



Associations among workaholism, leisure attitude, and work-life balance among academics working in faculties of sport sciences

Relaciones entre la adicción al trabajo, la actitud hacia el ocio y el equilibrio entre la vida laboral y personal en académicos que trabajan en facultades de ciencias del deporte

Authors

Muhammet Mavibaş¹
Murat Turan²
Buğra Çağatay Savaş³
Yunus Emre Çingöz⁴

^{1,2,3} Erzurum Technical University
(Türkiye)

⁴ Bayburt University (Türkiye)

Corresponding author:
Muhammet Mavibaş
muhammet.mavibas@erzurum.edu.tr

Received: 14-08-25

Accepted: 27-03-26

How to cite in APA

Mavibaş, M., Turan, M., & Savaş, B. Çağatay. (2026). Associations among workaholism, leisure attitude, and work-life balance among academics working in faculties of sport sciences. *Retos*, 78, 1043-1060.
<https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v79.117405>

Abstract

Introduction: Academic work in faculties of sport sciences has increasingly been shaped by high performance demands and blurred boundaries between work and personal life. Within this context, workaholism and leisure attitude have become relevant for understanding perceived balance across these domains.

Objective: This study aimed to examine the relationships among workaholism, leisure attitude, and perceived work-life balance among academics employed in faculties of sport sciences. It also tested whether leisure attitude played a mediating role in this relationship.

Methodology: A correlational design was used. Data were collected in March 2025 from 353 academics working at different universities through an online questionnaire. The study variables were measured using validated scales, and the data were analyzed through correlation analysis and mediation analysis based on resampling procedures.

Results: Higher workaholism was associated with lower perceived work-life balance, whereas a more positive leisure attitude was associated with higher perceived work-life balance. Workaholism remained a significant negative predictor of balance, and leisure attitude was a significant positive predictor. However, the indirect effect was not statistically significant.

Discussion: These findings were consistent with literature indicating that maladaptive overwork is associated with less favorable work-life balance outcomes, whereas positive leisure-related orientations are associated with more favorable well-being perceptions.

Conclusions: The findings suggest that workaholism is negatively associated with perceived work-life balance and that leisure attitude is positively associated with this balance, although it does not appear to function as a mediating mechanism in this relationship.

Keywords

Workaholism; leisure attitude; work-life balance; academics; mediation analysis.

Resumen

Introducción: El trabajo académico en las facultades de ciencias del deporte ha estado cada vez más condicionado por altas exigencias de rendimiento y por límites difusos entre la vida laboral y la vida personal. En este contexto, la adicción al trabajo y la actitud hacia el ocio han adquirido relevancia para comprender el equilibrio percibido entre ambos ámbitos.

Objetivo: Este estudio tuvo como objetivo examinar las relaciones entre la adicción al trabajo, la actitud hacia el ocio y el equilibrio percibido entre la vida laboral y personal en académicos que trabajan en facultades de ciencias del deporte. Asimismo, analizó si la actitud hacia el ocio desempeñó un papel mediador en dicha relación.

Metodología: Se utilizó un diseño correlacional. Los datos se recopilaron en marzo de 2025 a partir de 353 académicos de distintas universidades mediante un cuestionario en línea. Las variables del estudio se evaluaron mediante escalas validadas y los datos se analizaron mediante análisis de correlación y análisis de mediación con remuestreo.

Resultados: Un mayor nivel de adicción al trabajo se asoció con un menor equilibrio percibido entre la vida laboral y personal, mientras que una actitud más positiva hacia el ocio se asoció con un mayor equilibrio percibido. La adicción al trabajo siguió siendo un predictor negativo y significativo del equilibrio, y la actitud hacia el ocio fue un predictor positivo y significativo. Sin embargo, el efecto indirecto no fue estadísticamente significativo.

Discusión: Estos hallazgos fueron consistentes con la literatura que señala que el sobretrabajo desadaptativo se relaciona con resultados menos favorables en el equilibrio entre la vida laboral y personal, mientras que las orientaciones positivas hacia el ocio se relacionan con percepciones de bienestar más favorables.

Conclusiones: Los hallazgos sugieren que la adicción al trabajo se asocia negativamente con el equilibrio percibido entre la vida laboral y personal y que la actitud hacia el ocio se asocia positivamente con dicho equilibrio, aunque no parece actuar como mecanismo mediador en esta relación.

Palabras clave

Adicción al trabajo; actitud hacia el ocio; equilibrio entre la vida laboral y personal; académicos; análisis de mediación.



Introduction

In higher education, working life is increasingly shaped by rising performance pressures, accelerating digitalization, and expanding role expectations. Academics simultaneously carry teaching, research, consultancy, and administrative responsibilities, which often increases boundary permeability between work and nonwork domains and normalizes always on work patterns (Clark et al., 2016; Schaufeli et al., 2006). Current evidence indicates that a considerable proportion of academics work more than 50 hours per week and that workload has increased markedly over time (Taris et al., 2020). In this context, work life balance (WLB) should not be reduced to time management alone. Instead, it is a multidimensional outcome reflecting individuals' capacity to manage demands across work and nonwork domains and to allocate limited time and psychological resources sustainably (Siem et al., 2025).

At the same time, balance in higher education is not solely an individual coping issue. It is also shaped by institutional discourses, reward systems, and norms (Oberhauser et al., 2025). Research on unbounded work in academia suggests that boundary permeability is often conditioned by organizational support and structural expectations rather than purely personal preference. Accordingly, individual level solutions such as flexibility may be insufficient to protect WLB if organizational norms that erode boundaries remain unchanged (Johnston et al., 2022). This implies that explaining WLB in academia requires considering work demands alongside individual working patterns and recovery related resources.

Within this framework, one salient individual vulnerability that can undermine WLB is workaholism, characterized by compulsive and excessive working tendencies. Workaholism is typically defined as a compulsive work pattern driven by internal pressure, often accompanied by discomfort or guilt during nonwork activities (Schaufeli et al., 2006). The academic environment's emphasis on self regulation, continuous productivity, and performance based evaluation may increase susceptibility to such patterns (Bakker et al., 2014). Occupational health research indicates that workaholism is linked to chronic stress related complaints, functional impairment, and elevated health risks, which may translate into measurable declines in productivity (Matsuyama et al., 2024). In academic contexts, publish or perish norms and performance based funding and reward systems can intensify pressure toward overwork, potentially reinforcing maladaptive overwork patterns (Airagnes et al., 2024). Moreover, unchecked workaholic behavior may indirectly reduce institutional effectiveness by weakening student engagement and support processes (Van Beek et al., 2011). Taken together, these findings suggest that workaholism cannot be understood as merely working hard. Rather, it is a maladaptive overwork pattern that can erode WLB (Clark et al., 2016; Shimazu & Schaufeli, 2009).

However, WLB is shaped not only by risk factors but also by recovery related resources. Contemporary approaches conceptualize leisure as more than optional free time. It is a resource domain that can foster psychological recovery and sustain functioning under high demands (Strassburger et al., 2023). Leisure participation has been shown to reduce stress, enhance life satisfaction, and buffer against burnout (Caldwell, 2005). Within this domain, leisure attitude is particularly relevant because individuals' cognitive valuation of leisure, affective legitimization of leisure experiences, and behavioral orientation toward leisure can shape actual participation and, consequently, recovery processes (Ragheb & Beard, 1982). Individuals with more positive leisure attitudes are more likely to engage in leisure activities and derive psychological, interpersonal, and physical benefits (Teixeira & Freire, 2013). Leisure has been conceptualized as a multidimensional life domain that can serve developmental, restorative, and enjoyment functions, supporting the view that leisure-related orientations may matter for sustainable functioning (Martínez-Agut, 2025). Conversely, pronounced workaholic tendencies may be associated with devaluing leisure, perceiving it as unnecessary or even harmful, thereby relinquishing critical recovery opportunities (Atroszko et al., 2020). Recent evidence further indicates that leisure attitude is positively related to self rated health and psychological well being and may operate within explanatory models involving indirect pathways (Rodríguez-Cifuentes et al., 2024). Complementary studies also suggest that leisure related engagement is meaningfully associated with workaholism and WLB and that some relationships may vary by contextual characteristics such as gender (Akçakese et al., 2024). Overall, this literature supports a resource based logic. When individuals value leisure and orient toward it behaviorally, recovery is more likely to occur, which may strengthen WLB.



Evidence from Türkiye also points to notable WLB strain among academics (Ofloğlu & Aksoy Doğan, 2022). Furthermore, discipline specific contexts may entail distinctive demand profiles. Research conducted in faculties of sport sciences suggests that perceptions of work negatively affecting life, time planning difficulties, and performance metric pressures shaping daily work organization may be particularly salient (Orak et al., 2025). This discipline specific demand composition, combining teaching, research, consultancy, and field related responsibilities such as applied practice, fieldwork, and events, may indicate greater vulnerability in WLB. Findings also suggest that proactive career behaviors without adequate leisure integration can exacerbate imbalance, especially among early and mid career academics (Marthalina et al., 2025). Nevertheless, studies that test workaholism, leisure attitude, and WLB within a single integrated model in sport sciences academics remain limited. Recent bibliometric evidence in university physical education contexts shows a growing research focus on quality of working life and 'double presence', highlighting psychosocial risks, gendered patterns, and work-family reconciliation as recurring themes (Sornoza Zavala et al., 2026). This broader university context is also compatible with evidence showing that leisure, work, and study demands may coexist in ways that shape well-being and time-related experiences in higher education settings (Aguirre-Cardona et al., 2024).

Despite this growing body of evidence, two gaps stand out. Empirically, integrated examinations testing workaholism, leisure attitude, and WLB within the same model remain scarce in academic samples, and this scarcity appears more pronounced in discipline specific groups. Conceptually, although leisure is frequently discussed as beneficial, fewer studies position leisure attitude explicitly as a mediating mechanism explaining how workaholism translates into poorer WLB (Aziz et al., 2023; Rodríguez-Cifuentes et al., 2024). With increasing attention to psychosocial safety climate and healthy organizations, clarifying these associations can provide an evidence base for well being oriented policies and interventions in higher education (Reig-Botella et al., 2025).

Although the positive effects of leisure on well-being and recovery are frequently emphasized, it is important to conceptually distinguish leisure attitude from leisure participation and leisure involvement. Leisure attitude refers to individuals' cognitive, affective, and behavioral orientation toward leisure, whereas participation and involvement reflect actual leisure-related behaviors more directly (Ragheb & Beard, 1982; Teixeira & Freire, 2013). Existing studies have more often demonstrated the potential buffering role of leisure in relation to workaholism and work-related strain through participation and involvement rather than through leisure attitude itself (Aziz et al., 2023; Akçakese et al., 2024). Therefore, although leisure attitude may be considered a potential mediator in the relationship between workaholism and work-life balance, this assumption appears to be more appropriately treated as an empirical possibility to be tested rather than as an established conclusion. To address these gaps, the present study focuses on academics employed in faculties of sport sciences in Türkiye and tests an integrated model linking workaholism, leisure attitude, and WLB. More specifically, the present study investigates whether leisure attitude may help explain part of the relationship between workaholism and work-life balance. Accordingly, leisure attitude is considered not as an established mediating mechanism, but as a potential mediator

Accordingly, the hypotheses of the present study are as follows:

H1. Workaholism is negatively associated with work life balance. This expectation is consistent with evidence indicating that unbounded work and increasing academic demands weaken work life balance, as well as with syntheses showing poorer balance among individuals exhibiting maladaptive excessive work patterns (Johnston et al., 2022; Kenyhercz et al., 2024; Siem et al., 2025).

H2. Workaholism is negatively associated with leisure attitude. In contexts where boundaries are blurred, compulsive and excessive investment in work may reduce the legitimacy and priority of leisure, thereby weakening cognitive, affective, and behavioral tendencies toward leisure (Akçakese et al., 2024; Aziz et al., 2023; Osmanović et al., 2024).

H3. Leisure attitude is positively associated with work life balance. Given that more positive leisure attitudes are linked to better well being and health and that leisure related resources support recovery processes, a more favorable leisure attitude is expected to co occur with stronger perceptions of balance (Rodríguez-Cifuentes et al., 2024; Strassburger et al., 2023).

H4. Leisure attitude is expected to help explain, at least in part, the relationship between workaholism and work-life balance. Specifically, higher workaholism is expected to be associated with less favorable



leisure attitudes, which in turn are expected to be associated with poorer work–life balance. This expectation is informed by studies suggesting that leisure-related resources may attenuate some negative outcomes of workaholism and that leisure attitudes may be associated with well-being outcomes relevant to balance (Aziz et al., 2023; Rodríguez-Cifuentes et al., 2024; Akçakese et al., 2024).

Method

Purpose of the Study

This research primarily aimed to examine the interrelationships among workaholism, leisure attitudes, and perceptions of work-life balance among academic personnel employed at sports sciences faculties in Türkiye. Additionally, the study sought to determine whether leisure attitude functions as a mediating variable in the association between workaholism and work-life balance.

Research Design

A correlational research methodology was adopted to identify the direction and strength of relationships among the variables without the application of any experimental manipulation (Karasar, 2016). The model included both direct and indirect pathways, enabling an investigation into the potential mediating role of leisure attitude. To test this mediation model, Hayes' PROCESS Macro (Model 4) was used with 5,000 bootstrap samples for enhanced reliability and confidence interval estimation (Hayes, 2013).

Participants

The target population of the study consisted of academic staff employed in faculties of sport sciences across Türkiye (N = 2,838). Rather than selecting a subsample, the study adopted a census-based invitation approach, and the survey link was distributed to the full accessible population in March 2025. Data were collected from 353 academics who voluntarily participated in the study, yielding a response rate of 12.4%. Analyses were conducted on the basis of these valid responses. To facilitate a clearer evaluation of the sample characteristics, the demographic distribution of the participants is presented in Table 1.

Because the online questionnaire was configured to require responses to all scale items, no missing data occurred in the study variables. In addition, to reduce the likelihood of duplicate submissions, the survey system was restricted to one response per account.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Variable	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	219	62.0
	Female	134	38.0
Age	≤30 years	39	11.0
	31–40 years	134	38.0
	41–50 years	85	24.1
	51–60 years	60	17.0
	≥61 years	35	9.9
Marital Status	Married	240	68.0
	Single	113	32.0
Academic Title	Lecturer	48	13.6
	Research Assistant	63	17.8
	Assistant Professor	84	23.8
	Associate Professor	96	27.2
	Professor	62	17.6
Administrative Duty	Yes	143	40.5
	No	210	59.5
Leisure Activity Preference	Social Activities	97	27.5
	Cultural Activities	53	15.0
	Physical Activities	203	57.5
	Total	353	100

A total of 353 academic personnel participated in the study. The gender distribution indicated that male participants comprised the majority, with 62.0% (n = 219), while female participants accounted for 38.0% (n = 134).



In terms of age, the highest representation was found in the 31–40 age bracket, encompassing 38.0% of the total sample.

With respect to marital status, 68.0% (n = 240) of the respondents were married, whereas 32.0% (n = 113) identified as single.

When examining academic rank, Associate Professors constituted the largest subgroup at 27.2%, followed by Assistant Professors (23.8%), Research Assistants (17.8%), Professors (17.6%), and Lecturers (13.6%). This distribution suggests that the sample largely consisted of individuals with mid- to senior-level academic positions.

Administrative duties were reported by 40.5% of the participants, indicating that a substantial portion held managerial or leadership responsibilities, while the remaining 59.5% were not engaged in administrative roles.

In terms of preferred leisure activities, the majority (57.5%) expressed a preference for physical activities. Social activities were favored by 27.5% of participants, while 15.0% indicated a preference for cultural activities. These findings suggest a pronounced inclination toward physically active recreational pursuits among the academic staff.

Data Collection Tools

Four primary instruments were utilized to gather data concerning demographics, levels of workaholism, attitudes toward leisure, and perceptions of work-life balance.

Personal Information Form: A custom-designed Demographic Information Form was used to collect essential background data such as participants' age, gender, marital status, academic title, administrative duties, and preferred types of leisure activities.

DUWAS Workaholism Scale: Workaholism levels were measured using the Dutch Work Addiction Scale developed by Schaufeli et. al. (2006), with its Turkish adaptation completed by Doğan and Tel (2011). This scale comprises 14 items categorized under two subdimensions: "Excessive Work" and "Compulsive Work." Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the DUWAS TR demonstrated an acceptable fit for its two factor structure, namely Working Excessively and Working Compulsively ($\chi^2/df=3.44$, GFI=0.92, CFI=0.91, IFI=0.91, AGFI=0.87, RMSEA=0.080). Regarding reliability, Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients were reported as 0.85 for the total scale, 0.76 for the Working Excessively subscale, and 0.74 for the Working Compulsively subscale.

Leisure Attitude Scale – Short Form: Participants' leisure attitudes were assessed using the abbreviated version of the Leisure Attitude Scale, originally designed by Ragheb and Beard (1982), shortened by Teixeira and Freire (2013), and adapted into Turkish by Önal and Bedir (2023). The scale contains 18 items addressing cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components of leisure attitudes, with responses rated on a five-point Likert scale. Within the scope of construct validity, the exploratory factor analysis results supported a three factor structure consisting of cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. The suitability of the data for factor analysis was confirmed with a KMO value of 0.88 and Bartlett's test of sphericity, and the three factors were reported to explain 72.46 percent of the total variance. Confirmatory factor analysis further indicated that the three factor model demonstrated good fit, with the following fit indices reported: chi square divided by degrees of freedom 1.35, RMSEA 0.044, GFI 0.91, NFI 0.94, and CFI 0.98. Internal consistency was high, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.91 for the cognitive subscale, 0.94 for the affective subscale, and 0.89 for the behavioral subscale.

New Work-Life Balance Scale: The New Work-Life Balance Scale, developed by Agha, Azmi, and Khan (2017) and translated into Turkish by Yılmaz and Söyük (2022), was used to measure perceptions of work-life balance. This tool includes 15 items distributed across three subscales: "Work Life," "Personal Life," and "Improvement." Each item was rated on a five-point Likert scale. Item analysis results indicated that no item had a total score correlation below 0.15, no item loading fell below 0.30, and no item showed problematic cross loadings across factors. Confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated that the New Work-Life Balance Scale exhibited an acceptable fit for its three factor structure, namely Personal Life, Work Life, and Enhancement ($\chi^2/df = 1.72$, RMSEA = 0.060, SRMR = 0.058, GFI = 0.91, AGFI = 0.87, CFI = 0.98). Regarding reliability, Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficients were reported as

0.871 for the Personal Life subscale, 0.848 for the Work Life subscale, 0.660 for the Enhancement subscale, and 0.884 for the total scale.

Table 2. Common Method Bias Test Results (Harman's Single-Factor Test)

Indicator	Result
KMO	0.841
Bartlett's test of sphericity, χ^2	13,570.559
df	1081
p	< .001
Number of factors with eigenvalues > 1	8
Variance explained by the first factor (%)	22.963
Cumulative explained variance (%)	68.675
Conclusion	The first factor explained less than 40%/50% of the total variance, and multiple factors emerged; therefore, common method bias was unlikely to be a serious concern.

Table 2 presents the results of Harman's single-factor test conducted to assess the potential influence of common method bias. As noted by Podsakoff et al. (2003), common method bias may be a concern when either a single factor emerges from the factor analysis or one general factor accounts for the majority of the covariance among the measures. In the present study, the first unrotated factor explained 22.963% of the total variance, which is well below the commonly used 50% rule of thumb in applied research. In addition, the KMO value (0.841) and the significant Bartlett's test of sphericity ($\chi^2 = 13,570.559$, $df = 1081$, $p < .001$) indicated that the data were suitable for factor analysis. Taken together, these findings suggest that common method bias was unlikely to represent a serious threat to the study results. Detailed unrotated extraction results are presented in Appendix 1.

Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected during March 2025 using an online survey created via Google Drive. The survey link was distributed to academic staff through institutional email networks. Participants were required to provide electronic informed consent prior to accessing the questionnaire. The survey was active for one month to ensure an adequate number of responses.

Data Analysis

All analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 25. Descriptive statistics were computed for demographic variables and scale scores. Normality was assessed using skewness and kurtosis values. Because skewness and kurtosis values were within the commonly accepted ± 2 range (George & Mallery, 2011), parametric techniques were applied. Independent-samples t tests were used to compare workaholism, leisure attitude, and work-life balance scores across binary demographic groups (gender, marital status and administrative duty), whereas one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used for comparisons involving variables with more than two categories (age group, academic title, and preferred leisure activity type). Tukey's HSD test was performed for post hoc comparisons when omnibus ANOVA results were statistically significant. Pearson correlation analysis was used to examine bivariate associations among the main study variables.

To assess the potential influence of common method bias, Harman's single-factor test was conducted by entering all measurement items into an unrotated principal component analysis. The first unrotated factor accounted for 22.96% of the total variance, suggesting that common method bias was unlikely to represent a serious threat to the findings. Mediation analyses were conducted using Hayes' PROCESS Macro Model 4 with 5,000 bootstrap resamples. Indirect effects were evaluated using percentile bootstrap confidence intervals. Standardized coefficients and completely standardized indirect effects reported by PROCESS were used to provide standardized effect estimates. Because the online questionnaire required responses to all scale items, no missing data were observed in the study variables. Statistical significance was set at $p < .05$.

Ethical Approval



This study adhered to ethical guidelines for human subject research. Ethical clearance was obtained from the Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee of Erzurum Technical University (Approval Date: March 27, 2025; Decision No: 5/4). All participants provided informed consent, and assurances of confidentiality and anonymity were clearly communicated.

Results

All measurement instruments employed in the study demonstrated satisfactory internal reliability, with Cronbach's alpha values surpassing the widely accepted threshold of .70, as proposed by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994).

For the Workaholism Scale, moderate average scores were observed across its subdimensions. The Excessive Work component recorded a mean score of 3.33, while the Compulsive Work subscale yielded a slightly higher mean of 3.49. The scale showed strong internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.889.

The Leisure Attitude Scale revealed high levels of agreement in its Cognitive (M=4.54) and Affective (M=4.49) domains, indicating generally positive attitudes toward leisure among participants. However, the Behavioral domain produced a lower mean score, suggesting a potential gap between attitude and practice. Overall, the reliability of the scale was excellent, as evidenced by a Cronbach's alpha of 0.917.

For the Work-Life Balance Scale, the lowest average was observed in the Personal Life dimension (M=2.99), whereas the Work Life (M=3.65) and Improvement (M=3.62) dimensions indicated relatively higher levels of perceived balance. The scale exhibited high internal reliability, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.907.

Tests of normality based on skewness and kurtosis indicated that the scale distributions were within the acceptable ± 2 range, as suggested by George and Mallery (2011). Accordingly, parametric statistical techniques were applied in analyses. Although the skewness values for the cognitive and affective subdimensions of leisure attitude and the work-life balance subscale approached the upper range of the adopted criterion, all skewness and kurtosis values remained within ± 2 . This range is commonly considered acceptable for the use of parametric methods in social science research. In addition, given the relatively large sample size (N=353), the use of t tests and ANOVA was considered sufficiently robust to moderate deviations from normality. Furthermore, the mediation analysis relied on bootstrap confidence intervals, which do not assume a normal sampling distribution of the indirect effect.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics and Reliability Coefficients for Workaholism, Leisure Attitude, and Work-Life Balance Scales

Scale	Subdimensions	n	Min.	Max.	Mean \pm SD	Skewness		Kurtosis		Cronbach's Alpha
						Stat.	SE	Stat.	SE	
Workaholism	Excessive Work	353	1.38	5.00	3.33 \pm 0.80	-.172	.130	-.612	.259	.807
	Compulsive Work	353	1.17	5.00	3.49 \pm 0.78	-.318	.130	-.219	.259	.771
	Total Score	353	1.29	5.00	3.40 \pm 0.76	-.230	.130	-.453	.259	.889
Leisure Attitude	Cognitive	353	1.83	5.00	4.53 \pm 0.60	-1.402	.130	1.496	.259	.915
	Affective	353	1.33	5.00	4.48 \pm 0.70	-1.476	.130	1.823	.259	.945
	Behavioral	353	1.00	5.00	3.37 \pm 0.86	-.207	.130	-.225	.259	.830
	Total Score	353	1.71	5.00	4.11 \pm 0.59	-1.315	.130	1.447	.259	.917
Work-Life Balance	Personal Life	353	1.00	5.00	2.99 \pm 0.91	-.537	.130	-.939	.259	.949
	Work Life	353	1.00	5.00	3.64 \pm 0.58	-1.466	.130	1.610	.259	.854
	Improvement	353	1.00	5.00	3.61 \pm 0.79	-.356	.130	.273	.259	.741
	Total Score	353	1.00	5.00	3.33 \pm 0.63	-.587	.130	.033	.259	.907

Note: 1.00-1.80: Very Low; 1.81-2.60: Low; 2.61-3.40: Moderate; 3.41-4.20: High; 4.21-5.00: Very High. (Jenkins, 2007; Suwannasri, 2016)

Table 4 shows that workaholism, leisure attitude, and work-life balance did not differ significantly by gender, marital status or administrative duty ($p > .05$). These findings suggest that the study variables were distributed similarly across these demographic groups in the present sample.

Table 4. Comparison of Workaholism, Leisure Attitude, and Work–Life Balance by Gender, Marital and Administrative Duty Status

Variable	Scale	Group	n	M±SD	t	p
Gender	Workaholism	Male	219	3.36±0.77	-1.048	.296
		Female	134	3.45±0.76		
	Leisure Attitude	Male	219	4.08±0.61	-1.070	.285
		Female	134	4.15±0.55		
	Work-Life Balance	Male	219	3.37±0.62	1.508	.132
		Female	134	3.27±0.65		
Marital Status	Workaholism	Married	240	3.38±0.77	-.706	.481
		Single	113	3.44±0.76		
	Leisure Attitude	Married	240	4.08±0.58	-1.086	.278
		Single	113	4.16±0.61		
	Work-Life Balance	Married	240	3.34±0.66	.366	.715
		Single	113	3.31±0.58		
Administrative Duty	Workaholism	Yes	143	3.32±0.77	-1.464	.144
		No	210	3.45±0.76		
	Leisure Attitude	Yes	143	4.05±0.68	-1.390	.166
		No	210	4.14±0.51		
	Work-Life Balance	Yes	143	3.30±0.63	.735	.463
		No	210	3.35±0.64		

As shown in Table 5, age was significantly associated with both workaholism, ($F=5.170$, $p<.001$), and work–life balance, ($F=5.251$, $p<.001$), whereas leisure attitude did not differ significantly across age groups, ($F=2.386$, $p=.053$). Tukey post hoc comparisons indicated that participants aged 30 years and under reported significantly higher workaholism scores than those aged 51–60 and 61 years and over, and participants aged 41–50 also reported higher workaholism scores than those aged 51–60. For work–life balance, all older age groups reported significantly higher scores than the youngest group.

Academic title did not significantly differentiate workaholism, ($F=2.373$, $p=.052$), or leisure attitude, ($F=0.377$, $p=.825$). However, work–life balance differed significantly across academic title groups, ($F=2.769$, $p<.05$). Post hoc comparisons showed that assistant professors and associate professors reported significantly higher work–life balance scores than lecturers.

Preferred leisure activity type did not produce significant differences in workaholism, ($F=0.083$, $p=.920$), or work–life balance, ($F=2.125$, $p=.121$). In contrast, leisure attitude varied significantly across activity types ($F=8.526$, $p<.001$). Tukey test results indicated that participants preferring physical activities reported significantly higher leisure attitude scores than those preferring social activities.

Table 5. Comparison of Workaholism, Leisure Attitude, and Work–Life Balance across Age, Academic Title, and Preferred Leisure Activity Type

Variable	Scale	Group	n	M±SD	F	p	Post-Hoc (Tukey)
Age	Workaholism	¹ ≤30 years	39	3.70±0.62	5.170	<.001	1>4.5 3>4
		² 31-40 years	134	3.37±0.84			
		³ 41-50 years	85	3.56±0.68			
		⁴ 51-60 years	60	3.14±0.74			
		⁵ ≥61 years	35	3.18±0.61			
	Leisure Attitude	¹ ≤30 years	39	4.20±0.48	2.386	.053	-
		² 31-40 years	134	4.16±0.55			
		³ 41-50 years	85	4.14±0.64			
		⁴ 51-60 years	60	3.92±0.70			
		⁵ ≥61 years	35	4.01±0.40			
	Work-Life Balance	¹ ≤30 years	39	2.97±0.62	5.251	<.001	2.3.4.5>1
		² 31-40 years	134	3.31±0.72			
		³ 41-50 years	85	3.33±0.52			
		⁴ 51-60 years	60	3.53±0.56			
		⁵ ≥61 years	35	3.46±0.49			
Academic Title	Workaholism	¹ Lecturer	48	3.45±0.84	2.373	.052	-
		² Research Assistant	63	3.48±0.78			
		³ Assist. Prof. Dr.	84	3.25±0.79			
		⁴ Assoc. Prof. Dr.	96	3.53±0.73			
		⁵ Prof. Dr.	62	3.25±0.65			
	Leisure Attitude	¹ Lecturer	48	4.15±0.46	.377	.825	-
		² Research Assistant	63	4.15±0.64			
		³ Assist. Prof. Dr.	84	4.05±0.62			
		⁴ Assoc. Prof. Dr.	96	4.09±0.61			
		⁵ Prof. Dr.	62	4.12±0.56			
	Work-Life Balance	¹ Lecturer	48	3.31±0.66	2.769	<.05	3.4>1
		² Research Assistant	63	3.11±0.64			
		³ Assist. Prof. Dr.	84	3.40±0.66			

		⁴ Assoc. Prof. Dr.	96	3.35±0.59			
		⁵ Prof. Dr.	62	3.44±0.61			
Leisure Activity Preference	Workaholism	¹ Sosyal Activities	97	3.42±0.85	.083	.920	-
		² Kültürel Activities	53	3.41±0.66			
		³ Fiziksel Activities	203	3.38±0.75			
	Leisure Attitude	¹ Social Activities	97	3.91±0.68	8.526	<.001	3>1
		² Cultural Activities	53	4.09±0.66			
		³ Physical Activities	203	4.20±0.49			
	Work-Life Balance	¹ Sosyal Activities	97	3.22±0.71	2.125	.121	-
		² Kültürel Activities	53	3.35±0.61			
		³ Fiziksel Activities	203	3.38±0.60			

The correlation analysis revealed predominantly weak and negative associations between workaholism and leisure attitude. Notably, a significant inverse relationship was observed between the Excessive Work subdimension and Affective Leisure Attitude ($r=-0.202$, $p<.05$), as well as between total Workaholism scores and Affective Leisure Attitude ($r=-0.166$, $p<.01$). These findings indicate that individuals who demonstrate higher tendencies toward workaholic behaviors may find it more challenging to emotionally engage in or derive satisfaction from leisure activities. In contrast, correlations involving other leisure attitude subdimensions were either not statistically significant or demonstrated minimal effect sizes.

In contrast, statistically significant positive correlations were identified between leisure attitude and various dimensions of work-life balance. Specifically, the Cognitive ($r = 0.205$, $p < .01$), Affective ($r=0.278$, $p<.01$), and total Leisure Attitude scores ($r = 0.181$, $p < .01$) were positively associated with overall Work-Life Balance scores. These outcomes suggest that individuals who possess more favorable perspectives toward leisure are more likely to report a higher degree of balance between work and personal life domains.

Conversely, workaholism was negatively correlated with work-life balance. A moderate and statistically significant inverse relationship was detected between total Workaholism scores and Work-Life Balance ($r=-0.305$, $p<.01$). In particular, higher levels of workaholism were linked to decreased scores in the Personal Life ($r=-0.399$, $p<.01$) and Work Life ($r=-0.148$, $p<.01$) subdimensions of the work-life balance scale. Collectively, these results underscore that greater workaholic tendencies are associated with increased difficulties in achieving and maintaining equilibrium between professional obligations and personal well-being.

Collinearity diagnostics indicated no multicollinearity concerns (tolerance=.997 and VIF=1.003 for both predictors).

Table 6. Correlations among Workaholism, Leisure Attitude, and Work-Life Balance Subdimensions

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	1.000										
2	0,835**	1.000									
3	0.972**	0.939**	1.000								
4	-0.096	0.007	-0.059	1.000							
5	-0.202*	-0.098	-0.166**	0.705**	1.000						
6	0.004	0.024	0.014	0.225**	0.292**	1.000					
7	-0.067	0.009	-0.037	0.682**	0.722**	0.799**	1.000				
8	-0.375**	-0.393**	-0.399**	0.095	0.203**	0.078	0.130*	1.000			
9	-0.166**	-0.108*	-0.148**	0.195**	0.264**	-0.094	0.112*	0.504**	1.000		
10	0.038	0.047	0.044	0.328**	0.297**	0.098	0.234**	0.423**	0.320**	1.000	
11	-0.295**	-0.289**	-0.305**	0.205**	0.278**	0.059	0.181**	0.928**	0.635**	0.667**	1.000

Pearson correlation coefficients are reported. $p<.05$ is indicated by *; $p<.01$ is indicated by **.

1=Excessive Work, 2=Compulsive Work, 3=Workaholism Total, 4=Cognitive, 5=Affective, 6=Behavioral, 7=Leisure Attitude Total, 8=Personal Life, 9=Work Life, 10=Improvement, 11=Work-Life Balance Total

In the first stage of the mediation analysis (Model 1), the effect of workaholism (X) on leisure attitude (M) was examined. Although the association was negative in direction, it did not reach statistical significance ($B=-0.040$, $p=.331$; 95% CI [-0.1210, 0.0409]; $\beta=-0.051$). The model's explanatory power was

negligible ($R^2=.0027$), and the overall model was not statistically significant ($F=0.947$, $p=.331$). Accordingly, Hypothesis 2 (H2), which posited a significant negative association between workaholism and leisure attitude, was not supported.

In the second model (Model 2), workaholism (X) and leisure attitude (M) were entered simultaneously as predictors of work–life balance (Y). Results showed that workaholism had a significant negative effect on work–life balance (direct effect: $B=-0.211$, $p<.001$; 95% CI [-0.2940, -0.1285]; $\beta=-0.253$), whereas leisure attitude had a significant positive effect ($B=0.218$, $p<.001$; 95% CI [0.1113, 0.3256]; $\beta=0.202$). The model explained 11.05% of the variance in work–life balance ($R^2=.1105$) and was statistically significant ($F=21.748$, $p<.001$). Accordingly, Hypotheses 1 (H1) and 3 (H3) were supported.

In Model 3, the total effect of workaholism on work–life balance was evaluated. The findings indicated a statistically significant negative total effect ($B=-0.220$, $p<.001$; 95% CI [-0.3044, -0.1356]; $\beta=-0.264$), with the model explaining 6.97% of the variance in work–life balance ($R^2=.0697$, $F=26.299$, $p<.001$).

Finally, the mediating role of leisure attitude in the relationship between workaholism and work–life balance was tested using a bootstrapping procedure with 5,000 resamples. The indirect effect was not statistically significant (-0.0087; 95% BootCI [-0.0326, 0.0167]) because the confidence interval included zero. Consistently, the completely standardized indirect effect was also not significant (-0.0105; 95% BootCI [-0.0377, 0.0200]). Therefore, Hypothesis 4 (H4), which proposed a mediating effect of leisure attitude, was not supported.

A covariate-adjusted mediation model controlling for gender, age, marital status, academic title, administrative duty, and preferred leisure activity type is presented in Appendix 2 as a robustness check.

Table 7. Mediation Analysis results for the effect of Workaholism on Work-Life Balance through Leisure Attitude

Model	Path	B	SE	t	p	95% CI (Lower–Upper)	β	R^2	F	P (Model)
Model 1 (Mediator Model)	Constant (M)	4.247	0.14	29.610	.000	[3.9651, 4.5293]	-	.0027	0.947	.331
	X → M	-0.040	0.04	-0.973	.331	[-0.1210, 0.0409]	-0.051			
Model 2 (Dependent Variable Model)	Constant (Y)	3.156	0.27	11.524	.000	[2.6179, 3.6953]	-	.1105	21.748	.000
	X → Y (direct effect)	-0.211	0.04	-5.022	.000	[-0.2940, -0.1285]	-0.253			
	M → Y	0.218	0.05	4.008	.000	[0.1113, 0.3256]	0.202			
Model 3 (Total Effect)	Constant (Y)	4.084	0.14	27.309	.000	[3.7902, 4.3785]	-	.0697	26.299	.000
	X → Y (total effect)	-0.220	0.04	-5.128	.000	[-0.3044, -0.1356]	-0.264			
Indirect Effect (Bootstrap 5000)	X → M → Y	-0.008	0.01	-	-	[-0.0326, 0.0167]	-	-	-	-
Completely standardized indirect effect (Bootstrap 5000)	X → M → Y	-0.010	0.01	-	-	[-0.0377, 0.0200]	-	-	-	-

Note: X = Workaholism, M = Leisure Attitude, Y = Work–Life Balance. B = unstandardized coefficient. β = standardized coefficient (PROCESS output). SE in the indirect effect rows corresponds to BootSE, and CI corresponds to bootstrap confidence intervals (BootLLCI–BootULCI).

Discussion

This study examined the relationships among workaholism, leisure attitude, and work–life balance (WLB) among academic staff employed in faculties of sport sciences in Türkiye. Three primary findings emerged. First, workaholism was significantly and negatively associated with WLB. Second, leisure attitude was significantly and positively associated with WLB. Third, leisure attitude did not demonstrate a significant mediating effect in the association between workaholism and WLB. These findings should be interpreted in light of the study context and design. Specifically, the data were collected from a single disciplinary setting within Türkiye and were cross-sectional; therefore, the results describe patterns of association rather than causal relationships and should be generalized cautiously to comparable contexts.



The negative association between workaholism and WLB is consistent with contemporary discussions indicating that boundary blurring and performance pressures in higher education can undermine balance (Johnston et al., 2022; Oberhauser et al., 2025; Siem et al., 2025). Importantly, recent syntheses emphasize that workaholism is not simply a benign form of high work investment but can reflect a compulsive and potentially unsustainable pattern, which may have implications for nonwork functioning and well-being (Andersen et al., 2023; Kenyhercz et al., 2024). Systematic reviews highlighting associations between workaholism and impairments in social functioning, quality of life, and balance-related indicators further contextualize the present findings (Kenyhercz et al., 2024). In the academic domain, studies describing academia as a high-demand environment have similarly stressed the importance of considering workaholic patterns together with burnout and WLB outcomes (Osmanović et al., 2024).

In the present study, workaholism displayed stronger negative associations with the personal life dimension of WLB. This pattern is compatible with the unbounded work perspective, where academic work can extend into nonwork time through digital connectivity and institutional norms (Johnston et al., 2022; Siem et al., 2025). Although objective indicators of workload or boundary management norms were not directly measured, prior evidence suggests that workaholism may co-occur with reduced recovery opportunities and diminished nonwork functioning. However, because mechanisms such as sleep-related impairment, presenteeism, burnout-related spillover, or other health-related pathways were not assessed directly in the present study, they should be regarded as possible contextual explanations rather than data-driven conclusions.

Within Türkiye, reports of WLB difficulties among academics provide a relevant backdrop (Ofloğlu & Aksoy Doğan, 2022). Studies focusing on sport sciences faculties have also noted that time management challenges and perceived work intrusions into personal life may be salient (Orak et al., 2025). This is particularly relevant for sport sciences settings, where academic roles may combine teaching and research responsibilities with applied practice, fieldwork, and event-related duties. Such a demand composition could increase vulnerability to imbalance, especially under performance-based evaluation systems. Recent work similarly suggests that WLB in higher education cannot be explained solely as an individual time management issue, because institutional evaluation norms and organizational functioning can shape balance outcomes (Oberhauser et al., 2025; Siem et al., 2025; Elifneh et al., 2025). Again, because work demands and organizational norms were not directly measured, these interpretations should be treated as contextual framing rather than direct empirical tests within this dataset.

The positive association between leisure attitude and WLB aligns with literature conceptualizing leisure as a functional recovery-related resource rather than merely discretionary free time. Empirical work reporting that leisure attitude is positively related to self-rated health and psychological well-being supports the notion that more favorable leisure orientations may co-occur with stronger balance perceptions (Rodríguez-Cifuentes et al., 2024). Complementary evidence linking leisure satisfaction to well-being outcomes provides additional context for this association (Dokuzoğlu et al., 2023; Yurcu, 2021). Although the present study did not measure recovery experiences directly, prior research suggests that leisure-related resources can support stress regulation and well-being processes that may plausibly contribute to perceived balance.

A descriptive pattern in the present sample was that cognitive and affective leisure attitude scores were higher than behavioral leisure attitude scores. This may suggest that academics tend to value leisure cognitively and affectively while experiencing more difficulty in translating these orientations into consistent behavioral engagement. However, because actual leisure participation was not directly measured and no formal hypothesis was specified regarding differences among leisure attitude subdimensions, this pattern should be interpreted cautiously as a descriptive observation rather than as a direct test of an attitude-behavior gap.

Most importantly, the hypothesized mediating role of leisure attitude was not supported, primarily because workaholism did not significantly predict leisure attitude (the $X \rightarrow M$ path). This point is central to interpreting the failed mediation. The non-significant $X \rightarrow M$ path suggests that, in the present sample, workaholic tendencies may not be sufficiently reflected in general attitudinal orientations toward leisure. Put differently, academics with stronger workaholic tendencies may still report broadly favorable beliefs or feelings about leisure, even if their work-life balance is poorer. From this perspective, the absence of mediation may indicate not only that the indirect pathway was statistically unsupported, but

also that leisure attitude, as operationalized in the present study, may not represent the most proximal mechanism linking workaholism to lower WLB.

This interpretation invites a more critical consideration of construct choice. Although leisure attitude is theoretically relevant to recovery-related functioning, the present results suggest that it may be less sensitive to workaholic tendencies than more behaviorally grounded constructs. It is therefore plausible that variables such as actual leisure participation, psychological detachment from work, recovery experiences, or boundary management processes would provide a more direct account of how workaholism relates to poorer WLB. Prior research supports this possibility by showing that leisure participation can attenuate the adverse association between workaholism and stress (Aziz et al., 2023), and that leisure involvement is meaningfully connected to both workaholism and WLB (Akçakese et al., 2024). Accordingly, the present findings suggest that leisure attitude may still be relevant to balance-related outcomes, but not necessarily as the principal mechanism through which workaholism translates into poorer balance.

A secondary, more tentative interpretation is that favorable leisure attitudes may coexist with workaholic tendencies because structural constraints restrict their behavioral enactment. In academic contexts characterized by constant availability, performance pressure, and blurred boundaries, individuals may continue to endorse leisure positively while lacking the time, energy, or institutional conditions required to engage in it consistently. Research on unbounded work suggests that flexibility alone may not protect balance when organizational expectations continue to erode boundaries (Johnston et al., 2022; Oberhauser et al., 2025). However, because structural constraints, recovery opportunities, and actual leisure participation were not directly measured in the present study, this interpretation should be treated as speculative and regarded as a direction for future research rather than as a direct explanation supported by the data.

In addition to the main model findings, the group comparisons offered several contextual insights. Younger academics reported higher workaholism and lower work–life balance than older age groups. Although the specific age pattern in the present study should be interpreted cautiously, it is broadly compatible with the higher education literature suggesting that academic work is often characterized by unbounded demands, role overload, and blurred boundaries, conditions that may be especially difficult to manage during earlier career stages (Johnston et al., 2022).

Work–life balance also differed significantly by academic title, with assistant professors and associate professors reporting more favorable scores than lecturers. This finding is consistent with previous research showing that work–life balance tends to improve with higher academic rank among higher education lecturers (Marič & Žnidaršič, 2018). In a more recent study conducted with academics in faculties of sport sciences in Türkiye, work–life balance was also examined in relation to demographic and professional characteristics, supporting the view that balance in academic settings may vary across role-related conditions rather than being distributed uniformly across all groups (Orak et al., 2025).

Leisure attitude further differed according to preferred leisure activity type, with participants who preferred physical activities reporting more positive leisure attitudes than those who preferred social activities. This pattern is also broadly compatible with sport-based evidence suggesting that regular participation in organized physical activity may be experienced as relevant to the reconciliation of work and personal life demands (Balibrea Melero & Santos Ortega, 2023). This pattern is broadly in line with previous research indicating that leisure participation can buffer some of the negative outcomes associated with workaholism (Aziz et al., 2023) and that leisure involvement is meaningfully associated with workaholism and work–life balance (Akçakese et al., 2024). It also accords with evidence showing that more positive leisure attitudes are related to better well-being outcomes (Rodríguez-Cifuentes et al., 2024).

By contrast, no significant differences were found by gender, marital status, or administrative duty. The absence of a gender-based difference is not inconsistent with previous higher education research, as Marič and Žnidaršič (2018) similarly reported no significant difference in work–life balance according to gender among higher education lecturers. In the present study, these non-significant findings may suggest that the main study variables were distributed relatively similarly across these demographic and professional groups.

The present findings may provide a modest basis for reflection in the context of faculties of sport sciences in Türkiye. Nevertheless, in view of the cross-sectional and self-report nature of the study, the results



should be considered as preliminary and should not be interpreted as supporting specific institutional or policy actions. The findings appear to indicate a negative association between workaholism and work–life balance and a positive association between leisure attitude and balance-related outcomes. However, because the hypothesized mediating role of leisure attitude was not observed, any applied implications should be framed with considerable caution. Further research is needed to clarify whether behavioral dimensions, including actual leisure participation and recovery experiences, may help explain the relationship between workaholism and work–life balance.

Limitations

The present findings should be interpreted considering several limitations. First, the cross sectional design does not allow causal inference or temporal ordering among workaholism, leisure attitude, and work life balance, and reciprocal relationships remain possible. Second, all variables were measured using self report instruments, which may increase the risk of common method variance and social desirability effects despite assurances of anonymity. Third, although the invitation was census based, participation was voluntary and the response rate was 12.4 percent, which may introduce self selection and nonresponse bias and limit representativeness. Fourth, several potentially relevant explanatory variables were not directly measured, including objective indicators of work demands, institutional boundary norms, leisure participation behavior, and recovery experiences; therefore, interpretations referring to these mechanisms should be considered plausible explanations rather than data driven conclusions. Finally, the study focused on sport sciences academics in Türkiye, and generalization to other disciplines and national contexts should be made cautiously and supported by replication.

Future Research Directions

Future studies should employ longitudinal or experience sampling designs to test temporal ordering and within person dynamics. Incorporating behavioral indicators of leisure participation and validated measures of recovery experiences would allow direct tests of mechanisms that may link workaholism to work life balance. Including organizational level indicators such as workload metrics, psychosocial safety climate, and boundary management norms would further clarify contextual drivers of balance. Replication across disciplines and institutions would help determine whether the observed pattern is specific to sport sciences faculties or generalizes to broader academic settings.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the present study provides a cautious and preliminary contribution to understanding the associations among workaholism, leisure attitude, and work–life balance among academics in faculties of sport sciences in Türkiye. The observed pattern suggests that higher workaholism may coincide with lower work–life balance, while a more positive leisure attitude may be associated with more favorable balance-related outcomes. At the same time, because the hypothesized mediating role of leisure attitude was not observed, these findings should be interpreted conservatively. Leisure attitude may still be relevant in this context, but the present results do not support treating it as an established mechanism through which workaholism relates to work–life balance. Further research is needed to examine whether more immediate behavioral indicators, including actual leisure participation and recovery experiences, may offer a clearer explanation of this association.

Acknowledgements

This study was presented as an abstract paper at the 6th International Recreation and Sports Management Congress held in Antalya.

References



- Agha, K., Azmi, F. T., & Khan, S. A. (2017). Work-life balance: Scale development and validation. In M. Las Heras Maestro, N. Chinchilla, & M. Grau (Eds.), *The work-family balance in light of globalization and technology* (pp. 109–130). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Aguirre-Cardona, L. A., Aldana-Villalobos, K., & Rubio-Florado, I. (2024). Ocio, trabajo y estudio en estudiantes universitarios, un acercamiento desde una perspectiva colombiana [Leisure, work, and study among university students: An approach from a Colombian perspective]. *Retos*, 53, 563–570. <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v53.102233>
- Airagnes, G., Fisk, D., Haddad, R. E., Le Faou, A. L., & Limosin, F. (2024). Burnout mediates the association between workaholism and substance use: findings from a French national company. *Journal of Prevention*, 45(3), 451–466. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10935-024-00770-6>
- Akçakese, A., Tükel, Y., & Demirel, M. (2024). The work-life balance: Understanding the role of leisure involvement on workaholism from a gender perspective. *Work*, 79(2), 911–924. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-240012>
- Andersen, L. L., Christensen, K. B., Hogh, A., Malinowska, D., Borritz, M., & Turczyńska, E. (2023). The prevalence of workaholism: A systematic review and meta-analysis of self-reported data. *PLOS ONE*, 18(6), e0287889. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287889>
- Atroszko, P. A., Demetrovics, Z., & Griffiths, M. D. (2020). Work addiction, obsessive–compulsive personality disorder, burnout, and global burden of disease: Implications from the ICD-11. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(2), 660. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17020660>
- Aziz, S., Meier, B., Wuensch, K., & Dolbier, C. (2023). Take a break! Leisure participation moderates the workaholism-work stress relationship. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 71(4), 315–329. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cdq.12336>
- Balibrea Melero, K., & Santos Ortega, A. (2023). Deporte y conciliación en mujeres deportistas de edad adulta: El caso del Valencia Hockey Mamis [Sports and work-life balance among adult sportswomen: The case of Valencia's Hockey Mamis]. *Retos*, 49, 878–884. <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v49.98501>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD–R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 389–411. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091235>
- Caldwell, L. L. (2005). Leisure and health: Why is leisure therapeutic? *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 33(1), 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069880412331335939>
- Clark, M. A., Michel, J. S., Zhdanova, L., Pui, S. Y., & Baltes, B. B. (2016). All work and no play? A meta-analytic examination of the correlates and outcomes of workaholism. *Journal of Management*, 42(7), 1836–1873. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314522301>
- Doğan, T., & Tel, F. D. (2011). DUWAS İşkoliklik Ölçeği Türkçe formunun (DUWAS-TR) geçerlik ve güvenilirliğinin incelenmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(1), 61–69.
- Dokuzoğlu, G., Sağiroğlu, İ., & Çevik, A. (2023). Investigation of the relationship between the levels of leisure time satisfaction and passion in sports who exercise individuals fitness. *Journal of Sport Sciences Research*, 8(3), 613–629. <https://doi.org/10.25307/jssr.1320520>
- Elifneh, Y. W., Wonda, T. A., & Abbay, Y. A. (2025). Work-life balance among university academic leaders in a developing country context: Empirical evidence from Ethiopia. *SAGE Open*, 15(3), 21582440251366875. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251366875>
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2011). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple study guide and reference* (10th ed., 17.0 update). Pearson Education India.
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.
- Johnston, K., Tanwar, J., Pasamar, S., Van Laar, D., & Bamber Jones, A. (2022). Blurring boundaries: Work-life balance and unbounded work in academia: The role of flexibility, organisational support and gender. *Labour & Industry*, 32(2), 139–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10301763.2022.2081902>
- Karasar, N. (2016). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler*. Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Kenyhercz, V., Mervó, B., Lehel, N., Demetrovics, Z., & Kun, B. (2024). Work addiction and social functioning: A systematic review and five meta-analyses. *PLOS ONE*, 19(6), e0303563. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0303563>



- Marič, M., & Žnidaršič, J. (2018). The effect of gender, age and academic rank on work-life balance. *Škola biznisa*, 2018(2), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.5937/skolbiz2-20983>
- Marthalina, M., Darlis, E., Hadi, F. P., & Syahra, F. R. (2025). Work-life balance woman working in the government sector. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-03-2024-4372>
- Martínez-Agut, M. P. (2025). Investigación sobre animación turística, retos y sostenibilidad en la formación inicial de técnicos/as superiores en animación sociocultural y turística e inserción laboral. *Retos*, 73, 1660–1687. <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v73.117498>
- Matsuyama, K., Nagata, T., Odagami, K., Nagata, M., Kajiki, S., Sakai, K., & Mori, K. (2024). Association between workaholism and headaches causing presenteeism: A cross-sectional study in Japan. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 66(8), e328–e332. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000003130>
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Oberhauser, A. M., Dixon, B., & Mossa, J. (2025). Complicating work–life balance in higher education: Perspectives from geography. *The Professional Geographer*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00330124.2025.2510968>
- Ofluoğlu, G., & Aksoy Doğan, G. (2022). Akademisyenlerin iş-yaşam dengesi üzerine bir araştırma. *International Journal of Management and Administration*, 6(11), 41–52. <https://doi.org/10.29064/ijma.1037209>
- Orak, M. E., Üzümlü, H., & Karlı, Ü. (2025). Investigation of the relationship between time management and work life balance of academicians working in the faculty of sport sciences. *Türkiye Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9(1), 36–47. <https://doi.org/10.32706/tusbid.1668141>
- Osmanović, A., Marić, B., & Gazivoda, R. (2024). Workaholism, work engagement and burnout among academics in Montenegro: The role of work-life balance. *Work*, 78(3), 1081–1092. <https://doi.org/10.3233/wor-230347>
- Önal, L., & Bedir, F. (2023). Serbest Zaman Tutum Ölçeği Kısa Formu (SZTÖ-KF): Türkçe geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Spor ve Bilim Dergisi*, 1(1), 27–39.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Ragheb, M. G., & Beard, J. G. (1982). Measuring leisure attitude. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 14(2), 155–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1982.11969512>
- Reig-Botella, A., Caballer, A., Topa, G., & Rodríguez-Sánchez, A. M. (2025). Healthy organizations: An umbrella review of psychosocial safety climate literature. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 12, 473–500. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-111821-035514>
- Rodríguez-Cifuentes, F., López-Gonzalez, M. A., Rubio-Garay, F., Topa, G., Belo, P., Pocinho, R., ... Fernández-Muñoz, J. J. (2024). Leisure attitude, self-rated health, and psychological well-being in older adults: A moderated mediation model. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 17, 1417–1431. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S453396>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Bakker, A. B. (2006). Dr. Jekyll or Mr. Hyde: On the differences between work engagement and workaholism. In R. Burke (Ed.), *Research companion to working time and work addiction* (pp. 193–217). Edward Elgar.
- Shimazu, A., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Is workaholism good or bad for employee well-being? *Industrial Health*, 47(5), 495–502. <https://doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.47.495>
- Siem, T. T., Nguyen, H. T. T., & Luc, P. T. (2025). Work-life balance in higher education: A review based on bibliographic coupling analysis. *Acta Psychologica*, 260, 105567. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105567>
- Sornoza Zavala, G. A., Poveda Zúñiga, J. A., & Luna Encarnación, J. I. (2026). Tendencias investigativas sobre la calidad de vida laboral y doble presencia en docentes universitarios de Educación Física: Un análisis bibliométrico. *Retos: Nuevas Perspectivas de Educación Física, Deporte y Recreación*, 75. <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v75.118300>
- Strassburger, C., Wachholz, F., Peters, M., Schnitzer, M., & Blank, C. (2023). Organizational leisure benefits: A resource to facilitate employees' work-life balance? *Employee Relations*, 45(3), 585–602. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-10-2021-0428>

- Suwannasri, C. (2016). *An investigation into awareness and attitudes of vocational students in tourism towards varieties of spoken English as a lingua franca in ASEAN* [Doctoral dissertation, Mahidol University].
- Taris, T. W., van Beek, I., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2020). The motivational make-up of workaholism and work engagement: A longitudinal study on need satisfaction, motivation, and heavy work investment. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 1419. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01419>
- Teixeira, A. C., & Freire, T. (2013). The leisure attitude scale: Psychometric properties of a short version. *Leisure/Loisir, 37*(1), 57–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14927713.2013.776748>
- Van Beek, I., Taris, T. W., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2011). Workaholic and work engaged employees: Dead ringers or worlds apart? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*(4), 468–482. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024392>
- Yılmaz, S., & Söyük, S. (2022). Determination of work–life balance in healthcare professionals: Validity and reliability of the new work–life balance scale. *Archives of Health Science and Research, 9*(2), 130–137. <https://doi.org/10.54614/ArcHealthSciRes.2022.22025>
- Yurcu, G. (2021). Leisure attitude, anxiety, and mental well-being in Turkey: The case of COVID-19. *European Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation, 11*(2), 181–194. <https://doi.org/10.2478/ejthr-2021-0017>

Authors' and translators' details:

Muhammet Mavibaş	muhammet.mavibas@erzurum.edu.tr	Author
Murat Turan	muratturan@erzurum.edu.tr	Author
Buğra Çağatay Savaş	bugra.savas@erzurum.edu.tr	Author
Yunus Emre Çingöz	yunusemrecingoz@bayburt.edu.tr	Author, Translator

Appendix 1. Total Variance Explained (Harman's Single-Factor Test)

Factor	Initial Eigenvalue			Extraction Sum of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	10.792	22.963	22.963	10.792	22.963	22.963
2	7.820	16.639	39.601	7.820	16.639	39.601
3	4.754	10.114	49.716	4.754	10.114	49.716
4	3.159	6.721	56.436	3.159	6.721	56.436
5	1.809	3.850	60.286	1.809	3.850	60.286
6	1.551	3.301	63.586	1.551	3.301	63.586
7	1.252	2.663	66.249	1.252	2.663	66.249
8	1.140	2.426	68.675	1.140	2.426	68.675
9	0.940	2.000	70.676			
10	0.898	1.911	72.586			
11	0.867	1.844	74.430			
12	0.798	1.697	76.128			
13	0.762	1.621	77.749			
14	0.715	1.522	79.271			
15	0.694	1.476	80.748			
16	0.652	1.386	82.134			
17	0.604	1.286	83.419			
18	0.595	1.265	84.685			
19	0.538	1.144	85.829			
20	0.491	1.044	86.873			
21	0.431	0.916	87.789			
22	0.422	0.898	88.687			
23	0.408	0.869	89.556			
24	0.378	0.805	90.361			
25	0.364	0.774	91.135			
26	0.356	0.757	91.891			
27	0.329	0.701	92.592			
28	0.314	0.669	93.261			
29	0.301	0.640	93.900			
30	0.291	0.618	94.519			
31	0.274	0.584	95.103			
32	0.255	0.543	95.645			
33	0.231	0.491	96.136			
34	0.221	0.469	96.605			
35	0.211	0.449	97.054			
36	0.192	0.409	97.463			
37	0.175	0.373	97.836			
38	0.161	0.343	98.179			
39	0.155	0.329	98.508			
40	0.139	0.297	98.804			
41	0.119	0.252	99.057			
42	0.103	0.218	99.275			
43	0.095	0.202	99.476			
44	0.087	0.186	99.662			
45	0.064	0.136	99.798			
46	0.059	0.126	99.924			
47	0.036	0.076	100.000			

Appendix 2. Covariate-Adjusted Mediation Model Predicting Leisure Attitude and Work-Life Balance

Panel/Outcome	Predictor	B	SE	t	p	95% CI	β	
Panel A. Mediator model Outcome: Leisure attitude	Constant	3.938	0.255	15.448	< .001	[3.436, 4.439]	—	
	Workaholism	-0.066	0.040	-1.642	.102	[-0.146, 0.013]	-0.086	
	Gender	0.010	0.068	0.145	.885	[-0.124, 0.144]	0.008	
	Age	-0.117	0.035	-3.368	< .001	[-0.185, -0.049]	-0.228	
	Marital status	0.005	0.069	0.070	.944	[-0.131, 0.141]	0.004	
	Academic title	0.054	0.029	1.863	.063	[-0.003, 0.112]	0.119	
	Administrative duty	0.098	0.064	1.533	.126	[-0.028, 0.224]	0.081	
	Leisure activity type	0.162	0.035	4.611	< .001	[0.093, 0.232]	0.239	
	Model fit		R ² = .092, F(7, 345) = 4.961, p < .001					
	Panel B. Outcome model Outcome: Work-life balance	Constant	2.495	0.346	7.213	< .001	[1.815, 3.175]	—
Workaholism (direct effect)		-0.188	0.042	-4.450	< .001	[-0.271, -0.105]	-0.225	
Leisure attitude		0.235	0.056	4.181	< .001	[0.124, 0.345]	0.218	
Gender		-0.042	0.071	-0.597	.551	[-0.182, 0.097]	-0.032	
Age		0.106	0.037	2.869	.004	[0.033, 0.178]	0.191	
Marital status		0.041	0.072	0.572	.568	[-0.101, 0.183]	0.030	
Academic title		0.006	0.031	0.195	.846	[-0.054, 0.066]	0.012	
Administrative duty		0.095	0.067	1.423	.156	[-0.036, 0.227]	0.073	
Leisure activity type		0.024	0.038	0.644	.520	[-0.050, 0.099]	0.033	
Model fit		R ² = .154, F(8, 344) = 7.835, p < .001						



Panel C. Total, direct, and indirect effects	Total effect of workaholism on WLB	-0.203	0.043	-4.726	< .001	[-0.288, -0.119]	-0.244
	Direct effect of workaholism on WLB	-0.188	0.042	-4.450	< .001	[-0.271, -0.105]	-0.225
	Indirect effect via leisure attitude	-0.016	0.012	—	—	[-0.041, 0.008]	—
	Completely standardized indirect effect	-0.019	0.015	—	—	[-0.048, 0.010]	—