The Relationship between Workaholism and job performance: An applied research on Egyptian Managers

Shawky Mohamed Elsabbaugh[1]

Al Zahraa Atef Mohamed Shalan[2]

1- Shawky Mohamed Elsabbaugh; professor of Business Administration, Head of Business administration Department, and Former Dean of Faculty of Commerce, Menofia University. His main research interest fields are human resources management, organizational behavior, public administration, and crisis management.
Shawky.elsabagh@commerce.menofia.edu.eg

2- Al Zahraa Atef Mohamed Shalan, Degree of Master in Commercial sciences. Her main research interest fields are human resources management and organizational behavior.
Alzahraa.a.shalan@gmail.com

ملخص البحث:

اهتم البحث الحالي بتوصيف العلاقة بين إدمان العمل والأداء الوظيفي للمديرين بالجامعات المصرية محل البحث، بالإضافة إلى تقييم الاختلافات بين ادراكات المديرين بالجامعات محل البحث لأبعاد إدمان العمل طبقا لبعض المتغيرات الديموجرافية، كذلك اهتم البحث الحالي بتقييم الاختلافات في الأداء الوظيفي للمديرين بالجامعات محل البحث طبقا لبعض المتغيرات الديموجرافية تم تطبيق هذا البحث على (٢٨٤) من المديرين في المستويات التنظيمية الثلاثة بجامعات وسط الدلتا، وتم جمع البيانات الأولية اللازمة للبحث من خلال قائمة الاستقصاء.

أشارت نتائج البحث إلى عدم وجود اختلاف في ادراك المديرين بالجامعات محل البحث لأبعاد إدمان العمل طبقا لبعض المتغيرات الديموجرافية، كما أظهرت النتائج وجود اختلاف في مستوى الأداء الوظيفي للمديرين محل البحث وكان هذا الاختلاف لصالح جامعة المنوفية حيث أشارت النتائج إلى ارتفاع مستوى الأداء الوظيفي لمديريها عنه في جامعتي طنطا وكفر الشيخ.

ولتوصيف العلاقة بين أبعاد إدمان العمل والأداء الوظيفي استخدم الباحث أسلوب الانحدار والارتباط المتعدد بطريقتي (Enter Method, Stepwise Method) وأظهرت النتائج وجود علاقة معنوية بين أبعاد إدمان العمل والأداء الوظيفي، كما تم تحديد أكثر متغيرات إدمان العمل تأثيرا في الأداء الوظيفي.

Abstract:

Given the apparent magnitude of the problems presented by workaholism, the present research was designed to provide evidence for the impact of workaholism on workaholic managers' performance. This Research aims to explore the difference in workaholic managers' perception of workaholism according to their demographic characteristics, explore the difference in managers' job performance according to their demographic characteristics, and describe the relationship between workaholism and managers' job performance, as well as identify the relative importance of workaholism dimensions in terms of their correlation with job performance in a sample of (284) Egyptian managers at various organizational levels in Middle Delta Universities. The needed primary data were collected via the survey method.

Results showed that none of the demographic variables affect workaholic managers' perception of workaholism. Regarding the relationship between workaholism and job performance, it is found that there is a strong relationship between all workaholism dimensions and job performance. Finally, output of Stepwise method of Multiple Regression Analysis showed that there are only six variables out of twenty variables of workaholism dimensions had a significant relationship with job performance. Two of these variables have a significant negative relationship with job performance, whereas, the remaining four variables have a significant positive relationship with job performance.

Introduction:

In recent years, working conditions has been changing rapidly, for instance, clear role expectations at work do not exist anymore (Shimazu, et al., 2010; Clark, et al., 2014). In addition, advances in communication technology in recent years have made it possible for work to be performed almost anywhere and anytime at home or on holiday (Shimazu, et al., 2011; Moyer, et al., 2017) as a result boundaries between work and personal life have become blurred (Shimazu and Schaufeli, 2009; Porter, 2001; Moyer, et al., 2017). In fact, however, there are many indications that the work ethic remains strong and for some people it is even growing. In certain situation, individual may over-commit their energies and their time to their working lives, this over-commitment to work has been used literature to describe the notion of workaholism (Seybold and Salomon, 1994; Snir and Harpaz, 2004). Thus, these changes can induce more workaholism especially in managerial employees, who now have both greater incentives and greater opportunities invest more heavy in work (Ng, et al., 2007; Andreassen, 2014). The present research mainly aims to:

- explore the difference in workaholic managers' perception of workaholism (at the selected universities) according to their demographic characteristics,
- explore the difference in managers' job performance (at the selected universities) according to their demographic characteristics, and
- Describe the relationship between workaholism dimensions and managers' job performance (at the selected universities), as well as identify the relative importance of these dimensions in terms of their correlation with job performance.

Workaholism:

In recent years, there has been a dramatic increase in research devoted to the study of workaholism. However, these continues to be confusion surrounding the definition, conceptualization, and measurement of workaholism, which has resulted in diverging opinions over whether workaholism is a positive or negative phenomenon (Baruch, 2011; Clark, et al., 2014). Some researchers have proposed the existence of different types of workaholic behavioral patterns, each having potentially different antecedents and association with job performance work and life outcomes (Spence and Robbins, 1992; Snir and Harpaz, 2004). One of the main issues hindering theoretical and empirical progress regarding the study of workaholism is a lake of agreement on what workaholism actually is workaholism has been discussed as an addiction, as a behavioral pattern and as a syndrome. In addition, some researchers have categorized workaholics in to different workaholic type, where different types of workaholism have differential relationships with outcomes such as job performance (Porter, 2001; Buelens and Poelmans, 2004; Burke, et al., 2006b; Ng, et al., 2007).

Defining workaholism:

The term workaholism originated from Oates, who describes it as "the compulsion or the uncontrollable need to work excessively". Further, he defined workaholic as a person whose need for work has become so excessive that it creates a noticeable disturbance, and interference with his or her bodily health, personal happiness, and interpersonal relations, and with his smooth social functioning (Brady, et al., 2008; Krudler, 2010; Sussman, 2012). Since Oates, the term workaholism has been conceptualized in a variety of different ways. Table (1) summarized the main ways researchers have defined and operationalized workaholism. After examining the various definitions and operationalization of workaholism, many commonalities as well as some disagreements are found among these definitions which are discussed in the next sections.

Areas of consensus:

Turning first to the areas of consensus across workaholism definitions, it is clear that majority of scholars are conceptualized workaholism as an addiction to work (Spence and Robbins, 1992; Ng, et al., 2007; Schaufeli, et al., 2009; Aziz, et al., 2013; Andreassen,

2014). The element of addiction has been central to our understanding of workaholism from the earliest years of workaholism research (Seybold and Salomon, 1994).

Table 1 Summary of Definitions of Workaholism
(Presented in Chronological Order)

Definitions of Workaholism/Workaholic		Source
Oates (1971)	A person whose need for work has become so excessive that it creates noticeable disturbance or interference with his bodily health, personal happiness, and interpersonal relations, and with his smooth social functioning.	Taris et al (2005)
Machlowitz (1980)	Those whose desire to work long and hard is intrinsic and whose work habits almost always exceed the prescriptions of the job they do and the expectations of the people with whom or for whom they work.	Peiperl and Jones (2001)
Mosier (1983)	Those who work at least 50 hours a week.	Spence and Robbins (1992)
Fassel (1990)	A progressive, fetal disease in which a person is addicted to the process of working.	Ng et al (2007)
Spence and Robbins (1992)	Spence and Robbins (1992): A workaholic is a person who exhibits three properties: in comparison to others, the workaholic is highly work involved, feels compelled or driven to work because of inner pressures, and is low in enjoyment of work.	Spence and Robbins (1992:162)
Porter (1996)	Excessive involvement with work evidenced by neglect in other areas of life based on internal motives of behavior maintenance rather than requirements of the job or organization.	Porter (1996:71)
Scott, Moore, and Miceli (1997)	Those who spend a good deal of time in work activities at the expense of family and other outside obligations, who persistently think about work when they are not at work, and who go above what is reasonably expected of the at the job.	Scott, Moore, and Miceli (1997: 71)
Vitiello et al (2016)	An obsessive-compulsive disorder that manifests itself through self-imposed demands, an inability to regulate work habits, an overindulgence in work to the exclusion of most other life activities.	Robinson (1998;7)
Mudrack and Naughton (2001)	A set of behavioral tendencies to (a) spend considerable time and energy engaged in work activities that are not technically required and to (b) influence and control the work of others.	Clark et al. (2014)
Aziz and Zickar (2006)	Workaholism is a syndrome, in which individuals need to be high in work involvement and work drive, and low in work enjoyment.	Clark et al. (2014)
Ng, Sorensen, and Feldman (2007)	Those who enjoy the act of working, who are obsessed with working, and who devote long hours and personal time to work.	Ng, Sorensen, and Feldman (2007:114)
Schaufeli, Taris, and Van Rhenen (2008)	Workaholics work harder than their job prescriptions require and put much more effort into their jobs than is expected by the people with whom or for whom they work, and in doing so they neglect their life outside the job.	Schaufeli, Taris, and Van Rhenen (2008:175)
Sussman (2012)	Feeling driven beyond the stated demands of the job to attempt to obtain an appetitive effect, a sense of lack of control over working, and suffering negative consequences as a result.	Sussman (2012:7)
Snir and Harpaz (2012)	A subtype of heavy work investment (i.e., heavy investment of both time and effort in work) that stems not from external predictors or from a passion for work, but from an addiction to work.	Snir and Harpaz (2012:236)
Clark et al. (2014)	An addiction to work that involves feeling compelled or driven to work because of internal pressures, having persistent and frequent thought about work when not working, and working beyond what is reasonably expected despite potential negative consequences.	Clark et al. (2014:5)

While the meaning of addiction is far from consensual, the research on addiction spears to place emphasis on three overarching dimensions: affect, cognition, and behavior. Addiction involves compulsion and preoccupation with the behavior, and loss of self-control (cognition) and continued engagement in the behavior despite adverse consequences (behavior), and prior research and theory suggest that workaholics exhibit each of these characteristics (Griffiths, 2005; Ng, et al., 2007; Sussman and Sussman, 2011; Clark, et al., 2014).

Second, workaholism involves a preoccupation and compulsion regarding one's work. This aspect of workaholism is echoed in most conceptualization of the construct. Specially, workaholics are obsessed with work, stemming from an inner compulsion or a need to work that cannot be resisted or controlled. Others go so far as to say that workaholism is an obsessive-compulsive disorder. Workaholics constantly think about work when they are not working and have a very difficult time disengaging from work (See, Spence and Robbins 1992; Tziner and Tanami, 2013; Clark, et al., 2014).

Finally, almost every conceptualization of workaholism involves the ides that workaholics work longer and harder than others, the cost of too much devotion to work is expanded to include the danger done to interpersonal relations. Given that workaholics tend to work longer and harder than others, they may often miss family events, work evening or weekends, and consistently bring work home with them. They also tend to blur the lines between work and non-work by choosing recreational activities that advance or complement their work. This excessive work involvement has been said to continue even in the face of negative consequences such as marital or health problems (Porter, 2001; Ng, et al., 2007; Clark, et al., 2014).

Each of these aspects of workaholism has to be taken into consideration when measuring one's workaholic behavior. For instance, Clark and colleagues stated that measuring only excessive time spent at work does not provide any definitive information on whether an individual is a workaholic. Other factors such as motives behind working and thoughts associated with working also need to be considered.

Areas of disagreement:

Based on workaholism literature, it is clear that there is a debate regarding the effective experience of workaholics. On one hand, there is general agreement on the workaholics' emotions when they are not working i.e., anxiety and guilt (Burke, 2002; Vitiello, et al., 2016), which is likely stem from the internal drive to work. On the other hand, there is considerably less consensus over the emotional experiences of workaholics while at work. Some have proposed that workaholics are high in experience work enjoyment (e.g., Spence and Robbins, 1992), whereas, others have stated that one characteristic of a true workaholic is that he/she greatly enjoys the act of working (e.g., Douglas and Morris, 2006, Baruch, 2011). Therefore, according to those workaholics may not necessarily enjoy his or her work, but may still experience flitting moments of an addiction rush i.e., after getting paid or when starting a new work assignment (Clark, et al., 2014).

Correlates of workaholism:

Most of the research on the correlates of workaholism has focused on its negative side.

Taris et al (2005) observes that these writers ..depict workaholics as unhappy, obsessive, tragic figures who were not performing their jobs well and were creating difficulties for their co-workers. Whereas, others are more sanguine about workaholism, suggesting that it might sometimes be beneficial for individuals or organizations (e.g., Peiper and Jones, 2001; Clark, et al., 2010; Baruch, 2011; Gorgievski, et al., 2014). More interestingly, Ng and colleagues (2007) posit that one approach to understanding whether workaholism is positive or negative for individuals and organization is to differentiate short-term consequences from long-term consequences. Furthermore, it is important to note that research findings in this area have been impacted by the number and type of workaholism dimensions assessed, as well as by the measures of the construct that were employed.

Previous research suggests that workaholism is an all-encompassing phenomenon that has implications for both the work and the non -work domain. Consistently, the following paragraph examines workaholism in the context of both domains.

Non work domain:

   There is general agreement that family members and friends are adversely affected by the behavior of workaholics. It has been proposed that the suffering experienced by children and spouses of workaholics is comparable to the distress felt by spouses and off spring of alcoholics. Also, It has been noted that workaholics have virtually no time for outside interpersonal relations (See, Caruso, 2006; Brady, et al., 2008; Vitiello, et al., 2016).

   Scott et al (11997) commented that workaholics are commonly isolated from family and friends. Furthermore, research shows that workaholics report more work family conflict and poorer functioning outside work than non-workaholics (Taris, 2005; Ng, et al., 2007; Andreassen, 2014). As these authors observed, workaholics spend great deal of time in work activities when given the discretion to do so, which results in their giving up important social, family, or recreational activities because of work.

   The second cost associated with workaholism is poor physical health. A physician seeing workaholics in general practice noted that workaholics tend to deny the existence of fatigue and push themselves beyond reason, before physical complaints stop them working long hours and lead them to seek help. Further, previous research suggests that self-neglect was a hallmark of workaholism, workaholics also are susceptible to chronic fatigue, mental fatigue and anxiety (Spence and Robbins, 1992; Burke, et al, 2006a; Ng, et al., 2007). For instance, workaholics particularly high in drive (one of the three workaholism sub-components) seem to suffer increased health problems (i.e., blood pressure; back pain; coronary heart disease) (McMillan and O'driscoll, 2004; Shimazu et al., 2009).

Workaholism at work:

   Previous research has shown that workaholics spend more time on their work than others. Workaholics may even create more work for themselves by making simple projects more complicated than necessary, or by causing crises for the fun of working on the problems resulting from these. This suggests that workaholics work longer and harder than others not because their jobs require them to do so, but because they tend to create high job demands for themselves (Scott, et al., 1997; McMillan and O'driscoll, 2005; Taris, et al., 2005). Research is inconclusive regarding the outcomes of the hard work of workaholics.

Job and career satisfaction:

   Previous research suggests that workaholism may be positively related to job and career satisfaction. In particular, those who find working pleasurable and feel guilty or anxious in non-work activities would logically feel more satisfied at work (job satisfaction) and in their work careers (career satisfaction). For instance Spence and Robbins (1992) found that enjoyment of work was significantly and positively related to career satisfactions. Therefore, even though Douglas and Morris (2006) workaholics don not enjoy the nature of their work as much as the act of working itself, Ng, posit that, in general, workaholism will be positively related to job attitudes.

Perfectionism and distrust:

   Workaholism can also produce some negative cognition-related outcomes such as perfectionism and distrust of coworkers (Burgess, et al., 2006; Ng, et al., 2007). For instance, Spence and Robbins (1992) found that three dimensions of workaholism, they proposed were related to perfectionism and non-delegation of work to colleagues. Because workaholics are heavily concerned with their work, they have unreasonably high performance standards, and therefore, find it difficult to trust their colleagues to perform up to their standards (Porter, 2001). Unfortunately, the drive for perfectionism can also lead to more negative perceptions of one's own abilities and performance, further promoting the workaholic's tendency to increase his/her own work input. As noted by Porter (2001) workaholic behaviors can also create a very competitive atmosphere, thereby further straining relationships with coworkers, as well as lack of teamwork (Ng, et al., 2007; Brady, et al., 2008; Gorgievski and Bakker, 2010).

Workaholism and Performance:

Besides satisfaction, perfectionism and distrust, another relevant outcome associated with workaholism is job performance. The relationship between workaholism and performance is still unclear (Gorgievski and Bakker, 2010; Krulder, 2010), According to some authors, workaholics are extremely productive (e.g., Peiperl and Jones 2001; Clark, et al., 2014; Gorgievski, et al., 2014). However, other researchers have claimed that workaholic's performance would not necessarily be good and may even be poor, and comes at a high price for both the individuals and the organizations. Scott et al., (1997) identified workaholism as an important variable and proposed several consequences for job performance depending on the type of workaholic behavior. The first empirical research on the relationship workaholism – as defined – as the tendency to work excessively hard in a compulsive way – and job performance – spilt in – role and extra role- was conducted by Schaufeli and colleagues (2006). They found that workaholics work hard rather than smart, create difficulties for their coworkers, suffer from perfectionism, are rigid and inflexible and do not delegate. Both working excessively (WE) and working compulsively (WC) were found to be weakly positively related to extra-role performance, but did not show a relationship with in- role performance. Additionally, Mudrack and Naughton (2001) indicated that extra-role performance is related to if not part of workaholism. Further, Shimazu and Schaufeli (2009) measured performance as overall performance and found that workaholism was weakly negatively related. Interestingly, they found that only the work compulsively component was significantly related to performance. At the same line, a negative relationship between workaholism and job performance was also suggested by Burke (2001) who found that workaholic behavior were not associated with salary increase. The poor performance of workaholics might be explained by the fact that they spend more time on their work which may exhaust them emotionally and cognitively over time. Furthermore, since workaholics are so deeply involved in their work, they have unreasonably high performance standards, which lead to more negative perceptions of one's own abilities and performance (Shimazu and Schaufeli, 2009).These job demands can act as a mediator between workaholism and performance (Krulder, 2010). More recently Loscalzo and Giannini (2019) conducted that, among the organizational/situational outcomes of workaholism there is lower work performance, greater absence due to sickness, aggressive workplace behaviors, and less organizational citizenship behavior.

This Study:

Regarding the previous studies which examined the distinctiveness between workaholism and job performance, many authors have described how workaholics often go beyond the demands of the job, engage in "busy work", and continuously re-check their efforts. This focus on the quantity of work can have detrimental effects on the quality of jobs performed by workaholics (Spence and Robbins, 1992). Others have portrayed workaholic employees as lacking in creativity, being inflexible, and having difficulty in the delegation of job duties. Moreover, the greatest threat for organizations may be from workaholics who are in managerial positions. Overall, we expect that workaholics are not necessarily good and perhaps even poor performers, given the long list of negative attitudes and behaviors that might interfere with job performance. In line with this reasoning, we formulated the following hypotheses:

▪ There is no significant difference in workaholic managers' perceptions of workaholism dimensions (at the selected universities) according to their demographic characteristics.
▪ There is no significant difference in managers' job performance (at the selected universities) according to their demographic characteristics.
▪ There is no significant relationship between the workaholism dimensions and managers' job performance (at the selected universities).

Method

Participants

Participants included 284 managers, (67% of the total respondents were males, while only 33% were females. 48% of the respondent work in Menofia University, 37% of the

respondents work in Tanta University, while only 15% of the respondents work in Kafrelshikh University. Also, the majority of this research participants work within the operational level (86%), and 12% within the middle level, whereas 2% within the senior level.

Procedure

The needed primary data for this applied research were collected via the survey method. A structured and direct questionnaire was carefully designed in order to gather the required data with regard to the key variables and sub-variables under consideration. The questionnaire was administrated by the researcher herself by using the personal interview method. The questionnaire developed was divided to three main sections (workaholism, job performance, and demographic variables). The researcher has modified, edited, and deleted some contents of the questionnaire reaching to its final form that facilitate collecting the needed primary data to testing the hypotheses and achieving the research objectives. The response rate was 82.5%. However, there were 46 incomplete questionnaires, and then they must be eliminated. Therefore the number of usable questionnaires for the process of data analysis was only 284, representing 71% of the entire sample (400 managers).

Measures

Workaholism: workaholism was measured using QAQ scale. The QAQ is a 29-item self -report measure of workaholism scored on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), with higher scores indicating higher levels of workaholism.

Job performance: Job performance was assessed using single item-question with pre-specified responses from the World Health Questionnaire. Respondents were asked to rate their overall work performance during the past year on a self-anchoring scale, with 0 representing the worst possible work performance a person could have on this job, and 6 indicating top work performance on the job. We used the single-item self-report global scale because it has been argued that a global index of overall job performance (single item measure) is an inclusive and valid measure of job performance, data on the objective performance of employee is difficult to obtain, and alternative self-report measure of job performance focuses on single occupations and includes questions tailored to the unique demands of those occupations.

Demographic characteristics: It includes three main individual demographic characteristics each measured by single item with pre-specified responses were included: organization name, organizational level, and gender.

Results

This section aims to analyze and discuss the primary data collected by surveys from targeted managers (at the three organizational levels) in the three universities under investigation. Data were analyzed by Descriptive Measures of Central Tendency, Multiple Regression and Correlation Analysis. Also, the hypotheses of this study were tested via F-Test, and t-Test. Hence this section has been divided into three sections as follows:
• Workaholic managers' perceptions of workaholism dimensions.
• Managers' job performance.
• The relationship between workaholic dimensions and job performance.

Workaholic Managers' Perceptions of Workaholism Dimensions:

This section aims to discuss and interpret the statistical findings obtained from data analysis process which are related to workaholic managers' perception of workaholism dimensions, in order to answer the first research question as well as testing the first research hypothesis which stated that: There is no significant difference in workaholic managers' perceptions of workaholism dimensions, taken together and separately (at the selected universities) according to their demographic characteristics (organizations, organizational levels, and gender).

Workaholic Mangers' Perceptions of Workaholism Dimensions According to their Organizations:

One-way ANOVA analysis, was conducted for exploring the extent to which workaholic managers at the selected universities differ in their perceptions of workaholism dimension (taken together and separately), according to their organizations.

F-Test findings revealed that there is no significant difference among workaholic managers (at the selected universities) with respect to their perceptions of all of the workaholism dimensions (taken together) according to their organizations (P-value >0.05). On the contrary, the findings revealed that there is a significant difference among workaholic managers (at the selected universities) with respect to their perceptions of workaholism dimensions (work-life conflict, work perfectionism, work addiction, unpleasantness, and withdrawal symptoms), taken separately according to their organizations (P-value was significant at 0.05 and 0.01, See table 2).

Table 2
Workaholic Managers' Perceptions of Workaholism Dimensions
According to their organizations

Workaholism Dimensions	Mean for the Responses			Grand Mean
	Menofia University	Tanta University	Kafrelshikh University	
Work-Life Conflict:*	3.04	3.30	2.93	3.09
• I have difficulty maintaining friendships.	2.41	2.20	2.05	2.22
• My work often seems to interfere with my personal life.**	2.38	3.15	2.54	2.69
• I often miss out on important personal activities because of work demands.**	3.36	3.89	3.11	3.45
• I often put issues in my personal life "on hold" because of work demands.	3.51	3.74	3.84	3.70
• I find myself unable to enjoy other activities because of my thoughts of work.**	3.24	3.35	2.49	3.03
• I find it difficult to schedule vacation time for myself.	3.35	3.61	3.14	3.37
• I constantly feel too tired after work to engage in non-work activities.	3.36	3.48	3.11	3.32
• I feel stressed out when dealing with work issues.	2.71	2.94	3.16	2.94
Work Perfectionism:**	3.40	2.97	3.04	3.14
• I frequently check over my work many times before I finish it.**	4.57	3.49	4.00	4.02
• It take me a long time to finish my work because it must be perfect.**	3.34	2.99	2.51	2.95
• I frequently feel anxious or nervous about my work.	2.30	2.43	2.59	2.44
Work Addiction:**	3.32	3.58	2.93	3.28
• I enjoy spending evenings and working.**	2.80	3.42	2.54	2.92
• I feel very addicted to my work.**	3.57	3.71	2.92	3.40
• I think about work constantly.	3.58	3.60	3.32	3.50
Unpleasantness:*	1.80	1.95	2.30	2.02
• People would describe me as being impatient and always in a hurry.*	2.01	2.45	2.00	2.15
• I consider myself to be a very aggressive person.**	1.54	1.58	2.62	1.91
• I get irritated often with others.	1.83	1.82	2.27	1.97
Withdrawal Symptoms:**	3.99	3.85	3.35	3.73
• I feel anxious when I am not working.**	3.71	3.33	2.86	3.30
• I feel guilty when I am not working.**	4.03	3.88	3.22	3.70
• I feel bored or restless when I am not working.	4.21	4.32	3.97	4.17
Grand Mean	3.11	3.09	2.91	3.05

*Significant at 5% (According to F Test).   **Significant at 1% (According to F Test).

As noticed from the previous table, the overall mean of workaholic managers' perceptions of workaholism dimensions (at the selected universities) is 3.05 suggesting a moderate level of workaholism dimensions.

Further, Menofia University reports higher level of workaholism than Tanta and Kafrelshikh universities. Additionally, the mean scores of the five workaholism dimensions (work-life conflict, work perfectionism, work addiction, unpleasantness, and withdrawal symptoms) at the selected universities ranged from (2.02 to 3.73).

Across all workaholism dimensions it found that withdrawal symptoms dimension represented in (I feel anxious when I am not working, I feel guilty when I am not working), which had the highest mean score (mean= 3.73) among the other workaholism dimensions followed by the perfectionism dimension (mean= 3.14). Results showed that workaholic managers at Menofia university had higher level of workaholism (mean=3.99) than workaholic managers at Tanta university (3.85), and Kafrelshikh university (3.35), with

respect to withdrawal symptoms dimension. Similarly, workaholic managers at Menofia University had higher level of the work perfectionism dimension than those in Tanta and Kafrelshikh universities.

Finally, with respect to unpleasantness dimension which had the lowest mean score (2.02) among the other workaholic dimensions, it is noticed that the difference in workaholic managers' perception was for workaholic managers at Kafrelshikh university.

Based upon the above mentioned results, the first null hypothesis is rejected with respect to type of organization for the five workaholism dimensions (taken separately). Thus, there is a significant difference in workaholic managers' perceptions of the five workaholism dimensions (taken separately) according to their organizations.

Contrary, the first null hypothesis is supported type of organization for the five workaholism dimensions (taken together). Thus, there is no significant difference in workaholic managers' perceptions of the five workaholism dimensions (taken together) according to their organizations.

Workaholic Managers' Perceptions of Workaholism Dimensions
According to their Organizational levels:

Based upon the same analytical technique and test, it was possible to explore the extent to which workaholic managers at the selected universities differ in their perceptions of workaholism dimension (taken together and separately), according to their organizational levels.

F-Test findings revealed that workaholic managers at the three organizational levels at the selected universities exhibit similar levels of workaholism dimensions (taken together and separately) except for only two variables. In other words, there is no significant difference among workaholic managers at the three different organizational levels with respect to their perceptions of workaholism dimensions (taken together and separately), except for only two variables (i.e., my work often seems to interfere with my personal life, and I feel very addicted to my work). (See table 3). Our findings support the idea that workaholism is more prevalent among managers than others (McMillan and O'driscoll, 2004).

Table 3
Workaholic Managers' Perceptions of Workaholism Dimensions
According to their Organizational levels

Workaholism Dimensions	Mean for the Responses			Grand Mean
	Senior Level	Middle Level	Operational Level	
Work-Life Conflict:	3.69	2.97	3.12	3.26
• I have difficulty maintaining friendships.	3.00	2.04	2.29	2.44
• My work often seems to interfere with my personal life.**	3.83	2.14	2.73	2.90
• I often miss out on important personal activities because of work demands.	3.83	3.32	3.53	3.56
• I often put issues in my personal life "on hold" because of work demands.	4.00	3.82	3.61	3.81
• I find myself unable to enjoy other activities because of my thoughts of work.	3.83	3.25	3.13	3.40
• I find it difficult to schedule vacation time for myself.	4.00	3.18	3.42	3.53
• I constantly feel too tired after work to engage in non-work activities.	3.83	3.11	3.38	3.44
• I feel stressed out when dealing with work issues.	3.17	2.93	2.85	2.98
Work Perfectionism:	3.06	3.42	3.16	3.21
• I frequently check over my work many times before I finish it.	4.00	4.43	4.05	4.16
• It take me a long time to finish my work because it must be perfect.	2.50	3.07	3.10	2.89
• I frequently feel anxious or nervous about my work.	2.67	2.75	2.45	2.59
Work Addiction:	3.89	3.62	3.29	3.60
• I enjoy spending evenings and working.	3.83	3.21	2.92	3.32
• I feel very addicted to my work.*	4.00	4.11	3.42	3.84
• I think about work constantly.	3.83	3.54	3.54	3.64
Unpleasantness:	1.61	2.19	1.91	1.90
• People would describe me as being impatient and always in a hurry.	2.00	2.14	2.18	2.11
• I consider myself to be a very aggressive person.	1.50	2.11	1.68	1.76
• I get irritated often with others.	1.33	2.32	1.85	1.83
Withdrawal Symptoms:	3.83	4.06	3.80	3.90
• I feel anxious when I am not working.	3.67	3.61	3.41	3.56
• I feel guilty when I am not working.	3.83	4.14	3.80	3.92
• I feel bored or restless when I am not working.	4.00	4.43	4.19	4.21
Grand Mean	3.22	3.25	3.06	3.17

*Significant at 5% (According to F Test).   **Significant at 1% (According to F Test).

It is noticed that workaholic managers at the senior level report higher mean score (3.83) than those at the middle level (2.14), and the operational level (2.73). While it is found that

workaholic managers at the middle organizational level report higher mean score (4.11) than those at the senior level (4.00), and the operational level (3.42) with respect to the second variable (I feel very addicted to my work). (See table 3)

Based upon the above mentioned results, the first null hypothesis is supported and with respect to organizational levels for the five workaholism dimensions (taken together and separately). In other words, there is no significant difference in workaholic managers' perceptions of the five workaholism dimensions (taken together and separately) according to their organizational levels.

Workaholic Managers' Perceptions of Workaholism Dimensions Based on their Gender:

Statistical descriptive technique using the mean coupled with t-test is conducted in order to exploring the extent to which workaholic managers at the selected universities differ in their perceptions of workaholism dimensions (taken together and separately) according to their gender.

t-test showed that there is no significant difference among workaholic managers (at the selected universities) with respect to their perceptions of workaholism dimensions (taken together) according to their gender, as well as three of workaholism dimensions (Work addiction, Unpleasantness, Withdrawal symptoms) taken separately, as P-value > 0.05. However, the findings revealed that there is a significant difference in workaholic managers with respect to their perceptions of two workaholism dimensions (Work-life conflict, Work perfectionism) taken separately according to their gender, as P-value is significant at (0.01 and 0.05).

Table 4
Workaholic Managers' Perceptions of Workaholism Dimensions based on their Gender

Workaholism Dimensions	Mean for the Responses		Grand Mean
	Male	Female	
• Work-Life Conflict:**	3.21	2.93	3.07
• I have difficulty maintaining friendships.**	2.41	2.03	2.22
• My work often seems to interfere with my personal life.**	2.89	2.29	2.59
• I often miss out on important personal activities because of work demands.	3.55	3.43	3.49
• I often put issues in my personal life "on hold" because of work demands.**	3.77	3.39	3.58
• I find myself unable to enjoy other activities because of my thoughts of work.**	3.34	2.81	3.08
• I find it difficult to schedule vacation time for myself.	3.43	3.37	3.40
• I constantly feel too tired after work to engage in non-work activities.**	3.21	3.66	3.44
• I feel stressed out when dealing with work issues.**	3.09	2.43	2.76
Work Perfectionism:*	3.10	3.35	3.23
• I frequently check over my work many times before I finish it.**	3.89	4.48	4.19
• It take me a long time to finish my work because it must be perfect.*	2.95	3.33	3.14
• I frequently feel anxious or nervous about my work.	2.47	2.25	2.50
Work Addiction:	3.38	3.29	3.35
• I enjoy spending evenings and working.	3.18	2.61	2.90
• I feel very addicted to my work.	3.45	3.66	3.55
• I think about work constantly.	3.51	3.61	3.56
Unpleasantness:	1.97	1.86	1.92
• People would describe me as being impatient and always in a hurry.	2.21	2.08	2.15
• I consider myself to be a very aggressive person.	1.79	1.61	1.70
• I get irritated often with others.	1.90	1.89	1.90
Withdrawal Symptoms:	3.88	3.76	3.82
• I feel anxious when I am not working.	3.49	3.34	3.42
• I feel guilty when I am not working.	3.82	3.90	3.86
• I feel bored or restless when I am not working.	4.31	4.03	4.17
Grand Mean	3.11	3.03	3.07

*Significant at 5% (According to F Test).   **Significant at 1% (According to F Test).

Moreover, the means are displayed in table 4 and as noticed from the table, the male workaholics report greater work-life conflict than females. The difference in work-life conflict represented in (I have difficulty maintaining friendships, My work often seems to interfere with my personal life, I often put issues in my personal life "on hold" because of work demands, I find myself unable to enjoy other activities because of my thoughts of work, I constantly feel too tired after work to engage in non-work activities, I feel stressed out when dealing with work issues, their mean scores ranged from (2.41 to 3.77).

On the other hand, the present research findings along with those reported by (Burgess, et al. 2006; Burke, 1999; Spence and Robbins, 1992) based on different measure indicated that females report greater perfectionism than did males. Female workaholics in the selected universities had higher mean score in response to the following statements (I frequently check over my work many times before I finish it, It take me a long time to finish my work because it must be perfect) than did male workaholics.

Based upon the above mentioned results, the first null hypothesis is rejected with respect to gender for two dimensions of workaholism dimensions (work life conflict, work perfectionism). In other words, there is a significant difference in workaholic managers' perceptions of two dimensions of workaholism dimensions (work life conflict, work perfectionism) according to their gender.

Contrary, the first null hypothesis is supported with respect gender for the five workaholism dimensions (taken together) and for three dimensions of workaholism dimensions (work addiction, unpleasantness, and withdrawal symptoms). In other words, there is no significant difference in workaholic managers' perceptions of the five workaholism dimensions (taken together), and for three dimensions of workaholism dimensions (work addiction, unpleasantness, withdrawal symptoms) according to their gender. In sum, none of the demographic variables were significantly related to workaholism.

Job Performance of Workaholic Managers:

This section aims to discuss and interpret the statistical findings obtained from data analysis process related to managers' job performance, in order to answer the second research question as well as testing the second research hypothesis which stated that: There is no significant difference in managers' job performance (at the selected universities) according to their demographic characteristics (organization, organizational levels, and gender).

Job Performance of Workaholic Managers According to their Organizations:

One-way ANOVA analysis was conducted for exploring the extent to which workaholic managers at the selected universities differ in their job performance with respect to their organizations. Results were represented in the following table 5.

Table 5
Managers' job performance According to their Organizations

University**	Mean	Standard Deviation
Menofia University	5.32	.488
Tanta University	5.07	.875
Kafrelshikh University	5.01	.687
Grand Mean	5.18	

**Significant at 1% (According to T test)

F-test results indicate that there is a significant difference in managers' job performance according to their organizations, as P-value < 0.05.

The overall mean of managers' job performance based on 6-point scale was (5.13), whereas (1=Very poor, 6= Excellent). Also, the results revealed that workaholic managers at Menofia University reported higher level of job performance (mean=5.32, s.d = .488) than workaholic managers at Tanta university (mean=5.07, s.d= .875) and Kafrelshikh university (mean=5.01, s.d= .687).

Job Performance of Workaholic Managers According to their Organizational Levels:

Based upon the same analytical technique and test, it was possible to explore the extent to which workaholic managers at the selected universities differ in their job performance with respect to their organizational levels. Results were represented in the following table 6.

Table 6

Managers' job performance According to their Organizational Levels

Organizational Levels [ns]	Mean	Standard Deviation
Senior Level	5.33	.816
Middle Level	5.21	.630
Operational Level	5.18	.699
Grand Mean	5.24	

ns= non significant at 5%

As shown in table 6, the researcher compared workaholic managers at the three organizational levels in terms of their job performance, ANOVA analysis showed that there is no significant difference between workaholic managers with respect to their job performance according to their organizational levels, as (P-value > 0.05).

It is noticed also from the descriptive statistics at the previous table that, the overall mean of managers' job performance at the three organizational levels is (5.24) (1=Very poor, 6= To Excellent). And the mean scores of workaholic managers at the three organizational levels are (5.33, 5.21, 5.18 respectively) suggesting that workaholic managers' at the three organizational levels exhibit similar levels of job performance.

Job Performance of Workaholic Managers Based on their gender:

Statistical descriptive technique using the mean and standard deviation coupled with t-Test was conducted in order to exploring the extent to which workaholic managers at the selected universities differ in their job performance according to their gender.

The findings obtained from T-test indicated that there is no significant difference in managers' job performance according to their gender, as (P-value > 0.05) (See table 7).

Table 7

Managers' job Performance Based on their Gender

Gender [ns]	Mean	Standard Deviation
Male	5.21	.673
Female	5.14	.729
Grand Mean	5.18	

ns= non significant at 5%

It is noticed also from the previous table that male workaholic managers report higher level of job performance (mean= 5.21, s.d = .673) than female workaholic managers (mean= 5.14, s.d = .729).

Based upon the above mentioned results, the second null hypothesis is rejected regarding type of organization. In other words, there is a significant difference in managers' job performance according to their organization. Contrary, the second null hypothesis is supported regarding organizational levels and gender as follows: there is no significant difference in managers' job performance according to their organizational levels and gender.

The Relationship between Workaholism Dimensions and Job Performance:

This section aims to discuss and interpret the statistical findings related to the third research question which states that: Is there a relationship between workaholism dimensions (taken together and separately) and job performance?

As well as, to test the third research hypothesis which states that: There is no significant relationship between workaholism dimensions (taken together and separately) and job performance.

The previous hypothesis tends to investigate the significance, strength, and the direction of the relationship between workaholism dimensions and job performance.

Type and Strength of the relationship:

Multiple regression analysis has conducted for (20 variables) of workaholism dimensions (as independent variables, obtained high degree of reliability and validity), in addition, to one variable related to the overall job performance (as a dependent variable).

By applying the Enter method, the researcher has found that there is a significant relationship between all workaholism dimensions and job performance. (sig.= .000, according to F- test); this relation is a strong relationship (R= .584, in the overall model); and the variables of workaholism dimensions can interpret approximately 34% (R^2= .342) of the overall variation in job performance. (See, table 8).

Table 8
Relationship between Workaholism Dimensions and Job Performance
(Outputs of Multiple Regression Analysis)

Independent Variables (Workaholism Dimensions)	Beta	R	R^2	Sig.
• I enjoy spending evenings and working.**	.290	.263	.069	.000
• I often put issues in my personal life "on hold" because of work demands.**	-.350	.418	.175	.000
• It take me a long time to finish my work because it must be perfect.**	.124	.487	.237	.000
• I consider myself to be a very aggressive person.**	.097	.502	.254	.009
• My work often seems to interfere with my personal life.*	-.097	.516	.266	.016
• I often miss out on important personal activities because of work demands.*	.097	.528	.279	.043

*Significant at 5% (According to F Test).   **Significant at 1% (According to F Test).

Relative Importance of Workaholism dimensions:

Output of Stepwise method of multiple regression analysis showed that there are only (6 variables) out of (20 variables) of workaholism dimensions had a significant relationship with job performance (sig. between 0.01, 0.05, according to T- test). Two of these variables have a significant negative relationship with job performance (I often put issues in my personal life "on hold" because of work demands, My work often seems to interfere with my personal life), contrary to them, there are four variables have a significant positive relationship with job performance (I enjoy spending evenings working, It take me a long time to finish my work because it must be perfect, I consider myself to be a very aggressive person, I often miss out on important personal activities because of work demands).

Additionally, the strength of the relationship extended from (.263 to .528), and the percentage of interpreted variation in the dependent variable (job performance) by these variables (taken separately) ranged between (.069 to .279) (See, table 8).

The rank of these variables (according to their importance) is as follows:
• I often put issues in my personal life "on hold" because of work demands (β= -.350)
• I enjoy spending evenings working (β= -.290)
• It take me a long time to finish my work because it must be perfect (β= .124)
• I consider myself to be a very aggressive person (β= .097)
• My work often seems to interfere with my personal life (β= -.097)
• I often miss out on important personal activities because of work demands (β= .097)

Based upon the above mentioned results, a decision was made to reject the third null hypothesis for the overall relationship between workaholism dimensions and job performance. Also, the third null hypothesis of this research was rejected for only six variables of workaholism dimensions that have significant relationship with job performance, taken separately; and was accepted for the same null hypothesis for the remaining variables (14 variables taken separately).

Limitations:

Several limitations need to be described. First, all indicators were measured using self-report questionnaires; individuals often hold inaccurate opinions of themselves, which may produce erroneous results. Moreover, self-report data are irreplaceable as a mean of

collecting information on how people perceive themselves; a more accurate picture could be attained by gathering data from coworkers, supervisor, peers, and even close friends or family members.

Second, Due to the cross sectional nature of the research, participants only completed the research questionnaire one time, so responses were concurrent, therefore, it is possible that one's responses can change overtime based on various factors. Also, as previously noted the trajectory of the workaholism syndrome suggests that there may be positive short-time effects followed by negative long-term consequences as symptoms progress (Ng, et al., 2007Clark, et al., 2014; Vitiello, et al., 2016). Thus, cross sectional assessment of workaholism levels may not be as reliable as longitudinal designs. In turn future researchers should analyze these over a period of several months to determine if individual scores an workaholism fluctuate.

Third, because the participants were recruited only from three universities in Egypt, the findings could not be generalized.

Discussion:

The present finding that workaholics appear to perform relatively well, without many negative outcomes, support those Brauch (2011) who suggested that workaholism can be constructive and beneficial; and can be linked to positive outcomes. Such as increased job satisfaction and career satisfaction (Ng, et al., 2007). Additionally, Burke (1999) observed that high enjoyment workaholics had fewer psychosomatic symptoms and more favorable physical well-being than many other workers. This suggests that workaholism may have positive as well as negative outcomes, but findings are mixed across studies (e.g., Brady, et al., 2008; Clark, et al., 2014).

Research is inclusive regarding the outcomes of the hard work of workaholics. Whereas some authors depict workaholics as tragic figures who not perform well and who creating difficulties for their coworkers (Porter, 2001), others maintain that workaholics are extremely productive and valuable asset to any organization (Peiperl and Jones, 2001).

The findings of the present research revealed that First: none of the demographic variables affect workaholism level at the three universities under investigation, which further substantiates the ides that workaholics are motivated by strong inner drive rather than by external motivators. Our findings report the idea that workaholics are likely to be highly achievement-oriented and strive to perfectionist standards. It has also been noted that empirical research has generally concluded that workaholism adversely impact relationship and can lead to increased work family conflict. The issue of work life conflict (imbalance) has received substantial attention in recent years as well. One reason for this interest is the widely accepted belief that both (positive and negative) occurring within work and non-work spheres affects one another. Second: regarding the second hypothesis, results indicate that there is a significant difference in managers ' job performance only according to their organizations, as p. value <0.05. Also, the results revealed that workaholic managers at Menofia University and Kafrelshikh University. It is important to draw attention to the possibility that perhaps low levels of unpleasantness of workaholic managers at Menofia University is the critical factor which lead to higher performance outcomes. Third: regarding the relationship between workaholism dimensions and workaholic managers' job performance, it is found that a strong significant relationship between all workaholism dimensions and job performance (R=.584). Additionally, results showed that workaholics appear to perform relatively well. This is contingent with the notion that workaholism should not be taken for granted merely as a negative and damaging phenomenon which organizations should aim to eliminate.

We therefore propose that further research around the organizational value of workaholism, and strategies on how to maximize its benefits and tactics to minimize its costs is imperative.

References:

1. Aaker, D. A., Kumar, V., and Day, S. G.,(2013), "Marketing Research", 9th edition, John Wiley and Sons, New York.
2. Andreassen, C. S., (2014), "Workaholism; An overview and current status of the research", Journal of Behavioral Addiction, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 1-11.
3. Aziz, S., Uhrich, B., Wuensch, K. L., and Swords, B., (2013), "The workaholism analysis questionnaire: Emphasizing work-life imbalance and addiction in the measurement of workaholism", Institute of Behavioral and Applied Management.
4. Baruch, Y., (2011), "The positive wellbeing aspects of workaholism in cross cultural perspective", Career Development International, Vol. 16, No. 6, pp.572-591.
5. Brady, B. R., Vodanovich, S. J., and Rotunda, R., (2008), "The Impact of workaholism on work-family conflict, job satisfaction, and perception of leisure activities", The Psychologist Manager Journal. Vol. 11, pp. 241-263.
6. Buelens, M., and Poelmans, S., A. Y., (2004), "Enriching the Spence and Robbins, Typology of workaholism demographic, motivational and organizational correlates", Journal of Organizational Change Management, Vol. 17, No. 5, pp. 440-458.
7. Burgess, Z., Burke, R. J., and Oberklaid, F., (2006), "Workaholism among Australian psychologists: gender differences", Equal Opportunities International, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 48-59.
8. Burke, R. J., (2001), "Workaholism in organization: The role of organizational values", Personal Review, Vol. 30, No. 6, pp. 637-645.
9. Burke, R. J., (2002), "Do workaholics prefer demanding, aggressive, and results-oriented organizational cultures?" Career Development International, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 211-217.
10. Burke, R. J., Burgess, Z., and Fallon, B., (2006a), "Workaholism among Australian female managers and professionals: Job behaviors, satisfactions and psychological health", Equal Opportunities International, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 200-213.
11. Burke, R. J., Matthiesen, S. B., and Pallesen, S., (2006b), "Workaholism, organizational life and well-being of Norwegian nursing staff", Career Development International, Vol. 11, No. 5, pp. 463-477.
12. Caruso, C. C., (2006), "Possible Broad impacts of long work hours", Industrial Health, Vol. 44, pp. 531-536.
13. Clark, M. A., Michel, J. S., Zhdanova, L., Pui, S. Y., and Baltes, B. B., (2014), "All work and no play? A meta-analytic examination of the correlates and outcomes of workaholism", Journal of Management, Vol. 20, No. 10, pp. 1-38.
14. Douglas, E. J., and Morris, R. J., (2006), "Workaholic or just hard worker?" Career Development International, Vol. 11, No. 5, pp. 394-417.
15. Edrees, T. A., (2016), "Marketing Research, Techniques of Measurements, and Analysis, and Testing Hypotheses", El-Dar Elgameaya, (In Arabic).
16. Gorgievski, M. J., and Bakker, A. B., (2010), "Passion for work: Work engagement versus workaholism", In Al brecht, S.L. (Ed), The Handbook of Employees Engagement: Perspectives, Issues Research and Practice, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 264-271.
17. Gorgievski, M. J., Moriano, J. A., and Bakker, A. B., (2014), "Relating work engagement and workaholism to entrepreneurial performance", Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 106-121.
18. Griffiths, M., (2005), "Workaholism is still a useful construct", Addiction Research and Theory, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 97-100, UK.
19. Krulder, L., (2010), "The empirical distinctiveness of workaholism and work engagement and their relationship with job outcomes", Thesis, Mater in Work and Organizational Psychology.

20. Kubota, K., Shimazu, A., Kawakami, N., Takahashi, M., Nakata, A., and Schaufeli, W. B., (2012), "The empirical distinctiveness of work engagement and workaholism among hospital nurses in Japan: The effect on sleep quality and job performance", Ciencia & Trabajo, Vol. 14, pp. 31-36.

21. Loscalzo, Y. and Giannini, M., (2019), "what type of worker are you? Work-related inventory (WI-10): A comprehensive instrument for the measurement of workaholism", Work, Vol. 62, pp. 383-392.

22. McMillan, L. H. W. and O'driscoll, M. P., (2004), "Workaholism and health: Implications for organizations", Journal of Organizational Change Management, Vol. 17, No. 5, pp. 509-519.

23. Moyer, F. Aziz, S., Wuensch, K.,(2017), "From workaholism to burnout: Psychological capital as a mediator", International Journal of Workplace Health Management, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 213-227.

24. Mudrack, P. E., and Naughton, T. J., (2001), "The assessment of workaholism as behavioral tendencies: Scale development and preliminary empirical testing", International Journal of Stress Management, Vol. 8, No. 2,   pp. 93-111.

25. Ng, T. W. H., Sorensen, K. L., and Feldman, D. C., (2007), "Dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of workaholism: Can mindfulness help?", Int. J. Ment. Health Addiction. Doi: 10.1007/s11469-014-9484-3.

26. Peiperl, M., and Jones, B., (2001), "Workaholics and overworkers productivity or pathology?", Group and Organization Management, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 369-393.

27. Porter, G., (2001), "Workaholic tendencies and the high potential for stress among co-workers", International Journal of Stress Management, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 147-164.

28. Schaufeli, W. B., Shimazu, A., and Taris, T. W., (2009), "Being driven to work excessively hard the evaluation of a two-factor measure of workaholism in the Netherlands and Japan", Cross. Cultural Research, Vol. 43, No. 4, pp. 320-348.

29. Schaufeli, W.B., Taris, T. W., and Rhenen, W. V., (2008), "Workaholism, burnout, and work engagement: Three of a kind or three different kinds of employees well-being?", Applied Psychology: An International Review, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 173-203.

30. Scott, K. S., Moore, K. S., and Miceli, M. P., (1997), "An exploration of the meaning and consequences of workaholism", Human Relations, Vol. 50, No. 3, pp. 287-314.

31. Shimazu, A., and Schaufeli, W. B., (2009), "Is workaholism good or bad for employees well-being? The distinctiveness of workaholism and work engagement among Japanese employees", Industrial Health, Vol. 47, pp. 495-502.

32. Shimazu, A., Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Shimada, K., and Kawakami, N.,(2011), "Workaholism and well-being among Japanese dual-earner couples: A spillover-crossover perspective", Social Science and Medicine, Vol. 73, pp. 399-409.

33. Shimazu, A., Schaufeli, W. B., and Taris, T. W., (2010), "How does workaholism affect worker health and performance? The Mediating Role of Coping", Int. J. Behav. Med. Vol. 17, pp. 154-160.

34. Snir, R., and Harpaz, I., (2004), "Attitudinal and demographic antecedents of workaholism", Journal of Organizational Change Management, Vol. 17, No. 5, pp. 520-536.

35. Spence, J. T., and Robbins, A. S., (1992), "Workaholism: definition, measurement, and preliminary results", Journal of Personality Assessment, Vol. 58, No. 1, pp. 160-178.

36. Sussman S. and Sussman, A. N., (2011), "Considering the Definition of Addiction", International Journal Environment Research Public Health 2011, 8, 4025-4038.

37. Sussman, S., (2012), "Workaholism: A review", Journal of Addiction Research and Theory, Supplementary, 6,4120.doi: 10.417212155-6105., S6-001.

38. Taris, T. W., Schaufeli, W. B., and Verhoeven, L. C., (2005), "Workaholism in the Netherlands: Measurements and implications for job strain and work-nonwork conflict", Applied Psychology: An International Review, Vol. 54, No. 1, pp. 37-60.

39. Tziner, A., and Tanami, M. (2013), "Examining the links between attachment perfectionism, and job motivation potential with job engagement and workaholism", Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 29, pp. 65-74.

40. Vitiello, K., Aziz, S., and Wuensch, K., (2016), "Workaholism and Authenticity: The role of life satisfaction", Institute of Behavioral and Applied Management.