# Supplementary Materials

**Table S1:** Characteristics of the studies for each instrument

| No | Instrument name and authors | Study design | Number of items | Dimension measured | Response Options | Sample tested | | | Country | Psychometric properties | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | *N* | Participants | Mean age (SD) years | | Theory | Validity | Reliability |
| 1 | Workaholism Battery (WorkBAT) (Spence & Robbins, 1992) | Development | 25 | Workaholism (Work involvement, Work enjoyment, and Drive). | 5 | 291 | Participants were social workers selected from a National Association of Social Workers data base and 75 workers were assoaciate/assitant profesor. | *Mdn* = 43 | USA | CTT | **Relations to other variables** All three factors correlated with Time commitment and Work involvement. In addition, Work involvement and Drive were correlated with Job stress, Perfectionism, and Nondelegation. Finally, Drive and Work enjoyment correlated with health complaints. | **Internal consistence** Factors: Work involvement ($\alpha$ = 0.69 and 0.67), Drive ($\alpha$ = 0.81 and 0.67), and Work enjoyment ($\alpha$ = 0.86). |
| 2 | Workaholism Battery (WorkBAT) (Kanai et al., 1996) | Adaptation | 19 | Workaholism (Work enjoyment and Drive). | 5 | 1,072 | The sample was compused of full-time workers in 10 private enterprises of differents sectors (manufacturing, wholesale/ retail, service, and others). | 28 | Japan | CTT | **Internal structure** Orthogonal two-factor model (EFA), factor loadings greater than 0.30 and variance explained 32%.<br><br>**Relations to other variables** Both factors correlated with Time commitment, Job involvement and Perfectionism. Drive was also | **Internal consistence** Factors: Drive ($\alpha$ = 0.70) and Work enjoyment ($\alpha$ = 0.85). |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | correlated with Job stress, Non-delegation and Health complaints. | |
| 3 | Workaholism Battery (WorkBAT) (Burke, 1999) | Psychometric properties | 25 | Workaholism (Work involvement, Work enjoyment, and Drive). | Not reported | 530 | Almost one third worked 46 to 50 hours per week. Almost three quarters had been with their present employers 10 years or less and in their present jobs 5 years or less. | Not reported. | Canada | CTT | **Relations to other variables** The three factors correlated with Job involvement, Time on the job and Hours worked. Drive correlated with Perfectionism ($r$ = 0.42), Overtime worked ($r$ = 0.26) and Non-delegation ($r$ = 0.20). Work enjoyment correlated with Overtime worked ($r$ = –0.26). | **Internal consistence** Factors: Work involvement ($\alpha$ = 0.67), Drive ($\alpha$ = 0.80), and Work enjoyment ($\alpha$ = 0.88). |
| 4 | Workaholism Battery (WorkBAT) (Burke, 2001) | Psychometric properties | 25 | Workaholism (Work involvement, Work enjoyment, and Drive). | 5 | 67 | The participants were workers full or part time and enrolled in an evening (part-time) MBA program. | 27.3 (4.3) | Canada | CTT | Not reported. | **Internal consistence** Factors: Work involvement ($\alpha$ = 0.66 and 0.67), Drive ($\alpha$ = 0.73 and 0.71), and Work enjoyment ($\alpha$ = 0.88). **Test-retest** Three months. Work involvement ($r$ = 0.52), Drive ($r$ = 0.59), and Work enjoyment ($r$ = 0.76). |
| 5 | Workaholism Battery (WorkBAT) (Burke & Koksal, 2002) | Adaptation | 25 | Workaholism (Work involvement, Work enjoyment, and Drive). | Not reported | 60 | Data were collected from managers and professionals workig in Istanbul. About half were in middle management positions (49%) and worked 45 hours per week or less (52%). | Not reported. | Turkey | CTT | **Relations to other variables** The three factors were correlated with work behaviors, job satisfaction, emotional well-being, beliefs and fears, and balance values. | **Internal consistence** Factors: Work involvement ($\alpha$ = 0.56), Drive ($\alpha$ = 0.46), and Work enjoyment ($\alpha$ = 0.79). |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | Workaholism Battery (WorkBAT) (Burke et al., 2002) | Psychometric properties | 25 | Workaholism (Work involvement, Work enjoyment, and Drive). | Not reported. | 171 | The sample was almost all male (99%), in senior management (74%), with many of these being company presidents, between 35 and 45 years of age (45%), and had worked between 41 to 50 hours per week (51%). | Not reported. | Norway | CTT | **Internal structure** Three-factor orthogonal model (PCA) and variance explained 39%. | **Internal consistence** Factors: Work involvement ($\alpha$ = 0.45 and 0.64), Drive ($\alpha$ = 0.81 and 0.87), and Work enjoyment ($\alpha$ = 0.85 and 0.84).<br><br>**Test-retest** Six months. Work involvement ($r$ = 0.49), Drive ($r$ = 0.45), and Work enjoyment ($r$ = 0.56). |
| 7 | Workaholism Battery Revised (WorkBAT-R), revised version of the Workaholism Battery (WorkBAT) (McMillan et al., 2002) | Psychometric properties | 14 | Workaholism (Work enjoyment and Drive). | 7 | 320 | The sample comprised 69.7% employees, 11.9% employers, and 17.8% self-employed. Participants worked more hours per week ($M$ = 45.1, $SD$ = 11.75) than the general population ($M$ = 39.2 hours). | 38.2 | New Zealand | CTT | **Internal structure** Orthogonal two-factor model (EFA), factor loadings greater than 0.40, variance explained 41.43%, correlation between factors 0.22.<br><br>**Relations to other variables** Enjoyment and Drive were correlated with job satisfaction (except for Drive), work involvement, an alternative measure of work addiction (SNAP-Work), and intrinsic work motivation. Likewise, the number of hours worked correlated 0.16 with Enjoyment and 0.22 with Drive. | **Internal consistence** Factors: Enjoyment ($\alpha$ = 0.85) and Drive ($\alpha$ = 0.75). |
| 8 | Workaholism Battery (WorkBAT) | Adaptation | 20 | Workaholism (Work involvement and Drive). | 5 | 175 | Adult volunteers who were graduates of 28 different | Not reported. | Turkey | CTT | **Internal structure** Two-factor oblique model (EFA), factor loadings | **Internal consistence** Workaholism ($\alpha$ = 0.83, split-half reliability coefficient = 0.69). |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (Ersoy-Kart, 2005) | | | | | | universities in Turkey. They were employed full-time in a variety of industries and 71% worked between 26 and 45 hours per week. | | | | greater than 0.40, variance explained 29.60%, correlation between factors was 0.47.<br><br>**Relations to other variables**<br>Work involvement ($r$ = 0.22) and drive ($r$ = 0.24) were correlated with type A behavior. | Factors: Work involvement ($\alpha$ = 0.81) and Drive ($\alpha$ = 0.81). |
| 9 | Workaholism Battery (WorkBAT) (Andreassen et al., 2007) | Psychometric properties | 22 | Workaholism (Work involvement, Work enjoyment, and Drive). | 5 | 235 | The bank employees participated in the study. Most of the employees worked full time (82%), between 31 and 40 h per week (75%). Of the sample 25% sat in leadership positions, whereas the rest were consultants and customer advisers. | 44.1 (9.7) | Norway | CTT | **Internal structure**<br>The two-factor (no work involvement) and three-factor (CFA) models had an acceptable fit.<br><br>**Relations to other variables**<br>Drive and Work enjoyment were correlated with work stress, burnout and subjective health complaints. Work enjoyment was also correlated with work engagement components. | **Internal consistence**<br>Factors: Work involvement ($\alpha$ = 0.49), Drive ($\alpha$ = 0.80), and Work enjoyment ($\alpha$ = 0.79). |
| 10 | Workaholism Battery (WorkBAT) (Huang et al., 2010) | Adaptation | 24 | Workaholism (Work enjoyment, Work involvement-enjoyment, Drive-work involvement, Drive, and Work involvement). | 7 | 1,235 | The majority of the respondents were not in managerial positions (74.9%). The industries for which the participants worked included information technology (39.5%), finance (21.4%), manufacturing (17.2%), service (13.8%), medical | 33.36 (7.09) | China | CTT | **Internal structure**<br>Five-factor model (EFA), factor loadings greater than 0.30, variance explained 54.65%, correlation between factors ranged from –0.24 to 0.31.<br><br>**Relations to other variables** | **Internal consistence**<br>Factors: Enjoyment ($\alpha$ = 0.88), Work involvement-enjoyment ($\alpha$ = 0.69), Drive-work involvement ($\alpha$ = 0.58), Drive ($\alpha$ = 0.73), and Work involvement ($\alpha$ = 0.60). |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | and biotechnical (6.6%), and other (1.5%). On average, participants worked 46.19 hours per week. | | | | The five WorkBAT factors correlated with the Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) and most of its factors, as well as with career commitment job involvement, emotional exhaustion, and job satisfaction. | |
| 11 | Workaholism Battery (WorkBAT) (Andreassen et al., 2013) | Psychometric properties | 25 | Workaholism (Work involvement, Work enjoyment, and Drive). | 5 | 661 | Most of the employees worked full time (88%) and had worked in the organisations for between 0 and 10 years (86%). | 42.6 (10.5) | Norway | CTT | **Internal structure** Four-factor oblique model (PCA), factor loadings greater than 0.40. The three-factor model (CFA) had a poor fit.<br><br>**Relations to other variables** The Drive factor had the best correlations with the WART and DUWAS. Work involvement and Work enjoyment showed variable results. | **Internal consistence** Factors: Involvement ($\alpha$ = 0.63), Drive ($\alpha$ = 0.82), and Work enjoyment ($\alpha$ = 0.84).<br><br>**Test-retest** 24–30 months. Work involvement (ICC = 0.65), Drive (ICC = 0.64), and Work enjoyment (ICC = 0.61). |
| 12 | Workaholism Battery (WorkBAT) (Boada-Grau et al., 2013) | Adaptation | 19 | Workaholism (Work enjoyment and Drive). | 5 | 627 | Self-employed workers, who are actively working. They are residents of the Autonomous Community of Catalonia, belonging to various productive sectors, for example, financial mediation, education and social services, health, and | 43.31 (9.46) and 45.93 (9.61) | Spain | CTT | **Internal structure** Two-factor oblique model (EFA), factor loadings greater than 0.30, variance explained 42.64%, correlation between factors 0.19. Two-factor related and good fit model (CFA).<br><br>**Relations to other variables** | **Internal consistence** Factors: Work enjoyment ($\alpha$ = 0.82, CI 0.80–0.84) and Drive ($\alpha$ = 0.80, CI 0.78–0.83). |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | hospitals, among others. | | | | The WorkBAT correlated with irritation, burnout and obsessive beliefs. | |
| 13 | Workaholism Battery (WorkBAT) (Santos et al., 2018) | Adaptation | 25 | Workaholism (Work involvement, Work enjoyment, and Drive). | 7 | 407 | The majority of participants are employed (81.3%), followed by entrepreneurs (11.8%), and service providers (3.4%). | 39 (10.45) | Portugal | CTT | **Internal structure** Two- and three-factor related (CFA) model, poor fit in all goodness-of-fit indices. | **Internal consistence** Workaholism ($\alpha$ = 0.81). Factors: Work involvement ($\alpha$ = 0.56), Drive ($\alpha$ = 0.82), and Work enjoyment ($\alpha$ = 0.76). |
| 14 | Work Addiction Risk Test Revised (WART-R), revised version of the Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) (Urbán et al., 2019) | Adaptation | 17 | Work addiction (Overcommitment, Impatience, Hard-working, and Salience). | 4 | 1,286 | The average working hours per week was 43.32, although most participants worked 40 hours a week (65.6%). Regarding the field of work, participants worked in industry (22.1%), trade (15.8%), education or science (7.9%), health care (7.3%), tourism (5%), or was a civil servant (7%). Most of them worked in the private sector (67.4%) and a quarter in a government-maintained sector. | 38.9 (10.8) | Hungary | N/A | **Internal structure** Four-factor oblique model (EFA), factor loadings greater than 0.40 and correlations between factors from 0.16 to 0.50. Related four-factor model (CFA), good fit, factor loadings between 0.39 and 0.73 and correlations between factors from 0.47 to 0.74.<br><br>**Relations to other variables** The amount of Time spent working, Mental health symptoms, and Hostility were significantly associated with four factors. | Not reported. |
| 15 | Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) (Robinson et al., 1992) | Psychometric properties | 25 | Work addiction | 4 | 151 | Sociology undergraduate students. | Not reported. | USA | CTT | Not reported. | **Internal consistence** Work addiction ($\alpha$ = 0.85).<br><br>**Test-retest** Two weeks. Work addiction ($r$ = 0.83). |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16 | Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) (Robinson & Post, 1994) | Psychometric properties | 25 | Work addiction | Not reported | 50 | Graduate students at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. | Not reported. | USA | N/A | **Test content** Subjects were presented five of the major symptoms of work addiction around which the 25-item measure was constructed: Overdoing, Self-worth, Control-Perfectionism, Intimacy, and Mental Preoccupation-Future Reference. Subjects were asked to select the symptom that matched each of the 25 items. The percentage of correct categorizations ranged from 40% to 96%. | Not reported. |
| 17 | Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) (Robinson & Phillips, 1995) | Psychometric properties | 25 | Work addiction | 3 | 20 | Psychotherapists randomly selected from the North Carolina Directory of Licensed Marriage and Family Therapists. | Not reported. | USA | N/A | **Test content** Ten statements unrelated to work addiction were nested throughout the 25-item test. Subjects were asked to identify the 25 items from a list of 35 statements they believed to be symptoms of work addiction. The mean percentage score of correctly identified symptoms was 89.4%. The percentages ranged from 65% to 100%. | Not reported. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) (Robinson & Post, 1995) | Psychometric properties | 25 | Work addiction | 4 | 442 | Graduate counseling students at the University of North Caroha at Charlotte, students in two undergraduate sociology classes, and respondents from a national 12-Support group for work addiction, and conference registrants from national sd-help conferences. | Not reported. | USA | CTT | Not reported. | **Internal consistence** Work addiction (Spearman-Brown split-half correlation coefficient = 0.85). |
| 19 | Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) (Robinson, 1996) | Psychometric properties | 25 | Work addiction | 4 | 363 | Undergraduate students. | 22 | USA | N/A | **Relations to other variables** Workaholism correlated with generalized anxiety ($r$ = 0.40), type A behavior patterns ($r$ = 0.37), and with scores on the four scales of the Jenkins Activity Survey with 0.50 on the Type A scale, 0.50 on the Speed and Impatience scale, 0.39 on the Hard-driving and Competitive scale, and 0.20 on the Job Involvement scale. | Not reported. |
| 20 | Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) (Robinson, 1999) | Development | 25 | Work addiction | 4 | 363 | College students enrolled in courses at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. | 22 | USA | CTT | **Relations to other variables** Work addiction was correlated with anxiety ($r$ = 0.40), Type A behaviors ($r$ = 0.37), Type A ($r$ = 0.50), Speed and impatience ($r$ = 0.49), Hard- | **Internal consistence** Work addiction ($\alpha$ = 0.88). |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | driving and competitive ($r$ = 0.38), and Job involvement ($r$ = 0.20). | |
| 21 | Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) (Flowers & Robinson, 2002) | Psychometric properties | 25 | Work addiction (Compulsive tendencies, Control, Impaired communication/Self-absorption, Inability to delegate, and Self-Worth). | 4 | 468 WG = 105 and CG = 363 | Workaholic group (WG): Participants from Workaholics Anonymous, a 12-step support group for work addiction, and conference registrants from national self-help conferences. Control group (CG): Students attending graduate and undergraduate classes at a large university. | WG: 44 and CW: 22. | USA and Canada | CTT | **Internal structure** Five-factor oblique model (PCA), factor loadings greater than 0.40 and variance explained 52%.<br><br>**Relations to other variables** Four discriminant analyses were conducted to examine the correct classification rate of scores on the WART and explore which of the factors and items accounted for the differences in the average score profiles of the WG and CW. The correct classification rate for the CG remained consistent, ranging from 93.8 to 95.3. The correct classification rate for the WG varied between 57.3 and 70. | **Internal consistence** Work addiction ($\alpha$ = 0.90). |
| 22 | Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) (Taris et al., 2005) | Adaptation | 24 and 8 | Work addiction (Compulsive tendencies, Control, Impaired Communication/Self-Absorption, Inability to delegate, and Self-worth). | Not reported | 555 | White-collar personnel of two heavy-industry organizations and a nuclear power plant, and differents occupations. Also, | 47.8 (7.5), 45.5 (9.0), 41.8 (10.2), and 39.6 (8.3). | The Netherlands | CTT | **Internal structure** Model with five first-order and one second-order factor (CFA), good fit and factor loadings between 0.30 and 0.80 (first | **Internal consistence** Work addiction ($\alpha$ = 0.93). Factors: Compulsive tendencies ($\alpha$ = 0.90), Control ($\alpha$ = 0.82), Impaired Communication/Self- |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | a subsample of people who successfully completed a burnout treatment program and had resumed work. | | | | order) and 0.85 and 0.96 (second order).<br><br>**Relations to other variables**<br>The WART correlated highly with the Compulsive tendencies factor ($r$ = 0.89 and 0.93), which is proposed as a short version of the WART. Both versions correlated with job stress (job demands and overtime), job strain (work-nonwork conflict, exhaustion, and cynism), and mental health. | Absorption ($\alpha$ = 0.62), and Self-worth ($\alpha$ = 0.56). |
| 23 | Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) (Andreassen et al., 2013) | Psychometric properties | 25 | Work addiction (Compulsive tendencies [CT], Control [CL], Impaired communication [IC], Self-worth [SW], and Inability to delegate [ID]). | 4 | 661 | Most of the employees worked full time (88%) and had worked in the organisations for between 0 and 10 years (86%). | 42.6 (10.5) | Norway | CTT | **Internal structure**<br>Four-factor oblique model (PCA), factor loadings greater than 0.40. The five-factor model (CFA) had a poor fit.<br><br>**Relations to other variables**<br>The five WART factors (and the total) correlated with the DUWAS factors and with the WorkBAT Drive factor. | **Internal consistence**<br>Work addiction ($\alpha$ = 0.86). Factors: CT ($\alpha$ = 0.77), CL ($\alpha$ = 0.75), IC ($\alpha$ = 0.59), and SW ($\alpha$ = 0.36).<br><br>**Test-retest**<br>24–30 months. Work addiction (ICC = 0.70), CT (ICC = 0.63), CL (ICC = 0.69), IC (ICC = 0.56), ID (ICC = 0.32), and SW (ICC = 0.56). |
| 24 | Work Addiction Risk Test Portuguese of Brazil Version (WART15- | Adaptation | 15 | Work addiction (Compulsive tendencies, Control, and Impaired Communication/Self-Absorption). | 4 | 153 | Managers from companies located in Brazil, mainly from services and industry sector. Related to job, | 41 (9.06) | Brazil | CTT | **Internal structure**<br>Three-factor model (CFA), good fit and factor loadings between 0.36 and 0.95. | **Internal consistence**<br>Work addiction ($\alpha$ = 0.83). Factors: Compulsive tendencies ($\alpha$ = 0.79), Control ($\alpha$ = 0.54), and |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | PBV), adapted version of the Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) (Romeo et al., 2014) | | | | | | 36.6% declared that they worked 45 hours or more per week and 21.6% between 40 and 45 hours. | | | | **Relations to other variables** WART15-PBV correlated with the DUWAS ($r$ = 0.90) and the correlations between the factors of both tests were greater than 0.50. WART15-PBV also correlated with general health perception ($r$ = 0.29). | Impaired communication/Self-absorption ($\alpha$ = 0.68). |
| 25 | Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) (Ravoux et al., 2018) | Adaptation | 25 | Work addiction (Compulsive tendencies, Control, Impaired communication and self-absorption, Self-worth, and Inability to delegate). | 4 | 187 | Workers of differents occupations (merchants-business, employees, intermediate profession, inactive employment, and manager-intellectual profession). Hours worked per week ($M$ = 41.6, $SD$ = 12.1). | 41.6 (11.7) | France | CTT | **Internal structure** Four-component model (PCA).<br><br>**Relations to other variables** Work addiction and the factors Compulsive tendencies, Control, and Impaired communication and self-absorption were correlated with the visual analog scale of stress at work ($r$ = 0.43), stress at home ($r$ = 0.41), and the visual analog scale of well-being ($r$ = –0.40). | **Internal consistence** Work addiction ($\alpha$ = 0.90). Factors: $\alpha$ between 0.57 y 0.85.<br><br>**Test-retest** One week. The Lin concordance coefficient indicated a value of 0.90 for the total test and values between 0.66 and 0.86 for the factors. |
| 26 | Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS) (Schaufeli et al., 2009) | Development | 10 | Workaholism (Working excessively [WE] and Working compulsively [WC]). | 4 | 7,594 (TN), and 3,311 (JP) | TN: The major occupational groups are hospital workers (28%), managers (24%), and professionals such as | TN: 36.4 (9.5) and JP: 34.4 (10.5) | The Netherlands (TN) and Japan (JP) | CTT | **Internal structure** Two-component model (PCA), factor loadings between 0.57 and 0.82 (TN) and 0.52 and 0.74 (JP). Explained | **Internal consistence** Factors (TN): WE ($\alpha$ = 0.78) and WC ($\alpha$ = 0.78).<br><br>Factors (JP): WE ($\alpha$ = 0.73) and WC ($\alpha$ = 0.68). |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | organizational consultants (14%).<br><br>JP: The major occupational groups are nurses (48%), blue-collar workers (20%), and lower professionals, such as engineers (24%). | | | | variance of 52.5% (TN) and 46.5% (JP).<br>Related two-factor model (CFA), good fit and relationship between factors high in TN ($r$ = 0.50) and JP ($r$ = 0.59).<br>Factor invariance: CFA-MG tested the equivalence of the CFA (configural) model in the Dutch and Japanese samples.<br><br>**Relations to other variables**<br>All correlations between workaholism (WE and WC) and excess working time (overtime percentage and overwork) are positive.<br>Workaholism was not related to Engagement ($r$ = –0.19, NT; $r$ = –0.05, JP) and was related to Burnout ($r$ = 0.53, NT; $r$ = 0.64, JP). | |
| 27 | Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS) (del Líbano et al., 2010) | Psychometric properties | 17 and 10 | Workaholism (Working excessively [WE] and Working compulsively [WC]). | 4 | 2,714. 2,164 (TN), and 550 (SP) | Employees from different occupational sectors (i.e., services, education, industry or commerce). | TN: 37.9 (11.2) and SP: 33.8 (9.8) | The Netherlands and Spain | CTT | **Relations to other variables** (DUWAS-10 and DUWAS-17): Inter-correlations between the original and shortened factors ranged between 0.92 and 0.94 in the TN and SP | **Internal consistence**<br>DUWAS-17 Factors.<br>TN: WE ($\alpha$ = 0.82) and WC ($\alpha$ = 0.84).<br>SP: WE ($\alpha$ = 0.85) and WC ($\alpha$ = 0.79).<br><br>DUWAS-10 Factors.<br>TN: WE ($\alpha$ = 0.75) and WC ($\alpha$ = 0.81). |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | samples. The intercorrelations of WE and WC with perceived health and happiness were negative in both samples.<br><br>**Internal structure** (DUWAS-10): Two-factor related (CFA) model and good fit in the TN and SP samples. Factor invariance (DUWAS-10): CFA-MG tested the equivalence of the CFA model (factor structure, covariance and factor loadings) between the TN and SP samples. | SP: WE ($\alpha$ = 0.78) and WC ($\alpha$ = 0.79). |
| 28 | Dutch Work Addiction Scale - Observer Rating (DUWAS-OR) (Falco et al., 2012) | Psychometric properties | 10 | Workaholism (Working excessively [WE] and Working compulsively [WC]). | 6 | 486 | Sample of 243 couples (husband and wife/partners), 17% top-level manager, 10.3% mid-level manager, 34.6% office worker, 22.5% blue-collar, 15.6% other kinds of employment (e.g. freelancer). | 54.7 (6.72) | Italy | CTT | **Internal structure** Related two-factor model (CFA), acceptable fit, factor loadings between 0.61 and 0.86, in addition, the correlation between factors was 0.69.<br><br>**Relations to other variables** AVE was 0.50 for WE and 0.65 for WC. In addition, the two factors correlated with the UWES (self-report), WE ($r$ = 0.49) and WC ($r$ = 0.43). WE and WC correlated with Workload and WE | **Internal consistence** Factors: WE ($\alpha$ = 0.86) and WC ($\alpha$ = 0.89). |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | with Work-family conflict. Discriminant evidence: Evidence was provided through the Fornell and Larcker criterion for the two factors. | |
| 29 | Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS) (Molino et al., 2012) | Psychometric properties | 5 | Working excessively | 4 | 853 | Employees and self-employees from different occupational sectors: 50% were from public and private service, 38% were from education and research, 8% were from industry and commerce and 3% were from public health. Weekly working hours were, on average, 38.97 (SD = 9.97; min = 0; max = 96). | Not reported. | Italy | CTT | **Internal structure** One-factor model (EFA), factor loadings between 0.41 and 0.76 and explained variance 38.62%. Unifactorial model (CFA), good fit, factor loadings between 0.38 and 0.84.<br><br>**Relations to other variables** Relationship between Working excessively and Work-family conflict ($r$ = 0.49). | **Internal consistence** Working excessively ($\alpha$ = 0.74). |
| 30 | Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS) (Andreassen et al., 2013) | Psychometric properties | 10 | Workaholism (Working excessively [WE] and Working compulsively [WC]). | 4 | 661 | Most of the employees worked full time (88%) and had worked in the organisations for between 0 and 10 years (86%). | 42.6 (10.5) | Norway | CTT | **Internal structure** Two-factor oblique model (PCA), factor loadings greater than 0.40. The two-factor model (CFA) had a poor fit.<br><br>**Relations to other variables** The two DUWAS factors correlated with the WART factors and the WorkBAT factors. | **Internal consistence** Factors: WE ($\alpha$ = 0.69) and WC ($\alpha$ = 0.63).<br><br>**Test-retest** 24–30 months. WE (ICC = 0.61) and WC (ICC = 0.65). |
| 31 | Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS) | Psychometric properties | 20 | Workaholism (Working excessively [WE], Working | 4 | 530 | Public and private sector employees working in various sectors of service | Not reported. | India | CTT | **Relations to other variables** Convergent evidence: AVE | **Internal consistence** Workaholism ($\alpha$ = 0.83). Factors: WE ($\alpha$ = |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (Sharma & Sharma, 2013) | | | compulsively [WC], and Overwork[O]). | | | industries (banking and telecom, education, hotel and restaurant, hospital, and insurance) of Jammu region. | | | | greater than 0.50 for the three factors. Discriminant evidence: Evidence was provided through the Fornell and Larcker criterion for the three factors.<br><br>**Internal structure** Three-factor hierarchical model (CFA). Poor fit. Factor loadings between 0.50 and 0.77 (first order), and between 0.51 and 0.89 (second order). | 0.88), WC ($\alpha$ = 0.83), and O ($\alpha$ = 0.60). |
| 32 | Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS) (Littman-Ovadia et al., 2014) | Adaptation | 10 | Workaholism (Working excessively [WE] and Working compulsively [WC]). | 4 | 351 | All respondents held a full-time job (at least 40 hours a week) with tenure of at least six months in their current workplace. | 34.9 (10.8) | Israel | CTT | **Internal structure** Related two-factor model (CFA), acceptable fit, factor loadings between 0.38 and 0.77, in addition, the correlation between factors was 0.76.<br><br>**Relations to other variables** Self-reports and peer-reports of workaholism (UWES answered by spouse, boyfriend, girlfriend, friend, or colleague) correlated; Workaholism ($r$ = 0.52), WE ($r$ = 0.50), and WC ($r$ = 0.43). | **Internal consistence** Workaholism ($\alpha$ = 0.78). Factors: WE ($\alpha$ = 0.61) and WC ($\alpha$ = 0.70).<br><br>**Test-retest** Two or three months. Workaholism ($r$ = 0.79). Factors: WE ($r$ = 0.77) and WC ($r$ = 0.71). |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | Workaholism and its scales showed positive correlations with overcommitment, the actual number of hours worked per week, burnout (emotional exhaustion), work engagement (Absorption), and intrinsic aspects of the job. | |
| 33 | Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS) (Rantanen et al., 2015) | Psychometric properties | 10 | Workaholism (Working excessively [WE] and Working compulsively [WC]). | 4 | 9,010 (TN), and 4,567 (FL) | TN: Medical residents, managers, white-collar workers (e.g., office clerks), higher professionals (e.g., consultants), executives, teachers, social workers, paramedics, blue-collar workers (e.g., production line workers), lower professionals (e.g., technicians), nurses, physicians, sales persons, pink-collar workers (e.g., waitress) and artists.<br><br>FL: Dentists, managers, and lawyers. | TN: 38 and FL: 49. | The Netherlands (TN) and Finland (FL) | CTT | **Internal structure**<br>Related two-factor model (CFA), acceptable fit in both samples. However, a second-order model showed a better fit (WE: working frantically and working long hours; WC: obsessive work drive and unease if not working) with loadings greater than 0.50. Likewise, a four-factor related model (with the first-order factors of the previous model) also indicated a good fit.<br>Factorial invariance: Second-order factor structure showed reasonable measurement invariance and stability of factor | **Internal consistence**<br>Workaholism ($\alpha$ = 0.82, TN; $\alpha$ = 0.86, FL). Factors (TN): WE ($\alpha$ = 0.72) and WC ($\alpha$ = 0.80). Factors (FL): WE ($\alpha$ = 0.80) and WC ($\alpha$ = 0.80). Subfactors $\alpha$ between 0.51 and 0.80.<br><br>**Test-retest**<br>Two-year. Factors: WE ($r$ = 0.66) and WC ($r$ = 0.76). Subfactors $r$ between 0.60 and 0.71. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | structure across the two samples and time in the Finish sub-sample of managers with two measurement points two years apart. | |
| 34 | Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS) (Mir et al., 2016) | Adaptation | 8 | Workaholism (Working excessively [WE] and Working compulsively [WC]). | 4 | 317 | Doctors (18%), university teachers (20.8%), lawyers (18.3%), bankers (27.1%), and nurses (15.8%). | 32.6 (9.27) | Pakistan | CTT | **Internal structure** Two-factor model (CFA), good fit, factor loadings between 0.46 and 0.74, 5 items for WE and 3 items for WC. | **Internal consistence** Workaholism ($\alpha$ = 0.71). Factors: WE ($\alpha$ = 0.66) and WC ($\alpha$ = 0.64). |
| 35 | Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS) (Azevedo & Mathias, 2017) | Psychometric properties | 10 | Addiction to work | 4 | 1,108 | Doctors in the state of Paraíba in the municipalities of João Pessoa, Pombal, Guarabira, Bayeux, Santa Rita, Cabedelo, Campina Grande, Sousa, Cajazeiras, Monteiro, Itaporanga, Piancó, Catolé do Rocha, Belém do Brejo dos Santos, São Bento, and Patos. | 44.42 (13.89) | Brazil | CTT | **Internal structure** One-component model (PCA), factor loadings between 0.60 and 0.70, and explained variance of 44.5%.<br><br>**Relations to other variables** Addiction to work was positively correlated with the number of shifts worked ($r$ = 0.20), and it showed a negative correlation with age ($r$ = –0.20). | **Internal consistence** Addiction to work ($\alpha$ = 0.86). |
| 36 | Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS) (Balducci et al., 2017) | Psychometric properties | 10 | Workaholism (Working excessively [WE] and Working compulsively [WC]). | 4 | 1,027 | 171 self-employed individuals or managers with different jobs, among which lawyer, engineer, architect, entrepreneur, university professor or researcher, manager, etc. 574 medical doctors, | Not reported. | Italy | CTT | **Internal structure** Related two-factor model (CFA), good fit and factor loadings between 0.44 and 0.72. Factor invariance: CFA-MG tested the equivalence of the CFA model (configural, metric, factor variance and factor | **Internal consistence** Workaholism ($\alpha$ = 0.82). Factors: WE ($\alpha$ = 0.74, CI = 0.72–0.77; $\omega$ = 0.75) and WC ($\alpha$ = 0.74, CI = 0.72–0.77; $\omega$ = 0.75).<br><br>**Test-retest** One-year. Workaholism ($r$ = 0.57). Factors: WE ($r$ = 0.62) and WC ($r$ = 0.54). |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | nurses, administrative staff, and others (e.g., personnel responsible for cleaning rooms). 282 employees in nonmanagerial position, playing an administrative or a technical role. | | | | covariance) between the Italian sample and another Dutch sample ($n$ = 7,523).<br><br>**Relations to other variables**<br>DUWAS and its factors are positively related to number of hours worked in a week, job demands (workload and work-to-family conflict), high and low arousal job-related negative affect, and psychological strain symptoms. | |
| 37 | Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS) (Nonnis et al., 2017) | Psychometric properties | 10 | Workaholism (Working excessively [WE] and Working compulsively [WC]). | 4 | 485 | Nurses working in five hospitals in Sardinia, 70.6% were woman. Their work experience ranged from 0–10 years (24.8%), to 11–20 years (36.3%), to 21 years and over (38.8%). | Not reported. | Italy | RMT | **Internal structure**<br>The parallel analysis of the residuals shows that the work engagement has two significant components. However, the eigenvalues are below the cut-off point (2) in both factors. | **Internal consistence**<br>Person separation reliability R, which scored 0.49 in the WE and 0.56 in the WC. |

Note. USA = United States, PCA = Principal Component Analysis, EFA = Exploratory Factor Analysis, CFA = Confirmatory Factor Analysis, CTT = Classical Test Theory, RMT = Rasch Measurement Theory, $\alpha$ = Alpha coefficient, $\omega$ = Omega coefficient, r = Correlation coefficient, AVE = Average Variance Extracted, Mdn = Median, CI = Confidence interval, CCI = Intraclass Correlation Coefficient, N/A = Not Applicable.

## References

Andreassen, C. S., Hetland, J., & Pallesen, S. (2013). Psychometric assessment of workaholism measures. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*,

*29*(1), 7–24. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-05-2013-0143

Andreassen, C. S., Ursin, H., & Eriksen, H. R. (2007). The relationship between strong motivation to work, "workaholism" , and health. *Psychology and Health*, *22*(5), 615–629. https://doi.org/10.1080/14768320600941814

Azevedo, W. F., & Mathias, L. A. da S. T. (2017). Addiction to work and factors relating to this: A cross-sectional study on doctors in the state of Paraíba. *Sao Paulo Medical Journal*, *135*(6), 511–517. https://doi.org/10.1590/1516-3180.2016.0312250417

Balducci, C., Avanzi, L., Consiglio, C., Fraccaroli, F., & Schaufeli, W. (2017). A cross-national study on the psychometric quality of the Italian version of the Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *33*(6), 422–428. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000300

Boada-Grau, J., Prizmic-Kuzmica, A.-J., Serrano-Fernández, M.-J., & Vigil-Colet, A. (2013). Estructura factorial, fiabilidad y validez de la escala de adicción al trabajo (WorkBAT): versión española. *Anales de Psicología*, *29*(3), 923–933. https://doi.org/10.6018/analesps.29.3.147071

Burke, R. J. (1999). Workaholism in organizations: Measurement validation and replication. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *6*(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021910303807

Burke, R. J. (2001). Spence and Robbins' measures of workaholism components: Test-retest stability. *Psychological Reports*, *88*(3), 882–888. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2001.88.3.882

Burke, R. J., & Koksal, H. (2002). Workaholism among a sample of Turkish managers and professionals: An exploratory study. *Psychological Reports*, *91*(1), 60–68. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2002.91.1.60

Burke, R. J., Richardsen, A. M., & Martinussen, M. (2002). Psychometric properties of Spence and Robbins' measures of workaholism components. *Psychological Reports*, *91*(3), 1098–1104. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2002.91.3f.1098

del Líbano, M., Llorens, S., Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. (2010). Validity of a brief workaholism scale. *Psicothema*, *22*(1), 143–150. www.psicothema.com

Ersoy-Kart, M. (2005). Reliability and validity of the Workaholism Battery (Work-BAT): Turkish Form. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *33*(6), 609–618. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2005.33.6.609

Falco, A., Kravina, L., Girardi, D., Dal Corso, L., Di Sipio, A., & De Carlo, N. A. (2012). The convergence between self and observer ratings of workaholism: A comparison between couples. *TPM - Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, *19*(4), 311–324. https://doi.org/10.4473/TPM19.4.5

Flowers, C. P., & Robinson, B. (2002). A structural and discriminant analysis of the Work Addiction Risk Test. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *62*(3), 517–526. https://doi.org/10.1177/00164402062003008

Huang, J. C., Hu, C., & Wu, T. C. (2010). Psychometric properties of the Chinese version of the workaholism battery. *Journal of Psychology*, *144*(2), 163–183. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980903472219

Kanai, A., Wakabayashi, M., & Fling, S. (1996). Workaholism among employees in Japanese corporations: An examination based on the Japanese version of the Workaholism Scales. *Japanese Psychological Research*, *38*(4), 192–203. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5884.1996.tb00024.x

Littman-Ovadia, H., Balducci, C., & Ben-Moshe, T. (2014). Psychometric properties of the Hebrew version of the Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS-10). *Journal of Psychology*, *148*(3), 327–346. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2013.801334

McMillan, L. H. W., Brady, E. C., O'Driscoll, M. P., & Marsh, N. V. (2002). A multifaceted validation study of Spence and Robbins' (1992) Workaholism Battery. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *75*(3), 357–368. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317902320369758

Mir, I., Kamal, A., & Masood, S. (2016). Translation and validation of Dutch Workaholism Scale. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, *31*(2), 331–346.

Molino, M., Ghislieri, C., & Colombo, L. (2012). Working excessively: Theoretical and methodological considerations. *Giornale Italiano Di Medicina Del Lavoro Ed Ergonomia*, *34*(1, Supplemento A), A5–A10.

Nonnis, M., Cuccu, S., Cortese, C. G., & Massidda, D. (2017). The Italian version of the Dutch Workaholism Scale (DUWAS): A study on a group of nurses. *BPA Applied Psychology Bulletin*, *65*(278), 47–57.

Rantanen, J., Feldt, T., Hakanen, J. J., Kokko, K., Huhtala, M., Pulkkinen, L., & Schaufeli, W. (2015). Cross-national and longitudinal investigation of a short measure of workaholism. *Industrial Health*, *53*(2), 113–123. https://doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.2014-0129

Ravoux, H., Pereira, B., Brousse, G., Dewavrin, S., Cornet, T., Mermillod, M., Mondillon, L., Vallet, G., Moustafa, F., & Dutheil, F. (2018). Work Addiction Test questionnaire to assess workaholism: Validation of French version. *JMIR Mental Health*, *5*(1), e12. https://doi.org/10.2196/mental.8215

Robinson, B. E. (1996). Concurrent validity of the Work Addiction Risk Test as a measure of workaholism. *Psychological Reports*, *79*(3), 1313–1314. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1996.79.3f.1313

Robinson, B. E. (1999). The Work Addiction Risk Test: Development of a tentative measure of workaholism. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *88*(1), 199–210. https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1999.88.1.199

Robinson, B. E., & Phillips, B. (1995). Measuring workaholism: Content validity of the Work Addiction Risk Test. *Psychological Reports*, *77*(2), 657–658. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1995.77.2.657

Robinson, B. E., & Post, P. (1994). Validity of the Work Addiction Risk Test. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *78*(1), 337–338. https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1994.78.1.337

Robinson, B. E., & Post, P. (1995). Split-half reliability of the Work Addiction Risk Test: Development of a measure of workaholism. *Psychological Reports*, *76*(3), 1226. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1995.76.3c.1226

Robinson, B. E., Post, P., & Khakee, J. F. (1992). Test-retest reliability of the Work Addiction Risk Test. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *74*(3), 926. https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1992.74.3.926

Romeo, M., Yepes-Baldó, M., Berger, R., & da Costa, F. F. N. (2014). Workaholism in Brazil: Measurement and individual differences. *Adicciones*, *26*(4), 312–320. https://doi.org/10.20882/adicciones.37

Santos, J., Sousa, C., Sousa, A., Figueiredo, L., & Gonçalves, G. (2018). Psychometric evidences of the Workaholism Battery in a Portuguese sample. *Journal of Spatial and Organizational Dynamics*, *6*(1), 40–51.

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*, *43*(4), 320–348. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069397109337239

Sharma, P., & Sharma, J. (2013). A confirmatory factor analysis of Dutch Work Addiction Scale (DUWAS). *Global Business Review*, *14*(2), 211–223. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150913477449

Spence, J. T., & Robbins, A. S. (1992). Workaholism: Definition, measurement, and preliminary results. In *Journal of Personality Assessment* (Vol. 58, Issue 1, pp. 160–178). Lawrence Erlbaum. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5801_15

Taris, T. W., Schaufeli, W. B., & Verhoeven, L. C. (2005). Workaholism in the Netherlands: Measurement and implications for job strain and work-nonwork conflict. *Applied Psychology*, *54*(1), 37–60. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2005.00195.x

Urbán, R., Kun, B., Mózes, T., Soltész, P., Paksi, B., Farkas, J., Kökönyei, G., Orosz, G., Maráz, A., Felvinczi, K., Griffiths, M. D., & Demetrovics, Z. (2019). A four-factor model of work addiction: The development of the Work Addiction Risk Test Revised. *European Addiction Research*, *25*(3), 145–159. https://doi.org/10.1159/000499672