Abstract

Purpose -. This research considered the relationship of two workaholic job behaviors proposed by Mudrack (2006) with potential correlates in a large sample of Egyptian managers.

Design/methodology/approach - Data were collected from 242 respondents, 146 males and 96 females, using anonymously completed questionnaires, a 48% response rate. Measures included two workaholic job behaviors, personal demographic and work situation characteristics, stable individual difference personality factors, job behaviors, work outcomes, after-work recovery experiences, indicators of quality of life (e. g., work-family conflict, life satisfaction) and psychological well-being.

Findings –The two workaholic job behaviors, Non-required work and control of others, were significantly and positively correlated, but modestly. One or both were related to job demands and to perfectionism and difficulty delegating.. Managers scoring higher on workaholic job behaviors tended to report poorer psychological well-being. But managers scoring higher on workaholic job behaviors also tended to be more job satisfied and work engaged, the latter being contrary to expectations.

Research limitations/implications –The sample, though large, may not be representative of Egyptian managers. In addition questions of causality could not be addressed. .

Practical implications – Workaholic job behaviors, as measured by the Mudrack scales, may not capture the negative connotations of the workaholism concept. Findings point out the difficulties in reducing workaholic job behaviors if they are associated with perceptions of job and career satisfaction.

Originality/value -.This study adds to our understanding of workaholism in Egypt. Human resource management and worker attitudes have not received much research attention in Egypt.

Key words: Workaholism, Egyptian managers, work outcomes, psychological well-being

Paper type –Research paper

Workaholic job behaviors among managers in Egypt:
Potential antecedents and consequences.[1]

Ronald J. Burke   and   Ghada El-Kot
York University   Arab Academy for Science and Technology
and Maritime Transport

Workaholism in organizations

The concept of workaholism has received considerable attention in the popular press in North America, the UK and Japan, developed countries noted for long work hours. However very little research as been conducted to further our understanding of it. As a result, opinion, observations and conclusions about workaholism are conflicting. Some writers view workaholism positively from the organization's perspective (Machlowitzs, 1980); other writers view workaholism negatively from both individual and organizational perspectives (Fassel, 1990; Killinger, 1991; Schaef & Fassel, 1988; Oates, 1971; Porter, 1996; Robinson, 1998).

Researchers have also used different definitions of workaholism (see Scott, Moore, & Miceli, 1997; Spence & Robbins, 1992; Robinson, 1998, for examples). The measure of workaholism then becomes critical to our understanding of it. Two measures of workaholism have been widely used; one, the most widely used, is the Spence and Robbins workaholism triad (Spence & Robbins, 1992), and the other is the Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) developed by Robinson (1998). And as is often the case in organizational research, the more a measure is used the more questions are raised about it. Both the Spence and Robbins and Robinson measures have received some criticisms.   The Spence and Robbins measure contains three scales: work involvement, feeling driven to work because of inner pressures, and work enjoyment. Studies have shown that the work involvement measure sometimes lacks reliability, is not found in some factor analyses, and contains attitudes (work involvement) and outcomes (work enjoyment)

Mudrack (2006) and McMillan, O'Driscoll, Marsh and Brady (2001) have raised these concerns. The Robinson measure contains items that overlap with negative outcomes (Burke, 2000).

Two other measures of workaholic behaviors have been developed over the past few years by Mudrack (2001, 2006) and Schaufeli, Taris and Bakker (2008) The Mudrack measure includes two scales: Non-required work and Control of others. The Schaufeli, Taris and Bakker measure also contains two scales: Working compulsively and Working excessively. Both view workaholism negatively and both attempt to measure individual workaholic job behaviors.

Mudrack (2006) builds on the Scott, Moore and Miceli (1997) review, arguing that workaholism is a behavior or behavioral tendency. Workaholic job behaviors would include spending free time at work, thinking about work when not at work, and working more than is required by one's organization or one's financial needs. He reports, based on a study of a large sample of US MBA students working full time, modest but significant relationships of the two scales (Non-required work, Control of others) with several work attitudes (e.g., job involvement, job satisfaction , job stress, role conflict) and personality factors (e.g., need for achievement, orderliness, rigidity).Control of others was more strongly correlated with other variables than was Non-required work, but few correlations exceeded .40. Non-required work and Control of others were significantly and positively correlated but only moderately (r=.25, p<.001). Mudrack did not present the mean values on the two workaholic scales however.

The present study used the two Mudrack workaholic job behavior scales, incorporating a larger variety of potential antecedents and consequences, and applied them to a different sample, managers and professionals working in a variety of organizations and industries in Egypt. The Mudrack measures have only been used in two studies to our knowledge, the original study (Mudrack & Naughton, 2001; Mudrack, 2006) and Burke, Jeng, Koyuncu & Fiksenbaum, 2009).

Burke, Jeng, Koyuncu and Fiksenbaum (2009) examined the relationship of Non-required work and Control of others in a study of 309 male and female managers working in 3-, 4-, and 5-star hotels in Beijing, China, a 90% response rate. The two workaholic job behaviors were highly reliable and were significantly and positively correlated (r=.63, p<.001). Managers scoring higher on the two workaholic job behaviors were at higher organizational levels, worked in more intense jobs, and worked more hours per week. Managers scoring higher on the two workaholic job behaviors were also more perfectionistic and delegated less often. Contrary to predictions, however, workaholic job behaviors had few relationships with work and career satisfaction, work-family and family-work conflict, and indicators of psychological well-being. Mudrack's two workaholic job behaviors seemed to be measures of characteristics of high level jobs than actual workaholic behaviors associated with distress. The lack of support for Mudrack's measures in this long work hours sample may also reflect the economic realities and cultural values of China, different from those of the US (Hofstede, 1980).

The present study examined the two Mudrack workaholic job behavior scales in a large sample of managers working in various organizations and industries in Egypt. Is workaholism relevant to Egypt, a large Muslim country practicing the Islamic religion?

Egyptian cultural values

There has been increasing research attention devoted to business in the Middle East over the past two decades. The Middle Eastern economy has flourished partly the result of oil and partly the result of a young and growing population (Ali, 1999; Budhwar & Mellahi, 2007). Egypt is similar to other Middle Eastern countries in some ways but different in others (Ali, 1999; 2005; Muna, 1980). Hofstede (1980) found that all Middle Eastern countries shared similar societal and cultural values. These countries indicated large power differences, scored high on uncertainty

avoidance, scored low on individualism (or high on collectivism) and scored only slightly above average on masculinity. Egypt is a patriarchal society with boys more highly valued than girls (El -Ghannam, 2001, 2002), and strict gender roles with women responsible for home and family (Ali, 2005; Metcalfe, 2006; 2007, 2008: Mostafa, 2003). Hofstede concluded that the small number of women in the workforce generally and their absence at senior levels of management and in politics, reflected religious values (Islam) more than masculine values (see also El;-Saadawi, 2002; Sidani, 2005). In addition, it has been difficult to undertake human resource management research in Egypt since many organizations are not interested in such research and many managers do not want their subordinates to participate in research that might be critical of their performance (Ali, 2005; Budhwar & Mellahi, 2007)

But Egypt is in transition. Researchers (El-Kot & Leat, 2008, Leat & El-Kot, 2007) have shown that human resource practices in Egypt tend to reflect a combination of those based on traditional cultural values and newer practices developed in the Western world. There are now an increasing number of women in the workforce (Al-Lamky, 2007; Jamali, Safieddine & Daouk, 2006). In addition, an increasing number of Egyptians are being educated with women's numbers in university approaching those of men (Mostafa, 2003).

Egypt is a patriarchal and traditional society (Ali, 2005; Metcalfe, 2007) and Egyptian organizations use human resource management practices that are patriarchal (Ali, 2005) Egypt places a high value on the family (Metcalfe, 2006). The Egyptian education system is weak and needs improving (Tyler & Holmes, 2008); Egypt has shown only slow economic development (Ali, 2005; Budhwar & Mellahi, 2007).

Research objectives

The preset investigation attempts to replicate and extend the earlier Mudrack research by employing a different occupational sample in a country at a different stage of economic development and having different values (Hofstede, 1980).As the Mudrack scales have only been used in two previous studies, this research will further add to our understanding of them. It replicates the Mudrack work by including measures of work outcomes and psychological well-being; it extends the Mudrack work by including measures of use of recovery experience after work (sonnentag & Fritz, 2007).

Based on the workaholism literature, the following general hypotheses were considered.

1. Scores on the two workaholic job behaviors would be significantly and positively correlated.

2. Managers scoring higher on the two workaholic job behaviors would work more hours per week and report greater work intensity.

3. Managers scoring higher on the two workaholic job behaviors would score higher on both perfectionism and non-delegation.

4. Managers scoring higher on the two workaholic job behaviors would be more work engaged; work engagement being another behavioral manifestation of workaholism.

5. Managers scoring higher on the two workaholic job behaviors would make less use of recovery experiences after work.

6 . Managers scoring higher on the two workaholic job behaviors would indicate lower levels of work satisfaction, work engagement, and greater intent to quit.

7. Managers scoring higher on the two workaholic job behaviors would indicate a poorer quality of life and more psychological distress, workaholism having negative connotations.

Method

Procedure

Data were collected between October 2008 and January 2009 from service and manufacturing organizations in two Egyptian cities (Alexandria and Cairo) Members of the research team contacted about 50 organizations in these cities requesting their participation in the research. The 24 cooperating organizations then provided a list of managers and professionals to the researchers. Service organizations included telecommunications, banks, educational institutions, and a maritime service provider. Manufacturing organizations included pharmaceutical, petroleum companies, and production companies focusing upon production of milk, juice and food. Approximately 500 managers and professionals were contacted; of which 242 provided completed questionnaires, a 48% response rate. Questionnaires were completed anonymously in English. The respondents are best described as a large convenience sample of Egyptian managers and professionals in a variety of industries. .

Respondents

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the sample. Over half were male (60%), almost all worked full-time (93%), over half were 30 years of age or younger (61%), most were single (62%), without children (64%), were university graduates (95%), worked 40 hours a week or less (42%), were in middle management (33%), supervised others (66%), earned over LE 25,000 a year of income (46%), a had relatively short job and organizational tenures (over half having 2 years or less job tenure-60% and over one third having two years of less of organizational tenure -37%), and worked in organizations of varying sizes, the average being about 1000 employees. Respondents fell into several functions: IT and logistics, 16%; marketing and sales, 14%; finance, 13%; production, 11%'; and customer service, 9%.

Measures

Personal Demographic and work Situation Characteristics

A number of personal demographics (e.g., age, gender, level of education, marital and parental status) and work situation characteristics (e.g., organizational level, job and organizational tenure) were measured by single items (see Table 1).

Workaholic Job Behaviors

Two workaholic behavior scales developed by Mudrack (2006) were included. One, Non-required work, had 4 items (α =.82). An item was "Thinking of ways to improve the quality of work provided to customers and/or co-workers." The other, Control others, also had 4 items (α =.74). One item was "fixing problems created by other people".

Job Demands

Two job demands were included.

Work hours were assessed by a single item. Respondents indicated the number of hours they worked in a typical week.

Work intensity was assessed by a 15 item scale (α =.74). Some items were taken from Hewlett and Luce (2006) while others were developed by the researchers. Items included: "an unpredictable flow of work", "availability to clients 24/7", and "a large scope of responsibility that amounts to more than one job".

Job Behaviors

Two job behaviors were assessed.

Perfectionism was measured by 8 items (α =.67) developed by Spence and Robbins (1992). One item was "I cannot let go of projects until I'm sure they are exactly right."

Non-delegation was assessed by 7 items (α =.72) also developed by Spence and Robbins (1992). An item was "I feel that if you want something done correctly you should do it yourself."

Work and Well-Being Outcomes

A wide range of outcome variables were included in this study covering both work and extra-work domains. These variables were consistent with those typically used in studies of work and well-being more generally (e.g., Barling, Kelloway & Frone, 2005; Schabracq, Winnubst & Cooper, 2003).

Work Outcomes

Four work outcomes were included.

Job satisfaction was measured by a seven item scale (α =.80) developed by Kofodimos (1993). An item was "I feel challenged by my work."

Career satisfaction was assessed by a five item scale (α =.88) created by Greenhaus, Parasuraman and Wormley (1990). One item was "I feel satisfied with the progress I have made in my career to date."

Job stress was measured by a nine item scale (α =.59) developed by Spence and Robbins (1992). One item was "Sometimes I feel like my work is going to overwhelm me."

Intent to quit was measured by two items (α =.84) used previously by Burke (1991). One item was "Are you currently looking for a different job in a different organization? (Yes/no).

Work engagement

Three aspects of work engagement were assessed using scales developed by Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma and Bakker (2002). These were:

Dedication was assessed by five items (α =.88) One item was "I am proud of the work that I do."

Vigor was measured by six items (α =.72). An item was "at my work I feel bursting with energy."

Absorption was measured by six items (α =.74). One item was "I am immersed in my work." Respondents indicated their agreement with each item on a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 5=strongly agree).

 Recovery experiences

Four recovery experiences were measure using scales developed by Sonnentag and Fritz (2007). These were:

Psychological detachment was measured by 4 items (α =.92). One item was "I forget about work"

Relaxation was also measured by 4 items (α =.85). An item was "I take time for leisure."

Mastery was assessed by 4 items (α =.75) One item was "I learn new things."

Control was measured by 4 items (α =.88). An item was "I determine for myself how I will spend my time."

<u>Psychological Well-Being</u>

Four aspects of psychological well-being were considered.

<u>Exhaustion</u> was measured by a nine item scale (α =.74), part of the Maslach Burnout Inventory, developed by Maslach, Jackson and Leiter (1996). An item was "I feel emotionally drained from my work."

<u>Work-Family Conflict</u>

Three aspects of work-family conflict were assessed using scales developed by Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000). Each had three items and assessed tinme-, strain-, and behavior-based conflict. The respective reliabilities for these were .92, .60, and .645. These three scales were also combined into a composite score since they were significantly and positively inter-correlated (alpha=-.83). One item was "The stress from my job often makes me irritable when I get home."

<u>Psychosomatic symptoms</u> was measured by a nineteen item scale (α =.85) developed by Quinn and Shepard (1974). Respondents indicated how frequently they had experienced each physical symptom (e.g., headaches, difficulty sleeping) in the past year.

<u>Life satisfaction</u> was assessed by a five item scale (α =.) created by Diener, Emmons, Larsen and Griffin (1985). A sample item was "I am satisfied with my life."

<div align="center">Results</div>

<u>Descriptive statistics</u>.

The two workaholic job behaviors, Non-required work and Control of others, were significantly and positively correlated (r=.32, p<.001, n=242). Mangers scored higher on Non-required work than on Control of others (means being 3.5 and 3.2 respectively). These two

measures were more highly correlated in the Chinese sample (r=.63) and were correlated at about the same level as in the original Mudrack study (r=.25). Respondents in the Chinese sample scored 3.5 on Non-required work and 3.3 on Control of others, very similar to levels in the present Egyptian study. Male and female managers in the present study scored similarly on Non-required work (3.4 and 3.6, respectively) but males scored significantly higher on Control of others (3.3 and 2.9,respectively); Male and female managers scored similarly on both Non-required work and Control of others in the Chinese study (3.5 and 3.4 on Non-required work, 3.2 and 3.4 on Control of others).

Analysis Plan

To better understand the measures of workaholic job behaviors, and to examine our general hypotheses, a hierarchical regression analysis was first undertaken in which the two workaholic job behaviors were regressed on two blocks of predictors. The first block of predictors (N= 5) consisted of personal demographics (e.g., age, gender level of education). The second block of predictors (N=4) consisted of work situation characteristics (e.g., organizational level, job and organizational tenure). When a block of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on a given criterion variable (p<.05), individual items or measures within such blocks having significant and independent relationships with these criterion variables were then identified (p<.05). The two workaholic job behaviors were then entered a s third block of predictors to determine their relationship with various dependent variables. This analysis controls for the relationship of both personal demographic and work situation characteristics before examining the relationship of the two workaholic job behaviors and the work and well-being outcome variables.

Predictors of Non-required work and Control of others

Table 2 presents the results of hierarchical regression analyses in which the two workaholic job behaviors were regressed on two blocks of predictors (personal demographics, work situation characteristics). No block of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on Non-required work. Both block of predictors, however, accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on Control of others. Males, managers with less education, and managers having longer job tenure indicated more Control of others (*B*s=-.22, -.19 and .34, respectively).

- -

Enter Table 2 About Here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Predictors of job demands and job behaviors

Table 3 shows the results of hierarchical regression analyses in which two job demands (top half of Table 3) and two job behaviors (bottom half of table 3) were separately regressed on three blocks of predictors (personal demographics, work situation characteristics, two workaholic job behaviors.

The following comments are offered in summary First, two blocks of predictors accounted for a significant mount or increment n explained variance on hours worked per week (personal demographics, workaholic job behaviors). Managers having more education, and managers scoring higher on Control of others worked more hours per week (*B*s=.22 and .18, respectively). Second, all three blocks of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on work intensity. Males, managers working in smaller -sized organizations, managers scoring higher on Control of others and Non-required work indicated higher levels of work intensity (*B*s=-.19,-.16, .35 and .19, respectively).Third, two blocks of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on perfectionism (personal

13

demographics, workaholic jog behaviors). Managers who were married, more highly educated, and scoring higher on Non-required work reported higher levels of perfectionism *(Bs*=.22, .13 and .28, respectively). Fourth, all three blocks of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on non-delegation. .Managers working in larger organizations, managers at lower organizational levels, and managers scoring higher on control of others indicated higher levels on non-delegation (**B**s=.26, .24 and .29, respectively).

- -
Enter Table 3 About Here
- -

Workaholic job behaviors and work engagement

Table 4 presents shows the results of hierarchical regression analyses in which the three measures of work engagement were separately regressed on the three blocks of predictors. All three blocks of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on vigor. Males, single managers, managers at higher organizational levels and managers scoring higher on Non-required work indicated higher levels of vigor (*B*s=.30, .20, .15 and .39, respectively). Two blocks of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on dedication. Managers having less education, single managers, males and managers scoring higher on Non-required work indicated higher levels of dedication (*B*s=-..22, .26, .13 and .30, respectively). . Finally, all three blocks of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on absorption. Less educated managers, managers working in smaller organizations, and managers scoring higher on Non-required work reported higher levels of absorption (*B*s=-.28, .18 and .27, respectively). The fact that Non-required work emerged as a significant predictor of all thee work engagement measures reflects the fact that spending more hours on work-related matters is an element of an engaged worker.

- --

Enter Table 4 About Here

- -

Workaholic job behaviors and use of recovery experiences

Table 5 presents the results of hierarchical regression analyses in which use of each of four

recovery experiences after work were regressed on the three blocks of predictors. Workaholic job

behaviors accounted for a significant increment in explained variance on three of the four

recovery experiences (Psychological detachment, Relaxation, Mastery). Managers scoring higher

on Non-required work and managers scoring higher on control of others made less use of

psychological detachment (*B*s=.-.22 and -.19, respectively); managers scoring higher on Non-

required work and managers scoring higher on control of others made less use of relaxation

(Bs=.- 23 and -.17, respectively); but managers scoring higher on Non-required work made

greater use of Mastery (*B*=..21)

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Enter Table 5 About Here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Workaholic job behaviors and work outcomes

Table 6 shows the results of hierarchical regression analyses n which the four work outcomes

(job satisfaction, career satisfaction, intent to quit) were separately regressed on the three blocks

of predictors. The following comments are offered in summary. First, workaholic job behaviors

accounted for a significant increment in explained variance on all four work outcomes.

Managers scoring higher on Non-required work were more job satisfied (*B*=.42), more career

satisfied *(B*=..17). and less likely to quit (*B*=-.21); managers scoring higher on control of others,

however, indicated higher levels of job stress (*B*=.38).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Enter Table 6 About Here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Workaholic job behaviors and psychological well-being

  Table presents the results of hierarchical regression analyses in which four indicators of

psychological well-being (exhaustion, work-family conflict, psychosomatic symptoms, life

satisfaction) were separately regressed on the three blocks of predictors. First, all three   blocks

of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on

exhaustion. Women, managers in shorter marriages, managers having more education, and

managers at lower organizational levels indicated higher levels of exhaustion. *(Bs=*.18, -.28, .13,

and -.22, respectively). Second, two blocks of predictors (work situation characteristics,

workaholic job behaviors) accounted for significant increments in explained variance on work-

family conflict (work situation characteristics, workaholic job behaviors). Managers at lower

organizational levels, managers working in larger organizations, and managers scoring higher on

Control of others reported more work-family conflict *(Bs=*-.22, .16, and .24, respectively).

Third, all three blocks of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained

variance on psychosomatic symptoms. Older managers, females, managers at lower

organizational levels managers working in smaller organizations, managers scoring higher on

Control of others and managers scoring lower on Non-required work reported higher levels of

psychosomatic symptoms (*B*s=.55, .16, -.20, -.19, ,17 and -.23, respectively). Finally, all three

blocks of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment n explained variance on life

satisfaction .Managers who were married a shorter period of time and managers scoring lower

on control of others indicated more life satisfaction *(Bs=*-.17 and -.17, respectively).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -- -

Enter Table 7 About Here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Discussion

This study attempted to replicate and extend an earlier study of Mudrack (2006) of the relationships of workaholic job behaviors and potential correlates. Two workaholic job behaviors proposed by Mudrack were included: Non-required work and Control of others.. Mudrack suggested, and we agree, that an emphasis on job behaviors rather than attitudes would be a better indicator of workaholism. Our results, obtained from a large sample of managers in Egypt, provide only partial support for our hypotheses and were only partially consistent with Mudrack's earlier published work.

It should be noted before proceeding that the Egyptian sample was relatively young, mostly single, highly educated and did not necessarily work long hours. In addition, the Egyptian economy was growing very slowly at the time of data collection and may not offer the rewards or opportunities for long work hours.

Our findings provided complete or partial support for several of our hypotheses. The two workaholic job behaviors were significantly and positively correlated, but moderately. But there were no common personal demographic or work situation predictors of the two workaholic job behaviors (see Table 2). The workaholic job behaviors had relationships with perfectionism and non-delegation as hypothesized (see Table 3) Managers scoring higher on workaholic behaviors also indicated greater job demands on both work hours and perceptions of work intensity (see Table 3). And as predicted, managers scoring higher on workaholic job behaviors made less use of particular recovery experiences after work (see Table 5). Ironically, managers that perhaps had a greater need to make use of these recovery experiences (psychological detachment,

relaxation) male less use of them. And not surprisingly, managers scoring higher on the workaholic job behaviors were more work engaged (see Table 4), work engagement likely being a related behavioral measure of work investment or workaholism. Finally, there was some support for the negative relationship of workaholic job behaviors and aspects of psychological well-being and quality of life (see Table 7). Managers scoring higher on a workaholic job behavior indicated more psychosomatic symptoms, greater work-family conflict and lower levels of over-all life satisfaction.

However there was limited support for the relationship of workaholic job behaviors and job and career dissatisfaction (see Table 6). In fact, the opposite was found, consistent with the relationship of workaholic job behaviors and work engagement.   Our "workaholics" worked more hours, in more intense jobs, were more work engaged, and more job and career satisfied. These results were consistent with those reported by Hewitt and Luce (2006), obtained in two large samples of international managers holding senior level and executive but "extreme jobs" in which they worked 60 or more hors per week in high work intensity positions.

Our Egyptian findings, similar to those obtained in our earlier study of Chinese hotel managers (Burke, Jeng, Koyuncu & Fiksenbaum, 2009),   raise some concern s about the Mudrack measures of workaholic job behaviors. The Mudrack measures seem to be further indicators of behaviors reflecting one's investment or commitment to one's job rather than capturing the "dark side" of workaholism. (Porter 1996; Robinson, 1998).

Limitations of the research

This research, like most others, has some limitations. First, all data were collected using self-report questionnaires raising the small possibility of responses being affected by use of a common method. Second the data were collected at one point in time making it difficult to

18

establish causal relationships. Third, a few of the measures had levels of internal consistency reliability below the generally accepted level of .70. Fourth, although the sample was relatively large, it was not likely a representative sample of Egyptian managers and professionals in the manufacturing sector. Fifth, the sample was relatively young, single and without children; it is not clear the extent to which these results would generalize to an older sample having both children and longer work and organizational tenure. Sixth, the extent to which these findings would generalize to respondents working in other industrial sectors or respondents in other countries is yet to be determined.

Future research directions

Future research would benefit from the inclusion of the workaholism measures developed and validated by Schaufeli, Taris and Bakker (2008) which appear to be associated with the negative connotations of workaholism. More cross-cultural research is needed to determine whether workaholism or work addiction has the same meaning, and antecedents and consequences in different countries and cultures (Aycan, 2004; Aycan, Kanungo, Mendonca, Yu, Deller, Stahl & Kurshid, 2000; Wasti, 1998). In addition, an examination of the role of gender differences would also add to our understanding of workaholism.

<div align="center">Footnotes</div>

References

Al-Lamky, A. (2007 Feminizing leadership in arable societies: The perspectives of Omani female leaders. Women in Management Review, 22, 49-67.

Ali, A. J., (2005) Islamic perspectives on management and organization. Cheltenhalm, UK: Edward Elgar.

Ali, A. (1999) Middle East competitiveness in the 21st century's global market. Academy of Management Executive, 1, 102-108.

Aycan, Z. (2004) Key success factors for women in management in Turkey. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53, 453-277.

Aycan, Z. (2001) Human resource management in Turkey: Current issues and future challenges. International Journal of Manpower, 22, 252-260.

Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R. N., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, J., Stahl, G., & Kurshid, A. (2000) Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A 10-country comparison. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49, 192-231.

Barling, J., Keloway, E. K., & Frone, M. R. (2005) Handbook of work stress. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Budhwar, P., & Mellahi, K. (2007) Introduction: Human resource management in the Middle East. International Journal of Human Resources Management, 18, 2-10.

Burke, R. J. (2000) Workaholsm in organizations: Concepts, results and future research directions. International Journal of Management reviews, 2, 1-16.

Burke, R. J., (1991) Early work and career experiences of female and male managers and professionals: Reasons for optimism? Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 8, 224-230.

Burke, R. J., Jeng, W., Koyuncu, M., & Fiksenbaum, L (2009) Workaholic job behaviors among hotel managers in Beijing China Unpublished Manuscript. York University. Toronto.

Carlson, D., Kacmar, J., & Williams, L. (2000) Construction and initial validation of a multi-dimensional   measure of work-family conflict. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56, 249-278.

. Diener, E., Emmons, R., A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985) The Satisfaction with Life Scale. Journal of Personality Assessment, 49, 71-75.

El-Ghannam, A. (2002) Analytical studies of women's participation in Arab societies. Equal Opportunities International, 21, 1-18.

El-Ghannam, A. (2001) Modernization in Arab societies: The theoretical and analytical view. International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 21, 99-131.

.El-Kot, G.., & Leat, M. (2008) A survey of recruitment and selection practices in Egypt.Education, Business and Society: Contemporary Middle eastern Issues, 1, 200-212.

El-Saadawi, N. (1982) Women and Islam. Women's Studies International Forum, 5, 193-206.

Fassel, D. (1990) Working ourselves to death: The high costs of workaholism, the rewards of recovery. San Francisco, CA: HarperCollins.

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. (1990) Organizational experiences and career success of black and white managers. Academy of Management Journal, 33, 64-86.

Hewlett, S. A., & Luce, C. B. (2006) Extreme jobs: The dangerous allure of the 70-hour work week. Harvard Business Review, December, 49-59.

Hofstede, G. (1980) Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Jamali, D., Safieddine, A., & Daouk, M. (2006) The glass ceiling: Some positive trends from the Lebanese banking sector. Women in Management Review, 21, 625-642.

Killinger, B. (1991) Workaholics: The respectable addicts. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kofodimos, J. (1993) Balancing act. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Leat, M., & El-Kot, G., (2007) HRM practices and policies in Egypt: The influence of national context? International Journal of Human Resources Management, 18l 147-158.

Machlowitz, M. (1980) Workaholics: Living with them, working with them. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). Maslach Burnout Inventory, 3rd ed. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

McMillan, L. H. W., O'Driscoll, M. P., Marsh, N. V., & Brady, E. C. (2001) Understanding workaholism: Data synthesis, theoretical critique and future design strategies. Internation,l Journal of Stress Management, 8, 69-91.

Metcalfe, B. D. (2008) Women in management and globalization in the Middle East. Journal of Business Ethics, 83, 85-100.

Metcalfe, B. D. (2007) Gender and human resource management in the Middle East. International Journal of Human Resources Management, 18, 54-74.

Metcalfe, B. D. (2006) Exploring cultural dimensions of gender and management in the Middle East. Thunderbird International Business Review, 48, 93-102.

.Mostafa, M. M. (2003) Attitudes towards women who work in Egypt. Women in Management Review, 18, 252-268.

Mudrack, P. E. (2006) Understanding workaholism: The case for behavioral tendencies. In R. J. Burke (ed.) Research companion to working time and work addiction. Chichester, UK: Edward Elgar. pp. 108-128.

Mudrack, P. E., & Naughton, T. J. (2001) The assessment of workaholism as behavioral tendencies: Scale development and preliminary empirical testing. International Journal of Stress Management, 8, 93-112.

Muna, F.(1980) The Arab executive. London: MacMillan.

Oates, W, (1971) Confessions of a workaholic: The facts about work addiction. New York: World

Porter, G. (1996) Organizational impact of workaholism: Suggestions for researching the negative outcomes of excessive work. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1, 70-84.

Quinn, R. P., & Shepard, L. J., (1974) The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Robinson, B. E. (1998) Chained to the desk: A guidebook for workaholics, their partners and children and the clinicians who treat them. New York: New York University Press.

Schabracq, M. J., Winnubst, J. A. M., & Cooper, C. L (2003) The handbook of work and health psychology. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley.

Schaef, A. W., & Fassel, D. (1988) The addictive organization. San Francisco: Harper Row.

Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Bakker, A. B. (2008) It takes two to tango: Workaholism is working excessively and working compulsively. In R. J. Burke & C. L. Cooper (eds.) the long work hours culture: Causes, consequences, and choices. Bingley, UK: emerald Publishing. pp. 203-226.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002) The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. Journal of Happiness Studies, 3, 71-92.

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

.Sidani, Y. (2005) Women, work and Islam in Arab societies. Women in Management review, 20, 496-512.

Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2007) The Recovery Experience Questionnaire: Development and validation of a measure for assessing recuperation and unwinding from work. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology. 12, 204-221.

Sonnentag, S., & Kruel, U. (2006) Psychological detachment from work during off-job time: the role of job stressors, job involvement, and recovery-related self-efficacy. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology. 15, 197-217.

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

Tyler, M., & Holmes, E., (2008) Higher education reforms in Egypt: Preparing graduates for Egypt's changing political economy Education, Business and Society: Contemporary Middle Eastern Issues, 1, 175-185.

Wasti, S. A., (1998) Cultural barriers in the transferability of Japanese and American human resources practices to developing countries: The Turkish case. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 9, 608-631

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of Sample

Gender	N	%	Age	N	%
Male	146	60.3	25 or less	73	30.2
Female	96	39.7	26-30	74	30.5
			31-35	29	12.0
Work status			36-40	13	5.4
Full time	226	93.4	41-45	13	5.4
Part time	16	6.6	46 or older	40	16.5
Marital status			**Length of marriage**		
Married	92	38.0	1-5 years	36	40.0
Single	150	62.0	6-10	13	14.4
			11-15	7	7.8
Parental status			16-20	19	21.1
Children	86	35.5	21-25	17	18.9
No children	156	64.5	26 or more	4	4.4
Education			**Number of children**		
High school	12	5.0	0	155	64.0
Bachelors	185	80.6	1	27	11.2
Masters	35	14.4	2	44	18.2
			3 or more	16	6.6
Hours worked					
40 or less	102	42.1	**Income- LE$**		
41-45	51	21.1	$10,000 or less	62	25.6
46-50	49	20.7	$10,001-$15,000	16	6.6
51-55	7	2.9	$15,001-$20,000	22	9.1
56-60	20	8.2	$20,001-$25,000	30	12.4
61 or more	12	5.0	$25,001 or more	112	46.3
Organizational level			**Supervisory duties**		
Non-management	70	28.9	Yes	161	66.5
Lower management	56	23.1	No	81	33.5
Middle management	80	33.1			
Senior management	36	14.9	**Job tenure**		
			1-2 years	145	59.9
Organizational tenure			3-5	51	21.1
1.-2 years	90	37.2	6-10	43	17.8
3-5	55	22.7	11 or more	3	1.2
6-10	56	23.2			
11 or more	41	16.9			
Organizational size			**Function**		
250 or less	59	20.2	Finance	32	13.2
251-500	36	14.9	Production	26	10.7
501-1000	47	19.4	IT	23	9.5
1001-2000	34	14.1	Customer service	22	8.1
2001-5000	70	28.9	Marketing	18	7.4
5001 or more	6	2.5	Sales	17	7.0
			Logistics	17	7.0

Table 2
Predictors of Workaholic Job Behaviors

Workaholic
Job Behaviors

Non-required work	R	R2	Change R2	P
Personal demographics	.18	.03	.03	NS
Work situation characteristics	.22	.05	.02	NS

Control of others				
Personal demographics	.34	.12	.12	.001
Gender (-.22)				
Education level (-.19)				
Work situation characteristics	.42	.18	.06	.01
Job tenure (.34)				

Table 3

Workaholic job behaviors, Job Demands and Job Behaviors

Job Demands

Work hours	R	R2	Change R2	P
Personal demographics	.22	.05	.05	.05
Education level (.22)				
Work situation characteristics	.24	.06	.01	NS
Workaholic job behaviors	.30	.09	.03	.05
Control of others (.18)				
Work Intensity				
Personal demographics	.28	.08	.08	.001
Gender (-.19)				
Work situation characteristics	.38	.15	.07	.001
Organizational size (-.16)				
Workaholic job behaviors	.57	.33	.18	.001
Control of others (.35)				
Non-required work (.19)				
Job Behaviors				
Perfectionism				
Personal demographics	.32	.10	.10	001
Marital status (.22)				
Education level (-.13)				
Work situation characteristics	.35	.12	.02	NS
Workaholic job behaviors	.45	.20	.08	.001
Non-required work (.28)				
Non-delegation				
Personal demographics	.28	.08	.08	.01
Work situation characteristics	.42	.18	.10	.001
Organizational size (-.26)				
Organizational level (.24)				
Workaholic job behaviors	.50	.25	.07	.001
Control of others (.29)				

Table 4

Workaholic Job Behaviors and Work Engagement

Work Engagement

Vigor	R	R2	Change R2	P
Personal Demographics	.27	.08	.08	.001
Gender (.30)				
Marital status (.20)				
Work situation characteristics	.34	.12	.04	.05
Organizational level (.15)				
Workaholic job behaviors	.50	.25	.13	.001
Non-required work (.39)				
Dedication				
Personal demographics	.35	.12	.12	.001
Education level (-.22)				
Marital status (.26)				
Gender (.13)				
Work situation characteristics	.39	.15	.03	NS
Workaholic job behaviors	.50	.25	.10	.001
Non-required work (.30)				
Absorption				
Personal demographics	.31	.09	.09	.001
Education level (-.28)				
Work situation characteristics	.37	.13	.04	.05
Organization size (.18)				
Workaholic job behaviors	.44	.20	.07	.001
Non-required work (.27)				

Table 5

Workaholic Job Behaviors and Use of Recovery Experiences

Recovery Experiences
Psychological

Detachment	R	R2	Change R2	P
Personal demographics	.39	.16	.16	.001
Age (-.40)				
Education level (.24)				
Gender (.15)				
Work situation characteristics	.42	.18	.02	NS
Workaholic job behaviors	.56	.32	.14	.001
Non-required work (-.22)				
Control of others (-.19)				
Relaxation				
Personal demographics	.41	.16	.16	.001
Age (-.30)				
Education level (.27)				
Gender (.19)				
Work situation characteristics	.46	.21	.05	.05
Job tenure (-.23)				
Organization size (.13)				
Workaholic job behaviors	.55	.31	.10	.001
Non-required work (-.23)				
Control of others (-.l7)				
Mastery				
Personal demographics	.28	.08	.08	.01
Bender(.22)				
Age (-..28)				
Work situation characteristics	.34	.11	.03	NS
Workaholic job behaviors	.39	.15	.04	.01
Non-required work (.21)				
Control				
Personal demographics	.37	.14	.14	.001
Gender (.31)				
Education level (.16)				
Age (.29)				
Work situation characteristics	.50	.25	.11	.001
Job tenure (-.56)				
Organizational level (.25)				
Workaholic job behaviors	.50	.25	.00	NS

Table 6

Workaholic Job Behaviors and work Outcomes

Work Outcomes				
Job satisfaction	R	R2	Change R2	P
Personal demographics	.24	.06	.06	.05
Length of marriage (.28)				
Marital status (-.17)				
Education level (-.12)				
Work situation characteristics	.44	.20	.14	.001
Organization size (-.19)				
Organizational level (.20)				
Organizational tenure (.23)'				
Job tenure (-.24)				
Workaholic job behaviors	.60	.36	.16	.001
Non-required work (.42)				
Career satisfaction				
:Personal demographics	.21	.04	.04	NS
Work situation characteristics	.29	.08	.04	.05
Workaholic job behaviors	.35	.12	.04	.001
Non-required work (.12)				
Job stress				
Personal demographics	.20	.04	.04	NS
Work situation characteristics	.26	.07	.03	.05
Workaholic job behaviors	.46	.22	.15	.001
Control of others (.38)				
Intent to quit				
Personal demographics	.36	.13	.13	.001
Educational level (.19)				
Age (-.36)				
Gender (.18)				
Work situation characteristics	.39	.16	.03	.05
Organizational level (-.16)				
Workaholic job behaviors	.44	.19	.03	.05
Non-required work (-.21)				

Table 7

Workaholic Job Behaviors and Psychological Well-Being

Psychological Well-Being Exhaustion	R	R2	Change R2	P
Personal demographics	.33	.11	.11	.001
Gender (.18)				
Length of marriage (-.28)				
Education level (.13)				
Work situation characteristics	.38	.14	.03	.001
Organizational level (-.22)				
Workaholic job behaviors	.40	.16	.02	NS
Work-Family Conflict				
Personal demographics	.21	.04	.04	NS
Work situation characteristics	.32	.10	.06	.01
Organizational level (-.22)				
Organization size (16)				
Workaholic job behaviors	.38	.15	.05	.001
Control of others (.24)				
Psychosomatic Symptoms				
Personal demographics	.31	.10	.10	.001
Age (.55)				
Gender (.16)				
Work situation characteristics	.39	.16	.06	.01
Organizational level (-.20)				
Organization size (-.19)				
Workaholic job behaviors	.45	.20	.04	.001
Non-required work)-.23)				
Control of others (.17)				
Life Satisfaction				
Personal demographics	.24	.06	.06	.05
Length of marriage (.17)				
Work situation characteristics	.28	.08	.02	.05
Workaholic job behaviors	.32	.10	.02	.01
Control of others (-.17)				