

**Workaholic job behaviors among hotel managers
in Beijing China:
Potential antecedents and consequences**

Ronald J. Burke

Prof. Dr., York University

Wang Jeng

Beijing Union University

Mustafa Koyuncu

Doc. Dr./ Assoc. Prof., Nevsehir University

Lisa Fiksenbaum

York University

Temmuz/July 2009, Cilt/Vol: 11, Sayı/Num: 3, Page: 11-26
ISSN: 1303-2860, DOI: 10.4026/1303-2860.2009.0108.x

Makalenin on-line kopyasına erişmek için:

<http://www.isgucdergi.org/?p=makale&id=372&cilt=11&sayi=3&yil=2009>

To reach the on-line copy of article:

<http://www.isguc.org/?p=article&id=372&vol=11&num=3&year=2009>

Makale İçin İletişim/Correspondence to:

Ronald J. Burke, rburke@schulich.yorku.ca

© 2000- 2009

“İşGüç” Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi
“İşGüç” Industrial Relations and Human Resources Journal

Temmuz/July 2009, Cilt/Vol: 11, Sayı/Num: 3

ISSN: 1303-2860, DOI: 10.4026/1303-2860.2009.0108.x

Editör/Editor-in-Chief

Aşkın Keser (Kocaeli University)

Editör Yardımcıları/Co-Editors

K.Ahmet Sevimli (Uludağ University)

Gözde Yılmaz (Kocaeli University)

Uygulama/Design

Yusuf Budak (Kocaeli University)

Yayın Kurulu / Publishing Committee

Dr.Zerrin Fırat (Uludağ University)

Doç.Dr.Aşkın Keser (Kocaeli University)

Prof.Dr.Ahmet Selamoğlu (Kocaeli University)

Yrd.Doç.Dr.Ahmet Sevimli (Uludağ University)

Yrd.Doç.Dr.Abdulkadir Şenkal (Kocaeli University)

Yrd.Doç.Dr.Gözde Yılmaz (Kocaeli University)

Dr.Memet Zencirkıran (Uludağ University)

Uluslararası Danışma Kurulu / International Advisory Board

Prof.Dr.Ronald Burke (York University-Kanada)

Assoc.Prof.Dr.Glenn Dawes (James Cook University-Avustralya)

Prof.Dr.Jan Dul (Erasmus University-Hollanda)

Prof.Dr.Alev Efendioğlu (University of San Francisco-ABD)

Prof.Dr.Adrian Furnham (University College London-İngiltere)

Prof.Dr.Alan Geare (University of Otago- Yeni Zelandiya)

Prof.Dr. Ricky Griffin (TAMU-Texas A&M University-ABD)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Diana Lipinskiene (Kaunos University-Litvanya)

Prof.Dr.George Manning (Northern Kentucky University-ABD)

Prof. Dr. William (L.) Murray (University of San Francisco-ABD)

Prof.Dr.Mustafa Özbilgin (University of East Anglia-UK)

Assoc. Prof. Owen Stanley (James Cook University-Avustralya)

Prof.Dr.İşık Urla Zeytinioğlu (McMaster University-Kanada)

Danışma Kurulu / National Advisory Board

Prof.Dr.Yusuf Alper (Uludağ University)

Prof.Dr.Veyssel Bozkurt (Uludağ University)

Prof.Dr.Toker Dereli (Işık University)

Prof.Dr.Nihat Erdoğmuş (Kocaeli University)

Prof.Dr.Ahmet Makal (Ankara University)

Prof.Dr.Ahmet Selamoğlu (Kocaeli University)

Prof.Dr.Nadir Suğur (Anadolu University)

Prof.Dr.Nursel Telman (Maltepe University)

Prof.Dr.Cavide Uyargil (İstanbul University)

Prof.Dr.Engin Yıldırım (Sakarya University)

Doç.Dr.Arzu Wasti (Sabancı University)

Dergide yayınlanan yazılardaki görüşler ve bu konudaki sorumluluk yazarlarına aittir.

Yayınlanan eserlerde yer alan tüm içerik kaynak gösterilmeden kullanılamaz.

All the opinions written in articles are under responsibilities of the authors.

None of the contents published can't be used without being cited.

Workaholic job behaviors among hotel managers in Beijing China: Potential antecedents and consequences*

Ronald J. Burke

Prof. Dr., York University

Wang Jeng

Beijing Union University

Mustafa Koyuncu

Doc. Dr./ Assoc. Prof., Nevsehir University

Lisa Fiksenbaum

York University

Abstract:

This research examined the relationship of two workaholic job behaviors proposed by Mudrack (2007) and potential antecedents and consequences. The two workaholic job behaviors were Non-required work and Control of others. Data were collected from 309 male and female managers working in 3, 4 and 5 star hotels in Beijing China using anonymously completed questionnaires, a 90% response rate. The two workaholic job behaviors 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.

Keywords: Workaholic job behaviors , psychological well-being, Hotel managers

* Preparation of this manuscript and conduct of the research was supported in part by Beijing Union University, York University and Nevsehir University. We thank the Human Resource Directors of the various properties for assisting in data collection. We also acknowledge the participation of our respondents. Finally, Rozita Moazemi contributed to the collection and review of the literature.

Organizations today are facing increasing pressure to remain competitive and increase their performance in the face of global challenges. This has resulted in increases in work hours among many of those still fortunate to have jobs. Some individuals have no choice but to work longer hours in order to meet organizational expectations; other individuals freely choose to work long hours because they many love their jobs in some cases or may be addicted to their work in other cases. The present research examines correlates of workaholic job behaviors among men and women working in hotel management jobs in China. To our knowledge, no previous research has considered this subject.

We begin by reviewing some literature addressing workaholism in organizations and then consider the hospitality and tourism sector in China.

Workaholism in organizations

Although workaholism has received considerable attention in the popular press, very little research has been undertaken to further our understanding of it. It should not be surprising then that opinions, observations and conclusions about workaholism are both varied and conflicting.

Some view workaholism positively from an organizational perspective (Machlowitz, 1980); others view workaholism negatively from both an individual and organizational perspective. (Fassel, 1990; Killinger, 1991; Schaeff & Fassel, 1988; Oates, 1971, Porter, 1996). Researchers have also used different definitions of workaholism (see Scott, Moore & Micelli, 1997; Spence & Robbins, 1992, Robinson, 1998, for examples).

The measure of workaholism then becomes critical to our understanding of it. Two measures have been widely used to study workaholism; one, the most widely used, developed by Spence and Robbins-the workaholism triad (1992), and the other developed by Robinson-the Work Addiction Risk

Test or WART (1998). And as often happens in organizational research, the more a measure is used the more questions are often raised about it. Both the Spence and Robbins and Robinson measures have received some criticism. The Spence and Robbins measure contains three components,(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 (2007) 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 new measures of workaholic behaviors have been developed over the past few years by Mudrack (2007) and Schaufeli, Taris and Bakker (2007). 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, Working excessively). Both view workaholism negatively, and both attempt to measure individual workaholic job behaviors.

Building on the Scott, Moore and Micelli (1997) review, Mudrack argues that workaholism is a behavior or behavioral tendency. Workaholic job behaviors would include spending discretionary time at work, thinking about work when not at work, and working more than required by one's organization or one's economic needs. In a study of a large sample of US MBA students, he reports 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, affiliation, orderliness, rigidity. Control of others was more strongly correlated with other variables than was Non-required work. In this study, Non-required work and Control of ot-

hers were significantly and positively, but moderately, correlated ($r=.25$, $p<.001$). The present study uses the two Mudrack workaholic job behavior scales, adding a wider variety of potential antecedents and consequences, and applies them to a different sample (managers and professionals working in hotels) working in a different culture and country (China).

Hospitality and Tourism in china

Increasing research attention has been devoted to understanding the Chinese economy and Chinese business practices (e.g., Ambler, Witzel & Xi, 2008). China is a growing economy that may be the world's largest by 2025. An increasing number of multi-national companies are now operating in China. The Chinese government is privatizing more sectors and organizations as it transitions from a centrally-planned to a more open economy.

One sector that exemplifies these changes is the hospitality and tourism sector (Lew, Yu, Ap & Guangrui, 2002; Tisdell & Wen, 1991). Hospitality and tourism now account for an increasing part of China's GDP and job growth (Poffenberger & Parry, 2007; Wang, 2008; Webb, 2004) And while all hotels were state owned 30 years ago, today there is a mixture of ownership arrangements including state-owned properties, foreign managed properties, and joint ventures with international hotel chains (e.g., Marriott) available to Chinese and foreign travelers (Heung, Zhang & Juiang, 2008; Mak, 2008; Xiao, O'Neill & Wang, 2008). Foreign tourists now account for an increasing number of visitors to China (Lew, 2007).

Although growing, the hospitality and tourism sectors in China still face important challenges (Gu, 2003, Pine & Qu, 2004). The Beijing Olympics held in August 2008 drew fewer visitors to China than expected. In addition, China had a major earthquake a few months before the Olympics and received negative publicity for its handling of Tibet and for human rights abuses more generally (Gartner & Shen, 1992). In addition, Chinese

hotels in the past were seen as providing poor quality service and having low levels of cleanliness (Cook, 1989; Tsang & Qu, 2000). In addition, there is some evidence that Chinese workers report lower levels of work engagement than do workers in other countries (Fenci & Masarech, 2008; Kulesa, 2008). Finally, China may have built more hotels than it can accommodate (Zhao, 1989) increasing competition within the country.

Hotels are in the service sector; the quality of service depends largely on the attitudes and behaviors (quality) of hotel staff. Besides improving the quality of service and levels of cleanliness, hotels in China face other challenges (Hae-Yan & Baum, 2006; Qiu & Lam, 2004; Wang & Qu, 2004). These include the shortage of highly skilled staff, anticipated future shortages of staff as the workforce ages with fewer new workforce entrants arriving, and cultural values (Hofstede, 1980) that may interfere with providing high quality service (e.g., saving face).

There are also some unique aspects of managing in the hospitality sector. These include its' labor intensiveness, high labor turnover, weak internal labor markets, the low status and gender composition of the workforce (mostly female), the 24/7 52 weeks a year operation and a low level of professional prestige. These factors place a high demand on managers to both maintain daily operations and undertake long-term planning. It is also likely that male customers and clients, along with male colleagues, would perceive female managers as less capable and interact with them in ways that would diminish their abilities and job success (Cooke, 2004; Frank, 2001). The hotel industry is also seen as requiring operating managers to make sacrifices in their family and personal lives, particularly difficult in a culture that makes women responsible for home and family. These demands include working long irregular hours, being seen and available, and relocating (Munck, 2001)..

Research Objectives

The present study 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). In addition, since the Mudrack scale has only been used in one previous study, this research will add to our understanding of it.

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. Hotel managers scoring higher on the two workaholic job behaviors would indicate lower levels of satisfaction, and work engagement and greater intent to quit.
5. Hotel managers scoring higher on the two workaholic job behaviors would indicate a poorer quality of life and more psychological distress.

Method

Procedure

A member of the research team and a Vice-Director of an international training center for hotel managers in Beijing called senior managers of 25 hotels in Beijing asking them to have their properties take part in the research. The Directors of Human Resources of these properties met a research team member who explained the purposes of the study and asked them to nominate respondents in middle management and above to complete anonymous questionnaires. Scales developed in English were translated into Mandarin using the back-translation method to check for accuracy in translation. The research team member then went back to par-

ticipating hotels to pick up completed surveys. Data were collected from 19 hotels (a 76% participation rate), four 5 star hotels, five 4 star, and ten 3 star hotels. Nominated respondents at the various properties ranged from a high of 30 to a low of 1. About 330 surveys were distributed and 309 surveys were returned, a response rate of about 90%. Almost 60% of the respondents worked in 3 star hotels with about 30% in 5 star hotels and about 15% in 4 star hotels.

The hotels varied in size, age, location in Beijing, ownership structure and country of management. This sample of hotels was diverse and is best described as a convenience sample.

Respondents

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the sample (N=309). About one-third of the sample was between 36-40 years of age, 59% were male, most were married (78%), with children (52%), most had high school education (42%) were in middle management (74%), had supervisory duties (95%), had worked in hotels and hospitality before their current job (94%), had considerable hospitality/hotel sector tenure (about 60% having 10 or more years, but less hotel and job tenure (50% having 5 or fewer years of hotel tenure and 68% having 5 or fewer years of job tenure), most worked in mid-sized hotels having 300-400 employees *(30%), and a majority worked between 41-50 hours per week (41%).

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 Behaviors

Two measures of workaholic job behaviors

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of Sample

<u>Age</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Gender</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
30 or less	68	23.2	Male	180	59.4
31 – 35	50	17.1	Female	123	40.6
36 – 40	90	30.7	<u>Length of Marriage</u>		
41 – 45	38	13.0			
46 or older	47	16.0			
<u>Marital Status</u>			1 – 5 years	57	24.8
Single/divorced	66	21.9	6 – 10 years	51	22.2
Married	236	78.1	11 – 15 years	48	20.8
			16 – 20 years	39	16.9
			21 years or more	35	15.2
<u>Children</u>			<u>Number of Children</u>		
Yes	184	62.2	1 child	179	96.2
No	112	37.8	2 or more	7	3.8
<u>Education Level</u>			<u>Work Hours</u>		
Middle School	7	2.3	40 or less	112	37.5
High school	30	9.9	41 – 50	122	40.8
College 3 years	128	42.2	51 or more	65	21.7
College 4 years	89	29.4			
Bachelors	40	13.2	<u>Supervisory Duties</u>		
Masters	9	3.0	Yes	288	95.0
			No	15	5.0
<u>Organizational Level</u>			<u>Worked in hospitality before</u>		
Non-management	9	3.0	Yes	286	94.4
Lower management	40	13.2	No	17	5.6
Middle management	224	74.2			
Senior management	29	9.6	<u>Hotel Tenure</u>		
<u>Years in Hospitality</u>			2 years or less	67	23.3
5 years or less	45	15.0	3 – 5	76	26.5
6-10	71	23.7	6 – 10	62	21.6
11-15	48	16.0	11 or more	82	28.6
16 – 20	96	32.0			
21 or more	40	13.3	<u>Employees</u>		
<u>Job tenure</u>			100 or less	36	12.7
1 year	70	24.2	101 – 200	71	25.1
2 – 5	121	41.9	201 – 400	87	30.8
6 – 10	61	21.1	401 or more	89	31.4
11 or more	37	12.8			

developed by Mudrack (2007) were included. One, Non-required work, had 4 items ($\alpha = .75$). An item was "Thinking of ways to

improve the quality of work provided to customers and/or co-workers." The other, Control of others, also had 4 items ($\alpha = .82$).

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 ($\alpha = .84$). 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 ($\alpha = .71$) 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 ($\alpha = .68$) 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 ($\alpha = .87$) developed by Kofodimos (1993). An item was "I feel challenged by my work." Career satisfaction was assessed by a five item scale ($\alpha = .84$) 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 ($\alpha = .75$) 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 ($\alpha = .68$) 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 ($\alpha = .93$) One item was "I am proud of the work that I do." Vigor was measured by six items ($\alpha = .65$). An item was "at my work I feel bursting with energy." Absorption was measured by six items ($\alpha = .86$). 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).

Quality of life

Work-Family Conflict

Three aspects of work-family conflict were assessed using scales developed by Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000). Each had three items and assessed time-, strain-, and behavior-based conflict. These three scales were combined into a composite score since they were significantly and positively inter-correlated ($\alpha = .85$). One item was "The stress from my job often makes me irritable when I get home."

Family-Work Conflict

Three aspects of family-work conflict were assessed using scales developed by Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000) each had three items and assessed time-, strain-, and behavior-based conflict. These three scales were combined into a composite score since they were significantly and positively inter-correlated ($\alpha = .86$). An item was "I have to miss work activities due to the amount of time I must spend on family responsibilities".

Psychological Well-Being

Three aspects of psychological well-being

were considered. Exhaustion was measured by a nine item scale ($\alpha = .89$), part of the Maslach Burnout Inventory, developed by Maslach, Jackson and Leiter (1996). An item was "I feel emotionally drained from my work" Psychosomatic symptoms was measured by a nineteen item scale ($\alpha = .90$) 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. Life satisfaction was assessed by a five item scale ($\alpha = .82$) created by Diener, Emmons, Larsen and Griffin (1985). A sample item was "I am satisfied with my life."

Results

Descriptive statistics

Non-required work and Control of others were correlated .63 in this study, significantly different from zero ($p < .001$), and significantly higher than in the North American sample. Respondents scored slightly higher on Non-required work than on Control of others, the respective means being 3.5 and 3.3. Males and females indicated similar levels of Non-required work (3.5 and 3.4, respectively) and Control of others (3.2 and 3.4, respectively)

Analysis Plan

In order 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, education). The second block of predictors ($N=4$) consisted of work situation characteristics (e.g., organizational level, job and hotel 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 relationship with these criterion variables were then identified ($p < .05$). The two workaholic job behaviors were then entered as a third block of predictors to determine their relationship with the dependent variables. This analysis controls for the relationship of both personal demographic and work situation characteristics before examining the relationship of both the two workaholic job behaviors and the work and well-being outcome variables.

Predictors of Workaholic Job Behaviors

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 and work situation characteristics). The following comments are offered in summary. One block of predictors (work situation characteristics) accounted for significant increment in explained variance on both workaholic job behaviors. Managers at higher organization levels and managers working in larger hotels reported higher levels of workaholic job behaviors ($Bs = .17$ and $.13$, and $.15$ and $.16$, respectively)

Table 2
Predictors of Workaholic Job Behaviors

Workaholic Job Behaviors	R	R ²	ΔR^2	P
<u>Non-required work</u>				
<u>Personal Demographics</u>	.18	.03	.03	NS
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.28	.08	.05	.05
Organizational level (.17)				
Organizational size (.15)				
<u>Control of others</u>				
<u>Personal demographics</u>	.18	.03	.03	NS
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.28	.08	.05	.05
Organizational size (.16)				
Organizational level (.13)				

Job Behaviors

Table 3 shows the results of hierarchical regression analyses in which perfectionism and non-delegation were regressed on three blocks of predictors (personal demographics, work situation characteristics, workaholic job behaviors). The following comments are offered in summary. First two blocks of predictors accounted for a significant increment in explained variance on perfectionism. Managers at higher organizational levels and managers scoring higher on Non-required work reported higher levels of perfectionism ($B_s=.13$ and $.32$, respectively) Second, one block of predictors accounted for a significant increment in explained variance on non-delegation (workaholic job behaviors). Managers scoring higher on Control of others, and managers scoring lower on Non-required work, reported higher levels on non-delegation ($B_s=.29$ and $-.29$, respectively).

Table 3

Predictors of Job Behaviors

<u>Job Behaviors</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>R²</u>	<u>ΔR²</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Perfectionism</u>				
<u>Personal Demographics</u>	.18	.03	.03	NS
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.27	.07	.04	.05
Organizational level (.13)				
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.40	.16	.09	.001
Non-required work (.32)				
<u>Non-delegation</u>				
<u>Personal demographics</u>	.14	.02	.02	NS
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.23	.05	.03	NS
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.34	.12	.07	.001
Control of others (.29)				
Non-required work (-.29)				

Job Demands

Table 4 shows the results of hierarchical regressions in which two job demands (work hours, work intensity) were regressed on the three blocks of predictors. One block of predictors (workaholic job behaviors) accounted for a significant increment in explained variance on both. Neither worka-

holic job behaviors, however, had independent and significant relationships with hours worked; both Non-required work and control of others, however, had significant and positive relationships with work intensity ($B_s=.36$ and $.24$, respectively).

Table 4

Predictors of Job Demands

<u>Job Demands</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>R²</u>	<u>ΔR²</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Work Hours</u>				
<u>Personal Demographics</u>	.19	.04	.04	NS
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.20	.04	.00	NS
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.26	.07	.03	.05
<u>Work intensity</u>				
<u>Personal demographics</u>	.24	.06	.06	.05
Gender (-.13)				
Age (-.15)				
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.30	.09	.03	NS
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.59	.35	.26	.001
Non-required work (.39)				
Control of others (.24)				

Work Outcomes

Table 5 shows the results of hierarchical regression analyses in which the four work outcomes (job satisfaction, career satisfaction, job stress, intent to quit) were regressed on the three blocks of predictors. First, one block of predictors (workaholic job behaviors) accounted for a significant increment in explained variance on job satisfaction; managers scoring higher on Non-required work were more job satisfied ($B=.22$). Second, none of the blocks of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on career satisfaction. Third, two blocks of predictors accounted for a significant amount and increment in explained variance on job stress. Managers having longer organizational tenure reported higher levels of job stress ($B=.19$). Fourth, only one block of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on intent to quit (workaholic job behaviors). Managers scor-

ing higher on Non-required work indicated lower intentions to quit (B=-.18).

Table 5
Predictors of Work Outcomes

<u>Work Outcomes</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>R²</u>	<u>ΔR²</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Job Satisfaction</u>				
<u>Personal Demographics</u>	.18	.03	.03	NS
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.24	.06	.03	NS
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.34	.12	.06	.001
Non-required work (.22)				
<u>Career Satisfaction</u>				
<u>Personal demographics</u>	.13	.02	.02	NS
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.16	.02	.00	NS
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.17	.03	.01	NS
<u>Job stress</u>				
<u>Personal demographics</u>	.16	.03	.03	NS
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.27	.08	.05	.05
Organizational tenure (-.19)				
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.31	.10	.02	.05
<u>Intent to quit</u>				
<u>Personal demographics</u>	.14	.02	.02	NS
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.16	.02	.00	NS
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.23	.05	.03	.05
Non-required work (-.18)				

Work Engagement

Table 6 shows the results of hierarchical regression analyses in which the three measures of work engagement were regressed on the three blocks of predictors. /these comments are provided in summary. First, two block of predictors accounted for a significant increment in vigor (work situation characteristics, workaholic job behaviors). Managers having shorter hotel tenure indicated higher levels of vigor as did managers scoring higher on Non-required work (Bs=.17 and .21, respectively). Second, the same two blocks of predictors accounted for significant increments in explained variance on dedication. Managers having shorter hotel tenure and managers scoring higher on Non-required work indicated higher levels of dedication.

Third, the same two blocks of predictors accounted for a significant increment in explained variance on absorption. Managers at higher organizational levels, those having shorter hotel tenure, and those scoring higher on Non-required work indicated higher levels of absorption (Bs=.18, -.18 and .24, respectively).

Table 6
Predictors of Work Engagement

<u>Work Engagement</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>R²</u>	<u>ΔR²</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Vigor</u>				
<u>Personal demographics</u>	.19	.04	.04	NS
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.30	.09	.05	.01
Organizational tenure (.17)				
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.38	.14	.05	.001
Non-required work (.21)				
<u>Dedication</u>				
<u>Personal demographics</u>	.15	.02	.02	NS
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.31	.10	.08	.001
Organizational tenure (-.18)				
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.39	.16	.06	.001
Non-required work (.31)				
<u>Absorption</u>				
<u>Personal demographics</u>	.18	.03	.03	NS
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.34	.11	.08	.001
Organizational level (.18)				
Organizational tenure (-.18)				
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.40	.16	.05	.001
Non-required work (.24)				

Quality of Life and Psychological Well-being

Table 7 presents the results of hierarchical regression analyses in which five indicators of quality of life and psychological well-being were regressed on the three blocks of predictors. First, two blocks of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment on work-family conflict (personal demographics, workaholic job behaviors). Managers having less education were more satisfied with their lives as were men (B=-.19

and -.16, respectively). One block of predictors (personal demographics) accounted for a significant amount of explained variance on family work conflict. Women indicated higher levels of family-work conflict than did men ($B=-.22$) only one block of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on exhaustion (personal demographics). Respondents without children indicated higher levels of exhaustion ($B=-.25$). Only one block of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on psychosomatic symptoms (work situation characteristics). Managers having longer hotel tenure reported more psychosomatic symptoms. Finally, only one block of predictors accounted for a significant amount or increment in explained variance on life satisfaction (personal demographics).

Discussion

This research replicated and extended an earlier study of Mudrack (2007) of the relationships of workaholic job behaviors and potential antecedents and consequences. Two workaholic job behaviors considered by Mudrack were included here: Non-required work and Control of others. Mudrack proposed an emphasis on job behaviors would be a better indicator of workaholic as opposed to other measures that include attitudes and satisfactions (e.g., Spence & Robbins, 1992).

Our results provided only partial support for our hypotheses and were only partially consistent with Mudrack's earlier work.

The following findings were generally supportive of our hypotheses. First, the two workaholic job behaviors were significantly and positively correlated ($r=.63$), but at a significantly higher level than reported by Mudrack in his work using US respondents ($r=.25$). Second, managers scoring higher on

Table 7
Predictors of Quality of Life and Psychological Well-Being

<u>Quality of Life</u>				
<u>Work-Family Conflict</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>R²</u>	<u>ΔR²</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Personal demographics</u>	.24	.06	.06	.01
Education (.19)				
Gender (-.16)				
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.27	.07	.01	NS
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.31	.10	.03	.05
<u>Work-Family Conflict</u>				
<u>Personal demographics</u>	.24	.06	.06	.05
Gender (-.22)				
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.26	.07	.01	NS
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.28	.08	.01	NS
<u>Psychological Well-Being</u>				
<u>Exhaustion</u>				
<u>Personal demographics</u>	.24	.06	.06	.05
Children (.25)				
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.30	.09	.03	NS
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.32	.10	.01	NS
<u>Psychosomatic symptoms</u>				
<u>Personal demographics</u>	.17	.03	.03	NS
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.26	.07	.04	.05
Organizational tenure (.18)				
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.28	.08	.01	NS
<u>Life satisfaction</u>				
<u>Personal demographics</u>	.29	.09	.09	.001
Length of marriage (.37)				
<u>Work situation characteristics</u>	.32	.10	.01	NS
<u>Workaholic job behaviors</u>	.33	.11	.01	NS

the two workaholic job behaviors indicated higher levels of work intensity but not longer work hours, providing only partial support for our hypotheses and measures. Third, managers scoring higher on the two workaholic job behaviors indicated more perfectionism in one case (Non-required work), and more non delegation (Control of others) providing only partial support for our hypotheses. . Fourth, managers scoring higher on the two workaholic job behaviors indicated more job satisfaction, higher levels

of work engagement, and less intent to quit, contrary to our hypotheses. Fifth, workaholic job behaviors had no relationship with indicators of quality of life (work-family and family-work conflict) and indicators of psychological well-being (exhaustion, psychosomatic symptoms, life satisfaction) providing no support for our hypotheses. Thus our findings support our first hypothesis, partially support our second and third hypotheses, but do not support our most critical hypotheses, the fourth and fifth.

These findings are at odds with much of the previously published studies of workaholism. These studies have generally indicated less positive work and well-being outcomes (see Burke, 2007; Robinson, 1998; Schaufeli, Taris & Bakker, 2008, for a partial review). Chinese hotel managers scoring higher on Mudrack's workaholic job behaviors indicated higher levels of job satisfaction, work engagement and lower intentions to quit. Chinese hotel managers scoring higher on Mudrack's two workaholic job behaviors indicated the same levels of quality of life and psychological well-being as those scoring low on the two workaholic job behaviors.

Why were most of our results different from Mudrack's and why were our central hypotheses not supported? Mudrack (2007) reported only the zero-order correlations between scores on the two workaholic job behaviors and the other variables included in his study. Analyses controlling for personal and work situation factors might have changed the results based only on the zero-order correlations. In addition, Mudrack did not report the mean levels on his two workaholic job behaviors; it is therefore not possible to determine whether the Chinese hotel managers scored higher, lower or the same on either. Our data suggests that rather than serving as a measure of workaholic job behaviors, Mudrack's measures tap into behaviors associated with one's job (e.g., level, intensity) rather than an individual's propensity to willingly put one's job above all else (see Tables 2 and 3).

Although Mudrack began his work spurred on by the commonly used definitions and measures of workaholism, it is not clear how his work advances our understanding of workaholism. Workaholism, as he mentions, is likely to have negative consequences. Our study did not show that his two workaholic job behaviors in fact had negative consequences (see Tables 6 and 7).

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 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 Chinese hotel managers. Fifth, hotels in Beijing are likely to be of higher quality and use more effective human resource management practices than hotels in the outskirts of China. Sixth, the extent to which these findings would generalize to respondents working in other industrial sectors or hotel managers in other countries is yet to be determined.

Future research directions

Several promising research directions can be identified. First, the two workaholic job behaviors proposed by Mudrack should be used in other studies to provide more information on their content and correlates using more sophisticated data analysis strategies. Second, the measures developed by Schaufeli, Taris and Bakker (2007) should be included along with the Mudrack measures. The Schaufeli, Taris and Bakker data indicated that workaholism had negative effects.

References

- Ambler, T., Witzel, M., & Xi, C. (2008) Doing business in China. London: Routledge.
- Barling, J., Keloway, E. K., & Frone, M. R. (2005) Handbook of work stress. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Burke, R. J. (2000) Workaholism 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.
- 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.
- Cooke, F. L (2004) Women in management in China. In M. J. Davidson & R. J. Burke (eds.) *Women in management worldwide: Facts, figures and analysis*. Hants, UK: Ashgate Publishing.
- Cook, D. (1989) China's hotels still playing catch up. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 39, 64-71.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R., A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985) The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75.
- Fassel, D. (1990) Working ourselves to death": The high costs of workaholism, the rewards of recovery. San Francisco: CA: Harper Collins.
- Fenci, W., & Masarech, M. A. (2008) Increase employee engagement at your company. *Workspan*, June, 30-34.
- Frank, E. J., (2001) Chinese students' perceptions of women in management: Will it be easier? *Women in Management Review*, 16, 316-324.
- Gartner, C., & Shen, J. (1992) the impact of Tiananmen Square on China's tourism image. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30, 2-9.
- 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.
- Gu, Z. (2003) The Chinese lodging industry: Problems and solutions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15, 386-392.
- Hai-yan, K., & Baum, T. (2006) skills and work in the hospitality sector: The case of hotel front office employees in China. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18, 509-518.
- Heung, V. C. S., Zhang, H., & Jiang, C. (2007) International franchising: Opportunities for China's state-owned hotels? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27, 368-380.
- 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.
- Killinger, B. (1991) *Workaholics: The respectable addicts*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kofodimos, J. (1993) *Balancing act*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Kulesa, P. (2008) Employee engagement in Asia Pacific: The tie to career development. *Workspan*, June, 46-51.
- Lew, A. A. (2007) China's growing wanderlust. *Far Easter Economic Review*, 170, 60-64.
- Lew, A. A., Yu, L., Ap, J., & Guangrui, Z. (2002) *Tourism in China*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.
- Li, L., Tse, E. C-Y., & Xie, L., (2007) Hotel general manager profile in China: A case of Guangdong Province. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 19, 263-274.
- Machlowitz, M. (1980) *workaholics: Living with them, working with the*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Mak, B. (2008) The future of state-owned hotels in China: Stay or go? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27, 355-367.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997) *The truth about burnout*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 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. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 8, 69-91.
- Mudrack, P. E. (2007) 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.
- Munck, B. (2001) Changing a culture of face time. *Harvard Business Review*, November, 3-8.
- Oates, W. (1971) *Confessions of a workaholic: The facts about work addiction*. New York: World.
- Pine, R., & Qi, P., (2004) Barriers to hotel chain development in China.: *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 14, 246-260.
- Poffenberger, C., & Parry, D. (2007) The new face of tourism in China. *The China Business Review*, 34, 12-15
- Porter, G. (1996) Organizational impact of workaholism: Suggestions for researching the negative outcomes of excessive work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1, 70-84,
- Qiu, H. Z., & Lam, T. (2004) Human resources issues in the development of tourism in China: Evidence from Heilongjiang Province. *International Journal of contemporary Hospitality Management*, 156, 45-51,
- 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.
- Schaeff, A. W., & Fassel, D. (1988) *The addictive organization*. San Francisco, CA: Harper Row.

- Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Bakker, A. B. (2007) 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.
- Spence, J. T., & Robbins, A. S. (1992) Workaholism: Definition, measurement, and preliminary results. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 58, 160-178.
- Tindell, C., & Wen, J. (1991) Foreign tourism as an element in PR China's economic development strategy. *Tourism Management*, 12, 55-67.
- Tsang, N., & Qu, H. (2000) Service quality in China's hotel industry" a perspective from tourists and hotel managers. *International Journal of contemporary Hospitality Management*, 112, 316-326.
- Wang, Y. (2008) Tourism and hospitality management in China. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27, 323-324.
- Wang, S., & Qu, H. (2004) A comparison study of Chinese domestic tourism: China vs. the USA. *International Journal of contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16, 108-115.
- 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.
- Webb, S. (2004) Hoteliers head for the Far East. *National Real Estate Investor*, 46, 26-28.
- Xiao, Q., O'Neill, J. W., & Wang, H. (2008) International hotel development: a study of potential franchisees in China. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27, 325-336.
- Zhao, J. (1989) Overprovision in Chinese hotels. *Tourism Management*, 10, 63-66.
-