ABSTRACT

Kerri Marie Elizabeth Conning, PSYCHOLOGICAL CLIMATE AND WORK ADDICTION RISK: DO THE PERCEPTIONS OF OUR ORGANIZATIONS MATTER? (Under the direction of Dr. John Cope) Department of Psychology, December, 2009.

A workaholic, the word combination of work and alcoholic, has generally had a negative connotation in the research community. Many researchers believe that the workaholic's behavior is not healthy to the individual nor to the organization. This current study was designed to explore the possibility of a relationship between psychological climate and work addiction risk. Participants ($N = 175$) responded to a survey to further understand not only the overall relationship between psychological climate and work addiction risk but also the relationship between each subscales (e.g., Challenge, Recognition). A correlation analysis showed that there was a significant relationship between the overall means of psychological climate and work addiction risk. No significant relationship was found between work addiction risk and the psychological climate subscales: Supportive Management, Role Clarity and Recognition. The analysis also revealed that there were significant relationships between work addiction risk and the psychological climate subscales: Challenge, Contribution and Self-Expression. The implications of these results and the potential reasons for it are discussed.

PSYCHOLOGICAL CLIMATE AND WORK ADDICTION RISK:

Do THE PERCEPTIONS OF OUR ORGANIZATIONS MATTER?

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Psychology

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Psychology

by

Kerri Marie Elizabeth Conning

December, 2009

PSYCHOLOGICAL CLIMATE AND WORK ADDICTION RISK:

DO THE PERCEPTIONS OF OUR ORGANIZATIONS MATTER?

By

Kerri Marie Elizabeth Conning

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF THESIS $\overline{\hspace{4cm}}$
John G. Cope, Ph.D.

COMMITTEE MEMBER $\overline{\hspace{4cm}}$
William F. Grossnickle, Ph.D.

COMMITTEE MEMBER $\overline{\hspace{4cm}}$
Shahnaz Aziz, Ph.D.

CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT
OF PSYCHOLOGY $\overline{\hspace{4cm}}$
Kathleen A. Row, Ph.D.

DEAN OF GRADUATE SCHOOL $\overline{\hspace{4cm}}$
Paul Gemperline, Ph.D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my thesis chair, Dr. Cope, for always believing in me. Your continually positive words of encouragement were pivotal in the completion of my M.A. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Aziz for giving chances and for always being a patient and an intelligent role model and to Dr. Grossnickle for always having a welcoming smile and an open door. Each of you has made my time memorable at East Carolina and words will never be able to express my gratitude for all of your tolerance and help. Last but not least, I want to thank my Dad for always telling me that I could accomplish anything that I wanted…as long as my heart and mind were in sync.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

By definition, a workaholic is someone who has a compulsive and unrelenting need to work (The American Heritage Dictionary, 2009). The term workaholic was introduced in 1968 as a portmanteau word composed of work and alcoholic. This view focused on workaholism as an addiction (Oates, 1968). Oates continued his focus on workaholism in the book, *Confessions of a Workaholic*, in which he described workaholism as a negative concept (Oates, 1971). In general, workaholics are considered to be overly concerned with their work and tend to neglect other areas of their lives, such as their families (Persuad, 2004). Robinson (2000) described the condition as when a person prefers to work and not think about emotional and personal aspects of life (Burke, 2000). Although there has been a lot of focus on the idea of workaholism over the past forty years, there has been little scientific study concerning workaholism until recently. Even with the continued lack of consensus, Porter (1996) defined it as neglect in other areas of life based upon internal motives of behavior maintenance rather than requirements of the job or organization. For the current study, workaholism will be defined as the difference between healthy excessive behaviors and addictions, where healthy behaviors add to life and addictions take away from life (Griffiths, 2005).

Defining Workaholism

Workaholism has become a popular term referring to people who work hard and for many hours. There is still little accord on an operational definition concerning workaholism (Porter, 1996). Until 1990, the majority of the writing on workaholism was anecdotal, atheoretical, and non-empirical (Burke, 2004).

Without having an operationally sound definition, there is no way of truly categorizing workaholism. In order to combat this dilemma, Spence and Robbins (1992) created the workaholism typology. Their definition was the first empirically-based definition of workaholism and their measure was described in enough detail to assess reliability and validity issues (Spence & Robbins, 1992). Spence and Robins identified and labeled six respondent types based on the three measures that make up the triad: work involvement, driven to work, and work enjoyment. Work involvement is a generalized attitude of psychological environment with work. Work enjoyment is the level of pleasure derived from work and drive is the inner pressure to work which is maintained by internal fulfillment rather than external pressure (Spence & Robbins, 1992). Worker types are based upon either the high or low scores using the median on three scales (see Table 1). Positively engaged workers scored high on all three components and are considered to be healthy in their working behavior. Workaholics scored high on work involvement and feeling driven to work and low on work enjoyment. Scoring low on all three worker types, the unengaged worker is described as unmotivated by money, uncommitted to work, lacking in loyalty, unhappy with the work challenge, but not really dissatisfied and not showing a high intention to leave (Buelens & Poelmans, 2004). Work enthusiasts scored high on work involvement and work enjoyment and low on feeling driven to work. A work enthusiast is a person who is highly involved in work, but unlike the workaholic, highly enjoys their work rather than being driven to work. Relaxed workers do not perceive much pressure at work, enjoy the challenges presented at work, but are not involved at all. They also are found to report the

highest amount of time devoted to private activities (Buelens & Poelmans, 2004). The

disenchanted worker has been found to be completely alienated, completely dissatisfied,

with a strong intention to leave (Buelens & Poelmans, 2004). Overall, Spence and

Robbins' definition was one of the first to promote a multi-dimensional perspective on

workaholism, although there is still disagreement concerning the validity of the specific

content dimensions.

Table 1

Spence and Robbins' Classification of Worker Types

Worker Type	Driven to Work	Work Involvement	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

Porter (1996) suggested that workaholism is an excessive involvement with work while neglecting other areas of life, and is based on internal motives. Scott, Moore, and Miceli (1997), consistent with Porter's definition, concluded that workaholics spend a great deal of time in work activities (even at the cost of sacrificing time for other non-work activities), constantly think about work when they are not working, and work beyond organizational requirements or economic needs. However, even with the recent attempts to define workaholism, there is still little consistency found in the different typologies (Ng, Sorensen, & Feldman, 2006).

Robinson and Post (1994) defined workaholism as the "overindulgence in and preoccupation with work, often to the exclusion and detriment of the workaholic's health, intimate relationships, and participation in child rearing" (p. 517). Robinson and his colleagues developed and validated the Work Addiction Risk Test (WART). The 25 items of the WART were pulled from a list of symptoms reported by clinicians who diagnose workaholism (Taris, Schaufeli, & Verhoeven, 2005). Robinson (1999) presented analyses of the factorial structure of the WART, showing that it had five dimensions: (a) Compulsive Tendencies (dealing with working hard and having difficulties relaxing after work); (b) Control (referring to annoyance when having to wait for something/someone, or when things to do not go their way); (c) Impaired Communication and Self-Absorption (dealing with putting more energy into one's work than into relationships with others); (d) Inability to Delegate; (e) Self-Worth (concerned with the degree to which one is interested in the results of one's work rather than the work process itself).

Flowers and Robinson (2002) found that the WART's five dimensions were not fully supported. Instead, a three-dimension scale explained more covariance. The subsequent scale included 15 items (Compulsive Tendencies, Control, and Impaired Communication/Self-Absorption) and correctly classified workaholics 88.1% of the time. The Compulsive Tendency subscale was found to be the most important variable.

Workaholism in Today's Society

To date, most studies have shown that those individuals who are in the medical profession are among the most likely to be workaholics (Killinger, 1992). There have also been suggestions of workaholism increasing in North America (Schor, 1991). There could be many reasons for the rise in workaholism, including the increasing complexity of professions, constant pressure to be more efficient, and the advancement of technology (Griffiths, 2005). It has also been noted that the changing nature of careers in recent years further accentuates the need to understand workaholism (Arthur & Rousseau, 1996). Additionally, changes continue to occur in the work/life structure, resulting in ambiguity in terms of the differences between work and personal life (Fletcher & Bailyn, 1996; Sullivan, 1999). Another concept is whether or not gender plays a role in workaholism. Until recently, the vast majority of workaholics were assumed to be men (Burke, 2000). Most of present research has not indicated any significant differences between men and women. A study by Aziz and Cunningham (2009) found there to be no workaholic differences between men and women. In contrary, Keane (1998) believed that in a "male dominated and macho culture," women must be seen to work harder and

longer than men in order to be viewed as equals, thus causing women to be more likely to exhibit workaholic behaviors.

Consequences of Workaholism in the Workplace

Many studies have shown the detrimental effects of workaholism—not only to the workaholic individual, but also to the organization as a whole. It is not uncommon for workaholics to have major health problems, including stress-induced illnesses, chronic fatigue, and increased anxiety levels (Caproni, 1997). Additionally, Aziz and Zickar's (2006) findings support the notion of workaholism as a health-related syndrome in that workaholism was found to correlate with such variables as work stress and work life imbalance. In terms of stress reactions and possible burnout, consequences to the organization may be imminent through a decline in individual performance, increases in health- and accident-related expenses, or higher turnover rates (Homer, 1985; Maslach & Jackson, 1981). A workaholic's interaction with fellow employees will influence the workplace environment through ongoing interactions, which in turn has immediate as well as long-term effects (Porter, 1996). Coworkers may learn of the workaholic's less productive work style and then actively decrease working with the workaholic. As a result, workaholics tend to work more independently, which could then cause them to think they are indispensable to the organization. This workaholic behavior could cause the deterioration of gains from collaborative work, which in turn could be detrimental to the effectiveness of the overall organization (Porter, 1996).

Views of Workaholism

One common trend found in most literature concerning workaholism is the opposing views of whether workaholism is a positive or a negative phenomenon. Some researchers portray workaholism as a beneficial quality. For example, Furnham (1997) pointed out that, "unlike other forms of addiction which are held in contempt, workaholism is frequently lauded, praised, expected, and even demanded" (p. 220). In addition, Machlowitz (1980) conducted a qualitative study of 100 workaholics and found them to be very satisfied and productive. It is important to note; however, that her sample was biased towards successful executives and not likely representative of professionals and managers in general (Burke, 2004).

The majority of literature leans toward the negative position (Fassel, 1992; Killinger, 1992; Oates, 1971). These researchers equated workaholism with other addictions, and viewed workaholics as unhappy, obsessive figures, who were not performing their jobs well and were creating difficulties for their coworkers (Naughton, 1987; Oates, 1971; Porter, 1996). Some have speculated that workaholic behaviors may limit job performance (Naughton, 1987). An employee highly involved in work, or obsessed with details, may not be productive. Creating busy work, completing simple projects, or creating crisis to provide opportunities to work harder, are likely to hinder performance. In addition, undertaking a high volume of work may influence the quality of Contributions (Burke, 2000). Fassel stated that workaholism can be deadly and dangerous with an onset (e.g., business), a progression (e.g., loss of productivity, relationships, etc.) and a conclusion (e.g., hospitalization or death from a heart attack).

Workaholism can be viewed as both a negative and complex process that eventually affects a person's ability to function properly (Killinger, 1992).

Even with the contrary views of workaholism, the need to better understand workaholism is evident. The real difference between healthy excessive behaviors and addictions is that healthy behaviors add to life, whereas addictions take away from it (Griffiths, 2005). Korn, Pratt, and Lambrou (1987) believe that positive workaholic behavior patterns may be acquired through training. It may also be possible to reduce the negative effects of workaholism, particularly health consequences, through stress management training (Korn et al., 1987).

Organizational Climate and Organizational Culture

There are other environments outside of family that have the possibility of influencing work habits such as the work environment. A study by Ng et al. found that vicarious learning at work and peer competition were found to be positively related to workaholism (2006). Understanding the organizational culture or climate may be necessary when trying to identify with a workaholic's behavior. There is no doubt that culture and climate are similar in that they both describe employees' experiences of the organization (Patterson et al., 2005). However, many people use the terms climate and culture interchangeably, but there is a difference between the two concepts. Schneider (2000) stated that organizational climate represents the descriptions of events that employees experience in the organization; it is behaviorally oriented. On the other hand, organizational culture describes employee's views on the existence of patterns. The question is answered in relation to shared values, common assumptions, and patterns of

beliefs held by organizational members; these characteristics define the culture (Patterson et al., 2005). Climate can be understood as the surface manifestations of culture (Schein, 1985). It is also important to note that the measurement between climate and culture differs; most climate research utilizes quantitatively-based questionnaire measures applied across several organizations, while most culture research uses qualitative measures and focuses on single organizations (Patterson et al., 2005). Some organizations and industries have cultures that, to a certain extent, induce and sustain workaholism (Harpaz & Snir, 2003). On the other hand, if the organizational culture does not reinforce excessive working or competitiveness, workaholism will be discouraged.

Organizational Climate and Psychological Climate

Organizational climate is based upon the entire organization and does not consist of separate individual perceptions. In contrast, psychological climate represents the individual level of analysis and perceptions of the work environment (Rousseau, 1988). These perceptions of the organizational environment take on personal meaning and a motivational or emotional significance through a process of "valuation." Valuation describes the cognitive representations of the environmental features and how it is interpreted by the individual's values and well-being (James, Hater, Gent, & Bruni, 1978). These individual views show how work environments are cognitively appraised and are represented in terms of their meaning to and significance for individual employees in organizations (James & Jones, 1980). Prior research also defines psychological climate as the "degree to which the environment is personally beneficial versus detrimental to one's self of well-being" (James, James, & Ashe, 1990, p. 53).

Psychological climate can be thought as the linkage between the individual and the organization that serves as an important "sensemaking" function (Weick, 1993). The purpose of measuring the psychological climate over the organizational climate is to understand how employees experience their organizations (Patterson et al., 2005). These perceptions are assumed to be primarily descriptive (Schneider & Reichers, 1983). By studying the psychological climate in comparison to the organizational climate, one is able to measure the employee's perceptions and valuations of the organizational environment (James & Jones, 1980).

Brown and Leigh's Measure of Psychological Climate

The purpose of Brown and Leigh's (1996) measure was to investigate the process by which psychological climate is related to employee involvement, effort, and performance. Their study was built on the ethnographic research by Kahn (1990) that described climate factors as influencing employees' tendencies to engage themselves completely in their work or distance themselves psychologically from work. Their measure of psychological climate includes six dimensions (Supportive Management, Role Clarity, Contribution, Recognition, Self-Expression, and Challenge). Supportive Management is the extent to which management is perceived as flexible and supportive. Role Clarity identifies how easily a job can be identified. Self-Expression is described by the amount of freedom for self-expression. Contribution is the employee's perceived contribution toward organizational goals. Recognition is the adequacy of acknowledgement received from the organization, and Challenge is the perceived amount of difficulty within the position (see Table 2).

Even though the Brown and Leigh (1996) measure of psychological climate was
created in 1996, there are many studies still using their measure to some degree. For

Table 2

Brown and Leigh's Measure of Psychological Climate

Supportive Management

       My boss is flexible about how I accomplish my job objectives.
       My manager is supportive of my ideas and ways of getting things done.
       My boss gives me the authority to do my job as I see fit.
       I'm careful in taking responsibility because my boss is often critical of new ideas
       (reverse score)
       I can trust my boss to back me up on decision I make in the field.

Role Clarity
       Management makes it perfectly clear how my job is to be done.
       The amount of work responsibility and effort expected in my job is clearly
       defined.
       The norms of performance in my department are well understood and
       communicated.

Contribution
       I feel very useful in my job.
       Doing my job well really makes a difference.
       I feel like a key member of the organization.
       The work I do is very valuable to the organization.

Recognition
       I rarely feel my work is taken for granted.
       My superiors generally appreciated the way I do my job.
       The organization recognizes the significance of the Contributions I make.

Self-Expression
       The feelings I express at work are my true feelings.
       I feel free to be completely myself at work.
       There are parts of myself that I am not free to express at work. (reversed score)
       It is okay to express my true feelings in this job.

Challenge
       My job is very challenging.
       It takes all of my resources to achieve my work objectives.

---

example, a study by Byrne, Stoner, Thompson, and Hochwarter (2004) found that the conscientiousness subscale predicted performance in the presence of both high work effort and positive psychology, such as the treatment methods or intentional activities aimed at cultivating positive feelings, positive behaviors, or positive cognitions.

Another study using Brown and Leigh's (1996) measure of psychological climate found that high quality leader-member exchange and team-member exchange relationships are predictive of some measures of climate (Ford & Seers, 2006). Ford and Seers did not use the original 22-item psychological climate measure, but used five out of the six measures and added an additional measure of senior management effectiveness.

What Came First—the Chicken or the Egg?

Are workaholics created by organizations or are they choosing organizations that have a workaholic climate? A study by Burke (2002) looked at whether workaholics preferred demanding, aggressive, and results-oriented climates. Burke (2002) compared various workaholic and non-workaholic types and found that enthusiastic addicts generally had stronger organizational climate preferences than workaholic and non-workaholic types on several climate measures. Meaning, people who rate higher on drive to work and enjoyment in work are more likely to pick organizations which promote workaholic behavior. The study also found that students scoring higher on feeling driven to work had stronger organizational climate preferences in general. The findings of this study indicate that workaholics chose their organizational climate. He also found that participants scoring higher on feeling Driven to Work had a significantly stronger

preference for general organizational climate, such as results-oriented, demanding and career-focused climates.

Current Study

There have been several studies that focused on the organizational climate's relationship with work addiction. One example includes a study conducted by Burke (2002) which looked at the climate preference of workaholics. No previous researchers have tried to examine the individual's psychological climate and the relationship to work addiction. The purpose of this study was to explore the possibility of a relationship between psychological climate and work addiction. These findings could affect future research as well as influence treatment for work addiction. Treatment for most health related issues are given at an individual level. By understanding the individual's perception of their own psychological climate rather than the organizational climate as a whole, treatment could be tailored specifically for the individual. If the current study finds individual differences, further research can focus on the work addiction risk for individuals rather than looking at work addiction risk at the group level.

There is no universally agreed upon definition or measurement of workaholism. However, Flowers and Robinson's (2002) modified version for Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) allows individuals to fall along a continuum of work addiction rather than being identified in a specific category (e.g., workaholic) as in the case of Spence and Robbins' (1992) scale. The WART is found to have face, content, and criterion-related validity (Robinson, 1999; Robinson & Phillips, 1995; Robinson & Post, 1994) and can also be used cross-culturally (Taris , Schaufeli, & Verhoeven, 2005). Studies on validity

and reliability of the WART revealed good psychometric properties (see Robinson, 1999, for review). Robinson and Post (1994) also found face validity with the WART. The WART was found to have high content validity and criterion-related validity (Robinson, 1999; Robinson & Phillips, 1995). The condensed version was also found to accurately diagnose workaholism 88.1% of the time. The current study's purpose is to try and understand if there is a relationship between psychological climate and work addiction risk. This type of research will be best if both measures were on a continuous scale rather than specifically categorizing participants and potentially eliminating participants who do not fit into one of the typology categories. Based upon the explanations above, the Robinson and Flower's modified version of the work addiction risk test was the best option for examining workaholism in the current study.

Psychological climate was measured using Brown and Leigh's (1996) measure. Schenider (2000) suggests that the use of general multidimensional measures of climate should not be used; rather, facet-specific approaches where climate has a focus (Patterson et al., 2005). Brown and Leigh's measure of psychological climate focuses on employee's engagement or disengagement with the work environments. Higher ratings on Brown and Leigh's measure of psychological climate indicate a more positive work environment, whereas low ratings indicate a negative work environment. Perceptions of a positive climate are thought to lead to job engagement while a negative climate is proposed to lead to disengagement (Kahn, 1990). Thus, the overall psychological climate scale, as well as its six subscale dimensions, will be used to examine where individuals fall on the WART.

Study Hypotheses

Given that there has been very little research concerning perceptions of organizational climate (psychological climate) as related to workaholism (high work addiction), most of the proposed research will be exploratory. Yet, some hypotheses can be stated based upon prior findings in other areas of research.

As stated previously, workaholics may be driven to control processes and therefore have problems delegating and asking for assistance (Porter, 1996). This could possibly affect their relationships with coworkers, including their supervisors. Therefore, participants scoring higher on the WART are expected to score lower on the Supportive Management as well as on Role Clarity subscales of the psychological climate measure.

> *Hypothesis 1* (H1): Participants scoring lower on Supportive Management
>
> and Role Clarity will score higher on the WART.

Workaholics are also overly concerned with their work (Persaud, 2004) and their work addiction may lead them to think they are more important team players compared to other coworkers (Porter, 1996). Therefore, it is expected that participants scoring higher on the WART will score high on the Recognition, Challenge, and Contribution subscales of the psychological climate measure.

> *Hypothesis 2* (H2): Participants who score higher on Challenge,
>
> Recognition, and Contribution will score higher on the WART.

No prior research has been conducted on Self-Expression and work addiction risk. Brown and Leigh define the Self-Expression subscale by the amount of freedom to communicate personal beliefs (1996). Past research focused on work addiction as

behavioral maintenance for a person who does not want to think about the personal

aspects of their life (Porter, 1996; Robinson, 2000). Self-Expression may include

communicating personal aspects of one's life; it would appear that a person with risk of

high work addiction may score lower on the Self-Expression subscales. No specific

predictions will be made concerning the relation between Self-Expression and overall

risk work addiction; it will be tested for exploratory purposes.

CHAPTER 2: METHOD

Participants

A sample comprised of 180 alumni, friends, and acquaintances, employed in

diverse organizations (e.g., government contracting, private industry), was collected for

the current study of psychological climate and work addiction risk. Five of the original

180 surveys were discarded because three of the participants failed to answer one or more

of the survey items and two participants withdrew from the survey prior to completion.

The data from the remaining 175 participants were used in the correlations and

descriptive statistics. During the entire data collection process, International Review

Board (IRB) regulations and standards were carefully observed (see Appendix A).

Overall, participants ranged from 25 to over 45 years of age. Specifically, almost

half of the participants (47%) ranged from 26 to 35 years of age, followed by 25 years or

younger (35%), over 45 years of age (12%), and 36 to 45 years of age (5%). Seventy

percent of the participants were female. A large majority of participants (66%) were

single, followed by 28% being married, life partner (3%), and divorced/widowed (2%).

Only 17% of the participants had children. Eighty-nine percent of the sample was

comprised of Caucasian Americans, followed by Asian/Pacific Islander and Other (2%),

Native Americans (1%), and Latin Americans (.5%). Over half of the participants held

positions in non-management (55%) followed by positions either in lower to middle

management (36%), and senior management (7%). Sixty-six percent held their position

from less than 1 year to 2 years, while 19% held their position from 3 to 5 years, 6 to 9

years (13%), 10 to 14 years (2%), and 15 years of more (3%). Twenty-nine percent of

participants were in their organizations from 1 to 2 and 25% were in their organizations

for 3 to 5 years, less than a year in organization (17%), 6 to 9 years in organization (9%),

10 to 14 years in organization (3%), and 15 years or more in organization (5%). The

average number of hours participants worked per week was between 41 to 45 hours

(25%) followed by 36 to 40 hours (23%), 46 to 60 hours (21%), 51 to 55 hours (11%),

more than 60 hours (10%), 35 or less hours (6%), and 56 to 60 hours (5%). The average

income bracket ranged from $40,000 to $59,999 (27%), followed by $20,000 to $39,999

(18%), $60,000 to $79,999 (13%), less than $20,000 (7%), $80,000 to $99,999 (6%),

$100,000 to $149,999 (4%), and $150, 000 to $199,999 (1%).

Procedure

Surveys were administered online through a Survey Monkey link provided by e-

mail (Survey Monkey, 2009). The survey information was sent through both e-mail and

networking medias (e.g., Linkedin, Facebook). Before participating in the survey, the

participants were presented with an electronic informed consent document and survey

instructions on the first page of the survey. Participation agreement was identified by

hitting the "next" button on the bottom of the first page (see Appendix B). The

participants were assigned a random identity number automatically through Survey

Monkey to ensure confidentiality throughout the entire process of the study. No

information was stored, or analyzed by employee name or company designations.

Contact information was provided to each individual through an e-mail invitation in order

for respondents to ask questions about the study. The participants had the opportunity to

withdraw from the study at any time. The survey took approximately 10 minutes to complete. Once all of the data were collected, scoring and data analysis began.

Measures

    Work Addiction Risk Test. Flowers and Robinson's (2002) modified version WART is a 15-item self-report measure separated into three subscales including: Compulsive Tendencies, Control, and Impaired Communication/Self-Absorption (See Appendix C). Respondents were instructed to rate each item according to how well the item describes their work habits. Responses were scored on a 4-point scale: 1 = Never True, 2 = Sometimes True, 3 = Often True, and 4 = Always True. The respondents fell on a continuous score between 15 (low work addiction risk) to 60 (high work addiction risk). Scores between 15 and 37.5 were considered low and scores between 37.6 and 60 were considered high. These scores were found by the aggregate amount scored on the Work Addiction Risk Test portion of the survey.

    Psychological Climate. Brown and Leigh's (1996) 22-item measure related to self-engagement in work was used to assess psychological climate (see Appendix D). Psychological climate is separated into six subscales: Supportive Management, Role Clarity, Contribution, Recognition, Self-Expression, and Challenge. Respondents were instructed to rate each item according to how well the item describes their perception of the organizational environment. Responses were scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 3 = Disagree, 4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree 5= Agree 7 = Strongly Agree). Two items, E-3 and S-4, on the scale were reverse scored (See Appendix C). Higher scores meant a more positive and engaged work environment,

while lower scores meant an unhealthy work environment. The respondents fell on a continuous scale between 22 (unhealthy psychological climate) and 154 (engaged work environment). These scores were found by the aggregate amount scored on the psychological climate portion of the survey.

Data Analysis

Using SPSS, a Pearson Product Moment correlation analysis was employed to describe the relationship between overall psychological climate and the overall work addiction risk. Next, all psychological climate subscales were correlated with the overall work addiction risk. Then all work addiction risk subscales were correlated with the overall psychological climate subscales. Last, the subscales for both psychological climate and work addiction risk were correlated. Results were considered statistically significant at an alpha level of .05.

CHAPTER 3: RESULTS

Data Screening

The 175 participants' data were used in the following correlations, means and standard deviations. The participants were identified as having low or high work addiction risk based on the sum of their WART scores. The scores ranged between 20 and 53; 130 participants identified themselves as low work addiction risk (scores between 15 and 37.5) and 45 participants identified themselves as having high work addiction risk (scores between 37.6 and 60). Because the current study did not focus on just high work addiction risk, a correlation analysis was conducted on all participants regardless of their work addiction risk identification.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 3 presents the intercorrelations as well as means and standard deviations for all current study variables. The internal consistency of each scale, as presented with Cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha, is shown on the diagonal. The overall mean for the WART (WARTM) was 33.20 ($SD = .45$) and the overall mean for the psychological climate (PCM) was 98.73 ($SD = .71$).   Table 4 presents the correlations between the WARTM and the demographic information (e.g., work hours per week, career status). The purpose of Table 4 is to have a better understanding of the sample. There was a positive correlation between the WARTM and the amount of hours worked per week (HPW), $r_{(N = 175)} = .592$, $p = .000$.

Table 3

Correlations Among All Variables (N = 175)

Variable	PCM	WART M	SMPC	RCPC	CoPC	RPC	SEPC	CHPC	CTW	CW	ICW
PCM	.68										
WARTM	.19**	.74									
SMPC	.62**	-.08	.74								
RCPC	.66**	-.06	.40**	.74							
CoPC	.81**	.18**	.41**	.34**	.70						
RPC	.77**	-.03	.53**	.50**	.61**	.71					
SEPC	.37**	.18**	.03	.21**	.23**	.20**	.75				
CHPC	.52**	.50**	.00	.06	.40**	.10	.20**	.75			
CTW	.30**	.93**	-.04	-.01	.25**	.08	.30**	.57**	.73		
CW	-.52	.66**	-.14*	-.06	.00	-.19**	.05	.14*	.38**	.76	
ICW	.00	.60**	-.04	-.20**	.01	-.10	.09	.29**	.46**	.28**	.76
M	4.63	2.21	5.18	4.08	5.24	4.44	4.31	4.52	2.32	2.27	1.61
SD	.71	.45	1.03	1.24	1.17	1.18	.48	1.49	.54	.56	.61

Note. Entries on main diagonal are Cronbach's alpha. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 4

Correlations Among WARTM and Demographic Data (N = 175)

Variable	WARTM	HPW	COL	CS	IB
HPW	.60**				
COL	.05	.20**			
CS	.16*	.32**	.39**		
IB	.20**	.39**	.39**	.27**	
M	2.21	3.61	2.58	1.78	3.14
SD	0.45	1.67	1.23	0.99	1.35

Note. * *p* < .05 ** *p*<.001.
Length in Current Organization is indicated by COL.

There was a significant and positive correlation between the WARTM and both career status (CS), $r_{(N = 175)} = .160$, $p = .035$ and income bracket (IB), $r_{(N = 175)} = .202$, $p = .007$.

Overall Means

Table 3 shows that significant and positive correlations were found between the PCM and the WARTM, $r_{(N = 175)} = .198$, $p = .004$.

WARTM and Psychological Climate Subscales

Again as found in Table 3, positive and significant correlations were found between the WARTM and Contribution (CoPC), $r_{(N = 175)} = .180$, $p = .009$. WARTM and Self-Expression (SEPC), $r_{(N = 175)} = .181$, $p = .008$. WARTM and Challenge (CHPC), $r_{(N = 175)} = .499$, $p = .000$.

Psychological Climate and WART Subscales

Positive and significant correlations were found between the PCM and Compulsive Tendencies (CTW), $r_{(N = 175)} = .298$, $p = .000$ (See Table 3).

Psychological Climate Subscales and WART Subscales

Positive and significant correlations were found between CoPC and CTW, $r_{(N = 175)} = .249$, $p = .000$. SEPC was positively and significantly correlated with CTW, $r_{(N = 175)} = .203$, p $= .003$. Finally, CHPC was positively correlated with CTW, $r_{(N = 175)} = .573$, $p = .000$, Control (CW), $r_{(N = 175)}$, $p = .038$, and Impaired Communication/Self-Absorption (ICW), $r_{(N = 175)} = .228$, $p = .001$ (see in Table 3).

As shown in Table 3, significant and negative correlations were found between Supportive Management (SMPC) and CW, $r_{(N = 175)} = -.143$, $p = .029$. Significant and negative correlations were also found between Role Clarity (RCPC) and ICW, $r_{(N = 175)} =$

-.195, $p = .005$. Finally, significant and negative correlations were found between

Recognition (RPC) and CW, $r_{(N = 175)} = -.190$, $p = .006$.

CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION

Current Study

There have been no previous studies conducted concerning the individual perceptions of organizational climate (psychological climate) in relation to work addiction risk or even workaholism (high work addiction risk). Most of the research focuses on the organizational climate, organizational culture and the relationship to workaholism, eliminating the individuals' understanding of their psychological climate. The purpose of the current study was to provide a better understanding of this relationship by comparing not only the overall relationship between work addiction risk and psychological climate but also to understand how each individual subscale played a role in a possible relationship.

Relationship Between Psychological Climate and WARTM

Results showed a significant positive correlation between the psychological climate mean and the WARTM indicating that the more positive a person views the psychological climate or the more engaged they are at work, the more likely they are to exhibit work addiction risk behavior. The Role Clarity and Self-Expression subscales had significant correlations with the WARTM. More specifically, the Challenge subscale had a significant correlation with the WARTM. Challenge is the perceived amount of difficulty within an individual's position (Brown & Leigh, 1996). The current study's findings shed some light on why some individual perceptions of the work environment may have a direct relationship with their workplace behaviors, including work addiction risk.

Supportive Management, Role Clarity, and WARTM

The correlation results (see Table 3) show that participant scores on the psychological climate subscales, Supportive Management and Role Clarity did not have a significant relationship with the WARTM, thereby providing no further insight on H1. The first hypothesis stated that participants who scored lower on Supportive Management and Role Clarity would score higher on the WART. Past research has found that workaholics are more likely to have problems delegating and working in a team-oriented environment. These actions may reflect on how they work not only with their colleagues but also with their superiors. Without being able to identify the necessary responsibilities of a workaholic's job, employees may not have a clear understanding of what activities are specifically linked to their role. Despite these findings, the current study results indicate that there was no significant relationship between the Supportive Management relationships and Role Clarity (Porter, 1996). Supportive Management measures the extent to which management is perceived as flexible and supportive (Brown & Leigh, 1996). Future research should continue to investigate how work addiction risk relates to different styles of management and colleague and subordinate relationships. Porter (1996) focused on how a workaholic behavior may deter colleagues from working and did not focus on their relationship with their immediate supervisor. Role Clarity describes how easily a job can be identified. The current study shows that there is no significant relationship between understanding the role and work addiction risk behavior. These findings may agree with the past studies that state that a workaholic's motivation is based upon behavioral maintenance rather than requirements of the job or organization

(Porter, 1996). This reasoning may explain why it may not be important for people who score higher on the WARTM to have clear understanding of their role.

Challenge, Recognition, Contribution and WARTM

Participants who scored higher on the psychological climate subscales, Challenge and Contribution, had a significant relationship with the WARTM. However, participants did not show a significant relationship between the psychological climate subscales, Recognition and the WARTM, thereby offering only partial support for H2. The second hypothesis stated that participants who scored higher on Challenge, Recognition, and Contribution would score higher on the WART. The current study results indicated a positive relationship between Contribution and the WARTM. The Contribution subscale indicates an employee's perceived involvement in the organization. This finding is in line with past research, which state that people who have higher work addiction risk may lead them to think that they have a more pivotal role within the organization than they really do (Porter, 1996). Workaholics are often found to work more independently, giving them a false sense of being indispensible to their organizations.

Recognition is defined as the adequacy of acknowledgement received from the organization (Brown & Leigh, 1996). Finding no significant relationship with work addiction risk may be explained in a similar fashion as the lack of relationship between the WARTM and supportive management. Robinson (2000) believed that workaholics are only focused on work and ignore emotional and personal aspects of their life. Being recognized by the organization generally involves a relationship or at least caring about

relationships with your direct supervisor or colleagues. If having these relationships are not important to the workaholic, then the person may not find it is necessary to be recognized for the amount of work contributed to the organization. In addition, the motivation of the workaholic is not recognition but the preoccupation with work itself (Robinson & Post, 1999).

The current study indicated a strong relationship between Challenge and the WARTM. Based upon Brown and Leigh's measure of psychological climate, the Challenge subscale was the perceived amount of difficulty within the position (1996). By having the perception of a more challenging environment, a person who scores higher on work addiction risk is not able to easily complete a task and therefore does not necessarily have to invent extra work to complete. A challenging environment may be the perfect environment for someone who has work addiction risk tendencies or a challenging environment may foster work addiction behaviors. Further research should be conducted to gain a better understanding of the strong relationship between Challenge and high work addiction risk.

Self-Expression and WARTM

Brown and Leigh define the Self-Expression subscale by the amount of freedom to communicate personal beliefs (1996). No prior research has been conducted on Self-Expression and work addiction risk. The current study found a significant positive relationship between Self-Expression and high work addiction risk, a finding that may contradict past research that focuses on work addiction and behavioral maintenance for a person who does not want to think about the personal aspects of life (Porter, 1996;

Robinson, 2000). Self-Expression can also include communicating personal aspects of one's life, it would appear that a person with high work addiction risk would score lower on the psychological climate subscale. Further research should be conducted to explain why Self-Expression relates to work addiction.

Study Limitations and Future Research

As previously mentioned, the current study differed from past studies concerning workaholism. A large amount of past research focused on the Spence and Robins (1992) typology. It may be important to review past research done with the Spence and Robbins typology against the Flowers and Robbins abbreviated WART. The past research on organizational climate using the Spence and Robbins typology may not generate the same results if researchers had used the WART.

Overall, the data sample was generally homogeneous. The current findings should not ignore the lack of external validity or the generalizability of the study. There were only 175 participants who participated in the complete study, and 82% were between the ages of 25 and 35. Seventy percent of the participants were female at the non-management level. Expanding the participant pool could change the results and make the results more reflective of the overall population.

It should also be noted that the data was collected through self-report. Self-report data are subjective and may be distorted or biased, which in turn can affect the study outcomes. Future research would benefit on having a more comprehensive approach towards understanding the work addiction risk of an individual rather than solely relying on their own self-report. Since workaholism can be observed in more than just the

organizational environment, collecting work addiction risk data from colleagues, supervisors, subordinates and family/personal relationships will be important.

Last, but not least, it is important to remember that the current study only examined the relationship between psychological climate and work addiction risk. Future studies would benefit from determining if there is a directional relationship between the two main variables. It is still unknown whether a person picks a psychological climate which portrays work addiction risk behaviors or if the psychological climate fosters the behavior for someone to become a workaholic. Further research would benefit from understanding the motivation of the workaholic before understanding the view on psychological climate.

Organizational and Practical Implications

Results from the current study indicated a significant relationship between having a positive view of the psychological climate of the organization and exhibiting work addiction risk behaviors. A majority of past research focuses on the negative side of workaholism (Burke, 2000; Oates, 1968, 1971; Persuad, 2004; Robinson, 2000). Workaholism or high work addiction risk may also contain a constructive component if employees have a positive psychological climate view. Maschlowitz (1980) conducted a study on 100 workaholics and found them to be satisfied and productive. The current study may question if organizations need to be concerned with work addiction. Based upon the findings, individuals who rate higher on work addiction risk are positively engaged as well. Despite the abundant amount of past research which has found

workaholism to be negative, perhaps the individual's perception of their environment and their work addiction risk may need to be further assessed.

Conclusions

Should workaholism be considered an addiction? Griffiths (2005) stated that the real difference between healthy excessive behaviors and addictions is that healthy behaviors add to life, whereas addictions take away from life. The primary goal of the current study was to determine whether there was a relationship between an individuals' psychological climate and their work addiction risk. The results did show that people who scored higher on the WART viewed their psychological climate at work as more positive. Additionally, findings indicated that specific psychological climate subscales (e.g., Challenge) had a strong relationship with work addiction risk. The current study contradicts a majority of the past research, which stated that workaholism was a negative and unhealthy habit. Continuing individual level research to understand the healthy components associated with workaholism may help organizations understand how to maintain a healthy workforce.

REFERENCES

Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (1996). The boundaryless career: A new employment

principle for new organizational era. In D. M. Rousseau & M. D. Arthur (Eds.), *The*

boundaryless career (pp. 370-382). New York: Oxford University Press.

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., & Cunningham, J. (2009). Workaholism, work stress, work-life imbalance: Exploring

gender's role. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, *23*, 553-566.

Brown, S. P., & Leigh, T. W. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to

job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*, 358-368.

Buelens, M., & Poelmans, S. A. Y. (2004). Enriching the Spence and Robbins' typology of

workaholism: Demographic, motivational and organizational correlates. *Journal of*

Organizational Change Management, 17, 440-458.

Burke, R. J. (2000). Workaholism among women managers: Personal and workplace correlates.

Journal of Managerial Psychology, *15*, 520-534.

Burke, R. J. (2002). Do workaholics prefer demanding, aggressive, and results oriented

organizational cultures? *Career Development International, 7*, 211-217.

Burke, R. J. (2004). Workaholism in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change*

Management, *17*, 420-423.

Byrne, Z. S., Stoner, J., Thompson, K. R. , & Hochwarter, W. (2004). The interactive effects of

conscientiousness, work effort, and psychological climate of job performance. *Journal of*

Vocational Behavior, 66, 326-338.

Caproni, P. J. (1997). Work/life balance: You can't get there from here. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *33*, 46-56.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297-334.

Facebook. (2009). Web site: http://www.thefacebook.com

Fassel, D. (1992). *Working ourselves to death: The high costs of workaholism and the rewards of recovery*. London, UK: Thornsons.

Fletcher, J. K., & Bailyn, L. (1996). Challenging the last boundary: Reconnecting work and family. In M. B. Arthur & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *The boundaryless career* (pp. 3-20). New York: Oxford University Press.

Flowers, C. P., & Robinson, C. (2002). A structural and discriminant analysis of the Work Addiction Risk Test. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 62*, 517-526.

Ford, L. R., & Seers, A. (2006). Relational leadership and team climates: Pitting differentiation versus agreement. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 258-270.

Furnham, A. (1997). *The psychology of behavior at work*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Griffiths, M. (2005). Workaholism is still a useful construct. *Addiction Research and Theory*, *13*, 97-100.

Harpaz, I., & Snir, R. (2003). Workaholism: Its definition and nature. *Human Relations*, *56*, 291-319.

Homer, J. B. (1985). Worker burnout: A dynamic model with implications for prevention and Control. *System Dynamics Review*, *1*, 42-62.

James, L. R., Hater, J. J., Gent, M. J., & Bruni, J. R. (1978). Psychological climate: Implications from cognitive social learning theory and interactional psychology. *Personnel Psychology, 31,* 783-813.

James, L. R., & Jones, A. P. (1980). Perceived job characteristics and job satisfaction: An examination or reciprocal causation. *Personnel Psychology*, *33*, 97-135.

James, L., James, L., & Ashe, D. (1990). *The meaning of organizations: The role of cognition and values in organizational climate and culture*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*, 692-724.

Keane, F. (1998). *Family values fall apart in our workaholic corporate culture*. Retrieved on July 23, 2009, from http://livense.icopyright.net/user/viewFreeUse/act?fuid

Killinger, B. (1992). *Workaholics: The respectable addicts*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Korn, E. R., Pratt, G. J., & Lambrou, P. T. (1987). *Hyper-performance: The A.I.M. strategy for releasing your business potential.* New York: John Wiley.

LinkedIn. (2009). Web site: http://www.linkedin.com

Machlowitz, M. (1980). *Workaholics.* New York: Mentor.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual* (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychological Press.

Naughton, T. J. (1987). A conceptual view of workaholism and implications for career counseling and research. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 180-187.

Ng, T. W. H., Sorensen, K. L., & Feldman, D. C. (2006). Dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of workaholism: A conceptual integration and extension. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *28*, 111-136.

Oates, W. (1968). On being a workaholic (a serious jest). *Pastoral Psychology, 19*, 16-20.

Oates, W. (1971). *Confessions of a workaholic*. New York: World Books.

Patterson, G. M., West, M. A., Shackleton, V. J., Dawson, J. F., Lawthom, R, Maitlis, S., Wallace, A. M. (2005). Validating the organizational climate measure: Links to managerial practices, productivity and innovation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*, 379-408.

Persuad, R. (2004). Are you dependent on your work? *BMJ Careers*, *329*, 36-37.

Porter, G. (1996). Organizational impact of workaholism: Suggestions for researching the negative outcomes of excessive work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *70*, 70-83.

Robinson, B. E. (1999). The Work Addiction Risk Test: Development of a tentative measure of workaholism. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *88*, 199-210.

Robinson, B. E. (2000). Workaholism: Bridging the gap between workplace, socioculture, and family research. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, *37*, 31-47.

Robinson, B. E., & Post, P. (1994). Validity of the Work Addiction Risk Test. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *78*, 337-338.

Robinson, C. E., & Phillips, B. (1995). Measuring workaholism: Content validity of the Work Addiction Risk Test. *Psychological Reports*, 77, 657-658.

Rousseau, D. M. (1988). The construction of climate in organizational research. In C. L.Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 139-158). New York: Wiley.

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic review*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, B. (2000). The psychological life of organizations. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. M. Wilderon, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate* (pp. xvii-xxi). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schneider, B., & Reichers, A. E. (1983). On the etiology of climates. *Personnel Psychology, 36*, 19-39.

Schor, J. B. (1991). *The overworked American: The unexpected decline of leisure*. New York: Basic Books.

Scott, K. S., Moore, K. S., & Micell, M. P. (1997). An exploration of the meaning and consequences of workaholism. *Human Relations*, *50*, 287-314.

Spence, J. T., & Robbins, A. S. (1992). Workaholism: Definition, measurement, and preliminary results. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *58*, 160-178.

Sullivan, S. E. (1999). The changing nature of careers: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 25*, 457-484.

Survey Monkey. (2009). Web site: http://www.surveymonkey.com

Taris, T. W., Schaufeli, W. B., & Verhoeven, L. C. (2005). Workaholism in the Netherlands: Measurement and implications for job strain and work-nonwork conflict. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *54*, 37-60.

Workaholic. (n.d.). *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition*. Retrieved October 06, 2009, from Dictionary.com website: http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/workaholic.

Weick, K. (1993). The collapse of sensemaking in organizations: The Mann Gulch disaster, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *38*, 628 -652.

APPENDIX A: IRB DOCUMENTATION

University and Medical Center Institutional Review Board
East Carolina University • Brody School of Medicine
600 Moye Boulevard • Old Health Sciences Library, Room 1L-09 • Greenville, NC 27834
Office **252-744-2914** • Fax **252-744-2284** • www.ecu.edu/irb
Chair and Director of Biomedical IRB: L. Wiley Nifong, MD
Chair and Director of Behavioral and Social Science IRB: Susan L. McCammon, PhD

TO: Kerri Conning, 1808 N. Queens Lane, Apr 215, Arlington, VA 22201

FROM   UMCIRB *lcr*

DATE: November 2, 2009

RE: Human Research Activities Determined to Meet Exempt Criteria

TITLE: "Psychological Climate and Work Addiction Risk: Do the Perceptions of our Organizations Matter?"

UMCIRB #09-0762

This research study has undergone IRB review on 10.28.09. It is the determination of the IRB Chairperson (or designee) that these activities meet the criteria set forth in the federal regulations for exemption from 45 CFR 46 Subpart A. This human research activity meets the criteria for an exempt status because it is a research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects and 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.

The Chairperson (or designee) deemed this **unfunded** study **no more than minimal risk.** This research study does not require any additional interaction with the UMCIRB unless there are proposed changes to this study. Any changes must be submitted to the UMCIRB for review prior to implementation to allow determination that proposed changes do not impact the activities eligibility for exempt status. Should it found that a proposed change does require more substantive review, you will be notified in writing within five business days.

The following items were reviewed in determination exempt certification:
- Internal Processing Form (dated 7.30.09)
- Survey including informed consent
- Cover letter
- COI Disclosure Form (dated 10.4.09)
- Thesis Proposal

It was furthermore determined that the reviewer does not have a potential for conflict of interest on this study.

The UMCIRB applies 45 CFR 46, Subparts A-D, to all research reviewed by the UMCIRB regardless of the funding source. 21 CFR 50 and 21 CFR 56 are applied to all research studies that fall under the purview of Food and Drug Administration regulations. The UMCIRB follows applicable International Conference on Harmonisation Good Clinical Practice guidelines.

IRB00000705 East Carolina U IRB #1 (Biomedical) IORG0000418
IRB00003781 East Carolina U IRB #2 (Behavioral/SS) IORG0000418
IRB00004973 East Carolina U IRB #4 (Behavioral/SS Summer) IORG0000418
Version 3-5-07

UMCIRB #09-0762
Page 1 of 1

APPENDIX B: ONLINE SURVEY

Psychological Climate and Work Addiction Risk

CONSENT DOCUMENT

Title of Research Study: Psychological Climate and Work Addiction Risk: Do the Perceptions of our Organizations Matter?
Principal Investigator: Kerri Conning, Industrial and Organizational Psychology
Institution: East Carolina University
Telephone #: 540-604-6195

INTRODUCTION
You have been asked to participate in a research study being conducted by Kerri Conning. This research study is Psychological Climate and Work Addiction Risk: Do the Perceptions of our Organizations Matter?

PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES
Approximately 5-10 minutes should be allotted to complete this questionnaire. Please do not include your name. You may end your participation at any time or refuse to answer any questions you deem inappropriate. Completion of the survey equates participation consent. Please be honest when indicating responses to the questionnaire.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS
Some items asked on the survey may be of a personal nature and could be uncomfortable for some respondents. Please note that you may withdraw from participation at any time or refuse to answer any questions that you deem personal or otherwise inappropriate.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS
There may be no personal benefit from your participation but the knowledge received may be of value to humanity.

SUBJECT PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY OF RECORDS
Participation of this study is entirely voluntary. All responses to this survey will remain completely anonymous and confidential, as you will never be asked to identify yourself. The final report will include data from the study, but only in its aggregated form; no individuals will be singled out for analysis. Your participation in the study and completion of the questionnaire would be greatly appreciated. The responses you provide will be automatically encoded and digitally transmitted back to the research team at ECU. Only members of the ECU research team will be permitted to review responses to the survey.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION
Participating in this study is voluntary. If you decide not to be in this study after it has already started, you may stop at any time without losing benefits that you should normally receive. You may stop at any time you choose without penalty.

PERSONS TO CONTACT WITH QUESTIONS
The investigators will be available to answer any questions concerning this research, now or in the future. You may contact the investigators, Kerri Conning or Dr. Cope at phone numbers 540-604-6195 (days) or 252-328-6497 (days), respectively. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, you may call the Chair of the University and Medical Center Institutional Review Board at phone number 252-744-2914 (days). If you would like to report objections to this research study, you may call (Investigator should choose the appropriate office and delete the one(s) that is/are not relevant) the ECU Director of Research Compliance at phone number 252-328-9473 (for research studies conducted through ECU) or the PCMH Risk Management Office at 252-847-5246 (for research studies conducted through PCMH).

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
This study is funded by Kerri Conning which is supporting the costs of this research. Neither the research site, nor Kerri Conning will receive any financial benefit based on the results of this study.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE
Title of research study: Psychological Climate and Work Addiction Risk: Do the Perceptions of our

Psychological Climate and Work Addiction Risk

Organizations Matter?

I have read all of the above information, asked questions and have received satisfactory answers in areas I did not understand.

If the above statement is true and you still voluntarily wish to participate in this study, please proceed to the survey and complete it by checking the appropriate box below and clicking the confirm button. Otherwise, please do not continue. Please print a copy of this consent form for your records.

Psychological Climate and Work Addiction Risk

Please answer the following questions based on the scale below
1 - (Strongly Disagree)
2 - (Disagree/Strongly Disagree)
3 - (Disagree)
4 - (Neither Disagree nor Agree)
5 - (Agree)
6 - (Agree/Strongly Agree)
7 - (Strongly Agree)

1. My boss is flexible about how I accomplish my job objectives.

2. My manager is supportive of my ideas and ways of getting things done.

3. My boss gives me the authority to do my job as I see fit.

4. I'm careful in taking responsibility because my boss is often critical of new ideas.

5. I can trust my boss to back me up on decision I make in the field.

6. Management makes it perfectly clear how my job is to be done.

7. The amount of work responsibility and effort expected in my job is clearly defined.

8. The norms of performance in my department are well understood and communicated.

9. I feel very useful in my job.

10. Doing my job well really makes a difference.

11. I feel like a key member of the organization.

Psychological Climate and Work Addiction Risk

12. The work I do is very valuable to the organization.

[▾]

13. I rarely feel my work is taken for granted.

[▾]

14. My superiors generally appreciated the way I do my job.

[▾]

15. The organization recognizes the significance of the contributions I make.

[▾]

16. The feelings I express at work are my true feelings.

[▾]

17. I feel free to be completely myself at work.

[▾]

18. There are parts of myself that I am not free to express at work.

[▾]

19. It is okay to express my true feelings in this job.

[▾]

20. My job is very challenging.

[▾]

21. It takes all of my resources to achieve my work objectives.

[▾]

Psychological Climate and Work Addiction Risk

Please answer the following questions based on the scale below
1 - (Never True)
2 - (Sometimes True)
3 - (Often True)
4 - (Always True)

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

[▾]

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

[▾]

3. I find myself doing two or three things at one time such as eating lunch and writing a memo, while talking on the phone.

[▾]

4. I overly commit myself by biting off more than I can chew.

[▾]

5. I feel guilty when I am not working on something.

[▾]

6. I find myself continuing to work after my coworkers have called it quits.

[▾]

7. I put myself under pressure with self-imposed deadlines when I work.

[▾]

8. It is hard for me to relax when I am not working.

[▾]

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

[▾]

10. Things do not seem to move fast enough or get done fast enough for me.

[▾]

11. I get angry when people don't meet my standards of perfection.

[▾]

12. I get upset when I am in situations where I cannot be in control.

[▾]

Psychological Climate and Work Addiction Risk

13. I get upset with myself for making even the smallest mistake.

[▾]

14. I put more thought, time, and energy into my work than I do into my relationships with friends and loved ones.

[▾]

15. I forget, ignore, or minimize birthdays, reunions, anniversaries, or holidays.

[▾]

Psychological Climate and Work Addiction Risk

Demographic Information

1. Age

[▼]

2. Gender

[▼]

3. Ethnicity

[▼]

4. Relationship Status

[▼]

5. Do you have children?

[▼]

6. Hours worked per week (including hours worked at home)

[▼]

7. How long have you been in your current organization?

[▼]

8. How long have you been in your current position?

[▼]

9. Career Status

[▼]

10. Income Bracket

[▼]

APPENDIX C: PSYCHOLOGICAL CLIMATE SCALE

Supportive Management
S1. My boss is flexible about how I accomplish my job objectives.
S2. My manager is supportive of my ideas and ways of getting things done.
S3. My boss gives me the authority to do my job as I see fit.
S4. I'm careful in taking responsibility because my boss is often critical of new ideas (reverse score)
S5. I can trust my boss to back me up on decision I make in the field.

Role Clarity
C11. Management makes it perfectly clear how my job is to be done.
C12. The amount of work responsibility and effort expected in my job is clearly defined.
C13. The norms of performance in my department are well understood and communicated.

Contribution
Co1. I feel very useful in my job.
Co2. Doing my job well really makes a difference.
Co3. I feel like a key member of the organization.
Co4. The work I do is very valuable to the organization.

Recognition
R1. I rarely feel my work is taken for granted.
R2. My superiors generally appreciated the way I do my job.
R3. The organization recognizes the significance of the Contributions I make.

Self-Expression
E1. The feelings I express at work are my true feelings.
E2. I feel free to be completely myself at work.
E3. There are parts of myself that I am not free to express at work. (reversed score)
E4. It is okay to express my true feelings in this job.

Challenge
Ch1. My job is very challenging.
Ch2. It takes all of my resources to achieve my work objectives.

APPENDIX D: FLOWERS AND ROBINSON'S MODIFIED VERSION OF WORK
ADDICTION RISK TEST

Compulsive Tendencies

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

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

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.

7. I overly commit myself by biting off more than I can chew.

8. I feel guilty when I am not working on something.

15. I find myself continuing to work after my coworkers have called it quits.

18. I put myself under pressure with self-imposed deadlines when I work.

19. It is hard for me to relax when I am not working.

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

Control

11. Things do not seem to move fast enough or get done fast enough for me.

16. I get angry when people don't meet my standards of perfection.

17. I get upset when I am in situations where I cannot be in Control.

22. I get upset with myself for making even the smallest mistake.

Impaired Communication/Self-Absorption

23. I put more thought, time, and energy into my work than I do into my relationships with friends and loved ones.

24. I forget, ignore, or minimize birthdays, reunions, anniversaries, or holidays.

APPENDIX E: INFORMED CONSENT FORM (CONSENT DOCUMENT FROM
ONLINE SURVEY)

CONSENT DOCUMENT

Title of Research Study: Psychological climate and Work addiction risk: Do the Perceptions of our Organizations Matter?
Principal Investigator: Kerri Conning, Industrial and Organizational Psychology
Institution: East Carolina University
Address:1808 N Queens Lane #215, Arlington, VA 22201
Telephone #: 540-604-6195

INTRODUCTION

You have been asked to participate in a research study being conducted by Kerri Conning. This research study is Psychological climate and Work addiction risk: Do the Perceptions of our Organizations Matter?

PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES

Approximately 5-10 minutes should be allotted to complete this questionnaire. Please do not include your name. You may end your participation at any time or refuse to answer any questions you deem inappropriate. Completion of the survey equates participation consent. Please be honest when indicating responses to the questionnaire.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

Some items asked on the survey may be of a personal nature and could be uncomfortable for some respondents. Please note that you may withdraw from participation at any time or refuse to answer any questions that you deem personal or otherwise inappropriate.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS

There may be no personal benefit from your participation but the knowledge received may be of value to humanity.

SUBJECT PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY OF RECORDS

Participation of this study is entirely voluntary. All responses to this survey will remain completely anonymous and confidential, as you will never be asked to identify yourself. The final report will include data from the study, but only in its aggregated form; no individuals will be singled out for analysis. Your participation in the study and completion of the questionnaire would be greatly appreciated. The responses you provide will be automatically encoded and digitally transmitted back to the research team at ECU. Only members of the ECU research team will be permitted to review responses to the survey.

COSTS OF PARTICIPATION & COMPENSATION

You will not receive any monetary compensation for your participation in this study.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

Participating in this study is voluntary. If you decide not to be in this study after it has already started, you may stop at any time without losing benefits that you should normally receive. You may stop at any time you choose without penalty.

PERSONS TO CONTACT WITH QUESTIONS

The investigators will be available to answer any questions concerning this research, now or in the future. You may contact the investigators, Kerri Conning or Dr. Cope at phone numbers 540-604-6195 (days) or 252-328-6497 (days), respectively. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, you may call the Chair of the University and Medical Center Institutional Review Board at phone number 252-744-2914 (days). If you would like to report objections to this research study, you may call the ECU Director of Research Compliance at phone number 252-328-9473.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

This study is funded by Kerri Conning which is supporting the costs of this research. Neither the research site, nor Kerri Conning will receive any financial benefit based on the results of this study.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

Title of research study: Psychological climate and Work addiction risk: Do the Perceptions of our Organizations Matter?

I have read all of the above information, asked questions and have received satisfactory answers in areas I did not understand.

If the above statement is true and you still voluntarily wish to participate in this study, please proceed to the survey and complete it by checking the appropriate box below and clicking the confirm button. Otherwise, please do not continue. Please print a copy of this consent form for your records.