

## ABSTRACT

Ryan M. Weber. THE ARTISTIC WORKER VERSUS THE WHITE-COLLAR PROFESSIONAL: WORKAHOLISM, WORK/NONWORK INTERFERENCE AND ENHANCEMENT, AND OBSESSIVE COMPULSIVE BEHAVIOR IN TWO SAMPLES (Under the direction of Dr. Shahnaz Aziz) Department of Psychology, April, 2011.

Artists are an important although often misunderstood part of the workforce. This study sought to shed light on the work habits of this population by conducting a discriminant function analysis to differentiate between a sample of white-collar professionals and a sample of artistic workers on workaholism and two of its correlates: work/nonwork interference and enhancement, and obsessive compulsive behavior. Contrary to hypotheses 1 and 2, no difference was found between these two groups on either measure of workaholism, on hours worked, or in work interference with personal life. In line with hypotheses 3 and 4, results indicated a significant difference between the two groups on work enhancement of personal life such that self-employed artists scored higher, and no significant difference between these groups on obsessive-compulsive behavior. Additional results revealed a significant difference between white-collar professionals and artists on work enjoyment such that artists scored higher, and the control measure of the WART such that white-collar professionals scored higher. A breakdown of these groups by self-employment status revealed that being self-employed was a significant factor in determining work enhancement of personal life. These results reinforce the study of artists' work behaviors as important for future research involving work/nonwork balance.

*Keywords:* workaholism, artist, white-collar, work/nonwork, work enjoyment, self-employed



THE ARTISTIC WORKER VERSUS THE WHITE-COLLAR PROFESSIONAL:  
WORKAHOLISM, WORK/NONWORK INTERFERENCE AND ENHANCEMENT, AND  
OBSESSIVE COMPULSIVE BEHAVIOR IN TWO SAMPLES

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Psychology

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirement for the Degree of

Master of Arts in Psychology

by

Ryan Weber

April 11, 2011

© (Ryan M. Weber, 2011)

THE ARTISTIC WORKER VERSUS THE WHITE-COLLAR PROFESSIONAL:  
WORKAHOLISM, WORK/NONWORK INTERFERENCE AND ENHANCEMENT, AND  
OBSESSIVE COMPULSIVE BEHAVIOR IN TWO SAMPLES

By

Ryan M. Weber

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF THESIS

\_\_\_\_\_  
Shahnaz Aziz, Ph.D

COMMITTEE MEMBER

\_\_\_\_\_  
Karl L. Wuensch, Ph.D

COMMITTEE MEMBER

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Baranik, Ph.D

CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kathleen Row, Ph.D

DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul J. Gemperline, Ph.D

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank my thesis committee chair Dr. Shahnaz Aziz for her inspiration, support, feedback and encouragement throughout the thesis development and writing process. I would also like to thank Drs. Karl Wuensch and Lisa Baranik, my committee members, for their extensive advice, constructive criticism and guidance during this long process. I'd also like to thank my fellow graduate students at East Carolina University who provided a wealth of information and gentle nudges in the right direction when it was needed. To Penland School of Crafts, the College of Fine Arts and Communication at East Carolina University, the Arts Councils of Pitt and Moore counties, the Seagrove, NC area potters, Professor Mike Sanford at Elon University and all other artists or artistic organizations who participated or facilitated participation in this survey, thank you. Finally I'd like to thank my parents, Ron and Rosemary Weber for their love and support throughout my education and this process.

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
What is Workaholism .....	3
Measuring Workaholism .....	5
What is Obsessive Compulsive Behavior.....	6
Obsessive Compulsive Behavior and Workaholism.....	6
What is Work/Nonwork Interference?.....	8
Workaholism and Work/Nonwork Interference .....	9
Self-employed Versus Salaried Workers.....	10
Workaholism.....	11
Compulsivity.....	11
Hours Worked.....	12
Job Satisfaction .....	12
Current Study.....	13
Study Hypotheses .....	14
Hypothesis 1 .....	14
Hypothesis 2 .....	14
Hypothesis 3 .....	15
Hypothesis 4 .....	15
Method.....	17
Participants .....	17
Procedure .....	19
Measures.....	20

Workaholism.....	20
Obsessive-compulsive behavior .....	21
Work/nonwork interference and enhancement .....	21
Work enjoyment .....	22
Data Analysis.....	22
Results.....	24
Data Screening.....	24
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations .....	24
Discriminant Function Analysis .....	29
Artists vs. White-Collar Professionals on the Major Scales.....	29
Artists vs. White-Collar Professionals on the Subscales.....	32
Self-employed artists vs. Non-self-employed Artists vs. Non-self-employed White-Collar Professionals .....	35
Self-employed Artists vs. Non-self-employed Artists.....	39
Self-employed Artists vs. Non-self-employed White-Collar Professionals .....	39
Tests of Hypotheses.....	41
Hypothesis 1a .....	41
Hypothesis 1b .....	42
Hypothesis 2 .....	42
Hypothesis 3 .....	43
Hypothesis 4 .....	43
Discussion.....	44
Correlations Among Age, Gender, Hours, Salary and Time.....	44



Scale Differences by Occupation.....	46
Work Enjoyment.....	46
Workaholism.....	47
OCB .....	47
Work/NonWork Interference and Enhancement .....	48
Study Limitations.....	49
Practical Implications .....	50
Directions for Future Research.....	51
Conclusions.....	52
References.....	53
Appendix A: IRB Approval Form .....	59
Appendix B: Consent Form .....	61
Appendix C: Measures .....	65

## List of Tables

1. Classification of Worker Types .....	7
2. Correlations and Descriptive Statistics ( $N = 177$ ) .....	26
3. WART & WNIE Subscale Correlations and Descriptive Statistics ( $N=177$ ).....	28
4. White-Collar (Shaded) vs. Artist (Un-shaded) Correlations ( $N=177$ ).....	29
5. Structure of the Discriminant Function (Structure Matrix) .....	30
6. Group Means on the Five Main Variables.....	31
7. Tests of Equality of Group Means.....	31
8. Structure of the Discriminant Function (Structure Matrix) .....	33
9. Group Means on the Subscales and Work Enjoyment .....	34
10. Tests of Equality of Group Means.....	35
11. Frequencies: Occupation by Employment.....	36
12. Structure of the Discriminant Functions (Structure Matrix).....	37
13. Group Means .....	38
14. Tests of Equality of Group Means.....	38
15. Tests of Equality of Group Means .....	39
16. Tests of Equality of Group Means.....	41
17. Tests of Equality of Group Means.....	42

## Chapter I: Introduction

*“Being good in business is the most fascinating kind of art. Making money is art and working is art and good business is the best art.” - Andy Warhol*

Though definitions abound, workaholism is commonly conceptualized as “an addiction to work, the compulsion or the uncontrollable need to work incessantly” (Oates, 1971, p. 11). Ever since the introduction of the concept in the early seventies, scientific interest in the area of workaholism has grown rapidly (Schaufeli, Bakker, van der Heijden, & Prins, 2009). The number of hours U.S. employees are working per week has also increased, rising from 43 to 47 hours in the last decade (Austin, 2000), with Americans edging out international competition in the more than 45 hours worked per week category. However, opinions, observations, and conclusions regarding workaholism have been both varied and conflicting, thereby necessitating further research on this topic (Burke & Koxsal, 2002).

Although research on the correlates of workaholism is somewhat limited (Brady, Vodanovich, & Rotunda, 2008), the importance of studying these correlates is as important as studying workaholism itself. Doing so provides opportunities for intervention on the negative aspects of workaholism and increases the overall understanding of workaholism as a problem that affects and is affected by more than time spent working. Some such relationships have been observed, among which is the concept of work/nonwork interference, as has been demonstrated in numerous studies (Aziz & Zickar, 2006; Bonebright, Clay, & Ankenmann, 2000; Brady, Vodanovich, & Rotunda, 2008; Piotrowski & Vodanovich, 2008; Taris, Schaufeli, & Verhoeven, 2005). Work/nonwork interference is bidirectional in that it includes work interfering with nonwork (e.g., family) and nonwork interfering with work, both of which have been explored extensively in the research. With the boundaries between personal life and work becoming more

and more blurred (Fletcher & Bailyn, 1996) research on work-life conflict has become increasingly relevant and as such will be examined in greater detail in the current study.

Obsessive-compulsive behavior, though more often referenced in clinical settings, has also emerged as a correlate of workaholism (Mudrack, 2006). Its relevance to Oate's (1971) definition is apparent in that the definition implies an internal drive to work, which could be at least partially explained by obsessive-compulsive behavior. Various studies have highlighted this crossover of clinical psychology into I/O psychology (Chonk, 1983; Liang & Chu, 2009; Mudrack, 2004; Naughton, 1987) highlighting obsessive compulsive behavior as a potential trait which contributes to workaholism. Bridging the gap between organizational and clinical research in the study of workaholism, as previous research has done, is essential for the future understanding of this construct.

A PsycINFO search on workaholism research revealed that certain careers are underrepresented in this area of study. Although white-collar workers have a healthy representation (Aziz & Zickar, 2006; Burke, 2001; Burke & Koxsal, 2002), blue-collar workers are notably less so (Kanai & Wakabayashi, 2001). Additionally, although workaholism in organizations has been explored, and workaholism in self-employed workers has been touched upon (Gorgievski, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2010; Morales, 2009; Snir & Harpaz, 2004; Taris, Geurts, Schaufeli, Blonk, & Lagerveld, 2008), no research to date has examined workaholism in artistic careers. The importance of studying this group of people and their work behaviors is underscored by their presence in the workforce. According to a report issued by the National Endowment for the Arts (2008a) based primarily on US Census data and billed as "the first nationwide look at artists' demographic and employment patterns in the 21st century (National Endowment for the Arts, 2008b, p.1)", artists comprised of 1.9 million workers or 1.4% of the

American workforce and are one of the largest occupation groups in the country just behind active-duty and reserve personnel in the U.S. military. They represent a larger group than the legal profession (lawyers, judges, and paralegals) or medical doctors (physicians, surgeons, and dentists), groups that are more extensively represented in workaholism literature. Access to this group of individuals could be to blame, as could the notion that “white-collar professionals are typically associated with workaholism” (Aziz & Zickar, 2006, p. 55). Although what is apparent is that although the size of the artistic community gives it extraordinary income (\$70 billion annually) “in terms of sheer numbers, artists represent a powerful labor force whose economic contributions go largely unrecognized by both the general public and the government (National Endowment for the Arts, 2008a, p. iii)” and apparently by research as well.

By limiting the scope and influence of workaholism to white-collar jobs, research has neglected a population that may provide insight into the comprehensive understanding of workaholism and its correlates. The purpose of the current study, therefore, is to compare workaholism in a white-collar sample to workaholism with a sample of individuals in artistic occupations, ranging from sculptors to painters to actors to musicians. Additionally work non/work interference and obsessive-compulsive behavior, which are correlates of workaholism, will be examined with respect to the two participant groups (i.e., white-collar professionals and artistic workers).

### **What is Workaholism?**

The term workaholism, coined by Oates (1971) forty years ago, has penetrated popular culture and driven research interests since its inception. However, as of yet, there seems to be no consensus on a complete and accurate definition of workaholism in the research (Ng, 2007). Although Bonebright, Clay, and Ankenmann (2000) found that workaholics were likely to work

more hours per week than their nonworkaholic counterparts, research suggests that the mere number of hours worked is insufficient to define a workaholic (Aziz & Zickar, 2006; Machlowitz, 1980). That is, other underlying factors such as dispositional traits, sociocultural experiences, and behavioral reinforcements, are involved in the addiction to work (Ng, 2007).

One of the more widely accepted definitions of workaholism is Spence and Robbins's (1992) development of the workaholic triad that consists of three dimensions of workaholism: work involvement, work drive, and work enjoyment. Work involvement is the extent to which a worker devotes himself to a project and makes constructive use of his time. Work drive is indicative of the internal motivation to work. Work enjoyment involves drawing pleasure from work. Based on high and low scores on these three facets, Spence and Robbins defined the workaholic as someone high on work involvement and drive to work, but low on work enjoyment. This conceptualization of workaholism is one of the most prevalent in the workaholism literature (Bonebright et al., 2000).

More recently, the notion of workaholism as a syndrome has been explored by Aziz and Zickar (2006), as well as Piotrowski and Vodanovich (2008). A syndrome is defined by the medical community as "a combination of signs and/or symptoms that forms a distinct clinical picture indicative of a particular disorder" (Oxford University Press, 2010). In the past, the syndrome classification has been applied to such psychological concepts as burnout (Jackson, Schwab, & Schuler, 1986), rape trauma (Burgess & Holmstrom, 1974), child abuse (Koszuth, 1991), and post-traumatic stress disorder (Figley, 1988). For example, burnout has operationalized as a three-component psychological syndrome comprising of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and feelings of low personal accomplishment. Research is similar in workaholism such that three components of workaholism, namely, high work involvement,

high work drive, and low work enjoyment (as described by Spence & Robbins, 1992) are necessary though not sufficient conditions for classification as a workaholic. Assigning such a set of distinct characteristics to workaholism not only furthers research implications, but also provides guidance for effective intervention and treatment strategies on a clinical level.

### **Measuring Workaholism**

Few empirically validated measures of workaholism currently exist (McMillan, O'Driscoll, Marsh, & Brady, 2001). The Work Addiction Risk Test (WART), developed by Robinson (1989), is a self-report measure that assesses five dimensions of workaholism. The five dimensions that comprise the WART include: compulsive tendencies, control, impaired communication/self-absorption, inability to delegate, and self worth. In this 25-item inventory, respondents are instructed to rate each item on a four-point Likert-type scale as to how true the statement reflects their behavior in a work setting. Validity for the WART has been demonstrated in several different studies. For example, Robinson, Post and Khakee (1992) reported a test-retest correlation coefficient of .83 after a two-week interval, and a phi coefficient of .85. Robinson and Post (1995) reported a Spearman Brown Split half reliability of .85 and Robinson (1999) reported a coefficient alpha of .88 based on 363 respondents.

The Workaholism Battery or WorkBAT, developed by Spence and Robbins (1992), is an alternative to the WART and is considered the most widely used instrument in workaholism research (McMillan, O'Driscoll, Marsh, & Brady, 2001). It is a 25-item self-report measure, utilizing a five-point Likert response format that consists of three scales (i.e., work involvement, work drive, and work enjoyment). The WorkBAT has been demonstrated to have adequate content validity and face validity. Additionally, convergent validity has been established with job involvement, hours worked, and perfectionism (McMillan et al., 2001). Moreover, some

discrepancy exists in its internal factor structure such that low alphas have been reported on the work involvement facet (Cronbach's alpha = .69; Spence & Robbins, 1992).

### **What is Obsessive Compulsive Behavior?**

Obsessive-compulsive behavior is becoming an increasingly important variable in the workaholism research. The concept of obsessive compulsion can be traced back to Freudian theory (as cited in Schwartz, 1983) and has its roots in both medicine and psychiatry. The DSM-IV criterion points out the distinction between obsessive compulsion as a neurosis and as a personality orientation. From a clinical perspective, obsessions can be viewed as a syndrome of persistent thoughts; however, the psychological literature refers to it in terms of traits such as obstinacy and orderliness. Although the DSM-IV recognizes obsessive-compulsive personality as a diagnosable disorder and general personality orientation, obsessive-compulsion has also been viewed as not so extreme as to constitute a disorder and may in fact be part of normal human behavior (Macdonald & De Silva, 1999). In the current study, the focus is on obsessive-compulsive personality traits and behaviors, rather than the disorder referred to in the DSM-IV.

From a personality characteristic perspective, obsessive compulsion involves such traits as obstinacy, inconclusiveness, orderliness, and parsimony (Naughton, 1987). Examples of obstinacy include over-conscientiousness at work, as well as rigidity and excessive control in performing assignments. Inconclusiveness pertains to difficulty completing a task, orderliness involves routines and rituals, and parsimony refers to valuing one's time. This perspective, as well as other evidence, suggests that obsessive compulsion is a multidimensional construct.

### **Obsessive Compulsive Behavior and Workaholism**

Aziz, Wuensch, and Brandon (2010) investigated Spence and Robbins's (1992) worker types (see Table 1) in terms of correlates of workaholism. Working professionals were classified



into different worker types following the traditional median-split technique as well as with a composites approach they developed to capture the worker types in a continuous fashion. Their study found the positively engaged worker and the workaholic composites to be significantly positively correlated with obsessive-compulsive behavior ( $r = .32$  and  $.25$ , respectively). Results also indicated that the work drive component of workaholism likely has the strongest relationship with obsessive-compulsive behavior.

Table 1

*Classification of Worker Types*

Worker Type	Work Involvement	Work Drive	Work Enjoyment
Positively engaged worker	High	High	High
Workaholic	High	High	Low
Unengaged worker	Low	Low	Low
Work enthusiast	High	Low	High
Relaxed worker	Low	Low	High
Disenchanted worker	Low	High	Low

Bonebright et al. (2000) refer to obsessive-compulsive behavior or obsessive-compulsive personality as one of three possible causal explanations for workaholism. Chonk (1983) and Naughton (1987) have both tied obsessive-compulsive personality with workaholism to the extent that job involvement may be related to obsessive compulsion. Work behaviors may be a

way of manifesting obsessive-compulsive tendencies, according to Naughton (1987), but caution should be taken in that devotion to one's work or career might differ from obsessive compulsion.

Also falling in line with Naughton (1987) are the findings of Liang and Chu (2009). They identified antecedents of workaholism, including such personality traits as obsessive-compulsive personality, Type A personality, and need for achievement, that theoretically support the correlation between obsessive compulsion and workaholism. The DSM-IV also lays support to the theories of Chonk and Naughton in that it includes in its diagnostic criteria for Obsessive Compulsive Personality Disorder: "...excessively devoted to work and productivity to the exclusion of leisure activities and friendships." (American Psychiatric Association, 2000)

### **What is Work/Nonwork Interference?**

*"Let me know when your whole life goes up in smoke. Means it's time for a promotion"*  
*–The Devil Wears Prada*

Work/nonwork conflict, work-family conflict, work/nonwork interference; these are all terms which address the work/life interface. The idea of the work/life interface has been a topic of discussion in casual conversation and popular culture for many years. The primary point of contention in the literature has not so much been what constitutes work itself, but what constitutes nonwork and how does one separate nonwork from family as a construct.

Work-family conflict has been defined as "a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect" (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985, p.77). In more recent research, attempts have been made to differentiate between work-family conflict and work/nonwork conflict in response to past research which has confused and comingled the two constructs (Fisher, Bulgar, & Smith, 2009; Voydanoff, 2005). In doing so the work, family, and community framework has been introduced and has been conceptualized as the theoretical underpinning of work/nonwork conflict. Rather

than focusing solely on family in its relationship to work as work/family conflict does, work/nonwork conflict incorporates non-familial elements which may contribute to conflict and/or enhancement of work. This conceptualization results in a more holistic portrayal of the work/nonwork interface, and thus will be the one used in the current study.

Although several self report measures (e.g., Gutek, Searle & Kelpa's (1991) Work Interference with Family Scale; Carlson, Kacmar & Williams' (2000) Work-Family Conflict Scale; Fisher, Bulgar, & Smith's (2009) Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement Scale) have been developed to assess work-life imbalance, the major difference between them is the focus on family as opposed to nonwork. Many of the earlier measures tend to blur the lines between family and nonwork, which may alienate some participants, thereby decreasing the measure's content validity. Fisher et al.'s (2009) scale is inclusive and has been shown to be a valid measure of work/nonwork interference and enhancement, regardless of familial or marital status, which is a huge step forward in this area of research. That is, by assessing both sides of the spectrum and focusing on work/nonwork as opposed to work/family, they created a construct with increased generalizability and clarity as compared with previous measures. Due to the sound theoretical basis behind their model, Fisher et al.'s (2009) notion of work/nonwork is deemed appropriate for use in the current study.

### **Workaholism and Work/Nonwork Interference**

Given that empirical research on workaholism is in its infancy, it is not surprising that only a few studies have examined the relationship between workaholism and work-life balance. In an early review of the literature and commentary on counseling implications, Seybold and Salomone (1994) posited that workaholism affects an employee's lifestyle and family negatively

to the extent that both personal and family life may suffer as a result of a family member's workaholism.

In a more recent empirical investigation, Aziz and Zickar (2006) sought to establish correlates of workaholism and to conceptualize workaholism as a syndrome in a sample of 174 white-collar professionals and their acquaintances (e.g., spouse, coworker, close friend). Among other things, they found that workaholics experienced more work-life imbalance and less life satisfaction than nonworkaholics. In their cluster analysis of Spence and Robbins's (1992) triad of workaholism, they identified a cluster of individuals that corresponded to the workaholic profile (high work involvement, high work drive, low work enjoyment). In doing so, they found empirical support for the notion that workaholism should be conceptualized as a syndrome.

More recently, Brady, Vodanovich, & Rotunda (2008), examined the relationship between workaholism and work-family conflict, job satisfaction, and enjoyment of leisure time in a sample of 232 white-collar employees. They found that higher scores on Robinson's (1989) Work Addiction Risk Test were related to greater work-family conflict and lower gratification with leisure time. They concluded that workaholism was a significant predictor of work-family conflict, whereas, high work enjoyment was significantly related to lower work-family conflict.

### **Self-Employed Versus Salaried Workers**

Many professional artists are self-employed and unaffiliated, according to Abbing (2002) and Menger (1999), and echoed by the National Endowment for the Arts (2008a) who report as many as 56% of visual artists identify themselves as being self-employed, indicating a fundamental difference between white-collar workers and artists since fewer than 10% of the general labor force considers themselves to be self-employed (National Endowment for the Arts,

2008a). Consequently, this difference between the two types of workers bears exploration due to its potential influence on work habits, as well as potential implications for nonwork life.

**Workaholism.** Although the difference between traditional salaried workers and self-employed workers, in terms of workaholism and other work-related factors, has been explored recently in research, the majority of the literature has focused on the salaried worker. A study by Gorgievski, Bakker, and Schaufeli, (2010) is one of the few and the most recent notable examples of such a comparison. In their study of a Dutch sample of 262 self-employed workers and 1,900 salaried workers, they found that the self-employed scored significantly higher on work engagement and working excessively than their salaried counterparts, although this was not so for working compulsively. This finding is indicative of a positive motivation by self-employed workers in that their job characteristics lend them to exhibit self-motivation rather than stress.

Likewise, Taris et al. (2008), in a sample of Dutch workers, found that perceived health among self-employed workers was negatively related to their inability to detach from work, which is one of two components they used to define the construct of workaholism. In other words, workaholism and well-being were related and inability to detach from work, not number of hours worked, was the primary correlate of poor health; number of hours worked (observed in self employed workers) was weakly correlated with poor health.

**Compulsivity.** Gorgievski, Bakker, and Schaufeli (2010) found self-employed workers to be more passionate about work in that they were higher on work engagement and working excessively than non self-employed workers. In turn, this led to better self-reported performance, but the self-employed workers did not work more compulsively, which is considered a key component of workaholism (Oates, 1971).

**Hours worked.** Snir and Harpaz (2004) found that self-employed respondents worked significantly more hours (i.e., an average of seven more hours) per week than their non-self-employed counterparts. Their findings have been supported by a recent Gallup poll which found that nearly half of the self-employed workers surveyed, typically worked more than 44 hours per week (Morales, 2009). The same poll, which aggregated the results of over 2,000 telephone surveys conducted over a three year period, revealed some interesting findings. That is, despite the recession, Americans are working about the same number of hours as they have been for the last few years, self-employed workers are most likely to work long hours, and education is positively related to work hours. Though this does not directly prove the self-employed worker as having more incidences of workaholism than the non-self-employed, it does indicate (and further support) an emerging trend about the self-employed worker's excessive work behavior. Likewise, artists may be apt to taking on secondary jobs to supplement their income, thus contributing to their overall hours worked according to Abbing (2002).

**Job Satisfaction.** Business owners, operationalized as the self-employed, are still ahead of other professions in terms of well-being and overall job satisfaction, according to a 2010 Gallup poll of over 120,000 participants (Witters, 2010). This same Gallup poll classified artists in a "professional" category along with doctors, lawyers and musicians, ranking that group lower in job satisfaction than business owners, but still higher than managers/executives. This suggests that artists (self-employed or not) still report higher job satisfaction ratings than non-self-employed business people.

Shalley, Gilson and Blum (2000) and Runco (1995) offer a more direct connection between artists and job satisfaction. Shalley et. al (2000) determined that jobs requiring a high degree of creativity were complex, autonomous and demanding. Subjects in that study had

higher satisfaction and expressed less intention to leave when elements of work environment were in harmony with the creativity demands of the job (Shalley et al., 2000). In a study of artists who worked in organizations, Runco (1995) found that having a creative personality and working in a climate associated with creative performance made an important contribution to the artists' job satisfaction.

Overall, based on the existing research, one could surmise that self-employment status and creativity on the job contribute to job satisfaction in a significant way. As such creativity and autonomy associated with self-employment may be contributing factors in the differences found between artistic and white-collar workers, given that self-employment has been found to have implications for working behaviors when compared to the non-self-employed worker.

### **Current Study**

The increasing relevance of workaholism in the modern working world, as evidenced by the increasing number of hours worked per week and the growing concern for employee well-being, reinforces the need for additional research on workaholism in terms of its antecedents and correlates. As such, investigation of a diverse set of careers on which workaholism research is conducted serves to further complete the nomological net and to contribute to a better understanding of the workaholism syndrome as a whole.

The purpose of the current study; therefore, was to expand our understanding of workaholism by examination of obsessive-compulsive behavior and work/nonwork interference and their relationships with workaholism in both a traditional white-collar and a nontraditional artistic sample. In comparing the relationships between obsessive-compulsive behavior, work/nonwork interference, and workaholism in both samples, a broader understanding of the

workaholism syndrome may be reached and light may be shed on careers which have, up until now, been largely overlooked in the literature.

### **Study Hypotheses**

As discussed earlier, previous research (Snir & Harpaz, 2004) has found self-employed workers to work longer hours compared to their non-self-employed counterparts. This in turn contributes to the incidence of workaholism as represented in the findings of Bonebright, Clay, and Ankenmann (2000) who found that workaholics were likely to work more hours per week than nonworkaholics. Given these findings and the finding by Abbing (2002) that the vast majority of artists consider themselves to be self-employed, the following hypothesis is presented:

**Hypothesis 1:** Creatively self-employed workers will work more hours per week and will have higher levels of workaholism than white-collar professionals.

Fisher et. al (2009) conducted a confirmatory factor analysis on the Work/NonWork Interference and Enhancement Scale (WNIE), which revealed that work interference with personal life and personal life interference with work were significantly negatively related to job satisfaction. Gorgievski et. al, (2010) reports that working excessively occurs more often in the self-employed, a group to which most artists identify themselves (Menger, 1999). Moreover, working excessively is seen as a tenet of work interference with personal life as described by the theoretic underpinnings of Fisher's et. al (2009) survey design and conceptualization of the work and nonwork interface. Given this relationship between the self-employed, working excessively and work interference with personal life (a subscale of the work/nonwork interference scale), the following hypothesis is presented:

**Hypothesis 2:** Creatively self-employed workers will have higher levels of



work/nonwork interference compared to white-collar professionals.

Research has shown that job satisfaction among self-employed workers is higher than in other job categories, including managerial and executive level positions (Witters, 2010). Moreover, Fisher et. al (2009) conducted a confirmatory factor analysis on the Work/NonWork Interference and Enhancement Scale (WNIE), which revealed that work interference with personal life and work enhancement of personal life were both significantly related to job satisfaction. Shalley et al. (2000) determined that jobs requiring a high degree of creativity were also relatively complex, autonomous and demanding, yet relatively low on organizational controls. Subjects had higher satisfaction and expressed less intention to leave when elements of the work environment were in harmony with the creativity demands of the job (Shalley et al., 2000). In a study of artists who worked in organizations, Runco (1995) found that having a creative personality and working in a climate associated with creative performance made an important contribution to the artists' job satisfaction. Given that a significant portion of artists are self-employed and given that the Work Enhancement of Personal Life subscale of the WNIE has been shown to be related to job satisfaction, the following hypothesis is presented:

**Hypothesis 3:** Creatively self-employed workers will have higher levels of work/nonwork enhancement than white-collars.

Workaholics in both the artistic and the white-collar samples are expected to show obsessive-compulsive behavior given that, to date, no differences have been found in the literature between these two groups. Gorgievski et. al (2010) reported that self-employed workers did not score higher on working compulsively when compared to salaried employees. Given the findings of Gorgievski (2010) the following hypothesis is presented:

**Hypothesis 4:** Levels of obsessive-compulsive behavior in the white-collar sample will

be similar to the creatively self-employed sample.

## **Chapter II: Method**

### **Participants**

Data from 202 participants in two separate sample groups (i.e., white-collar and creatively artistic) was collected utilizing online survey software. Data from twenty-five participants were deleted due to more than 10% of the questions being unanswered on a given variable, leaving 177 surveys completed. Participation was voluntary, confidential, and anonymous, and all standards set by the Institutional Review Board guiding data collection were followed. A copy of the IRB approval form is available in Appendix A.

The white-collar sample participants were identified by personal contacts of the researcher who were then asked to pass the survey along to qualified associates. Respondents included individuals in both managerial and non-managerial positions and included job titles ranging from data analyst to college professor and included a variety of primarily U.S. based organizations in the Northeastern and Southeastern regions of the country.

Demographics collected included gender, age, average number of hours worked per week and length of time spent in the current organization and in the current position. This subset, totaling 86 participants or 49% of the total study, comprised of men (36%) and women (64%), and included employees from non-management positions (31%), lower, middle and senior management (33%) as well as college professors (33%). Job titles included Assistant Professor, executive director, analyst, and lawyer to name a few. As to age, nearly half of this group were over the age of 40 (49%), 25 and under (20%), 26-30 (13%), 31-35 (11%), and 36-40 (7%). Ninety percent of this group reported being Caucasian, another 6% reported being Asian or Pacific Islander, and 2% reported being African American. The average number of hours worked per week was 46-50. The breakdown of participants in the hours worked category was as

follows: 35 or less (9%), 36-40 (21%), 41-45 (13%), 46-50 (16%), 51-55 (21%), 56-60 (9%), and more than 60 (11%). The average salary reported was \$60,000 - \$79,999 per year with the breakdown of participants in the salary category as follows: less than \$20,000 (2%), \$20,000-\$39,999 (19%), \$40,000-\$59,999 (28%), \$60,000-\$79,999 (17%), \$80,000-\$99,999 (5%), \$100,000-\$149,999 (16%), \$150,000 or more (9%). This group was also well-educated, with 24% having a four year degree, 36% having a Master's degree and 27% having a doctoral degree. 92% of this group did not consider themselves to be self-employed.

The artistic sample consisted of full time potters, crafts people, and artists of a diverse skill set, including visual and performing artists in an effort to make the sample generalizable to artists of many types. This group was recruited through personal contacts of the researcher and also through the cooperation of arts schools and organizations whose member contact lists were utilized to distribute the survey. Art professors were grouped into this category while all other professors were grouped into the white-collar sample. Those in this group were primarily located in the United States however a number of respondents were also recruited from European countries including Denmark, Turkey and the UK.

This subset, totaling 91 participants or 51% of the total study, comprised of men (48%) and women (52%) and included artists of varying disciplines including: Ceramic Artists (29%), Glass Blower/Glass Artist (26%), Art Professor/Instructor (20%) and Sculptor (19%). An additional 20% classified their discipline as Other with such entries as Neon Artist, Choreographer, Book Artist, and Flameworker. Twenty-three artists classified themselves as being artists of multiple disciplines, which drove the total number of selections in this category to 129 explaining why the aforementioned percentages exceed 100%. A variety of ages were represented but more than half of this group was over age 40, 25 and under (6%), 26-30 (12%),

31-35 (15%), 36-40 (11%), and over 40 (56%). Ninety-two percent of this group reported being Caucasian, another 1% reported being Asian or Pacific Islander, another 1% Native American, and 6% Other. The average number of hours worked per week was 46-50. The breakdown of participants in the hours worked category was as follows: 35 or less (14%), 36-40 (15%), 41-45 (10%), 46-50 (11%), 51-55 (13%), 56-60 (13%), and more than 60 (23%). The average salary reported was \$20,000 - \$39,999 per year with the breakdown of participants in the salary category as follows: less than \$20,000 (32%), \$20,000-\$39,999 (34%), \$40,000-\$59,999 (11%), \$60,000-\$79,999 (13%), \$80,000-\$99,999 (3%), \$100,000-\$149,999 (2%), and \$150,000 or more (2%). This group was also fairly well-educated, with 11% having a high school education, 10% having an associates degree, 28% having a four year degree, 40% having a masters and 6% having a doctoral degree. Seventy-four percent of this group considered themselves to be self-employed.

## **Procedure**

Participants were initially recruited through professional contacts and were subsequently asked to forward the online survey invitation to other white-collar or artistic workers in order to maximize the number of respondents. An email was sent containing the link to the survey, which was developed and administered using Qualtrics online survey software. Upon clicking the survey link, an informed consent form was first presented to each study participant prior to being presented with the survey itself (see Appendix B). The survey contained measures of workaholism, work/nonwork interference, work enjoyment and obsessive-compulsive behavior, as well as demographic information (see Appendix B). Anonymity and confidentiality were maintained throughout the survey process. Survey completion was on a voluntary basis and participants were made aware that they were free to stop during any part of the survey process.

Completion of the survey required approximately 10 minutes. The data was entered into Predictive Analysis SoftWare (PASW) for statistical analyses.

## **Measures**

Self-report has been gauged as an effective method to assess workaholism and its correlates. In fact, Aziz and Zickar (2006) found acquaintance reports to have substantiated the self-reported measures of workaholism. That is, reports by spouses, friends, and significant others were judged to be as accurate as self report measures, thereby eliminating the need to verify the accuracy of self-report in this case.

**Workaholism.** The 25-item Work Addiction Risk Test (WART), developed by Robinson (1999), was used to measure workaholism in the current study (see Appendix B, Working Styles). The WART is a self-report measure that assesses compulsive tendencies (items 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 18, 19, and 20), control (items 2, 4, 11, 12, 16, 17, and 22), impaired communication/self-absorption (items 13, 21, 23, 24, and 25), inability to delegate (item 1), and self-worth (items 9 and 10); the total WART score was used to assess workaholism. Respondents were instructed to rate each item on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (*very untrue of me*) to (*very true of me*). A sample item from this scale includes: “I feel guilty when I am not working on something.” None of the items needed to be reverse scored. The coefficient alpha of this scale as reported by Robinson (1999) is .88. The current study produced a reliability coefficient of .84 for the total WART and Cronbach’s alphas of .81 for Compulsive Tendencies; .77 for Control; and .62 for Inability to Delegate.

For exploratory purposes, the Workaholism Analysis Questionnaire (WAQ; Swords, Aziz, Walker, & Wuensch, 2008)), a newly developed, unpublished, measure of workaholism was also included in the analyses. The current study produced a reliability coefficient of .92

**Obsessive-compulsive behavior.** The 8-item Obsessive-Compulsive Behavior (OCB) subscale of Morey's (1991) Personality Assessment Inventory was used to assess obsessive-compulsive behavior in the current study (see Appendix B, Control). The response scale ranges from 1 (*false, not at all true*) to 4 (*very true*). Items included in the OCB subscale involve the following behaviors: self-control, hyper-attentiveness to detail, performance of rituals, and perfectionism. A sample item from this scale includes: "I have to do some things a certain way or I get nervous." Item 4 ("I can relax even if my home is a mess") was reverse scored. The current study produced a reliability coefficient of .73.

**Work/nonwork interference and enhancement.** Fisher et al.'s (2009) 17-item self report Work/Nonwork scale was used to measure work/nonwork interference and enhancement in the current study (see Appendix B). The Work/Nonwork scale consists of four factors: 1) Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL; items 1-5), 2) Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW; items 6-11), 3) Work Enhancement of Personal Life (WEPL; items 12-14), and 4) Personal Life Enhancement of Work (PLEW; items 15-17). Respondents were to indicate the frequency with which they have felt a particular way during the last three months using a 5-point scale: 1 (*not at all*), 2 (*rarely*), 3 (*sometimes*), 4 (*often*), and 5 (*almost all of the time*). Sample items from each subscale are as follows: WIPL, "I come home from work too tired to do thing I would like to do." PLIW, "My personal life drains me of the energy I need to do my job." WEPL, "Because of my job, I am in a better mood at home." PLEW, "My personal life gives me the energy to do my job." Therefore higher scores indicated a higher frequency of each particular work/nonwork related mindset subscribing to each factor. None of the items needed to be reverse scored.

Fisher et al. (2009) reported the following coefficient alphas for the subscales of the Work/Nonwork scale: WIPL, 5 items,  $\alpha = .91$ ; PLIW, 6 items,  $\alpha = .82$ ; WEPL, 3 items,  $\alpha = .70$ ; and PLEW, 3 items,  $\alpha = .81$ . Reliabilities in the current study were higher for three of the four subscales of the Work/NonWork Scale such that WIPL, 5 items,  $\alpha = .93$ ; PLIW, 6 items,  $\alpha = .81$ ; WEPL, 3 items,  $\alpha = .76$ ; and PLEW, 3 items,  $\alpha = .86$ .

**Work Enjoyment.** The 10-item Work Enjoyment facet of Spence and Robbins's (1992) workaholism scale was also included in analyses in order to assess work enjoyment in the two samples. Respondents were instructed to rate each item on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (*very untrue of me*) to 4 (*very true of me*). A sample item from this scale includes: "My job is so interesting that it often doesn't seem like work." None of the items needed to be reverse scored. Spence and Robbins's (1992) reported  $\alpha = .86$  for this subscale of their measure. A Cronbach's alpha of .88 was observed for this 10-item subscale in the current study.

### **Data Analysis**

Descriptive statistics (i.e., means, standard deviations, ranges) and correlations were determined for all current study variables (e.g., workaholism, hours worked per week, obsessive-compulsive behavior, work/nonwork interference and enhancement). Demographics included age, gender, ethnicity, relationship status, hours worked per week, number of years with current organization, number of years in current position, occupation, career status, and income bracket.

Two discriminant function analyses were conducted between the current study variables. Specifically, worker types (i.e., white-collar and artistic) were used as criterion variables to examine differences on a set of five continuous predictor variables: work/nonwork interference and enhancement, work enjoyment, obsessive-compulsive behavior and two measures of workaholism. A second DFA was performed using 3 criterion variables (i.e. white-collar non-



self-employed, artist self-employed and artist non-self-employed) to examine differences on the same aforementioned predictor variables but taking employment status into account. The process attempted to relate the worker type to workaholism and hours worked per week to determine if there was a difference between the scores (Hypothesis 1). Worker type was also thought to be related to work/nonwork interference (Hypotheses 2 and 3) and obsessive-compulsive behavior (Hypotheses 4). Confidence intervals of means and standard deviations were also reported. A .05 criterion of statistical significance was employed for all tests.

## **Chapter III: Results**

### **Data Screening**

Twenty-five out of a total of 202 surveys were discarded for use in the current study to abide by the 90% rule for missing data. As such, all cases in which more than 10% of the items were missing for a given scale were discarded. For the majority of these cases, it was apparent that the surveys were begun and not finished; in most cases, these surveys were less than half complete. Perhaps survey fatigue from the fairly extensive demographic section at the onset of caused these participants to not complete the rest of the survey. Two participants completed all but one of the measures; in one case skipping a short obsessive-compulsive behavior scale in the middle of the survey while the other completed only half of the obsessive-compulsive behavior measure. As such, these two participants were removed prior to conducting data analysis.

Consequently, the total number of surveys analyzed after data screening was 177.

Missing data in cases where less than 10% of the items in a given scale were missing were replaced with the series mean (i.e., the mean on other items in that scale for that case). As the survey was not a forced response format, this issue was most likely due to user error or to an election not to answer certain questions in a given scale; however, no one question had significantly more missing data than any other item.

### **Descriptive Statistics and Correlations**

Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, ranges) and intercorrelations for the current study scales are shown in Table 2. For exploratory purposes, the Workaholism Analysis Questionnaire (WAQ; Swords, Aziz, Walker, & Wuensch, 2008), a newly developed, unpublished, measure of workaholism was included in the analyses. The WART and the WAQ were found to be positively correlated to one another as well as positively correlated with

obsessive-compulsive behavior, Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement, work enjoyment, and hours worked per week. High scores on the WART were also positively correlated with higher salary, but this was not so for the WAQ. Obsessive-compulsive behavior was positively correlated with Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement and negatively correlated with age. Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement was positively correlated with work enjoyment as well as hours worked. Work enjoyment was positively correlated with age and hours worked. All scales were positively correlated with one another with the exception of work enjoyment and obsessive-compulsive behavior. Hours worked was also positively correlated with all scales (as well as age) with the exception of obsessive-compulsive behavior.

The diagonal on the table represents Cronbach's alpha, the internal consistency reliability of each scale. With the exception of Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement, which is broken down into four different factors (see Measures section), reliabilities for the measures were judged to be acceptable in that they fell above the generally accepted value of .70 (Nunnally, 1978). Also included in Table 2 are the means, standard deviations, and ranges for all variables of interest.

Table 2

*Correlations and Descriptive Statistics (N = 177)*

Variable	WART	WAQ	OCB	WNIE	WE	Age	Gender	Hours	Salary	Time
WART	(.84)									
WAQ	.73**	(.92)								
OCB	.42**	.48**	(.73)							
WNIE	.39**	.53**	.21**	(.60)						
WE	.17*	.26**	.03	.27**	(.88)					
Age	.05	-.03	-.21**	.08	.25**	--				
Gender	.11	.01	.08	-.03	-.04	-.08	--			
Hours	.25**	.25**	-.06	.17*	.26**	.23**	-.16*	--		
Salary	.16*	-.03	-.05	-.04	-.05	-.08	-.21**	.37**	--	
Time	-.11	-.11	-.27**	.023	.35**	.61**	-.08	.08	-.02	--
Range of Current Data	1.48-3.64	1.17-4.33	1.13-3.75	1.59-3.65	1-4	1= 25 and under, 5= Over 40	1=Male, 2=Female	1= 35 or less, 7= More than 60	1= Less than \$20,000, 7= \$150,000 or more	1=Less than 1yr, 6=More than 15yrs
Range of Possible Scores	1-4	1-5	1-4	1-4	1-4	1-5	1-2	1-7	1-7	1-7
Mean	2.71	2.73	2.50	2.63	2.95	3.77	1.58	4.07	3.12	3.79
SD	.40	.64	.56	.38	.58	1.50	.50	2.02	.50	1.91

*Note.* Entries on the main diagonal are Cronbach's alpha. WART = Work Addiction Risk Test; WAQ = Workaholism Analysis Questionnaire; OCB = Obsessive-Compulsive Behavior; WNIE = Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement; WE = Work Enjoyment; Time = Length of time in current position. \* $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$ .

According to Flowers and Robinson (2002), three out of the five dimensions of the WART (i.e., compulsive tendencies, control, and impaired communication) have been found to be the best predictors of workaholism. Based on this finding, along with the low item totals for the two remaining dimensions (i.e., inability to delegate and self-worth), only the compulsive tendencies, control, and impaired communication/self-absorption dimensions of the WART are typically included in studies. As shown in Table 3, significant correlations were also found in the subscales of the WART and the WNIE scale such that within the subscales of the WART, Compulsive Tendencies was positively correlated with Control and Impaired Communication. Also, Control was positively correlated with Impaired Communication. Within the WNIE scale, Work Interference with Personal Life was positively correlated with Personal Life Interference with Work and negatively correlated with, as one might expect, Work Enhances Personal Life and Personal Life Enhances Work. Personal Life Interferes with Work was negatively correlated with Work Enhances Personal Life as well as Personal Life Enhances Work. Also, Personal Life Enhances Work was positively correlated with Work Enhances Personal Life. In correlating the two subscales, Work Interference with Personal Life was found to be positively correlated with the WART subscales of Compulsive Tendencies, Control, and Impaired Communication. Personal Life Enhances Work was negatively correlated with those same three WART subscales (Compulsive Tendencies, Control, and Impaired Communication).

The diagonal on Table 3 represents Cronbach's alpha, the internal consistency of each scale. The reported alpha for Impaired Communication/Self-Absorption is on the low range of acceptable for undetermined reasons. All other reliabilities were deemed acceptable, falling above the generally accepted value of .70 (Nunnally, 1978). Also included in Table 3 are the means, standard deviations and ranges for the variables of interest.

Table 3

*WART & WNIE Subscale Correlations and Descriptive Statistics (N = 177)*

Variable	CT	CTL	IC	WIPL	PLIW	WEPL	PLEW
CT	(.81)						
CTL	.43**	(.77)					
IC	.37**	.35**	(.62)				
WIPL	.54**	.26**	.46**	(.93)			
PLIW	.07	.11	.19*	.21**	(.81)		
WEPL	.06	-.13	-.05	-.32**	-.21**	(.76)	
PLEW	-.15*	-.15*	-.19*	-.40**	-.19*	.43**	(.86)
Range of Current Data	1.11-4	1.14-4	1-4	1-5	1-3.46	1-5	1-5
Range of Possible Scores	1-4	1-4	1-4	1-5	1-4	1-5	1-5
Mean	3.01	2.56	2.13	2.75	1.95	3.10	3.37
<i>SD</i>	.55	.58	.58	.99	.64	.87	.91

*Note.* Entries on the main diagonal are Cronbach's alpha. WART subscales: CT= Compulsive Tendencies; CTL= Control; IC=Impaired Communication/Self-Absorption; WNIE Subscales: WIPL=Work Interference with Personal Life; PLIW= Personal Life Interference with Work; WEPL= Work Enhances Personal Life; PLEW= Personal Life Enhances Work. \* $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$ .

Correlations among the current study measures were also computed separately for artists and white-collar workers (see Table 4). Results for white-collar employee correlations (shaded in gray) as compared to artist correlations (un-shaded) reveal that the WART was positively correlated with work enjoyment in the white-collar sample, but this was not the case in the artist

sample. In addition, obsessive-compulsive behavior was positively correlated with Work/NonWork Interference and Enhancement in the artist sample, but not so in the white-collar sample.

Table 4

*White-Collar (Shaded) vs. Artist (Un-shaded) Correlations (N=177)*

Variable	WART	WAQ	OCB	WNIE	WE
WART	1.00	.70**	.52**	.39**	.11
WAQ	.77**	1.00	.51**	.65**	.22*
OCB	.32**	.48**	1.00	.32**	.15
WNIE	.39**	.41**	.12	1.00	.28**
WE	.30**	.29**	.04	.24*	1.00

*Note.* WAQ = Workaholism Analysis Questionnaire; WART = Work Addiction Risk Test; OCB = Obsessive-Compulsive Behavior; WNIE = Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement; WE = Work Enjoyment. \* $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$ .

### **Discriminant Function Analysis**

Discriminant function analysis (DFA) was employed in PASW to illuminate the differences between the white-collar and artist groups on the five main scales (i.e., WART, WAQ, WNIE, OCB, WE) as well as on the subscales of the WART and the unidimensional WAQ. Furthermore, DFA was used to explore the differences between self-employed and non-self-employed artists and white-collar employees.

### **Artists vs. White-Collar Employees on the Major Scales**

The five major scales (i.e., WART, WAQ, WNIE, OCB, WE) served as predictor variables and were entered into the DFA with occupation (artistic or white-collar) serving as the criterion variable. Group centroids (i.e., group means on the discriminant function) were

significantly different (artist = .528 vs. white-collar = -.559, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .770$ ,  $\chi^2(N = 177) = 45.04$ ,  $p < .001$ ), which means that two groups' means are different from one another beyond the .05 criterion of statistical significance. Note that Wilks'  $\Lambda$ (lambda) is a statistic of separation, ranging from 0-1, with smaller statistics representing better separation, in this case showing moderate separation. High scores on the DFA are associated with membership in the artist group, which only occurs on the Work Enjoyment subscale, which illustrates the correlations between the variables in the model and the discriminant function (see Table 5).

Table 5

*Structure of the Discriminant Function (Structure Matrix)*

Variable	Loading
WE	.94
WNIE	.17
WAQ	.14
OCB	-.11
WART	-.08

*Note.* WAQ = Workaholism Analysis Questionnaire; WART = Work Addiction Risk Test; OCB = Obsessive-Compulsive Behavior; WNIE = Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement; WE = Work Enjoyment.

Table 6 contains the group means on all five variables. This, along with the tests of equality of group means (as seen in Table 7), reveal that the only significant difference on the five major scales (i.e. WART, WAQ, OCB, WNIE, and WE) was in relation to work enjoyment,  $F(1, 175) = 46.26$ ,  $p < .001$ . There were no significant differences on the WART and the WAQ between the artist and white-collar groups.



Table 6

*Group Means on the Five Main Variables*

Variable	White-Collar	Artist	<i>d</i>
WART	2.72 (a)	2.69 (a)	.09
WAQ	2.68 (a)	2.78 (a)	-.15
OCB	2.53 (a)	2.47 (a)	.11
WNIE	2.60 (a)	2.68 (a)	-.19
WE	2.69 (a)	3.22 (b)	-1.02

*Note.* In each row means having the same letter were not significantly different at the .05 level. WAQ = Workaholism Analysis Questionnaire; WART = Work Addiction Risk Test; OCB = Obsessive-Compulsive Behavior; WNIE = Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement; WE = Work Enjoyment. *d* = standardized difference between the means

Table 7

*Tests of Equality of Group Means*

Variable	Wilks' Lambda	<i>F</i> (1, 175)	<i>p</i>
WART	.99	.33	.57
WAQ	.99	1.06	.31
OCB	.99	.57	.45
WNIE	.99	1.57	.21
WE	.79	46.26	.00**

*Note.* WAQ = Workaholism Analysis Questionnaire; WART = Work Addiction Risk Test; OCB = Obsessive-Compulsive Behavior; WNIE = Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement; WE = Work Enjoyment. \**p* < .05 \*\* *p* < .001.

### **Artists vs. White-Collar Employees on the Subscales**

The subscales of the WART and the WNIE, as well as the Work Enjoyment scale, were also entered into a DFA with occupation as the criterion variable. The Work Enjoyment scale was included in these analyses because it is a subscale of a larger scale, which was not included in this study. Group centroids (i.e. group means on the discriminant function) were significantly different (artist = .611 vs. white-collar = -.647, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .714$ ,  $\chi^2(12, N = 177) = 56.85$ ,  $p < .001$ ), once again showing that the two groups' means are different from one another beyond the .05 criterion of statistical significance. The structure matrix for this DFA can be seen in Table 8, which illustrates the correlations between the variables in the model and the discriminant function. WE was shown to load well on the discriminant function and WEPL was shown to load moderately well. These loadings (in the structure matrix below) show that subjects who scored high on the discriminant function tended to be artists.

Table 8

*Structure of the Discriminant Function (Structure Matrix)*

Variable	Loading
WE	.81
WEPL	.47
CTL	-.29
IC	.22
PLEW	.22
WIPL	-.13
CT	.05
PLIW	-.04

*Note.* WE= Work Enjoyment; WART subscales: CT= Compulsive Tendencies; CTL= Control; IC=Impaired Communication/Self-Absorption; WNIE Subscales: WIPL=Work Interference with Personal Life; PLIW= Personal Life Interference with Work; WEPL= Work Enhances Personal Life; PLEW= Personal Life Enhances Work.

For these subscales, white-collar employees and artists differed significantly on the WART's Control subscale,  $F(1, 175) = 6.04, p = .015$ , with white-collar employees being higher, and on Work Enhances Personal Life subscale of the WNIE measure,  $F(1, 175) = 15.44, p < .001$ , with artists being higher. This is evident in Table 9, which contains the group means on all seven subscales and work enjoyment. This, along with the Tests of Equality of Group Means (as seen in Table 10), reveal that the only observed difference on the major scales was in relation to work enjoyment. There were no significant differences on the WART and the WAQ between the artist and white-collar groups.

Table 9

*Group Means on the Subscales and Work Enjoyment*

Variable	White-Collar	Artist	<i>d</i>
CT	2.99 (a)	3.02 (a)	-.06
CTL	2.67 (a)	2.46 (b)	.37
IC	2.04 (a)	2.20 (a)	-.28
WIPL	2.84 (a)	2.67 (a)	.17
PLIW	1.96 (a)	1.93 (a)	.05
WEPL	2.85(a)	3.34(b)	-.59
PLEW	3.24(a)	3.49(a)	-.28
WE	2.69(a)	3.22(b)	-1.02

*Note.* In each row means having the same letter were not significantly different at the .05 level. WE= Work Enjoyment; WART subscales: CT= Compulsive Tendencies; CTL= Control; IC=Impaired Communication/Self-Absorption; WNIE Subscales: WIPL=Work Interference with Personal Life; PLIW= Personal Life Interference with Work; WEPL= Work Enhances Personal Life; PLEW= Personal Life Enhances Work. *d*= standardized difference between the means

Table 10

*Tests of Equality of Group Means*

Variable	Wilks' Lambda	<i>F</i> (1, 175)	<i>p</i>
CT	.99	.15	.70
CTL	.96	6.04	.02
IC	.98	3.45	.07
WIPL	.99	1.25	.27
PLIW	.99	.10	.75
WEPL	.92	15.44	.00
PLEW	.98	3.36	.07
WE	.79	46.26	.00**

*Note.* WART subscales: CT= Compulsive Tendencies; CTL= Control; IC=Impaired Communication/Self-Absorption; WNIE Subscales: WIPL=Work Interference with Personal Life; PLIW= Personal Life Interference with Work; WEPL= Work Enhances Personal Life; PLEW= Personal Life Enhances Work. \**p* < .05 \*\* *p* < .001.

### **Self-Employed vs. Non-Self-Employed Artists vs. Non-Self-Employed White-Collar**

#### **Professionals**

Discriminant function analysis was also used to explore potential differences among groups defined by both occupation type and self-employment status, with the WART, WAQ, OCB, WNIE, and WE scales serving as predictor variables. An insufficient number of participants fell into the “white-collar self-employed” category; however, a three group DFA was conducted for the other three categories (i.e., self-employed artist, non-self-employed artist and non-self-employed white-collar employees). The frequencies of all four groups are available in Table 11. Group centroids for the first DFA (i.e., group means on the discriminant function)

were significantly different (self-employed artist = .633 vs. non-self-employed artist = .330 vs. non-self-employed white-collar = -.629, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .728$ ,  $\chi^2 (10, N=177) = 52.78$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The structure matrix for this DFA can be seen in Table 12, which illustrates the correlations between the variables in the model and the discriminant functions. The second DFA was not statistically significant, (self-employed artist = .06 vs. non-self-employed artist = -.22 vs. non-self-employed white-collar = .015, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .992$ ,  $\chi^2 (4, N = 177) = 1.33$ ,  $p = .856$ ). The heavy loading of work enjoyment on the first DFA indicates that the difference in the groups on this function was almost entirely related to work enjoyment.

Table 11

*Frequencies: Occupation by Employment*

Variable	Frequency	Percent
ASE	67	37.90
ANSE	24	13.60
WCSE	6	3.40
WCNSE	80	45.20
Total	177	100.00

*Note.* ASE= Artistic Self Employed; ANSE= Artistic Non-Self Employed; WCSE= White-Collar Self Employed; WCNSE= White-Collar Non-Self Employed

Table 12

*Structure of the Discriminant Functions (Structure Matrix)*

Variable	DF1	DF2
WE	.947	-.104
WAQ	.166	.106
OCB	-.071	.652
WART	-.064	-.322
WNIE	.179	-.184

*Note.* WAQ = Workaholism Analysis Questionnaire; WART = Work Addiction Risk Test; OCB = Obsessive-Compulsive Behavior; WNIE = Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement; WE = Work Enjoyment.

In comparing non-self-employed artists ( $n = 24$ ) to non-self-employed white-collar employees ( $n = 80$ ), 93% of the overall white-collar sample, similar DFA results were observed to those of the general artist vs. white-collar. Specifically, a significant difference was observed on work enjoyment,  $F(2, 168) = 27.40, p < .001$ , such that non-self-employed artists scored a mean of 3.12, while non-self-employed white-collar employees scored a mean of 2.65. Table 13 illustrates this mean difference while Table 14 illustrates its significance.

Table 13

*Group Means*

Variable	WCNSE	ANSE	ASE
WART	2.72 (a)	2.72 (a)	2.68 (a)
WAQ	2.65 (a)	2.74 (a)	2.79 (a)
OCB	2.52 (a)	2.40 (a)	2.49 (a)
WNIE	2.59 (a)	2.67 (a)	2.67 (a)
WE	2.65 (a)	3.12 (b)	3.25 (b)

*Note.* In each row means having the same letter were not significantly different at the .05 level. WCNSE= White-Collar Non-Self Employed; ANSE= Artistic Non-Self Employed; WAQ = Workaholism Analysis Questionnaire; WART = Work Addiction Risk Test; OCB = Obsessive-Compulsive Behavior; WNIE = Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement; WE = Work Enjoyment.

Table 14

*Tests of Equality of Group Means .*

Variable	Wilks' Lambda	$F(2, 168)$	$p$
WART	.99	.20	.82
WAQ	.99	.85	.43
OCB	.99	.44	.64
WNIE	.99	.99	.37
WE	.75	27.40	.00**

*Note.* WAQ = Workaholism Analysis Questionnaire; WART = Work Addiction Risk Test; OCB = Obsessive-Compulsive Behavior; WNIE = Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement; WE = Work Enjoyment. \* $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$ .



### Self-employed Artists vs. Non-self-employed Artists

In comparing self-employed artists ( $n = 67$ ) to non-self-employed artists ( $n = 24$ ), no significant differences were observed in the WART, the WAQ, WNIE, OCB and WE. However, in examination of the subscales using a DFA, the WNIE subscale of Work Enhances Personal Life was found to be significantly different in the two groups,  $F(1, 89) = 5.52, p = .02$ , such that self-employed artists scored higher on average than non-self-employed artists ( $M=3.45$  vs.  $M=3.03$ ). These results are evident in Table 15 below.

Table 15

#### *Tests of Equality of Group Means*

Variable	Wilks' Lambda	$F(1, 89)$	$p$
CT	.98	2.15	.15
CTL	1.00	.04	.84
IC	.99	.07	.79
WIPL	.98	1.98	.16
PLIW	.99	.58	.45
WEPL	.94	5.52	.02*
PLEW	.99	.23	.63

*Note.* WART subscales: CT= Compulsive Tendencies; CTL= Control; IC=Impaired Communication/Self-Absorption; WNIE Subscales: WIPL=Work Interference with Personal Life; PLIW= Personal Life Interference with Work; WEPL= Work Enhances Personal Life; PLEW= Personal Life Enhances Work. \* $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$ .

### Self-employed Artists vs. Non-self-employed White-Collar Professionals

In comparing self-employed artists ( $n = 67$ ) to non-self-employed white-collar employees ( $n = 80$ ), there was once again a significant difference between the two groups on work enjoyment such that self-employed artists scored significantly higher ( $M= 3.25$ ) than non-self-

employed white-collar employees ( $M = 2.65$ ),  $F(1, 145) = 48.40$ ,  $p < .001$ . Subscale DFA results also echoed the original general DFA such that the WART's Control subscale was found to be significantly higher among non-self-employed white-collar employees when compared to self-employed artists,  $F(1, 145) = 4.83$ ,  $p = .03$ . Similarly, the mean results of the Work Enhances Personal Life subscale of the WNIE measure was found to be significantly higher for self-employed artists ( $M = 3.45$ ) when compared to non-self-employed white-collar employees ( $M = 2.8$ ),  $F(1, 145) = 23.45$ ,  $p < .001$ . Wilks Lambda, F-value, degrees of freedom and significance for these subscales and work enjoyment are available in Table 16 below.

Table 16

*Tests of Equality of Group Means*

Variable	Wilks' Lambda	<i>F</i> (1, 145)	<i>p</i>
WART	.99	.32	.57
WAQ	.99	1.59	.21
OCB	.99	.14	.71
WNIE	.99	1.71	.19
CT	1.00	.00	.99
CTL	.97	4.83	.03*
IC	.98	3.06	.08
WIPL	.98	2.18	.14
PLIW	1.00	.00	.99
WEPL	.86	23.45	.00**
PLEW	.99	1.93	.17
WE	.75	48.41	.00**

*Note.* WAQ = Workaholism Analysis Questionnaire; WART = Work Addiction Risk Test; OCB = Obsessive-Compulsive Behavior; WNIE = Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement; WE = Work Enjoyment; WART subscales: CT= Compulsive Tendencies; CTL= Control; IC=Impaired Communication/Self-Absorption; WNIE Subscales: WIPL=Work Interference with Personal Life; PLIW= Personal Life Interference with Work; WEPL= Work Enhances Personal Life; PLEW= Personal Life Enhances Work. \* $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$ .

**Tests of Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis 1a.** As stated earlier, Hypothesis 1 was comprised of two parts, the first proposing that creatively self-employed workers will work more hours per week than white-collar employees. Frequencies showed that artists worked more hours per week on average than those in the white-collar sample ( $M = 4.12$  vs.  $M = 3.88$ ). However, as evidenced by the DFA

conducted on these two groups and displayed in Table 17 below, the difference was not significant,  $F(1, 145)=.75, p= .39$ . Due to a lack of a significant difference in these two groups on hours worked, Hypothesis 1a cannot be supported.

Table 17

*Tests of Equality of Group Means*

Variable	Wilks' Lambda	$F(1,145)$	$p$
Hours Worked Per Week	.99	.75	.39

**Hypothesis 1b.** The second half of Hypothesis 1 proposed that creatively self-employed workers would have higher levels of workaholism than white-collar workers. The DFA performed on these two groups, whose results can be viewed in Table 16, revealed no significant difference on either measure of workaholism, the WART,  $F(1, 145) = .32, p = .57$ , or the WAQ,  $F(1, 145) = 1.59, p = .21$ . Although not significant, white-collar workers had a higher mean score on the WART ( $M = 2.72$ ) than did their artistic counterparts ( $M=2.67$ ), but the reverse was true on the WAQ with white-collar workers averaging 2.65 to the self employed artist's 2.79. Therefore due to this lack of a significant difference as evidenced by the DFA, Hypothesis 1b is not supported.

**Hypothesis 2.** That self-employed artists will have higher levels of work/nonwork interference compared to white-collar workers was the tenet of the second hypothesis. Overall, mean scores on the WNIE scale reveal that self-employed artists scored higher compared to white-collar workers ( $M = 2.67$  vs.  $M = 2.59$ ), although this difference was not significant,  $F(1, 145)=1.71, p = .19$ , as evidenced by the DFA and illustrated in Table 16. Moreover, on the subscale of Work Interference with Personal Life, a higher average score for white-collar

employees was observed when compared to self-employed artists ( $M = 2.83$  vs.  $M = 2.58$ ), but this difference also fell short of significance  $F(1, 145) = 2.18, p = .14$ . Given that no significant difference was observed on either the WNIE scale or its WIPL subscale, Hypothesis 2 cannot be supported.

**Hypothesis 3.** That creatively self-employed workers will have higher levels of work/nonwork enhancement compared to white-collar employees was the tenet of the third hypothesis. The DFA conducted on both groups revealed that on one subscale of Work/NonWork Interference and Enhancement, Work Enhances Personal Life scores were observed to be significantly different for the two groups,  $F(1, 145) = 23.45, p < .001$ , such that self-employed artists scored higher on average on the WEPL subscale. Though the difference was not significant, self-employed artists also scored higher on the Personal Life Enhances Work subscale when compared to white-collar employees ( $M = 3.46$  vs.  $M = 3.25$ ). Due to the significant difference in these two groups on the Work Enhances Personal Life subscale, as evidenced by the DFA, Hypothesis 3 is supported.

**Hypothesis 4.** That levels of obsessive-compulsive behavior in the white-collar sample would be similar to the creatively self-employed sample was the tenet of the fourth hypothesis. No significant difference between the two groups was observed on the OCB scale,  $F(1, 145) = .14, p = .71$ , nor was a significant difference observed on the Compulsive Tendencies Subscale of the WART,  $F(1, 145) = .00, p = .99$ , the other measure of obsessive-compulsive behavior in the study. Therefore, due to a lack of statistically significant difference between artists and white-collar employees on these measures of obsessive-compulsive behavior as seen in Table 16, Hypothesis 4 is supported.

## **Chapter IV: Discussion**

The purpose of the current study was to apply the findings of previous workaholism research to a population, artists, who up until this point have not been included in workaholism or work life balance research. Workaholism, as well as its known correlates (i.e., work-life balance, obsessive-compulsive behavior, and work enjoyment) were examined using a discriminant function analysis to highlight the differences between artists and white-collar professionals.

The results of the current study, the first of its kind to examine the work addiction and work/nonwork balance of artists, levels the workaholism playing field for the two targeted populations (artists and white-collar professionals) by showing no significant difference in the incidence of workaholism between them on two separate measures of the construct. At the same time a significant difference observed on the control subscale of the Work Addiction Risk Test (WART; Robinson, 1999), leaves room for future exploration and interpretation of workaholism in these two groups, indicating that the nature of workaholism in artists may be different than that in white-collar professionals. Though there was no difference on the overall workaholism scales in the two groups, the control subscale of the WART may ultimately reveal some differences on workaholism in these two groups in the future. A measure of work/nonwork interference and enhancement successfully bridged the gap between self-employment and art revealing that while work enjoyment is contingent upon occupational factors, work enhancement of personal life is related to self-employment status and its correlates.

### **Correlations Among Age, Gender, Hours, Salary and Time**

Age was found to be significantly positively correlated with hours worked per week as well as length of time spent in the current position. These results indicate that older people in

both groups work longer hours than their younger counterparts and as is logical to assume, length of time spent in the current position increases with the age of the participant. The older a person gets the more likely it is they will have spent more years on any given job, be it artistic, white-collar or otherwise since they have had more time to allocate to that job over their lifetime.

Gender was significantly related to hours worked and salary such that men worked more hours on average and earned a greater salary than women in this sample. These two variables (salary and hours worked) were significantly positively correlated with one another, following what one would logically assume, that the more you work the more money you make, with the inverse also being true. As to the gender component, it appears that this sample is not immune to the gender gap, which has been shown to exist in many areas of the American workforce. These findings align with those reported by the National Association of Women (2007) who found that overall women earn only 69% as much as men after ten years of college.

Hours worked was significantly positively correlated with both measures of workaholism, the WART and the WAQ, falling in line with past research (Bonebright, Clay, & Ankenmann, 2000) which ties working excessively and hours worked to incidences of workaholism. Seemingly contradictory to this finding is that the Work Enjoyment scale and the Work/NonWork Interference and Enhancement (WNIE) scale were also significantly positively correlated with hours worked. An investigation at the subscale level utilizing discriminant function analysis revealed a significant positive correlation between hours worked and work interference with personal life (WIPL) in both the artist and white-collar samples. Significant positive correlations were also maintained for hours worked and work enjoyment. While the connection between hours worked and work interference with personal life is readily apparent, the connection between work enjoyment and hours worked is less so.

Time in current position and age were found to be significantly negatively correlated with obsessive-compulsive behavior. Seeing as how age and time in organization are so closely related it is difficult to determine what is causing older people to score lower on obsessive-compulsive behavior.

### **Scale Differences by Occupation**

**Work enjoyment.** Discriminant Function Analysis (DFA) was conducted on the five major scales (WART, WAQ, WNIE, OCB and WE) using occupation as the criterion variable. In examining all white-collar participants as compared to all artistic participants the only significant difference observed was in the Work Enjoyment scale. The same held true when the criterion variable was further specified to compare non-self-employed artists and non-self-employed white-collar employees, as well as in the comparison between self-employed artists and non-self-employed white-collar employees. No such significant difference was observed between the self-employed and non-self-employed artist samples.

These results indicate that artists enjoy their jobs significantly more than white-collar employees and this difference appeared regardless of self-employment status, indicating that it is not the organizational component of employment type that effects work enjoyment but that it is the profession which makes the difference on this variable. Rather than the increased autonomy or hourly flexibility associated with being a self-employed worker (or some other factor associated with that type employment status) being the predictor of this high work enjoyment, it would appear that work enjoyment is more closely tied to the nature of the work or the type of people performing it. It may have to do with work environment or intrinsic motivation on the part of artists, but the reasoning is unclear.



**Workaholism.** No significant differences were observed on either measure of workaholism, the WART or the WAQ, between the white-collar and artist groups thus lending no support to Hypothesis 1b. The theoretical underpinnings of this hypothesis were based upon the higher incidences of workaholism among the self-employed, of which a majority of artists report as their occupational status. Self-employed artists, however, did not exhibit this higher level of workaholism as was expected. Moreover, the lack of support for Hypothesis 1a was also detrimental to the support for Hypothesis 1b. Without artists working more hours than their white-collar counterparts it becomes more difficult to build a case that they work more excessively than white-collar professionals and as such the results revealed no difference in the work habits of these two groups, which is in itself quite revealing.

Curiously, although there was no significant difference on the total WART or WAQ, there was an observed significant difference between the two groups on the WART control subscale such that white-collar workers scored higher than artists. Past research (Flowers & Robinson, 2002) has shown that within the WART control was one of the subscales, which had the greatest ability to separate the workaholic group from the control group. While the difference in this subscale was clearly not enough to significantly sway the results of the entire measure towards one group or another, it's possible that the control subscale is more closely related to workaholism incidences in the white-collar professions. Meaning that white-collar workaholism may look different than artistic workaholism and while there was no difference in the overall WART, the control subscale may hold the key to this difference.

**OCB.** The Obsessive Compulsive Behavior scale revealed no difference between artists and white-collar professionals on this proposed correlate of workaholism, which was contrary to the hypothesis (4) presented. Given the previously established strong correlation that OCB has

with workaholism (Mudrack, 2006), it is reasonable to conclude that as workaholism goes, so does OCB. As was the case in the current study, neither workaholism nor OCB were shown to be significantly different in the occupational groups (artist and white-collar).

**Work/nonwork interference and enhancement.** A lack of support for Hypothesis 2 provides further evidence that the work habits of these two groups do not significantly negatively affect their personal lives in different ways given that no difference was found on the Work Interference with Personal Life subscale. Support for Hypothesis 3 does; however, reveal that the work of both groups enhances their personal lives differently such that artists' personal lives are significantly enhanced by their work. As reported by Fisher et. al (2009) this dimension of the scale is tied to job satisfaction and given these results it can be concluded that job satisfaction is an important component of work which affects workers personal lives, more positively so for artists than white-collar professionals.

Additional analyses revealed that self-employed artists were significantly higher on WEPL when compared to non-self-employed artists and non-self-employed white-collar professionals, the difference in these samples being employment status. If the difference was due to occupation, no significant difference would have been observed between the two artist groups on this subscale; however, since a difference was observed between these two groups, the criterion most likely to be responsible is self-employment status. This could indicate that the autonomy and flexibility associated with self-employment enhances personal lives more so than specific job type.

The lack of a difference in personal life interference with or enhancement of work in both groups indicates that while work may affect their personal lives differently, their personal lives appear not to affect their work any differently in either sample.

## **Study Limitations**

The manner in which data were collected for this study could be construed as a limitation in that an online survey system, like any data collection system, is prone to certain errors. In the case of this data collection method, the online survey system is reliant on the Internet connectivity and hardware capabilities of the participant's computer. Utilizing this method of emailing surveys to be completed online, while having the advantage of reaching large numbers of participants from varying geographical areas, does not allow the researcher to fully control the data collection environment. Moreover, such problems in compatibility and connectivity may have been partly to blame for a relatively low response rate and may have been responsible for some incomplete data. As to the response rate, no specific count of surveys distributed could be calculated since participants were asked to forward the survey to friends, family and colleagues who fit into the two occupational categories of interest. It is estimated, however, that between the two targeted groups in excess of 1,000 surveys were distributed resulting in a response rate of +/- 20%. The researcher received a handful of emails claiming that the survey link was not operational, whether due to user error, faulty Internet connections or even software incompatibility. This may have limited the ability of some users to access the survey.

Contacts within artistic organizations indicated an inherent difficulty in reaching the artist population in general. This could be due to the nature of their work, a lesser dependence on technology when compared to white-collar workers or any number of factors. White-collar workers are very much tied to computers due to the very nature of their jobs, but many artists may find themselves untethered by computers and technology. This may further explain some difficulties in obtaining a high response rate for the artist group.

The use of self-report measures has been a cause for debate in psychology but previous research has validated the use of self-report questionnaires of the assessment of workaholism such that acquaintance reports have substantiated the self-reported measures of workaholism (Aziz & Zickar, 2006). That is, reports by spouses, friends, and significant others were judged to be as accurate as self report measures, thereby eliminating the need to verify the accuracy of self-report in this case.

The use of the work enjoyment and obsessive-compulsive behavior subscales could be construed as a limitation to this study as well. While the reliability and validity of these subscales has been established in previous research (Morey, 1991; Spence & Robbins, 1992), they are nevertheless subscales of larger measures and by removing them from their larger scales its possible that these subscales are being taken out of their original context.

Breaking down the two occupation groups was revealing in and of itself, and breakdown of these groups further by self-employed status subsequently revealed additional reasoning behind the differences observed in the broader two-group breakdown. However, the lack of sufficient self-employed white-collar professionals in the sample limited the scope of this research. Without the presence of this subgroup, implications as to the full impact of self-employment status across occupations could not be realized.

### **Practical Implications**

The similarities found between white-collar professionals and artists makes clear that artists are not immune to the effects of workaholism and its correlates. Managers and supervisors of artists of any kind should therefore keep in mind that workaholism and work interference with personal life are not just problems affecting traditional white-collar American employees, but are also problems which can affect a diverse group of workers. In this way managers can better

prepare their artistic employees to deal with the adverse effects of workaholism through intervention and awareness.

Moreover, organizations and small businesses alike can draw from the positive effect associated with self-employment evident in this study, namely work enhancement of personal life. By applying principals and characteristics of the self-employed occupations, such as increased autonomy and flexible work schedules, to salaried jobs, the positive personal life outcomes and increases in healthy work/nonwork balance might be realized for a broader group of workers.

### **Directions for Future Research**

Any subsequent research on the artist population should seek to further generalize their results to include more artistic occupations, including graphic designers or cinematographers, and other artistic groups more closely tied to computers who might yield different, more universally beneficial results. By increasing the scope of the current research and delving into ever more diverse career areas finding additional significant differences in these populations may be possible.

As noted in the limitations of this study the lack of sufficient self-employed white-collar professionals in the sample limited the reach of the present research. Further research investigating both positive and negative implications of self-employment status in these groups should actively recruit members of all subgroups.

Future research should also further explore the WART control subscale, which was observed to be significantly different in these two groups. Subsequent research could seek to paint a better picture of what workaholism looks like in each of these populations through the use of qualitative data analysis, peer/significant other interviews or the application of additional

measures of workaholism. It is possible that occupations this different may express workaholism in different ways and the WART control subscale may be a start to exploring those differences.

## **Conclusions**

The lack of a significant difference between the two groups, artists and white-collar professionals, on the WART or the WAQ indicates that the myth that workaholism only affects white-collar Americans has been disproven. Artists, despite numbering nearly two million in the US, have long gone unrecognized in their contributions to the world around them and moreover have been left out of many main areas of research, including work-related research. Their significant numbers, their power as an economic generator, and their positive contributions to modern society makes them a group who can not only contribute to industrial and organizational psychology as a discipline but also makes them a group which can serve to benefit from the research our field has produced. There is much we can learn from artists and they from us and while that may make them sound like foreign a entity, that is essentially what they are to the body of research. Their high work enjoyment and work enhancement of personal life may help to further the understanding of job satisfaction and work/nonwork balance as we know it today. Further research on this population might reveal some of the artists' secrets to gaining this satisfaction from their work and may help to bring those practices to other fields, which do not enjoy such benefits from their jobs. Although inclusivity is not necessarily the modus operandi of the artist it is clear that psychologists, artists, and non-artists stand to benefit from artists being included in I/O research.

## References

- Abbing, H. (2002). *Why are artists poor?: The exceptional economy of the arts*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th-TR ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association.
- Arora, R. (2004, 5-October). *Are Americans really abject workaholics?* Retrieved 2010, 20-October from [gallup.com: http://www.gallup.com/poll/13291/americans-really-abject-workaholics.aspx](http://www.gallup.com/poll/13291/americans-really-abject-workaholics.aspx)
- Aziz, S., & Zickar, M. J. (2006). A cluster analysis investigation of workaholism as a syndrome. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*, 52-62.
- Aziz, S., Wuensch, K., & Brandon, H. (2010). A comparison among worker types using a composites approach and median splits. *The Psychological Record, 60*, 627-642.
- 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*, 469-477.
- Brady, B. R., Vodanovich, S. J., & Rotunda, R. (2008). The impact of workaholism on work-family conflict, job satisfaction, and perception of leisure activities. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal, 11*, 241-263.
- Burgess, A. W., & Holmstrom, L. L. (1974). Rape Trauma Syndrome. *Journal of American Psychiatry, 131*, 981-986.
- Burke, R. J. (2001). Predictors of workaholism components. *International Journal of Stress Management, 1*, 113-127.

- Burke, R. J., & Koksai, H. (2002). Workaholism among a sample of turkish managers and professionals: An exploratory study. *Psychological Reports, 91*, 60-68.
- Chonko, L. B. (1983). Job involvement as obsessive-compulsion: Some preliminary empirical findings. *Psychological Reports, 53*, 1191-1197.
- Figley, C. R. (1988). Toward a field of Traumatic Stress. *Journal of Traumatic Stress , 1*, 3-16.
- Fisher, G. G., Bulgar, C. A., & Smith, C. S. (2009). Beyond work and family: A measure of work/nonwork interference and enhancement. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14*, 441-456.
- Fletcher, J. K., & Bailyn, L. (1996). Challenging the last boundary: Reconnecting work and family. In M. B. Arthur, & D. M. Rousseau, *The boundaryless career* (pp. 256-267). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gorgievski, M. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2010). Work engagement and workaholism: Comparing the self-employed and salaried employees. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 5*, 83-96.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review, 10*(1), 76-88.
- Jackson, S. E., Schwab, R. L., & Schuler, R. S. (1986). Toward and understanding of the burnout phenomenon. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 630-640.
- Kanai, A., & Wakabayashi, M. (2001). Workaholism among Japanese blue-collar employees. *International Journal of Stress Management, 8*, 129-145.
- Koszuth, A. M. (1991). Sexually abused child syndrome: Res ipsa loquitur and shifting the burden of proof. *Law and Psychology Review, 15*, 277-297.



- Liang, Y.-W., & Chu, C.-M. (2009). Personality traits and personal and organizational inducements: Antecedents of Workaholism. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 37, 645-660.
- Macdonald, A. M., & De Silva, P. (1999). The assessment of obsessionality using the Padua inventory: Its validity in a British non-clinical sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 27, 1027-1046.
- Machlowitz, M. (1980). *Workaholics: Living with them, working with them*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- McMillan, L. H., Brady, E. C., O'Driscoll, M. P., & Marsh, N. V. (2002). A multifaceted validation study of Spence and Robbins' (1992) workaholism battery. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75, 357-368.
- McMillan, L. H., 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, 69-91.
- Menger, P.M. (1999). Artistic labor markets and careers. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25, 541-574.
- Morales, L. (2009, 26-August). *Self-employed workers clock the most hours each week*. Retrieved 2010, 20-October from [gallup.com: http://www.gallup.com/122510/self-employed-workers-clock-hours-week.aspx](http://www.gallup.com/122510/self-employed-workers-clock-hours-week.aspx)
- Mudrack, P. (2004). Job involvement, obsessive-compulsive personality traits, and workaholic behavioral tendencies. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17, 490-508.

- Mudrack, P. S. (2006). Understanding workaholism: The case for behavioral tendencies. In R. J. Burke, *Research companion to working time and work addiction* (pp. 108-128). Nothampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- National Endowment for the Arts. (2008a). *Artists in the workforce: 1990-2005*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
- National Endowment for the Arts. (2008b). *Artists in the workforce: 1990-2005, executive summary*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
- Naughton, T. J. (1987). A conceptual view of workaholism and implications for career counseling and research. *Career Development Quarterly*, 35, 180-187.
- Ng, T. W., Sorensen, K. L., & Feldman, D. C. (2007). Dimensions, antecedants, and consequences of workaholism: A conceptual integration and extension. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 111-136.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Oates, W. E. (1971). *Confession of a workaholic*. New York, NY: World Pub.
- Oxford University Press. (2010). *Concise medical dictionary*. Retrieved 2010, 17-November from Oxford Reference Online:  
<http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t60.e9827>
- Parslow, R. A., Jorm, A. F., Christensen, H., Rodgers, B., Strazdins, L., & D'Souza, R. M. (2004). The associations between work stress and mental health: A comparison of organizationally employed and self-employed workers. *Work & Stress*, 18, 231-244.
- Piotrowski, C., & Vodanovich, S. J. (2008). The workaholism syndrome: An emerging issue. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35, 103-105.

- Robinson, B. E. (1999). The work addiction risk test: Development of a tentative measure of workaholism. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *1*, 199-210.
- Robinson, B. E., & Post, P. (1995). Work addiction as a function of family of origin and its influence on current family functioning. *The Family Journal*, *3*, 200-206.
- Robinson, B. E., Post, P., & Khakee, J. F. (1992). Test-retest reliability of the work addiction risk test. *Perception and Motor Skills*, *3*, 926.
- Runco, M. (1995). The creativity and job satisfaction of artists in organizations, *Empirical Studies of the Arts*, *13*, 39-45.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., van der Heijden, F. M., & Prins, J. T. (2009). Workaholism, burnout and well-being among junior doctors: The mediating role of role conflict. *Work & Stress*, *23*, 155-172.
- Schwartz, H.S. (1982). Job involvement as obsessive compulsion. *Academy of Management Review*, *7*, 429-432.
- Shalley, C.E., Gilson, L.L., & Blum, T.C. (2000). Matching creativity requirements and the work environment: Effects on satisfaction and intentions to leave. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *43*, 215-223
- Snir, R., & Harpaz, I. (2004). Attitudinal and demographic antecedents of workaholism. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *17*, 520-537.
- Spence, J. T., & Robbins, A. S. (1992). Workaholism: Definition, measurement, and preliminary results. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *58*, 160-178.
- Swords, B., Aziz, S., Walker, A., & Wuensch, K. (2008). Development of the Workaholism Analysis Questionnaire: Assessing workaholism in a diverse sample of employees. Unpublished Master's thesis, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC.

- Taris, T. W., Geurts, S. A., Schaufeli, W. B., Blonk, R. W., & Lagerveld, S. E. (2008). All day and all of the night: The relative contribution of two dimensions of workaholism to well-being in self-employed workers. *Work & Stress, 22*, 153-165.
- Taris, T. W., Schaufeli, W. B., & Verhoeven, L. C. (2005). Workaholism in the Netherlands: Measurement and implications for job strain and work-nonwork conflict. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*, 37-60.
- Voydanoff, P. (2005). Social integration, work-family conflict and facilitation and job and marital quality. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*, 666-679.
- Witters, D. (2010, 6-September). *Business owners still lead in wellbeing among job types*. Retrieved 2010, 20-October from [gallup.com](http://www.gallup.com/poll/142871/business-owners-lead-wellbeing-among-job-types.aspx):
- <http://www.gallup.com/poll/142871/business-owners-lead-wellbeing-among-job-types.aspx>

## **Appendix A: IRB Approval**



## EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board Office

1L-09 Brody Medical Sciences Building • 600 Moye Boulevard • Greenville, NC 27834

Office 252-744-2914 • Fax 252-744-2284 • [www.ecu.edu/irb](http://www.ecu.edu/irb)

---

**Date:** February 1, 2011

**Principal Investigator:** Ryan Weber, Graduate Student  
**Dept./Ctr./Institute:** Department of Psychology  
**Mailstop or Address:** weberr09@students.ecu.edu

**RE:** Exempt Certification  
**UMCIRB#** 11-045  
**Funding Source:** Unfunded

**Title:** "The Creatively Self-Employed Worker versus the White-Collar Professional: Workaholism, Work/Nonwork Interference, and Obsessive-Compulsive Behavior in Two Samples"

Dear Mr. Weber:

On 01/26/2011, the University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board (UMCIRB) determined that your research meets ECU requirements and federal exemption criterion #2 which includes research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior on subjects 18 years of age or older, unless:

- (a) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and
- (b) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

It is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted in the manner reported in your Internal Processing Form and Protocol, as well as being consistent with the ethical principles of the Belmont Report and your profession.

This research study does not require any additional interaction with the UMCIRB unless there are proposed changes to this study. Any change, prior to implementing that change, must be submitted to the UMCIRB for review and approval. The UMCIRB will determine if the change impacts the eligibility of the research for exempt status. If more substantive review is required, you will be notified within five business days.

The UMCIRB Office will hold your exemption application for a period of five years from the date of this letter. If you wish to continue this protocol beyond this period, you will need to submit an Exemption Certification Request at least 30 days before the end of the five year period.

Sincerely, *KWB*

Chairperson, University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board

Pc: Dr. Shahnaz Aziz, PhD.

## **Appendix B: Consent Form**

## **Informed Consent**

**Q1 Researchers at East Carolina University (ECU) study problems in society, health problems, environmental problems, behavior problems and the human condition. Our goal is to try to find ways to improve the lives of you and others. To do this, we need the help of volunteers who are willing to take part in research.**

**Please read the informed consent form below for information on the survey you are about to partake in and answer yes at the end of the informed consent to begin the survey. Thank You.**

### **Why is this research being done?**

The purpose of this research study is to investigate workaholism in a variety of occupations. The decision to take part in this research is yours to make. By conducting this research, we hope to learn more about the workaholism syndrome and its relationship with other constructs related to this topic.

**Why am I being invited to take part in this research?** You are being invited to take part in this research because you are a member of the professional community. If you volunteer to take part in this research, you will be one of approximately 400 people to do so.

### **Are there reasons I should not take part in this research?**

This study is intended for employed individuals over the age of 18. If this description does not fit you, please do not proceed to complete the questionnaire. Also note that you may withdraw from the study at any time or refuse to answer any question that you deem too personal in nature.

### **What other choices do I have if I do not take part in this research?**

You have the choice to not take part in this research study.

### **Where is the research going to take place and how long will it last?**

The research procedures will be conducted online, via a secure online survey software company. The total amount of time you will be asked to volunteer for this study is approximately 15 minutes, on only one occasion.

### **What will I be asked to do?**

You are being asked to complete an online survey regarding work-related behaviors. Please do not include your name at any point during completion of the survey. You may end your participation at any point, or refuse to answer any of the questions that you deem inappropriate. Completion of the online survey equates participant consent. Please be honest when indicating responses to the questionnaire.

### **What possible harms or discomforts might I experience if I take part in the research?**

It has been determined that the risks associated with this research are no more than what you would experience in everyday life.

### **What are the possible benefits I may experience from taking part in this research?**

We do not know if you will get any benefits by taking part in this study. This research will further our understanding of workaholism, a syndrome with potentially serious health implications. There may be no personal benefit from your participation, but the information gained by doing this research may help others in the future.

### **Will I be paid for taking part in this research?**



We will not be able to pay you for the time you volunteer while being in this study.

**What will it cost me to take part in this research?**

It will not cost you any money to be part of the research study.

**Who will know that I took part in this research and learn personal information about me?**

To do this research, ECU and the people and organizations listed below may know that you took part in this research and may see information about you that is normally kept private. With your permission, these people may use your private information to do this research:

- Any agency of the federal, state, or local government that regulates human research. This includes the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), the North Carolina Department of Health, and the Office for Human Research Protections.
- The University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board (UMCIRB) and its staff, who have responsibility for overseeing your welfare during this research, and other ECU staff who oversee this research.

**How will you keep the information you collect about me secure? How long will you keep it?**

At no point in the survey process will any identifying information be associated with your responses. All responses to this survey will remain completely anonymous and confidential, as you will never be asked to identify yourself. The final report for this study will include only aggregated data; no individual data will be singled out for separate analysis. The responses that you provide will be encoded and analyzed by the research team at East Carolina University. Only members of the East Carolina University research team will be permitted to view the responses to the survey. The information collected from this study will be stored in a private database and will only be kept throughout the duration of analysis. All analyses will be conducted prior to May 2011.

**What if I decide I do not want to continue in this research?**

If you decide you no longer want to be in this research after it has already started, you may stop at any time. You will not be penalized or criticized for stopping. You will not lose any benefits that you should normally receive.

**Who should I contact if I have questions?**

The people conducting this study will be available to answer any questions concerning this research, now or in the future. You may contact the Principal Investigator, Ryan Weber, at 973-214-2893 (days) or Dr. Aziz at 252-328-1379 (days) if you have any questions regarding this study.

If you have questions about your rights as someone taking part in research, you may call the UMCIRB Office at phone number 252-744-2914 (days, 8:00 am-5:00 pm). If you would like to report a complaint or concern about this research study, you may call the Director of UMCIRB Office, at 252-744-1971.

**I have decided I want to take part in this research. What should I do now?**

The person obtaining informed consent will ask you to read the following and if you agree, you should sign this form:

- I have read (or had read to me) all of the above information.
- I have had an opportunity to ask questions about things in this research I did not understand and have received satisfactory answers.

- I know that I can stop taking part in this study at any time.
- By signing this informed consent form, I am not giving up any of my rights.

Q2 Do you consent to participating in this survey?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

## **Appendix C: Measures**

## Demographics

Please check the box that best reflects your answer to each of the following questions.

**How many hours per week do you work (including from home)? \_\_\_\_\_ hours**

**Age:**  25 years and under  26-30  31-35  36-40  Over 40

**Gender:**  Male  Female **Ethnicity:**  Caucasian American  African American  Native American  
 Latin American  Asian/Pacific Islander  Other

**What is your highest level of education?**  High School  Associates Degree  College  
(B.A./B.S.)  Professional Degree (J.D. MD etc)  Masters (M.A. etc.)  Doctorate (PhD etc.)

**Have you ever been married?**  Yes  No **Do you have children?**  Yes  No

**If yes, what is your relationship status?**  Living with someone  Currently married  
 Separated  Divorced  Widowed

**Hours worked per week (including at home):**  35 or less  36-40  
 41-45  46-50  51-55  56-60  More than 60

**How long have you been with your current organization?**  Less than 1 year  
 1-2 years  3-4 years  5-9 years  10-14 years  15 years or more  N/A

**How long have you held your current position?**  Less than 1 year  
 1-2 years  3-4 years  5-9 years  10-14 years  15 years or more

**(WHITE COLLAR) Career Status:**  Professor  Non management  
 Lower management  Middle management  Senior management  N/A

**(ARTIST) Occupation (Check all that apply):**  Sculptor  Painter  Other  
 Glass Blower/Glass Artist  Ceramic Artist  Iron Worker  Carpenter/Woodworker  
 Textiles Artist  Photographer  Musician  Actor  Professor/Instructor  Full Time Student

**Income Bracket:**  Less than \$20,000  \$20,000-39,999  \$40,000-59,999  
 \$60,000-79,999  \$80,000 - \$99,000  \$100,000 - \$149,000  \$150,000 and over

## Working Styles1

Please answer the following questions concerning how you feel about various aspects of your work by choosing one of the four alternatives that best reflects your answer.

1	2	3	4
▼	▼	▼	▼
Very Untrue of Me	Somewhat Untrue of Me	Slightly True of Me	Very True of Me

1. I prefer to do most things myself rather than ask for help.....	1	2	3	4
2. I get impatient when I have to wait for someone else or when something takes too long, such as long, slow-moving lines.....	1	2	3	4
3. I seem to be in a hurry and racing against the clock.....	1	2	3	4
4. I get irritated when I am interrupted while I am in the middle of something..	1	2	3	4
5. I stay busy and keep many irons in the fire.....	1	2	3	4
6. I find myself doing two or three things at one time such as eating lunch and writing a memo, while talking on the phone.....	1	2	3	4
7. I overly commit myself by biting off more than I can chew.....	1	2	3	4
8. I feel guilty when I am not working on something.....	1	2	3	4
9. It is important that I see the concrete results of what I do.....	1	2	3	4
10. I am more interested in the final result of my work than in the process .....	1	2	3	4
11. Things do not seem to move fast enough or get done fast enough for me..	1	2	3	4
12. I lose my temper when things don't go my way or work out to suit me.....	1	2	3	4
13. I ask the same question over again, without realizing it, after I've already been given the answer once.....	1	2	3	4
14. I spend a lot of time mentally planning and thinking about future events while tuning out the here and now.....	1	2	3	4
15. I find myself continuing to work after my coworkers have called it quits .....	1	2	3	4
16. I get angry when people don't meet my standards of perfection.....	1	2	3	4
17. I get upset when I am in situations where I cannot be in control.....	1	2	3	4
18. I put myself under pressure with self-imposed deadlines when I work .....	1	2	3	4
19. It is hard for me to relax when I'm not working.....	1	2	3	4
20. I spend more time working than on socializing with friends, on hobbies, or on leisure activities.....	1	2	3	4
21. I dive into projects to get a head start before all phases have been finalized .....	1	2	3	4
22. I get upset with myself for making even the smallest mistake.....	1	2	3	4
23. I put more thought, time, and energy into my work than I do into my relationships with friends and loved ones.....	1	2	3	4
24. I forget, ignore, or minimize birthdays, reunions, anniversaries, or holidays.....	1	2	3	4
25. I make important decisions before I have all the facts and have a chance to think them through thoroughly.....	1	2	3	4

## Working Styles2

Please answer the following questions concerning how you feel about various aspects of your work by choosing one of the five alternatives that best reflects your answer.

1	2	3	4	5
▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. I feel stressed out when dealing with work issues.....	1	2	3	4	5
2. I feel guilty when I am not working.....	1	2	3	4	5
3. I feel anxious when I am not working.....	1	2	3	4	5
4. I feel bored or restless when I am not working.....	1	2	3	4	5
5. I am unable to relax at home due to preoccupation at work.....	1	2	3	4	5
6. I constantly feel too tired after work to engage in nonwork activities...	1	2	3	4	5
7. I think about work constantly.....	1	2	3	4	5
8. I prefer to work excessive hours, preferably 60 hours or more per week	1	2	3	4	5
9. I have a need for control over my work.....	1	2	3	4	5
10. I have a need for control over others.....	1	2	3	4	5
11. I enjoy spending evenings and weekends working.....	1	2	3	4	5
12. I frequently have work-related insomnia.....	1	2	3	4	5
13. I feel very addicted to my work.....	1	2	3	4	5
14. I find myself unable to enjoy other activities because of my thoughts of work.....	1	2	3	4	5
15. I consider myself to be a very aggressive person.....	1	2	3	4	5
16. I get irritated often with others.....	1	2	3	4	5
17. People would describe me as being impatient and always in a hurry...	1	2	3	4	5

18. I often obsess about goals or achievements at work.....	1	2	3	4	5
19. I frequently check over my work many times before I finish it.....	1	2	3	4	5
20. I ask others to check my work often.....	1	2	3	4	5
21. I frequently feel anxious or nervous about my work.....	1	2	3	4	5
22. It takes me a long time to finish my work because it must be perfect...	1	2	3	4	5
23. I experience conflict with my significant other or with close friends.....	1	2	3	4	5
24. My work often seems to interfere with my personal life.....	1	2	3	4	5
25. I often put issues in my personal life "on hold" because of work demands.....	1	2	3	4	5
26. I often neglect personal needs due to work demands.....	1	2	3	4	5
27. I often miss out on important personal activities because of work demands.....	1	2	3	4	5
28. I find it difficult to schedule vacation time for myself.....	1	2	3	4	5
29. I have difficulty maintaining friendships.....	1	2	3	4	5
30. I have difficulty maintaining intimate relationships.....	1	2	3	4	5

## Control

The following are questions related to your level of need for control. Please read each statement carefully and consider the extent to which you think it is like you. Select one number on the scale below each statement that best reflects your answer.

1	2	3	4
▼	▼	▼	▼
False, Not at all True	Slightly True	Mainly True	Very True

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I have to do some things a certain way or I get nervous.....         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. I have impulses that I fight to keep under control.....              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. It bothers me when things are out of place.....                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. I can relax even if my home is a mess.....                           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. People say that I'm a perfectionist.....                             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. I'm usually aware of objects that have a lot of germs.....           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. People see me as a person who pays a lot of attention to detail..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. I keep myself under tight control.....                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |





### Work Enjoyment

1	2	3	4
▼	▼	▼	▼
Very Untrue of Me	Somewhat Untrue of Me	Slightly True of Me	Very True of Me

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. My job is so interesting that it often doesn't seem like work.....                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. When I get involved in an interesting project, it's hard to describe how exhilarated I feel..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. I lose track of time when I'm engaged in a project.....  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. I do more work than is expected of me strictly for the fun of it.....                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Most of the time my work is very pleasurable.....  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Sometimes I enjoy my work so much that I have a hard time stopping.....                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. I like my work more than most people do.....   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. I rarely find anything to enjoy about my work.....   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. Sometimes when I get up in the morning, I can hardly wait to get to work..                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. My job is more like fun than work.....  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |