

QUESTIONNAIRE REVIEW

Work Addiction Risk Test

Brief history

Robinson first developed the Work Addiction Risk Test (WART) by studying samples of US students (1999). WART is a measure of workaholism which Robinson defined as an ‘overindulgence in and preoccupation with work, often to the exclusion and detriment of the workaholic’s health, intimate relationships, and participation in child rearing’ [1].

Description

The widely used test consists of 25 questions that were based on symptoms reported to doctors treating workaholics. The questions are self-rated on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from never true = 1 to always true = 4. Overall scores of 67–100 indicate highly workaholic tendencies, scores of 57–66 indicate moderate workaholic tendencies and scores less than 57 are considered normal. The test has been criticized by others as it is felt to focus more on measuring type-A behaviours and anxiety traits rather than a more contemporary view of workaholic addictive behaviours. More recently, the Bergen Work Addiction Scale has been developed to measure workaholism as an addiction. [2]

Items

Robinson and Flowers suggested that five dimensions were analysed by the questions within the test [3]:

Dimension	Examples of questions within the test
Compulsive tendencies	‘I seem to be in a hurry and racing against the clock’
Control	‘I get impatient when I have to wait for someone else...’
Impaired communication/ self-absorption	‘I forget, ignore or minimize important family celebrations...’
Inability to delegate	‘I prefer to do most things myself rather than ask for help’
Self-worth	‘It is important that I see the concrete results of what I do’

Validity

Validity testing has largely been undertaken by its author. A total of 363 college students completed a battery of tests

including the WART. Internal consistency of the scores was ($a = 0.88$) and WART scores correlated with generalized anxiety ($r = 0.40$) and type-A behaviour ($r = 0.37$ – 0.50) [1]. Satisfactory two-week test–retest reliability ($r = 0.83$) was found in a sample of 50 US students and the coefficient alpha for the individual items was 0.85 [4]. Validity studies have largely used non-representative samples of either undergraduates or members of Workaholics Anonymous and the validity of the test has been questioned [5]. In addition, a lack of understanding as to how workaholism should be measured or defined between studies and in comparison with other work addiction tests has been noted [5–7].

Key research

All physicians at a French University hospital were invited to complete the WART as a survey and 13% were found to be highly work addicted [8]. A total of 126 Polish academic workers were asked to complete both the WART and the general health questionnaire. Sixty-six per cent of the subjects were classified as having a moderate to high risk of workaholism and the study suggested workaholism is associated with poorer mental health [7].

Source

The WART is widely available in the public domain and is not protected by copyright.

Rachel Sharp

e-mail: rachel.sharp@hobsonhealth.co.uk

References

1. Robinson RE. The Work Addiction Risk Test: development of a tentative measure of workaholism. *Percept Mot Skills* 1999;**88**:199–210.
2. Andreassen CS, Griffiths MD, Hetland J, Pallesen S. Development of a work addiction scale. *Scand J Psychol* 2012;**53**:265–272.
3. Flowers CP, Robinson B. A structural and discriminant analysis of the Work Addiction Risk Test. *Educ Psychol Meas* 2002;**62**:517–526.
4. Robinson BE, Post P. Validity of the Work Addiction Risk Test. *Percept Mot Skills* 1994;**78**:337–338.
5. Cecilie Schou Andreassen. Workaholism: an overview and current status of the research. *J Behav Addict* 2014;**3**:1–11.
6. Patel AS, Bowler MC, Bowler JL, Methe SA. A meta-analysis of Workaholism. *Int J Bus Manag* 2012;**7**:2–17.

7. Bartczak M, Ogiriska-Bulik N. Workaholism and mental health among Polish academic workers. *Int J Occup Saf Ergon* 2012;**18**:3–13.

8. Rezvani A, Bouju G, Keriven-Dessomme B, Moret L, Grall-Bronnec M. Workaholism: are physicians at risk? *Occup Med (Lond)* 2014;**64**:410–416.

Environmental & Ethical Policies

Oxford Journals is committed to implementing environmentally friendly policies and practices. Where possible we use environmentally accredited papers. Look out for the FSC and SFI logos on our journals.

For more information visit: www.oxfordjournals.org/ethicalpolicies.html

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS