014) note that the prevalence of WFC over FWC implies that boundaries are asymmetrically impermeable, such that it is more acceptable for work demands to enter the family domain than vice versa. Boundary asymmetry is particularly relevant to workaholics who are likely to have very weak boundaries in the work-to-family direction (in effect allowing work to infringe upon the home domain) and also have strong boundaries in the family-to-work direction (preventing personal issues from impacting work). In the following paragraphs I will outline the theoretical model of this study, then theoretical and empirical justifications for aforementioned pattern of boundary management among workaholics. After, I will discuss the relationship between boundary management and WFC.

The current study proposes a general framework that links workaholism and work-family conflict through boundary enactment. I then expand upon this mediation model by proposing and testing moderating effects of boundary preference to further explain the individual and

dispositional processes underlying the link between workaholism and work-family conflict. The proposed theoretical model can be seen in Figure 1. Given the relative lack of explanatory mechanisms that illustrate the links between workaholism and employee outcomes, boundary theory may be a promising extension of the literature that has examined workaholism in relation to work-family conflict.

The link between workaholism and boundary enactment can in part be explained through the centrality of work and family roles. Role identity centrality can impact the types of boundaries that individuals enact (Kossek & Lautsch, 2012). For example, Powell and Greenhause (2010) found that family role salience was positively related to the preference to segment, which was positively related to enacted segmentation. As mentioned earlier, workaholics have higher work identity centrality and low family identity centrality which impact the strength of enacted boundaries. Those with high identification with a role are likely to have less permeable and flexible (i.e., stronger) boundaries (Ammons, 2013). Workaholics tend to have a strong work identity and weak family identity so one would therefore expect them to have strong or segmented boundaries in the home-to-work direction (referred to as home boundaries) and weak or integrated boundaries in the work-to-home direction (referred to as work boundaries). In other words, based upon boundary theory, one would expect workaholics to enact boundaries to favor their work role over their family role due to the perceived difference in importance of these two roles.

This association between workaholism and weak work boundaries is supported in the workaholism literature. Ng et al. (2007) suggest that workaholism is a construct that creates three manifestations: affective, cognitive, and behavioral. The affective manifestation refers to how workaholics often experience negative emotions because they experience displeasure when not

working, since work appears to provide most of the pleasure in their life. Workaholics tend to experience guilt and anxiety when deprived of work. The cognitive manifestation pertains to the fact that workaholism involves persistently thinking about work when not working (Scott et al., 1997). Ng et al. (2007) also note that the behavioral manifestation refers to the workaholic tendency toward excessive involvement in work. This is comprised of both working long hours and the "extent to which work is allowed to entwine itself with personal life" (p. 116). Workaholics may engage in work during non-work activities (e.g., eating, vacationing) and their leisure activities may be related to work (e.g., golfing with clients). Essentially, workaholics sacrifice non-work activities (e.g., social, family, and leisure) for the sake of work (Bonebright, 2000). The affective component of workaholism is as mentioned earlier, controversial (Clark et al., 2016), so this theoretical argument below will focus on the cognitive and behavioral manifestations of workaholism.

These cognitive and behavioral manifestations are a consequence of employees' addiction to work and similar to our definition of boundary integration. The persistent thinking of work while not working is essentially weak cognitive work boundaries. In other words, workaholics have no boundaries to prevent work related thoughts from entering the home domain. This is consistent with the fact that workaholics tend to spend their time either working or thinking about work during leisure activities (McMillan et al., 2001). The behavioral manifestation of workaholism refer to the high work involvement, in which employees tend to work for longer hours, this tendency suggests weak temporal work boundaries. Additionally, workaholics have a drive to work as much as they can because of their addiction, leading them to bring work home with them when possible. When opportunities to work from home arise (e.g., telework) workaholics will likely take them as it likely enables them to work for longer hours

than it otherwise would. Thus, workaholics may tend to have weaker spatial boundaries as well. This problem is likely compounded by the increasing use of information communication technology and flexible work arrangements. Technology has led to a massive change in the ways people manage work boundaries due to virtual workspaces and information communication technology (Kreiner et al., 2009). Kossek and Lautsch (2012) note that with increasing access to flexible work arrangements, worker boundaries are becoming increasingly blurred. Ng et al. (2007) argue that the general trend towards boundaryless (i.e., integrated) careers provides opportunity for workaholism to grow as workaholics tend to mix their work and personal lives. These manifestations suggest that workaholics are likely to have weak work boundaries and thus have work easily enter the home domain, which is consistent with the latter part of the behavioral manifestation: work being allowed to *entwine itself* with personal life. There has not yet been any quantitative examination of the relationship between workaholism and boundary enactment; therefore, this study represents a novel contribution to the literature.

Unlike the relationship between workaholism and boundary management, there is substantial empirical literature that demonstrates that boundary enactment is associated with work-family conflict. This may be in part because the theoretical case is quite direct. Work-family conflict occurs when work and family roles interfere with one another. Boundaries define separation from different roles reducing the extent that these roles interact with each other. Thus, enacted segmentation should result in less work-family conflict and enacted integration with more work-family conflict. Previous literature has suggested that WFC is associated with a tendency to integrate one's roles (Halbesleben et al., 2012; Liu & Cheung, 2015). Likewise, Kossek et al. (2006) found that boundary management strategies with greater integration were positively related to FWC. The authors imply that this positive relationship is due to an increase

in role transitions and process loss due to the increased number of role transitions and a reduced ability to buffer negative effects from one domain on the other. Powell and Greenhaus (2010) found that the actual (i.e., enacted) segmentation of work is negatively related to WFC. Michel et al. (2014) argue that mindfulness is a cognitive-emotional segmentation strategy. The authors found that mindfulness is associated with satisfaction with work-life balance and negatively related to strain-based WFC. Kubicek and Tement (2016) found that work segmentation supplies are associated with lower time-based and strain-based WFC, and that individual boundary management strategies are related to time-based, but not strain-based, FWC; the authors mention that this may be due to their individual boundary management scale pertaining mostly to timebased issues (i.e., work interruptions at home). In accordance with these findings Hecht and Allen (2009) found that work boundary strength was a negative predictor of WFC, whereas home boundary strength was a negative predictor of FWC. For both samples in Hecht and Allen (2009), the negative relationship between work boundary strength and WFC was stronger than the relationship between home boundary strength and FWC. These studies demonstrate that the link between boundary enactment and work-family conflict is strong, particularly in the work-tofamily direction which this study is focused on. In summary, we have reason to believe that workaholism is related to higher work integration enactment and that this higher work integration enactment should lead to greater WFC. Thus, work integration enactment should serve as a mediator for the workaholism-WFC relationship.

Hypothesis 1: Work integration enactment will mediate the relationship between workaholism and WFC.

Boundary Fit

This relationship may be further compounded if an individual prefers to segment, or separate, their roles but is unable to do so. Individuals compelled to bring their work home may suffer greater conflict when they prefer to keep work out of their personal lives. This coincides with the prescriptions of the boundary fit approach. Ammons (2008) proposes that alignment between boundary preference and boundary enactment within an environmental context (known as "boundary fit") is related to work-family conflict and work-family balance. According to the boundary fit approach, individuals who have high work integration enactment and high work segmentation preference experience misfit between their actual and desired boundaries that should lead to worse outcomes (e.g., higher work-family conflict). This boundary fit approach deviates from the previously examined person-environment fit perspectives to a more individual focused perspective. This person-environment fit work is also relevant to discuss as it too provides support for our proposed model. This is because a discrepancy between preferred and enacted boundaries may be indicative of a lack of control over boundaries, which should be related to increased conflict (Kossek & Lautsch, 2012). These studies examined boundary dynamics from an organization-level perspective, of more interest in this examination of workaholism are the individual-level boundary dynamics that are relatively understudied (Allen et al., 2014; Kreiner, 2009). Boundary fit, as an individual-level approach, has been examined through qualitative research (e.g., Ammons, 2008, 2013), but has only just recently been examined quantitatively by Michel et al. (2021). The authors found that work and non-work boundary fit impacted subjective well-being through work and life satisfaction (Michel et al., 2021). However, no research has quantitatively examined the relationship of boundary-fit with workaholism or work-family conflict. Thus, this study provides a novel contribution to the

boundary management literature. In the following paragraphs I will outline previous fit research regarding boundary management and how this relates to workaholism, review the literature examining the relationship between boundary preference and WFC, and outline the proposed theoretical model of this study.

Boundary management researchers have investigated fit between different boundary constructs. Rothbard (2005) first examined boundary theory from a person-organization fit perspective. Person-Organization fit theory suggests that when there is an incongruence between the needs or the desires of the person and the values of the organization then harmful outcomes to the organization or individual can result (Chatman, 1989). Incongruence in desired boundaries can result from boundary differences with supervisors, subordinates, clients, or the occupation generally (Kreiner et al., 2009). According to Rothbard et al. (2005) misalignment between enactment and preference may result from organizational context. For example, workplace policies may communicate organizational values of how boundaries should be enacted. This could include childcare on the integration side or flextime on the segmentation side. Rothbard et al. (2005) investigated the congruence between the individuals desire to segment or integrate and the organizations practices regarding work-nonwork boundaries (referred to as boundary congruence). With higher perceived access to onsite childcare (an integration policy), workers with a preference for integration were more satisfied and committed to the organization, whereas those with a preference for segmentation were less satisfied and committed to the organization. As employees had higher perceived access to flextime (a segmentation policy), workers with a preference for segmentation were more satisfied and committed to the organization, whereas those with a preference for integration were less satisfied and committed to the organization. Rothbard et al. (2005) demonstrated the importance of boundary preference in congruence with

organizational policies that influence enactment. Kreiner (2006) expanded on this idea by examining the person-environment fit between individual's preference for work-home segmentation and the extent that the workplace provides for boundary segmentation supplies. The author states that organizations differ in the extent that they allow or require integration. Some organization have policies for onsite childcare or may require employees to work from home or check email during non-work hours. Kreiner (2006) found that work-family conflict decreased as segmentation supplies approached segmentation preferences (i.e., higher boundary congruence). The authors also found a negative main effect for supplies, providing some support to the proposed positive work-family conflict relationship with integration enactment. The qualitative data of Kreiner et al. (2009) suggest a link between boundary incongruence and workfamily conflict and state that specific events that violate desired boundaries are linked to increased work-family conflict. Chen et al. (2009) likewise find that boundary congruence is negatively related to work-family conflict. This organization-level boundary congruence approach has shown a clear relationship with WFC.

Now, we turn to the individual-level boundary fit approach. Using a grounded theoretical approach, Ammons (2013) interviewed white collar workers that were part of a large company that was implementing an initiative to allow workers to have more freedom to set boundaries. Four ideal types of boundary management emerged from a computer software analysis of the interview transcripts. In descending order of popularity, they include: "protecting family" in which individuals keep work and family separate, "above and beyond" in which work is allowed into the family domain but not the reverse, "enhancing family" in which family is allowed into the work domain while work is contained, and "holistic" which the workers have few if any boundaries between work and home. It is interesting to note that even when given more freedom

to set their own boundaries, almost no individuals with poor boundary fit corrected their boundary styles. Ammons (2013) found that when workers were given greater control over their boundaries boundary management styles mostly stayed the same, but boundary fit overall improved; this suggests that contextual factors are important for boundary fit in addition to individual factors.

Of these four types, workaholism appears to be the "above and beyond" boundary management strategy. This is consistent with the earlier discussion regarding workaholics setting boundaries for the benefit of the work domain (i.e., weak work boundaries and strong home boundaries). This category was further divided into "eager above and beyonders" and "reluctant above and beyonders". Eager above and beyonders were described as "prioritizing work ahead of all other involvements, putting in long workdays and work weeks" (pg. 7). They either had no personal or family responsibilities or had others (e.g., spouses) deal with them. They took work home, thought about work while not working, and thought they were the same person at work and at home. As one participant stated: "Um, I definitely do insert the job into my life a little bit more than... other people may want to, or consider healthy. So, it's just a kind of more of a personal thing. But, I don't think it's anything that the job necessarily, absolutely requires" (p. 57). It is important to note that these individuals did not feel forced into this boundary arrangement as a result of their job and believed that they could change their boundary management if they wanted to. These respondents acknowledged that their boundary management exerts costs on their personal and family lives. They also questioned the sustainability of their boundary management style, with none of these types of respondents stating that they wished to work like this indefinitely. The negative nature of these statements

suggest that respondents were likely experiencing workaholism rather than engagement, which may display a similar boundary management profile.

Eager going above and beyond is contrasted with reluctantly going above and beyond. These workers allowed their work to enter their home life but did not want this integration. Reluctant above and beyonders had family and wished they could spend more time with them but could not due to conflicts or distance. Like the eager above and beyonders, they appeared to be very focused on work, often working additional hours at home. They tended to have mastery over their jobs and a desire for more challenging work, suggesting that they intrinsically desired work. These workers appear to consider work the default and when they could not spend time with their family, they chose to spend their time working. One participant stated "...So, I can have a day off, but ... if I don't have anything to do at home or any projects or anything like that...might as well come to work." (p. 57). In addition to working longer hours, these reluctant above and beyonders tended to think about work more than they otherwise would have and not use vacation time. Both eager and reluctant above and beyonders show similarities to descriptions of workaholism: They work long hours, they constantly think about work, have an intrinsic desire to work, and they choose work over personal and family time. The difference between the two is that enthusiastic above and beyonders prefer their integrated work boundary whereas reluctant above and beyonders prefer a more segmented work boundary. Both types expressed concern that their boundary management was putting strain on their family relationships, but based upon the profiles of these two types, reluctant above and beyonders are more concerned about the impact that their boundary management style has on their family lives. Therefore, this study provides further support to the notion that the effects of workaholism on

WFC through boundary enactment is stronger for those with a preference for a segmented work boundary.

Unlike with boundary enactment, the literature that has examined boundary preference has found little evidence for a negative relationship with work-family conflict (e.g., Kreiner 2006: Powell & Greenhaus 2010), the notable exception being Park and Jex (2011) who found a negative relationship between preference for segmentation and psychological work-family conflict. Psychological work-family conflict refers to preoccupation with one role while in another role (Allen et al., 2014), which we posit is analogous to how workaholics may maladaptively focus too much attention on the work domain while in the home domain via weak cognitive boundaries. Similarly, Park et al. (2011) found that psychological detachment (which is a recovery strategy that is similar to psychological WFC; Allen et al. 2014; Michel & Rexroth, 2014) was related to segmentation preference, segmentation norms, and communication technology use at home. In summary, there is little evidence that boundary preference is related to WFC as frequently measures (i.e., time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based), but some evidence to suggest that segmentation preference is negatively related to psychological WFC. This may be due to the possibility that certain cognitive-emotional segmentation strategies are flexibly deployable (e.g., mindfulness; Michel & Rexroth, 2014) and thus cognitive boundaries are more easily aligned with preferences. This study examined the relationship between the more common time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based WFC. The findings of boundary congruence and boundary fit research — coupled with the absence of support for a direct relationship between boundary preference and WFC --- suggest that segmentation preference may be more important in how it impacts the effects of enactment on WFC. This notion has some support in the literature: Derks et al. (2016) found that daily smart phone use reduced

work-family conflict among those who prefer to integrate, but not for those who prefer to segment. In other words, the effect of boundary enactment was moderated by the boundary preference of the participants. In aggregate, the literature seems to suggest that boundary preference may not be directly related to WFC, but that it may make the negative consequences of work integration enactment more extreme because of poor boundary fit. Thus, I expect the indirect effect of workaholism on WFC to be stronger for employees with high segmentation preference than those low in segmentation preference, since the former will experience greater boundary misfit.

Hypothesis 2: The relationship between workaholism and WFC through work integration enactment is moderated by work segmentation preference, such that individuals with a preference for segmented work boundaries will experience more WFC as a result of integrated work boundaries than those who have a preference for integrated work boundaries.

Chapter 2

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants were recruited through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) in order to gather data from a wide range of workers. MTurk has been shown to result in diverse occupational samples that approximate population norms (Michel, O'Neill, Hartman, & Lorys, 2018). MTurk qualification requirements were set such that a minimum of 100 approved Human Intelligence Tasks (HITs) and an approval rate greater or equal to 95 percent for HITs was required for participation (Peer et al., 2014). Participants were pre-screened in order to ensure that they were 18 years of age or older, employed full-time (35 hours or more per week), and living in the United States. Although MTurk participants have been found to perform better on online attention checks than traditional subject pool participants (Hauser & Schwarz, 2016), instructed response items were included to ensure insufficient effort responding (IER) was not an issue in the current study, which conforms to recommendations in the IER literature (Huang, Curran, Keeney, et al., 2012; Huang et al., 2015; Meade & Craig, 2012). An example of such an item is "Please select strongly agree for this item." Participants that missed any IER items were excluded from the study.

Data were collected in two waves separated by approximately one month to help alleviate concerns regarding common method variance (Podsakoff et al., 2003). At Time 1, 1004 participants completed the survey, with 817 missing zero IER items and providing a valid MTurk ID to be invited for Time 2. At Time 2, 524 of the invited participants completed the survey missing zero IER items and providing a valid MTurk ID, resulting in an overall completion/retention rate of approximately 52%. The average participant was 38.4 years of age

(SD = 10.7), female (61.8%). The ethnic breakdown of the sample was: 80.3% Caucasian or White (non-Hispanic), 7.3% African-American or Black, 5.9% Asian American or Pacific Islander, 4.4% Hispanic, .6% Native American, and 1.5% "other." The highest level of education completed was: 6.9% high school or equivalent, 2.9% vocational/technical school, 26.5% some college, 44.8% bachelor's degree, 14.1% master's degree, 2.5% professional degree (MD, JD, PsyD, etc.), and 1.3% doctoral degree (PhD). Most of the participants were married or living as married (55.7%), with the remaining either single or never married (33.0%) or separated, divorced, or widowed (11.3%). The majority of participants stated that they had children (55.2%), the breakdown is as follows: 44.8% had no children, 21.8% had 1 child, 18.5% had 2 children, 9.5% had 3 children, 4.0% had 4 children, and the remaining 1.4% had 5 or more children. The percentage of participants living with grandparents or elderly parents was 14.3%. All participants were employed full-time throughout the duration of the study and worked an average of 42.2 (standard deviation [SD] = 4.9) hours per week. Participants held varied job titles such as accountant, administrative assistant, general manager, registered nurse, sales associate, software engineer, and teacher. The job families that participants selected similarly demonstrate a variety in occupation. The breakdown of the job families is as follows: 1.3% Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources; 2.7% Architecture and Construction; 5.0% Arts, Audio/Video Technology, and Communications; 6.9% Business Management and Administration; 13.2% Education and Training; 5.7% Finance; 6.3% Government and Public Administration; 9.2% Health Science; 5.0% Hospitality and Tourism; 5.2% Human services; 8.2% Information Technology; 3.2% Law, Public Safety, Correction, and Security; 5.2% Manufacturing, 14.3% Marketing, Sales, and Service; 4.0% Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics, 4.4% Transportation, Distribution, and Logistics.

Measures

Workaholism. Workaholism was assessed at Time 1 with the 10-item Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS-short version) developed by Schaufeli et al. (2009). This measure captures the irresistible inner drive to work very hard through working compulsively and excessively. Example items include "I spend more time working than on socializing with friends, on hobbies, or on leisure activities" (working excessively) and "It is hard for me to relax when I'm not working" (working compulsively). Responses ranged from 1 (never or almost never) to 4 (always or almost always). Coefficient alpha was $\alpha = .83$.

Work Segmentation Preferences. We captured work segmentation preferences at Time 2 with a four-item scale developed by Kreiner (2006). This measure assesses the extent to which people prefer to segment their work role from their family domain. A sample item is "I don't like to have to think about work while I'm at home." Responses ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Coefficient alpha was .94.

Work Integration Enactment. Work integration enactment was measured at Time 2 with a four-item scale used by Michel et al. (2021). This measure assessed the extent that people integrate their work role with their family domain and the items correspond to the segmentation preference items. A sample work integration item is, "I often think about work while I'm at home," this item corresponds to the work segmentation preference item above. Responses ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Coefficient alpha was .94.

Work-Family Conflict. Work-to-family conflict was assessed at Time 2 with the 9-item measure constructed and validated by Carlson et al. (2000). This measure captures the directional time, strain, and behavior-based role pressures from the work-to-family domains. Sample items include, "My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like" (time-based

work-to-family conflict), "I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family" (strain-based work-to-family conflict), and "The problem-solving behaviors I use in my job are not effective in resolving problems at home" (behavior-based work-to-family conflict). Coefficient alpha was .92.

Results

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics, correlations, and alpha reliabilities for all study variables. At the bivariate level, workaholism was significantly related to work integration enactment (r = .41, p < .001), and work integration enactment was significantly related to work-to-family conflict (r = .49, p < .001). Similarly, workaholism exhibited a significant relationship with work-to-family conflict (r = .34, p < .001). Neither univariate nor bivariate outliers were identified. Means and standard deviations for study variables by education level and work sector are reported in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively.

To determine that the workaholism scale was appropriately measuring its intended construct, relationships between workaholism and demographics variables were examined. Workaholism and hours worked were positively correlated (r [524] = .273, p < .001). Workaholism was not correlated with age (r [524] = .022, p =.611), gender (r [524] = .073, p = .096), number of children (r [524] = -.037, p = .392) number of dependents (r [524] = -.076, p = .084), tenure (r [524] = -.001, p = .984), nor income (r [524] = -.043, p = .324). These results are consistent with the meta-analytic results of Clark et al. (2016) which found that the only significant relationship between workaholism and these variables is hours worked (ρ = .27). In order to control for the effects of hours worked, it was treated as a covariate for the mediated and moderated-mediation models.

Nested mediation and moderated-mediation models were examined to test our study hypotheses; bootstrapping procedures were used to test the proposed indirect and conditional indirect effects (Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007). Mediation and moderated-mediation analyses were conducted using PROCESS version 3.5 for SPSS (Hayes, 2018). The index of moderated-mediation was used to provide a formal test for moderatedmediation (Hayes, 2015). Path coefficients are reported as unstandardized coefficients as these are the preferred metric in path analysis (Asher, 1983; Hayes, 2018; James et al., 1982).

Hypothesis 1 proposed that integration enactment would mediate the relationship between workaholism and work-to-family conflict. This hypothesis was supported (see Table 2). Specifically, results from the mediation model indicate there was a significant workaholism to work integration enactment direct effect (*a effect* = 1.16, *p* <.001), work integration enactment to work-to-family conflict direct effect (*b effect* = .22, *p* < .001), and indirect effect from workaholism to work-to-family conflict through work integration enactment (*indirect effect* = .257, CI.95 = .132, .413). These results suggest work integration enactment acts as a mediator within the workaholism and work-family conflict relationship, where self-reported workaholism is related to higher perceptions of work integration enactment behaviors, and higher enactment behaviors is related to higher reports of work-to-family conflict.

Hypothesis 2 proposed that the relationship between workaholism and work-to-family conflict through integration enactment is moderated by segmentation, such that individuals high in segmentation preference would experience more conflict as a result of integration enactment than those low in segmentation preference. This hypothesis was also supported. Specifically, results from the moderated mediation model indicate a significant positive interaction term for work segmentation preferences (*effect* = .04, *p* = .003), as well as a significant index of moderated-mediation (*index* = .050, CL₉₅ = .015, .089).

Table 2 illustrates these moderated indirect effects through changes in the level of work segmentation preference. Specifically, low levels of work segmentation preference had a weaker indirect effect (*indirect effect* = .261, $CI_{.95}$ = .171, .365), while high levels of work segmentation preference had a stronger indirect effect (*indirect effect* = .378, $CI_{.95}$ = .281, .484). Figure 2 graphically illustrates the magnitude and 95% confidence band of this indirect effect at continuous levels of the work segmentation preferences moderator. These results indicate that the indirect effect between workaholism and work-to-family conflict is conditional upon work segmentation preference, such that higher levels of work segmentation preferences increase the magnitude of the indirect effect.

Supplemental post-hoc analyses of the facet level relationships for both workaholism (working excessively and compulsively) and work-to-family conflict (time, strain, and behaviorbased) were performed for both the mediation and mediated-moderation models, by replacing the variable with the associated facet level measure. All five of the mediation models were significant. All moderated mediation effects except for behavior-based conflict were significant. Additionally, this relationship held for working excessively and compulsively while controlling for the other (e.g., significant for working excessively while controlling for working compulsively). These findings suggest robust and consistent findings across the facets of workaholism, as well as the time and strain-based facets of work-to-family conflict.

Chapter 3

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to test if boundary management could explain the relationship between workaholism and WFC. Analyses suggest that workaholics have higher boundary integration enactment and that this level of enactment is associated with higher WFC. The implication of this finding is that workaholics do not enact strong boundaries, which allows the work domain greater ability to exert detrimental pressures on the family domain. While previous literature has outlined the negative outcomes associated with workaholic behavior for both the individual and the organization (Clark et al., 2016; Porter, 1996), little is known regarding how (i.e., explanatory mechanisms) workaholism is related to experiences of conflict between domains. The present study addressed this gap in testing the mediating and moderating effects of integration enactment and segmentation preference.

The first hypothesis was supported in that integration enactment did mediate the relationship between workaholism and work-family conflict. Previous workaholism literature has suggested that greater entwinement between work and home (i.e., integration enactment) may serve as an explanation of the relationship between job demands and WFC. This study corroborates this previous research. It appears that workaholics have weaker boundaries due to their integration of work and home and thus are more likely to allow work obligations to spill over into the home domain, which may be viewed by workaholics as less important. Additionally, Hypothesis 2 was supported in that segmentation preference moderated the relationship between integration enactment and conflict, such that those who are higher in segmentation preference do experience more conflict as a result of integration enactment. Again, those who have stronger boundaries may find an abundance of resources at their disposal due to
acting in role-congruent ways, allowing for better adjustment and lower work-family conflict (Liu & Cheung, 2015). Those who prefer to segment their roles but are unable to may subsequently experience more conflict due to this incompatibility between actions and preferences (Kreiner, 2006). The encroachment of the work domain upon the home domain that is associated with workaholism seems particularly distressing for those that prefer stronger boundaries between work and home. This research, subsequently, provides a useful explanatory mechanism to better understand the relationship between workaholism and WFC through worker's boundary management.

Theoretical Implications

This study further supports boundary theory and the segmentation-integration model proposed by Ashforth et al. (2000). According to their model, higher integration should lead to a higher rate of WFC due to greater role contamination, more role blurring, and increased interruptions between the domains. The results of this study conform to boundary theory expanding its application into the domain of workaholism by identifying a relationship between workaholism and boundary enactment. Perhaps most importantly, the current study establishes boundary management as an explanatory mechanism for the workaholism-WFC relationship. Thus, this study helps to address the inadequate explanation of this relationship in the literature mentioned by Clark et al. (2016). Additionally, these results suggest that boundary theory may have explanatory power for other construct relationships with work-life outcomes. A promising next step is to investigate whether the relationship found in this study holds for the positive side of the work-life interface. For example, Siu et al. (2010) found that engagement mediated the relationship between family-friendly organizational policies and work-family enrichment, and that work engagement was the most proximal predictor of work-family enrichment. As mentioned in the introduction, work engagement, like workaholism, describes a form of heavy work involvement — albeit one commonly associated with beneficial outcomes (Aziz & Moyer, 2018). Therefore, the theoretical framework put forward in this study implies that integration enactment may serve as an explanatory mechanism for the relationship between work engagement and work-family enrichment. The results of this study open new opportunities to apply boundary theory to achieve a more in-depth understanding of work-home processes.

This study also supports the boundary fit approach, in that it demonstrates the importance of studying preference and enactment in conjunction with each other. By examining how preference and enactment interact with each other through the workaholism-WFC relationship, this study has found preliminary support for the importance of researching this boundary fit approach. It finds a similar relationship for individual boundary management as was found for supplies and preference in Kreiner (2006) in that individuals who had supplies that better fit their preferences had better outcomes. Ammons (2013) argues that individual boundary fit between preference and enactment is important in accounting for work-life outcomes. This boundary fit approach is focused on how individuals manage their boundaries as compared to the personenvironment fit approach more frequently used in boundary management literature, which looks at preferences relative to the work environments of employees. Edwards et al. (2006) outline different approaches to studying perceived person-environment fit and argued that these approaches have important implications for theory and measurement. As boundary fit remains a relatively new approach in the boundary management literature, it is unclear what is the most appropriate method to quantify and measure the construct. Recently, Michel et al. (2021) found support for boundary fit's impact on role satisfaction and subsequently subjective wellbeing utilizing an atomistic fit approach. The authors argue that future research should examine the

approach to congruence outlined in Edwards (1994) that borrows from response surface methodology due to the issues with other congruence measures. This approach may not be appropriate to measure boundary fit in relation to WFC; as Allen et al. (2014) note, boundary enactment is related to WFC, but preferences are not. Therefore, this study provides a valuable contribution to the boundary management literature in that it establishes a connection between boundary preferences and work-family conflict through the moderating effect it has on boundary enactment. More specifically, it contributes to the boundary fit approach by demonstrating another methodology that is effective for investigating the relationship between boundary fit and WFC. The appropriate methodology to assess boundary fit may depend on the constructs being examined in relation with boundary fit. This study therefore emphasizes the necessity to further investigate individual boundary management and boundary fit.

These findings also have implications for the WH-R model. According to the WH-R model, the influence of work demands on home outcomes is mediated by a reduction in personal resources. Analyzing this study from a WH-R perspective implies that segmentation between work and life can be considered a personal resource. While this may be accurate for the negative side of the work-life interface, it poses problems when simultaneously analyzing the effects of boundary management on the positive side of the work-life interface. For example, Ilies et al. (2009) found that workers with more highly integrated roles showed higher levels of both positive and negative affective spillover. This poses somewhat of a problem since one of the goals of the WH-R model is to account for both positive and negative relationships between domains (Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). Another possibility is to consider boundary management as a key resource (e.g., optimism, self-efficacy) that moderates the effect of contextual demands and contextual resources on personal resources. According to the WH-R

model, key resources increase the likelihood of experiencing work-family enrichment and decreases the likelihood of WFC. Therefore, this conceptualization suffers from the same issue that the personal resource conceptualization does, high integration enactment is associated with both higher WFC and higher work-family enrichment. The implication for the WH-R model is that boundary management may be better conceptualized as a moderating factor (neither a resource nor a demand) between the individual and the domains. For example, an employee with highly integrated domains is likely to think about work more while at home. If this employee has an experience at work that resulted in a negative mood (i.e., a reduction in personal resources), then this reduction is likely to lead to greater negative home outcomes since they are having to devote more resources to address the more frequent negative thoughts about work. Conversely, if this same employee experienced a positive experience at work which resulted in improved mood (i.e., an increase in personal resources), then this experience is going to lead to a greater surplus of positive home outcomes as they are reminded of this more frequently. With this conceptualization, integration enactment could be considered as intensifying the effect of demands and resources in the work domain on the home domain. The purpose of the WH-R model is to describe the process through which work and home domains influence each other. Boundary theory provides insight into this process, but it is unclear exactly how boundary management should be conceptualized within the WH-R model. Future research should investigate the most appropriate ways to integrate boundary theory into the WH-R model. As Ten Brummelhuis and Bakker (2012) mention, research into moderation of work-home processes outlined in the W-HR model provide valuable contributions to the work-family research domain.

Practical Implications

In addition to theoretical contributions, there are several practical implications to take from the results of this study. Perhaps most importantly, the model supported by the current investigation suggests that strengthening boundaries between work and life may be an effective means of limiting the negative impact of workaholism on the work-life interface. Van Wijhe et al. (2010) note that workaholism is particularly difficult to treat because 1) it is an addiction to a behavior (i.e., work) that workers cannot completely abstain from, 2) it is perceived "just" as an excess of a key virtue in most societies (and therefore don't receive much social pressure to change), 3) workaholics are largely in denial, and 4) they do not have time for counseling or treatment because they are always working. Van Wijhe et al. (2010) mention many potential avenues for interventions for addressing workaholism. Some of these are clearly related to improving boundary management, such as emphasizing the value of setting strong boundaries between work and life, requesting that work should be done in the time frame of normal working hours, or even closing access to email accounts outside of normal work hours. Encouraging employees to detach after work may reduce the negative outcomes that workaholics experience, such as burnout and WFC. While these approaches on their own are not sufficient for addressing the issue of workaholism, they may help to reduce the environmental pressures that contribute to workaholism while potentially reducing the negative effects of workaholism. The results of this study provide preliminary support that interventions focused on improving boundary management may provide supplemental benefits to more targeted interventions, although more research is needed to establish the efficacy of attempts to mitigate workaholism through boundary management.

Another more general means of preventing workaholism may be through organizational culture. Van Wijhe et al. (2010) argue that primary prevention of workaholism is essentially an issue of changing organizational culture from one of revering workers who excessively work to one that promotes working smart rather than hard and having a healthy work-life balance. Burke (2001) notes that workaholism is related to organizational culture. If organizations can create a culture that does not expect employees to be "always on" and responsive 24/7, then that environment will enable employees to engage in appropriate boundary enactment. This notion is particularly relevant to employees who prefer more segmented work and home domains, as this study suggests that the impact of workaholism on WFC is stronger for those with preferences for segmentation. If boundary management that aligns with preferences is seen by employees as not only possible, but also a norm that is valued, workaholics with high segmentation preference may have greater ability to enact their desired boundaries.

Andreassi & Thompson (2008) state that despite organizational attempts to make workplaces more family-friendly through policies like telecommuting, onsite childcare and flextime, employees are reluctant to take advantage of these programs because they conflict with entrenched organizational norms. The authors emphasize that having a friendly work-family culture is crucial for employees to utilize these programs. Thompson et al. (1999) outline three components for a work-family culture: organizational time demands, perceived career consequences of using work-family benefits, and managerial support for family needs. The component of work-family culture that most clearly relates to workaholism is the first, as it refers to organizational expectations for long work hours and prioritizing work over family. Thus, reducing work hour expectations and rewards for prioritizing work over family may be the most appropriate direction for cultural change to reduce the likelihood of workaholic behavior.

However, each of these components may help to ameliorate the negative effects of workaholism through boundary management. For example, Greenhaus et al. (2012) found that the positive effect of family supportive supervision on work-family balance was fully mediated by the work-interfering with family and family interfering with work. Unfortunately, as of yet no research has investigated the effects of work-family culture change on workaholism, so it is much too early to draw conclusions regarding the efficacy of this approach. Overall, this study provides preliminary support for proposed workaholism interventions that would impact boundary management, although much more research is needed to address gaps in this area of the literature.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

Though this study does provide a novel contribution to the literature, we should acknowledge limitations when considering the empirical and theoretical contributions made in this present study. First, participants for this study were recruited through Amazon's Mechanical Turk, a large online crowdsourcing marketplace, which may raise concerns about the validity and generalizability of the data. Nevertheless, this should not be a major concern. Numerous studies have demonstrated the high data quality and accuracy of MTurk workers (Buhrmester, et al., 2011; Michel, et al., 2018). MTurk samples are more demographically and organizationally diverse than other samples (e.g., student samples), subsequently increasing the sample adequacy and generalizability of the study inferences (Behrend et al., 2011; Landers & Behrend, 2015). A second limitation concerns itself with my use of self-reported measures, which could lend itself to the effects of common method variance (Crampton & Wagner, 1994). However, in an attempt to minimize the effects of common method variance, we followed the suggestions of Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Podsakoff (2012) by collecting the predictor and criterion data in two separate

waves. While common method variance is not likely to produce artefactual interactions (Evans, 1985), we still wish to note this limitation. Additionally, measuring data at three timepoints would have provided stronger evidence for the proposed theoretical model as it would have better examined the proposed process over time and further address potential concerns of common method variance. Future research should examine these relationships with self and other (e.g., spouse) report measures to provide greater confidence in the inferences (Jick, 1979; Scandura & Williams, 2000). Future research could also consider the implementation of longitudinal designs, such as cross-lagged panel designs, to further reveal the effect of time on variations between and within individuals (see Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2010). Given that this research focuses upon the mechanism through which workaholics may experience more conflict between roles, longitudinal designs may help to further explain how workaholism leads to increased WFC.

For future research and theoretical advancements on workaholism within the work-family domain, development of workaholism interventions that specifically target work-family issues would be beneficial for a variety of organizational members as well as overall organizational objectives. This research suggests that interventions focused on employee boundary management should be investigated as potential way to reduce the negative work-family impacts associated with workaholism. While some preventative tactics have been hypothesized, none have targeted specific work-family constructs (Iwasaki et al., 2006). Additionally, while current intervention strategies target those who already exhibit signs or over-work, potential solutions in job design and organizational culture may be able to alleviate the number of individuals that engage in these types of behaviors in the first place. A review of the current literature shows that interventions are most often based in interpersonal solutions, rather than system-wide implementations. If a

reduction in workaholism in the applied setting is to be accomplished, additional contributions are still needed (Andreassen, 2013). The results of this study raise questions about how the effects of workaholism could be reduced through boundary management mechanisms, which should provide fruitful areas of future research.

This research utilized boundary enactment and preference as an explanatory mechanism, which components of the individual focused boundary fit approach. Future studies would benefit from a quantitative examination of Ammons' (2013) boundary fit approach in order to determine how different levels of boundary enactment and preference interact with each other in order to determine important work-family outcomes such as WFC. Researchers should also examine if the explanatory relationship holds for the person-environment fit approach by incorporating segmentation supplies and organizational norms pertaining to boundary management. This would also allow for a more in-depth test of the boundary fit approach, as Ammons (2013) notes that individual boundary fit is influenced by the environmental context. This would enable the examination of individual vs. organizational cultural influence of boundary management in the workaholism-WFC relationship, thus informing researchers whether cultural interventions or targeted boundary management interventions are more appropriate for reducing workaholism. It may be the case that workaholics are less susceptible to organizational pressures and thus targeted interventions are more appropriate. The effectiveness of interventions may also depend on boundary preferences, workaholics with a preference for segmentation may enact stronger boundaries if they believe their organization values those boundary management strategies. Much research is needed to determine the most effective way to utilize the findings of this study in reducing the impact of workaholism.

Future research could examine in greater detail the underlying impact of boundary management on WFC. This could be analyzed through an integration of boundary management and the WH-R model as mentioned earlier. There are numerous questions that such research could answer; for example, does higher work-home segmentation reduce the influence of work demands on personal resources or reduce the influence of personal resources on domain outcomes? Studies that examine the short-term work-home processes may be able to provide a more thorough analysis of the process. Experience sampling methodology could be employed in order to examine daily demands at work, the impact these have on personal resources (e.g., time energy, and attention), and evening assessments of WFC. Comparison of how these relationships unfold between workers with different boundary configurations would provide researchers with a clearer picture of how boundary theory and the WH-R model can be integrated into a framework of work-home processes.

Future research could also investigate what specific boundary characteristics are associated with workaholism. This study focused on overall boundary enactment, yet there are different types of boundaries that can be enacted (e.g., spatial, temporal, cognitive, emotional, or relational boundaries). As discussed earlier, the workaholism literature implies that workaholics may have weaker spatial, temporal, and cognitive boundaries. By analyzing different boundary types, it can be determined to what extent each of the boundary types can explain the workaholism-WFC relationship. This could have practical implications for potential future interventions. For example, if it is found that the WFC of workaholics is caused primarily by temporal boundaries, then it would suggest that interventions like closing access to email accounts of identified workaholics outside of normal work hours may be effective. Subsequent studies could also examine boundary fit for these different boundary types as it may be the case

that workaholics desire segmentation for certain boundary types or that boundary preference does not influence the outcomes for certain boundary types. Additionally, the examination of different boundary types would enable investigations into relationships with specific types of work-family conflict. In particular, it is reasonable to expect that temporal boundaries are primarily associated with time-based WFC, but unclear which types of boundaries most strongly influence behavior-based conflict. Future research could further elucidate the theoretical model of this study as well as provide a more thorough understanding of boundary management outcomes.

Conclusion

This study found support for boundary enactment as an explanatory mechanism in the workaholism and WFC relationship. Results also indicated that this mediation effect was stronger for individuals with high boundary segmentation preference. This suggests that both enactment and preference are important for explaining the relationship between workaholism and work-life outcomes. It also suggests that work-life interventions, particularly those focused around managing work-life boundaries, could potentially be an effective strategy to reduce the negative work-family outcomes of workaholism. Overall, the findings of this study are show promise for reducing the negative consequences of workaholism.

References

- Allen, T. D., Cho, E., & Meier, L. L. (2014). Work–family boundary dynamics. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 99-121.
 doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091330
- Ammons, S. K. (2013). Work-family boundary strategies: Stability and alignment between preferred and enacted boundaries. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82(1), 49-58. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2012.11.002
- Andreassen, C. S. (2013). Workaholism: An overview and current status of the research. Journal of Behavioral Addictions, 3(1), 1-11. doi:10.1556/jba.2.2013.017
- Andreassi, J. K., & Thompson, C. A. (2008). Work-family culture: Current research and future directions. In K. Korabik, D.S. Lero & D.L. Whitehead (Eds.). Handbook of work-family integration: Research, theory, and best practices. New York: Elsevier. doi:10.1016/B978-12372574-5.50021-1
- Asher, H. B. (1983). Causal modeling. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472-491. doi:10.5465/amr.2000.3363315
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Burke, R. (2009). Workaholism and relationship quality:
 A spillover-crossover perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(1), 23-33. doi:10.1037/a0013290
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., Oerlemans, W., & Sonnentag, S. (2013). Workaholism and daily recovery: A day reconstruction study of leisure activities. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(1), 87-107. doi:10.1002/job.1796

- Behrend, T. S., Sharek, D. J., Meade, A.W., & Wiebe, E. N. (2011). The viability of crowdsourcing for survey research. *Behavior Research Methods*, 43, 1-14. doi:10.3758/s13428-011-0081-0
- Bonebright, C. A., Clay, D. L., & Ankenmann, R. D. (2000). The relationship of workaholism with work–life conflict, life satisfaction, and purpose in life. *Journal* of Counseling Psychology, 47(4), 469. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.47.4.469
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6, 3-5. doi:10.1177/1745691610393980
- Burke, R. J. (1999). Workaholism and extra-work satisfaction. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 7, 352-364. doi: 10.1108/eb028906
- Burke, R. (2001), Workaholism in organizations: the role of organizational values. *Personnel Review, 30*(6), 637-645. doi: 10.1108/EUM000000005977
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56(2), 249-276. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1999.1713
- Clark, M. A., Michel, J. S., Zhdanova, L., Pui, S. Y., & Baltes, B. B. (2016). All work and no play? A meta-analytic examination of the correlates and outcomes of workaholism. *Journal of Management*, 42(7), 1836-1873. doi: 10.1177/0149206314522301
- Crampton, S., & Wagner, J. (1994). Percept-percept inflation in micro-organizational research: An investigation of prevalence and effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 67-76. doi: 10.5465/ambpp.1993.10317060

- Davies, A. R., & Frink, B. D. (2014). The origins of the ideal worker: The separation of work and home in the United States from the market revolution to 1950. Work and Occupations, 41(1), 18-39. doi: 10.1177/0730888413515893
- Derks, D., Bakker, A. B., Peters, P., & van Wingerden, P. (2016). Work-related smartphone use, work–family conflict and family role performance: The role of segmentation preference. *Human Relations*, 69(5), 1045-1068. doi: 10.1177/0018726715601890
- Eagle, B. W., Miles, E. W., & Icenogle, M. L. (1997). Inter-role conflicts and the permeability of work and family domains: Are there gender differences? *Journal* of Vocational Behavior, 50(2), 168-184. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1996.1569
- Edwards, J. R. (1994). The study of congruence in organizational behavior research: Critique and a proposed alternative. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 58*(1), 51-100. doi: 10.1006/obhd.1994.1029
- Edwards, J. R., Cable, D. M., Williamson, I. O., Lambert, L. S., & Shipp, A. J. (2006).
 The phenomenology of fit: linking the person and environment to the subjective experience of person-environment fit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(4), 802-827. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.802
- Evans, M. G. (1985). A Monte Carlo study of the effects of correlated method variance in moderated multiple regression analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 36*, 305-323. doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(85)90002-0
- Fry, L. W., & Cohen, M. P. (2009). Spiritual leadership as a paradigm for organizational transformation and recovery from extended work hours cultures. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84, 265-278. doi: 10.1007/s10551-008-9695-2

- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*(1), 76-88. doi:10.2307/258214
- Greenhaus, J. H., Ziegert, J. C., & Allen, T. D. (2012). When family-supportive supervision matters: Relations between multiple sources of support and work–family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 266-275. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2011.10.008
- Goh, J., Pfeffer, J., & Zenios, S. A. (2015). The relationship between workplace stressors and mortality and health costs in the United States. *Management Science*, 62(2), 608-628. doi: 10.1287/mnsc.2014.2115
- Halbesleben, J. R., Wheeler, A. R., & Rossi, A. M. (2012). The costs and benefits of working with one's spouse: A two-sample examination of spousal support, work–family conflict, and emotional exhaustion in work-linked relationships. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(5), 597-615. doi: 10.1002/job.771
- Harrington, D., Bean, N., Pintello, D., & Matthews, D. (2005). Job satisfaction and burnout: Predictors of intentions to leave a job in a military setting. *Administration in Social Work*, 25, 1-16. doi: 10.1300/J147v25n03_01
- Hauser, D. J., & Schwarz, N. (2016). Attentive Turkers: MTurk participants perform better on online attention checks than do subject pool participants. *Behavior Research Methods*, 48(1), 400-407. doi:10.3758/s13428-015-0578-z
- Hayes, A. F. (2015). An index and test of linear moderated mediation. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 50(1), 1-22. doi: 10.1080/00273171.2014.962683

- Hayes, A. F. (2018). Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach (2nd edition). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Hecht, T. D., & Allen, N. J. (2009). A longitudinal examination of the work–nonwork boundary strength construct. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *30*(7), 839-862. doi: 10.1002/job.579
- Hauk, M., & Chodkiewicz, J. (2013). The role of general and occupational stress in the relationship between workaholism and work-family/family-work conflicts. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health*, 26(3), 383-393. doi: 10.2478/s13382-013-0087-1
- Huang, L., Chuang, C. J., & Lin, H. (2003). The role of burnout in the relationship between perceptions of organizational politics and turnover intentions. *Public Personnel Management, 32*, 519-531. doi: 10.1177/009102600303200404
- Huang, J. L., Curran, P. G., Keeney, J., Poposki, E. M., & DeShon, R. P. (2012).
 Detecting and deterring insufficient effort responding to surveys. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27(1), 99-114. doi:10.1007/s10869-011-9231-8
- Huang, J. L., Liu, M., & Bowling, N. A. (2015). Insufficient effort responding:
 Examining an insidious confound in survey data. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(3), 828-845. doi:10.1037/a0038510
- Ilies, R., Wilson, K. S., & Wagner, D. T. (2009). The spillover of daily job satisfaction onto employees' family lives: The facilitating role of work-family integration. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(1), 87-102. doi:10.5465/amj.2009.36461938

- Iwasaki, K., Takahashi, M., & Nakata, A. (2006). Health problems due to long working hours in Japan: Working hours, workers' compensation (Karoshi), and preventive measures. *Industrial Health*, 44(4), 537-540. doi: 10.2486/indhealth.44.537
- James, L. R., Mulaik, S. A., & Brett, J. (1982). *Causal analysis: Assumptions, models, and data*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jick, T. D. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 602-611. doi: 10.2307/2392366
- Kanai, A., Wakabayashi, M., & Fling, S. (1996). Workaholism among employees in Japanese corporations: An examination based on the Japanese version of the Workaholism Scales. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 38(4), 192-203. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5884.1996.tb00024.x
- Kreiner, G. E. (2006). Consequences of work-home segmentation or integration: A person-environment fit perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(4), 485-507. doi: 10.1002/job.386
- 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. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2005.07.002
- Kubicek, B., & Tement, S. (2016). Work intensification and the work-home interface:
 The moderating effect of individual work-home segmentation strategies and
 organizational segmentation supplies. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 15, 7689. doi: 10.1027/1866-5888/a000158

- Landers, R. N., & Behrend, T. S. (2015). An inconvenient truth: Arbitrary distinctions between organizational, Mechanical Turk, and other convenience samples. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(2), 142-164.
 doi:10.1017/iop.2015.13
- Liu, H., & Cheung, F. M. (2015). The role of work–family role integration in a job demands–resources model among Chinese secondary school teachers. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 18(4), 288-298. doi: 10.1111/ajsp.12103
- McMillan, L. H., O Driscoll, M. P., & Burke, R. J. (2003). Workaholism: A review of theory, research, and future directions. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 18, 167-190. doi: 10.1002/0470013346.ch5
- Meade, A. W., & Craig, S. B. (2012). Identifying careless responses in survey data. *Psychological Methods*, 17(3), 437-455. doi:10.1037/a0028085
- Meek, C. B. (2004). The dark side of Japanese management in the 1990s: Karoshi and ijime in the Japanese workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 19*(3), 312-331. doi: 10.1108/02683940410527775
- Michel, J. S., O'Neill, S. K., Hartman, P., & Lorys, A. (2018). Amazon's Mechanical Turk as a viable source for organizational and occupational health research. *Occupational Health Science*, 2, 83-98. doi:10.1007/s41542-017-0009-x
- Michel, J. S., Rotch, M. A., & O'Neill, S. K. (2021). The effects of work and nonwork boundary fit on role satisfaction and subjective well-being. *Stress and Health*. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.3070

Nagy, S., & Davis, L. (1985). Burnout: A comparative analysis of personality and environmental variables. *Psychological Reports*, 57, 1319-1326. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1985.57.3f.1319

Ng, T. W. H., Sorensen, K. L., & Feldman, D. C. (2007). Dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of workaholism: A conceptual integration and extension. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*, 111-136. doi: 10.1002/job.424

NowThis News. (2017, November 6). *Death by overwork in Japan: Karoshi & Japanese Salarymen* | *NowThis* [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qp_KiDqfjGo

- Park, Y., Fritz, C., & Jex, S. M. (2011). Relationships between work-home segmentation and psychological detachment from work: The role of communication technology use at home. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *16*(4), 457-467. doi: 10.1037/a0023594
- Park, Y., & Jex, S. M. (2011). Work-home boundary management using communication and information technology. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 18(2), 133. doi: 10.1037/a0022759
- Peer, E., Vosgerau, J., & Acquisti, A. (2014). Reputation as a sufficient condition for data quality on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Behavior Research Methods*, 46(4), 1023-1031. doi:10.3758/s13428-013-0434-y
- Ployhart, R. E., & Vandenberg, R. J. (2010). Longitudinal research: The theory, design, and analysis of change. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 94-120. doi: 10.1177/0149206309352110

- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879-903. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 539-569. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452
- Porter, G. (1996). Organizational impact of workaholism: Suggestions for researching the negative outcomes of excessive work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1, 70-84. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.1.1.70
- Powell, G. N., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2010). Sex, gender, and the work-to-family interface: Exploring negative and positive inter-dependencies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 513-534. doi: 10.5465/amj.2010.51468647
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40, 879-891. doi: 10.3758/BRM.40.3.879
- Preacher, K. J., Rucker, D. D., & Hayes, A. F. (2007). Assessing moderated mediation hypotheses: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 42*, 185-227. doi: 10.1080/00273170701341316
- Oates, W. E. (1971). *Confessions of a workaholic: The facts about work addiction*. New York: World.

Robinson, B. E. (1997). Work addiction and the family: Conceptual research considerations. *Early Child Development and Care, 137*, 77-92. doi: 10.1080/0300443971370106

- Robinson, B. E., Flowers, C., & Carroll, J. (2001). Work stress and marriage: A theoretical model examining the relationship between workaholism and marital cohesion. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *8*, 165-175. doi: 10.1023/A:1009533415030
- Robinson, B. E., & Post, P. (1995). Work addiction as a function of family of origin and its influence on current family functioning. *Family Journal*, *3*, 91-95. doi: 10.1177/1066480795033003
- Rothbard, N. P., Philips, K. W., & Dumas, T. L. (2005) Managing multiple roles: Work– family policies and individuals' desire for segmentation. *Organization Science*, *16*(3), 243-258. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1050.0124

Russo, J. A., & Waters, L. E. (2006). Workaholic worker type differences in work-family conflict: The moderating role of supervisor support and flexible work scheduling. *Career Development International*, 11(5), 418-439. doi: 10.1108/13620430610683052

- Scandura, T. A., & Williams, E. A. (2000). Research methodology in management: Current practices, trends, and implications for future research. *Academy of Management Journal, 43,* 1248-1264. doi: 10.5465/1556348
- Schaufeli, W. B., Shimazu, A., & Taris, T. W. (2009). Driven to work excessively hard:
 The evaluation of a two-factor measure of workaholism in the Netherlands and
 Japan. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 43, 320-348. doi : 10.1177/1069397109337239

- Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & van Rhenen, W. (2008). Workaholism, burnout, and work engagement: Three of a kind or three different kinds of employee wellbeing? *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *57*, 173-203. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00285.x
- Siu, O. L., Lu, J. F., Brough, P., Lu, C. Q., Bakker, A. B., Kalliath, T., O'Driscoll, M., Phillips, D. R., Chen, W., Lo, D., Sit, C., & Shi, K. (2010). Role resources and work–family enrichment: The role of work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(3), 470-480.
- Snir, R., & Harpaz, I. (2004). Attitudinal and demographic antecedents of workaholism. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(5), 520-536. doi: 10.1108/09534810410554524
- Spence, J. T., & Robbins, A. S. (1992). Workaholism: Definition, measurement, and preliminary results. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 58(1), 160-178. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa5801_15
- Taris, T. W., Schaufeli, W. B., & Verhoeven, L. C. (2005). Workaholism in the Netherlands: Measurement and implications for job strain and work–nonwork conflict. *Applied Psychology*, 54(1), 37-60. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2005.00195.x
- Thompson, C. A, Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work-family 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. doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1998.1681

- Van Wijhe, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Peeters, M. C. W. (2010) Understanding and treating workaholism: Setting the stage for successful interventions. In C. L. Cooper & R. J Burke (Eds.), *Psychological and behavioural risks at work* (pp. 107-134) Wiley: Chichester.
- Williams, J. C. (2000). Unbending gender: Why family and work conflict and what to do about it. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities

Variables	М	SD	Skew	Kurt	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Workaholism	2.51	.59	08	10	.83									
2. Enactment	3.42	1.86	.36	-1.09	.41**	.94								
3. Preference	6.02	1.27	-1.67	2.98	11**	27**	.94							
4. WFC	2.47	1.01	.46	57	.34**	.49**	.10*	.92						
5. Work Hours	42.20	4.89	2.30	7.62	.27**	.25**	14**	.20**	-					
6. Age	38.40	10.70	.77	.196	.02	.05	.02	03	.08	-				
7. Gender	1.62	.49	49	-1.77	.07	.07	.04	.01*	04	.04	-			
8. Children	1.45	.50	.21	-1.96	04	.00	02	.04	06	30**	00	-		
9. Dependents	1.86	.35	-2.00	2.19	08	04	.06	.01	03	.03	06	.08	-	
10. Tenure	7.16	6.47	2.06	5.74	00	.04	05	06	.06	.49**	01	26**	00	-
11. Income	11.30	3.77	14	616	04	.01	.02	13**	.10*	.10*	04	18**	.04	.20**

Note. N = 524. M = mean; SD = standard deviation; Skew = skewness; Kurt = kurtosis; WFC = work-to-family conflict. Enactment = work integration enactment; Preference = work segmentation preference. Alpha reliabilities are in italics and appear on the diagonal. *p < .05, **p < .01

Education Level		Workaholism	Integration	Segmentation	Work-Family
			Enactment	Preference	Conflict
High school or equivalent	Mean	2.683	3.306	6.229	2.540
	SD	0.733	1.990	1.212	1.174
Vocational/technical school	Mean	2.580	3.300	5.950	2.578
	SD	0.539	1.675	1.107	0.816
Some college	Mean	2.539	3.385	5.969	2.561
	SD	0.613	1.761	1.331	1.055
Bachelor's degree	Mean	2.442	3.242 ^a	6.069	2.374
	SD	0.561	1.865	1.281	1.004
Master's degree	Mean	2.587	4.024 ^a	6.061	2.614
	SD	0.566	1.846	1.109	0.895
Professional degree (MD, JD, PsyD, etc.)	Mean	2.569	3.500	5.481	2.402
	SD	0.562	1.831	1.281	0.894
Doctoral degree (PhD)	Mean	2.557	4.786	5.714	2.698
	SD	0.810	2.133	1.571	1.133
Other	Mean	2.260	3.000	5.200	1.822
	SD	0.709	2.345	1.915	0.819
Total	Mean	2.512	3.421	6.022	2.474
	SD	0.594	1.859	1.272	1.010

Study Variable Means and Standard Deviations by Education Level

Note. N = 524. Letters indicate a significant difference in means according to Tukey's HSD

(honest significant difference) test.

Work Sector		Workaholism	Work	Work	Work-Family
			Integration Enactment	Segmentation Preference	Conflict
Agriculture, Food, and Natural	Mean	2.714	3.214	6.000	2.809
Resources					
	SD	0.664	1.185	1.041	1.398
Architecture and Construction	Mean	2.629	3.500	5.714	2.516
	SD	0.551	1.421	1.155	0.886
Arts, Audio/Video Technology, and Communications	Mean	2.369	3.471	5.548	2.188
	SD	0.544	2.229	1.921	1.117
Business Management and	Mean	2.508	3.521	6.076	2.463
Administration	~~				1
	SD	0.490	1.824	1.105	1.002
Education and Training	Mean	2.601	3./46 ^a	5.902	2.390
	SD	0.657	1.932	1.120	0.926
Finance	Mean	2.540	3.200	6.192	2.370
	SD	0.660	1.940	1.181	1.019
Government and Public Administration	Mean	2.555	3.606	6.386	2.539
	SD	0.614	1.751	0.815	0.983
Health Science	Mean	2.463	3.474	5.823	2.359
	SD	0.392	1.954	1.448	1.025
Hospitality and Tourism	Mean	2.465	3.462	6.317	2.543
	SD	0.625	1.784	0.880	0.945
Human Services	Mean	2.544	3.917 ^b	6.065	2.757
	SD	0.814	1.877	1.455	1.076
Information Technology	Mean	2.414	3.547°	5.727	2.349
	SD	0.524	1.662	1.587	0.940
Law, Public Safety, Corrections and Security	Mean	2.558	3.566	6.263	2.842
	SD	0.635	2.119	1.019	0.992
Manufacturing	Mean	2.470	1.991 ^{abcd}	6.157	2.193

Study Variable Means and Standard Deviations by Work Sector

	SD	0.663	1.071	1.288	0.953
Marketing, Sales, and	Mean	2.597	3.530 ^d	6.013	2.554
Service					
	SD	0.581	1.928	1.356	1.031
Science, Technology,	Mean	2.452	3.310	5.952	2.656
Engineering and					
Mathematics					
	SD	0.456	1.837	1.094	1.013
Transportation,	Mean	2.256	2.600	6.587	2.652
Distribution, and					
Logistics					
	SD	0.679	1.653	0.660	1.207
Total	Mean	2.512	3.421	6.022	2.474
	SD	0.594	1.859	1.272	1.010

Note. N = 524. Letters indicate a significant difference in means according to Tukey's HSD (honest significant difference) test.

Mediation and Moderated-Mediation Estimates

Direct Effects	Coefficient	SE	t	р	Model R ²
Work Integration Enactment as DV					
Constant	-1.92	.65	-2.95	.003	
Workaholism	1.16	.13	9.08	.000	.192***
Work-Family Conflict as DV					
Constant	.59	.34	1.74	.083	
Workaholism	.27	.07	3.81	.000	
Work Integration Enactment	.22	.02	9.69	.000	.262***
Indirect Effect	Effect	Boot SE	Boot LLCI		Boot ULCI
Workaholism on Work-Family Conflict	.257	.042	.1	80	.342

	Moderated-Mediation Model							
Direct Effects	Coefficient	SE	t	р	Model R ²			
Work Integration Enactment as DV								
Constant	-1.92	.65	-2.95	.003				
Workaholism	1.16	.13	9.08	.000	.19***			
Work-Family Conflict as DV								
Constant	.17	.53	.33	.744				
Workaholism	.28	.68	4.04	.000				
Work Integration Enactment	01	.09	13	.898				
Work Segmentation Preference	.01	.07	.21	.003				
Enactment*Preferences	.04	.01	2.99	.003	.33***			
Conditional Indirect Effects	Effect	Boot SE	Ba	oot	Boot ULCI			
			LL	.CI				
Low Work Segmentation Preference	.235	.045	.1	52	.327			
Mean Work Segmentation Preference	.310	.046	.225		.404			
High Work Segmentation Preference	.335	.050	.2	43	.437			
Index of Moderated Mediation	Index	Boot SE	Ba LL	oot .CI	Boot ULCI			
Work Segmentation Preference	.050	.019	.0	15	.089			

Note. N = 524. DV = dependent variable. SE = standard error. Boot = 50,000 bootstrap samples.

LLCI = bias corrected lower limit confidence interval. ULCI = bias corrected upper limit

confidence interval. Effect size estimates are unstandardized coefficients. Moderator values of low and high are the mean plus/minus one standard deviation. Mean centering was used for product terms.

****p* < .001

Figure 1. Theoretical model summarizing the predicted relationships between constructs.





Figure 2. A plot of the indirect effect of workaholism on work-family conflict versus the moderator (work segmentation preference) with confidence bands.

Appendix A

Study Items

Study Items

Workaholism

1. I seem to be in a hurry and racing against the clock.

2. I find myself continuing to work after my co-workers have called it quits.

3. It's important to me to work hard even when I don't enjoy what I'm doing.

4. I stay busy and keep many irons in the fire.

5. I feel that there's something inside me that drives me to work hard.

6. I spend more time working than on socializing with friends, on hobbies, or on leisure activities.

7. I feel obliged to work hard, even when it's not enjoyable.

8. I find myself doing two or three things at one time such as eating lunch and writing a memo

while talking on the telephone.

9. I feel guilty when I take time off work.

10. It is hard for me to relax when I'm not working.

Work Segmentation Preference

- 1. I don't like to have to think about work while I'm at home.
- 2. I prefer to keep work life at work.
- 3. I don't like work issues creeping into my home life.
- 4. I like to be able to leave work behind when I go home.

Work Integration Enactment

- 1. I often think about work while I'm at home.
- 2. I am unable to keep work matters at work.

3. My work issues often creep into my home life.

4. I am unable to mentally leave work behind when I go home.

Work Family Conflict

Time-Based

1. My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like.

2. The time I must devote to my job keeps me from participating equally in household responsibilities and activities.

3. I have to miss family activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities.

Strain-Based

4. When I get home from work I am often too frazzled to participate in family activities/responsibilities.

5. I am often so emotionally drained when I get home from work that it prevents me from contributing to my family.

6. Due to all the pressures at work, sometimes when I come home I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy.

Behavior-Based

7. The problem-solving behaviors I use in my job are not effective in resolving problems at home.

8. Behavior that is effective and necessary for me at work would be counterproductive at home.

9. The behaviors I perform that make me effective at work do not help me to be a better parent and spouse.

Demographics

- 1. What is your age?
- 2. How many hours per week do you work?
- 3. What is your gender? Male, Female, Other (specify)
- 4. What is your race/ethnicity?
 - a) African-American/Black
 - b) Caucasian/White (Non-Hispanic)
 - c) Hispanic
 - d) Asian American/Pacific Islander
 - e) Arabic
 - f) Native American
 - g) Other (specify)
- 5. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
 - a) High school or equivalent
 - b) Vocational/technical school
 - c) Some college
 - d) Bachelor's degree
 - e) Master's degree
 - f) Professional degree (MD, JD, PsyD, etc.)
 - g) Doctoral degree (PhD)
 - h) Other
- 6. What is your marital status?
 - a) Single (never married)

b) Married/living as married

- c) Separated/divorced/widowed
- 7. Do you have any children?

If yes, how many?

What is the age of your youngest child

8. Do you have dependents living with you (other relatives, such as grandparents or elderly

parents, that reside with you that you provide more than half the financial support for)?

9. Which of the following job families does your work most closely resemble?

- a) Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources
- b) Architecture and Construction
- c) Arts, Audio/Video Technology, and Communications
- d) Business Management and Administration
- e) Education and Training
- f) Finance
- g) Government and Public Administration
- h) Health Science
- i) Hospitality and Tourism
- j) Human Services
- k) Information Technology
- l) Law, Public Safety, Corrections and Security
- m) Manufacturing
- n) Marketing, Sales, and Service
- o) Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics
p) Transportation, Distribution, and Logistics

- 10. How long have you been working for your current employer?
- 11. What is your yearly household income?
 - a) Less than \$5,000
 - b) \$5,000 to \$9,999
 - c) \$10,000 to \$14,999
 - d) \$10,000 to \$14,999
 - e) \$15,000 to \$19,999
 - f) \$20,000 to \$24,999
 - g) \$25,000 to \$29,999
 - h) \$30,000 to \$34,999
 - i) \$35,000 to \$39,999
 - j) \$40,000 to \$44,999
 - k) \$45,000 to \$49,999
 - 1) \$50,000 to \$59,999
 - m) \$60,000 to \$69,999
 - n) \$70,000 to \$79,999
 - o) \$80,000 to \$89,999
 - p) \$90,000 to \$99,999
 - q) \$100,000 to \$124,999
 - r) \$125,000 to \$149,999
 - s) \$150,000 to \$199,999
 - t) \$200,000 to \$249,999

u) \$250,000 and above