**ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this research is to compare the workaholism level of managers and non-managers. N= 283 employees working in several sectors participated in the research. 85 participants reported that they hold a managerial position in the organization, whereas 194 employees reported that they did not have a managerial position in the organization, and 4 participants didn’t report their position in the organization. Workaholism was measured by the Turkish version (Doğan & Tel, 2010) of DUWAS workaholism scale developed by Schaufeli, Taris, and Bakker (2009). In order to compare the workaholism levels of the participants, the Independent Samples T Test and Hedges’ g Test were performed. Both the T Test and Hedges’ g Test findings indicated that employees who have a managerial position have higher workaholism level than those who do not. Also managers working in the private sector scored higher in workaholism than the managers who work in public organizations. Working hours per week were found to be higher in private sector. Results were discussed and suggestions were made for further research.
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**ÖZ**

Bu çalışmanın amacı yönetici ve yönetici olmayan çalışanların işkoliklik seviyelerinin karşılaştırılmasıdır. Çeşitli sektörlerden n= 383 çalışan araştırmaya katılmıştır. 85 katılımcı örgüt yöneticisi, ancak 194 çalışan örgüt yöneticisi pozisyonu sahibi olduğu belirtmiştir ve 4 çalışan örgüt pozisyonu belirtmemiştir. İşkoliklik seviyelerinin karşılaştırılması için Başlangıç Örneklemeler T Testi ve Hedge g Testi uygulanmıştır. Çalışmanın sonuçları, yönetici olmayan çalışanların işkoliklik düzeylerini, yöneticinin ve örgüt pozisyonu sahip çalışanların işkoliklik düzeylerini, örgüt pozisyonu sahip çalışanların işkoliklik düzeylerini, aydınlamak amacıyla-helper Çalışmadan yöneticiler, kamu sektöründe çalışan yöneticilere göre daha yüksek işkoliklik skoru almıştır. Özellikle sektörde hafıza çalışma saati daha yüksek bulunmuştur. Bulgular tartışılması ve gelecek araştırmaların önerilerinde bulunulmuştur.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of workaholism that was introduced in the 1970s (Oates, 1971) has begun to be studied extensively in various areas of psychology and management, especially after 2000. In this direction, a large number of studies have been carried out for the measurement, causes, results, treatment, and conceptual development of workaholism (Andreassen, 2014). Today, although some researchers claim that workaholism might have positive results (Machlowitz, 1979; Spence & Robbins, 1992), in previous research it was found that workaholism have been mainly adversely related to work and social life related outcomes (Andreassen, Pallesen, & Torsheim, 2018; Andreassen, Ursin, & Eriksen, 2007; Shimazu & Schaufeli, 2009). Recently the amount of research on analyzing the differences in workaholism is increasing, depending on factors such as gender (Bardakçı, & Baloğlu, 2012), personality (Mudrack, 2004), culture (Schaufeli, Shimazu, & Taris, 2009), region, and occupations. However, there are not enough studies to be able to understand deeply which employees tend to be more workaholics, especially in the organizational hierarchy. The studies carried out in the Turkey sample mainly focused on relationships of workaholism with work or organization related attitudes (Bulgurcu Gürel & Altunoğlu, 2016; Naktiyok & Karabey, 2005; Özsøy, Filiz & Semiz, 2013). However, both internationally and nationally, the number of studies examined workaholism in the context of organizational hierarchy, managerial (Bardakçı & Baloğlu, 2012), or leadership positions (Clark et al., 2016) are still limited. With this reason, in the current study, it is aimed to compare the levels of workaholism of employees who have managerial positions and who do not have managerial positions in organizations. Thus, it is aimed to make an indirect inference about the workaholism tendencies of managers.

In the scope of the study, firstly the conceptual framework of workaholism is briefly discussed. Then the research background, theoretical and empirical grounds of hypothesis are discussed. Finally, data collection details, analyses and findings are shared, the findings are discussed and some future research directions are recommended.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Workaholism

Workaholism is a concept that has originated from the concept of alcoholism. In 1971 Oates defined workaholism as "an uncontrollable need for working" Although there has been a large increase in the number of studies on workaholism over the past 50 years, there is no consensus on the definition of workaholism yet (Sussman, 2012). One of the main reasons for
this is the different approaches regarding the concept, because some researchers approach workaholism positively (the numbers are much less) and others approach it negatively (majority). Based on the first inspiration of the concept (i.e., alcoholism), first definitions (emphasis on compulsiveness), direction of present empirical findings (predominantly negative), it can be argued that workaholism is essentially is a negative concept.

Lately, there has been an increasing tendency to explain and understand the concept based on the starting point (i.e., alcoholism) of workaholism. At this point, attempts have been made to explain and measure the concept based mainly on the concept of addiction. This suggests that workaholism shows a large conceptual overlap with addiction to work. However, for better understanding of workaholism, it is necessary to explain it through the basic characteristics of workaholics that are widely emphasized in the literature. According to this, the prominent features of workaholism are as follows (Bakker et al., 2012; Burke, 2000; Machlowitz, 1980; Scott, Moore, & Miceli, 1997; Snir & Zohar, 2008):

**Working excessively:** Spending a lot of time on work-related activities (not only in terms of weekly average working hours but also including the off-hours) is one of the main characteristics of workaholics (Schaufeli, Taris, & Bakker, 2008). But working hard is already an expectation that is supported by many cultures and organizations. Therefore, at first sight, working hard is not perceived as a negative feature. For instance, engaged employees are also working harder than average employees (Salanova, Agut, & Peiro, 2005). However, there are critical differences between workaholics and engaged employees. One of the most important differences between them is the reason for working excessively. Because workaholics tend to not be comfortable when they cannot work, they can show themselves only by working because they tend to feel they are worthless if they are not working excessively. Therefore, if a person works overtime because of those reasons, it is unexpected that it mainly leads to the desired results in terms of both individuals and organizations. On the other hand, engaged employees also work hard, but the main reason for their hard work stems mostly from internal motivation. That is, they enjoy while working and they have a positive attitude towards the job, working environment and the organization itself. That approach helps them work enthusiastically instead of compulsively. But it is not possible to say the same thing for the workaholics (Gorgievski, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2010; Schaufeli, Taris, & Bakker, 2006; Schaufeli, Taris, & van Rhenen, 2008; Shimazu et al., 2015).

**Working Compulsively:** One of the most prominent features of workaholics is the tendency to work obsessively and uncontrollably. These people are constantly thinking about work as if they were born only to work. This partially pathological situation makes it harder for
them to control their energy and time for the other parts of the life (Schaufeli, Taris, & Bakker, 2008).

Making an effort more than expected: Workaholics spend more time and energy than is expected (Andreassen, 2013). For example, even if they don’t have extra pay, they tend to stay in the workplace after-hours. Even if it is not necessary to keep working they still tend to work on vocations or in leisure time. However, the effort made is not always linearly related to performance improvement in all conditions.

Enduring work even in low productivity: Even if the health of workaholics is adversely affected, they tend to continue to work compulsively. They tend to not prefer productivity by little but qualified work, instead they tend to be perceived constantly busy even if it is inefficient. As such, although they are inefficient, they still continue to work due to the uncontrollable need for work.

2.2. Antecedents of Workaholism

There are many factors that affect workaholism. These can be categorized into social, organizational, and individual factors (Snir & Harpaz, 2004). Within the context of social factors, factors such as the modern industrial society, and competitive world order created by the current dominant economic system are included. Organizational factors can be listed as factors such as competitive working environment, decreasing number of new positions in organizations, extreme working hours, fast pace working environments, challenging promotion criterias, and increasing fear of losing jobs in organizations. Individual factors include personality (Burke, Matthiesen, & Pallesen, 2006), unsatisfied needs (Andreassen Hetland, & Pallesen 2010), a person's background, age, gender, and all of the other factors that create diversity for an individual (Taris, van Beek, & Schaufeli, 2012). However, the most important issue on individual factors could be considered as personality. It can be claimed that desire to obtain power, the tendency of being a perfectionist and ambitious (Liang & Chu, 2009) are the traits that might effects an individual to be addicted to work. Theoretically these traits are closely related to the Type A behavioral pattern. People with a Type A personality are competitive, punctual, power-driven and desire to achieve success. These traits might also trigger workaholism.

2.3. Consequences of Workaholism

One of the most important reasons for the positive and negative perception of workaholism in the literature is that the consequences of workaholism are still uncertain. However, when empirical findings regarding workaholism are examined, it can be said that
workaholism is mainly adversely related to many attitudes towards work, organization and social life in many national and international studies. According to this, workaholism was related adversely with; job satisfaction (Schaufeli et al., 2009; Shimazu & Schaufeli, 2009), burnout (2012; Jenaabadi et al., 2016; Naktiyok & Karabey, 2005; van Beek et al., 2012), life satisfaction (Andreassen et al., 2011; Aziz & Zickar, 2006)\(^2\), work family-family work conflict (Bakker, Demerouti & Burke, 2009; Clark et al., 2014; Molino, Bakker & Ghislieri, 2015), happiness (del Libano et al., 2010), and stress (Aziz, Wuensch & Brandon, 2010; Bulgurcu Gürel & Altunoğlu, 2016; Kanai, Wakabayashi & Fling, 1996; Özsoy, 2018; Shariat et al., 2012; Srivastava, 2012). One of the other reasons for the uncertainty and inconsistency in the results of workaholism research might depend on the scale that workaholism is measured. Duwas (the Dutch Work Addiction Scale) (Schaufeli, Shimazu, & Taris, 2009) has two dimensions and these are working excessively and working compulsively. When the empirical findings are examined, it shows that these dimensions are usually either adversely related to attitudes towards both work and social life or not significantly related. However when measuring workaholism with for example WorkBat (Spence & Robbins, 1992) which has three dimensions (enjoyment of work, drive, and work involvement). The findings of work enjoyment dimension are not always coherent with the other two dimensions (e.g., Andreassen et al., 2011; Aziz & Zickar, 2006; Burke, 2000).

3. RESEARCH BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Within the scope of the antecedents of workaholism, various research on individual differences (gender differences; Spence & Robbins, 1992; personality differences; Fayyazi et al., 2013), different cultures (Kanai & Wakabayashi, 2001), and occupational differences (Taris, van Beek, & Schaufeli, 2012) have been carried. However, in particular, there has been limited research on examining the managers’ workaholism tendencies (Andreassen et al., 2012; Taris, van Beek, & Schaufeli, 2012). In this respect, it is expected that in order to better understand how workaholism differs within the organizational structure, it is expected that comparing the workaholism levels of employees who do not have a managerial position and who have a managerial position will contribute to workaholism research.

Employees with managerial positions in organizations are expected to have higher workloads, work demands, and responsibilities in many dimensions than those who do not have

\(^2\) Except for enjoyment of work dimension for both research
managers have a number of areas of responsibility such as (Cieślińska, 2007; Reh, 2018; Koçel, 2003):

- Managing employees who are in their span of control,
- Need for accurate and fast decision making,
- Keeping the conflicts in the organization at an effective level,
- Analyzing the environment and the industry in a systematic and continuous manner to ensure competitive advantage,
- Effective communication among and outside the organization.

Due to the content of their job responsibilities, supervisors, managers, or leaders might have to work longer hours, take work home, spend their leisure time for coordination issues and so on. For both managers and business owners, these possible additional efforts might affect becoming a workaholic. As a matter of fact, this may lead to an increase in the stress level and working hours (in total) and decrease in allocating time work for social life and family of the employees working in a managerial position. In this case, managers might tend to be more inclined to become a workaholic. With this reason, it is expected that the level of workaholism of the employees with managerial positions in the organizations is higher than the employees with non-managerial positions. Supporting this expectation in previous research managers found to be more workaholics (Taris, van Beek, & Schaufeli, 2012). Therefore depending on the theoretical and empirical background, the hypothesis formed in the light of this expectation is as follows;

**Hypothesis:** The level of workaholism in managers is higher than non-managers.

4. METHODS

4.1. Procedure and Data Collection

Employees working in both several public and private organizations in Sakarya province (Turkey) were targeted for the research. In this direction, 315 questionnaire forms were distributed to employees (paper-pencil method). 295 questionnaire forms were obtained and among them 12 questionnaire forms were excluded due to the lack of attention and some critical missing parts. Therefore 283 valid questionnaire forms were used for the analysis.
4.2. Measures

4.2.1. Duwas Workaholism Scale

In order to measure workaholism, The Turkish version (Duwas-Tr) (Doğan & Tel, 2010) of the Duwas workaholism scale (the Dutch Work Addiction Scale) developed by Schaufeli, Shimazu, & Taris, (2009) was used. The scale has two dimensions (i.e., working excessively and working compulsively). In the adaptation study Doğan and Tel (2010) omitted 3 items from the scale. Therefore, the Turkish version of Duwas has 14 items with two dimensions [(i.e., working excessively (8 items) and working compulsively (6 items)]. The scale was used on a five point Likert type (i.e., 1-totally disagree, 5-totally agree). Validation findings for Duwas-Tr for this research is shared below (see, Table 1 and Figure 1).

4.3. Findings

CFA (Confirmatory factor Analysis) findings (Fit Indexes; Table 1; Factor Loadings Figure 1), demographic characteristics (Table 2), descriptive statistics (Table 3), internal consistency findings (Cronbach’s Alpha) (Table 3), and findings for examining the differences in workaholism between managers and non-managers are presented (Independent Samples T Test and Hedge’ g Test; Table 4).

Table 1: Fit Indexes for Duwas-Tr

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>χ²/df</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>196.39/76 = 2.58</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CFA was used to test the factor structure of DUWAS Turkish form (Duwas-Tr). Two-factor model (see Doğan & Tel, 2010) fit the data well for Duwas-Tr; χ² = 196.39, p < .001, χ²/df = 2.58, GFI (Goodness of Fit Index) = 0.91, AGFI (Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index) = 0.88, TLI (Tucker–Lewis index) = 0.84, CFI (comparative fit index) = 0.87, RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation) = 0.07 (see Table 1). These findings supported to factorial validity of Duwas-Tr.
Table 2: Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>High School and Less</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master and Ph.D</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is seen in Table 1, 54.1% of the participants are women, 58% are married, 60.4% are private sector employees, and the majority of (47.3%) the participants hold a bachelor’s degree. More details are shared in Table 2.
Factor loadings (in terms of standardized regression weights) ranged from .44 to .72 for Duwas-Tr. These findings also supported to factorial validity of Duwas-Tr (see Figure 1).

**Figure 1**: Standardized Regression Weights for Duwas-Tr
Table 3: Descriptive Statistics, Internal Consistency Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workaholism Total Score</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Excessively</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Compulsively</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>34.02</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Hours Per Week</td>
<td>43.88</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (monthly as TL)</td>
<td>3695</td>
<td>1665.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SD = Standard Deviation, α = Cronbach’s α,

As can be seen in Table 3, the workaholism level of the participants is moderate, the average age of participants is 34.02, the average working hours per week is 43.88 and monthly income is 3695 TL [with the current (November, 2018) exchange rate it is approximately 694 USD]. As for the internal consistency score (in terms of Cronbach’s Alpha) all the scales achieved an acceptable score with the minimum value of 0.76 for working compulsively dimension. Thus it can be stated that Duwas is a reliable scale.

Table 4: Independent Samples T Test and Hedge’s g Test Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Hedge’g²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workaholism Total Score</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>5.46***</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Manager</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Excessively</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.27**</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Manager</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Compulsively</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>4.64***</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Manager</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekly Working Time</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47.16</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>2.30*</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Manager</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>43.03</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workaholism Total Score</td>
<td>Manager in Public S.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2.28*</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager in Private S.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Excessively</td>
<td>Manager in Public S.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.93*</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager in Private S.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Compulsively</td>
<td>Manager in Public S.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager in Private S.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekly Working Time</td>
<td>Manager in Public S.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42.19</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>-1.77*</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager in Private S.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48.57</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workaholism Total Score</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Excessively</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Compulsively</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 368. SD = Standard Deviation, S= Sector, α = Cronbach’s α, * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

As explained earlier in the manuscript, workaholism was measured by Duwas which has two dimensions and also it is possible to calculate its total score (i.e., workaholism global).

---

1 In addition to the independent samples T test which was applied to examine the differences, Hedges’ g test was also applied. The main reason for this is, Hedges’ g test provides efficient results when there are significant differences in sample sizes in groups that are compared. For example, the Hedges’ g test, which compares the difference between the two groups calculates an effect size that shows how strong the difference is. Therefore it is an important alternative because there are significant differences in sample size between the two compared groups (n=95 for managers vs n=194 for non-manager). Because at Hedges’ g test, the pooled standard deviation value is considered as standard deviation value and it minimizes the miscalculation of sample size differences.
For this reason, the independent samples T test conducted for a) the total score of the Duwas scale, b) the working excessively dimension c) the working compulsively dimension.

According to the independent samples T test findings, managers were found to have a higher level of workaholism (in terms of both total score and each of the sub-dimensions). This finding supported the research hypothesis. Moreover, in the Hedges' $g$ test, which comparing to the independent samples T test reduces the deviations due to sample size differences, the effect size (Hedges' $g = 0.69$) on the difference of workaholism levels between the managers and the non-managers was found to be highly strong. This finding also supported the research hypothesis.

In addition, managers are categorized as a) managers working in the public sector, b) managers working in the private sector, and the levels of workaholism in the private sector were found to be higher than in the public sector. Similarly, the Hedges' $g$ effect size is calculated as -0.23. In other words, the workaholism level of managers in the public sector was found to be lower than the level of workaholism of managers in the private sector. However, the degree of the effect was weak.

Lastly, analyses to test the differences were conducted for the variables, such as gender and sector. According to the T test findings, no significant findings were obtained in the workaholism scores (without considering any categories in terms of managerial positions) of gender and sector types. However, according to Hedges' $g$ score, with a low effect size, workaholism in the private sector was found to be higher than in the public sector.

5. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

In this section, firstly the findings of the research are summarized. Findings are interpreted both theoretically and empirically. Then the limitations of the research and future research suggestions are included. Finally, the section is ended with a short conclusion.

Interpretation of findings: Findings yielded that employees working in managerial positions had a higher level of workaholism than those who are not. This finding is expected because, as employees move towards higher organizational levels, the span of control and responsibilities also increase (Koçel, 2003), since the responsibilities of the employees, working in a managerial position are more strategic and complex (Wells, 1996). Managerial positions also require working longer time, more energy, and other sources that an employee who does not hold a managerial position. This potentially increases the propensity of managers to be more stressfull and workaholics than non-managers. Essentially, the factors that increase
the stress level of employees and the individual, organizational, and socio-economic factors that increase the degree of workaholism overlap to some extent. For instance, the individual factors of stress and workaholism are closely related (Srivastava, 2012). As a matter of fact, in previous research workaholism has been connected to occupations which demand more mental energy, more complex processes, and more interpersonal interaction (Burke & Matthiesen, 2004; Fayyazi et al., 2013). When it is taken from an organizational point of view, factors such as competition within the organization, intra-organizational practices, demanding systematic and continuous improvements from employees triggers workaholism. From a sociological point of view, it is necessary for the people in the top management to meet many expectations in the public and private sector and that puts more pressure on managers. Due of these reasons, sometimes from internal dynamics (individual factors, personality traits), sometimes due to external requirements (institutional and sociological expectations), an employee can exhibit behavioral tendencies such as; working more than expected, making work the center of life, ignoring the other aspects of life and being compulsively addicted to work. Thus, all of these factors strengthen the theoretical background of the result of this research.

On the other hand, when it is examined in depth, the compulsive work need that is exhibited mainly by the internal motives of an individual is one of the main reasons to become a workaholic; because although some employees have exactly the same working conditions, in some organizations their workaholism levels differ. Thus factors such as job responsibilities are critical in affecting an employee’s attitudes towards the job, which in this study having a managerial position is considered to be a critical factor to have more workaholic tendencies. But there are some other internal issues that affect to become a workaholic. Therefore it should be noted that internal drives (Andreassen, 2014) are also critical to understand the antecedents of workaholism and by only examining the descriptive examination of the concept can’t really provide strong conclusion on the role of managerial positions.

Working excessively, workaholism total score and weekly average working hours were all found to be higher for the managers working in private sector than public sector. Therefore it is another important issue that needs to be taken into account in terms of working conditions in public and private sector in Turkey. Under normal conditions the competitive environment and working conditions, working hours and even days vary in private sector organizations in Turkey. This might results less; stress, fear of losing the job, work-role conflict, competition among employees. In a previous research Özsoy, Uslu and Öztürk (2016) found that employees working in public sector are happier at work (job satisfaction) and in life (life satisfaction). It
might be due to the working conditions mentioned above. This different organizational policies and implementations might also be a reason to explain why managers are more inclined to be workaholic in private sector in Turkey.

**Limitations:** This study was characterized by a number of limitations. First, the number of participants with managerial positions in the sample was substantially less than the number of participants who did not have managerial positions. Second, the lack of any categorization within the managerial position led to the inability to compare the levels of workaholism of upper, middle and bottom line managers. Furthermore, this study was just descriptive and allowed only a comparison in the levels of workaholism. Finally employees took part in the survey divided only two main sectors (i.e., public and private). But this sampling method hinders to analyze the differences in terms of workaholism on the detailed sector and job differences.

**Future research directions:** In future research, a similar study can be replicated in a larger sample (preferably in a specific sector), in Turkey and different cultures, and categorizing managers (i.e., top, middle, and bottom). In this way, findings can be obtained about which sector, which cultures, and which managers differ in the tendency to workaholism. Also rather than focusing solely on descriptive findings, managers with very high levels of workaholism can be identified with quantitative methods and their personality, work performance, and social life can be examined in various ways (preferably with qualitative methods to make a deeper examination). Thus some novel empirical findings could be obtained to understand inner or external factors that plays role in workaholism, as there is still a strong need to understand the antecedences of workaholism. In this way, more comprehensive findings can be obtained about both the workaholism levels of managers and its consequences.

As a result, although this research has several limitations, it was one of the first attempts in workaholism literature that directly compares the level of managers and non-managers in a specific country. This study contributes to understanding of the neglected organizational position differences in workaholism. However, there is still much more need to conduct research on workaholism in managerial positions both in the national and international contexts.
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