

Workaholism and Psychological Well-Being among Employees of Banking and Telecom Sector

Author's Details:

⁽¹⁾Warda Sahar ⁽²⁾Shaista Waqar ⁽¹⁾Quaid-i-Azam University, National Institute of Psychology, Islamabad, Pakistan ⁽²⁾Quaid-i-Azam University, National Institute of Psychology, Islamabad, Pakistan

ABSTRACT: *The aim of the present study was to find the relationship between workaholism and psychological well-being among employees of banking and telecom sector. The sample consisted of 276 employees from both public and private sector. Workaholism was measured by using Work Battery (Spence & Robbins, 1992) and psychological well-being was measured by using Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). The results showed significant positive relationship between workaholism and psychological well-being. Group comparisons revealed that employees working in banks exhibited higher levels of workaholism than employees of telecom sector while no gender differences were observed. Implications, limitations and suggestions have been highlighted.*

Key Words: Workaholism, Psychological Well-Being, Demographic Characteristics, Eudaimonic, Hedonic.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the midst of the growth of current societies, the working rivalry has developed progressively extreme. The workers confronts a ton of fast and complex changes that have indicated a complete new period of business portrayed by expanding work pressures, day to day tasks, overextended working hours etc. Schor (1991) considers that the rise in hours is an outcome of the work demands that society has set upon employees. Steady with Schor's conclusions, George (1997) incorporated that, given the fear of unemployment and the open door for advancement and raises; it doesn't astound people that employees are putting more hours into work. Indeed, organizations stereotypically grasp qualities clichéd workaholics; then again, life outside of work may be harmfully affected by workaholism (Gini, 1998).

To begin with, workaholics contribute a great deal of time on work when given the decision to do so — they are amazingly determined workers. Second, it's hard for workaholics to detach from work, and they persistently and restlessly consider work when they are not at work. This recommends that workaholics are preoccupied with their work—they are preoccupied employees. The third essential feature of workaholics is that they work beyond what is basically expected from them to meet organizational or monetary requisites.

Workaholism research has been discouraged by the inadequacy of clear and dependable thoughts, good operational definitions and approved measures (Scott, Moore, & Miceli, 1997), despite the fact that current development is, no doubt made (Buelens & Poelmans, 2004).

Oates (1971) sights workaholism as a fixation, first depicting a workaholic as a person whose prerequisite for work has created so unreasonable to the point that it makes discernable interruption or interfering with his physical prosperity, individual happiness, and interpersonal relations, and with his smooth social working. Spence and Robbins (1992) define the first hypothetical and operational explanation of workaholism as a set of state of psyche. They depict the workaholic as a person who appears to be significantly included in work, feels committed or inspired to work due to internal motivation, and is low in satisfaction of work, in

comparison with others. On a similar topic, Machlowitz (1980) restricts that what separate workaholics is their disposition towards work, not the measure of hours they work. She asserts that the workaholic is impelled by "psychic income" which begins from commitment, prospect and appreciation, not financial benefits (Seybold & Salomone, 1994).

Interestingly, Scott et al. (1997) claim that workaholism is not a disposition however an exhibit of activities with three components viz: the individual put critical discretionary time in work, considers about work when not at work and works beyond financial or organizational necessities. Robinson (2000) proposes a generally inflexible definition reflective of what he sees as the 'genuine workaholic'. He characterized workaholism as an obsessive-compulsive disorder that shows itself through induced burdens created by self, a lack of ability to oversee work practices, and overindulgence in work to the rejection of most other life happenings (Robinson, 2000).

1.1. Trait Approach.

In trait theory, workaholism would be theorized as a manifestation of a fundamental attribute that got to be obvious in late pre-adulthood, displayed constancy across various employment circumstances, and was aggravated by environmental spurs for example, anxiety (McMillan, et al., 2001). Therefore, workaholism would grow as a consequence of a trait-environment interface. Trait-specific models emphasis on comparatively constricted behavioral patterns and recognizes individual discrepancy however clarifies just a relatively confined scope of phenomena.

1.2. Psychological Well-Being

World Health Organization, defined health as a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity (WHO, 1948). In recent times, positive mental health is defined by WHO as a state of well-being in which the individual realizes his or her own abilities, can cope with the normal stresses of life, can work productively and fruitfully, and is able to make a contribution to his or her community.

The theoretical system of mental wellbeing displayed by Ryff is based upon qualification between two kinds of wellbeing: hedonic prosperity and eudaimonic prosperity. Hedonic prosperity is the sort of prosperity that identifies with your sentiments, for example, liking yourself and not being anxious. Eudaimonic wellbeing, an idea present by Aristotle, is the sort of prosperity that is identified with understanding your potential and having a feeling of self-improvement, reason in life and dominance over environment. Hedonic and eudaimonic prosperity are identified with one another however are not the same thing. For instance, watching TV may make you feel great, but it regularly has little to do with helping you understand your potential, yet it may not feel great at the time. As per the eudaimonic viewpoint, prosperity comprises of more than simply being glad. Well-being is constantly completely utilitarian, instead of essentially achieving desires.

1.2.1 Multidimensional Model.

A model of psychological well-being is presented by Ryff and Keyes (1995). The conclusion drawn by Ryff and Keyes (1995) is that Psychological well-being is a multifaceted construct which encompasses six components. These are described as follows:

(a) Autonomy. It is the feeling of determination toward oneself. The full working individual is likewise depicted as having an inner locus of evaluation, where by one doesn't search others for support, however assesses oneself by particular norms; individuation is seen to include a deliverance from convention in which the individual no more sticks to aggregate apprehensions, and opinions.

(b) Environmental mastery. The individual capability to pick or make environment suitable to his/her psychic condition is characterized as qualities of mental wellbeing.

(c) Personal growth. Ideal psychological functioning requires not only that one accomplish earlier qualities, as well as that one keep on developing one's potential, to develop and grow as an individual.

(d) Purpose in life. Mental well-being is characterized to incorporate opinions that give one the sensation there is reason and intending to life. Therefore, life will be meaningful for those who functions completely and gain a sense of direction.

(e) Positive relation with others. The capacity to love is seen as the focal element of mental well-being, self actualizers are portrayed as having solid feeling of sympathy and warmth for all individuals and as being equipped for extraordinary adoration, deeper friendship and comprehensive identification with others.

(f) Self-acceptance. This is characterized as the focal feature of mental well-being and actualization toward oneself, ideal working and development. Life span developmentalists theories additionally highlights as a focal aspects of positive mental functioning.

1.3. Workaholism and Psychological Well-Being

The concept of wellbeing refers to general mental health which includes positive self-regard, competence, autonomy and integrated functioning (Warr, 1999, cited in Burke, 2001). The majority of research relating to workaholism indicates that it may have a harmful consequence on employee well-being (Vodanovich & Piotrowski, 2006). For example, physical and psychological health issues are more reported by workaholics (Spence & Robbins, 1992). Workaholics are also at greater risk for coronary heart disease and burnout (McMillan & O' Driscoll, 2004). A related finding is that workaholics experience greater levels of stress in their jobs (Burke, 2004; McMillan & O' Driscoll, 2004) and have poor emotional health. Furthermore, workaholics are at greater risk for secondary addictions such as obesity and alcoholism (Robinson, 1998) which is likely to have a harmful impact on their life. Finally, some research suggests that workaholics have difficulty separating from work and are unable to relax and enjoy their non-work activities (Porter, 2004). Workaholics experience difficulty in maintaining healthy relationships outside their jobs. They have less satisfaction with family, friends and their community (Vodanovich & Piotrowski, 2006).

Association between workaholism and psychological well-being are contradictory, shifting usually from sample to sample and from country to country. It may be that there are cultural differences between the samples, or that distinctive groups have an alternate work ethos that effect on results. Until now, subsequently, the relationship stays vague. An intriguing probability is that people may defer reporting minor well-being issues to focus on work, subsequently compounding the enduring likelihood of suffering diseases (McMillan et al., 2001).

1.4. Rationale of the study

About 40 years back, workaholism is taking place to apparent. Workaholics devote much time taking part in work; however they don't generally appreciate working, in this manner prompting issues in their associations with family, companions, and collaborators. As a result of this work-life unevenness, they can encounter a lot of anxiety and wellbeing issue.

Previous researches have highlighted much on workaholism and personality aspects, anxiety, work family conflict and so on. Workaholics in relation to non-workaholics, empirical research has demonstrated, that they usually report more ill-issues (Aziz & Zickar, 2006). Consistency however are lacking in these results. In relation to mental health, McMillan and O' Driscoll (2004) as well as Snir and Zohar (2008), for instance, found workaholics and non-workaholics with no differences.

Due to intensification in financial unpredictability and rivalry in Pakistan the trend of workaholism is rising and the exceedingly awful part is that it is going unnoticed. The principle theme of this study is to examine the relationship between workaholism and psychological well-being. This study additionally expects to break down the demographic components that may help in clarifying workaholic behavior patterns. External reinforcers such as raises, salary, advancement and societal demands, no doubt have an influence on employees.

Likewise, the association between workaholism and psychological well-being in the Pakistani populace has not been investigated prior to this study. Along these lines, the present study opens new doors of insight into the workaholic behavior, psychological well-being of the local sample.

2. METHOD

2.1. Objectives

This study incorporates a multitude of aims. The aims of the present study are:

1. To explore the relationship between workaholism and psychological well-being among employees of banking and telecom sector.
2. To investigate the relationship of demographic variables (gender, marital status, sector, work experience, job tenure, monthly income, working hours, promotions in career and working longer than office timings and management level) with workaholism and psychological well-being.

2.2. Hypotheses

1. Workaholism is negatively related to psychological well-being among employees of banking and telecom sector.
2. Men employees have higher levels of workaholism as compared to women employees.
3. Female employees possess higher levels of psychological well-being in comparison to men employees.
4. Middle management employees have high levels of workaholism and lower levels of psychological well-being as compared to lower level management employees.

2.3. Operational Definitions

Workaholism. Spence and Robbins (1992) defined workaholics as high on drive, high on work involvement, and low on work enjoyment. High scorer on Work Battery Scale (Spence & Robbins, 1992) reflects higher levels of workaholism and vice versa.

Psychological Well-Being. Psychological well-being is theoretically defined as determined for perfection that indicates the realization of one's true potential (Ryff, 1995). High scorer on Psychological Well-Being Scale reflects positive mental health, high self-acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, personal growth, and vice versa.

2.4. Instruments

In order to measure the proposed variables, following instruments were used.

2.4.1 Work BAT (Spence & Robbins, 1992).

Workaholism has been measured by Work Battery in the present study. The original English version scale has been used. It consists of 25 items. It is a 4 point likert scale vacillating from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 4 (*Strongly Agree*). Possible score range is 25 - 100. It has three sub scales that are Work Involvement (8 items), Drive (7 items), and Work Enjoyment (10 items) having coefficient alpha reliabilities of .59, .68, and .73, respectively. Reliability of the scale is .78. Items of Work Involvement are from 1 - 8, Drive 9 - 15 and Work Enjoyment 16 - 25. High scores indicated high level of workaholism and low scores reflected low level of workaholism. Negative phrased items are 1, 2, 3 and 21.

Commitment of an individual to being productive at work and constructive in using time both on and off the job is Work involvement. Reflection of a person's inner motivation to work is Work Drive. To gain a sense of emotional gratification from work is Work Enjoyment.

2.4.2 Psychological Well-Being (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

Shortened version of the scale has been used. It consists of 42 items. It is a six point likert scale ranging from 1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree Somewhat*, 3 = *Disagree Slightly*, 4 = *Agree Slightly* 5 = *Agree Somewhat* to 6 = *Strongly Agree*. Possible score range is 42 - 252. It has six sub scales that are Autonomy (7 items), Environmental Mastery (7 items), Personal Growth (7 items), Positive Relations (7 items), Purpose in Life (7 items) and Self-Acceptance (7 items) having coefficient alpha reliabilities of .51, .18, .57, .68, .55 and .66, respectively. Reliability of the scale is .86. Items of Autonomy are 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31, 37 Environmental Mastery 2, 8, 14, 20, 26, 32, 38 Positive Growth 3, 9, 15, 21, 27, 33, 39 Positive Relations 4, 10, 16, 22, 28, 34, 40 Purpose in life 5, 11, 17, 23, 29, 35, 41 and Self-Acceptance 6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 42. High scores indicated high level of psychological well-being and low scores reflected low level of psychological well-being. Negative phrased items are 3, 5, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 39, and 41.

The scale incorporates multiple facets of psychological well-being. These facets are:

- a sense of autonomy in thought and action
- the ability to handle complex environments to suit individual needs and values
- Continued growth and development as a person
- the establishing of quality ties to other
- the pursuit of meaningful goals and a sense of purpose in life, and
- Self-acceptance

2.5 Research Design

The present study is a correlational research; it was aimed to explore the relationship between workaholism and psychological well-being among employees of banking and

telecom sector. The scales used to measure the variables were Work Battery and Psychological Well-Being Scale. This research comprised of two phases. Phase I dealt with tryout of the scales ($n = 30$). It was carried out in order to determine the cultural appropriateness, difficulty level and item comprehension of the instruments used among employees of banking and telecom sector. Phase II dealt for achieving the objectives and finding the truth of the hypotheses through empirical testing.

2.6 Phase I

2.6. Tryout.

2.6.1 Objective. The try out phase was carried out to determine the cultural appropriateness, and ease of comprehension of the instruments used in the research i.e., Work Battery Scale (Spence & Robbins, 1992) and Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). This was done keeping in consideration the sample of employees of banking and telecom sector.

2.6.2 Instruments.

1. *Work Battery Scale (Spence & Robbins, 1992).*
2. *Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).*

2.6.3 Sample. Data was collected from banking and telecom sector. Total number of sample was 30. 15 participants were from bank and 15 were from telecom employees. 24 participants were male employees and 6 were female employees. Data was collected from Islamabad and Rawalpindi area. Lower and middle management were included in the sample.

2.6.4 Procedure.

(a) Author's consent. In order to follow the research ethics for utilizing the instruments of Work Battery Scale, it was necessary to obtain the consent from the author of instrument. For this purpose Work Battery Scale (Spence & Robbins, 1992) was contacted via email and was requested for the permission to use her scale in the present research. The author supported in the matter and granted their consent to employee the instrument in the procedure.

(b): Expert opinion. For the purpose of obtaining expert opinion, three experts were selected, including two assistant Psychologists and a Ph.D. scholar. The experts were individually approached and aim of the study was clarified to them. They were demanded to provide their opinion on cultural appropriateness and ease of compression of each item. In their opinion they found difficulty in comprehension for the sample due to its complex phrasing.

(c) Sample opinion. To obtain the sample opinion, 30 employees were approached in their office setting. 24 were male employees and 6 were female employees. The age of the sample ranged from 22 to 50 years. Employees were taken from bank and telecom sector. Each employee was explained

the purpose of the study and their consent to participate was obtained. The employees were given written as well as verbal instructions to give their opinion on cultural appropriateness and the ease of comprehension of Work Battery and Psychological Well-Being Scale. The participants were guaranteed that all data would be only used for research purpose and confidentiality will be maintained. The participant rated some items of Work Battery Scale and Psychological Well-Being Scale at the difficulty level and the scales were reported to be culturally appropriateness.

(d) Results. The experts suggested that the items of Work Battery Scale and Psychological Well-Being Scale were culturally appropriate to be used in this research. To increase the ease of comprehension of the sample, the committee suggested that synonymous alternates should be added for words that posed difficulty for the sample in comprehending the meaning of the statement.

After tryout there were some questions on which the participants wanted another options. There were 3 questions which were modified as a result of the input gathered.

- Item of Work Battery Scale (Spence & Robbins, 1992)

Original Item: Between my job and other activities I'm involved in I don't have much free time.

Modified Item: I don't have much free time because I am much involved in my job and other activities.

- Another item of Work Battery Scale (Spence & Robbins, 1992)

Original Item: When I get involved in an interesting project it's hard to describe how exhilarated I feel.

Modified Item: When I get involved in an interesting project it's difficult to explain how excited I feel.

- Item of Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff & Keyes, 1995)

Original Item: I have been able to build a home and a lifestyle for myself that is much to my liking.

Modified Item: I have been able to build a home and a lifestyle for myself that is matches my taste.

2.7 Phase II

2.7.1 Main study.

Phase II of the study comprised of the main study in which hypotheses were tested and objectives of the research were achieved.

2.7.2 Sample.

The sampling technique used for collecting data was stratified purposive sampling. The sample chosen for the research comprised of ($n = 276$) participants belonging from

banking ($n = 134$) and telecom sector ($n = 142$) were approached.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Sample ($N = 276$)

Demographics	<i>f</i>	%
Gender		
Male	213	77.2
Female	61	22.1
Missing	2	.7
Education		
Under Grad and Graduate	86	31.2
Post-Graduate	176	63.8
Missing	14	5.1
Marital Status		
Unmarried	113	40.9
Married	158	57.2
Missing	5	1.8
Family System		
Joint	145	52.5
Nuclear	118	42.8
Missing	13	4.7
Sector		
Banking	142	51.4
Telecom	134	48.6
Missing	0	0
Monthly Income		
20,000 and below	29	10.5
20,001 - 40,000	67	24.3
40,001 - 60,000	58	21.0
60,001 - 80,000	45	16.3
80,001 or above	61	22.1

Missing	16	5.8
Management Level		
Lower	85	30.8
Middle	153	55.4
Upper	15	5.4
Missing	23	8.3
Working at Office Longer than Office Timings		
Yes	180	65.2
No	90	32.6
Missing	6	2.2
Part-Time Job		
Yes	12	4.3
No	257	93.1
Missing	7	2.5

Table 1 represents the distribution of the sample of employees of banking and telecom sector on the basis of gender age, education, marital status, family system, sector, monthly income, management level, working longer than office timings and part-time job.

2.8 Procedure. The management of Mobilink, Ufone, Telenor, Allied Bank Limited (ABL), Pakistan Telecommunication Company Limited (PTCL), Small and Medium Enterprise Bank (SME), Habib Bank Limited (HBL), Zarai Taraqati Bank Limited (ZTBL), Askari Bank Limited, Pakistan Broadcasting, Standard Chartered Bank and Barclays Bank were contacted by the researcher on behalf of National Institute of Psychology in order to get the approval of sample recruitment. 400 questionnaires were distributed in banks and telecom sector. 200 questionnaires were distributed in banks and 200 in telecom. 142 questionnaires were given back by the telecom sector and 134 were given back by banks. After the official permission, the participants were individually contacted in their respective departments. They were briefed about the rationale and objectives of the present study. The instruments were accompanied by written as well as oral instructions on how to respond each question/item. They were guaranteed that all information collected would be used for research purpose only. Finally, the participants were wholeheartedly acknowledged for their assistance and support.

3. RESULTS

The present research was intended to investigate the relationship between workaholism and psychological well-being among employees of banking and telecom sector.

Appropriate statistical procedures were used to analyze the data. All analysis was done through SPSS–20 software. The internal consistencies of the scales were determined by the help of Alpha Reliability Coefficient. To determine the relationship between variables of the study i.e. workaholism and psychological well-being, Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used. Independent sample *t*-test was used to find out differences along gender, marital status, sector, and working longer than office timings. ANOVA was used to find out differences among various groups of income, and management level. The results are tabulated as follows:

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Instruments used in the study (N = 276)

Scale	n	α	M	SD	Range		Skewness
					Potential Scores	Actual Scores	
WH	25	.78	65.70	7.63	25-100	40-87	-.10
WI	10	.59	20.87	3.18	10-40	13-31	.13
D	8	.68	19.40	3.01	8-32	8-28	-.01
E	7	.73	25.45	3.93	7-28	13-36	-.38
PWB	42	.86	178.04	23.88	42-252	110-242	-.07
AU	7	.51	27.78	5.14	7-42	13-42	.09
EM	7	.18	27.69	4.05	7-42	15-39	-.03
PG	7	.57	30.56	5.53	7-42	15-42	-.01
PR	7	.68	30.69	5.98	7-42	12-42	-.10
PL	7	.55	29.62	5.32	7-42	17-42	.00
SA	7	.66	30.32	5.67	7-42	13-42	-.18

Note. WH = Workaholism; WI = Work Involvement, D = Drive, E = Enjoyment, PWB = Psychological Well-Being; AU = Autonomy, EM = Environmental Mastery, PG = Personal Growth, PR = Personal relations, PL = Purpose in Life, SA = Self-Acceptance.

Table 2 exemplifies alpha-coefficient reliability, skewness for workaholism and Psychological well-being. The reliability of the Work Battery Scale is .78 and Psychological Well-Being is .86. This shows that the scale is significantly reliable except for environmental mastery. It also demonstrates the means and standard deviations of study variables i.e., workaholism and psychological well-being. Similarly, the table displays the skewness values, it indicates that how much the distribution of scores for a particular variable deviates from normal distribution, and it is clear from the table that the scores have normal distribution.

Table 3: Correlation Matrix of Work Battery Scale and Psychological Well-Being Scale (N = 276)

Variable	WH	WI	D	E	PWB	AU	EM	PG	PR	PL	SA	AG	PC	WE	JT	WR
WH	-															
WI	.68**	-														
D	.69**	.21**	-													
E	.82**	.32**	.38**	-												
PWB	.14*	.15*	.09	.04	-											
AU	.01	-.04	.01	.02	.60**	-										
EM	.11	.07	.02	.12*	.67**	.30**	-									
PG	.10	.12	.04	.01	.82**	.43**	.43**	-								
PR	.03	.03	.06	-.01	.79**	.32**	.42**	.55**	-							
PL	.17**	.26**	.09	.00	.74**	.27**	.40**	.59**	.52**	-						
SA	.13*	.12	.10	.04	.82**	.41**	.51**	.59**	.60**	.48**	-					
AG	.17**	.09	.13*	.17**	-.04	.04	-.01	-.13*	.02	-.05	-.05	-				
PC	.11	.05	.01	.11	.01	.02	.00	-.03	.10	.00	.08	.42**	-			
WE	.22**	.12	.17**	.20**	.00	.05	.00	.09	.04	-.02	.01	.94**	.45**	-		
JT	.16*	.05	.14*	.17*	-.11	-.05	-.11	-.22**	-.04	-.07	-.14	.84**	.32**	.85**	-	
WR	-.07	.00	.04	-.18**	-.08	.03	.02	-.04	-.03	-.13*	.00	-.06	.04	-.08	-.04	-
M	65.70	20.87	19.40	25.45	178.0	27.78	27.69	30.56	30.69	29.62	30.32	33.61	1.64	11.00	9.05	8.44
SD	7.63	3.18	3.01	3.93	23.88	5.14	4.05	5.53	5.98	5.32	5.67	8.91	1.40	8.56	8.42	.80

Note. WH = Workaholism; WI = Work Involvement, D = Drive, E = Enjoyment, PWB = Psychological Well-Being; AU = Autonomy, EM = Environmental Mastery, PG = Personal Growth, PR = Personal relations, PL = Purpose in Life, SA = Self-Acceptance, AG = Age, PC =Promotions in Career, WE = Work Experience, JT = Job Tenure, WR = Working Hours, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 3 shows correlation matrix between workaholism, psychological well-being and their subscales among employees of banking and telecom sector. The table shows the inter-subscale correlation of workaholism and psychological well-being which is significantly positive. This reveals that the scales are suitable for use with the targeted sample. From the table it is evident that there is a significant positive relationship among workaholism and psychological well-being. Moreover, it reveals that workaholism is positively related with two subscales of psychological well-being i.e., PL and SA. Also, subscales of workaholism i.e., work involvement is significantly positive correlated with purpose in life. Table 5 also shows that age is significant positively correlated with workaholism and its two subscales i.e., drive and enjoyment. Also there exist a non-significant relationship between promotions in career, workaholism and psychological well-being.

Table 3 also demonstrates that work experience is significant positively correlated with workaholism and its two subscales i.e., drive and enjoyment. There exist a significant positive relationship between job tenure with workaholism and two subscales of workaholism i.e. drive and enjoyment. It is also significantly positive correlated with personal growth which is s subscale of psychological well-being. Working hours are significantly negative correlated with enjoyment (subscale of workaholism) and PL (subscale of psychological well-being).

Table 4: Means, SD, and t-values for comparison on the basis of Gender on Work Battery Scale and Psychological Well-Being Scale (N = 274)

Variables	Men (n = 213)		Women (n = 61)		t(272)	p	95% CI		Cohen's d
	M	SD	M	SD			LL	UL	
WH	65.87	7.46	65.40	8.20	.40	.48	-1.84	2.79	0.05
WI	20.96	3.02	20.64	3.66	.68	.47	-.60	1.24	0.09
D	19.38	3.01	19.50	3.09	.27	.99	-1.01	.76	-0.03
E	25.53	3.99	25.29	3.72	.40	.77	-.91	1.39	0.06
PWB	177.83	24.33	178.58	22.74	.19	.32	-.82	6.79	-0.03
AU	27.98	5.15	27.08	5.17	1.17	.64	-.60	2.39	0.17
EM	27.71	4.07	27.74	3.98	.04	.73	-1.24	1.18	-0.00
PG	30.41	5.67	31.05	5.10	.77	.28	-2.25	.98	-0.11
PR	30.72	6.00	30.55	6.08	.19	.77	-1.61	1.96	0.02
PL	29.45	5.19	30.31	5.82	1.07	.13	-2.43	.71	-0.15
SA	30.39	5.70	29.98	5.60	.47	.55	-1.27	2.09	0.07

Note. WH = Workaholism; WI = Work Involvement, D = Drive, E = Enjoyment, PWB = Psychological Well-Being; AU = Autonomy, EM = Environmental Mastery, PG = Personal Growth, PR = Personal relations, PL = Purpose in Life, SA = Self-Acceptance.

*p < .05, **p < .0

Table 4 shows the results of independent sample *t*-test for gender differences on Work Battery and Psychological Well-Being Scale and their subscales among employees of banking and telecom sector. From the table it is evident that there is a non-significant difference among male and female employees on workaholism and psychological well-being. The results also revealed that there is a non-significant difference between male and female employees on the subscales of workaholism and psychological well-being.

Table 5: Means, SD, and *t*-values for comparison on the basis of Marital Status on Work Battery Scale and Psychological Well-Being Scale (*N* = 271)

Variables	Unmarried (<i>n</i> = 113)		Married (<i>n</i> = 158)		<i>t</i> (269)	<i>p</i>	95% CI		Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
WH	65.53	7.93	66.17	7.09	.65	.41	-2.58	1.30	-0.08
WI	20.88	3.52	20.94	2.91	.14	.14	-.84	.73	-0.01
D	19.39	3.12	19.51	2.87	.31	.31	-.86	.62	-0.04
E	25.23	4.17	25.73	3.67	1.01	.50	-1.48	.47	-0.12
PWB	178.61	24.31	177.58	23.81	.31	.87	-5.39	7.45	0.04
AU	27.57	5.47	27.97	4.93	.62	.37	-1.69	.88	-0.46
EM	28.00	4.07	27.52	4.05	.94	.73	-.53	1.51	0.11
PG	31.10	5.63	30.13	5.51	1.36	.62	-.42	2.36	0.17
PR	30.64	5.86	30.76	6.14	.15	.98	-1.63	1.38	-0.01
PL	29.56	5.96	29.77	4.81	.30	.02	-1.54	1.12	-0.03
SA	30.37	6.13	30.31	5.34	.08	.10	-1.37	1.48	0.01

Note. WH = Workaholism; WI = Work Involvement, D = Drive, E = Enjoyment, PWB = Psychological Well-Being; AU = Autonomy, EM = Environmental Mastery, PG = Personal Growth, PR = Personal relations, PL = Purpose in Life, SA = Self-Acceptance.

p* < .05, *p* < .01

Table 5 shows the results of independent sample *t*-test for marital status differences on workaholism and psychological wellbeing among employees of banking and telecom sector. From the table it is evident that there is a significant (*p*<.05) difference among married and unmarried employees on the subscale of psychological well-being i.e., purpose in life. This means that married employee's shows greater purpose in life as compared to unmarried.

Table 6: Means, SD, and *t*-values for comparison on the basis of Sector on Work Battery Scale and Psychological Well-Being Scale (*N* = 276)

Variables	Telecom (<i>n</i> = 142)		Banking (<i>n</i> = 134)		<i>t</i> (274)	<i>p</i>	95% CI		Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
WH	65.00	8.40	66.47	6.66	1.49	.05	-3.42	.47	-0.19
WI	20.75	3.45	21.00	2.87	.65	.01	-1.02	.51	-0.07
D	19.22	3.37	19.60	2.57	1.03	.00	-1.12	.35	-0.12
E	25.11	4.17	25.80	3.64	1.40	.18	-1.65	.27	-0.17
PWB	180.85	24.84	175.20	22.85	1.77	.51	-.62	11.92	0.23
AU	27.92	5.42	27.65	4.84	.42	.11	-.98	1.52	0.05
EM	27.86	4.10	27.50	4.00	.70	.58	-.64	1.35	0.08
PG	31.23	5.52	29.87	5.47	1.98	.56	.01	2.71	0.24
PR	31.41	5.92	29.94	5.98	1.98	.91	.01	2.92	0.24
PL	30.27	5.41	28.91	5.16	2.06	.73	.06	2.65	0.25
SA	30.84	5.67	29.77	5.64	1.51	.83	-.32	2.46	0.18

Note. WH = Workaholism; WI = Work Involvement, D = Drive, E = Enjoyment, PWB = Psychological Well-Being; AU = Autonomy, EM = Environmental Mastery, PG = Personal Growth, PR = Personal relations, PL = Purpose in Life, SA = Self-Acceptance.

p* < .05, *p* < .01

Table 6 shows the results of independent sample *t*-test for sector differences on workaholism and psychological well-being among employees of banking and telecom sector. From the table it is evident that there is a significant (*p* < .05) difference among banking and telecom sector on workaholism. Workaholism exist more in banking sector as compared to telecom sector. It is also evident from the table that there is a significant (*p* < .01) difference between banking and telecom sector on the subscale of workaholism i.e. work involvement. Employees of banking sector are more involved in their work as compared to telecom sector. From the table it is evident that there is a significant (*p* < .01) difference between banking and telecom sector on the subscale of workaholism i.e. drive. Employees of banking sector feel more driven to their work as compared to employees of telecom sector. And there exist a non-significant difference among employees of banking and telecom sector on psychological well-being scale.

Table 7: Means, SD, and *t*-values for comparison on the basis of Working More Than Official Hours or Not on Work Battery Scale and Psychological Well-Being Scale (*N* = 270)

Variables	Working for longer than office timings (<i>n</i> = 180)		Not working longer than office timings (<i>n</i> = 90)		<i>t</i> (268)	<i>p</i>	95% CI		Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
	WH	66.03	7.90	65.39			7.15	.60	
WI	21.09	3.14	20.42	3.23	1.58	.55	-.16	1.50	0.21
D	19.57	2.99	19.20	3.09	.92	.65	-.42	1.16	0.12
E	25.42	4.17	25.71	3.43	.56	.17	-1.34	.74	-0.07
PWB	179.60	23.92	175.90	23.50	1.07	.72	-3.09	10.51	0.15
AU	28.05	5.25	27.42	4.99	.93	.65	-.70	1.98	0.12
EM	27.84	4.35	27.58	3.37	.47	.00	-.80	1.32	0.06
PG	30.69	5.46	30.52	5.64	.23	.57	-1.28	1.62	0.03
PR	31.03	5.86	30.33	6.24	.88	.46	-.86	2.26	0.11
PL	29.79	5.30	29.29	5.34	.70	.79	-.89	1.89	0.09
SA	30.76	5.80	29.62	5.32	1.51	.53	-.34	2.62	0.20

Note. WH = Workaholism; WI = Work Involvement, D = Drive, E = Enjoyment, PWB = Psychological Well-Being; AU = Autonomy, EM = Environmental Mastery, PG = Personal Growth, PR = Personal relations, PL = Purpose in Life, SA = Self-Acceptance.

p* < .05, *p* < .01

Table 7 shows the results of independent sample *t*-test for employees who work in office other than office timings and employees who don't work in office other than office timings on Work Battery and Psychological Well-Being Scale and their subscales. From the table it is evident that there is a significant (*p* < .01) difference among employees who work and who don't work in office other than office timings on the subscale of psychological well-being i.e. environmental mastery. Employees who work in office other than office timings have the ability to choose or create environment according to their psychic condition than employees who don't work in office other than office timings.

Table 8: Mean, SD and F-values across Income Level on Work Battery Scale and Psychological Well-Being Scale (N = 260)

Variables	20,000 or below		20,001 - 40,000		40,001 - 60,000		61,000 - 80,000		80,000 and above		F	p	i > j	D = i-j	95% CI	
	(n = 29)		(n = 67)		(n = 58)		(n = 45)		(n = 61)						LL	UL
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD						
WH	66.34	9.38	65.16	6.59	64.48	8.02	67.48	6.18	66.41	7.93	1.06	.37				
WI	20.51	4.18	20.93	3.09	20.94	3.25	20.95	2.68	21.05	3.10	.14	.96				
D	19.86	2.99	19.43	2.84	19.03	2.80	19.90	2.56	19.44	3.64	.60	.66				
E	25.96	5.00	25.10	2.85	25.60	3.94	26.64	3.39	25.71	4.52	1.93	.10				
PWB	185.72	23.35	169.33	24.28	180.42	19.80	175.85	23.98	183.23	23.65	3.39	.01	1 > 2 5 > 2	16.39* 13.90*	.88 1.56	31.88 26.24
AU	28.06	5.56	26.68	4.92	28.03	5.04	27.04	5.31	29.03	5.26	1.81	.12				
EM	28.57	4.74	26.96	3.64	27.80	4.22	27.73	4.04	28.34	3.87	1.21	.30				
PG	32.37	4.42	29.11	5.78	30.37	4.76	30.19	5.65	31.44	5.91	2.27	.06				
PR	31.06	6.81	29.41	5.80	30.98	5.65	31.17	6.01	31.78	6.04	1.32	.26				
PL	30.89	5.73	28.67	5.58	29.30	5.53	30.07	5.03	30.25	4.77	1.23	.29				
SA	30.64	6.52	28.80	5.22	31.18	4.57	30.12	5.71	31.00	6.29	1.69	.15				

Note. WH = Workaholism; WI = Work Involvement, D = Drive, E = Enjoyment, PWB = Psychological Well-Being; AU = Autonomy, EM = Environmental Mastery, PG = Personal Growth, PR = Personal relations, PL = Purpose in Life, SA = Self-Acceptance.

*p < .05, **p < .01

Table 8 demonstrates the non-significant differences on monthly income of the employees with workaholism and its subscales. Whereas, on the psychological well-being scale employees shows significant ($p < .01$) difference on the mean scores. It indicates that employees who are earning salary 20,000 or below scores greater on psychological well-being than employees who are earning 20,001- 40,000. It is also clear from the table that employees who are earning 80,000 and above scores greater on psychological well-being than employees who are earning salary ranging in 40,001- 60,000.

Table 9: Mean, SD and F-values across Management Level on Work Battery Scale and Psychological Well-Being Scale (N = 253)

Variables	Lower Management (n = 85)		Middle Management (n = 153)		Upper Management (n = 15)		F	p
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
WH	65.18	8.09	66.00	7.11	66.30	8.02	.31	.72
WI	20.62	3.33	21.04	3.19	19.86	2.97	1.16	.31
D	19.53	3.09	19.28	2.90	20.30	3.63	.77	.46
E	25.07	4.03	25.64	3.73	26.35	4.76	.91	.40
PWB	181.31	21.54	176.64	25.61	177.30	23.12	.81	.44
AU	28.00	5.24	27.68	5.12	28.73	5.32	.32	.72
EM	27.95	4.14	27.50	4.06	27.40	4.37	.32	.72
PG	30.97	5.06	30.57	6.05	29.64	3.83	.36	.69
PR	31.35	5.64	30.25	6.09	31.57	5.89	1.02	.36
PL	29.83	5.57	29.60	5.34	28.26	5.17	.52	.59
SA	30.98	5.17	29.79	6.02	30.78	5.33	1.14	.31

Note. WH = Workaholism; WI = Work Involvement, D = Drive, E = Enjoyment, PWB = Psychological Well-Being; AU = Autonomy, EM = Environmental Mastery, PG = Personal Growth, PR = Personal relations, PL = Purpose in Life, SA = Self-Acceptance.
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

The results in the table 9 demonstrate that there is a non-significant difference across different groups of management levels (lower, middle and upper) on Workaholism and its subscale i.e. Work involvement, work drive and work enjoyment. Also there exists a non-significant difference across all management levels on psychological well-being and its subscales.

5. DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to explore the relationship between workaholism and psychological well-being. The study was accompanied in twophases. In first phase, tryout of the instruments was conducted. The purpose of the tryout was to assess if respondents having any difficulty in answering the questionnaire. The scales have been developed for the Western culture; therefore it was necessary to check their suitability and clearness within the Pakistani population. After tryout in Work Battery (Spence & Robbins, 1992) two items were modified. One item of this scale Psychological well-being scale (Ryff & Keyes, 1995) was modified.

Second phase was conducted to test the hypothesis. The results of the main study shows that the scale Work Battery exhibited reliability .78 and for subscale are as follows; for work involvement it is .59 for work drive it is .68 for work enjoyment it is .73. The cronbach alpha value of PWB is .86 and for subscales reliability for PWB is as follows: for autonomy it is .51, for environmental mastery it is .18, for personal growth it is .57, for personal relations it is .68, for purpose in life it is .55 and for self-acceptance it is .66. Environmental mastery shows very low reliability this may be because of the cultural factors. The reason behind this may be that employees may find items of environmental mastery difficult to comprehend.

For the first hypothesis it was assumed that there is an inverse relationship between workaholism and psychological well-being. However, the results exhibited significant positive relationship between workaholism and psychological well-being (see Table 3). Previous studies showed an inverse relationship of Workaholism and psychological well-being. People who are workaholic tend to report more health complaints and therefore experience low psychological well-being. Workaholics may have same state of well-being in comparison to non-workaholics. McMillan and O’ Driscoll (2004) as well as Snir and Zohar (2008), for instance, found no dissimilarities among workaholics and non-workaholics in relation to psychological well-being and positive affect. Moreover, whether workaholism has positive or negative impact on organizations; it is so far not clear (Machlowitz, 1980; Killinger, 1991). Also, views and inferences related to workaholism are numerous and contradictory. Few authors consider workaholism as positively expression (Machlowitz, 1980), whereas many others view workaholism as a negative construct (Killinger, 1991; Oates 1971). Therefore, workaholics are a stereotype of modern life, and they are both praised and criticized.

Workaholics may be seen as an asset in the corporate world, and may be considered as an accepted way of getting promotions in some professions. This may be the reasons that people who are workaholic, they feel ambitious to work and feel driven to work are high on psychological well-being. They may experience deep happiness, wisdom and resilience from work, in this way they might experience well-being. Also, some people work long hours because it is their only source of satisfaction. Some people gain happiness by working harder and longer. In (1980) Machlowitz found that a group of workaholics who are unpredictably contented. They love to work and they feel good about work.

Organizational culture also plays a major role in encouraging workaholic behavior. Cultures of banks are usually that people in banks work longer because of the nature of work they have. Organizations often reward workaholics, and those who work long hours are thought of as dedicated employees. These people are also in a better position to compete for recognition, career development opportunities etc. Therefore, employees may experience well-being because of such opportunities. Also, downsizing has also created more work for fewer staff. Some organizations take pride in developing a culture that encourages long hours and sacrifice to achieve success and development (Hochschild, 1997). However past researchers found that workaholism have negative impact on organizations. Workaholic people on average may experience poor health and as the cost of illness is more for the workaholic individuals therefore, it also affects their physical health and performance (Shimazu, Schaufeli, & Taris, 2010).

The goal of second hypothesis was to explore the gender difference among males and females employees on workaholism. Results revealed that there exists a non-significant relationship when comparing men and females employees (See Table 4). Societies nowadays, are putting equal pressure of work on both the gender. Gender as a matter of fact is also not contributing much to the workaholism. The difference isn't significant so we can conclude that in our society, since one single person supports not only his / her own family, but in most of the cases the dependents include some step relations, grandparents or parents of spouse, financial dependents influences a person to increase working hours to earn more or get promotions.

Gender with respect to psychological well-being found no differences. The result does not support the hypothesis. There exists a non-significant difference between male and females employees on psychological well-being (See Table 4). (Perez, 2012) also indicated that there is non-significant gender difference in relation to environmental mastery, personal growth and self-acceptance. Females and males both may have a sense of continuous growth, may realize themselves as developing and getting higher, and may feel positive in recognizing their prospective.

The main objective of the fourth hypothesis states that middle management will be more workaholic then lower level management. The result also does not support this

hypothesis. There is a non-significant difference among different groups of management level on workaholism and psychological well-being (See Table 9). This may be because employees on all level work hard and longer to succeed and to achieve their career goals. They may feel driven to work may be because they want to accomplish success. Also, no differences were found on psychological well-being across different management groups. This may be because all employees in the organization strive to develop their potential and they have purpose in their life therefore, experience psychological well-being.

The aim of the present study was also to figure out relationship of demographic variables on workaholism and psychological wellbeing. For this purpose several demographics were taken which were marital status, sector, working longer than official timings and income level.. On marital status, it is clear that there is significant ($p < .05$) difference between married and unmarried employees (See table 5) on the subscale of psychological well-being i.e., purpose in life. Married employees have greater purpose in life as compared to unmarried. They feel a sense of direction and they perceive their life as meaningful. They have proper objective in their life. Also there is a non-significant difference on Workaholism (See Table 5). However, previous studies found that there is a difference between married and unmarried people on workaholism. Stress related to work was found to be associated with workaholism and it demonstrates weak marital cohesion (Robinson, Carroll, & Flowers, 2001), negative feelings to their workaholic partners and marital dissatisfaction. Other indication, though, proposes that marital relationships were not harmful because of workaholism. Furthermore, McMillan, O' Driscoll, and Brady (2004) found that self-reported contentment and private relationships with workaholics and their partners. After the first data collection, findings were replicated after 6 months, workaholics knew their problems, as per expectations they didn't refuse them, and for coping mechanism or stress buffer they used their close relationships.

Aim of the study was also to find out differences among employees of banking and telecom sector. Results have demonstrated that employees working in banking sector are more workaholic and are more involved in their work (See Table 6). This might be because that nature of tasks in banking sector requires more involvement in their work. On working longer than office timings or not, it is clear from the results that there is a significant ($p < .01$) difference among employees who work and who don't work in office other than office timings on the subscale of psychological well-being i.e. environmental mastery (See Table 7). Employees who work in office other than office timings have the ability to choose or create environment according to their psychic condition than employees who don't work in office other than office timings.

Another aim of the present study was to investigate the relationship of income with psychological well-being and workaholism. The study has demonstrated that there exist a significant difference on monthly income and psychological wellbeing (See Table 8). Employees who are earning salary 20,000 or below, have high psychological wellbeing

as compared to the employees who are earning salary ranging in 20,000 - 40,000. This may be because employees who are earning salary 20,000 or below, usually start their career. They tend to enjoy the newly professional life and their work so in this way they may experience high level of psychological well-being. Results also demonstrated that employees who are earning 80,000 and above have high psychological well-being as compared to the employees who are earning salary ranging in 20,001 - 40,000. The reason behind this may be that employees, who are earning 80,000 or more, have achieved their goals therefore they may experience more psychological well-being. The results also revealed that there exists a non-significant difference on monthly income and workaholism. They may involve in their work and feel determined to work, to achieve success.

4.1 Conclusion

The research was aimed to investigate the relationship of workaholism and psychological well-being among employees of banking and telecom sector. Results revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between workaholism and psychological well-being. And employees working in banking sector are more workaholic than employees of telecom sector.

4.1.1 Limitations and Suggestions

- Responses were taken from Rawalpindi and Islamabad area. There would be more response variation if the sample is taken from the different cities of Pakistan. Sample should be taken from all over Pakistan so that it has better representativeness.
- Data was collected only from literate people. Data should be collected from educated and ill-literate people so better comparison should come.
- More research should be conducted to know the motivated reasons that why people are more workaholic.
- Data was collected from head offices of banks and telecom, more data can be collected from branches as well.
- Majority of the data was taken from the private sector. Data could be taken from the government sector for better comparison among them.
- There exists relatively little research on the etiology of workaholism or the impact of workaholism throughout the lifespan. Personality, socio-environmental factors, and learning/reinforcement mechanisms need much examination.

Specifically, it is desirable to understand the influence of situational aspects on enjoyment of work and feeling motivated to work.

- Participants were taken from banking and telecom sector. Further empirical examination would be needed to generalize the current results to the other professions and countries.

4.1.2 Implications

- Workaholism is a very wide concept which encompasses various factors which if studied in detail can not only help organizations for managing its human resource but it can also help multi-nationals corporations know the characteristics of workaholics in Pakistan and the different ways of dealing with them.
- This study would open the doors to a whole new concept in Pakistan. The reasons, impacts etc. of workaholism in this country are very different from that of the developed countries due to deviations in culture and traditions. This would mean that ways of dealing with this problem in Pakistan will also be very different from the ways devised by the western countries. In other words, this would give the Human Resource Management, and business institutes an important job of researching and developing extensively the concept in our own country's perspective.

6. REFERENCES

- Aziz, S., & Zickar, M. J. (2006). A cluster analysis investigation of workaholism as a syndrome. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*(1), 52–62. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.11.1.52
- Buelens, M., & Poelmans, S. (2004). Enriching the Spence and Robbins' typology of workaholism. Demographic, motivational and organizational correlates. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17*(5), 440-458. doi: 10.1108/09534810410554470
- Burke, R. J. (2001). Predictors of workaholism components and behaviors. *International Journal of Stress Management, 8*(2), 113-127. doi: 10.1023/A:1009577230051
- Burke, R. J. (2004). Introduction: Workaholism in organizations. *Journal of Organisational Change Management, 17*(5), 420-423.

- George, D. (1997). Working longer hours: Pressure from the boss or pressure from the marketers? *Review of Social Economy*, 55(1), 33-65. doi: 10.1080/00346769700000023
- Gini, A. (1998). Working ourselves to death: *Workaholism, stress, and fatigue*. *Business and Society Review*, 100-101(1), 45-56. doi: 10.1111/0045-3609.00012
- Hochschild, A.R. (1997). *The Time Bind*, Metropolitan Books, New York, NY.
- Killinger, B. (1991). *Workaholics: The respectable addicts*. New York: Simon and Schuster
- Machlowitz, M. (1980). *Workaholics. Living with them, working with them*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Machlowitz, M. (1980). *Workaholics. Living with them, working with them*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- McMillan, L. H. W., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (2004). Workaholism and health: implications for organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(5), 509-520. doi: 10.1108/09534810410554515
- McMillan, L. H. W., O'Driscoll, M. P., Marsh, N. V., & Brady, E. C. (2001). Understanding workaholism: Data synthesis, theoretical critique, and future design strategies. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 8(2), 69-91. doi: 10.1023/A:1009573129142
- McMillan, L. H. W., O'Driscoll, M. P., Marsh, N. V., & Brady, E. C. (2001). Understanding workaholism: Data synthesis, theoretical critique, and future design strategies. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 8(2), 69-91. doi: 10.1023/A:1009573129142
- Oates, W. E. (1971). *Confessions of a workaholic: The facts about work addiction*. New York: World Publishing.
- Porter, G. (2004). Work, work ethic, work excess. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(5), 424-439. doi: 10.1108/09534810410554461
- Robinson, B. E. (1998). *Chained to the desk: a guidebook for workaholics, their partners and children, and the clinicians who treat them* (2nd ed.). New York: New York University Press
- Robinson, B. E. (2000). Workaholism: Bridging the Gap between Workplace, Sociocultural, and Family Research. *Journal of Employment Counselling*, 37(1), 31-47. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-1920.2000.tb01024.x
- Robinson, B. E., Flowers, C., & Carroll, J. (2001). Work stress and marriage: A theoretical model examining the relationships between workaholism and marital cohesion. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 8(2), 165-175. doi: 10.1023/A:1009533415030
- Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719-727.
- Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719-727.
- Schor, J. B. (1991). *The overworked American: The unexpected decline of leisure*. New York: Basic Books.
- Scott, K. S., Moore, K. S., & Miceli, M. P. (1997). An exploration of the meaning and consequences of workaholism. *Human Relations*, 50(3), 287-314. doi: 10.1023/A:1016986307298
- Seybold, K. C., & Salomone, P. R. (1994). Understanding workaholism: A review of causes and counseling approaches. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 73(1), 4-10. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.1994.tb01702.x
- Shimazu, A., Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2010). How does workaholism affect worker health and performance? The mediating role of coping. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 17(2), 154-160. doi: 10.1007/s12529-010-9077-x
- Snir, R., & Zohar, D. (2008). Workaholism as discretionary time investment at work: An experience-sampling study. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 57(1), 109-127. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2006.00270.x
- 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
- Vodanovich, S. J. & Piotrowski, C. (2006). Workaholism: a critical but neglected factor in O.D. *Organisational Development Journal*, 24(2), 55-60
- World Health Organization (1948). *Preamble to the constitution of the World Health Organization*. In Official records of the World Health Organization Ginebra: World Health Organization.

Author's Profile

Warda Sahar holds a Master's degree in psychology. Her research interests include human resources, organizational behavior and management. She can be reached at:
ws.saharwarda@gmail.com