WORKAHOLISM – CONDITIONS, CONSEQUENCES, COUNTERACTION IN THE CONTEXT OF ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

Sylwia GOŁĄB[1*], Beata BĘDZIK[2]

[1] West Pomeranian University of Technology in Szczecin, Faculty of Economics, Poland;
sylwia.golab@zut.edu.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-6572-9201
[2] West Pomeranian University of Technology in Szczecin, Faculty of Economics, Poland;
beata.bedzik@zut.edu.pl, ORCID: 0000-0003-1052-0977
* Correspondence author

Purpose: The purpose of this article is to present the phenomenon of workaholism as one of the many risks associated with organizational management policies. The paper assesses the consequences of the phenomenon in organizational, family, health and interpersonal aspects.

Design/methodology/approach: The article is a theoretical analysis of the phenomenon of workaholism in the context of organizational management. Workaholism is analyzed both through the prism of the causes and mechanism of formation, as well as the possible health, social and family consequences. The study uses secondary data taken from public statistics, thematic reports and scientific research. Available domestic data were used to illustrate the phenomenon, and foreign data were also referenced for comparative purposes.

Findings: the phenomenon of workaholism, posing a major threat to the effectiveness and efficiency of the activities undertaken, should be one of the main determinants of the organization's management policy.

Practical implications: the negative consequences of workaholism and the danger associated with social approval of increasing working hours, implies the need for research into the scale of the phenomenon and the identification and implementation of countermeasures in organizations. Difficulties in defining the phenomenon and contentious issues regarding the classification of workaholism should not be a reason for limiting research in this area.

Social implications: To draw attention to the problem of workaholism in organizations, especially corporations, and to point out the need to take specific measures to prevent it.

Originality/value: The article evaluates workaholism in the context of its consequences for the individual and the oraganization, and identifies examples of preventive measures. The article is aimed at employees of the organization to raise awareness of the risk of work addiction and managers to improve the work environment to protect the organization from the consequences, including the costs of workaholism.

Keywords: workaholism, psychosocial risk, organizational management.

Category of the paper: point of view, concept article.

1. Introduction

Work in many cultures is equated with prestige and social success, and industriousness in a common assessment is a trait viewed positively. It is treated as a sign of social maturity. To quote Golińska (2008), "a mature person is one who undertakes labor activity and, as a result, confirms and develops his resources, skills, abilities". So it should come as no surprise that the time devoted to work is lengthening, and other forms of activity are being neglected.

With people under increasing pressure and the boundaries between family and work life blurring, excessive work is becoming commonplace. This phenomenon, in the context of the scale of the problem, as well as the negative consequences in various areas of life, is gaining more and more scientific attention.

A workaholic devotes a significant part of his time to work, giving it special importance in the hierarchy of life goals and values. This is due, among other things, to the fact that this phenomenon is socially accepted and desirable (Ogińska-Bulik, 2010). A workaholic, therefore, can be evaluated as an employee who represents a valuable potential of the organization that employs him.

Observations of the problem in question in relation to the American experience, however, lead to the conclusion that the presence of a workaholic in a team contributes to unfavorable changes in the work environment and negatively affects performance (Mieścicka, 2002). The reason may be the workaholics' high expectations of themselves and their co-workers, as well as functioning in the face of demands for perfection and in constant fear of criticism.

Methods

The subject of the article is the phenomenon of workaholism in the context of organizational management. Workaholism is analyzed through the prism of both its causes and the mechanism of its emergence, stages of development, and anticipated health, social and economic consequences. The article presents statistics relating to the phenomenon in question.

The individual, social and economic effects of workaholism are described. The article uses secondary data from public statistics, thematic reports and scientific studies. Available domestic data were used to illustrate the phenomenon, and foreign data were also referred to for comparative purposes.

2. The essence of workaholism – an overview of definitions

Workaholism is a multidimensional concept, and there is no unanimity among researchers on how to unify and measure the phenomenon in question. This results in the lack of a uniform and widely accepted definition of workaholism. Reviewing the literature, three approaches to workaholism can be distinguished (Golińska, 2010). The first group refers to viewing workaholism in the category of addiction, which is identical in symptoms and consequences to physiological addiction. W.E. Oates, a psychiatrist and pastor, introduced this concept in his article "On Being a Workaholic" of the year and in his book "Confessions of a Workaholic". He defined workaholism as some kind of compulsion or uncontrollable need to work constantly (Oates, 1971, after Antroszko, 2010; Paluchowski, Hornowska, 2021). This definition is identical to that of Schaufeli and his colleagues (Schaufeli, Shimazu, Taris, 2009), who defined workaholism as a tendency to work excessively hard (behavioral component) and an obsession with work (cognitive component) that manifests itself in compulsive work. In a later discussion of the term, Spence and Robbins (1992) emphasized the addictive nature of workaholism. They noted that workaholics feel a compulsion to work, and failure to satisfy this need results in the appearance of guilt and depression. Spence and Robbins (1992) recognized that workaholism is a multifaceted phenomenon. They identified three dimensions of the so-called "triad of workaholism" - work involvement (work involvement), work compulsion (drive to work) and work enjoyment (work satisfaction). Work compulsion represents the internal pressure that forces an employee to work, while work enjoyment is the pleasure derived from the work activity itself. The commitment dimension refers to employees' involvement in work and the time invested in it (Spence, Robbins, 1992).

A different conception of understanding workaholism is promoted by Mudrack and Nughton (2001). In their view, workaholism is a learned and established behavioral tendency. Based on their research, they observed that workaholics tend to devote a significant amount of time and energy to work activities that are not required of them. These activities primarily referred to thinking about work, even when workaholics remained in another role. They also noted a strong need to control other employees and exert influence, which resulted in the emergence of conflicts.

In turn, still other researchers emphasize the importance of personality traits that accompany workaholism (Wojdyło, 2007; Clark et al., 2016). The results of research on personality determinants form a consistent picture of a workaholic. This is a person with low self-esteem who seeks to confirm his or her own worth through achievements and successes. She tries at all costs to avoid situations in which she might reveal a lack of competence or any weakness. The workaholic derives his motivation from anxiety, which results in obsessive and compulsive behavior aimed at lowering the tension associated with possible failure (Atroszko, 2010).

In conclusion, it should be noted that the vast majority of definitions of workaholism emphasize its negative impact on the functioning of the individual. However, there are also definitions whose authors draw attention to the positive aspects of this phenomenon. Thus, in the literature one can find both definitions, which show the dysfunctional side of workaholism, and those which see workaholism in terms of the norm. Definitions that emphasize the positive links between workaholism and the functioning of the subject, however, are few.

2.1. Workaholism – the scale of the phenomenon

The "Addiction in Poland" Report (2023) shows that in 2019 nearly one-tenth of Poles over the age of 15 (9.1%) had an addiction problem. Both addiction and the risk of addiction primarily affect young adults under the age of 35, particularly those aged 25-34, with similar rates for women and men. Various aspects of work activity are an important risk factor. Workaholism risk is fostered in particular by running a business, while a risk factor in the context of work addiction is holding leadership positions, being responsible for the work of others, or managing projects.

Although, in light of research on work addiction, the amount of time spent at work is not a necessary criterion for diagnosing workaholism (Poelmans, Buelens, 2004; Burke, Matthiesen, 2004), there is, however, a tendency among work addicts to devote more hours to work activities (Burke, 1999). Taris, Geurts, Schaufeli, Blonk and Lagerveld (2008), in their work, emphasize the temporal aspect of workaholism, defining work addiction as a phenomenon consisting of two components: the temporary commitment to work and the inability to stop it, i.e. the compulsion to perform the activity.

The latest research release, "Poles' gainful employment and satisfaction with it" (2023), shows that slightly more than half of gainfully employed Poles (51%) declare that their professional work takes them 40 hours a week, i.e. according to the current basic working hours. Working less is declared by 14% of respondents, and 28% indicate that they are gainfully employed more than 40 hours a week. The arithmetic average of the declared time devoted to gainful employment is 42 hours of work per week, which, given previous measurements, indicates a continuation of the downward trend. Employment conditions are clearly changing over the years, with the percentage of people working more than 40 hours a week steadily declining.

This is confirmed by the data in Table 1. Analyzing them, it can be seen that the percentage of employed people who typically work 49 or more hours per week is decreasing over the period under review. Despite this, as many as 7.5% of those employed in 2023 worked more than the accepted norms (Table 1). The reason for this may be that an increase in working hours can affect career opportunities, which, however, requires keeping up with the competition, either through a faster pace of work or greater availability (Golińska, 2014).

Table 1.
Long working hours at the main job (%)

Countries	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Belgium	10,1	10	9,8	10,1	9,3	9,5	9,5	9,3	9,3	8,6
Bulgaria	2,3	1,9	1,9	1,4	1,3	1,1	1	1,2	0,7	0,4
Czech Republic	12,1	12,2	11,8	11,5	11,4	11	9,4	6,3	8,1	7,4
Dishes	5,2	5,4	5,1	5,1	4,7	4,1	4,2	6	5,6	5,1
Germany	8,9	8,6	8,2	7,7	7,2	6,9	6	6,4	6	5,3
Estonia	4,2	4	3,7	3,6	3,6	3,6	2,9	2,9	2,2	1,9
Ireland	7,3	8,2	8,2	9,3	9,8	10	9,4	8,6	9,2	7,8
Greece	18,5	18,6	19,4	18,2	17,2	16,6	16,1	14,3	12,6	11,6
Spain	10,5	9,8	9,1	8,4	8	7,2	6,4	7	7,3	6,7
France	12,2	12	12,3	11,9	11,9	12	11,7	10	10,2	9,9
Croatia	4,7	6	5,8	5,5	6,2	6,3	5,8	4,6	4,5	3,7
Italy	10,3	10,5	10,3	10,6	10,6	10,1	8,9	9,7	9,4	9,6
Cyprus	12,1	12,6	12,5	11,7	10,7	9,9	9,1	9,4	9,7	9,9
Latvia	3,2	3,4	3,3	2,5	2,3	2,1	2,2	1,6	1,3	1,1
Lithuania	0,6	0,9	0,8	0,9	0,7	0,7	0,9	0,8	0,8	1,1
Luxembourg	6,2	5,4	5,4	5,3	4,1	4,2	3,9	7,6	6,6	6
Hungary	4,6	4,7	3,7	3,8	3,2	2,9	1,9	3	2,6	2,2
Malta	7,3	7,8	7,1	7,2	8,3	9,9	8,8	5,5	4,5	4,6
Netherlands	4,9	4,8	4,8	4,6	4,6	4,5	3,8	5,9	5,8	5,5
Austria	12,1	11,7	11,4	11,3	11	10,4	9,7	8,4	8,1	7,9
Poland	14	13,2	12,7	11,8	11	10,5	9,1	7,8	7,8	7,5
Portugal	12,9	11,4	10,8	11	10,4	10,4	8,7	9,7	9,2	9
Romania	3,2	2,7	2,6	2,3	2	2,2	2,1	2,6	2,2	1,8
Slovenia	9,2	8,6	7,4	7,3	7,2	7,1	6,6	6,3	5,7	5,5
Slovakia	11	10,5	9,9	9	9	9,4	8	5,6	6,1	6,1
Finland	7,8	7,8	7,8	7,4	7,5	7,5	7	6,4	6	5,6
Sweden	4,6	4,6	4,4	4,2	4,1	4,1	3,6	7,6	7,5	7,3

Source: Długie godziny pracy w głównej pracy. (2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023). Zbiór danych. Komisja Europejska, Eurostat. Retrieved from:
https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/lfsa_qoe_3a2/default/table?lang=en

Data included in the "How's life" report (OECD, 2020) indicate that Poles' long working hours do not translate into high levels of life satisfaction. In this aspect, we are below average, behind the French and the British. Moreover, long working hours are not conducive to work-life balance. The average rest time in OECD countries is 15 hours a day, in Poland only 14.4 hours.

Eurostat data shows that for years Poland has been in the lead among EU countries with the highest percentage of workers taking up additional employment, behind Germany, France. However, analyzing the data from 2014 to 2023, one can see a downward trend (Table 2). The reason for this situation may be the inability to secure the desired level of income from a single source.

Table 2.

Employees with a second job (thousands)

Countries	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Belgium	193	184,4	201,2	177,9	179,1	206,7	204,7	215,8	257,3	256,3
Bulgaria	16,8	13,3	14,5	13,2	11,4	12,4	11,7	10,6	11,3	12,6
Czech Republic	106,7	113,4	117,5	133,9	133,5	133,7	127,5	133,8	142,4	136,1
Dishes	199,3	189,3	248,3	229,9	199,7	225,1	209,4	219,8	228,9	228,7
Germany	1956,4	1996,7	2180,4	2203,4	2173,3	2262,7	1927,1	1784,2	1889,8	1903,2
Estonia	28,2	28,8	31,9	32,9	37,7	39	34,9	39,1	45,1	45
Ireland	47,2	46,4	46	55,7	59,9	66,6	60,1	76,5	86,7	93,3
Greece	58,6	58,1	65,4	76,2	79,3	78,6	71,2	66,4	63,2	55,7
Spain	380,6	401,2	422,4	444,2	437	463,1	417,6	498,1	525,9	562,8
France	1393	1341,4	1309,9	1312,5	1410,1	1385,3	1345,3	1202,1	1206	1234,8
Croatia	37,4	38,2	17	15,9	19,9	15,9	15,7	32,7	24,6	30,3
Italy	288,2	298,7	322,5	334,2	317,5	332,3	312,8	338	279,3	279,2
Cyprus	13	10,1	12,8	12,5	10	10,3	9	11,2	10,6	9,8
Latvia	39,2	47,4	49,2	36,5	37,3	40	33,6	33	34,9	42,5
Lithuania	83,8	67,4	66,7	64,4	63,7	64,6	62,8	67,6	78,1	82
Luxembourg	7,6	9,9	9,8	9,8	10,1	9,6	7,9	14,2	11,3	14,1
Hungary	68,3	46,1	54,5	65,9	62,4	62,5	53,3	55,7	59,6	59,7
Malta	9	8,7	7,4	6,8	8	8,4	9,6	11,9	12,5	13,7
Netherlands	670,1	705,5	686,9	685	704,6	704,6	699,4	884,9	943,3	972,6
Austria	182,4	183,1	198,4	199,6	183,8	186,9	184,5	222,5	231,6	246
Poland	999,1	907,9	888,5	883,5	865	846,2	784,4	787,1	708,4	705,5
Portugal	195,6	189,6	191,6	192	199,3	220,1	179,1	215	230,8	246,1
Romania	165	135,2	130,2	128,3	129,9	147,8	128,8	50,3	43,8	42,9
Slovenia	36,6	31,3	24	34	34	21,8	20,5	35,2	44,1	41
Slovakia	24,2	21,9	29,9	32	31,5	29,2	22,7	25,6	36,2	32,7
Finland	125,8	140,1	143,6	147,3	156,1	164,7	155,6	183,3	190,5	194,2
Sweden	419,5	415	413,3	418,6	420,7	441,9	384,7	261,9	299,6	318,6

Source: Procent osób pracujących mających drugą pracę (2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023). Zbiór danych. Komisja Europejska, Eurostat. Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/lfst_hh2jty/default/table?lang=en.

The more optimistic data are for weekend work. Analyzing the data in Table 3, there is a downward trend for Poland. Employees are paying more and more attention to work-life balance. Employers, in turn, are increasingly trying to create appropriate environments in which employees experience this balance. This is related to the increase in competition between companies, which translates into the need to be innovative. In the face of these challenges, the role of employees is becoming increasingly important. Employees must maintain high performance and contribute to the success of the company (Wolor et al., 2020). To ensure the productivity of employees, companies, in turn, must consistently consider their needs (Larasati, Hasanati, 2019).

Table 3.
Weekend work (%)

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Belgium	22,6	22,5	22,6	22,3	22,3	23	20,3	21,6	bd	21,4
Bulgaria	19,6	20	18,4	20,1	17,9	19	17,8	13,8	bd	9,9
Czech Republic	19,3	19,7	18,7	17,8	16,9	16,5	14	13,4	bd	14,4
Dishes	21,5	20,3	22,4	18,3	16,8	16,6	17,5	17	bd	15,1
Germany	26,6	26,6	26,2	26,2	25,6	25,1	20,1	19,6	bd	18,6
Estonia	22,9	21,6	23,6	22,8	21,9	20,5	19	13,4	bd	11,9
Ireland	32,9	32,3	32,4	33,2	34	32,8	27,4	29,1	bd	28,5
Greece	43,3	44	43,9	43,2	42,5	41,4	40,2	40,3	bd	41,3
Spain	31,5	31,9	31,4	31,5	30,8	31	26,7	29	bd	28,8
France	30,8	30,9	30,7	30,7	30,5	30,9	27,3	29,2	bd	29,3
Croatia	16,6	19,1	17,5	14,9	14	15,2	14	15,8	bd	16,6
Italy	35,5	35,6	35,9	36,5	36	36,1	31,4	34,5	bd	35,2
Cyprus	33,3	33,2	31,2	32,4	31,3	32,5	28,9	26,3	bd	26,7
Latvia	20,4	22,5	23,2	19,5	19,2	19,7	16,4	16,1	bd	16,6
Lithuania	20	18,7	20,2	18,3	17	16,8	15,7	6,9	bd	3,9
Luxembourg	17	18,2	17,4	16,4	17,2	16,5	15,2	12,9	bd	14,3
Hungary	10,3	9,8	10,3	9,3	8,8	8,7	7,5	7,6	bd	7
Malta	29,4	29,3	27,5	26	27	31,6	31	27,7	bd	28,5
Netherlands	31,1	31,4	31,9	32	31,7	31	29,8	18,2	bd	17
Austria	30,5	29,8	29,8	29,2	28,7	28,1	25,1	24,7	bd	24,3
Poland	15,9	15,1	14,2	13,5	12,4	11,7	10,2	9,5	bd	8,5
Portugal	10,5	10	10,4	10,9	10,6	10,7	10,4	20,8	bd	23,8
Romania	33,4	29,2	28,6	28,3	26,9	25,7	22,2	18,3	bd	18,1
Slovenia	23,7	22,1	20,1	20,2	19,4	18,8	17,6	13,6	bd	14,8
Slovakia	24,3	24,5	23,9	22,2	20,9	20,6	16,3	14,1	bd	15,9
Finland	24,9	24,9	25,9	25,3	25,7	24,9	23,8	18,6	bd	17,4
Sweden	17,1	17	16,6	16,1	15,8	16,6	15,7	18,9	bd	20,1

Source: Praca w weekendy (2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023).
Zbiór danych. Komisja Europejska, Eurostat. Retrieved from:
https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/lfsa_qoe_3b3/default/table?lang=en.

2.2. Causes of workaholism

When discussing the causes of workaholism, one should first refer to the three most important theories explaining workaholic behavior - trait theory, learning theory and addiction theory (McMillan et al., 2001). It is worth noting that workaholism is determined by various factors, both individual, organizational and cultural. Understanding these factors is essential for developing effective strategies to prevent it.

When analyzing individual factors that sensitize people to the occurrence of workaholism, it is important to consider personality trait theory. It emphasizes the habitual patterns of behavior, thoughts and emotions underlying workaholism (Jackson et al., 2016). It suggests that workaholism is a characteristic of an individual's personality (Sharma, Sharma, 2011). Workaholics exhibit traits such as obsession, compulsion, perfectionism, achievement orientation, conscientiousness and self-imposed demands to meet the demands of work. Their addictive relationship with work leads them to prioritize work over other aspects of life, potentially harming their physical and mental well-being (Innanen et al., 2014). According to trait theory, workaholism is an individual trait that applies to people from different

communities. It is therefore independent of the workplace and remains relatively constant throughout life (Retowski, 2003).

When analyzing factors on the side of the organization, one should refer to learning theory, which views workaholism as a learned behavior (McMillan et al., 2003). It includes classical conditioning, social learning theory and causal conditioning. Bandura's social learning theory suggests that individuals acquire workaholic behavior by observing and imitating others in their social environment. In contrast, causal conditioning, based on Skinner's theory, indicates that external reinforcements, such as work incentives, can motivate workaholic behavior. Thus, it can be surmised that the most vulnerable group to workaholism are workers with high salaries and professional status, while lacking satisfaction with non-work activities (Retowski, 2003).

When discussing the causes of workaholism, one should also consider the theory of addiction. It depicts workaholism as a form of addiction in which individuals engage in excessive work-related behavior that is difficult to control without external support. It includes medical and psychological addiction models, with the latter emphasizing the perceived benefits that individuals derive from work despite the negative consequences (Merkx, Nawijn, 2021).

It should be noted that workaholism includes factors beyond the individual level that these theories focus on. It takes into account organizational and external influences beyond the individual's control (Adongo, Dayour, Bukari, Akotoye, Amissah, 2024).

2.3. Consequences of workaholism

Authors of studies on workaholism emphasize its negative impact on the well-being, relationships and overall quality of life of individuals, and point out its causes and consequences.

Workaholism can lead to negative changes in both subjective and social functioning. The development of addiction carries the risk of mental as well as physical health disorders. It causes dysfunction in the family system, whose members try in different ways to find their way in the face of the workaholic's disturbed behavior. The consequences of workaholism are also experienced by acquaintances, friends and especially co-workers. The negative impact is then realized through his tendency to exaggerate control, exorbitant demands, subjective treatment of employees and unwillingness to delegate tasks to others (Chrapek, 2014).

Table 4.

Consequences of workaholism

Area	Consequences	Study authors
Family	Conflicts in family relationships. Conflicts in the marriage/partnership relationship. Lack of ability and/or willingness to engage in intimacy. Deprivation of family needs. Problems in the functioning of children of workaholics. Physical absence from family life. Lack of commitment to the family. Lack of or weakened ties with children.	Robinson, 2000; Golińska, 2008, 2010, 2021; Bakker et al., 2008; Maslach, 1986
Work	Deterioration of work quality. Less creativity and innovation. Lack of job satisfaction. Professional burnout. Deterioration of work ralations with co-workers superiors, which may affect the achievement of organizational goals. Deterioration of efficiency and productivity at work. Avoiding participation in work-related social functions. Resistance to working with other employees. Avoiding the delging of tasks carried out by yourself. Disparity between work efficiency and amount of time spent on work.	Schaufeli et al., 2009; Mazzetti et al., 2016; Spence, Robbins, 1992; Kanai, Wakabayashi, 2001; Maslach, 1986; Golińska, 2010, 2011
Private and professional interpersonal relations	Deterioration of relationships at work. Control and lack of trust in colleagues. Deterioration/loss of intrapersonal relationships outside of work. Social isolation. Conflicts on and off the job.	Bakker, Demerouti, Burke, 2009; Golińska, 2010, 2011
Health	Increased exhaustion due to long working hours. Increased stress levels. Professional burnout. Sleep problems, anxiety before sleep, insomnia. Cardiovascular diseases. Negative health effects of co-morbid addiction to workaholism. Death from overwork. Mental problems - panic attacks, depression, anxiety, anger, anhedonia.	Schaufeli et al., 2009; Salanova et al., 2016; Spagnoli et al., 2018; Andreassen et al., 2011; Kanai, Wakabayaschi, 2001; Killinger, 2007; Spence, Robins, 1992; Golińska, 2010, 2011
Personal	Low satisfaction with life. Insecurity. Deterioration of sense of well-being. Development of addiction.	Taris, Schaufeli, Verhoeven, 2005; Killinger, 2007; Golińska, 2010, 2011

Source: own compilation based on: Golińska, 2011, pp. 17-18; Borkowska, 2010, pp. 5-44. Bakker, Demerouti, Burke, 2009, pp. 23-33; Maslach, 1986, pp. 53-75; Mazzetti, Biolcati, Guglielmi, Vallesi, Schaufeli, 2016, pp. 567-587; Schaufeli, Bakker, Van der Heijden, Prins, 2009, pp. 249-272; Taris, Schaufeli, Verhoeven, 2005, pp. 37-60; Salanova, Lopez-Gonzalez, Llorens, del Líbano, Vicente-Herrero, Tomas-Salv´a, 2016, pp. 228-242.

In conclusion, it is worth noting that the phenomenon of workaholism poses a threat to maintaining work-life balance. A conflict arises regarding the time spent on work and non-work commitments, and because work time is a very important factor in reconciling work and private life, this conflict can contribute to imbalances between these spheres (Szydlik-Leszczyńska, 2017).

3. The role of organizations in countering workaholism among employees

3.1. Diagnosis and recognition of workaholism in the organization

There are many tools for diagnosing workaholism that accentuate its various dimensions. A well-known and widely used scale is the Questionnaire for Measuring Work Addiction Risk Test (WART), by Robinson and Philips (1995). The author of the scale distinguishes between 5 symptoms of workaholism (after Wojdyło, 2005):

- work overload,
- control/perfectionism,
- employment,
- neglect of close relationships,
- self-esteem.

A great deal of research has been conducted using this tool, primarily on the effects of workaholism, but it is worth adding that the method also has its opponents. Among the methods widespread in many countries, one should mention the Work-BAT (Workaholism Battery), whose authors are Spence and Robbins (1992). The questionnaire consists of scales examining feelings of work compulsion, job satisfaction and preoccupation with work. Another well-known tool for measuring workaholism is the Scales of Workaholism as Behavioral Tendencies (Mudrack, Naughton, 2001). The authors start from the premise that workaholism is a behavioral tendency, manifested by unrequired activity and excessive control of people's activities. In contrast, the DUWAS (Dutch Work Addition Scale), developed by Schaufeli and colleagues, emphasizes two dimensions of workaholism - excessive work and compulsive work.

Various attempts to adapt scales for studying workaholism can be found in Polish studies: Work- BAT - Golińska, 2014; WART – Wojdyło, 2005, 2010. It is also worth noting the Scale of Work Absorption (SZAP) by Golinska (2005).

The above questionnaires are used to study workaholism, but it is not always possible to use them in an organization. Therefore, it is important to know how to recognize workaholism. It is worth recalling that it is a heterogeneous phenomenon, and thus multidimensional, which can introduce uncertainty in assessing worrying symptoms. When assessing the symptoms of workaholism, it is worth addressing three perspectives: workaholic functioning, behavior, and emotional experience (Hu, 2018). The most easily discernible signs of workaholism are behavioral aspects. Behaviors such as increasing work hours, working during the weekend, limiting time for other activities outside of work, performing tasks beyond the organization's expectations, and doing work despite the lack of difficulty in meeting economic needs should draw the attention of managers. Referring to the cognitive aspect, it is worth noting, among other things, the compulsion to work, which is a symptom of addiction. A workaholic feels a constant, internal need to do work, unrelated to external demands (Spence, Robbins, 1992).

In addition to this symptom, constant thinking about work, and the inability to absitively, i.e. stop working, are often mentioned. Emotional components include positive emotions and moods related to work (joy, happiness, satisfaction) and negative ones when work is stopped (sadness, frustration, anger). It is noteworthy, however, that in some accounts of workaholism, the emotional component is overlooked (Malinowska et al., 2015).

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that the diagnosis of workaholism should be handled by a qualified person. However, the observation of certain disturbing symptoms should draw the attention of management and be the basis for taking an interest in the employee's situation.

3.2. The role of HR in preventing workaholism, including education and training for managers

As mentioned earlier, workaholism is a phenomenon that causes many negative consequences, such as psychological problems (psychosomatic complaints, affective disorders, anxiety disorders), problems in interpersonal relations and family problems. It is worth noting that the consequences of workaholism affect not only the person affected, but also those around him. An important issue in the concept of pro-coholism is the negative effects on oragnization. While in the case of the workaholic himself and his family the phenomenon of workaholism has a negative impact, in the case of organizations the problem is more complex due to the organizational climate conducive to workaholism that prevails in many companies. This is why the measures taken by organizations that can influence the occurrence of this phenomenon in enterprises are so important.

An important role in reducing the risk of workaholism and its negative consequences is the ways in which supervisors motivate employees. Excessive control, motivation by fear promotes the development of this addiction and its negative consequences (Schulz, 2017). Therefore, being attentive to the needs of employees, but also treating them subjectively and acccpeting certain imperfections can counteract the negative consequences of this phenomenon.

There are three main job demands that can affect workaholics: 1) role overload, referring to the multiplicity of work roles, resulting in a lack of time to perform related tasks, 2) role ambiguity, referring to the responsibilities assigned to the role, and 3) conflict at work, caused by the employee's inadequacy and pressure at work (Hu, 2018). The results of research published in the report "Professional work of Poles and satisfaction with it" (2023) show the dependence of the role performed and the amount of time spent on work. On average, people in leadership roles at work, responsible for the work of others, or in charge of projects spend significantly more time on paid work than those who do not perform such tasks (an average of 44.2 hours per week versus 41.1 hours). Clear differences can also be seen when we compare the declarations of the two groups of respondents in relevant time frames. The majority (56%) of those not involved in managerial tasks declare that paid work takes them an average of 40 hours a week, which is the standard norm for full-time work, and only one in four of this group (25%) generally work longer hours. Among respondents in managerial roles, responsible

for the work of others or managing projects, nearly two-fifths (37%) work more than 40 hours a week, and those declaring a 40-hour workweek make up just over two-fifths (44%) among them.

In view of the above, organizational support relating to work planning and transparency of tasks and responsibilities assigned to specific oragnization roles becomes important. Shaef and Fassel (1988, after Gilliss, 1993), on the other hand, recommend organizing management training that would relate to identifying the problem in employees and creating a favorable working environment. Also important is organizational culture, which plays a large role in promoting and reinforcing workaholism (Keller et al., 2016). A competitive work atmosphere, pressure, fear of failure and task orientation can promote workaholism. In contrast, a supportive work environment that pays attention to the employee's workload, shows respect for the employee's private life, and introduces stress-reducing solutions and teaches ways to cope with stress can influence employee satisfaction (while also benefiting the organization) and not eliminate the causes of workaholism (Szydlik-Leszczyńska, 2017).

Guerreschi (2005), on the other hand, indicates that outreach efforts should also involve schoolchildren. This would result, according to the author, in reducing the transmission of addiction to the next generation and prevent other mental health problems, such as other behavioral and substance addictions, mood and anxiety disorders.

4. Summary

New phenomena peculiar to the times we live in, such as globalization, socio-economic crisis, can generate pressure on employees and organizational management. Work ethic and organizational culture encourage work and indirectly work dependence. Support from family and friends, maintaining a balance between family and work life, and setting priorities can reduce the degree of work dependency. Moreover, effective organizational management can minimize the risk of addiction and help increase productivity and quality of work. Modern organizations are facing new challenges that management must deal with accordingly. In view of the above, human resource management should pay attention:

1. Introduce changes in work organization, which should take into account: working time for individual employees, defining professional roles, appropriate organization of own work.
2. Promoting health-oriented attitudes by emphasizing the importance of maintaining a work-life balance.
3. Promoting and creating conditions for teamwork.
4. Training managers to recognize the symptoms of work addiction.

5. Education of executives in terms of understanding the phenomenon of workaholism and the negative consequences for the organization.

6. Creating a work environment conducive to physical and mental health.

7. Individualized help for work addiction.

The above catalog of activities certainly does not exhaust the possibilities of organizations to counteract workaholism. Undoubtedly, it is worth paying attention to the system of work in organizations that can strengthen and perpetuate the described phenomenon.

References

1. Adongo, C.A., Dayour, F., Bukari, S., Akotoye, E.A., Amissah, E.F. (2024). Workaholism among young people in the ride-hailing travel economy. *Annals of Tourism Research Empirical Insights*, *Vol. 5, Iss. 1, 100117*. Retrieved from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666957923000320.

2. Andreassen, C.S., Hetland, J., Molde, H., Pallesen, S. (2011). Workaholism and potential outcomes in wellbeing and health in a cross-occupational sample. *Stress Health, Vol. 27(3),* pp. 209–214. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/smi.1366.

3. Atroszko, P. (2010). Uzależnienie od pracy – wynik „słabej woli" czy potrzeba doskonałości?. *Studia Psychologica*, *Vol. 10*, pp. 179-201.

4. Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., Burke, R. (2009). Workaholism and relationship quality: A spillover–crossover perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *Vol. 14(1),* pp. 23-33. doi: 10.1037/a0013290.

5. Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., Dollard, M.F. (2008). How job demands affect partners' experience ofexhaustion: integrating work–family conflict and crossover theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 93*(4), pp. 901-911. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.901.

6. Borkowska, S. (2010). Równowaga między pracą a życiem pozazawodowym. *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis, Folia Oeconomica, Vol. 240*, pp. 5-44. Retrieved from: http://hdl.handle.net/11089/434.

7. Burke, R.J. (1999). Workaholism in organizations: Gender differences. *Sex Roles*, *Vol. 41(5/6),* pp. 333-345. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018818731922.

8. Burke, R.J., Matthiesen, S.B. (2004). Workaholism among Norwegian joumalists: Antecedents and conseąuences. *Stress and Health, Vol. 20*, pp. 301-308. doi:10.1002/smi.1025.

9. Chrapek, E. (2014). Charakterystyka konsekwencji uzaleznienia od pracy z uwzględnieniem perspektywy indywidualnej oraz społecznej. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Częstochowskiej Zarządzanie, Vol. 15,* pp. 57-64. Retrieved from: http://www.zim.pcz.pl/znwz.

10. 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, Vol. 42(7),* pp. 1836-1873. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314522301.

11. *Długie godziny pracy w głównej pracy* (2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023). Zbiór danych. Komisja Europejska, Eurostat. Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/lfsa_qoe_3a2/default/table?lang=en

12. Gilliss, B.E.EdD. (1993). Organizations of the Future: An Analysis of Current Literature and a New Model. *Dissertations, 582*. Retrieved from: https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/582.

13. Golińska, L. (2011). *Pracoholik a pracoholik entuzjastyczny – dwa światy?* Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, pp. 17-18.

14. Golińska, L. (2005). Skala do badania zaabsorbowania pracą (SZAP). *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Psychologica, Vol.* 9, pp. 17-29. Retrieved from: https://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.hdl_11089_3932

15. Golińska, L. (2008). *Pracoholizm, uzależnienie czy pasja.* Warszawa: Difin, pp. 10, 54-67.

16. Golińska, L. (2010). Pracoholizm – istota, konsekwencje i uwarunkowania. *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Psychologica*, *Vol. 14*, pp. 97-107. https://doi.org/10.18778/1427-969X.14.07.

17. Golińska, L. (2011). Pracoholizm, stres a zdrowie. In: B. Dudek (ed.), *Społeczne, psychologiczne i zdrowotne skutki pracoholizmu.* Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, pp. 47-72.

18. Golińska, L. (2014). *Pracoholizm inaczej.* Warszawa: Difin.

19. Guerreschi, C. (2005). *Nowe uzależnienia.* Kraków: Salwator, p. 147.

20. Hu, L. (2018). A Review of Workaholism and Prospects. *Open Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 6*, pp. 318-334. https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2018.611024

21. Innanen, H., Tolvanen, A., Salmela-Aro, K. (2014). Burnout, work engagement and workaholism among highly educated employees: Profiles, antecedents and outcomes. *Burnout Research, Vol. 1(1),* pp. 38-49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2014.04.001

22. Jackson, S.S., Fung, M.C., Moore, M.A. C., Jackson, C.J. (2016). Personality and workaholism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *Vol. 95,* pp. 114-120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.02.020

23. Kanai, A., Wakabayashi, M. (2001). Workaholism among Japanese Blue – Collar employees. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *Vol. 8(2)*), pp. 129-164. doi: 10.1023/A:1009529314121

24. Keller, A.C., Spurk, D., Baumeler, F., Hirschi, A. (2016). Competitive Climate and Workaholism: Negative Sides of Future Orientation and Calling. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *Vol. 96*, pp. 122-126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.02.061

25. Killinger, B. (2007). *Pracoholicy. Szkoła przetrwania.* Poznań: Dom Wydawniczy Rebis.

26. Komunikat z badań Praca zarobkowa Polaków i zadowolenie z niej. Centrum Badania Opinii Społecznej, nr 152/2023.

27. Larasati, D.P., Hasanati, N. (2019). The effects of work-life balance towards employee engagement in millennial generation. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR), Vol. 304*, pp. 390-394. https://doi.org/10.2991/acpch-18.2019.93

28. Malinowska, D., Staszczyk, S., Tokarz, A. (2015). Pracoholizm – wskazania dotyczące diagnozy oraz przegląd działań interwencyjnych. *Medycyna Pracy, Vol. 66(1),* pp. 71-83. doi: 10.13075/mp.5893.00046

29. Maslach, Ch. (1986). Stress, Burnout and Workaholism. In: R. Kilburg, P. Nathan, R. Thoreson (Eds.), *Professionals in Distress: Issues, Syndroms and Solutions in Psychology* (pp. 53-75). Washington: American Psychological Assotiation.

30. Mazzetti, G., Biolcati, R., Guglielmi, D., Vallesi, C., Schaufeli, W.B. (2016). Individual characteristics influencing physicians' perceptions of job demands and control: The role of affectivity, work engagement and workaholism. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, Vol. 13*, pp. 567-587. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13060567

31. McMillan, L.H., O'Driscoll, M., Marsh, N.V., Brady, E.C. (2001). Understanding Workaholism: Data Synthesis, Theoretical Critique, and Future Design Strategies. *International Journal of Stress Management, Vol. 8(2),* pp. 69-91. doi: 10.1023/A:1009573129142

32. McMillan, L.H., O'Driscoll, M., Burke, R.J. (2003). Workaholism: A Review of Theory, Research, and Future Directions. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 18*, pp. 167-189. doi: 10.1002/0470013346.ch5

33. Merkx, C., Nawijn, J. (2021). Virtual reality tourism experiences: Addiction and isolation. *Tourism Management, Vol. 87*. doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2021.104394

34. Mieścicka, L. (2002). *Pracoholizm*. Warszawa: Instytut Psychologii Zdrowia, pp. 20-40.

35. Mudrack, P.E., 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, http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1009525213213

36. OECD (2020). How's life? 2020: Measuring well-being, Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from: https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2020/03/how-s-life-2020_b547d82c/9870c393-en.pdf

37. Ogińska-Bulik, N. (2010). *Uzależnienie od czynności. Mit czy rzeczywistość?* Warszawa: Difin, p. 35.

38. Paluchowski, W.J., Hornowska, E. (2021). *O pojęciu pracoholizmu.* Poznań: Rys, pp. 8, 15-16. doi: 10.48226/978-83-66666-54-2

39. Poelmans, S., Buelens, M. (2004). Enriching the Spence and Robbins' typology of workaholism. Demographic, motivational and organizational correlates. *Journal of*

Organizational Change Management, Vol. 17(5), pp. 440-458. doi: 10.1108/09534810410554470.

40. *Praca w weekendy* (2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023). Zbiór danych. Komisja Europejska, Eurostat. Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/lfsa_qoe_3b3/default/table?lang=en

41. *Procent osób pracujących mających drugą pracę* (2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023). Zbiór danych. Komisja Europejska, Eurostat. Retrieved from: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/lfst_hh2jty/default/table?lang=en

42. Raport 2023, Uzależnienia w Polsce (2023). Warszawa: Krajowe Centrum Przeciwdziałania Uzależnieniom, pp. 29-32. Retrieved from: https://kcpu.gov.pl/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Raport-2023-wersja-Internetowa.pdf

43. Retowski, S. (2003). Pracoholizm – próba teoretycznego zdefiniowania zjawiska. In: B. Wojciszke, M. Plopa (Eds.), *Osobowość a procesy psychiczne i zachowania.* Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls, pp. 334-335.

44. Robinson, B.E. (1998).The workaholic family: a clinical perspective, *American Journal Family Therapy*, Vol. 26(1), pp. 65-75. https://doi.org/10.1080/01926189808251087

45. Robinson, B.E. (2000). A Typology of Workaholics With Implications for Counselors. *Journal of Addictions & Offender Counseling, Vol. 21*, pp. 34-48. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1874.2000.tb00150.x

46. Salanova, M., Lopez-Gonzalez, A.A., Llorens, S., del Líbano, M., Vicente-Herrero, M.T., Tomas-Salv´a, M. (2016). Your work may be killing you! Workaholism, sleep problems and cardiovascular risk. *Work Stress, Vol. 30(3),* pp. 228-242. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2016.1203373

47. Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B., Van der Heijden, F., Prins, J.T. (2009). Workaholism among medical residents: It is the combination of working excessively and compulsively that counts. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *Vol. 16(4),* pp. 249-272. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017537

48. Schaufeli, W.B., Shimazu, A., 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(4),* pp. 320-348. doi.org/10.1177/ 1069397109337239

49. Schulz, A. (2017). Pracoholizm – znamieniem współczesności? *Zeszyty Naukowe PWSZ w Płocku, Nauki Ekonomiczne, t. 26,* pp. 417-434. doi: 10.19251/ne/2017.26(28)

50. Sharma, J., Sharma, P. (2011). Workaholism and its correlates: A study of academicians. *International Journal of Management and Business Research, Vol. 1(3),* pp. 151-160.

51. Spagnoli, P., Balducci, C., Kovalchuk, L.S., Maiorano, F., Buono, C. (2018). Are engaged workaholics protected against job-related negative affect and anxiety before sleep? A study of the moderating role of gender. *International Journal Research and Public Health, Vol. 15(9)*. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15091996

52. Spence, J.T., Robbins, A.S. (1992). Workaholism: Definition, measurement, and preliminary results. *Journal of Personality Assessment, Vol. 58*, pp. 160-178. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5801_15

53. Szydlik-Leszczyńska, A. (2017). Zagrożenia dla równowagi życie zawodowe a prywatne w kontekście wymagań stawianych współczesnym pracownikom. *Roczniki Ekonomii i Zarządzania, t. 9(45), Vol. 7,* pp. 77-88. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.18290/reiz.2017.9.3-6

54. Taris, T.W., Geurts, S.A.E., Schaufeli, W.B., Blonk, R.W.B., Lagerveld, S.E. (2008). All day and all of the night: The relative contribution of two dimensions of workaholism to well-beingin self-employed workers. *Work & Stress, Vol. 22*, pp. 153-165.

55. Taris, T.W., Schaufeli, W.B., Verhoeven, L.C. (2005). Workaholism in the Netherlands: Measurement and implications for job strain and non-work conflict. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 54*, pp. 37-60. Retrieved from: http://www.mpopa.ro/statistica master/workaholism fact an.pdf

56. Wojdyło, K. (2005). Kwestionariusz Pracoholizmu (WART) – adaptacja narzędzia i wstępna analiza własności psychometrycznych. *Nowiny Psychologiczne, Vol. 4,* pp. 71-84.

57. Wojdyło, K. (2007). Koncepcja osobowościowych wyznaczników pracoholizmu. Weryfikacja hipotez w korelacyjnym modelu. *Studia Psychologiczne, Vol. 45*, pp. 53-67.

58. Wojdyło, K., Buczny, J. (2010). Kwestionariusz do pomiaru pracoholizmu: WART-R. Analiza trafności teoretycznej i rzetelności narzędzia. *Studia Psychologiczne, Vol. 49*, pp. 67-80.

59. Wolor, C.W., Kurnianti, D., Zahra, S.F., Martono, S. (2020). The Importance of work-life balance on employee performance milennial generation in Indonesia. *Journal of Critical Reviews, Vol. 7(9),* pp. 1103-1109. doi: 10.31838/jcr.07.09.203