Electronic Supplementary Material for
Falco, A., Girardi, D., Dal Corso, L., De Carlo, A., & Di Sipio, A. (2020). Does workload moderate the association between perfectionism and workaholism? A longitudinal study. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000253

The possible confounding role of negative affectivity

We believe that negative affectivity (NA) could represent an alternative theoretical explanation for the hypothesized association between personal and contextual factors on the one hand (i.e., perfectionism and workload) and workaholism on the other (Becker et al., 2016). There are several compelling reasons behind this alternative hypothesis. First, although the affective dimension is not a key component in several (but not all) definitions of workaholism (including the one by Schaufeli, Taris, and Bakker, 2008, adopted in this study), the experience of negative emotions such as guilt, anxiety, anger, both at work and at home, is an important characteristic of workaholism (Clark, Michel, Stevens, Howell, & Scruggs, 2014). Previous research also underscored that negative emotions may play a central role in the development and maintenance of workaholism (Andreassen et al., 2016).

Negative affectivity is also related with perfectionism. This is in line with the concept of "neurotic perfectionism" originally introduced by Hamachek (1978), according to which individuals suffer from their perfectionistic tendencies. Individuals high in perfectionism also tend to be high in NA. Indeed, perfectionists tend to be nervous, anxious, and emotional, as well as prone to psychological distress and dysfunctional beliefs (e.g., concerns over mistakes, critical thoughts, and self-doubt; see Harari, Swider, Steed, & Breidenthal, 2018, for a meta-analysis; see also Stoeber, Corr, Smith, Saklofske, 2018, for a review).

Finally, it is well-known that NA may play a central role in the stress process. Individuals with high NA may perceive higher levels of job stressors (such as workload), create more stressors for themselves and others, self-select themselves into more stressful jobs, or react more negatively to stressful situations (see Spector, Zapf, Chen, and Frese, 2000, for a review).

In the light of these considerations, we decided to control for the possible confounding effect of negative affectivity in our models. Indeed, a possible alternative explanation is that individuals with high levels of perfectionism, who are also high in NA (i.e., perfectionism and NA are positively correlated), have a tendency toward workaholism. Workload may exacerbate this association, given that high-NA individuals react more strongly to stressful situations. Accordingly, the hypothesized associations are also estimated controlling for the effect of NA (Becker et al., 2016).

Method

The questionnaire administered at Time 1 also included a measure of negative affectivity.

Measures

Negative affectivity (T1) was determined using the Italian adaptation of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; see Terracciano, McCrae, & Costa 2003). The scale is composed of ten items (e.g., "guilty"), and the five-point response scale ranged from 1 (*very slightly or not at all*) to 5 (*very much*).

Data Analysis

The two main models described in the manuscript (i.e., M1 and M2) were also estimated controlling for the effect of negative affectivity. Those were M1b and M2b, respectively. Moreover, the two interaction effects were tested simultaneously in the same model, either not controlling or controlling for the effect of NA. These models were M3a and M3b, respectively.

Results

Model M1b showed a good fit to data, $\chi^2(129) = 264.92$, $p < .001$; RSMEA = .050, CFI = .959, NNFI = .946, SRMR = .043. In this model the interaction term between SOP and workload was significant, unstandardized β = .24, $p < .01$, standardized β = .16. Simple slope analysis revealed that SOP predicted an increase in workaholism in workers facing high (+1 *SD*) workload, unstandardized β = .31, $p = .03$, standardized β = .20, but not in workers facing low (-1 *SD*) workload, unstandardized β = -.17, $p = .16$, , standardized β = -.11.

Model M2b showed a good fit to data, $\chi^2(129) = 267.29$, $p < .001$; RSMEA = .050, CFI = .958, NNFI = .945, SRMR = .043. In this model the interaction term between SPP and workload was not significant.

Model M3a showed a good fit to data, $\chi^2(126) = 284.80$, $p < .001$; RSMEA = .054, CFI = .945, NNFI = .925, SRMR = .045. In this model the interaction term between SOP and workload was significant, unstandardized β = .31, $p < .01$, standardized β = .20, whereas the interaction term between SPP and workload was not. Simple slope analysis revealed that SOP predicted an increase in workaholism in workers facing high (+1 *SD*) workload, unstandardized β = .38, $p = .02$, standardized β = .24, but not in workers facing low (-1 *SD*) workload, unstandardized β = -.25, $p = .06$, standardized β = -.16.

Finally, Model M3b showed a good fit to data, $\chi^2(176) = 335.91$, $p < .001$; RSMEA = .046, CFI = .956, NNFI = .942, SRMR = .042. In this model the interaction term between SOP and workload was significant, unstandardized $\beta = .31$, $p < .01$, standardized $\beta = .20$, whereas the interaction term between SPP and workload was not. Simple slope analysis revealed that SOP predicted an increase in workaholism in workers facing high (+1 *SD*) workload, unstandardized $\beta = .38$, $p = .02$, standardized $\beta = .24$, but not in workers facing low (-1 *SD*) workload, unstandardized $\beta = -.25$, $p = .06$, standardized $\beta = -.16$.

References

Andreassen, C. S., Bjorvatn, B., Moen, B. E., Waage, S., Magerøy, N., & Pallesen, S. (2016). A longitudinal study of the relationship between the five-factor model of personality and workaholism. *TPM – Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology, 23*, 285–298. doi:10.4473/TPM23.3.2

Becker, T. E., Atinc, G., Breaugh, J. A., Carlson, K. D., Edwards, J. R., & Spector, P. E. (2016). Statistical control in correlational studies: 10 essential recommendations for organizational researchers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37*, 157–167. doi:10.1002/job.2053

Clark, M. A., Michel, J. S., Stevens, G. W., Howell, J. W., & Scruggs, R. S. (2014). Workaholism, work engagement and work–home outcomes: Exploring the mediating role of positive and negative emotions. *Stress and Health, 30*, 287–300. doi:10.1002/smi.2511

Hamachek, D. E. (1978). Psychodynamics of normal and neurotic perfectionism. *Psychology: A Journal of Human Behavior, 15*, 27–33.

Harari, D., Swider, B. W., Steed, L. B., & Breidenthal, A. P. (2018). Is perfect good? A meta-analysis of perfectionism in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 103*, 1121–1144. doi:10.1037/apl0000324

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* (pp. 203–225). Bingley, UK: Emerald.

Spector, P. E., Zapf, D., Chen, P. Y., & Frese, M. (2000). Why negative affectivity should not be controlled in job stress research: Don’t throw out the baby with the bath water. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 79–95. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200002)21:1<79::AID-JOB964>3.0.CO;2-G

Stoeber, J., Corr, P. J., Smith, M. S., & Saklofske, D. H. (2018). Perfectionism and personality. In J. Stoeber (Ed.), *The psychology of perfectionism: Theory, research, applications* (pp. 69–88). London: Routledge.

Terracciano, A., McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2003). Factorial and construct validity of the Italian Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *19*, 131–141. doi:10.1027//1015-5759.19.2.131