Pracoholizm i zaangażowanie w pracę a dobrostan pracowników. Mediująca rola konfliktów praca–rodzina i rodzina–praca

Celem badań było określenie zależności między pracoholizmem, zaangażowaniem w pracę a dobrostanem psychicznym pracowników oraz ustalenie, czy zależność ta jest mediowana przez konflikty między pracą i rodziną. Wskaźnikami dobrostanu psychicznego były stres, wypalenie zawodowe oraz satysfakcja z pracy. Osobami badanymi (N = 267) byli nauczyciele i pracownicy więziennictwa. Wyniki badań pokazały, że dobrostan psychiczny w pracy ujemnie wiąże się z pracoholizmem i dodatkowo z zaangażowaniem w pracę. Konflikt rodzina–praca mediuje efekt zarówno pracoholizmu, jak i zaangażowania na dobrostan w pracy, z kolei konflikt praca–rodzina mediuje jedynie efekt pracoholizmu. Uzyskane wyniki są częściowo zgodne z wcześniejszymi badaniami innych autorów.
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Workaholism and work engagement as indicators of employee well-being. The mediating role of work-family and family-work conflicts

Introduction

The dynamic development of our civilisation entails work-related changes – it affects work organisation, working conditions, methods of work, demands and ways of coping with those demands. Expectations relating to job roles are becoming more and more complex, and the boundaries between work and family life are being blurred. Recent developments in technology (e.g. the Internet, telecommunications) make it possible to perform an increasing number of job tasks outside work and normal working hours (Shimazu & Schaufeli, 2009). Evolution of the "world of work" triggers changes in employees’ approach to work – their attitudes, emotions and behaviour. While some employees consider work as "an unpleasant necessity", others devote much of their time and effort to it. Therefore, a question arises concerning the relationship between work-related attitudes and behaviours, and subjective well-being of employees. This relationship seems to be rather complex. On the one hand studies reveal that high job demands can be a source of mental strain, job burnout and, consequently, mental health-related problems (e.g. depression) (e.g. Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). The most extreme consequences of work overload are those described mainly by Japanese scholars: death from overwork called karoshi and suicide due to work overload called karo-jisato, whose number – according to research – is dramatically rising (Kanai, 2006). On the other hand, work can be passion, it can add new meaning to human life and through positive emotions can lead to increasing personal resources (e.g. self-efficacy beliefs), happiness and better health (Fredrickson, 2001).

The term “passion for work” derives from research into entrepreneurial motivation (Locke, 2000) and refers to enthusiasm, joy and eagerness resulting from energy-consuming and highly-demanding professional activity. Psychological literature provides at least two theoretical constructs in which “passion for work” is manifested. These are workaholism and work engagement. According to one of the leading models of workaholism, the phenomenon has three coexisting basic dimensions (or components) called the workaholic triad (Spence & Robbins, 1992). They include inner drive to work, work involvement and work enjoyment. Combinations of those three elements result in various types of workaholism and the so-called "healthy attitudes to work". However, this classification is questioned by some authors (e.g. Schaufeli, Taris & Bakker, 2006). In particular the second component – work involvement – poses
certain problems. Results of numerous studies conducted in different countries reveal that two components are sufficient to diagnose workaholism – internal drive to work and lack of work enjoyment, but not necessarily work involvement (Kanai, Wakabayashi & Fling, 1996; McMillan, Brady, O’Driscoll, Marsh, 2002; Wojdyło, 2010). Moreover, factor analysis conducted by Dutch researchers showed that work engagement forms a theoretical construct separate from workaholism and does not stand for its component (van Beck, Taris & Schaufeli, 2011). The authors argue that both persons addicted to work and those strongly engaged in work devote a lot of their time and energy to professional activity. They, however, differ in terms of at least two features – inner work drive and the quality of emotions experienced at work. While compulsive motives and negative emotions prevail among those addicted to work, persons involved in their work control their work to a larger extent and experience positive emotions. If workaholism and work engagement are in fact two relatively independent phenomena, they are expected to correlate differently with many key characteristics of work such as job performance, motivation to work as well as health and subjective well-being at work. This has been demonstrated by some previous studies (Schaufeli, Taris & Bakker, 2006; Schaufeli Taris & van Rhenen, 2008).

The aim of the present study is to determine how workaholism and work engagement relate to subjective well-being of employees. Well-being indicators will include perceived stress, job burnout and job enjoyment. I assume that persons experiencing high stress levels, high job burnout and low enjoyment from work will show relatively low subjective well-being. Similar proposals were earlier made by other authors (Schaufeli et al., 2008). As both persons addicted to work and persons involved in work invest a lot of time and effort in their work, also during their leisure time, I would like to find if and how work-family and family-work conflicts mediate the relationship of workaholism and work engagement with subjective well-being at work. In other words, I am interested in whether workaholism and work engagement affect well-being directly, or also indirectly – by escalating/reducing the work-family and family-work conflicts. Although the problem of workaholism has been discussed in Poland by many authors (e.g. Paluchowski & Hornowska, 2003; Wojdyło, 2010), I did not find works that would study the correlations proposed in this paper.

**Workaholism versus work engagement**

In spite of the growing interest in workaholism, our understanding of this phenomena is still limited (Schaufeli et al., 2006). In agreement with Burke (2001, p. 65) “much of the writing [on workaholism] has not been guided by a clear definition of the concept”. If we look at the origin of the term workaholism we will find that it was initially defined as a compulsion or a strong uncontrollable
need to work incessantly, leading to a person’s disturbed mental and physical health and interfering with his smooth social functioning (Oates, 1971). Perceived in this way, workaholism included two elements – working excessively and working compulsively. Those two components formed behavioral and cognitive dimensions of the addiction and allowed workaholism to be treated as a form of addiction. A workaholic was defined as a person who spends a lot of time working, irrespective of external rewards (e.g. organisational or financial rewards) and is unable to stop working, “mentally refrain from working”, who thinks of work incessantly, even in his spare time (the so-called “obsession towards work”). Over time, this conception of workaholism has changed and some authors start to distinguish between “good” and “bad” forms of workaholism. For example, Keichel (1989) distinguished between “happy” and “dysfunctional” workaholics, Scott et all (1997) identified “compulsive-dependent workaholics”, “perfectionist workaholics” and “achievement-oriented workaholics”. Some authors assert that “good” forms of workaholism have positive consequences for both workaholics and the organizations they work for (Machlowitz, 1980; Peiperl & Jones, 2001). For example Peiperl & Jones (2001, p. 388) consider “good” workaholics to be “hard workers who enjoy and get a lot out of their work”.

More widely approach to workaholism was proposed by Spence & Robbins (1992). They added two further components to the inner compulsion to work – work engagement understood as working in one’s leisure hours and spending free time on constructive activities, and also job enjoyment, i.e. deriving much pleasure from work. Based on the intensity of those three factors, the authors of the model differentiated between two types of workaholics (enthusiastic workaholics, non-enthusiastic workaholics) and four types of non-workaholics. Both types of workaholics score high on compulsive drive and work engagement, but differently on work enjoyment. The validity of this study was later disputed (Schaufeli et al. 2006). It seems questionable if involvement is an axial symptom of workaholism. Research review conducted by some researchers shows that the extent of work engagement is not fundamental in diagnosing workaholism (Kanai et al., 1996; McMillan et all., 2002; Wojdylo, 2010). Wojdylo claims that workaholism is determined not by the amount of time invested in work but by the compulsion-driven way of performing work. A series of research carried out by Schaufeli (e.g. Schaufeli et al., 2006) reveals also that workaholism and work engagement are two separate phenomena having different determinants and relating differently to subjective well-being measured e.g. by the quality of social relationship (Bakker, Demerouti & Burke, 2009), mental health (Schaufeli, et al., 2008) and job-related well-being (Brady, Vodanovich & Rotunda, 2008). For the sake of the conceptual clarity, instead of distinguishing between “good” and “bad” forms of workaholism, Taris et al (2010) postulate a distinction between workaholism (“being intrinsically bad”) and work engagement (“being intrinsically good”). This agrees with the recommendation of Porter (1996) to “return to the origin of the term as a starting point for future research”.
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In the present study was adopted conception of workaholism proposed by Robinson (1998). This approach is in agreement with the outlook of Porter (1996) and quite similar to initial understanding of workaholism proposed by Oates (1971), but more complex. These authors identify workaholism with work obsession characterised by self-imposed excessive demand accompanied by inability to regulate work habits and exclusion from a majority of other life activities. According to this definition workaholism can be described by five symptoms: overdoing, control-perfectionism, intimacy, self-worth derived from intensive work and mental preoccupation/future reference. Overdoing is related to strong tendency to work hard and to have difficulties in relaxing after work. Control-perfectionism refers to annoyance when having to wait for something or someone or when things do not go one’s way. Intimacy is characterized by putting more energy into one’s work than into relationships with others and neglect of social. Self worth and mental preoccupation refers to degree to which a person is interested in the results of one’s work rather than the work process itself and are related to compulsive thinking of one’s work even in free time (Robinson & Post, 1994).

Currently, one of the most frequently used models of work engagement is the concept proposed by Schaufeli et al (2002). This approach differs from previous models of engagement, for example Kanungo (1982) and Kahn (1992) and seems to be more extended and more adapted to contemporary work conditions. First of all, compared with the earlier models, Schaufeli et al (2002) treat work engagement not as a momentary, passing state but as a more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive relation to work-related duties, behaviors, individuals or objects. Moreover, they perceive it as exemplification of work attitudes, which includes not only cognitional, but also affective component. Another important reason for why this approach is used in the paper is the fact that a Polish adaptation of Schaufeli’s questionnaire of work engagement has been published in Psychology of Quality of Life recently (Szabowska-Walaszczyk, Zawadzka & Wojtaś, 2011) and checking it in context of employee well-being seems to be interesting. Schaufeli et al (2002) characterize work engagement by three factors: vigor, dedication and absorption. Vigor means high levels of energy and mental resilience at work, willingness to invest effort on the job and persistence even when faced with difficulties. Dedication is seen as a strong identification with work, a sense of importance, enthusiasm, and pride. Absorption is understood as focus on work, a state of being immersed in work, time passing quickly, and being unable to detach from the job (Schaufeli et al., 2002). The authors describe vigor and dedication as essential to work engagement. They treat absorption as factors describing activation while dedication as factor refer to job identification. Thus, an engaged employee have a sense of energetic effective connection with their work activities, high job resources, rich work-related relationships and they see themselves as able to deal well with demands of their jobs. In contrary to workaholics, they lack the typical
compulsive drive that is characteristic of any addiction. Engaged workers work hard simply because they like their job so much and not because they cannot resist a strong inner urge to work. In other words engaged workers are pulled to work because they enjoy it, whereas workaholics are pushed to work because they have to obey their obsession (Taris, Schaufeli & Shimazu, 2010).

**Workaholism, work engagement and employee subjective well-being**

According to the literature, both persons addicted to work and engaged in work spend a long time working, a question arises how work affects well-being in both of those groups. The results of studies examining this issue are not consistent. Many studies found that workaholism correlates with health negatively. For example, a study conducted among Norwegian journalists revealed that workaholism was related to heavy stress and high levels of somatic complaints (Burke et al., 2004). In other study was found strong link between workaholism and job burnout, both among Dutch and Japan workers (Schaufeli, Shimazu & Taris, 2009). Major portion of research shows that workaholics are less satisfied with their job, family life, relations with other people (Bakker, Demerouti & Burke, 2009) and general with life (Bonebright, Clay, Ankenmann, 2000) than “non-workaholics”. Besides, children whose fathers are addicted to work are characterized by higher levels of fear and depression (Robinson & Kelley, 1998).

Other authors, however, report a positive relation of workaholism with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Such results were obtained when studying a group of Turkish and Norwegian managers (Burke & Koksal, 2002; Burke, Richardsen & Morinussen, 2004). The positive relation between workaholism and job satisfaction could have been caused, however, by the fact that in the majority of studies workaholism was examined based on the approach of Spence and Robbins, where high level of job satisfaction is seen as one of the dimensions of workaholism measured using the WorkBat questionnaire.

When it comes to the relationship between work engagement and health or well-being, some studies show no such relations (Hakanen, Schaufeli & Ahola, 2008), and others reveal a positive relation (Schaufeli et al., 2008). For example, study conducted by Schaufeli and colleagues among a group of 587 hotel managers revealed that employees with high engagement levels display lower levels of perceived stress and depression. According to other studies, engaged employees displayed higher job satisfaction (Shimazu & Schaufeli, 2009) and organisational commitment (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) than those disengaged. In present study I predict that workaholism will result in low level of employee well-being (**H1**), in turn high engagement will contribute to high level of employee well-being (**H2**).

The Effort – Recovery model (Meijman & Mulder 1998) is an interesting theoretical proposal explaining why workaholism and work engagement relate to subjective wellbeing differently. The model focuses on health-related problems resulting from hard work. It is based on the assumption that effort
devoted by individuals into their tasks is accompanied by certain behavioral, physiological and psychological reactions, which are seen as costs. During breaks from work and holidays those reactions become weaker, the psycho-biological system restores its balance and recovery unfolds. However, if breaks are not long enough, the employee’s system may not be able to return to its baseline levels, and the so-called downward spiral may be activated. Then a greater effort is needed to complete tasks effectively, the reactions within the systems are stronger and it takes longer breaks from work to recover. This situation may in the long term lead to health problems such as exhaustion, sleep disturbances and somatic complaints. Workaholics work excessively long hours, continue in the evenings, during weekends and on holidays. Hence, they may have insufficient time for recovery and suffer poor relationship quality (Gorgievski & Bakker 2010). Whereas engaged workers will quit their passionate activities when the costs become too high, workaholics will continue at all costs, and will not shift their focus towards recuperation. Indeed, a recent diary study indicated that workaholics were most likely to work in the evening, whereas at the same time, they showed the strongest negative relationship between time spent on working in the evening and vigor, recovery, and happiness (Bakker, Demerouti, Oerlmans, Sonnentag, 2013).

*Mediating role of work-family and family-work conflicts*

The conflicts between work and family are defined as a variety of role conflicts where role expectations referring to one sphere of life make it difficult or impossible to perform roles relating to another sphere of life (Greenhaus & Beutell 1985). In other words, fulfillment of roles relating to family life (work) is hindered by the fulfillment of job roles (family roles). Those difficulties may arise from: a) lack of time (*time-based conflict*), e.g.: being absent from a family occasion because of job responsibilities, b) emotional strain (*strain-based conflict*), e.g.: being angry with family members due to stressful events at work, and c) the necessity to act differently in the family and work roles (*behavior-based conflict*), e.g.: treating family members as “a difficult customer” (Grzywacz et al. 2007). Scholars distinguish between *work-family* conflict referring to a situation where expectations relating to job roles affect functioning in a family, and *family-work conflict*, where expectations concerning family roles make it difficult to perform one’s job responsibilities. Those two are treated as separate constructs, although there is a strong correlation between them (Zalewska, 2008). A review of research from the years 1980–2002 showed that the work-family conflict is stronger, more frequent and more harmful to mental health of employees than the family-work conflict (Eby et al., 2005).

Both workaholics and engaged employees invest a lot of time, energy and mental effort in their work. Thus, it is expected that excessive concentration on job responsibilities interferes with other life spheres outside work, e.g.
in a family. One of the potential causes of the difficulties in meeting the demands of different roles can be resources drain. It refers to lack of sufficient personal resources to cope with demands of different roles (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000). Personal resources are aspects of the self that are generally linked to resiliency and refer to individuals’ sense of their ability to control and impact upon their environment successfully (Hobfoll, Johnson, Ennis, & Jackson, 2003). They can include for example self-efficacy, organizational-based self-esteem and optimism (Xanthopolou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007) which have been recognized by Hobfoll as fundamental components of individual adaptability.

On the other hand, according to the Broaden and build theory (Fredricson, 2001), experiencing of positive emotion at work can protect personal resources of workers. Some studies revealed that engaged workers experience more positive emotions at work (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), while workaholics experienced frequent negative emotions (Bovornusvakool, Vodanovich, Ariyabuddhiphongs & Ngamake, 2012). Perhaps, that is why work engagement is related to high personal resources (e.g. self efficacy, optimism) and also organizational resources (e.g. social support, job control), which are treated as those aspects of the job that ensure the achievement of work goals, reduce costs relating to work overload and stimulate personal growth and development (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). In turn, workaholism is correlated with low personal and organizational resources (Taris et al. 2010). Because the resources are usually described in literature as buffers of stress (e.g. role strain), therefore prolonged effort and hard work should have probably more negative effects on workaholics than on engaged workers. This also applies to conflicts between work and family. Moreover, numerous studies have found that conflicts between work and family are negatively related to health and subjective well-being of workers (Frone, 2000; Zalewska, 2008). Therefore in next two hypothesis (H3 and H4) I expect that work-family and family-work conflicts will mediate effects of workaholism and work engagement on subjective well-being in different way. Workaholism will lead to low subjective well-being by increase of conflicts between work and family, in turn work engagement will lead to high subjective well-being by decrease of the conflicts.

Previous studies have justified these assumptions to some extent. Positive links between workaholism and work-family conflict (but not family-work conflict) is strong confirmed in research in different countries (Bonebright et al., 2000; Brady et al., 2008; Taris, Schaufeli, Verhoeven & 2005) also in Poland (Chodkiewicz, 2011). Results of the relationship between work engagement and work-family conflict are not consistent. In some studies negative links between them were found (Montgomery et al., 2003; Baka & Derbis, 2012), whereas in other study this links were positive (Halbesleben, Harvey & Bolino, 2009).

Numerous studies support also negative links of conflicts between work and family with subjective employee well-being measured by low job satisfaction (Netemeyer et al., 1996), mental strain, depression, fear and psychoactive
drug abuse (Frone 2000), deteriorated mental and physical health (Mikkelsen & Burke 2004), a tendency to leave work (Kelloway, Gottlieb & Barham, 1999), reduced job performance (Witt & Carlson, 2006) and burnout (Bacharach et al., 1991). There are also studies that show a mediating role of the work-family conflict. Peeters et al. (2005) showed that the work-family conflict mediates the influence of job demands on burnout. Similar results were obtained by Polish researchers (Baka & Derbis, 2012). In Dutch study researchers found that the work-family conflict mediates the effect of workaholism on burnout and low job satisfaction (Schaufeli, Bakker & van der Heijden, Prins, 2009). The following hypotheses have been made in the course of the study:

   H1: Workaholism leads to low well-being at work
   H2: Work engagement leads to high well-being at work
   H3: The work-family and family-work conflicts mediate the relationship between workaholism and work-related well-being
   H4: The work-family and family-work conflicts mediate the relationship between work engagement and work-related well-being

Method

Study participants

The study tests were conducted over a period of time from January to June 2012 in the province of Silesia. Participation in the study was voluntary and anonymous. Study participants (SP) were recruited from among teachers (N = 134) and representatives of prison service (N = 133). In total 267 persons were surveyed, including 171 female (64%) and 96 male (36%) participants. The age bracket of SP ranged from 21 to 60 (M = 38.54; SD = 8.43). The length of service ranged from 1 year to 40 years (M = 14.79; SD = 9.19). The previous study found that the examined occupational groups differ in subjective well-being (Johnson, Cooper, Cartwright, Donald, Taylor, & Millet, 2005). It is partially also confirmed by the present study, in which teachers, in comparison with prison service, are characterized by higher job burnout t(267) = 3.02; p < 0.01 and lower job satisfaction t(267) = -2.87; p < 0.01. However, because of technical limits, all analyses were conducted in present study jointly for all the participants, without dividing them into two separated groups.

Measures

Workaholism. To measure workaholism a Polish version of the Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) was used as adapted by Wojdyło (2005). The questionnaire consists of twenty five statements evaluated with four answering categories (from 1 – hardly ever to 4 – almost always). It measures cognitive, behavioral and emotional reactions to work which constitute five dimensions of worka-
holism: overdoing, self-worth derived from work engagement, control-perfectionism, intimacy and mental preoccupation/future reference. The instrument demonstrated satisfactory psychometric properties (Cronbach’s coefficient $\alpha = 0.83$). The present study applies only the aggregate workaholism index, without scale subdivision.

*Work engagement.* This variable was measured with the *Utrecht Work Engagement Scale* (UWES, Schaufeli et al., 2002) in Polish adaptation (Szabowska-Walaszczyk i in., 2011). It is a seventeen-item instrument measuring three engagement factors – vigor, dedication and absorption. All items are scored from 0 to 6 (0 – never, 6 – every day). The instrument demonstrates satisfactory statistical parameters. The present analysis focuses on the global work engagement coefficient ($\alpha = 0.91$).

*The work-family and family-work conflicts.* This variable was measured with *Multidimensional Measure of Work – Family Conflict* (Carlson, Kacmar & Williams, 2000). It includes eighteen items, with two subscales (work-family and family-work) having nine items each. Each subscale includes three dimensions of the conflict: time, strain and behaviour. Cronbach’s reliability alpha coefficient in the original studies for the work-family and family-work conflicts was 0.78 and 0.88 respectively, and for the present study 0.83 and 0.84. Some authors emphasize that family is not the only area interfering with work. They suggest that it should be talked rather about the conflict between work and private life of people (Evans, Carner, & Wilkinson, 2013). Other authors (Lachowska, 2011; Zalewska, 2008), however, claim that the family is the domain which particularly strong interferes with work and between those areas the balance can hardly be found.

*Perceived stress.* It was measured with Perceived Stress Scale PSS-10 developed by Cohen and others, in Polish adaptation by Juczyński & Ogińska-Bulik (2008). The instrument measures stress based on the transactional model, focusing on self-assessment of experienced events. It consists of 10 items scored from 0 to 4 (0 – never, 4 – very often). The scale demonstrates satisfactory psychometric properties (Cronbach’s coefficient for the present study was $\alpha = 0.81$).

*Job burnout.* Job burnout was measured with the sixteen-item Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) (Demerouti et al., 2001). It includes two subscales – exhaustion and disengagement from work. Most commonly, however, an aggregate index of burnout is used (which was also the situation in the present study). Each subscale has eight items, including four statements that are reverse coded. The OLBI has good psychometric properties (Demerouti et al., 2001). Cronbach’s reliability alpha coefficient for this study was 0.85.

*Job satisfaction.* Job satisfaction was measured with an instrument worked out by Zalewska (2003). The Job Satisfaction Scale measures the degree of general work-related subjective well-being in cognitional aspects. The instrument consists of five items (e.g. “I have very good job conditions”), each measured on a 7-point scale (1 – completely disagree to 7 – completely
agree). For the original study the tool demonstrates very good psychometric properties. Cronbach’s coefficient for the present study was also satisfactory ($\alpha = 0.88$).

**Results**

*Descriptive statistics*

In table 1 there is contained the matrix of correlations for the variables included in the research. It is shown that demographic variables as age and job seniority are related to work engagement, and work – family and family – work conflicts positively. Workaholism are positive linked to both of conflicts and negative linked to all measures of employee subjective well-being – low job stress, low job burnout and high job satisfaction. In contrary to it, high work engagement is accompanied with low work – family and family – work conflicts and high employee subjective well-being. Work engagement and workaholism does not correlate with each other. There exists a positive relation between all measures of employee subjective well-being.

*Hypothesis verification*

In order to verify hypothesis 1–4 I used the procedure of statistical inference by Baron & Kenny (1986). To put it simply, the procedure is aimed at showing that an independent variable is a predictor of a mediator (the so called path a), the mediator is a predictor of a dependent variable with the independent variable being controlled (path b), and the independent variable is a predictor of the dependent variable with the mediator being controlled (path c’). Moreover, a direct relation between the independent variable and the dependent variable, with the mediator excluded, is tested (path c). Talking about the existence of mediation is allowed when conditions of statistical significance of values $\beta$ of paths a and b are fulfilled, and values $\beta$ of paths c and c’ are different. The effect of mediation may be additionally checked with the test by Sobel (http://people.ku.edu/~preacher/sobel/sobel.htm).

In case of H1 and H 2, the data analysis ought to show that workaholism and work engagement are predictor employee subjective well-being (direct effects, path c). In case of H3 and H4, the data analysis ought to show the following: workaholism and work engagement are predictors of work-family and family–work conflicts (path a); work-family and family-work conflicts are predictors of employee subjective well-being with workaholism and work engagement being controlled (path b); and the dependence between workaholism/work engagement and employee subjective well-being (path c) will change after including work – family and family – work conflicts ( path c’).

According to the H1 and H3 workaholism was expected to be negatively related to work-related subjective well-being directly (H1) and indirectly by
Table 1. Means, standard deviations and correlations among study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>38,54</td>
<td>8,43</td>
<td>14,79</td>
<td>2,41</td>
<td>1,72</td>
<td>3,38</td>
<td>2,61</td>
<td>1,69</td>
<td>4,66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8,43</td>
<td>1,91</td>
<td>9,19</td>
<td>0,93</td>
<td>1,01</td>
<td>1,27</td>
<td>1,09</td>
<td>0,81</td>
<td>1,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job seniority</td>
<td>0,07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workaholism</td>
<td>0,11</td>
<td>-0,06</td>
<td>-0,04</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>-0,06</td>
<td>-0,19</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work engagement</td>
<td>0,13*</td>
<td>-0,2**</td>
<td>0,12</td>
<td>-0,3**</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>-0,53</td>
<td>-0,42</td>
<td>-0,69*</td>
<td>-0,74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Work – family conflict</td>
<td>0,31***</td>
<td>-0,05</td>
<td>0,32**</td>
<td>-0,03</td>
<td>-0,46**</td>
<td>0,06</td>
<td>0,44*</td>
<td>0,64***</td>
<td>-0,33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Family – work conflict</td>
<td>0,15</td>
<td>-0,03</td>
<td>0,12</td>
<td>-0,32**</td>
<td>0,04</td>
<td>0,39*</td>
<td>0,39***</td>
<td>0,64***</td>
<td>0,45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Perceived stress</td>
<td>0,08</td>
<td>0,11</td>
<td>0,04</td>
<td>0,04</td>
<td>0,04</td>
<td>0,46***</td>
<td>0,64***</td>
<td>0,54***</td>
<td>0,41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Job burnout</td>
<td>0,04</td>
<td>-0,04</td>
<td>0,04</td>
<td>0,04</td>
<td>0,04</td>
<td>-0,65***</td>
<td>-0,32***</td>
<td>0,65***</td>
<td>-0,29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05  ** p < 0.01  *** p < 0.001
means of work-family and family-work conflicts (H3). Results of the mediation analysis indicate that workaholism is predictor of high perceived stress (figure 1 path c), high job burnout (figure 2, path c) and low job satisfaction (figure 3, path c). Data support direct effects of workaholism on low subjective well-being (H1). It is shown that high workaholism is indicator of high work – family conflict (figures 1, 2, 3; path a) and the latter is indicator of high perceived stress (figure 1, path b), high job burnout (figure 2; path b) but not job satisfaction (figure 3; path b). High workaholism indicates also high family – work conflict (figures 1, 2, 3; path a) and the latter indicates high perceived stress (figure 1; path b), high job burnout (figure 2; path b) and low job satisfaction (figure 3; path b). The described mediating effects were additionally confirmed with use of the tests by Sobel (values of Z). Results confirm H3 partially.

**Figure 1.** Work-family and family-work conflicts mediate effects of workaholism on perceived stress

**Figure 2.** Work-family and family-work conflicts mediate effects of workaholism on job burnout
In H2 and H4 were expected that high work engagement leads to high employee subjective well-being directly (H2) and indirectly, by means of decrease of work – family and family – work conflicts (H4). Results of the analysis indicate that work engagement is predictor of low perceived stress (figure 4, path c), low job burnout (figure 5, path c) and high job satisfaction (figure 6, path c). These data confirm direct effects of work engagement on low subjective well-being, expected in H2. Correlation analysis showed no links between work engagement and work-family conflict (table 1), therefore during test of H4 I focused on the mediating role of family-work conflict only. It turned out that high work engagement is indicator low family – work conflict (figures 4, 5 and 6, path a), and the latter indicates high perceived stress (figure 4, path b), high job burnout (figure 5, path b) and low job satisfaction (figure 6, path b). Sobel test (values Z) supports mediating effects of family – work conflict. H4 is confirmed partially.

**Figure 3.** Work-family and family-work conflicts mediate effects of workaholism on job satisfaction

**Figure 4.** Family-work conflicts mediate effects of work engagement on perceived stress
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**Discussion**

The present study was aimed to determine the relationship between workaholism, work engagement and subjective employee well-being. I attempted to establish whether workaholism and work engagement similarly or differently affect subjective well-being of employees, measured by perceived stress, job burnout and job satisfaction. I also tested the mediating role of work-family and family-work conflicts in those relationships. The obtained results confirmed H1 and H2. It appears that workaholism direct leads to lower employee well-being (increased stress, job burnout and decreased job satisfaction), while work engagement direct positively relates to all components of employee well-being. This results confirm the previous study (e.g. Schaufeli et al., 2008) and are in agreement with the Effort – Recovery model (Meijman & Mulder, 1998), whereby workaholics as a result of hazardous work style, suffer poor mental health.

The mediating role of work-family and family-work conflicts was confirmed partially (H3 and H4). The results showed that family-work conflict mediates the effects of workaholism and work engagement on three components of

---

**Figure 5.** Family-work conflicts mediate effects of work engagement on job burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work engagement</th>
<th>Path c</th>
<th>Path c'</th>
<th>Job burnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β = -0,19; p &lt; 0,05</td>
<td>Z = -2,66; p &lt; 0,001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.** Family-work conflicts mediate effects of work engagement on job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work engagement</th>
<th>Path c</th>
<th>Path c'</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β = 0,64; p &lt; 0,001</td>
<td>β = 0,57; p &lt; 0,001</td>
<td>Z = 1,98; p &lt; 0,05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
subjective well-being. But the nature of those mediating effects is different. While workaholism escalates family-work conflict, work engagement makes it weaker. In turn, work-family conflict mediate only the effect of workaholism on perceived stress and job burnout (not on job satisfaction) and does not mediate effects of work engagement on any components of well-being. It is interesting why mediating function of work-family conflict was not confirmed. Perhaps this is due to the specificity of the research sample. Most of participants were women, who is likely to higher identify with family roles than with work roles and therefore they are more susceptible to family-work conflict (e.g. Eby et al., 2005). On the other hand, it is probably that direction of the relationship between work engagement and family-work conflict is different than predicted in the present study. Some models are described in literature, in which family-work conflict is treated as antecedents of work engagement – high family-work conflict results in low work engagement (Lachowska, 2011; for review). Noteworthy is also the relationship between work-family conflict and job satisfaction. Correlation analysis reveals negative relation between these factors, while regression analysis shows that link between these factors is apparent and it is probably a result of strong impact of workaholism on both work-family conflict and job satisfaction. Similar effect was demonstrated in Polish study by Zalewska (2011) in regard to relationships between neurotism, persistent anxiety and job satisfaction.

Although, both workaholics and engaged workers devote to their work activities a lot of time and energy, which expose them to role strain, they differ from each other at least in two points. First issue refers to types of emotions experienced at work. Engaged workers experience more frequent positive emotions like happiness, pleasure, enthusiasm (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), in turn, workaholics experienced some negative emotions like frustration, fear, sadness and anger (Bovornusvakool et al., 2012). According to the Broaden and build theory (Fredricson, 2001), feeling positive emotions can lead to an increase of personal resources which helps to reduce strain and cope with stress more effectively. It is probable that strengthening of personal resources protects more effectively engaged employees against “resources drain” and as a result, they experience a weaker role conflicts. This suppositions are confirmed by empirical study in which demonstrated strong positive relationships between job resources and work engagement and negative relationships between job resources and workaholism (Schaufeli et al., 2006).

The results obtained show that workaholism and work engagement have different pattern of relationships with three components of well-being as well as with conflicts between work and family. It seems likely that they are two separate phenomena, relatively independent of each other. This is confirmed by the correlation analysis, which shows no significant connection between workaholism and engagement. The results seem to be consistent with those obtained by Schaufeli et al. (2008), as well as the writings of Wojdyło (2010), according
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to which engagement is not necessary for workaholism to develop. Workaholism
is not determined by the amount of time invested in work, but rather method
of dealing with work based on inner compulsion. Excess of work, characteristic
of workaholics, is well described by the proposed term of “non-required work”,
which involves mental preoccupation with work, contemplating better and more
effective ways of performing work. Constant preoccupation with work at the le-
vel of thoughts – which probably results from fear – should not be confused with
high work engagement. It should be emphasized that study was cross-sectional
and not longitudinal in nature. The studied phenomena are dynamic, therefore
longitudinal study would prove useful in the future with at least a several-
month break in the research. This could prove particularly valuable for further
explorations. Apart from theoretical benefits, the knowledge gained from the
present research can also have practical application. It is especially true in case
of managers, staff leaders and HR specialists. Harmfull effects of work addiction
can be negative not only for individuals, but also for the whole organization.
Conflicts between work and family, psychological stress, job burnout and low
job satisfaction experienced by the workers usually result in higher absence
at work, low job efficiency as well as high counterproductive work behavior
(Bakker, Demerouti, de Boer & Schaufeli, 2003; Baka, 2012). It should be the
bussiness of the organization to undertake activities limiting workaholism phe-
nomena. It seems that one of effective methods of controlling pathology of that
kind can be building up personal resources of workers.
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Workaholism and work engagement as indicators of employee well-being. The mediating role of work-family and family-work conflicts

The study was aimed at investigation (1) the links between workaholism, work engagement and work–related subjective well-being, measured by perceived stress, job burnout and job satisfaction and (2) the mediating role of work-family and family–work conflicts relating to the above-mentioned relationships. Participants were teachers and prison service workers (N = 267). As predicted, high workaholism correlated with low employee well-being and high work engagement correlated with high employee well-being. The effects of workaholism and work engagement were partially mediated by family–work conflicts. Work-family conflict mediated effects of workaholism but not effects of work engagement. These results are partially in agreement with the previous study.
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