

A Survey On Workaholism In Education Field: City Of Kırklareli Case In Turkey

Dr.Serdar Canbaz¹, Emel Poyraz², Dr.Hüseyin Çiçek³

¹(Management and Organization,Babaeski Vocational School/Kırklareli University, Kırklareli)

²(Management and Organization,Babaeski Vocational School/Kırklareli University, Kırklareli)

³(Office Management and Executive Assistance,Babaeski Vocational School/Kırklareli University, Kırklareli)

Correspondence Author: Dr.Serdar Canbaz

ABSTRACT: *In this study, it was aimed to reveal the workaholism level of the people working in the education sector in Kırklareli. In this study, an evaluation was firstly made on workaholism. The research conducted based on primary data was presented. The population of the research is the people who work in the education sector in Kırklareli Province. In this context, totally 394 questionnaires were evaluated, and the DUWAS scale, Cronbach's Alpha reliability test, t-test, Kolmogorov-Smirnov normal distribution test, One-Way ANOVA test and Tukey HSD tests were applied. Thus, the findings obtained by attempting to reveal the workaholism levels in Kırklareli scale were evaluated. In the survey conducted, the level of workaholism reached is 63.80% at the whole scale.*

KEYWORDS: *Workaholism, excessive working, compulsive working, workaholism level*

Date of Submission: 02-06-2018

Date of acceptance: 18-06-2018

I. INTRODUCTION

Workaholism that is defined as “the excessive dependence on work and being in need of working incessantly; spending more time than it needs on the activities related to work” appears as one of the big problems of our working lives nowadays. Gaining value of global capital in the period after the 2000s, technological developments and opportunities brought by those advancements, being easily accessible of work-life information out of the workplace and other updates enhance the rivalry between individuals and organizations. Individuals who want to be in an upper position in comparison with their rivals are continuously in a tendency to improve their education, experience, and equipment. It is observed that issues such as job protection issue, job loss anxiety, increase in the amount of the jobs that require too much effort and passion for a career feed workaholism in some way and also cause the number of workaholics to increase. Workaholism concept which is generally used to express focusing on working was firstly created by Wayne Oates, a theological lecturer from the U.S, based on alcoholism (cited from McMillan et al., Naktiyok and Karabey, 2005:181) in 1968, and he tried to express the dedication to work. Workaholics are dependent on over working on a high level, and regularly spare a great amount of time to the work-related activities and thoughts, although it's not based on the external needs. (Harpaz&Snir, 2003: 294; Spence & Robbins, 1992: 161.)

The community that individuals live in, family life, gender, occupation or work habits may make the individual a workaholic by pushing him toward overactivity. An increase might be observed in workaholism level of married people, in consequences of both the necessity for more income to meet the increased expenses and the request for being apart from anxiety experienced by marriage. Similarly, the workaholism level of females after having children may decrease in order to spare more time to their family, whereas those of men after having children may increase in order to have more income and status as well. Workaholism can be defined as the individual's over-dependence on work life, unable to enjoy with non-work related activities, the state of taking work home, being excessively work-oriented, or being married with work, in a different approach. (Zincirkıran, 2014: 447.) Owing to the opportunities that technology brings to life, the factors such as using the home as workplace out of working hours and feeling obliged to work usually causes him to neglect family and friends. Workaholism concept that is used to define the state of over-dependence on work and working life has been evaluated as a negative case because of damage to individual's health and social relations.

As well as easing the human life, it is possible to say that technology prompts employees to work more by creating the accessibility to working stock and not restricting work with workplace itself. (Canbaz et.al.2016:3) That's why it is crucial to determine workaholism levels on the local scale. In this study, a research on workaholism in Kırklareli was performed via DUWAS workaholism scale. It is seen when the literature is reviewed, Schaufeli and Taris (2004) worked hard through DUWAS workaholism scale to develop it. In the

research of Libanoet. al. (2010), the validity of the scale is confirmed by two factors on the employees in Holland and Spain. Castillo and Gómez (2012) conducted a survey on workaholism based on a DUWAS scale in a Colombian company. They pointed out at the end of the survey that workaholism level of employees from administrative departments is higher than the operational departments. Molino (2012) carried DUWAS and BWAS scales out in Italy for his study on workaholism and received results similar to the ones in literature.

II. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

It was aimed to reveal workaholism level of the employees that work in the education field in Kırklareli.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted on primary data with the help of the questionnaire consisting of 24 questions; 7 of them is demographic, and 17 of them is in the five-level Likert Scale. During the preparation of questionnaire, DUWAS workaholic scale, improved by Schaufeliet.al., (2006) to measure workaholism (2006) and adapted by Doğan and Tel into Turkish was taken into consideration.

Even though there is four-level Likert scale in DUWAS original workaholic scale, Doğan and Tel suggested to use five-level Likert scale and also to use the first and the second questions by converting their meaning to positive sentences, the Five-level Likert scale was used by preparing questionnaire in accordance with these suggestions; the responses were scored as 1 for ‘Totally Inappropriate’, 2 for ‘Inappropriate’, 3 for ‘Slightly Appropriate’, 4 for ‘Appropriate’ and 5 for ‘Totally Appropriate’.

DUWAS workaholism scale consists of two different sub-dimensions as Working Excessively and Working Compulsory. Three different attendance points were calculated as the result of obtaining participation levels from these two sub-dimensions and whole of the scale.

IV. POPULATION AND SAMPLE OF RESEARCH

This research was performed in Kırklareli and it’s districts. Random sampling was preferred within the scope of research; 394 questionnaires from 400 were received for consideration as a result of the examination through questionnaires. The response rate for questionnaires ($394/400=0.985$) approximately equals to 99%. Thus, the sample of the research consists of 394 individuals.

V. RESEARCH FINDINGS

Tables below show the responses received from 394 participants.

Table 1. Distribution of Demographic Qualifications of Participants

| Gender | Frequency | Percentage (%) | Number of children | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|----------------|
| Male | 213 | 54.1 | 0 | 165 | 41.9 |
| Female | 181 | 45.9 | 1 | 82 | 20.8 |
| Total | 394 | 100 | 2 | 115 | 29.2 |
| Marital status | Frequency | Percentage (%) | 3 and over | 32 | 8.1 |
| Single | 148 | 37.6 | Total | 394 | 100 |
| Married | 246 | 62.4 | | | |
| Total | 394 | 100 | Location | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
| Education | Frequency | Percentage (%) | City center | 97 | 24.6 |
| Postgraduate | 53 | 13.5 | County | 273 | 69.3 |
| Graduate | 218 | 55.3 | Village | 20 | 5.1 |
| Two-year degree | 49 | 12.4 | Town | 4 | 1.0 |
| High school | 60 | 15.2 | Total | 394 | 100 |
| Primary school | 14 | 3.6 | | | |
| Total | 394 | 100 | Income groups | Frequency | Percentage (%) |

| | | | (TL) | | |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Ages | Frequency | Percentages (%) | 0-1500 | 30 | 7.6 |
| 23-25 | 26 | 6.6 | 1501-2000 | 30 | 7.6 |
| 26-30 | 107 | 27.2 | 2001-2500 | 51 | 12.9 |
| 31-35 | 81 | 20.6 | 2501-3000 | 108 | 27.4 |
| 36-40 | 59 | 15.0 | 3001-3500 | 63 | 16.0 |
| 41-45 | 37 | 9.4 | 3501-4000 | 61 | 15.5 |
| 46-50 | 45 | 11.4 | 4001-4500 | 10 | 2.5 |
| 51-62 | 39 | 9.9 | 4501-5000 | 15 | 3.8 |
| Total | 394 | 100 | 5001-10000 | 26 | 6.6 |
| Sector | Frequency | Percentage (%) | Total | 394 | 100 |
| Civil servant | 115 | 29.2 | | | |
| Expert/ Technician | 30 | 7.6 | | | |
| Teacher | 223 | 56.6 | | | |
| Janitor | 26 | 6.6 | | | |
| Total | 394 | 100 | | | |

Demographic information of participants is shown in the first table. 45.9% of the population consists of males, 54.1% of them is females. 62.4% of participants' marital status is married, almost 38% of them are single. 41.9% of the participants don't have any children; however, 20.8% of them have a child, whereas 37.3% of participants have two children or more.

Factors that constitute the reasons of becoming a workaholic can be mentioned as the request of satisfying one's own, being anxious about future of himself and family, to be successful, and the need for making more money. Some workers' efforts that are more than expectation and being in need of working more may turn into a routine keeps them apart from understanding real situation, and this routine leads them to continuously seek for work. Employees who display such behaviours mostly keep their lunch short or skip it completely, continue working after daily shift almost every day and they may become an exhausted one by decreasing in performance. 94% of the participants live in the city and its districts, 6% of them live in a village and it's towns. Consequently, the slight excess population and the existence of more job potential may effect workaholism level. 69.4% of participants are in the ages between 23 - 40, 20.8% of them are in the ages between 41-50, 9.9% of participants are in the ages between 51-62. As the age range decreases, the severity of energies and determination increase and there occurs an intensifier effect for the awareness level of them for social needs. On the other hand, the age range decrement may create contradictory manners between work and social needs. However, when an individual gets older, not only the gratitude of energy and determination but also social necessity may decrease as well.

It is pointed out when the educational status of participants is analysed that, 68.8% of them are bachelor's and have master's degree, 27.6% of which are graduated from high school and have the two-year degree, finally 3.6 of them graduated from primary school. The rise of educational status may be seen as a triggering factor for individuals to follow technologic, socio-economic updates and cultural activities more and adapt this information into personal life by assimilating.

When we look at the occupational groups, teachers have the highest rate of 56.6%, followed by civil servants as 29.2% and assisted services as 14.2%. The universe of the population consists of teachers.

87% of participants have monthly income less than 4,000 TL, monthly income of 13% of them is more than 4,000 TL. Income's positive effect on expenses is well known. In order to increase their expenses in the consumption society, individuals need income. Request for increasing the spending potential enables people to effort for more work.

Table 2. Opinions on Excessive Working Dimension

| Opinions on Excessive Working Dimension(%) | Absolutely inappropriate | Inappropriate | Slightly appropriate | Appropriate | Absolutely appropriate | Average | StandardDeviation |
|---|--------------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1. I like working hard. (WkE) | 30.5 | 44.9 | 6.1 | 12.7 | 5.8 | 2.19 | 1.17 |
| 3.I seem as the one who frantically works against the clock. (WkE) | 7.4 | 28.4 | 14.7 | 27.9 | 21.6 | 3.28 | 1.28 |
| 4. Even if my colleagues stop working, I find myself go on working. (WkE) | 8.6 | 28.9 | 19.5 | 30.7 | 12.2 | 3.09 | 1.19 |
| 6. I always have a work to do. (WkE) | 3.0 | 10.2 | 10.7 | 42.1 | 34.0 | 3.94 | 1.06 |
| 8. I take on much more work than I can overcome. (WkE) | 3.0 | 22.1 | 18.8 | 36.5 | 19.5 | 3.47 | 1.13 |
| 10. I go off the deep end because of the time limits that I put to finish the work (WkE) | 11.2 | 23.6 | 16.5 | 28.9 | 19.8 | 3.23 | 1.31 |
| 12. I spend more time for work than my hobbies or leisure time activities or being together with friends. (WkE) | 9.1 | 30.2 | 21.3 | 26.1 | 13.2 | 3.04 | 1.21 |
| 13. I feel guilty if I don't work on anything. (WkE) | 5.1 | 22.6 | 16.5 | 32.2 | 23.6 | 3.47 | 1.22 |
| 15. I find myself doing 2 or 3 things such as both taking note and eating meal or talking on the phone. (WkE) | 12.4 | 29.7 | 15.5 | 26.1 | 16.2 | 3.04 | 1.31 |
| 17 I have difficulty in relaxing when I don't work. (WkE) | 27.2 | 24.9 | 14.5 | 20.1 | 13.5 | 2.68 | 1.41 |

Table 2 shows the answers to the questions relating to the magnitude of excessive work dimension. 18.5% of participants state that they agree or strongly agree with the opinion “I like working hard,” while 74.4% of them indicate that they disagree or strongly disagree with the opinion “I like working hard.” At this point, the working love that is the main indicator of workaholism seems at a low level. Nearly 50% of participants who don't like working at cognitive level see themselves as the ones who frantically work against the clock. 76.1% of attendees always have work to do while 56% of them accepts that those works are more than they can overcome. Being in search of a new work to do and being dissatisfied with available occupations do not seem at a higher level in here.

48.7% of participants of the survey accept that they give themselves into trouble in order to take more work than they can overcome. 39.3% of them mentioned that they spare time for work more than the time for friends and social activities. 55.8% of them feel guilty when they do not work. Therefore they think that there will be a job loss if they don't work, so, they try to do multiple things even if in case of resting, eating at the same time. When participants answer that if they don't work, they don't have any difficulties in relaxing, the percentage increases at The ratio is 48.1% that obtained from attendees who do not have difficulty in relaxing when they are not on to.

Table 3: Opinions on Compulsive Work Dimension

| Opinions on Compulsive Work Dimension (%) | Absolutely inappropriate | Inappropriate | Slightly appropriate | Appropriate | Absolutely appropriate | Average | Standard D. |
|--|--------------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------------|---------|-------------|
| 2.I wish I would cultivate myself to work more.(WkC) | 19.3 | 37.3 | 21.8 | 12.2 | 9.4 | 2.55 | 1.20 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 5. Even though I don't enjoy with the thing I work on, working hard is important for me. (WkC) | 2.5 | 19.3 | 14.5 | 42.6 | 21.1 | 3.60 | 1.10 |
| 7. Even if I want to be apart from work for a while , I frequently find myself thinking about that work. (WkC) | 6.3 | 14.5 | 11.7 | 39.1 | 28.4 | 3.69 | 1.21 |
| 9. Both I want to do something and not to do it, I feel a constraint to work so hard on that subject. (WkC) | 4.1 | 15.7 | 18.8 | 41.9 | 19.5 | 3.57 | 1.09 |
| 11. I usually feel that there is something inside me pushes to work hard (WkC) | 7.6 | 14.5 | 16.2 | 44.4 | 17.3 | 3.49 | 1.16 |
| 14. Even though the thing that I do isn't enjoyable, I feel constrained to work hard. (WkC) | 8.1 | 24.9 | 20.6 | 32.0 | 14.5 | 3.20 | 1.20 |
| 16. I feel guilty when I take a day off. (WkC) | 24.1 | 29.4 | 17.0 | 18.8 | 10.7 | 2.62 | 1.32 |

Table 3 shows the information relating to ideas push people to work by instinct, namely the compulsive working dimension. 56.6% of participants imply that they don't devote themselves to work, whereas 44.4% of them accept that they devote themselves to work more than it needs. 63.7% of the same attendees indicate that they feel obliged to work even if they don't like the job. Again, almost 68% of them find themselves thinking about work even though they try to run away from thinking about jobs that they do. Individual's constantly wishing to work and finding himself designing his works appear as one of the crucial dimensions of workaholism. 61.4% of participants stated that there is an internal reason which drives them to work more. It is possible to say that the wish of being respected, making more money, and being on a better wealth level lie down beneath the basis of this reason. As a result of realizing the relevant factors, it may unwittingly prompt the individuals to work more in order to protect his current status. More than half of participants, namely, 56.5% of them indicates that they have to work intuitively, even if they don't enjoy to do it. Again, 56.5 % of the attendees don't feel themselves guilty when they get permission from their work.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics

| Statistics | Low | High | Average | Standard D. | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|------------------------------------|------|------|---------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Gender | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.46 | 0.50 | 0.16 | -1.98 |
| Educational background | 1.00 | 5.00 | 3.60 | 1.01 | -0.84 | 0.02 |
| Marital status | 1.00 | 2.00 | 1.38 | 0.48 | 0.52 | -1.74 |
| Number of children | 0 | 3.00 | 1.04 | 1.02 | 0.39 | -1.18 |
| Age groups | 1.00 | 7.00 | 3.67 | 1.80 | 0.47 | -0.94 |
| Income groups | 1.00 | 9.00 | 4.52 | 2.03 | 0.41 | -0.07 |
| Occupational groups | 1.00 | 3.00 | 2.27 | 0.89 | -0.57 | -1.49 |
| Living place | 2.00 | 5.00 | 2.82 | 0.55 | 0.31 | 1.69 |
| Excessive Working Dimension (WkE) | 1.90 | 4.40 | 3.14 | 0.50 | 0.14 | -0.54 |
| Compulsive Working Dimension (WkC) | 1.29 | 4.71 | 3.25 | 0.59 | -0.20 | 0.29 |
| Total Workaholism | 2.06 | 4.53 | 3.19 | 0.47 | 0.04 | -0.41 |

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics

| Statistics | Excessive Working Dimension (WkE) | Compulsive Working Dimension (WkC) | Total Workaholism |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Sample | 394 | 394 | 394 |
| Lowest | 1.90 | 1.29 | 2.06 |
| Highest | 4.40 | 4.71 | 4.53 |
| Average | 3.14 | 3.25 | 3.19 |
| Workaholism level (%) | 62.80 | 65.00 | 63.80 |
| Standart deviation | 0.499 | 0.590 | 0.472 |
| Skewness | 0.140 | -0.197 | 0.036 |
| Kurtosis | -0.540 | 0.293 | -0.405 |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z | 1.500 | 1.644 | 1.086 |
| p (K-S) | 0.022 | 0.010 | 0.189 |

Table 5 shows the statistics relating to the scale and dimensions with workaholism levels. Reliability concept is essential for each of the measurements. Because the reliability reflects the consistency ratio of questions with each other in a survey and also it shows whether the scale reflects the questions handled. Analysis of reliability is a method developed to evaluate the qualifications of the tests, surveys or scales that are used for measuring.

One of the commonly used methods for reliability analysis is Cronbach’s Alpha (α) (Cronbach Alpha Coefficient). Alpha coefficient that is calculated by this method is between 0 and 1. It can be commented as follows (Kalaycı, 2010);

- 0.00 \leq α < 0.40 the scale is not reliable,
- 0.40 \leq α < 0.60 reliability of scale is low,
- 0.60 \leq α < 0.80 scale is pretty reliable, and,
- 0.80 \leq α < 1.00 scale is highly reliable.

When all the measurement is checked, a rate as 0.65 is encountered and it constitutes high reliability ($0.7 > \alpha \geq 0.6$) in the terms of reliability level. It is stated that results which are received from measurements are reliable. It is seen that workaholism level occurs approximately at 0.62 – 0.65. This rate may be commented like the participants do not display a high workaholism level.

Table 6. Multiple Comparisons of Tukey HSD test for Differences in Attendees’ Marital Status

| | | N | \bar{X} | Standard D. | \bar{X} | F | Sig. |
|------------------------------------|---------|-----|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------|--------------|
| Excessive Working Dimension (WkE) | Married | 246 | 3.26 | 0.48 | 8.85 | 38.92 | 0.00* |
| | Single | 148 | 2.95 | 0.48 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.14 | 0.50 | | | |
| Compulsive Working Dimension (WkE) | Married | 246 | 3.30 | 0.61 | 1.51 | 4.39 | 0.04* |
| | Single | 148 | 3.17 | 0.55 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.25 | 0.59 | | | |
| Total Workaholism | Married | 246 | 3.27 | 0.48 | 5.09 | 24.20 | 0.00* |
| | Single | 148 | 3.04 | 0.43 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.19 | 0.47 | | | |

* ($p < 0.05$) There are statistically meaningful differences.

Table 6 shows the results of differences of participants based on their marital status. After the T-test which was held to compare the workaholism levels, there is found differences between married and single participants.

According to these results, rates are as follows; ($\bar{X} = 3.26$) for excessive working dimension of married

participants, ($\bar{x} = 2.95$) for excessive working dimension of single participants, ($\bar{x} = 3.30$) for compulsive working dimension of married participants, ($\bar{x} = 3.17$) for compulsive working dimension of single participants, ($\bar{x} = 3.27$) for married participants in all dimension, and ($\bar{x} = 3.04$) for single participants. It is observed that married participants are more workaholic in comparison with the single ones. It is supposed that heading towards working life as an escape from married life due to its specific stress may lead to having higher workaholism level. There is no differentiation in workaholism levels based on gender in Excessive working dimension and Compulsive working dimension.

Table 7. Multiple Comparisons of Tukey HSD test Relating to Differences of Answers given by the location

| | | N | \bar{x} | St.D. | \bar{x} | F | Sig. |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-----|-----------|-------|-----------|------|--------------|
| Working Excessive Dimension (WkE) | City center | 97 | 3.14 | 0.54 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 1.00 |
| | County town | 273 | 3.14 | 0.50 | | | |
| | Village | 20 | 3.12 | 0.31 | | | |
| | Town | 4 | 3.10 | 0.12 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.14 | 0.50 | | | |
| Working Compulsive Dimension (WkC) | City center | 97 | 3.27 | 0.46 | 1.24 | 3.63 | 0.01* |
| | County town | 273 | 3.26 | 0.63 | | | |
| | Village | 20 | 3.10 | 0.52 | | | |
| | Town | 4 | 2.36 | 0.41 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.25 | 0.59 | | | |
| Total Workaholism | City center | 97 | 3.19 | 0.47 | 0.25 | 1.11 | 0.34 |
| | County town | 273 | 3.19 | 0.48 | | | |
| | Village | 20 | 3.11 | 0.30 | | | |
| | Town | 4 | 2.79 | 0.10 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.19 | 0.47 | | | |

* ($p < 0.05$) There are statistically significant differences.

The statistically significant difference was just found in compulsive working dimension ($p = 0.01$) in terms of the places they live in. Due to this statistically significant difference, Table 8 shows the Tukey HSD test Multiple Comparison analysis relating to differences of answers in terms of the location.

Table 8. Educational Background

| | | N | \bar{x} | St.D. | \bar{x} | F | Sig. |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----|-----------|-------|-----------|------|--------------|
| Excessive Working Dimension (WkE) | Primary School | 14 | 3.57 | 0.55 | 1.18 | 4.93 | 0.00* |
| | High school | 60 | 3.23 | 0.50 | | | |
| | Two-year degree | 49 | 3.17 | 0.47 | | | |
| | Bachelor's degree | 218 | 3.13 | 0.49 | | | |
| | Postgraduate | 53 | 2.97 | 0.48 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.14 | 0.50 | | | |
| Compulsive | Primary School | 14 | 3.37 | 0.54 | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-----|------|------|------|------|-------|
| Working Dimension (WkC) | High school | 60 | 3.34 | 0.57 | 0.41 | 1.17 | 0.33 |
| | Two-year degree | 49 | 3.27 | 0.70 | | | |
| | Bachelor's degree | 218 | 3.24 | 0.58 | | | |
| | Postgraduate | 53 | 3.12 | 0.54 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.25 | 0.59 | | | |
| Total Workaholism | Primary School | 14 | 3.49 | 0.48 | 0.77 | 3.56 | 0.01* |
| | High school | 60 | 3.28 | 0.47 | | | |
| | Two-year degree | 49 | 3.21 | 0.47 | | | |
| | Bachelor's degree | 218 | 3.17 | 0.47 | | | |
| | Postgraduate | 53 | 3.03 | 0.46 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.19 | 0.47 | | | |

* ($p < 0.05$) There are statistically significant differences.

There are statistically significant differences in terms of the educational status of participants ($p < 0.05$). It is seen that rates are as follows: ($p= 0.00$) in excessive working dimension, ($p= 0.00$) in compulsive working dimension, ($p= 0.00$). It is possible to say based upon data that as the educational status increases, workaholism level decreases.

Table 9. Number of Children

| | | N | \bar{x} | St.D. | \bar{x} | F | Sig. |
|------------------------------------|-------|-----|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|
| Excessive Working Dimension (WkE) | None | 165 | 2.96 | 0.47 | 3.31 | 14.68 | 0.00* |
| | One | 82 | 3.21 | 0.49 | | | |
| | Two | 115 | 3.31 | 0.45 | | | |
| | 3 - 4 | 32 | 3.31 | 0.56 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.14 | 0.50 | | | |
| Compulsive Working Dimension (WkC) | None | 165 | 3.11 | 0.60 | 2.01 | 5.99 | 0.00* |
| | One | 82 | 3.40 | 0.58 | | | |
| | Two | 115 | 3.31 | 0.58 | | | |
| | 3 - 4 | 32 | 3.36 | 0.45 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.25 | 0.59 | | | |
| Total Workaholism | None | 165 | 3.02 | 0.44 | 2.60 | 12.71 | 0.00* |
| | One | 82 | 3.29 | 0.48 | | | |
| | Two | 115 | 3.31 | 0.45 | | | |
| | 3 - 4 | 32 | 3.33 | 0.47 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.19 | 0.47 | | | |

* ($p < 0.05$) There are statistically significant differences.

There are statistically significant differences in terms of the number of children that participants have ($p < 0.05$). It is seen that rates are as follows: ($p= 0.00$) in excessive working dimension, ($p= 0.00$) in compulsive working dimension, ($p= 0.00$) in all levels of dimensions. Accordingly, as the number of children increases, the workaholic level increases at the same time. It might be thought that being in need of working more to meet expenses is effective in this increment.

Table 10. Age

| | | N | \bar{x} | St.D. | \bar{x} | F | Sig. |
|------------------------------------|-------|-----|-----------|-------|-----------|------|--------------|
| Excessive Working Dimension (WkE) | 23-25 | 26 | 3.02 | 0.51 | 1.83 | 8.16 | 0.00* |
| | 26-30 | 107 | 2.93 | 0.48 | | | |
| | 31-35 | 81 | 3.11 | 0.48 | | | |
| | 36-40 | 59 | 3.26 | 0.40 | | | |
| | 41-45 | 37 | 3.28 | 0.46 | | | |
| | 46-50 | 45 | 3.45 | 0.49 | | | |
| | 50-62 | 39 | 3.20 | 0.51 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.14 | 0.50 | | | |
| Compulsive Working Dimension (WkC) | 23-25 | 26 | 2.90 | 0.74 | 1.61 | 4.90 | 0.00* |
| | 26-30 | 107 | 3.15 | 0.51 | | | |
| | 31-35 | 81 | 3.16 | 0.56 | | | |
| | 36-40 | 59 | 3.35 | 0.38 | | | |
| | 41-45 | 37 | 3.29 | 0.65 | | | |
| | 46-50 | 45 | 3.50 | 0.74 | | | |
| | 50-62 | 39 | 3.43 | 0.59 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.25 | 0.59 | | | |
| Total Workaholism | 23-25 | 26 | 2.97 | 0.49 | 1.58 | 7.82 | 0.00* |
| | 26-30 | 107 | 3.02 | 0.43 | | | |
| | 31-35 | 81 | 3.13 | 0.44 | | | |
| | 36-40 | 59 | 3.30 | 0.35 | | | |
| | 41-45 | 37 | 3.28 | 0.49 | | | |
| | 46-50 | 45 | 3.47 | 0.53 | | | |
| | 50-62 | 39 | 3.29 | 0.49 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.19 | 0.47 | | | |

* ($p < 0.05$) There are statistically significant differences.

There are statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) in terms of the ages of participants. It is seen that rates are as follows: ($p = 0.00$) in excessive working dimension, ($p = 0.00$) in compulsive working dimension, ($p = 0.00$) in all levels of dimensions. Accordingly, workaholism level is high in the middle-aged and beyond (between 36-62). As the individual gets older, workaholism level increases as well.

Table 11. Income

| | | N | \bar{x} | St.D. | \bar{x} | F | Sig. |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----|-----------|-------|-----------|------|--------------|
| Excessive Working Dimension (WkE) | 0-1500 | 30 | 3.27 | 0.60 | 0.66 | 2.74 | 0.01* |
| | 1501-2000 | 30 | 3.05 | 0.59 | | | |
| | 2001-2500 | 51 | 3.05 | 0.46 | | | |
| | 2501-3000 | 108 | 3.15 | 0.46 | | | |
| | 3001-3500 | 63 | 3.04 | 0.45 | | | |
| | 3501-4000 | 61 | 3.12 | 0.47 | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|-----|------|------|------|------|--------------|
| | 4001-4500 | 10 | 3.26 | 0.54 | | | |
| | 4501-5000 | 15 | 3.17 | 0.60 | | | |
| | 5001-10000 | 26 | 3.50 | 0.47 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.14 | 0.50 | | | |
| Compulsive Working Dimension (WkC) | 0-1500 | 30 | 3.34 | 0.50 | 1.02 | 3.05 | 0.00* |
| | 1501-2000 | 30 | 3.41 | 0.56 | | | |
| | 2001-2500 | 51 | 3.10 | 0.54 | | | |
| | 2501-3000 | 108 | 3.17 | 0.66 | | | |
| | 3001-3500 | 63 | 3.10 | 0.59 | | | |
| | 3501-4000 | 61 | 3.41 | 0.50 | | | |
| | 4001-4500 | 10 | 3.14 | 0.48 | | | |
| | 4501-5000 | 15 | 3.32 | 0.63 | | | |
| | 5001-10000 | 26 | 3.53 | 0.56 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.25 | 0.59 | | | |
| Total Workaholism | 0-1500 | 30 | 3.30 | 0.52 | 0.63 | 2.95 | 0.00* |
| | 1501-2000 | 30 | 3.20 | 0.53 | | | |
| | 2001-2500 | 51 | 3.07 | 0.37 | | | |
| | 2501-3000 | 108 | 3.16 | 0.47 | | | |
| | 3001-3500 | 63 | 3.06 | 0.47 | | | |
| | 3501-4000 | 61 | 3.24 | 0.42 | | | |
| | 4001-4500 | 10 | 3.21 | 0.47 | | | |
| | 4501-5000 | 15 | 3.23 | 0.57 | | | |
| | 5001-10000 | 26 | 3.51 | 0.48 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.19 | 0.47 | | | |

* (p < 0.05) There are statistically significant differences.

There are statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$) in terms of the income of participants. It is seen that rates are as follows: ($p = 0.00$) in excessive working dimension, ($p = 0.00$) in compulsive working dimension, ($p = 0.00$) in all levels of dimensions. It is possible to say when the relationship between income level and workaholism is analyzed that the workaholism level is generally high at the lowest and highest income levels. As is seen via the relevant results, the group which has the lowest workaholism level heads towards to work more in order to increase the income, whereas those who have the highest income leans to work more both for protecting status and increasing income.

Table 12. Occupational Groups

| | | N | \bar{x} | St.D. | \bar{x} | F | S i g . |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----|-----------|-------|-----------|------|--------------|
| Excessive Working Dimension (WKE) | Civil servant | 115 | 3.17 | 0.47 | 1.71 | 7.05 | 0.00* |
| | Expert /Technician/Janitor | 56 | 3.35 | 0.57 | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| | Teacher | 223 | 3.08 | 0.48 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.14 | 0.50 | | | |
| Compulsive Working Dimension (WkC) | Civil servant | 115 | 3.18 | 0.65 | 0.43 | 1.23 | 0.29 |
| | Expert/Technician/Janitor | 56 | 3.26 | 0.63 | | | |
| | Teacher | 223 | 3.28 | 0.55 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.25 | 0.59 | | | |
| Total Workaholism | Civil servant | 115 | 3.17 | 0.48 | 0.52 | 2.36 | 0.10 |
| | Expert/Technician/Janitor | 56 | 3.31 | 0.55 | | | |
| | Teacher | 223 | 3.16 | 0.44 | | | |
| | Total | 394 | 3.19 | 0.47 | | | |

* ($p < 0.05$) There are statistically significant differences.

There are statistically significant differences ($p = 0.00$) in excessive working dimension in terms of the occupation of participants. According to this statistics, the highest workaholism level belongs to assisted services (expert/technician/janitor). Under these circumstances, the fact that occupational group has the lowest income among all the participants and request to keep working in earnest can be said as the relevant factor. We can say that being the group mentioned has the lowest income level is the effective factor in the desire to earn more money and continue to work.

VI. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Workaholics see socio-cultural activities as a waste of time and spend most of their time either by working or thinking about work. According to results from our research, the more responsibility the individual has, the higher workaholism rates there are. It is observed that married individuals with children have higher workaholism rates, compared to those who are single and have no children. However, as the age range increases, the workaholism level increases at the same time. Undoubtedly, one of the effective factors is the necessity that individual feels towards sparing more time for socio-cultural activities and social area. Since the relevant people perceive jobs as income channel, they are far from interiorizing the jobs and adapting themselves to work accordingly. Moreover, workaholism level increases more in cities and counties where the population is high and job opportunities more than in towns and villages.

Workaholism levels of participants are observed as 62.8% in excessive working dimension, 65.0% in compulsive working dimension and 63.8% in all working dimensions. It is observed that workaholism level of married participants is higher than those of single ones on the t-test which was carried out to determine workaholism level according to marital status. There is a statistically significant difference in compulsive working dimension in terms of the places where the attendees live in. When it comes to education levels, the lower it is, the higher workaholism level becomes. It might be commented that the effective factor in here is orthodoxy to the job because of the fear of losing job and money. Yet, higher workaholism rates were determined in occupational groups with lower income (in comparison with other participants). The rise in the number of children may be the effect on increasing workaholism level because of future anxiety.

When workaholism or over-dependence on work goes beyond isolating one from his social area, family or personal activities, it may cause problems. Although finishing work on time as requested is employees' major responsibility, if an employee works out of workplace and shifts by exceeding the notion of overwork and undertake more work than he can overcome, not to meet with friends and family, overworking may possibly turn out an addiction. It is highly possible that this situation leads to the problems such as feeling unsatisfied with the job, continuously being in a worried and an anxious mood, overreacting to external incidents, depression, impatience and disorder in personality. In order to avoid these possibilities, an individual should keep works within workplace and shifts. Moreover, he should communicate both with other colleagues at the workplace as well as being in touch with them. As a conclusion, the individual will be successful and achieve the targets such as having a good job, dignity and high salary by making an effective career plan keeping the work-life balance without falling into workaholism trap.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Akduman, C. A. (04-08 Kasım, 2015). ASM'lerde Görev Yapan Çalışanlar Üzerinde Karşılaştırmalı Bir İşkoliklik Araştırması . 6. Uluslararası Katılımlı Aile Hekimliği Kongresi, (s. 1-2). Antalya.: AHEKON.
- [2]. Arslantaş, M. Y. (2016). İşkoliklik ve Tükenmişlik Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi:Avukatlar Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *IJISSR*, sayı:3, 11-18.
- [3]. Canbaz, S. v. (2016). İşkoliklik Üzerine Kırklareli'nde Bir Araştırma. *Tekirdağ S.M.M.M.Odası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, sayı:5, 3-4.
- [4]. Doğan, T. v. (2011). Duwas İşkoliklik Ölçeği Türkçe Formunun (DUWAS-TR) Geçerlik ve Güvenirliğinin İncelenmesi. *AİBÜ, Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(1), 61-69.
- [5]. Harpaz, I. v. (2003). Workaholism: its definition and nature. *Human Relations*, sayı:56, 291-319.
- [6]. İnce, M. G. (2015). İşkoliklik Davranışlarının İş-Yaşam Kalitesine Etkileri Üzerine Sağlık Sektöründe Bir Uygulama. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 3(13), 40-59.
- [7]. Kalaycı, Ş. (2010). *SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri*(beşinci baskı). Ankara: Asil.
- [8]. Kanbur, A. v. (2014). Çalışanların Sınırsız ve Değişken Kariyer Yolculuğunda İşkolikliğin Rolü Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Manas Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 3(2), 27-58.
- [9]. Kesen, M. (2015). Örgütsel Bağlılığın İşkoliklik Üzerindeki Etkisi: Görgül Bir Araştırma. *Niğde Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(4), 53-68.
- [10]. Naktiyok, A. v. (2005). İşkoliklik ve Tükenmişlik Sendromu. *İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, Cilt: 19(2), 181-182.
- [11]. Salihoğlu, G. H. (2014). *Çalışanların Kariyer Yolculuğunda İşkolikliğin Rolü Üzerine Bankacılık Sektöründe Bir Araştırma*. Çorum: Hitit Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
- [12]. Yüksekbilgili, Z. (2016). Bireysel Mutluluk ve İşkoliklik İlişkisi. *KOSBED*, sayı 31, 95-112.
- [13]. Zincirkıran, M. (2014). Workaholism Research On Junior Administrative Police Officers In The Police Department. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(3) , 445-45.
- [14]. Zincirkıran, M. v. (2014). İşkoliklik İle İş-Aile Çatışması İlişkinin Yapısal Eşitlik Modeli İle İncelenmesi: Sağlık İşletmelerinde Bir Uygulama. *Finans Politik & Ekonomik Yorumlar Dergisi*, sayı 590, 105-106.

Dr.Serdar Canbaz." A Survey On Workaholism In Education Field: City Of Kırklareli Case In Turkey." *International Journal of Business and Management Invention (IJBMI)* , vol. 07, no. 06, 2018, pp. 79–90.