

Musinszki, Zoltán; Vallasek, Magdolna; Mélypataki, Gábor; Csolák, Erika
Horváthné; Lipták, Katalin

Article

Workaholism and a new generation: Labour market survey among Hungarian and Romanian youth

Amfiteatru Economic Journal

Provided in Cooperation with:

The Bucharest University of Economic Studies

Suggested Citation: Musinszki, Zoltán; Vallasek, Magdolna; Mélypataki, Gábor; Csolák, Erika Horváthné; Lipták, Katalin (2020) : Workaholism and a new generation: Labour market survey among Hungarian and Romanian youth, Amfiteatru Economic Journal, ISSN 2247-9104, The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Vol. 22, Iss. Special Issue No. 14, pp. 1227-1242,
<https://doi.org/10.24818/EA/2020/S14/1227>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/281551>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

WORKAHOLISM AND A NEW GENERATION – LABOUR MARKET SURVEY AMONG HUNGARIAN AND ROMANIAN YOUTH

Zoltán Musinszki¹, Magdolna Vallasek², Gábor Mélypataki³,
Erika Horváthné Csolák⁴ and Katalin Lipták^{5*}

^{1,3,4,5)} University of Miskolc, Miskolc, Hungary

²⁾ Sapientia Hungarian University of Transylvania, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

<p>Please cite this article as: Musinszki, Z., Vallasek, M., Mélypataki, G., Horváthné, Cs.E. and Lipták, K., 2020. Workaholism and a New Generation – Labour Market Survey among Hungarian and Romanian Youth. <i>Amfiteatru Economic</i>, 22(Special Issue No. 14), pp. 1227-1242.</p> <p>DOI: 10.24818/EA/2020/S14/1227</p>	<p>Article History Received: 5 May 2020 Revised: 18 August 2020 Accepted: 29 September 2020</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Abstract

What is the difference between a workaholic and a hard-working worker? This issue becomes especially important in the current situation with the growing role of home office and teleworking. In addition, the labour market is undergoing a transformation due to generational change, where members of Generation Z will begin entering the labour market. With the new generation in the case of flexible and new employment conditions, the concept of working time will change, and this will bring about changes in the concept of overtime. We assume that members of the younger generation, Generations Y and Z (date of birth between 1995-2009; age 20-29) have similar views on workaholism and working hours, regardless of country and settlement type. We conducted a questionnaire survey in Hungary and Romania. Based on the research, it can be stated that concerning the target group of 20-29-year-olds the concept of workaholism is judged differently by Hungarian and Romanian young people. In both countries, respondents would prefer to work with a schedule of partly or fully flexible working hours than in full-time, fixed or non-fixed working hours. Respondents prefer partly flexible working time in Hungary and fully flexible working time in Romania. Young people have the same attitude towards teleworking regardless of their country, but the type of settlement and their field of education affect their opinions on teleworking. Nearly half of the responders think that a work-life balance can be found, it is only a matter of perception.

Keywords: youth generation, working time, home office, Heavy Work Investments, labour market.

JEL Classification: J81, K31.

* Corresponding author, **Katalin Liptak** – e-mail: liptak.katalin@uni-miskolc.hu

Introduction

Heavy Work Investment (HWI) is a complex phenomenon (Schaufeli, 2016), which results from external environmental and individual attitudes. These gave rise to HWI-related phenomena such as karoshi, burnout and work mania. These phenomena focus on separate elements of a broad scale, which are connected by working time as a factor, including the possibility of overtime and the social, legal and economic expectations of it. Karoshi expresses the Japanese phenomenon when an employee literally works himself to death (Kanai, 2006). Karoshi can be interpreted as one of the most extreme forms of work mania. In comparison, burnout has other characteristics. Here, the personal attitude is primary and the environment is secondary, but it is closely related to working time and the main conceptual elements that define unnecessarily invested work (Rabenau and Aharoni-Goldenberg, 2017). Here we are not talking about the usefulness of the actual work, but about the crisis of the worker's own value judgment, based on which he/she himself/herself perceives the energy invested in work as wasted. In this case, we can speak of a mental move-away from work. If we were to rank the above phenomena, then burnout is the extreme value that opposes work mania, but in the same way the usefulness of the energy invested is questioned. In the case of work mania, the social and economic benefits of the work invested are called into question. In the case of burnout, the worker himself/herself questions the usefulness of his/her activity. Burnout syndrome was classified as a disease by the WHO in 2019. Burn-out syndrome is a response to persistent emotional and interpersonal stress at work, characterised by a triad of exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficiency (Csehák and Papp, 2006). The above-mentioned two phenomena represent the two end points of the scale, which are connected by working time as a factor. Both burnout syndrome and work mania are significantly associated with the amount of working time (Csehák and Papp, 2006; Iwasaki, Takahashi and Nakata, 2006). However, examining working time alone is far from sufficient. In order to examine the individual elements of HWI, it is absolutely necessary to take into account both human nature and free will.

Schaufeli (2016) emphasises that we need to distinguish between good and bad energy investment, which is related to both personal potential and the organisational environment. Work mania is a kind of work-related addiction or compulsion (Oates, 1971). Researchers note that this phenomenon can manifest in different ways, so it is not necessarily coercive in nature (Naughton, 1987; Spence and Robbins, 1992). HWI expresses the relationship of time, attention, and energy to work (Snir and Harpaz, 2009; Astakhova and Houge, 2016) and can take the form of coercive urge, such as work mania, and on the other hand, the time factor can also be an element influenced by the circumstances of the situation (Snir and Harpaz, 2006). Thus, HWI and work mania are all explained as similar labour investment behaviours. From the point of view of our research, the phenomena involving coercive force are significant. In our interpretation, work mania is a form located within the HWI in which, if not direct, then at least an indirect coercive force does exist. One of the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic is the mass redundancies of workers, which could also have psychological and social consequences, according to which those who have not lost their jobs will become even more attached to it and thus become much more vulnerable. The transformation of the labour market will also bring about a change in the behaviour of employees. The question posed by Killinger (2006) will become increasingly relevant. He asks what the difference is between a workaholic and a hard-working worker. A hard-working person is accessible to everyone, emotionally attached to family members and friends, and able to maintain a healthy balance between work and personal responsibility. The Z generation employee is characterized by a practical approach (Pál, 2013). According

to Töröcsik (2011), the concept of work has also changed in this generation. Young workers will see the opportunity for self-realization at work. Unfolding individual freedom will be one of the main motivations, which is similarly deceptive to current freedom.

1. Working time

The legal and social significance of working time is also well illustrated by the fact that the first convention adopted by the International Labour Organisation (hereinafter: ILO) occurred one hundred years ago to limit the working time of industrial companies to eight hours a day and forty-eight hours a week. This convention set in motion the process that led to the transformation of previously known labour law dependency. During the Industrial Revolution, workers could work 12–16 hours a day, which was allowed by contemporary rules, or considered an element that the parties were free to agree on based on the prevalence of contractual liberalism. If we look more closely, this freedom is quite ambiguous, where the employee is the more vulnerable party. As explained by Lee, McCann and Messenger (2007) the defining concept of work during early industrialisation was based on the notion that hours off work were considered “lost” time, which in practice meant that workers’ lives were subordinated to production needs. This perspective meant extending working hours, often to maximize the physical exploitation of workers, coupled with political concerns about how to ensure minimum working hours to discipline workers and maintain production levels. With the appearance of machines, the previously unified working time was divided into operating time and working time. This division still exists today, which significantly affects the organisation of working time. Gyulavári (2013) explains that the separation of working time and leisure time had the consequence that the demands of the trade union movement were aimed at determining the beginning and end of the working day. The basic concept of working time regulation is of a labour protection nature. However, the focus of the regulation of working time changed during the 20th century. Flexibility is at the heart of the new working time policy. At the same time, the employee's obligations have decreased, and his level of protection has increased. Free will has become increasingly important. However, the increase in the role of free will refers to the increased use of free time compared to previous eras. After a hundred years, we can say that the socio-economic and legal changes that started with ILO Convention No. 1 are going quite well and we have come to ideas like the 4-day work week (Máté, 2018; Jakab et al., 2019; Whiting, 2020). According to Snir and Harpaz (2004), the extent of working time in the context of work mania exceeds the required level, which is why it is important to examine the relationship between working time and HWI.

2. Working time regulations in Hungary and in Romania

It is worth examining the regulations of both countries in the light of the Directive 2003/88/EC. The most important legal source of Hungarian labour law is Act I of 2012 on the Labour Code (hereinafter referred to as Hungarian LC). It can be seen that both Hungarian and Romanian regulations are the legislative product of the new millennium, as the Romanian Labour Code is Act No. 53 of 2003 (hereinafter referred to as Romanian LC), which – of course – regulates the issues of working time and rest time. The Hungarian rules – as opposed to the Romanian rules – are the products of a second complete recodification after the change of regime. This does not mean that the Romanian rules have not been updated, only that they have been updated according to a different method. Although the regulatory tendencies of the two countries are different, due to the primacy of EU law we can talk about mostly uniform solutions in the mentioned issues.

The Hungarian rules, the Romanian rules and the Directive define the working time as well. According to Hungarian rules, working time is the duration from the commencement until the end of the period prescribed for working, covering also any preparatory and finishing activities related to working. In comparison, as we will see later in the case of the Romanian regulation, the parliament seized the issue from the side of the obligations. As we see from the definition of Article 111 of the Romanian LC, the period during which the employee performs work or is available to the employer and fulfils the rights and obligations prescribed in the individual or collective employment contract is considered working time. Based on this, we can say that under Romanian law, working time is the defined period, defined daily or weekly, during which the employee is obliged to perform the tasks specified in the employment contract (Țiclea, 2015). At the same time, the definition of working time is limited to the period of effective work; as a general rule time spent on lunch breaks, changing working clothes, etc. do not count as working time (Ștefănescu, 2014). In the light of the above, despite the uniform EU guidelines, there are differences in the interpretation of the concept of working time, as also highlighted in the Tyco case (McCann, 2016). However, similarly to the Hungarian regulation, the concept of working time has a double interpretation according to the Romanian regulations; on the one hand, we can talk about normal working hours fixed in the employment contract, and on the other hand, the maximum working hours, which may include overtime work (Țop, 2018). However, not only private law rules but also public law rules apply to working time. The obligation to register working hours is incumbent on the employer, who shall register daily working time, the exact start and end dates of the working time standby and leave according to Article 119 of the Romanian LC and Article 134 of the Hungarian LC.

As a result of the above, daily and weekly working hours are linked to the calendar day and week, respectively. If the beginning and end of the working time do not fall on the same day, the working time in 24 consecutive hours instead of the calendar day and 168 consecutive hours instead of the calendar week shall be examined. The legal daily working hours are 8 hours and a maximum of 12 hours (Gyulavári, 2013). This can only be exceeded if the parties have agreed on an unequal distribution of working time, a working time frame. A working time frame means that the employer determines how many hours of work have to be performed within a given period. For example: If there is a period (a working time frame) of one month, and within this one month there are 22 working days, the employee has to perform 8 hours multiplied by 22, that is 176 hours within this one month. The Romanian rules are similar to the Hungarian rules. For full-time employees, the normal working time in Romania is also 8 hours a day, 40 hours a week. As a general rule, working time is evenly distributed over 8 hours a day for 5 days, with a rest period of two days, but deviations from this are allowed, while respecting the normal working hours of 40 hours per week. According to the classic economic theory, people try to maximize income and leisure time, working longer when the wage rate is higher and working less when the wage rate is lower (Šabić-Lipovača, Strielkowski and Bilan, 2016).

In Hungarian law, depending on the operating hours of the employer, we can talk about multi-shift work schedules, uninterrupted work schedules, seasonal work and standby jobs. Night work or night shifts fit into the above-mentioned division. In several cases, the Hungarian solution links the concepts of working time to the operation of the employer. However, Romanian labour law links it to the work programme performed by the employee. When examining the safeguard elements, it is necessary to emphasize that this external environment does not necessarily protect the employee to the extent that we would have anticipated. The application of Hungarian law does not comply with EU law in several

respects, so the vulnerability of workers is also higher. It is easier to put pressure on the employee. Fodor (2016) emphasizes that an employer may not require an employee to work more than 48 hours in a seven-day period, which is calculated as an average according to the reference period referred to in Article 16 (b). An exception to this is if the employee has consented in advance to such work. Such a rule is not included in Hungarian law – at most to the extent that a longer working time is agreed with the employee in the employment contract itself – which can hardly be considered appropriate from the point of view of the Directive. We can see that the protection is not complete and the external environment itself is suitable for the coercion of the worker. Thus, typical work is still 8-hour-a-day and/or 40-hour-a-week work in both countries. However, in our view, employee expectations regarding working hours are also changing. One of the central questions in our survey is therefore the focus on the management of working time.

Some of the methods that differ from the typical work schedule can already be considered classic, such as the multi-shift work schedule, where the employer's operating schedule exceeds 40 hours per week. In the Romanian legislation, the employee-centred regulation remains, according to which employees perform their same work activities alternately in relation to the same work activities. The Hungarian legislation approaches the same from the employer's point of view, when it says that if the weekly operating time exceeds 40 hours, the work is considered shift-based. An important aspect of the topic is the regulation of overtime. As of 1 January 2019, the rules for ordering overtime working hours changed significantly in Hungary. The extent of overtime working hours that can be ordered and the way they are ordered also changed. According to the current Hungarian regulations, 250 hours of overtime work can be ordered per calendar year. There has been no change compared with the previous regulation in that neither individual, nor collective agreement is required to order 250 hours of overtime work. The change occurred in the ordering of overtime hours exceeding 250 hours. An employer has two options if he/she wants to order more than 250 hours of overtime work in a year. One of the options could be to implement the newly introduced voluntary overtime legal institution. According to the Hungarian rules, in addition to the 250 hours, an additional 150 hours of extraordinary work per calendar year can be undertaken on the basis of an agreement between the employer and the employee. The law requires an individual agreement as a condition for ordering 150 hours. The voluntary overtime agreement can be terminated by the end of the calendar year. Except as otherwise provided by law, overtime can only be performed with the employee's consent, but there is no formal requirement for consent or an application for overtime. In this sense the verbal instruction to perform overtime is valid, and the mere fact that beyond normal working hours the employee continues to stay at his/her workplace and perform work can also be considered as consent to overtime work (Athanasiu and Dima, 2005).

The regulation of the working time frame was not included in the original text of the Romanian LC, in contrast to the Hungarian LC, which was later provided for in 2005 by the amendments of the emergency government decree no. 65. However, according to the current rules, according to Community standards, the length of the working time frame can be four, six or twelve months, in which case the weekly working time not exceeding 48 hours will be calculated as an average of the working time frame. The rules of the Hungarian working time frame are being altered at the time of writing this manuscript. As an extension and perpetuation of the emergency rules, it has raised the limit on the working time frame to a limit of 24 months. The definition of working time in the case of home-office and teleworking is of paramount importance, as it is difficult for the worker to separate working time from leisure time in such a situation. The Romanian LC only

regulates the possibility of working from home, in this case allowing the employee to determine his/her own work programme, which must correspond to the duration of working hours under the employment contract (Ștefănescu, 2011).

Voluntary overtime can be considered as an opportunity and an obligation arising from these rules in same time as well. In many cases, it will become an obligation on the part of the employer, and the relative connection between overtime and work mania described by Mazetti, Schaufeli and Guglielmi (2014) clearly appears. On the one hand, the Hungarian rules allow pressure to be put on the employees, and on the other hand, they also allow room for the employee's individual attitude. In the following, we further examine the extent to which the legal framework described here makes work addiction possible and the attitudes of the young people interviewed in this regard. Compared to classic work, however, teleworking and home office require different types of competencies (Agrawal et al., 2020). In both cases, we usually talk about working from home, in which as a general rule the employee can organise working time on his/her own. Teleworking, home office and working through applications, as well as flexible work are increasingly searched for by the younger generations, which go hand in hand with IT support for changes in work processes. As Agrawal et al. (2020) also highlight, COVID-19 has accelerated the processes that led to working from home. Employers have been forced to introduce methods that had not been tried before both out of coercion and the feeling of mistrust against the new forms of labour relations. This gives freedom and ties at the same time to employees.

This duality of freedom and limits is duly illustrated by a teleworking pilot project called Plan Concilia launched in Spain in 2005. The Spanish government aimed to help ministry workers reconcile work and private life (Farkas, 2013). It gives freedom from strong employer control, as employees are farther from employers in space and sometimes even in time (Mendez and Serrani, 2015). In this case, the subordination of employees decreases greatly. The employee's place of work is outside of the control zone of the employer. It is an obligation, however, since workers have to make themselves to do the work as quasi-self-bosses, which – we believe – is also associated with the stress factor that a significant proportion of employees think they are invisible. These workers fear that because it is not visible what they are working on, they will be forgotten or fired. These workers often overcompensate, which typically manifests in overtime working. Their fears do not allow them to rest. Thus, despite having the freedom and struggling with loneliness or other factors, it is feared that many people will not use their freedom to strike the right balance between private life and work, but as Han (2015) has pointed out, they reduce their freedom by exploiting themselves. Now the rules in Romania in connection with teleworking is in Act 81 of 2018. Since the Hungarian regulation has known this solution, it regulates it among the atypical forms of work in the Hungarian LC as same as in Romanian Law. According to Romanian legislation, telework is considered to be work that takes place regularly and on a voluntary basis, at least once a month at a place of work organised by the employer, using telecommunications and information technology. Contrary to the provisions of the Romanian LC, the Telework Act contains specific provisions on overtime, the most important of which is that, according to Article 4, overtime can only take place with the written consent of the employee.

The relations outlined above prevail in the relationship between employer and employee in the classical sense of employment. Due to the subordinate status of the worker, the freedom of choice is limited, even if we have talked about voluntary overtime so far. After all, not all overtime working is voluntary, and on the other hand, the dependence between the

parties is much more pronounced (Wank, 1988). Changes in the labour market are moving in the direction of digitalisation, which can result in transforming working conditions. The clear directions for this are teleworking relationships and home office. In the earlier practice of the companies, they were mainly used in Western European countries, and were far less frequently used in Central and Eastern European countries.

3. Problems and research questions

We assume that members of the younger generation, Generations Y and Z (date of birth between 1995-2009; age of 20-29 years), have similar views on workaholism and working hours, regardless of country and settlement type. Narrowing our study to the fields of education of economics and law, we sought answers to the following research questions:

- **RQ1:** Do respondents perceive themselves as workaholics or work maniacs?
- **RQ2:** What type of working time schedule do they prefer?
- **RQ3:** How do they judge the relationship between home office and teleworking?

To answer our research questions, we conducted primary research (questionnaire survey).

The questionnaire survey was implemented online in Hungary and Romania in April 2020. The questionnaires were shared with the target groups with the help of colleagues in the faculties of economics and law. The operating rules of several universities and colleges do not allow such surveys to be conducted, therefore representativeness is not ensured. The survey started in the second half of April, and the questionnaires were closed on May 10th. Data collection was performed using Google Form and processing was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 26. The data were processed anonymously. After cleaning and checking the data, a sample of 251 people was available for analysis in Hungary and a sample of 125 people in Romania. Subsequently, only the responses of respondents in the age range 20–29 were retained for further analysis, so the number in the sample was 220. As a consequence of the analysis of the field of education we took two respondents out of the sample, because they did not provide an evaluable answer to this question. Data on the sample is provided in table no. 1.

Table no. 1. Characteristics of the sample (N = 220 people)

		Frequency	Percent
Country	Hungary	132	60.0
	Romania	88	40.0
Age	20-24	145	65.9
	25-29	75	34.1
Educational attainment	High school	70	31.8
	University degree or higher	150	68.2
Permanent residence (settlement type)	Village	48	21.8
	Other city	51	23.2
	County seat	79	35.9
	Capital city (of a country), that is Budapest or Bucharest	42	19.1
Field of education	Economics	127	58.3
	Law	91	41.7

Source: Own compilation

In order to conclude on the statistical population, we performed an independence test. As a nonparametric hypothesis, we performed a Chi-square test. The strength of the association between the data in the sample was determined by Cramer's V-index. During the variance analysis, the existence of mixed relationships (qualitative/territorial criterion - quantitative criterion) was tested by hypothesis testing.

4. The evaluation of results

4.1. What is workaholism? (RQ1)

In our questionnaire, we formulated the following answers about workaholism: Maximalism, work mania, engrossed in work, reluctant to give up work, rejecting other aspects of life, mixing other parts of life into work, "hidden" jobs, burnout. Respondents were able to mark multiple answers. The 220 respondents gave a total of 458 answers, i.e. each respondent indicated on average more than two options. For all the aspects we examined (country, settlement type, field of education), the term work mania was most often indicated. These 171 nominations made 37% of responses and 78% of responders. In the case of both the country (Hungary - Romania), the settlement type (capital city – county seat - other city - village) and the field of education (economic - legal), taking into account all possible outputs, at least 33% of the given answers was an expression of work mania. In addition to work mania, responders most often indicated the following terms: Engrossed in work, rejecting other aspects of life, burnout, and mixing other parts of life into work. With the exception of the legal field of education, engrossed in work is the second or third most common answer in all cases. Based on the study, it can be concluded that there is a weak significant relationship between the field of education and the responses to workaholism ($\chi^2 = 27.366$, $p = 0.000$, $df = 7$, Cramer's $V = 0.141$). There is a weak significant relationship between the country and responses to workaholism ($\chi^2 = 15.164$, $p = 0.034$, $df = 7$, Cramer's $V = 0.105$). The study does not show a significant relationship between the settlement type and the responses to workaholism ($\chi^2 = 9.608$, $p = 0.984$, $df = 21$, Cramer's $V = 0.084$). Thus, the content of the concept of workaholism is judged differently by Hungarian and Romanian young people aged 20-29 with a degree in economics or law (or pursuing such studies).

4.2. Are you a work maniac? (RQ1)

78% of respondents identified workaholism (also) with work mania. Consequently, we further examined the extent to which respondents considered themselves to be work maniacs. The evaluation was performed on a five-point Likert scale, where 1 - not at all, 5 - completely. 4.09% of responders do not consider themselves to be work maniacs at all and 9.09% consider themselves to be workaholics to a small extent. The majority indicated three or four on the scale. 39.09% of the responders gave a medium value (three) and 41.36% gave a point of four. 14 people (6.36%) consider themselves to be completely work maniacs. The mean is 3.37, the standard deviation is 0.889, and the mode is 4. For all segments, the pattern already mentioned can be observed for the whole statistical population. More detailed standard deviation and relative standard deviation data are given in table no. 2.

Table no. 2. The mean, standard deviation, relative standard deviation of work mania based on country, settlement type and field of education

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rel. Std. Deviation
Total	220	3.37	0.889	0.264
HU	132	3.39	0.862	0.254
RO	88	3.34	0.933	0.279
Capital city	42	3.40	0.885	0.260
County seat	79	3.39	0.898	0.265
Other city	51	3.43	0.806	0.235
Village	48	3.23	0.973	0.301
Economic field of education	127	3.31	0.888	0.268
Legal field of education	91	3.46	0.860	0.249

Source: Own compilation

We analysed independence in the cases of country, settlement type and field of education. Based on these, between the extent of work mania and (1) the country there is a very weak, non-significant relationship, ($\chi^2 = 1.241$, $p = 0.871$, $df = 4$, Cramer's $V = 0.075$), (2) with the settlement type there is a weak, non-significant relationship, ($\chi^2 = 6.712$, $p = 0.876$, $df = 12$, Cramer's $V = 0.101$), (3) with the field of education there is a weak, non-significant relationship. ($\chi^2 = 4.734$, $p = 0.316$, $df = 4$, Cramer's $V = 0.147$). A variance analysis was also performed following the independence test. In all cases, the significance level exceeds 0.05; therefore, we can state that neither the country, the settlement type, nor the field of education has an effect on the extent of work mania.

4.3. Examination of the type of working time schedule and the factors influencing it (RQ2)

Our next research question was whether the type of the working time schedule is influenced by the country, the settlement type or the field of education. The following working time schedules were examined: (1) Full-time fixed working hours (8 hours every day, 40 hours per week), (2) full-time non-fixed working hours (different number of working hours per day, but a total of 40 hours per week), (3) partly flexible working time (a 6-hour regular working time per day and a 2-hour flexible working time at the beginning or at the end of the workday), (4) fully flexible working time (weekly working time frame = 40 hours). Respondents were asked to rate these options on a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 - not at all, 5 - completely. (What kind of working time schedule would you like to work in?) In the case of full-time fixed working hours, the average in Hungary was 3.31; and the average in Romania was 3.20. The mean for the sample was 3.27. The mode was 4 in Hungary (27.27% of responders), 3 in Romania and 3 in the sample (30.68% and 26.36% of responders respectively). Based on the independence test there is a weak non-significant relationship between the full-time fixed working hours and the responses according to countries ($\chi^2 = 3.462$, $p = 0.484$, $df = 4$, Cramer's $V = 0.125$). In the case of full-time non-fixed working hours (different number of working hours per day but a total of 40 hours per week) the average in Hungary was 3.22 and it was 3.43 in Romania; the average of the sample was 3.30. There is a weak, non-significant relationship between the two variables ($\chi^2 = 4.626$, $p = 0.328$, $df = 4$, Cramer's $V = 0.145$). In the case of partly flexible working time (a 6-hour regular working time per day and a 2-hour flexible working time at the beginning or at the end of the workday), both the majority of Hungarian (41.67%) and

Romanian (35.23%) responders, as well as the majority of all respondents, marked it with the highest value on the scale (mode = 5). The average in Hungary was 3.99, the average in Romania was 3.64, and the average of the sample was 3.85. That is, there is a significant, weak relationship between the partly flexible working time and the country ($\chi^2 = 10.470$, $p = 0.033$, $df = 4$, Cramer's $V = 0.218$). In the case of fully flexible working time (weekly working time frame = 40 hours) – similarly to partly flexible working time – the mode is 5 in all cases. For both countries, more than 42% of respondents marked the highest value. At the same time, compared to partly flexible working time, the average in Hungary is lower (3.76), the average in Romania is higher (3.67), and the average of the sample is also lower (3.72). There is a weak, non-significant relationship between the two variables. ($\chi^2 = 4.243$, $p = 0.374$, $df = 4$, Cramer's $V = 0.139$). In both countries, responders would prefer to work in partly or fully flexible working time to full-time fixed or non-fixed working hours. Responders prefer partly flexible working time in Hungary and fully flexible working time in Romania. For both countries, a relative majority would like to work in a work schedule of fully flexible working time (table no. 3).

Table no. 3. The mean, standard deviation and relative standard deviation of the evaluation of working time schedule based on the settlement types

Categories	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rel. Std. Deviation	
Full-time fixed working hours (8 hours every day, 40 hours per week)	Capital city	42	3.07	1.386	0.451
	County seat	79	3.27	1.278	0.391
	Other city	51	3.35	1.354	0.404
	Village	48	3.35	1.229	0.366
	Total	220	3.27	1.302	0.398
Full-time non-fixed working hours (different number of working hours per day, but a total of 40 hours per week)	Capital city	42	3.36	1.411	0.420
	County seat	79	3.52	1.280	0.364
	Other city	51	3.12	1.194	0.383
	Village	48	3.10	1.225	0.394
	Total	220	3.30	1.280	0.387
Partly flexible working time (a 6-hour regular working time per day and a 2-hour flexible working time at the beginning or at the end of the workday)	Capital city	42	3.45	1.347	0.390
	County seat	79	4.16	1.079	0.259
	Other city	51	3.88	1.194	0.308
	Village	48	3.65	1.211	0.332
	Total	220	3.85	1.213	0.315
Fully flexible working time (weekly working time frame = 40 hours)	Capital city	42	3.79	1.474	0.389
	County seat	79	3.82	1.347	0.352
	Other city	51	3.55	1.222	0.344
	Village	48	3.69	1.446	0.392
	Total	220	3.72	1.362	0.366

Source: Own compilation

A schedule of full-time fixed working hours is the least preferred solution in all settlement types compared to the other options. The mean was 3.27, the mode 3 (26.40% of responders). The schedule of fixed working hours received the highest average in other cities and villages (3.35 – 3.35), while the mode was highest in the county seats. 35.4% of responders marked the value 4. There is a weak, non-significant relationship between the

two variables ($\chi^2 = 17.102$, $p = 0.146$, $df = 12$, Cramer's $V = 0.161$). In the case of full-time non-fixed working hours (different number of working hours per day, but a total of 40 hours per week), the mean was 3.30. This preference is also reflected in the case of villages and other cities. Concerning people living in the capital cities and in the county seats, the mode was 5, but it should be emphasized that in the case of the county seats there was only a difference of 1 between those who chose values 3, 4 and 5, (3: 20 people, 4: 21 people, 5: 22 people.) Thus, there is a weak, insignificant relationship between the two variables ($\chi^2 = 16.852$, $p = 0.155$, $df = 12$, Cramer's $V = 0.160$). The majority of respondents prefer partly flexible working. In all settlement types with the exception of the capital cities, this working time schedule received the highest average. This is due to the fact that 14.3% of people living in the capitals do not want to work in a schedule of partly flexible working time at all. The total number of respondents and the relative majority of those living in the capital towns of counties and other cities totally would like to work in a schedule of partly flexible working time. That is, there is a significant weak relationship between the partly flexible working time and the settlement type. ($\chi^2 = 24.983$, $p = 0.015$, $df = 12$, Cramer's $V = 0.195$). In the case of fully flexible working time (weekly working time frame = 40 hours), the mode was 5, with the exception of other cities. With the exception of other cities, at least 42.3% of respondents marked the highest value in all cases. The proportion of those who do not support partly flexible working time at all (1) or only to a small extent (2) is 14.1%. In contrast, the proportion of those who do not support fully flexible working time at all (1) or only to a small extent (2) is 21.8%. That is, there is a weak, non-significant relationship between the fully flexible working time and the settlement type. ($\chi^2 = 13.651$, $p = 0.324$, $df = 12$, Cramer's $V = 0.144$). For all types of working time schedule, it can be observed that those living in the capital cities gave the most extreme answers. The standard deviation is the highest in capital cities among all settlement types. It can also be observed that, with the exception of full-time fixed working hours (8 hours every day, 40 hours per week), people living in villages preferred the given working time schedule to a below-average extent. We performed variance analysis. The homogeneity was tested based on the Levene Statistic. As in the case of countries, with the exception of partly flexible working time, the significance level exceeds 0.05 in all cases, therefore we can state that there is no relationship between the settlement type and the given working time schedule. At the same time, a significant relationship can be discovered between the settlement type and the partly flexible working time ($F = 3.891$, $df1 = 3$, $df2 = 216$, $p = 0.001$).

Finally, let us look at how representatives of economic and legal profession relate to working time schedule. In the case of full-time fixed working hours the average of those with degrees in or studying economics was 3.23 and the average of those with degrees in or studying law was 3.34. The legal field of education is less divided in terms of the fixed-time work than the economic field of education. According to the independence test, there is a weak, non-significant relationship between the schedule of full-time fixed working hours and the responses according to the fields of education ($\chi^2 = 4.444$, $p = 0.349$, $df = 4$, Cramer's $V = 0.143$). The two fields of education have different approaches to full-time non-fixed working hours (different number of working hours per day, but a total of 40 hours per week). There is a weak significant relationship between the two variables ($\chi^2 = 9.393$, $p = 0.052$, $df = 4$, Cramer's $V = 0.208$). Partly flexible working time (a 6-hour regular working time per day and a 2-hour flexible working time at the beginning or at the end of the workday) is the most popular for both fields of education. Partly flexible

working time is totally supported by 39.45% of respondents and fully flexible working time by 42.66% of respondents. In the case of partly flexible working time, the average of the economic field of education was 3.91, the average of the legal field of education was 3.79, and the average of the sample was 3.86. In the case of fully flexible working time, the average of the economic field of education was 3.80, the average of the legal field of education was 3.64, and the average of the sample was 3.73. There is a weak, non-significant relationship between partly flexible working time and the field of education. ($\chi^2 = 3.405$, $p = 0.493$, $df = 4$, Cramer's $V = 0.125$) As we observed in the previous two cases (country and settlement type), respondents would prefer to work in a schedule of partly or fully flexible working time than in a schedule of full-time fixed or non-fixed working hours. In all cases, the significance level exceeds 0.05, therefore we can state that there is no significant relationship between the field of education and the given working time schedule.

4.4. Evaluation of home office and teleworking (RQ3)

Question in the questionnaire: Due to the COVID-19 epidemic, home office and teleworking will come to the fore. Have you ever tried this form of work? The answers to the question were examined along several dimensions (country, settlement type and field of education) and research sub-questions were formulated for each analysis. *What is the relationship between the country of residence of young people and their opinion about home office and teleworking due to the COVID-19 coronavirus epidemic?* Of the 220 people, 136 (61.8%) have already worked in the form of teleworking and 84 (38.2%) have not. The connection between the two variables is given by Pearson's Chi-square value. There is a very weak, almost non-existent non-significant relationship between the two variables (Cramer $V = 0.027$, the observed significance level $p = 0.692$).

Continuing the analysis, we were interested in the relationship between the settlement type in which young people live and their opinions about home office and teleworking due to the COVID-19 epidemic. Of the respondents, 48 people (21.8%) live in villages. 51 people (23.2%) in other cities. 79 people (35.9%) in county seats and 42 people (19.1%) in the capital. The connection between the two variables is given by Pearson's Chi-square value. The value of the indicator is 11.557 ($df = 3$), the critical significance level ($p = 0.009$) does not exceed the threshold of 0.05, so we reject the null hypothesis: There is a connection between the settlement type of the young people and their opinions about teleworking. This means that, depending on the settlement type where young people live, it is an appropriate predictive variable for their opinion of teleworking. There is a weak, significant relationship between the two variables (Cramer $V = 0.229$, the observed significance level $p = 0.009$).

As another research sub-question, we formulated: *What is the relationship between the field of education of young people and their opinions about home office and teleworking due to the COVID-19 epidemic?* As two respondents marked other fields of education (they participated neither in the legal nor the economic field of education), we ignored their response, so we analysed a total of 218 responses here. Of the 218 people, 127 (58.3%) have been studying or studied economics and 91 (41.7%) law. The value of the Chi-square index is 12.209 ($df = 1$), the critical significance level ($p = 0.000$) does not exceed the threshold of 0.05, so we reject the null hypothesis, i.e. there is a relationship between young

people's field of education and their opinions about teleworking. (Cramer $V = 0.237$, the observed significance level $p = 0.000$).

The question in the questionnaire was how much time should be spent working in the home office or when teleworking. Research sub-question: *What is the relationship between the country of residence of young people and their working time in the home office?* 72 people (32.7%) answered that they worked less in home office because of declining subsidiary activities, 89 people (40.5%) worked just as much in home office as in their normal workplace, and 59 people (26.8%) worked more during home office because the employee also made the preparations of work from home. There is a very weak, significant relationship between the two variables (Cramer $V = 0.224$, the observed significance level $p = 0.004$). Of those who worked less in the case of teleworking, 72% were Hungarian and 28% were Romanian. Those who worked just as much as under normal circumstances are 47% Hungarian and 53% Romanian. Those who worked more in the case of teleworking were 64% Hungarian and 36% Romanian, i.e. Romanians worked almost as much during teleworking as before, and the two extremes are more pronounced among Hungarians. *What is the relationship between the settlement type in which young people live and the working time in the home office?* The value of the Chi-square index is 12.471 ($df = 6$), the critical significance level ($p = 0.052$) exceeds the threshold of 0.05, so we accept the null hypothesis, i.e. there is no relationship between the settlement type of the young people and the working time in the home office. There is a very weak, significant relationship between the two variables (Cramer $V = 0.238$, the observed significance level $p = 0.052$). *What is the relationship between the field of education of young people and the working time in the home office?* Other fields of education were excluded from the cross-table analysis, so a total of 218 responses were evaluated. The value of the Chi-square index is 2.758 ($df = 2$), the critical significance level ($p = 0.252$) exceeds the threshold of 0.05, so we accept the null hypothesis, i.e. there is no relationship between the field of education of young people and the working time in the home office. There is a very weak, non-significant relationship between the two variables (Cramer $V = 0.112$, the observed significance level $p = 0.252$).

Question in the questionnaire: Is it easy to find a work-life balance in the home office? Analyses were performed along the three dimensions described above. Research sub-question: *What is the relationship between the country of residence of young people and the work-life balance?* According to our null hypothesis, there is no relationship between them, which was examined by cross-table analysis and Chi-square test. According to 105 people (47.7%) it is possible to find a balance between work and rest, it is only a matter of perception; according to 50 people (22.7%) it is difficult to do both in the same place; 5 people (2.3%) say it is difficult because everything would be more important than working; and 60 people (23.3%) think it is difficult because it is not possible to just focus on work like in the workplace. We accept the null hypothesis, so there is no significant relationship between young people's place of residence and work-life balance. This means that the place of residence (the countries) of young people is not an appropriate predictor in terms of their perceptions of work-life balance. There is a very weak, non-significant relationship between the two variables (Cramer $V = 0.118$, the observed significance level $p = 0.380$).

What is the relationship between the settlement type in which young people live and the work-life balance? The answer between the two variables is given by Pearson's Chi-square value. The value of the indicator is 3.418 ($df = 9$), the critical significance level ($p = 0.945$) exceeds the threshold of 0.05, so we accept the null hypothesis, so there is no significant

relationship between the settlement type of young people and the work-life balance. This means that the type of settlement in which young people live is not an appropriate predictor for their opinion on balancing work and leisure. There is a very weak, non-significant relationship between the two variables (Cramer $V = 0.072$, the observed significance level $p = 0.945$).

Conclusions

The concept of workaholism was identified with work mania by 78% of respondents. In addition to work mania, respondents most often indicated the following terms: Engrossed in work, rejecting other aspects of life, burnout, mixing other parts of life into work. Based on the research, it can be stated that concerning the target group of 20–29-year-old people the content of the concept of work mania is judged differently by Hungarian and Romanian young people, as well as by those with economic or legal field of education (or currently participating in such studies). It can also be stated that neither the country and the settlement type, nor the field of education has an effect on the extent of work mania (RQ1).

In both countries, respondents would prefer to work in a schedule of partly or fully flexible working time than in full-time, fixed or non-fixed working hours. Responders prefer partly flexible working time in Hungary and fully flexible working time in Romania. For both countries, a relative majority would like to work in a schedule of fully flexible working time. With the exception of the capital city, the schedule of fully flexible working time received the highest average in all types of settlements. The total number of responders and the relative majority of those living in the county seats or other cities would like to work in a schedule of partly flexible working time. In the case of the field of education, it can also be observed that the responders would prefer to work in a partly or fully flexible working time schedule than in a full-time fixed or non-fixed working schedule. The relative majority in the economic field of education prefer a fully flexible working time schedule, in the legal field of education a partly flexible working time schedule (RQ2).

More than 60% of the responders have already worked in telework. Young people have the same attitude towards teleworking regardless of their country, but the type of settlement and the field of education affect their opinions on teleworking. According to the relative majority of responders in Hungary, less work has to be performed during teleworking, while the absolute majority of responders in Romania said that the same quantity of work had to be done. Nearly half of the responders think that a work-life balance can be found, it is only a matter of perception. This perception characterises the 20–29 age group regardless of country, settlement type and field of education (RQ3).

Acknowledgment

This research is supported by project no. EFOP-3.6.2-16-2017-00007, titled “Aspects on the development of a smart, sustainable and inclusive society: Social, technological, innovation networks in employment and the digital economy.” The project has been supported by the European Union, co-financed by the European Social Fund and the budget of Hungary.

References

- Agrawal, S., De Smet, A., Lacroix, S., and Reich, A., 2020. *To emerge stronger from the COVID-19 crisis, companies should start reskilling their workforces now – Adapting employees' skills and roles to the post-pandemic ways of working will be crucial to building operating-model resilience*. New York: McKinsey Global.
- Astakhova, M. and Hogue, M., 2016. A heavy work investment typology: A biopsychosocial framework. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(4), pp.81-99.
- Athanasiu, A. and Dima, L., 2005. *Dretul muncii (Labour Law)*. București: Ed. All Beck.
- Csehák, A., and Papp, A., 2006. A kiégés, mint valós veszély - Adalékok a kiégés szindróma kutatásához. (Burnout as a Real Danger - Additives for Burnout Syndrome Research). *Acta Sana*, 1(1), pp.12-18.
- Farkas, V., 2013. Telework Pilot Projects in Spain, In: Gerencsér, B.Sz., ed. 2013. *Pilot projects in Public Administration Management - Summary of a Research at Pázmány Péter Catholic University Faculty of Law and Political Sciences Volume II*. Budapest: Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, pp.15-20.
- Fodor, T.G., 2016. A Munka Törvénykönyve munka- és pihenőidő szabályozásának uniós jogi megfelelőségéről. (The Labor Code on the adequacy of working and rest time regulations in EU law). *Magyar Munkajog E- folyóirat*, 3(2), pp.21-36. [online] Available at: <http://hllj.hu/letolt/2016_2/M_02_Fodor_hllj_2016_2.pdf> [Accessed 19. April 2020].
- Gyulavári, T., 2013. *Munkaidő (Labour Law)*. Budapest: ELTE-Eötvös.
- Han, B.C., 2015. *The Burnout Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Iwasaki, K., Takahashi, M. and Nakata, A., 2006. Health Problems due to Long Working Hours in Japan: Working Hours, Workers' Compensations (Karoshi) and Preventive Measures. *Industrial Health*, 44, pp.537-540.
- Jakab, N., Prugberger, T., Szöllös, A. and Tóth, H., 2019. Developments in Hungarian Labour and Public Service Legislation during the 2011–2012 Codification and the Subsequent Comprehensive Amendments. *Polgári Szemle*, 15(special issue), pp.252-263.
- Kanai, A., 2006. Economic and employment conditions, karoshi (work to death) and the trend of studies on workaholism in Japan. In: R.J. Burke, ed. 2006. *Research Companion to Working Time and Work Addiction*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp.158-172.
- Killinger, B., 2006. The workaholic breakdown syndrome. In: R.J. Burke, ed. 2006. *Research Companion to Working Time and Work Addiction*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp.61-88.
- Lee, S., McCann, D. and Messenger, J.C., 2007. *Working Time Around the World – Trends in working hours, laws and policies in a global comparative perspective*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Máté, D.A., 2018. Effects of Working Time on Work-Morale. *Conferinta Studenteasca Anuala „Constant” 2018*. Bucharest: University of Nicolae Titulescu. pp.430-435.
- Mazetti, G., Schaufeli, W.B. and Guglielmi, D., 2014. Are workaholics born or made? Relations of workaholism with person characteristics and overwork climate. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 21(3), pp.227-254.

- McCann, D., 2016. Travel Time as Working Time: Tyco, the Unitary Model and the Route to Casualisation. *Industrial Law Journal*, 45(2), pp.244-250.
- Mendez, L. and Serrani, L., 2015. *Work-Life Balance and the Economic Crisis: Some Insights from the Perspective of Comparative Law Volume II*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Naughton., T.J., 1987. A conceptual view of workaholism and implications for career counseling and research. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 35(3), pp.180-187.
- Oates, W., 1971. *Confessions of a Workaholic*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Pál, E., 2013. A Z generációról, irodalmi áttekintés (*About the Generation Z, Literature Review*). [online] Available at: <<http://www.zgeneracio.hu/tanulmanyok>> [Accessed 13. Sept 2020].
- Rabenau, E. and Aharoni-Goldenberg, S., 2017. Understanding the Relationship between Overtime and Burnout. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 47(4), pp.324-335.
- Šabić-Lipovača, A., Strielkowski, W. and Bilan, Y., 2016. Intertemporal Substitution and Labour Supply of Bosnian SME's. *Amfiteatru Economic*, 18(43), pp.634-653.
- Schaufeli, W.B., 2016. Heavy work investment, personality and organizational climate. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(6), pp.1057-1073.
- Snir, R. and Harpaz, I., 2004. Attitudinal and demographic antecedents of workaholism. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17, pp.520-36.
- Snir, R. and Harpaz, I., 2006. The workaholism phenomenon: A cross-national perspective. *Career Development International*, 11(5), pp.374-393.
- Snir, R. and Harpaz, I., 2009. Cross-cultural differences concerning heavy work investment. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 43(4), pp.309-319.
- Spence, J.T. and Robbins, A.S., 1992. Workaholism: Definition, measurement, and preliminary results. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 58(1), pp.160-178.
- Ștefănescu, A., 2011. *Munca la domiciliu și telemunca (Work at Home and Telework)*. București: Universul Juridic.
- Ștefănescu, I.T., 2014. *Tratat teoretic și practic de drept al muncii (Theoretical and Practical Treaty of Labor Law)*. București: Universul Juridic.
- Țiclea, A., 2015. *Tratat de dreptul muncii. Legislație. Doctrină. Jurisprudență (Labor Law Treaty. Legislation. Doctrine. Jurisprudence)*. București: Universul Juridic.
- Țop, D., 2018. *Tratat de dreptul muncii (Labor law treaty)*. București: Ed. Mustang.
- Töröcsik, M., 2011. *Fogyasztói magatartás - insight, trendek, vásárlók (Consumer behavior - insight, trends, customer)*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Wank, R., 1988. *Arbeitnehmerbegriff und Selbstständige (Concept of employee and self-employed)*. München: C.H. Beck.
- Whiting, K., 2020. *New Zealand Prime Minister opens door to 4-day working week*. [online] Available at: <<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/05/new-zealand-jacinda-ardern-4-day-week-pandemic-productivity/>> [Accessed 25. May 2020].