

Staying Late: Comparing Work Hours in Public and Nonprofit Sectors

**Mary Kathleen Feeney
University of Illinois at Chicago**

and

**Barry Bozeman
University of Georgia**

**Paper prepared for presentation at the Public Management Research Conference,
Tucson, Arizona, Oct. 25-27, 2007**

Staying Late: Comparing Work Hours in Public and Nonprofit Sectors

Abstract

This research compares work hours reported in, respectively, public and nonprofit organizations. There are three primary research questions: (1) What are the determinants of managers' work hours? (2) Are there differences between public and nonprofit organizations and, if so, what explains those differences? (3) What are the characteristics of the 'rate busters,' those who work much longer hours than the average? Factors examined in determining work hours include job histories, and perceptions of the organization and fellow employees. The study is based on questionnaire data from the National Administrative Studies Project-III (N=1220). The analytical approach employs ordinary least squares regression. Results indicate that managers in the nonprofit sector tend to work longer hours compared to public managers and that work hours are mitigated by external organizational ties (those with more ties work longer hours) and amount of perceived red tape in one's organization (those who perceive less red tape work longer hours). With respect to the managers' individual work histories, those who have had more previous positions in the public sector work fewer hours and those who have had more previous positions in the nonprofit sector work more hours. The analysis controls for the respondents' state of residence, gender, education, age and race.

Staying Late: Comparing Work Hours in Public and Nonprofit Sectors

The seemingly straightforward question “how many hours do you work?” masks a great deal of socially constructed meaning. For example, is working more a good thing? Does it imply commitment to one’s job or profession? Or is it a bad thing, implying that one is a “workaholic” with, at best, no sense of life’s proportion and, at worst, cheating one’s family of one’s time and attention?

Sometimes “how many hours do you work?” can seem an accusatory question. For example, public sector workers often are subject to presumptions that they are not working hard. After all, if they were “go getters” they would have chosen a private sector job. On occasion, presumptions about work hours can prove embarrassing or off-putting. Harvard University President Lawrence Summers’ well known gaffe claiming that women chose not to go into the sciences because they were unwilling or unable to work the required 80 hours per week (Bombardieri 2005) caused a firestorm ultimately ending in his resignation. Moreover, many work hours issues are construed as gender mediated (e.g., Smith 2002; Probert 1997), with family leave policies and outcomes being among the most controversial (Ruhm 1998; Murray 2001).

Many of the issues pertaining to work hours are hot beds of controversy and can inflame passions about such crucial topics as gender roles, family rights, life-work balance, workaholism, and labor exploitation. Often debates are so contentious and the adversaries so convinced of the righteousness of their views that empirical questions and data are ignored or used selectively to support obdurate views.

Without, we hope, being oblivious to the diverse social meanings of work hours, our primary concerns in this research are relatively prosaic. Our research compares work hours reported in, respectively, public and nonprofit organizations. There are two related research questions: (1) what are the determinants on managers’ work hours? (2) are there differences between public and nonprofit organizations and, if so, what explains those differences? Factors examined in determining work hours include job histories and perceptions of the organization and fellow employees. The study is based on questionnaire data from the National Administrative Studies Project-III (N=1220).

Previous Studies on Time at Work

There are various factors, both positive and negative, which may drive an individual to work longer or shorter hours. First, an employee may feel pressure from colleagues to work after 5pm or she may believe that her ability to get a promotion rests on the perception that she is dedicated to her work and willing to put in extra time in the office. Second, an individual may work long hours over the weekend because he is overloaded with tasks which must be completed before a particular date. A third employee may work extended hours because it takes him a longer number of hours to complete tasks that others do in a shorter time period. Likewise, there are numerous reasons why an individual may spend less time at work. An employee may leave work early each day to fulfill family commitments. A second employee may be an efficient worker who is able to complete tasks ahead of schedule and rewards herself by leaving work early. It is intuitive that the decision to work extended hours or less than average hours is related to personality, individual commitments, career expectations, and personal choice.

Just as there are numerous reasons why an individual may spend more or less time at work, there are a variety of outcomes which can emerge from the number of hours an individual works. These outcomes could be positive or negative for the individual, the organization, or both. Spending less time at work may be an indication of healthy life-work balance. It is possible that individuals who spend an excessive amount of time at work do so at the expense of leisure and family, thus penalizing their loved ones in favor of the workplace. On the other hand, working longer hours could be an indication of strong commitment to the organization, its mission, and one's colleagues.

The literature investigating the number of hours individuals dedicate to work identifies both positive and negative outcomes from working longer than average hours. Researchers typically investigate the number of hours worked through the lens of workaholism or overworking. Workaholics, a term first coined by Oates (1971), are defined as individuals who are driven by an inner motivation, or over-commitment, to work (Seybold & Salomon 1994; Spence & Robbins 1992). Researchers (Machlowitz 1980; Snir & Zohar 2002) describe workaholism as an approach or attitude to work, characterized by the steady allocation of time and thoughts to work-related activity, rather than hours worked alone. Although Oates characterized workaholism as a negative

behavior which could be detrimental to an individual's health, relationships, and happiness, more recent research (Machlowitz 1980; Scott *et al.* 1997) argues that overworking, defined as extra hours on the job, can be related to both positive and negative outcomes such as increased performance, job satisfaction, turnover, and personal satisfaction.

While culturally variant (Messenger 2004; Rogerson 2006), most conceptions of "overworking" imply that the individual is working more than 40 hours a week, sometimes in order to do the work of others. Mosier (1983) defined overworking as working more than 50 hours a week, while Grosch and colleagues (2006) developed categories of over-working ranging from lower overtime (41-48 hours) to higher overtime (70+ hr/week). Overtime work is related to increased job stress and increased participation in work-related decision making (Grosch *et al.* 2006). The research on overworking (Fassel 1990; Garfield 1987; Kiechel 1989a; Killinger 1991; Klaft & Leriner 1988; Machlowitz 1980; Spruel 1987; Weddell 1993) has found that the number of hours worked affects health (Grosch *et al.* 2006), occupational health (Jeffrey & Lipscomb 2006), leisure time, daily moods, alcohol consumption (Jones *et al.* 2006), and family relationships (Robinson 2001). Research also shows that overworking is related to individual demographics, personal beliefs and fears, work situation characteristics, and perceptions of organizational support of work-personal life imbalance (Burke 2001). For example, overtime workers compared to full-time workers are more likely to be white, male, and middle-aged, with higher levels of education (Grosch *et al.* 2006).

Even though research indicates that increases in hours worked results in lower time and energy given to families (Blair-Loy & Jacobs 2003) and affects men and women in different ways (Harpaz & Snir 2003), work hours alone do not necessarily indicate negative or positive outcomes for workers (Bonebright *et al.* 2000). Excessive work behavior can result in positive outcomes such as personal happiness (Machlowitz 1980, Peiperl & Jones 2001). Furthermore overtime work is associated with increased levels of participation in decision making and opportunities to develop special abilities in the work place (Friedman & Lobel 2003). In addition, individuals who happily overwork can serve as role models for balancing work and personal life and help to develop committed

people in the organization and encourage employees to realize the company's goals (Friedman & Lobel 2003).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Question One: What are the determinants of managers' work hours?

Given the number of studies focusing on work hours as either an independent or dependent variable, it is perhaps surprising how few of these focus on the simple issues of how many hours managers work and why. The preponderance of studies directly considering the question tends to focus on psychological attributes of the worker and on workaholic behaviors (e.g. Mudrack 2004; Burke 2001; Scott et al. 1997).

In considering the determinants of work, it is important to note distinctions between managers and professionals and other workers. Managers and professionals are likely to have at least some discretion about their work hours, but many production workers and unionized workers have very little discretion. In the latter case, the primary determinant of the number of work hours is the contract that has been negotiated. For unskilled and part-time workers the "choice" of work hours also is quite different and likely to relate to particular work flows, work seasonality and labor competition among other factors.

One obvious likely determinant of the amount of time that managers and professionals spend at work is pride in their jobs. If a manager or professional takes pride in her organization and her role in it, then one would expect that might lead to additional work hours. It may make little difference just why she takes pride in their work, it could be enjoyment of the performance of the job, perceived social significance of the job, financial rewards, or an inculcated value for pride or work.

Hypothesis One. All else equal, those respondents who report greater pride in their job will report working longer hours than those who report less pride in their job.

Regardless of the origins of pride in job, we expect that a manager who enjoys her job and finds it rewarding is likely to work longer hours. Thus, job satisfaction should affect time spent at work.

Hypothesis Two. All else equal (i.e. including controls), those respondents who report higher job satisfaction will report working longer hours than those who report lower job satisfaction.

We expect that three determinants of number of hours worked are likely to interact. First, is the respondent a manager? While most of the respondents in the NASP-III data set classify themselves as managers (70%), the data also include professionals and high-level technical workers (25%) (See Table 1 for a distribution of worker category, by sector). We expect that managers may work longer hours, compared to other well paid persons in similar status positions, because managers' work may be more general in the range of tasks and, since less discrete, the work may be less likely to have obvious, fixed completion points.

Hypothesis Three. All else equal, managers will report working longer hours than professionals and technical workers of equivalent work status.

Furthermore, if the manager is required to do the work of some of these subordinates (or perceives that she is required to do so), either because of shirking, poor quality work, or absenteeism, then the number of work hours is likely greater for the manager. We note that, in this case, it is the manager's perception that is most important. In some cases a manager may have competent subordinates who work hard and, nonetheless, the manager, acting out a sense of compulsion or insecurity, feels it necessary to do even more work or replicate the work that has already been done.

Hypothesis Four. All else equal, respondents who report doing some of the subordinates work for them will report working longer hours compared to respondents who report that they do not have to do the work of subordinates.

We expect that respondents who work in smaller organizations will tend to work longer hours than individuals in larger organizations. The logic being that larger organizations will provide less personal environments and more isolated tasks and, thus, workers more easily free ride or take unauthorized breaks. In smaller organizations there may be more personal relationships and heightened commitment among employees.

Hypothesis Five. All else equal, working in a smaller organization will be positively related to working longer hours

Especially for managers, the amount of time worked each week may interact with both the size of the organization and the number of employees the manager supervises. Assuming that the size of the organization interacts with the number of subordinates supervised, it follows that supervising a high number of subordinates in a small organization signifies increased responsibilities, compared to supervising a large number of subordinates in a larger organization. We predict that the number of employees supervised as a proportion of the organization's size will be related to a respondent's reported work hours.

Hypothesis Six. All else equal, an increase in the number of employees supervised will be positively related to working longer hours.

Another factor that may have an impact on the number of hours worked is the level of "organizational red tape" perceived by the respondent. During the past decade or so there has been a great increase in research on red tape, rules, procedures and formalization, but none of these studies has focused directly on effects of time spent at work. However, in light of some of the negative effects documented in red tape research, including lowered job satisfaction and commitment (DeHart-Davis & Pandey, 2005) and risk aversion (Bozeman & Kingsley, 1998), a perception of higher levels of red tape might well negatively affect work hours. To be sure, there is an alternative plausible hypothesis. Organizations with higher degrees of red tape are by definition (Bozeman, 2000) less efficient and it is altogether possible that these inefficiencies will result in more work, especially for managers. That said, this research is concerned with respondents' perceptions of red tape and how those perceptions may or may not affect the amount of time an individual spends working.

Hypothesis Seven. All else equal, those managers and professionals who perceive higher levels of red tape in their organization will report working fewer hours.

One of the factors that may well affect the amount of time an individual works is affiliations with outside organizations and engagement in outside activities. While it seems quite plausible that time invested in other activities and organizations would affect time invested in work, it is not abundantly clear that the effect of outside activities would be to suppress work time. Certainly that is possible; at some point involvement in other organizations and social networks would almost necessarily result in a diminution of work time. But before that threshold is reached it is possible that multiple activities in multiple organizations would have an energizing effect on one's work, especially if the activities were complementary or resulted in shared (work/non-work) social capital. Related, it is possible that multiple affiliations and activities outside work signifies that the individual is not stretched too thin but rather that the individual is energetic and generally engaged, including work.

Hypothesis Eight. All else equal, respondents who have an increased number of outside (non-work) social and organizational affiliations will report working longer hours.

Question Two: Are there differences between public and nonprofit organizations and, if so, what explains those differences?

There remains little sector specific research focusing on the amount of time public and nonprofit sector employees spend working each week and we know of no work making a direct comparison between public and nonprofit sector work hours. We do expect, however, that there will be some differences owing to the legal structure of the respective sectors, work incentives, sector norms, and organizational structures.

Typically, public sector managers are salaried employees who work 35 to 40 hours per week. However, this is changing; especially as states decentralize human resources and expand the number of at-will employees (Hays & Sowa 2006). For example, in Georgia approximately 72% of state employees are at-will hires (Hays & Sowa 2006). As the number of at-will employees in a state expands, it follows that restrictions on the amount of time an employee will spend at work each week can be weakened, thus encouraging workers to spend more time at work, or enabling them to collect increased compensation for overtime work.

Due to the complex personnel restrictions in the public sector, government employees typically do not receive overtime pay or increased extrinsic rewards for working overtime. For example, state agencies may limit the amount of overtime employees work since the Illinois personnel code requires that state employees within the jurisdiction of the Department of Central Management Services (CMS) receive “compensatory time off for overtime or for pay for overtime” (Personnel Code, Ch. 127, par. 63b108c). However, for Illinois state employees to regularly spend more time at work than specified by the position the position must be “approved by the [CMS] Director and designated on lists maintained by the Director” (2006, 81). The Personnel Rules go on to specify that “Overtime work shall be distributed as equitably as possible among qualified employees competent to perform the services required, when overtime is required” (2006, 81). Given the specifications required by the Illinois CMS for an employee to be authorized to work and be compensated for extra time, it follows that state employees lack the incentives necessary for them to spend extraordinary time at work.

Although public sector workers value opportunities for advancement and intellectually stimulating and challenging work more than nonprofit workers (Crewson 1995, 94; Lyons *et al.* 2006) there is no evidence that public sector workers are more likely to work overtime or stay late. In fact, research (Harpaz & Snir 2003) indicates that public sector employees, compared with private sector employees, are less likely to be workaholics or to report working extended hours.

The lack of over time work in the public sector could be explained by the lack of incentives and rewards for working late, or simply an organizational and cultural norm of not working overtime. For example, Izraeli (1990) argues that individuals can be attracted to the public sector because of a high need to control the time they spend at work, since the public sector is known as a place where people can work towards public goals in a work environment where hours are stable. Second, Buchanan (1974, 1975) notes that people enter management positions in the public sector with specific motives (i.e. public service motivation), but encounter frustrations that reduce their organizational commitment, job involvement, and service ethic. It is possible that public sector workers, despite their desire for challenging and intellectually stimulating work adopt the work

habits of their peers and the organization, which can include not working overtime or outside of the typical work day. In addition, the sector norms to not work overtime may be reinforced by stereotypes about public sector workers and the actual hours that many public offices are open. Public perceptions of government workers, or bureaucrats, as “lazy, incompetent, devious, and even dangerous” (Goodsell 2004, 3) coupled with office hours that rarely extend beyond 5pm and sometimes close earlier than that, there is little reason to expect that state government employees will stay late or work extra hours for which there is little to no reward.

Like the public sector, the nonprofit sector is not known for paying workers to stay late. Although unpaid overtime is common in the nonprofit sector, research indicates that a large number of nonprofit managers continue to choose to work overtime (McMullen & Schellingburg 2003). In defiance of the dearth of financial rewards for working overtime, we suspect that workers in nonprofit organizations will be more likely to spend more time at work because of sector norms and expectations.

First, nonprofit organizations, in particular those with more than 20 full-time employees, are more likely to offer flexible work hours to both men and women (McMullen & Schellingburg 2003). Working flexible work hours serves to expand the typical work day beyond office hours and the physical walls of the organizations. Though an organization may be open from 8am to 5pm, workers who work flexible hours become more accustomed to working nontraditional hours, working from home, and working on the road, which reduces the stigma of working overtime or spending more time working each week.

Second, we assume that spending more time at work, beyond the typical 40 hour work week, will be more common in the nonprofit sector where there are no civil service restrictions, smaller organizations, and more prevalent role conflict and ambiguous job duties (Mirvis & Hackett 1983). A lack of strict job descriptions and position classification frees nonprofit workers to take on tasks beyond their job descriptions and pay level. Furthermore, working in an environment with high role conflict and ambiguous job duties there are more likely higher expectations for workers to take on tasks, regardless of role and job duty, so that the organization can achieve its goals. Finally, working in smaller organizations necessitates that workers take on more than their share

of work, and helps to ensure that coworkers are keenly aware of the amount of work each individual is completing which adds pressure on employees to work extra hours. We expect that the combination of typically small organizations and role conflict and ambiguous job duties will help to make nonprofit managers more likely to work extra hours to complete tasks that further the organization's mission. Furthermore, given the reliance on volunteer labor in the nonprofit sector, compared to the level of staff available in many public agencies, we assume that paid nonprofit managers will take on additional duties which require attention beyond the typical day's work hours. Of course, the size of an organization and the number of employees supervised by a manager will tend to mitigate the relationship between sector culture and time spent at work, but holding these factors (and the other controls) constant, we predict that nonprofit managers will tend to work longer hours than public managers.

Hypothesis Nine. All else equal, managers in nonprofit organizations will report working longer hours than respondents working in state government organizations.

While the extensive research and theory on sector difference provides a broad rationale suggesting possible difference in work time, it is worth remembering that many individuals do not spend all of their time in a single sector. This suggests several points. First, is it the sector that is different and, possibly, affects work time as well as other behaviors and attitudes or is it the individual and self-selection into sector? The fact that persons work in more than one sector permits at least a partial analysis of the nature-nurture question as it pertains to work time. Recent studies (Bozeman & Ponomariov, 2007) have focused on various aspects of sector switching careers and sector "imprinting" (i.e. residual impacts from having working in another sector), but none has investigated work time directly. But in light of this previous, indirectly related work we expect that having worked in both sectors will result in one's work time profile differing from those who have worked in only one sector.

Hypothesis Ten. All else equal, an increase in the amount of previous public sector work experience will be negatively related to time spent at work.

Hypothesis Eleven. All else equal, an increase in the amount of previous work experience in the private sector will be related to reporting working fewer hours.

Hypothesis Twelve. All else equal, an increase in the amount of previous nonprofit sector work experience will be positively related to time spent at work.

Data and Methods

Our hypotheses are tested using data developed from the NASP-III questionnaire, a survey of 1849 public managers and 1307 nonprofit managers in Georgia and Illinois from organizations of numerous functions. The primary data gathering closed in January, 2006 with 1220 respondents (790 public sector; 430 nonprofit sector). The overall response rate was 39% percent (43% response rate for the public sector sample and 33% from the nonprofit sector sample). Six hundred and eighty-one of the respondents work in Illinois and 790, or 65%, of the respondents work in the public sector. Fifty-five percent of the public sector respondents and one quarter of the respondents from the nonprofit sector work in Georgia. (See Feeney 2007 for additional details about the study approach and relevant procedures.)

The NASP-III survey focused on managers and professionals in Georgia and Illinois. The two states, taken together, provide a strong representation of the U.S. as a whole. According to the Associated Press, which ranked Census data from each state and the District of Columbia on how closely it matched the national averages on 21 factors such as age, race, education, income, industrial mix, immigration, and proportion of people living in urban and rural areas, Illinois ranked first as the most representative of the nation and Georgia ranked sixth. Illinois and Georgia are similar in industrial mix, the education levels of the population, and migration (National Public Radio 2007) and both states are generally representative of the U.S. population. However, although Georgia and Illinois both have large urban and rural communities and are similar in geographic area (Illinois is 55,583 square miles and Georgia is 57,906 square miles), they have strikingly different cultural, political, and bureaucratic environments. Nationwide, Georgia is one of the leading states for government human resources reform including the dissolution of civil service and the expansion of at-will-employment, while Illinois has a history of strong unions and centralized human resource management.

Georgia and Illinois, though largely representative of the nation on demographic characteristics, are distinct in their representation of nonprofit organizations. According to the Urban Institute's National Center for Charitable Statistics (2007) summary of nonprofit organizations in the states, Illinois is a popular location for nonprofit organizations. For example, in 2006, there were 59,807 nonprofit organizations in Illinois, compared to only 33,017 in Georgia. In a ranking of the number of nonprofits, by state, Illinois ranks sixth in the nation and Georgia number fourteen. Nonprofit organizations in Illinois report a total revenue of about 71 billion, a little more than twice as high as Georgia. Illinois ranks third in total nonprofit assets compared to Georgia which ranks seventeenth out of all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Compared to the overall distribution of nonprofit organizations in the US, Illinois is home to 4.4% and Georgia is home to 2.4%.of all nonprofit organizations in the US (National Center for Charitable Statistics 2007).

Although Illinois is the home to more nonprofit organizations than Georgia, the distribution of nonprofit organizational types in Georgia is more representative of the national numbers on nonprofit organizations. For example, nationwide 23.5% of public charities registered with the IRS are reporting public charities, 20% are operating public charities, and 3.5% are supporting public charities, compared to 23.4%, 20.2%, and 3.2% in Georgia, respectively. Although the distribution of public charities in Georgia mirrors the nationwide distribution, the distribution of public charities, private foundations, and other nonprofits in Georgia and Illinois are distinct from one another. A lower percent of nonprofits in Illinois are public charities (53.9%) compared to the percent of public charities in Georgia (66.7%) and the US (61.2%). Meanwhile 8.3% of Illinois nonprofit organizations are private foundations, compared to 7.1% in Georgia and 7.4% in the US (National Center for Charitable Statistics 2007). Although Georgia and Illinois are closely matched to the national averages on 21 demographic factors (National Public Radio 2007) they remain distinct in the concentration and type of nonprofit organizations within their borders. The similarities of these two states and their relative representativeness of the US population in conjunction with their distinctiveness in state government and nonprofit organizations make them useful cases for comparing public sector and nonprofit sector managers.

Variables and Measurement

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable, **Time at Work**, is the self-reported number of hours worked during a typical work week (including work done away from the office but as part of the job). This variable ranges from 20 to 90 for all respondents, with a mean of 47 and a mode of 50 hours.¹ Although it is possible that respondents exaggerate the number of hours spent at work each week, this is a common self-reported measure in social science research (Peiperl & Jones 2001). Numerous studies assess self-reported work hours instructing respondents to report the number of hours worked each week (Burke 1999a; 1999b; Bonebright *et al.* 2000), the number of hours normally worked in a week including overtime and excluding travel time (van Echtelt *et al.* 2006, 498), or the number of hours worked in the previous week. For example, Grosh and colleagues (2006) asked respondents to indicate “How many hours did you work last week, at all jobs?” (944). Furthermore, national and international studies of time spent at work regularly rely on self-reported data. For example, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) relies on self-reported data to measure changes in per capita work hours across nations (OECD 1998; 2004), the Australian Survey of Social Attitudes 2003 provides self-reported data on respondents’ usual number of hours worked (van Echtelt *et al.* 2006), and the U.S. Census Bureau collects self-reported data on time spent at work. Although it remains possible that there are reporting biases associated with these self-reported data, it is unlikely that individuals will be highly motivated to misrepresent hours worked on a confidential survey for which the individual data results will not be available to the employing organization. Furthermore, any tendency to over or under report working hours should be random and just as likely to occur among employees in both sectors.

$$\text{Time spent at work} = B_0 + B_1(\text{nonprofit}) + B_2(\text{pride}) + B_3(\text{job satisfaction}) + B_4(\text{work of subordinates}) + B_5(\text{red tape}) + B_6(\text{manager}) + B_7(\text{Number of employees supervised}) + B_8(\text{Organization Size}) + B_9(\text{Organizational Affiliations}) + B_{10}(\text{Duration in private sector}) + B_{11}(\text{Duration in public sector}) + B_{12}(\text{Duration in}$$

¹ In addition to testing the continuous variable, We tested hours worked per week as a categorical variable with the following five categories: part-time (1-34 hr/week), full-time (35-40 hr/week), lower overtime (41-48 hr/week), medium overtime (49-69 hr/week), and higher overtime (70+ hr/week) (Grosch et al. 2006).

nonprofit sector) + B₁₃(Georgia) + B₁₄(female) + B₁₅(age) + B₁₆(nonwhite) + B₁₇(education) + E.

Independent variables

The independent variable, **Nonprofit**, is a dummy variable coded one if the respondent works in the nonprofit sector and zero if the respondent works in the public sector. Respondents are considered nonprofit employees if they work in organizations registered with the Internal Revenue Service as title holding corporations for exempt organizations 501(c)(2), public charities 501(c)(3), civic leagues and social welfare organizations 501(c)(4), labor, agricultural, and horticultural organizations 501(c)(5), business leagues and Chambers of Commerce 501(c)(6), and fraternal beneficiary societies and associations 501(c)(8). The variable, Nonprofit, is significantly correlated with the dependent variable measuring time spent at work (0.326).

We include measures for the respondent's perceptions of her organization, work, and colleagues. The variable, **Pride** is a variable indicating respondents' sense of pride working for their respective organizations. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the following statement: I feel a sense of pride working for this organization. The variable, **Job Satisfaction**, indicates respondents' level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement: All in all I am satisfied with my job. The variable labeled, **Work of Subordinates**, indicates respondents' views that they often have to do the work of their subordinates. Specially, respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the following statement: I often have to do work of my subordinates. The response categories for these three items (Pride, Job Satisfaction, and Work of Subordinates) included strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, and strongly disagree.

Respondents were asked to rate the level of red tape in their organization with red tape defined as: "burdensome administrative rules and procedures that have negative effects on the organization's effectiveness." The **Red Tape** variable is a combination of four questionnaire items. First, a scale ranging from 0 (almost no red tape) to 10 (great deal of red tape) in response to the following question: How would you assess the level of red tape in your organization? Second, three items asking for the respondent's level of agreement with the following three statements: (1) Because of the rules here, promotions

are based mainly on performance; (2) Even if a manager is a poor performer, formal rules make it hard to remove him or her from the organization; and (3) The formal pay structures and rules make it hard to reward a good employee with higher pay here.²

The dummy variable, **Job Position: Manager**, is coded one if the respondent is a manager. Although the NASP-III study targeted managers and high-ranking employees, it is possible that some of these individuals do not identify themselves as managers, but instead as professionals (e.g. accountants or lawyers) or technicians (e.g. engineers). Seventy percent of the respondents indicated that their primary responsibility is managerial, followed by 19% who report working as professionals, and 6% as technicians (See Table 1). Because research indicates that professionals and managers are more likely than non-managers to work long hours (Harpaz & Snir 2003), we expect that being a manager will be positively related to the dependent variables. We also include an ordinal variable, **Number Employees Supervised**, for the number of employees the respondent currently supervises.³ This variable for the number of individuals supervised also acts as a control for respondents who are fulfilling managerial responsibilities in organizations.

Because work behavior may be situation dependent (Machlowitz 1980), we include a measure of the organization's size. We expect that respondents working in larger organizations will work fewer hours than those in smaller organizations because these larger organizations will provide less personal environments while smaller organizations will include more personal relationships which may pressure employees to work more. In addition, smaller organizations would most likely require larger work commitments from higher ranking employees compared to larger organizations with large bureaucratic structures are more people to do complete tasks. **Organization Size** is a continuous variable indicating the number of full time employees in each respondent's organization.

We also include a variable for activities outside of the workplace. The variable **Organizational Affiliations** is an additive index of responses to a series of dummy

² We recoded the red tape scale into a four categories: 0=0; 1 thru 3.5=1; 3.6 thru 6.5=2; 6.6 thru 8.5=3; 8.6 thru 10=4. We then summed the four questionnaire items related to rules (1) the red tape scale, (2) Rules Item 1 (reversed coding), (3), Rules Item 2, and (4) Rules Item 3.

³ Responses to the number of employees supervised were skewed, ranging from zero to 1200, with the highest quintiles starting at less than 100. We created an ordinal variable with the following categories: zero employees supervised, 1-5, 6-10, 11-20, and more than 21 employees supervised.

variables listing organizations or groups to which the respondent might belong. The variable titled, Organizational Affiliations, is the sum of all memberships and is a rough indication of the respondent's external activities and involvement in non-work organizations.⁴ This variable captures the respondent's tendency to engage in extracurricular activities and seek out commitments outside the workplace.

The models include a series of variables related to the respondent's previous and current work experience. Since research indicates that the nonprofit sector is closely tied to the private sector as a source for management personnel (Odendahl *et al.* 1985) and that nonprofit and public sector managers are increasingly moving between the sectors (Ott 2001, 241; Ott & Dicke 2006), we include three dummy variables, which indicate the respondent's duration of work experience in each sector. The variables: **Duration in Public Sector**, **Duration in Private Sector**, and **Duration in Nonprofit Sector**, are continuous variables indicating the duration the respondent reported working in each sector, if at all.⁵ These variables serve as a control for work behavior that may be related to previous work experience and habits shaped by working in other sectors.

The dummy variable **Georgia** controls for variation by state, which may occur due to variation in state government personnel restrictions. For example, according to Hays and Sowa's (2006) analysis of human resource reforms in the states, about 72% of Georgia state government employees are at-will-employees and Georgia offers a restricted number of issues open to grievances. Illinois' public sector has not expanded its at-will-employment beyond its standard 20% and continues to offer a wide range of issues open to grievances. Hays and Sowa (2006) report a decline in job security in both Georgia and Illinois. The state control will also be important for identifying and variation in nonprofit organizations by state because the regulation of nonprofit organizations in states can vary due to state laws, tax codes, tort law, and regulations for nonprofit organizations (Harvard Law Review 1992, 1636). Since the regulation of nonprofit

⁴ Group membership response categories included: Church, synagogue, mosque, or religious organization; Political club or political party committees; Professional societies, trade or business association, or labor union; service organizations such as Rotary or Lions; Youth support groups such as the Girl's and Boy's Club, Little League Parents Association; Neighborhood or homeowners' associations; PTA, PTO, or school support groups; Groups sports team or club (e.g. softball team, bowling league); Other.

⁵ We also tested three dummy variables indicating is the respondent's previous job was in the private sector, the nonprofit sector, and the public sector, and a dummy variable for if the current job was a sector switch or not.

organizations in Georgia and Illinois may play a role in shaping employees' behavior and perceptions it is important to include this control.

We include a set of demographic variables to control for gender, education, race, and age. Because research has found that women report higher levels of job stress and other factors associated with lower levels of job satisfaction (Burke 1999) and, typically, work shorter hours than men (Harpaz & Snir 2003), we control for gender. The dummy variable **Female** is coded one if the respondent is a woman. The dummy variable **Nonwhite** is coded one if the respondent is not white and zero if the respondent is white. The continuous variable, **Age**, controls for differences in work hours and organizational involvement due to generational values (Jurkiewickz *et al.* 1998) and job experience and tenure. Education is measured using a categorical variable coded three if the respondent has a graduate degree, two if the respondent has a college degree, and one if the respondent has less than a college education.⁶

Descriptive statistics for each of the variables can be found in the Appendix.

Results

Do state government employees report working more or less hours per week than those in nonprofit organizations? As we can see from Table 2, the mean number of work hours for respondents in nonprofit organizations is 50.6 hours per week and for those working in government organizations it is 45.1 hours. This is a statistically significant difference according to a differences of means F test ($p=0.000$). However, we do not know the causal implications. For example, the difference could be a function of work hour restrictions in the public sector or it could be a result of larger organizational size. However, there is a difference and, as is the case in most observed difference in sector attributes, sorting out those differences presents theoretical and analytical challenges (Rainey & Bozeman 2000).

Table 3 reports an ordinary least squares model regressing time spent at work on all the predictor variables. The model explains (Adjusted R-squared) 23% of the variance in work time. The results show that almost all the predictor variables are significant in relation to time spent at work, but not always in the directions hypothesized. We consider

⁶ We tested a control variable for education. However, because 86.5% of the respondents have a college degree there is a lack of variance in this measure.

the results with respect to the hypotheses provided above. The hypotheses and their results are summarized in Table 4.

Let us first consider Hypothesis Two that is not only disconfirmed but for which the results are in the opposite direction predicted. We expected that job satisfaction would be positively associated with time spent on the job, but it is negatively associated- those who work more are less satisfied. Clearly, this is one of those cases where it is easy to invent an explanation regardless of the outcome- happier people work longer; working too much makes people unhappy. However, it is quite possibly the case that neither of those simple explanations is sufficient. The relationship of job satisfaction and time at work may depend on a number of contingencies. For example, it is possible that those who enjoy their job do spend more time at work but that other factors may be stronger, washing out this relationship. Thus, having to do the work of others and having to supervise a great many employees may be sufficiently important to diminish the relationship with job satisfaction. To some extent, of course, the application of multiple regression is designed to reveal these sorts of relationships. It is possible, however, that OLS is not sufficiently sensitive to show these relationships and, moreover, the technique is at best only suggestive for deeper theoretical explanation.

One of the most interesting findings was revealed earlier in the analysis of means: that those working in the nonprofit sector tend to spend more time at work. However, the relationship remains strong even when we control for a variety of known differences between the public and nonprofit samples, including most importantly the size of the organization, the number of persons supervised and the education levels of the respondents (all significant differences in this database between public and nonprofit respondents).

One set of findings seems to indicate that those who have “larger jobs” spend more time at work. Working in a large organization and an increase in the number of employees under one’s supervision are both related to more time working. These findings seem unremarkable. However, there is no logical relationship. Clearly, it is possible that those working in smaller organizations have less help and fewer slack resources and thus work longer. Indeed, a next step would be to examine possible range effects; that is, the relationship between organization size and work time is possibly curvilinear with those in

the largest and smallest organizations spending more time at work (though an elementary examination of the deciles for organization size did not reveal such a pattern).

It is also the case that those who report doing the work of others spend more time at work, but it is not entirely clear what one should make of this. In many instances a reliance on perceptual variables presents no problem because perceptions tell us much about behavior and clearly affect behavior. But in this case is the effect of perception on behavior is not patent. Possibly, the straightforward interpretation is the true one- that those who perceive they are doing the work of others are actually doing so and that this requires that they spend more time at work. But it is also possible that those who spend more time at work *feel* that they are doing the work of others because those others are not present or because the longer working individuals have a heightened sense of responsibility that does not correspond to actual work behaviors. More information is needed.

Duration variables are related to time spent at work. Those who have had a longer duration in the public sector, the nonprofit sector, and the private sector all spend more time working. This seems to imply at least two things: first, the sector of work duration seems unimportant; second duration itself is important. This may imply, among other possibilities, that those who have endured are managers who supervise larger numbers of people. The finding may indicate, in addition, a selection effect. Those who have spent less time at work may have dropped out of these particular labor pools at differential rates, leaving those who endure and who spend more time at work.

An interesting “nonfinding” is that perceived organizational red tape has no significant relationship to time spent at work. Other studies have shown that, in general higher-level managers (the preponderance of this sample of respondents) tend to perceive less red tape than those lower in the hierarchy and this may to some extent explain the finding. It is also the case that perceived red tape often does not correlate strongly to any more objective measure of red tape (Pandey and Scott, 2002) and, possibly, actual red tape might affect time spent at work, whereas perceived red tape does not. Or it may just be the case that red tape simply does not bear any relation to time spent at work.

Concluding Discussion

It is easy to believe that the reasons why people spend more time at work are varied and complicated. This preliminary study is not sufficient to fully sort these complexities. This much seems, on the basis of our evidence, to be true: people in the nonprofit sector tend to spend more time at work than those in state government and people with “larger” jobs, especially managers, spend more time at work. But the various attitudinal and perceptual variables need more attention than we have provided in this preliminary model.

A particularly interesting question is “what does it mean to spend more time at work?” This is certainly not the same as “being more productive” or, we conclude from this study, “being more satisfied with the job.” Quite possibly the time spent working is a complex admixture of a sense of obligation and responsibility, particular features of the job, and the requirements for the scope of the job. Another issue that cannot be skirted is the veracity of reporting. While there is no reason to believe that the “time spent at job” variable is more subject to socially desirable response bias than are other variables examined via questionnaire, it is nonetheless worth some reflection. If one reports spending more time does this comport with time at the office, work time in general, energy expended, some combination, or something else altogether? Nor can these issues be easily resolved by work audits. If we start by acknowledging that “being there” is not the same as “time spent at work,” any method for gauging time spent at work has its own problems. But this is no less true for our study than it is for national work and productivity studies reported worldwide and used for policy making. Moreover, the amount of time one reports spending at work seems of inherent interest, even if there is some inter-subjective difference in meaning in the reporting. Knowledge of (perceived) time working is especially interesting during a period of human work history during which it is not necessarily assumed that spending more time at work is noble or that, in a Calvinist sense, it is a sign that one is “of the elect.” Possibly more time working simply signifies that one has endured long enough to have a job that requires supervising many people, some of whom do not complete the work they have been assigned, necessitating even more work for the manager. Occam’s razor.

There are many limitations to this study. It is based on data from just two states and while these are in some respects representative it is not clearly the case than one can

generalize beyond these states, especially given the distinctiveness of public sector personnel systems. There are also the usual limits of questionnaire-based studies, perhaps even more significant than usual given the social baggage that goes along with work time. A study employing multiple methods, using qualitative approaches to draw more meaning from work constructs, seems a useful next step.

Table 1. Comparison of Job Position, by Sector

| | Public Sector | Nonprofit Sector | Total |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|------------------|-------|
| Main Responsibility: Manager | 507 | 331 | 838 |
| Main Responsibility: Professional | 188 | 42 | 230 |
| Main Responsibility: Technical | 64 | 3 | 67 |
| Main Responsibility: Other | 25 | 7 | 32 |
| Total | 794 | 396 | 1190 |

Table 2. Independent Samples Test for hours worked per week

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-------------------------|-----|-------|----------------|
| Public sector | 776 | 45.06 | 6.492 |
| Nonprofit sector | 420 | 50.55 | 8.669 |

F=23.37 p< .0001 (Equal variances assumed)

Responses to the questionnaire item: During a typical work week, about how many hours do you work?

Table 3. Results for OLS Regression Model Predicting Time Spent at Work

| Variable | Beta | Std Error | Significance |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Nonprofit | 5.820*** | .81155 | 0.000 |
| Pride | .782*** | .26019 | 0.003 |
| Job satisfaction | -.680* | .39683 | 0.087 |
| Work of subordinates | 1.359*** | .39996 | 0.001 |
| Manager | 2.210*** | .57235 | 0.000 |
| Red tape | -.069 | .11739 | 0.555 |
| Number of Employees Supervised | .0113*** | .00325 | 0.001 |
| Organization Size | .0001*** | .00005 | 0.005 |
| Organizational Affiliations | .532*** | .16437 | 0.001 |
| Duration in private sector | .160*** | .05395 | 0.003 |
| Duration in public sector | .083** | .03774 | 0.028 |
| Duration in nonprofit sector | .099* | .05754 | 0.086 |
| Georgia | 2.637*** | .53249 | 0.000 |
| Female | -.729 | .48478 | 0.133 |
| Age | .0491 | .03023 | 0.104 |
| Nonwhite | .518 | .70416 | 0.462 |
| Education | .821** | .34178 | 0.017 |
| Constant | 31.349 | 2.9551 | 0.000 |

p <.10=*, p <.05=**, p <.01*** Two tailed test of significance
R²=0.2414; Adjusted R²=0.2266
F (17,870) =16.29; Prob > F=0.0000
N=888

Table 4. Summary of Hypotheses and Results

| Hypothesis | Results |
|--|--|
| <i>Hypothesis One. All else equal, those managers who report greater pride in their job will report working longer hours than those who report less pride in their job.</i> | CONFIRMED: |
| <i>Hypothesis Two. All else equal (i.e. including controls), those managers who report higher job satisfaction will report working longer hours than those who report lower job satisfaction.</i> | Job Satisfaction is NEGATIVELY related to time spent at work |
| <i>Hypothesis Three. All else equal, managers will report working longer hours than will professionals and technical workers of equivalent work status.</i> | CONFIRMED |
| <i>Hypothesis Four. All else equal, respondents who report doing some of the subordinates work for them will report working longer hours compared to respondents who report that they do not have to do the work of subordinates.</i> | CONFIRMED |
| <i>Hypothesis Five. All else equal, working in a smaller organization will be positively related to working longer hours</i> | CONFIRMED |
| <i>Hypothesis Six. All else equal, an increase in the number of employees supervised will be positively related to working longer hours.</i> | CONFIRMED |
| <i>Hypothesis Seven. All else equal, those managers and professionals who perceive higher levels of red tape in their organization will report working fewer hours.</i> | DISCONFIRMED |
| <i>Hypothesis Eight. All else equal, managers who have an increased number of outside (non-work) social and organizational affiliations will report working longer hours.</i> | CONFIRMED |
| <i>Hypothesis Nine. All else equal, managers in nonprofit organizations will report working longer hours than managers working in state government organizations.</i> | CONFIRMED |
| <i>Hypothesis Ten. All else equal, an increase in the amount of previous public sector work experience will be negatively related to time spent at work.</i> | DISCONFIRMED |
| <i>Hypothesis Eleven. All else equal, an increase in the amount of previous private sector work experience will be positively related to reporting working fewer hours.</i> | CONFIRMED |
| <i>Hypothesis Twelve. All else equal, an increase in the amount of previous nonprofit sector work experience will be positively related to time spent at work.</i> | CONFIRMED |

Appendix: Descriptive Statistics and Frequencies

Dependent Variable

Number of Hours Worked: The dependent variable of interest is the self-reported number of hours worked (including work done outside the office). Respondents were asked the following questionnaire item: “During a typical week, about how many hours do you work (including work done away from the office but as part of your job)”: Mean 46.99; Standard Deviation 7.782; Minimum 20, Maximum 90; N=1196.

Independent Variables

Nonprofit: 0=Public, 1=Nonprofit; Mean .352; Standard Deviation .478; N=1220

Pride: Mean 3.345; Standard Deviation .763; Minimum 1, Maximum 4; N=1189

Job Satisfaction: Mean 3.347; Standard Deviation .744; Minimum 1, Maximum 4; N=1209

Manager: 0=Technical, Professional, and Other; 1=Manager; Mean .7055; Standard Deviation .456; N=1219

Red Tape: Mean 10.92; Median 11; Mode 12; Standard Deviation 3.078; Minimum 3, Maximum 16; N=1181

Number of Employees Supervised: Mean 21.123; Standard Deviation 73.084; Minimum 0, Maximum 1200; N=1057

Organization Size: Mean 3525.7; Standard Deviation 5703.1; Minimum 1, Maximum 18700; N=1125

Organization Affiliations: Mean 2.666; Standard Deviation 1.457; Minimum 0, Maximum 8; N=1219

Georgia: 0=Illinois, 1=Georgia; Mean .442; Standard Deviation .497; N=1220

Female: 1=Female, 0=Male; Mean .454; Standard Deviation .498; N=1208

Age: Mean 49.44269; Standard Deviation 8.913; Minimum 23, Maximum 81; N=1204

Nonwhite: 1=nonwhite; 0=white; Mean .141; Standard Deviation .348; N=1171

Education: 1=less than college, 2=college degree, 3=graduate degree; Mean 2.138; Standard Deviation .699; N=1204

Total Time in Private Sector: Mean 2.40; Std. Error of Mean .148; Median .00; Mode 0; Standard Deviation 5.156; Variance 26.587; Minimum 0; Maximum 36; Valid 1220.

Total Time in Public Sector: Mean 6.06; Std. Error of Mean .218; Median 3.00; Mode 0; Standard Deviation 7.620; Variance 58.070; Minimum 0; Maximum 42; Valid 1220.

Total Time in Nonprofit Sector: Mean 2.21; Std. Error of Mean .141; Median .00; Mode 0; Standard Deviation 4.912; Variance 24.124; Minimum 0; Maximum 38; Valid 1220.

Red Tape Measure: The measure for perceptions of red tape is a combination of a red tape scale and three questionnaire items about rules and procedures in the respondent's organization. We recoded the red tape scale into a four categories: 0=0; 1 thru 3.5=1; 3.6 thru 6.5=2; 6.6 thru 8.5=3; 8.6 thru 10=4. We then summed the four questionnaire items related to rules (1) the red tape scale, (2) Rules Item 1 (reversed coding), (3), Rules Item 2, and (4) Rules Item 3.

"If red tape is defined as "burdensome administrative rules and procedures that have negative effects on the organization's effectiveness," how would you assess the level of red tape in your organization? [*Please circle the appropriate response*]."

Response Scale ranges from 0 (Almost No Red Tape) to 10 (Great Deal of Red Tape): Mean 6.0319; Standard Deviation 2.683; Minimum 0; Maximum 10; Valid 1193.

"Here we ask that you provide information about rules and procedures at your current organization. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements."

Response categories: Strongly Agree, Agree Somewhat, Somewhat Disagree, Disagree Strongly.

Rules Item 1: Because of the rules here, promotions are based mainly on performance. Mean 2.384; Standard Deviation 1.013; Minimum 0; Maximum 4; Strongly Agree 14.8%, Agree Somewhat 33.6%, Somewhat Disagree 26.9%, Disagree Strongly 24.7%; Valid 1193.

Rules Item 2: Even if a manager is a poor performer, formal rules make it hard to remove him or her from the organization. Mean 2.614; Standard Deviation 1.009; Minimum 0; Maximum 4; Strongly Agree 21.3%, Agree Somewhat 36.4%, Somewhat Disagree 24.6%, Disagree Strongly 17.7% Valid 1195.

Rules Item 3: The formal pay structures and rules make it hard to reward a good employee with higher pay here. Mean 3.221; Standard Deviation 1.001; Minimum 0; Maximum 4; Strongly Agree 53.5%, Agree Somewhat 25.3%, Somewhat Disagree 11.2%, Disagree Strongly 10.1%; Valid 1199.

References

- Blair-Loy, M., & Jacobs, J. A. (2003). Globalization, work hours, and the care deficit among stockbrokers. *Gender & Society, 17*(2):230-249.
- Bombardieri, M. (2005). Summers' remarks on women draw fire. *The Boston Globe*, pp. Downloaded 1 March 2007 from http://www.boston.com/news/local/articles/2005/2001/2017/summers_remarks_on_women_draw_fire.
- Bonebright, C. A., Clay, D. L., & Ankenmann, R. D. (2000). The relationship of workaholism with work-life conflict, life satisfaction, and purpose in life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*(4):469-477.
- Buchanan, B. (1975). Red Tape and the Service Ethic: Some Unexpected Differences between Public and Private Managers. *Administration & Society 6*(4):423-444.
- Bozeman, B. (2000). *Bureaucracy and Red Tape*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Bozeman, B., & Kingsley, G. (1998). Risk culture in public and private organizations. *Public Administration Review, 58*:109-122.
- Bozeman, B. & Ponomariov, B. 2007.
- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 19*(4):533-546.
- Burke, R. J. (1999). Workaholism in organizations: Gender differences. *Sex Roles, 41*(5/6):333-345.
- Burke, R. J. (1999). Workaholism in organizations: Measurement validation and replication. *International Journal of Stress Management, 6*(1):45-55.
- Burke, R. J. (2001). Workaholism components, job satisfaction, and career progress. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31*(11):2339-2356.
- Crewson, P. E. (1995). *The Public Service Ethic*. American University, Washington, D.C.
- DeHart-Davis, L. and S. Pandey (2005) "Red Tape and Public Employees: Does Perceived Rule Dysfunction Alienate Managers? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 5*, (1):153-167.
- Developments in the law: Nonprofit corporations. (1992). *Harvard Law Review 105*(7):1578-1699.
- Fassel, D. (1990). *Working ourselves to death: The high costs of workaholism, the rewards of*

- recovery*. San Francisco: Harper Collins.
- Feeney, M. K. 2007. Sector Perceptions among State-Level Public Managers. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*.
- Friedman, S. D., & Lobel, S. (2003). The happy workaholic: A role model for employees. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(3):87-98.
- Garfield, C. A. (1987). *Peak performers: The new heroes of American business*. New York: William Morrow.
- Goodsell, C. T. (2004). *The Case for Bureaucracy: A Public Administration Polemic* (Fourth ed.). Washington DC: CQ Press.
- Grosch, J. W., Caruso, C. C., Rosa, R. R., & Sauter, S. L. (2006). Long hours of work in the US: Associations with demographic and organizational characteristics, psychosocial working conditions, and health. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 49(11):943-952.
- Harpaz, I., & Snir, I. (2003). Workaholism: Its definition and nature. *Human Relations*, 56(3):291-319.
- Hays, S. W., & Sowa, J. E. (2006). A broader look at the ‘accountability’ movement: Some grim realities in state civil service systems. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 26(2):102-117.
- Illinois Department of Central Management Services. Personnel Code. Executive Branch (20 ILCS 415/) Available at <http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs>,
- Illinois Department of Central Management Services. (2006). *Personnel Rules. 80 Illinois Administrative Code 301*. Retrieved. from.
- Izraeli, D. (1990). Human resources and labor relations in Israel. New horizons. In A. Globerson, A. Galin & E. Rozenshtein (Eds.), *Human resources and labor relations in Israel* (pp. 327–343). Tel Aviv, Israel: Ramot.
- Jeffrey, V. J., & Lipscomb, J. (2006). Long working hours, occupational health and the changing nature of work organization. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 49(11):921-929.
- Jones, F., O'Connor, D., Conner, M., & McMillan, B. (2006). Daily mood, work hours and job-strain variables: Impacts on alcohol consumption. *Psychology & Health*, 21:74-74.
- Jurkiewicz, C. L., Massey Jr, T. K., & Brown, R. G. (1998). Motivation in Public and Private Organizations: A Comparative Study. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 21(3):230-250.
- Kiechel, W. (1989, April 10). The workaholic generation. *Fortune*, 50–62.

- Killinger, B. (1991). *Workaholics: The respectable addicts*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Klaft, R. P., & Kleiner, B. H. (1988). Understanding workaholics. *Business*, 33:37–40.
- Lyons, S. T., Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. A. (2006). Motivation and Performance: A Comparison of the Values and Commitment of Private Sector, Public Sector, and Parapublic Sector Employees. *Public Administration Review*, 66(4):605-618.
- Machlowitz, M. (1980). *Workaholics: Living with them, working with them*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- McMullen, K., & Schellingburg, G. (2003). *Job Quality in Non-Profit Organizations* (2). Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Messenger, J. C. (2004). *Working Time and Workers' Preferences in Industrialized Countries: Finding the Balance*. New York: Routledge.
- Mirvis, P. H., & Hackett, E. J. (1983). Work and work force characteristics in the nonprofit sector *Monthly Labor Review*, 106(4).
- Mosier, S. K. (1983). *Workaholics: An analysis of their stress, success and priorities*. University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX.
- Mudrack, P. E. (2004). Job involvement, obsessive-compulsive personality traits, and workaholic behavioral tendencies. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(5):490-508.
- Murray, J. (2001). The International Regulation of Maternity: Still Waiting for the Reconciliation of Work and Family Life. *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations*, 17(1):25-46.
- National Center for Charitable Statistics. (2007). *U.S. and State Profiles*. National Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy. Urban Institute. Washington DC. Downloaded April 15, 2007 from <http://nccs.urban.org/statistics/profiles.cfm>
- National Public Radio. (2007). All Things Considered. New Norms Found in Study of American States. Interviews. Source: AP analysis based on Census Bureau data. Broadcast on May 17, 2007. Accessed on May, 17 2007 at <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=10239470>.
- Oates, W. E. (1971). *Confessions of a workaholic*. New York: Abingdon.
- Odendahl, T., Boris, E., & Daniels, A. (1985). *Working in Foundations: The Career Patterns of Men and Women*. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (1998). *Employment Outlook*. Paris:

- OECD.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2004). *Employment Outlook*. Paris: OECD.
- Ott, J. S. (2001). *Understanding Nonprofit Organizations: Governance, Leadership, and Management*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Ott, J. S., & Dicke, L. A. (2006). Accountability Challenges Facing Public Sector HRM in an Era of Downsizing, Devolution, Diffusion, and Empowerment In A. Farazmand (Ed.), *Strategic Public Personnel Administration/HRM: Building Human Capital for the 21st Century*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Pandey, S. and P. Scott (2002) “Red Tape: A Review and Assessment of Concepts and Measures *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 12(4):553-580.
- Peiperl, M., & Jones, B. (2001). Workaholics and Overworkers. *Group & Organization Management*, 26(3):369-393.
- Probert, B. (1997). Gender and Choice: The Structure of Opportunity. In P. James, W. F. Veit & S. Wright (Eds.) *Work of the Future: Global Perspectives*. St. Leonards: Allen & Unwin.
- Rainey, H., & Bozeman, B. (2000). Comparing Public and Private Organizations: Empirical Research and the Power of the A Priori. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(2):447-470.
- Robinson, B. E. (2001). Workaholism and family functioning: A profile of familial relationships, psychological outcomes, and research considerations. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 23(1):123-135.
- Rogerson, R. (2006). Understanding differences in hours worked. *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 9(3):365-409.
- Ruhm, C. J. (1998). The Economic Consequences of Parental Leave Mandates: Lessons from Europe. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113(1):285-317.
- Scott, K. S., Moore, K. S., & Miceli, M. P. (1997). An exploration of the meaning and consequences of workaholism. *Human Relations*, 50(3):287-314.
- Seybold, K. C., & Salomone, P. R. (1994). Understanding workaholism: A review of causes and counseling approaches. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 73:4–10.
- Smith, B. M. (2002). Time Norms in the Workplace: Their Exclusionary Effect and Potential for Change. *Columbia Journal of Gender and Law*, 11(2):271-360.
- Snir, R., & Zohar, D. (2000). *Workaholism: Work-addiction or workphilia?* . Paper presented at

- the International Conference on Psychology - Psychology after the year 2000.
- Spence, J. T., & Robbins, A. S. (1992). Workaholism: Definition, measurement, and preliminary results. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 58:160–178.
- Spruel, G. (1987). Work fever. *Training and Development Journal* (41):41–45.
- van Echtelt, P. E., Glebbeek, A. C., & Lindenberg, S. M. (2006). The new lumpiness of work: explaining the mismatch between actual and preferred working hours. *Work Employment and Society*, 20(3):493-512.
- Weddell, J. R. (1993). The grindstone. *Supervision*, 26, 11–13.

Appendix 1

National Administrative Studies Project III

The National Administration Studies Project (NASP) aims to increase our empirical knowledge of public management and administration. NASP-III is an attempt to blend the goals of NASP-I and II while addressing a few new themes of its own. NASP-III collected data from a random sample of public and nonprofit managers in Georgia and Illinois. Unlike NASP-II, which focused on a single functional agency (health and human services), the NASP-III sample includes managers from agencies and organizations of numerous functions.

The population of managers in Georgia was drawn from the Georgia Department of Audits (DoA) comprehensive list of state employees who were on state agency payrolls during the 2003/2004 fiscal year. We removed employees at technical colleges, commissions, authorities, the office of the governor, and institutions from the judicial or legislative branch. In addition we removed employees at institutions with less than 20 employees. The population included any job titles coded as "director" "coordinator" "officials or manager" and "professionals" under the pay grade of 017 and all individuals with a pay grade of 017 or higher. The resulting population included 6,164 Georgia managers.

The population of managers in Illinois was developed through a Freedom of Information Act request for a list of all state employees designated as either "senior public service administrators" or "public service administrators." This list included information on 5,461 state employees, including name, agency, and county.

Survey Administration: The survey administration included a pre-contact letter, Wave I survey with letter, follow-up postcard mailing, Wave II mailing, follow-up contacts by phone call and email, and a final Wave III mailing. The survey was closed January 1, 2006.

Response Rates: Though we began with a sample of 2000 public sector respondents our sample was reduced to 1849 (912 Georgia, 937 Illinois) because of respondents who had retired (16 cases) or were no longer working for the state (135 cases). The survey was closed with 432 responses from Georgia and 358 from Illinois. The respondents represent a random sample of the population of managers in Georgia and Illinois. Respondents and nonrespondents do not vary significantly by state, gender, job rank, salary (for Georgia), or agency of employment.