

Summer 2008

Policy analysis: Compressed workweek

Rick Crosby

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Matt Richardson

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Stephen Nowicki

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Ly Doan

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesedissertations>

 Part of the [Other Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#), [Policy Design, Analysis, and Evaluation Commons](#), [Public Administration Commons](#), [Public Affairs Commons](#), and the [Social Policy Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Crosby, Rick; Richardson, Matt; Nowicki, Stephen; and Doan, Ly, "Policy analysis: Compressed workweek" (2008). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 822.

<https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesedissertations/822>

This Capstone is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Scholarship@UNLV. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

COMPRESSED WORKWEEK (CWW)

By

Ricky Crosby
Matt Richardson
Stephen Nowicki
Ly Doan

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master in Public Administration

UNLV

Summer 2008

Approved by _____
Chairperson of Supervisory Committee

Program Authorized
to Offer Degree _____

Date _____

UNLV

ABSTRACT

COMPRESSED WORKWEEK

Today the economy has slowed down and inflation has risen to near record highs. Corporations, governments, and agencies are looking at ways to save costs. Budget expenditures on payroll are addressed as well as the cost of utilities, resources, and the costs of doing business. One implicated method to help solve these problems is for the use of compressed workweeks. Compressed workweeks are both beneficial to the agencies and the employees. The employee can have more time for home life while putting in the same amount of hours at work, and save money on commuting to work. Additionally the agency is saving on the budget, because of an extended weekend for the worker. An employer can shorten its workweek and lower operational costs, while improving employee attendance through the use of compressed workweeks.

This study is going to examine the different workweeks for differences in attendance, the best measurable variable in favor for the agency. The study will focus on the Clark County, Nevada, the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJS), which has an identical job classification working both traditional

workweeks and compressed workweeks. This type of study is rare in that the comparison group is within the same agency and job classification as the experimental group. This examination of compressed work weeks comes at a time where most work in the area of compressed work weeks remain exploratory (Pierce & Dunham 1992), and current agencies, and even entire government agencies are moving radically toward compressed workweeks because of the slowing of the economy and increased inflation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1	INTRODUCTION
CHAPTER 2.....	WHY COMPRESSED WORKWEEKS (CWW)?
CHAPTER 3.....	WHERE DID CWW ORIGINATE?
CHAPTER 4.....	OTHER STUDIES
CHAPTER 5.....	ADDITIONAL ADVANTAGES & DISADVANTAGES
CHAPTER 6.....	MEASUREMENTS
CHAPTER 7.....	METHODOLOGY
CHAPTER 8.....	FINDINGS
CHAPTER 9.....	LIMITATIONS
CHAPTER 10.....	CONCLUSION

APPENDIX

DJJS SURVEY

APPENDIX A

FINAL SURVEY

APPENDIX B

GRANT PROPOSAL

APPENDIX C

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Compressed work weeks allow a worker to extend the length of their working day, beyond eight hours, while completing their work week within three or four days, while allowing more than the usual two days off (Cohen and Gadon, 1978, Cunningham 1989). These compressed workweeks allow the worker more additional days for personal life activities and less trips to work, while putting in the same amount of hours at work. The worker is able to save money on travel related expenses for work, as well as the time it takes to prepare and commute to work. In addition the worker is given longer weekends, often times two and a half to three days off per week.

Compressed workweeks will not only allow the worker to spend more time at home; it will also save agency or government money in operational costs. Just recently the State of Utah initiated a statewide mandated compressed workweek schedule, to be on the four day, ten hour work schedule. USA Today reporter Larry Copeland relayed Utah Governor Jon Huntsman as saying, “The change will apply to about 17,000 employees, roughly 80% of the state workforce”. The change will not cover state police officers, prison guards or employees of the courts or Utah's public universities. Also, state-run liquor stores will stay open on Fridays. “Turning off the lights, the heat and the air conditioning on Fridays in 1,000 of 3,000 government buildings will save about \$3 million a year out of a state budget of \$11 billion” (“Utah is going to a 4 day workweek”, 2008).

Additionally, as job satisfaction rises there will be increases in worker attendance and additional savings for the agency on sick time and overtime. This study is aimed at showing significant differences between workers that are working compressed workweeks and workers that

are working traditional workweeks. Many factors will be examined to determine what can be affected. The implementation of compressed workweeks, with an emphasis on key variables that are significant to agencies and employees are discussed in the study.

This study is addressing important research questions:

- Do compressed workweeks affect worker attendance?
- Do compressed workweeks affect worker job satisfaction?
- Do compressed workweeks save agency money?
- What are the pros and cons to the implementation of compressed workweeks?

Chapter 2

WHY COMPRESSED WORK WEEKS (CWW)?

There are many reasons why research has been conducted and will continue to be conducted in the area of compressed workweeks. A compressed workweek can lead to a domino effect of positive outcomes in the area of worker attendance, absenteeism and turnovers, job satisfaction, worker savings, environmental changes and more. Additionally, the significance of relationship a compressed workweek can help develop is surprising to both agencies and employees.

Research has indicated that worker attendance increases with the use of compressed workweeks. In 1981 Cunningham found that in a comparison of ten-hour work shifts and standard 8-hour work shifts, attendance in the 8-hour workday decreased by 33% whereas in the experimental group (the group working 4-ten hour shifts) overtime was cut by 50%. This shows a significant gap in attendance, where an agency can save money in payroll and operational costs by implementing compressed work schedules.

This research is set out to establish that there is a relationship between leisure time and the productivity measures of overtime and absenteeism, which Cunningham suggested needed to be completed. In addition we will look at the many factors that can affect a workers attendance; such as high stress and job demands, social relationships at work, dependents and other obligations at home. Even an employee's perception of control over their work and working environment may affect their absenteeism (Dwyer & Ganster 1991).

Absenteeism and turnover affects an agencies budget considerably, and examination of what affects absenteeism is now crucial. Agencies are moving toward compressed workweeks in hopes to save money on operation and payroll expenditures, but little is known on the significance among the variables of attendance.

Job Satisfaction

Previous research (Dunham, Pierce and Castaneda, 1987) has indicated that a wide of factors range of factors has lead to the effects of worker job satisfaction. These effects have lead to moving toward an unconventional use of compressed workweeks; whereas job satisfaction is correlated positively and significantly with sick days (Dwyer & Ganster, 1991). There is a correlation between compressed workweeks and it's affect with the amount of sick days used by workers.

Reasons for the rise in job satisfaction can be related to a worker spending more time on leisure and family activities that the traditional work shift would restrict. The possibility of having a shortened workweek allows the worker to reorganize his/her time, to fully enjoy the leisure time, and a chance to “get away” from the job and its tensions (Cunningham, 1989). The expanded allocation of free time opens up the opportunities for the worker to pursue various goals as well as personal interest projects, spend time with their family, and allot time for physical exercise and recreation activities.

Worker Savings

One of the obvious advantages to making fewer trips to work is the fact that less money will be spent on transportation and related expenses for the worker to get to and from work. In today's world, these savings would make a significant impact on a worker's personal budget; with less frequent trips to work. For example, on a normal five-day work week that means the average travel would be

260 roundtrips to and from work per year, and a nine-nine schedule would mean an average of 234 roundtrips a year. If you were to work a four day-10 hour schedule it would only be an average 208 roundtrips to work a year and a three day work week would only be an average 156 roundtrips a year, while still working forty hours a week in all positions.

Environmental Effects

Compressed workweeks are good for the environment because they reduce total vehicle travel, which in turn, reduces auto emissions pumped into the air. Motor vehicles are major energy consumers and sources of air, noise and water pollution. They pollute the air through combustion and fuel evaporation. These emissions contribute greatly to air pollution nationwide and are the primary cause of air pollution in many urban areas. Transportation represents about 27% of total U.S. energy consumption and 70% of total petroleum consumption. Personal transportation represents about 60%, of total transportation energy consumption (ORNL, 2001). Recently released American Community Survey by the U.S. Census Bureau showed that Americans spent an average of 24.3 minutes commuting to work in 2003. This adds up to more than 100 hours annually for the morning commutes. The large metropolitan areas within this survey as well as many other communities are intensively pre-occupied with tackling the congestion issue, in the effort to improve mobility and achieve desired air quality standards. The Transportation Institute has assembled summaries of demand for management measures that can easily be implemented by companies and organizations within these metropolitan areas. One of these demands urges a push towards alternative work schedules.

Another survey of commuters found that AWS could reduce automobile commutes by 7-10%, making it among the most effective commute trip reduction strategies considered (CUTR,

1998). As gasoline prices surge toward \$4 to \$5 a gallon, companies and organizations are struggling to find ways to help employees with commuting costs. Most of these companies and organizations have started compressing their work weeks to assist employees, and because the data has been evidence based and has shown success, other companies and organizations are following suit.

Organizational Effectiveness/Employee Performance

Will an organization remain effective due to being on a compressed workweek? Pierce and Dunham (1992) reported that organization effectiveness remains unchanged by a shift to a compressed workweek. Pierce et al. conducted a study on a police department that moved from an 8-hour day schedule to a 12-hour day schedule.

The impact of alternative work schedules on employee performance has mixed results. Hartman and Weaver (1977) reported productivity increased, but Goodale and Aagaard (1975) found no significant productivity changes. No decline in organizational effectiveness has been found by a study by Pierce and Dunham. We do not predict compressed workweeks to change work productivity, but we rather propose the agency will spend less money on worker salaries because of the increase in worker attendance.

The Significant Types Of Compressed Workweeks

There are many different types of compressed workweeks, which may affect worker attendance, job satisfaction, and a workers' home life differently. The main advantage for working a compressed workweek is the fact that there are less additional days that a worker must report to work, while still working the same amount of hours in a pay period as a traditional 8-hour workday.

The different types of compressed workweeks that we will propose to examine at the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJS) are:

- The Standard 5-day workweek which is a traditional US practice, in which shifts are eight hours in length and the work week is forty hours per week
- 9-9 hour shifts in which a worker has nine working days within a two-week period, with the worker having a three-day weekend every other week. One of the work shifts within the two-week period is only eight hours long, traditionally the day before weekend days
- 4-10 hour shifts a week, which allows the worker to have three days off a week. This is the most popular compressed workweek schedule, but is not always adaptable to facilities that require twenty-four hour operations.
- Our proposed three-day workweek. The three-day workweek consists of three work shifts that are thirteen hours and twenty minutes long that allows the worker four days off per week. This particular work shift is designed specifically for twenty-four hour operations, in which the day shift is on the three-day workweek and graveyard is on the 4-10 workweeks.

Chapter 3

HISTORY

The adoption of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 set the stage for the standard for the five day, forty hour workweek. This has become the normative arrangement for the majority of the workingmen and women in the United States, and came about “... after long and hard fought legal and political battles”. The act allowed for a maximum work week of 44 hours, which then declined to 40 hours in the third year after enactment”. In addition, “... although employers could still demand longer work weeks, hours worked beyond the legal maximum would require time and a half pay ”. (Ilg, Gardner & Rhones, 1997)

The federal government in an experimental program at the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Albuquerque, New Mexico in 1972 first formally examined the idea of the compressed workweek. “Public Law 95-390, the Federal Employee’s Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act, established a government wide 3-year experimental program in 1978. The program was extended for another 3 years under public law 97-221 in 1982, and was made permanent in 1985 as Public Law 99-190” (McC Campbell 1996). The United States Office of Personnel Management (OPM) was given the primary responsibility for the interpretation and enforcement of the Act. The rationale behind this experiment was to test whether the adoption of these arrangements would result in a more positive workplace culture for both employees and employers. It was thought that allowing employees to choose their working hours gives them a more positive perception of their own and their family’s well being. "The timing of work and non-work time” writes Lonnie Golden, “in addition to its quantity,

may have a profound effect on an individual's well being". Golden, summarizing these "social and physical factors" points out that, "To the extent that the scheduling of a given volume of work hours interferes or conflicts with worker's ability to execute their non working responsibilities, well being is reduced. Conversely, the ease with which schedules allow individuals to properly sequence or transition between work and network activities often may be an important, valued feature of a job ", Golden added. "Traditionally" writes Thomas Beers, "Much of the American labor force has worked in a structured environment with the work schedule following a set pattern. Recent studies show that employers are beginning to recognize that many workers prefer schedules that allow for greater flexibility in choosing the times they begin and end their workday" (Beers, 2000).

The Beginning Of Compressed Workweeks

Avery and Zable, in their book *The Flexible Workplace*, point out that rigid work schedules really began in the mid 1800's with the advent of the industrial revolution. Prior to this, most working people made up their own daily schedules. They trace the beginning of the end of the 5 day work week and the uniform starting and ending time to the 1930's, when the Kellogg Cereal company " ... " replaced the traditional three day eight hour shifts with four six hour shifts in order to create work for laid off employees on December 1, 1930." (Avery and Zable, 2001) Private industry was years ahead of the federal government in their enthusiasm and adoption of the compressed working schedule paradigms, for a variety of reasons. Federal law traditionally established very stringent criteria regarding federal employee working hours, requiring these work hours to be set Monday through Friday. According to an analysis by the Georgetown University Law Center, "These requirements, along with provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, impede flexible work arrangements for federal employees." (Georgetown University Law Center, 2006) It took the adoption of the FEFCWSA (and

the intervention of the federal government by this statute) to initiate these changes in a governmental setting.

Along with the regulation of the more (by then) traditional flexible and flextime scheduling programs, for the first time the Act specifically allowed governmental agencies to “compress a regularly scheduled 80 hour biweekly work requirement into fewer than 10 workdays”, (including 4 day or similarly shortened workweeks), (Georgetown, 2006), the actual definitions being written into the law itself. The Office of Personnel Management defined three basic types of compressed schedules: Four day workweeks (Four ten hour days each week), Three day workweeks (Three thirteen hour and twenty minute days each week), and finally 5/4-9 compressed plans (eight nine hour and one eight hour day in a biweekly pay period).

Why Are Compressed Workweeks Important?

To understand the significance of the compressed work schedule movement, and its revolutionary effect on the American working world, it is necessary to examine the reasons why the new compressed schedules have become so important. In the book *Balancing Jobs and Family Life: Do flexible work schedules help?* there are proposed three significant changes in American society that took place after the Second World War that ... “over time, have created the basis for the current interest in flexible work scheduling:

- 1) The separation of workplace and home life.
- 2) The drop in the birth rate since the eighteenth century
- 3) “The increase in labor force participation by women with children.” (Bohen and Long, 1981)

Scholars have theorized that a combination of these circumstances have created a “perfect storm” that has ushered in a new social movement dedicated to the implementation of working conditions

more favorable to a young family's life. From the Civil war to the Second World War the emphasis of the modern American Labor movement was primarily on obtaining humane working conditions and realistic hours. Today we are witnessing a new and unique emphasis on compressed working hours that was sparked by a new recognition of the changing child rearing and employment responsibilities shared between modern men and women. A new era has come to be; the Green movement that has helped move compressed work shifts into the attention of the policy makers and concerned interest groups. Additionally we have now increased inflation with a slowing of the economy, which has increased the costs of agencies to conduct business and costs the employees more just to get to work. Compressed workweeks are an alternative to some of these problems and as of lately have become one the forefront issues of administration review.

Chapter 4

OTHER STUDIES

Dunham and Pierce (1992) first examined a Police Department that had adopted compressed work week schedules because of problems the department was having with too many officers scheduling vacation time during the summer months within the rotating, traditional eight hour shift schedules. This had led to real problems within the department. “Two forces within the department were on a collision course. Department Administration had decided to reduce the amount of vacation time to be allocated during the upcoming summer months, while there was an increase in the level of demand for time off requested by the police officers for the upcoming summer.” The department solved this problem by adopting a twelve-hour day, with four days on and four days off compressed workweek schedule. This allowed each employee to have “half of every “week” off from work, and therefore half of the summer. At the same time, the department could maintain a full complement of Police Officers during the summer.” (Dunham and Pierce) Here is an analysis that found benefits to both employer and employee.

Anderson and Leichy (2007) in their analysis of flexible workplace policies, point out that, “...Flexible schedules are both valued by parents and beneficial to many workers.” Parents employed full time “...say they want access to flextime, job sharing, compressed schedules, and part time work with benefits” (West and Hewlett, 1999). In addition, Halpern’s (1995) survey of working adults showed that when working people have more flexibility in choosing their schedules, they will come to work more often, and will feel less stress when they are there.

There are demonstrated advantages to the implementation of compressed workweeks, both for employers as well as employees. We are curious as to why these arrangements had not become more of an integral part of the American working culture. Specifically, if these new arrangements are such a great idea, why isn't the federal government taking the lead in their implementation? The General Accounting Office, in their landmark 1994 Report to Congress regarding the issue of Alternative Working Schedules, best summed up the problem with their title for the Report, which read "Alternative Work Schedules: Many Agencies Do Not Allow Employees the Full Flexibility Permitted by Law". The authors pointed out that the Statute "...permits, rather than requires agencies to institute Alternative Work Schedule Programs" (GAO, 1994) also finding that the majority of the fifty nine agencies studied "...generally limited workplace flexibility", (GAO) and also discovering that managers were resistant because of scheduling conflicts and concerns that they would not be able to adequately supervise their subordinates.

Chapter 5

ADDITIONAL ADVANTAGES & DISADVANTAGES OF COMPRESSED WORK WEEKS

A compressed workweek or "time crunch" can have various effects on our mental and physical health and on those who depend on us. Compressed workweek provisions are not necessarily designed to focus on balancing work and family responsibilities. In some cases, an employer solely in order to improve operational efficiency and to maximize production may initiate them. Obviously, the concept of "balancing" work and family responsibilities, while a noble goal, is not the central purpose of the new schedules from an agency standpoint. Conversely, while the goals of maximizing production and improving operational efficiency are essential in the private sector, the public domain requires a more comprehensive and thoughtful analysis, agency administrators have more considerations than just if their company will be profitable. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the compressed workweek schedule (CWS) from both the agency and employee standpoints?

Disadvantages

The initiation of compressed workweeks does not come easily in public agencies. In an analysis by the Georgetown University Law Center, (2006) the authors pointed out that the implementation of the compressed schedules could result in an Agency having more difficult and contentious Union negotiations. "In the CWS context, agencies have an additional burden to bargain for the right to alter existing CWS schedules because 6122(b) of the FEFCWA, (which ensures the agency's right to alter the existing FWS based on substantial disruption or additional cost) *does not apply to CWS*. This places an additional negotiating burden on the agency ". There are also significant

challenges faced by the individual employee with regard to the new schedules. One of most telling involves unfavorable financial and scheduling effects upon the employees themselves. For example, the Office of Personnel Management has taken the following position: "...employees on CWS cannot accumulate credit hours in order to vary the length of their workdays in their CWS. There is no legal authority for credit hours under a CWS program". (Georgetown, 2006) Of course this makes sense from a management standpoint, (especially within the area of study defined by this paper). In an institution such as DJJS, with its twenty four hour staffing needs, it would be impossible for an employee to use credit hours to vary starting and ending work shift hours. Nevertheless, it does present another obstacle for an employee in need of this type of scheduling flexibility.

Advantages

We discussed the possible disadvantages of the CWS from a legal and regulatory standpoint. The actual advantages themselves when a CWS system is implemented in the real world are more easily identifiable. As previously shown, Dunham and Pierce (1992) in their groundbreaking study of a "hybrid alternative shift compressed workweek schedule ", found advantages for both the agency and the employee, including job, life, and leisure time satisfaction. Researcher Rudy Hung studied the effects of the CWS on traditional office work occupations that had a five-day workweek. Mr Hung pointed out that most of the traditional research on the subject had involved looking at 12-hour shifts for occupations such as nursing. Hung found that time spent commuting to work decreased by twenty percent. In addition, he found that the adoption of the Clean Air Act in 1990 required large employers to implement employee commute options in urban areas with high levels of air pollution, and that the adoption of the compressed workweeks aided the implementation of these options (Hung, 1995) Mr.

Hung also found that “...operating hours could be extended... (to) provide better services”, and “savings on capital and space may be possible” (Hung, 1995).

Chapter 6

MEASUREMENTS

Measures in our Pretest Survey:

We measured rates of attendance by a self-report questionnaire. Respondents were asked to recall their attendance within the last thirty days to test for measures of attendance.

The measures for Attendance are:

- Number of sick days used in the last 30 days
- Number of vacation days used in the last 30 days
- Number of times tardy in the last 30 days
- Comprehensive time used in days, in the last 30 days
- Number of overtime shifts worked in the last 30 days

The measures for Job Satisfaction were tested in a Likert type 5-scale.

How would you rate your overall level of job satisfaction?

Very Satisfied, Satisfied, In the middle, Dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied

We tested for the work-family conflict theory:

Are you satisfied with the amount of time for home-life?

Yes No

Respondents were given the option to report whether or not they wished to be placed on a compressed workweek.

Yes (compressed workweek)

No (standard eight hour shift)

No preference to work shift

Respondents were asked to report their work tenure.

How long have you worked on an alternative work schedule?

Respondents were also given two open-ended questions to provide the research with variables that we may or may not have considered in the research.

- What has the greatest impact on attendance at work?
- Are there any circumstances that effect your attendance that you think should be mentioned?

Chapter 7

METHODOLOGY

PRE-TEST METHOD

Hypothesis #1: Compressed workweeks will increase worker attendance rates.

Null hypothesis: Compressed workweeks will not increase worker attendance rates.

Workers of compressed workweeks will show up to work more often than workers that are not on compressed workweeks. Agencies will save money due to reduced sick time used and overtime pay. Agencies that will be impacted more by attendance rates are ones that are twenty-four hour facilities that require having a specific amount of workers on duty at all times.

Hypothesis #2: Compressed workweeks will increase worker job satisfaction.

Null hypothesis: Compressed workweeks will not increase worker job satisfaction.

We are looking for a correlation between job satisfaction and attendance rates; along with a correlation between the work-family conflict and job satisfaction. This study makes a prediction that workers of standard eight-hour work shifts will have low rates of job satisfaction, and workers of compressed workweeks will have higher rates of job satisfaction. Thus, a worker that is placed or switched to a compressed workweek from a standard workweek will have increased job satisfaction.

Since we were unable to test an experimental group, we have to abandon our first two hypotheses, and leave them for our proposed work-study. Instead we will look at two possible factors that can be studied:

Hypothesis #3: Workers of standard workweeks will report low job satisfaction.

Null hypothesis: Workers of standard workweeks will not report low job satisfaction.

Hypothesis #4: Workers of standard workweeks will report that a work-family conflict exists.

Null hypothesis: Workers of standard workweeks will not report that a work-family conflict exists.

Data for this pretest study was collected during an editing session for grammar errors, readability, and comprehension of survey items. Luckily, all the participants of the study are of the same job title and have the same job responsibilities as well as work similar hours (2:30pm – 10:30pm). Employees of the current study are on a standard workweek. Employees selected for the pretest were selected to participate out of convenience, the two closest units to the exit of the facility. All workers of the two units participated in the survey. We received 8 completed surveys.

The first major limitation of this study is the absence of the experimental group (workers on compressed workweeks), for which we were to compare rates of absenteeism and levels of job satisfaction. The second major limitation is the number of participants in the study.

With the absence of the experimental group, we have to abandon hypothesis #1 and #2. With the low number of participants in the study, we have to be skeptical of our results. This study serves as a pre-test to a larger research proposal. The results of the study have led us to believe that our hypothesis #1 and #2 will hold up, if we are allowed to conduct a longitudinal study.

Chapter 8

FINDINGS

The data from this survey points out three important factors: 1) Workers are not satisfied with the amount of time for home life; 2) if given a choice, all workers would choose to work a compressed workweek; 3) and workers of the standard eight hour shift did not report low levels of job satisfaction.

The work-family conflict is evident in the small sample that we have taken, 87% of the respondents have reported that they are not satisfied with the amount of time that they have for home life. In support of these findings, all respondents report that they would rather work a compressed workweek, than a traditional 8-hour shift. These findings are relevant since research conducted by Glass & Estes has shown that the work-family conflict is related to decreased productivity, absenteeism, and turnover (qtd. In Facer & Wadsworth 2008).

Additionally, Pearson's two-tailed correlation showed a Large Negative Correlation (-.830) between Sick Days Used and Overall Job Satisfaction. The findings of a large negative correlation between sick days used and job satisfaction are in line with the past studies of Dwyer & Ganster (1991), where they too found the same correlation. There also exists a Large Negative Correlation (-.851) between Comp Days Used and Overall Job Satisfaction. These results show that when job satisfaction increases, the amount of sick and comp days taken decreases.

Workers responded either in the middle or higher in regards to levels of job satisfaction. This finding contradicts our hypothesis, and thus tells us that employees are content or satisfied with their

job. The low number of survey responses may be misrepresenting the view of the population; so all findings at this time are tentative until a longitudinal study can be conducted.

Compressed Work shifts:

	5 day workweek	9 – 9’s	4-tens	3-day workweek																		
Sick Days used in the last 30 days	1.67 days used on average																					
Vacation Days used in the last 30 days	2.29 days used on average																					
Comp Time used in the last 30 days	.92 day used on average																					
Number of days tardy in the last 30 days	1.25 times on average																					
Overtime Shifts in the last 30 days	3 shifts on average																					
Job Satisfaction	<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>Frequency</u></th> <th><u>Percent</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Very Dissatisfied</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dissatisfied</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In the middle</td> <td>5</td> <td>62.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Satisfied</td> <td>1</td> <td>12.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Very Satisfied</td> <td>2</td> <td>25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	Very Dissatisfied	0	0	Dissatisfied	0	0	In the middle	5	62.5	Satisfied	1	12.5	Very Satisfied	2	25			
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>																				
Very Dissatisfied	0	0																				
Dissatisfied	0	0																				
In the middle	5	62.5																				
Satisfied	1	12.5																				
Very Satisfied	2	25																				
Satisfied with time for home life? (Work-Family Conflict)	<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>Frequency</u></th> <th><u>Percent</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>7</td> <td>87.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>1</td> <td>12.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	No	7	87.5	Yes	1	12.5												
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>																				
No	7	87.5																				
Yes	1	12.5																				
Willingness to work a compressed workweek	<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>Frequency</u></th> <th><u>Percent</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Yes</td> <td>8</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	Yes	8	100	No	0	0												
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>																				
Yes	8	100																				
No	0	0																				
Job tenure	<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>Frequency</u></th> <th><u>Percent</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Less than 1 year</td> <td>1</td> <td>12.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 year to 5</td> <td>5</td> <td>62.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 years to 10</td> <td>2</td> <td>25.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	Less than 1 year	1	12.5	1 year to 5	5	62.5	5 years to 10	2	25.0									
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>																				
Less than 1 year	1	12.5																				
1 year to 5	5	62.5																				
5 years to 10	2	25.0																				
Round trips to work per year	260	234	208	156																		

	Overall Job Satisfaction	Enough Time for Home-Life (Work-Family Conflict)
Sick Days Used		
Pearson Correlation	-.830*	.400
Sig. (2-Tailed)	.041	.432
N	6	6
Late to Work		
Pearson Correlation	-.870	.333
Sig. (2-Tailed)	.130	.667
N	4	4
Comp Days Used		
Pearson Correlation	-.851*	.878*
Sig. (2-Tailed)	.032	.021
N	6	6
Vacation Days Used		
Pearson Correlation	-.577	.577
Sig. (2-Tailed)	.423	.423
N	4	4
Number of OT Shifts		
Pearson Correlation	-.520	.417
Sig. (2-Tailed)	.290	.410
N	6	6

Chapter 9

LIMITATIONS

The first major limitation of this study is the absence of the experimental group (workers on compressed workweeks), for which we were not able to compare rates of absenteeism and levels of job satisfaction. Time has been to blame, since the policy analysis has continued and meetings to get the approval to conduct the research continue, although the deadline for this paper has approached first.

The second significant limitation is the lower number of survey respondents. As mentioned earlier in the Method Section, the survey results are from an editing session for grammar errors, readability, and comprehension of survey items. All participants were members of the comparison group, and had similar job titles and responsibilities. We were unable to survey a significant amount of the population to draw an accurate conclusion to our hypothesis at this time. If allotted more time for this paper, we are confident that the results of the survey would be more valid.

Time is an important factor in collecting sufficient amounts of data to aid in the compressed work schedule theory. In this research only seven months was allocated to create a survey, seek the population and agency to implement the survey, implement the survey, then retrieve the data from the survey and make an accurate analysis. The average public government type survey usually takes at least a year to implement. The reason for the need for a longer period when implementing a public government agency type survey is because of the amount of red tape one must go through to seek permission from the management of each public agency to survey their employees. The approval

process at each public agency is necessary to properly implement a survey among employees. In some situations, even when a survey is approved to be conducted in the public forum, some agencies change their minds, and cause disruption in the research.

The approval delay to access the population surveyed can cause a delay in achieving a through research study among the population who participate in the alternative work schedule. In this research study, ideally University Medical Center (UMC), City of Las Vegas Detention Center (CLDC), and Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJS) was chosen to participate in the research, however due to the red tape of seeking approval from the UMC management group, that agency could not be used to participate in this study. The truth is after two to three months of requesting to survey their employees; the survey process was met with resistance. Basically, UMC was unsure of the nature of this research study and how it may effect their institution overall. Consequently, other public agencies could not be chosen to participate in the study.

The time constraint of the research brought upon another issue when collecting data from DJJS. We have not been able to get the go ahead “nod” at this point from administration within the time frame for this thesis project. With the lack of survey respondents, along with being unable at this time to survey a comparison group has lead to research proposal instead of a concrete thesis. The time period may be at blame for not being able to get through the red tape to conduct the survey adequately.

Environmental factors must be taken into account when reviewing the results of the survey. People who are taking the survey at work can feel intimidated to answer the surveys quickly for fear of management discovering their participation or because they only had a few minutes between their work schedule to take the survey. Consequently, because this research study has not yet received a full

endorsement from DJJS, completing the entire policy analysis has been postponed. In an ideal situation, researchers would be allocated ten or fifteen minutes during a meeting or a meet and greet time frame where they can introduce the survey and entertain any particular questions. If a lack of communication exists between the researcher and the population conducting the survey, then the survey may be misunderstood and answered incorrectly.

The limitations that would have occurred if this study had been conducted may result in the generalizability becoming jeopardized, because the sampling size collected has not yet represented the population. There is a possibility that not all or most of the employees at each DJJS will participate in the survey or in other words have the same opinion as those who completed the survey. Due to the fact that the survey would have been pushed out to the immediate population who had a relationship with the contact at DJJS, the point of view may have all been the same. A case in point is the “mob mentality”, in that everyone who feels the same or has the same opinion about their work environment tends to become friends and have a relationship among the same group. In contrast, those who have different perspectives may not choose to work for particular individuals or communicate with the same group of people. Hence, certain groups and opinions at DJJS may be opted because of the inability to reach the whole population who participate in alternative work schedule at DJJS. However, it should be noted that all staff asked to participate in the pre-test survey, participated in the survey. We are confident that this sampling bias would not be an issue, once Clark County approved the study to continue.

Using the onsite survey, employees would be working different work shifts therefore employees in different work shifts might not get surveyed. For example, the graveyard shift employees might not be surveyed if the onsite surveys conducted by researchers are conducted between 8:00 a.m.

and 7:00 p.m. The fact is certain groups may have a stronger or weaker opinion toward a compressed work schedule. Those who have to work Sundays may be more con then pro or vice versa. The point is, because of the short time frame to conduct this research and the ability to reach the complete population who participate in a compressed work schedule at DJJS can result in a misrepresentation of the overall result of the data. Emailing the survey may be one option to combat this problem, along with stationing persons during shift exchanges at the main entry/exit of the Detention Center and other Division buildings, catching everyone as they enter and leave their facilities.

Despite the limitations discussed, they would have been navigated during the full survey implementation. Therefore the survey analysis would have been without many of the limitations listed above.

Chapter 10

CONCLUSION

The data in this study suggests three factors that cannot be overlooked: Workers are not satisfied with the amount of time for home life; if given a choice, workers would choose to work a compressed workweek; and workers of the standard eight hour shift did not report low levels of job satisfaction.

For our pre-test survey hypothesis, we must reject our hypothesis #3 and accept our null hypothesis; Job satisfaction is not reported to be low in groups that work standard workweeks. No respondents reported to be dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with their overall job satisfaction.

All but one worker reported that they did not have enough time for home-life, leaving us to reject our null hypothesis #4. The hypothesis #4 argues that there is not enough time for home life. Facer and Wadsworth (2008) have pointed out that previous research has shown that the work-family conflict is related to decreased productivity, absenteeism, and turnover (Glass & Estes, 1997). Increasing time for home life and balancing the work-family conflict will increase attendance and thus save the agency money.

At this time we have been unable to identify a correlation between job satisfaction and the work-family conflict. This is an area that can be addressed by future research. This study cannot conclude that there is a clear dichotomy between overall job satisfaction and the work-family conflict either, even though our results point to this conclusion. This is another area that needs to be studied further.

In coming to an overall conclusion, it is recommended that agencies benefit from using compressed workweeks, which will in turn enable the employee to benefit from compressed workweeks as well. Quantitative data has shown that the use of compressed workweeks will decrease absenteeism, and thus save the agency money.

References

- 1) Avery, C. & Zable, D. (2001). *The Flexible Workplace: A Sourcebook of Information and Research* 2 books.google.com.
- 2) Anderson, Elaine, & Leichty, Janet. (2007). Flexible Workplace Policies: Lessons from the Alternative Work Schedules Act. *Family Relations* July 2007, 56 , 304-317
- 3) Beers, Thomas. (2000). Flexible Schedules and Shift Work: Replacing the “9 to 5” Workday. *Monthly Labor Review*. June. 33-40
- 4) Bohlen, H, & Long, J. (1981) *Balancing Jobs and Family Life: Do Flexible Work Schedules Help?* Temple University Press
- 5) Cohen, A, & Gadon, H (1978) *Alternative Work Schedules: Integrating Individual and Organizational Needs*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, Massachusetts.
- 6) Cunningham, Barton J. (1982) Compressed Shift Schedules: Altering the Relationship between Work and Non Work. *Public Administration Review* 42, (5) 438-447
- 7) Cunningham, Barton J. (1989) A Compressed Shift Schedule: Dealing with some of the Problems of Shift Work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 10, 231-245.
- 8) CUTR (1988) *A Market Based Approach to Cost effective Trip Reduction Program Design* . Center for Urban Transportation Research for Florida Department of Transportation. Retrieved at [http:// ntl.bts.gov/lib/3000/3600/3633/cashdoc](http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/3000/3600/3633/cashdoc).
- 9) Dunham, Randall B. and Pierce, John L. (1992). The 12 Hour Work Day: A 48 Hour, 8 Day Week. *Academy of Management Journal* , 35,(5) 1086-1098
- 10) Dunham, R, Pierce, J, and Castenada, M.. (1987). Alternative Work Schedules : Two Field Quasi Experiments. *Personnel Psychology* .40, 215-243
- 11) Dwyer, DJ and Ganster, DC. (1991). The Effects of Job Demands and Control on Employee Attendance and Satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 12, 595-608
- 12) Facer, R and Wadsworth, L. (2008). Alternative Work Schedules and Work- Family Balance: A Research Note. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*: 28.16
- 13) General Accounting Office. (1994). *Alternative Work Schedules: Many Agencies Do Not Allow Employees the Full Flexibility Permitted By Law*. Letter Report 3/29/GAO/GGD 94-55

- 14) Georgetown University Law Center Legal Memo. (2006). *Workplace Flexibility 2010: The Federal Employees Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act* www.law.georgetown.edu/workplace flexibility 2010.
- 15) Goodale, James G and Aagaard, AK. (1975). Factors Relating to Varying Reactions the 4 Day Work Week *Journal of Applied Psychology* . 60, 31-38
- 16) Golden, Lonnie. (2001) Flexible Work Schedules: Which Workers Get Them? *American Behavioral Scientist*: 44 (7) 1157-1178
- 17) Hartman, R.I.; and Weaver, M. (1977) Four factors influencing conversion to a four day work week. *Human Resource Management*, 16 (1) 1-31.
- 18) Halpern, Diane F. & Murphy, Susan E. (2004) *From Work-Family Balance to Work-Family Interaction: Changing the Metaphor Contributor* Published by Rutledge
- 19) Hill, Jeffery E., Hawkins, Alan J., Ferris, Maria, Weitzman, Michelle, (2001). Finding an Extra Day a Week: The Positive Influence of Perceived Job Flexibility on Work and Family Life Balance. *Family Relations*, Vol. 50, No. 1, pp. 49-58.
- 20) Ilg RE Rhones, P, Gardner GM (1997). Trends in Hours of Work since the mid 1970's *Monthly Labor Review*, - questia.com
- 21) Konrad, Alison M., Mangel, Robert, (2000). The Impact of Work-Life Programs on Firm Productivity. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 12, pp.1225-1237.
- 22) McCampbell, Atefeh. (1996). Benefits Achieved Through Alternative Work Schedules *Human Resource Planning* 19, (3) 31-37
- 23) Utah is going to a 4 day workweek (2008, July 3) *MSNBC*. Retrieved from <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/25518225>
- 24) West, Cornel & Hewlett, Sylvia, (1999). The Case for a New Social Movement. *Taking Parenting Public*. Published by Rowman & Littlefield
- 25) Zedeck, Sheldon, Jackson, Susan E., & Summers, Elizabeth, (1983). Shift Work Schedules and Their Relationship to Health, Adaptation, Satisfaction, and Turnover Intention. *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 297-310.

