

CONSEQUENCES OF WORKING MORE HOURS THAN PREFERRED AND INITIALLY AGREED UPON

IJ. HETTY VAN EMMERIK*

Abstract

The relationship between a specific type of experienced inequity, i.e., working more hours than preferred and initially agreed upon, and engagement in organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward supervisor and colleagues was examined. It was argued that some employees may attach more importance to their working conditions (i.e., women and part-time employees) and, therefore, are more likely to reduce their investments when they experience this type of inequity. Using data from 178 employees and hierarchical regression analyses, it was shown that working more hours than preferred was associated with the expected withdrawal of contributions. Moreover, gender and employment status were found to moderate the negative relationship between this type of inequity and engagement in OCBs directed toward the supervisor. No relationship was found between working more hours than preferred and engagement in organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward colleagues. Implications of results and directions for future research are discussed.

Introduction

Employees are increasingly being asked to work longer hours or to work more days each week, and to maintain this pace for longer periods in their working lives (Babbar & Aspelin, 1998; Crouter, Bumpus, & Head, 2001; Feldman, 2002). This 'overtime problem' may well be an inextricable feature of today's reengineered, reorganized, and downsized organizations (Babbar & Aspelin, 1998). Working overtime is frequently taken as a synonym for commitment and ambition (Balfour & Neff, 1993; Sullivan, 1999) and in some organizations

* J. Hetty van Emmerik is Associate Professor Sociology at Utrecht University. Address correspondence to Hetty van Emmerik, Department of Sociology, Willem C. van Unnikgebouw kr 1426, Heidelberglaan 1, 3584 CS Utrecht, The Netherlands or e-mail (H.vanEmmerik@fss.uu.nl).

performance is measured by the number of hours worked instead of how well the job is done (Babbar & Aspelin, 1998). Long working hours are common in Europe. Recent figures show that 20% of all European workers report long working hours (Merllié & Paoli, 2001). Much of the research has concentrated on overtime in relation to shift work and compressed work weeks. Hence, the focus was predominantly on the adverse consequences of working overtime. For instance, studies have shown that working overtime may easily result in short-term drawbacks, such as workplace injuries and illnesses (Savery & Luks, 2000), and in long-term effects of excessive working hours, e.g., impairment of employees' mental and physical health (Sparks, Cooper, & et al., 1997). In the present study, we examined a specific type of working long hours, namely, working more hours than preferred by the employee and initially, agreed upon, irrespective of whether this overtime is induced by organizational norms and job requirements, or is felt necessary in order to advance one's career (Harpaz & Snir, 2003). The relationship between working more hours than preferred and employees' behaviors was examined with regard to special types of helping behaviors, i.e., Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs). Helping behaviors are usually defined as voluntary and discretionary behaviors that contribute to organizational effectiveness, but these types of behaviors are commonly not included in traditional definitions of job performance (Organ & Konovsky, 1989). Within the organizational context, these helping behaviors are nowadays referred to as OCBs. Examples of OCBs are helping coworkers with job-related problems, accepting orders without a fuss, helping to keep the work area clean and uncluttered, making constructive statements about the work unit, promoting a favorable work climate, and protecting and conserving organizational resources (Bateman & Organ, 1983).

It was our aim to demonstrate the relationship between working overtime and employees' OCBs in the workplace, and thereby to bridge some of the gap between the organizational behavior perspective on OCBs and the more established literature on the consequences of unwanted overtime. From both the equity perspective (Adams, 1963) and the psychological contract breach literature (Robinson, 1996; Robinson, Kraatz, & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1989; Rousseau & Tijoriwala, 1998), it can be argued that employees who work more hours than they prefer and agreed upon may experience this to be an overcharge of their employer and that this may have unfavorable consequences for employees' behavior. In the present study, we examined whether such an experience of inequity is associated with specific types of reduction of contributions, i.e., decreased engagement in OCBs, directed toward the supervisor and toward colleagues. It was also argued that specific groups of employees (i.e., women and part-time employees) may attach more importance to working conditions and, therefore, are more likely to reduce their investments when confronted with inequity.

Working long hours

Working long hours is frequently referred to as overtime. A distinction can be made between mandatory and voluntary overtime (Feldman, 2002). Mandatory or involuntary overtime refers to compelling, forcing, or in more subtle ways persuading employees to work more hours than agreed upon. Voluntary overtime refers to willingly long working hours exchanging for higher income, but also to willingness to work extra hours which do not bring direct compensation (Feldman, 2002). As already mentioned, in the present study, working long hours or overtime referred to working more hours than preferred by the employee and initially agreed upon.

Over the last decades, employees have increased the time they spend at work. It has been suggested that this may stem from the implicit assumption that both organizational success and individual career success are linked to working long hours and extended workplace presence. Employees may view overtime as contributing to their career success, even if they do not think that office presence is necessary (Gephart, 2002).

However, working long hours may not reflect employee preferences (Clarkberg & Moen, 2001). Employees who work more hours than they prefer and agreed upon may consider this to be an overcharge of their employers. Obligations can be defined as beliefs, held by an employee or employer, that each is bound by promise or debt to an action or course of action in relation to the other party (Robinson, Kraatz, & Rousseau, 1994). Such obligations may derive from implicit or explicit promises of future exchange or reciprocity, but the construct is inherently a perceptual one. Parties develop their own perception of mutual obligations defining the relationship. These perceived obligations compose the psychological contract, and this perceptual, individual nature of the psychological contract is the defining attribute that distinguishes it from other forms of contracts (Robinson et al., 1994).

From an equity perspective (Adams, 1963), it can be argued that the output/input ratio will be perceived as unequal and that employees will strive to restore this inequity. More specifically, the reaction of employees to an overcharge by the employer can also be explained by the psychological contract breach model. This concept refers to an individual's beliefs about the terms and conditions of a reciprocal exchange agreement between that person and his or her employer (Robinson, 1996; Robinson et al., 1994; Rousseau, 1989; Rousseau & Tijoriwala, 1998). It specifies the contributions that employees believe they owe to their employer and the inducements that they believe are owed in return. Inequity occurs when – in the perception of employees – the employer has failed to adequately fulfill promised obligations (Arnold, 1996; Coyle-Shapiro, 2002). This is a distressing experience for employees, and it may strengthen employees' beliefs that obligations agreed upon have been violated (Robinson, 1996). In the present study, we took a specific instance of experienced inequity,

namely, when employees indicate that they are putting in more effort than they feel is obliged, i.e., when they work more hours than preferred and agreed upon.

Confronted with this experienced inequity, employees can attempt to regain costs by decreasing their efforts or by trying to increase the employer's obligations. It seems likely that inequity especially results in decreases in contributions, more than, for instance, trying to increase obligations. Employees may find adjusting their own contributions the most feasible reaction, as they may perceive themselves as powerless to effect change in their employers' behavior. Accordingly, they will adjust their own contributions in order to restore the balance (Robinson et al., 1994). Studies generally support this idea: the perception of inequity has been shown to be related to various reduced job investments, such as dissatisfaction and turnover (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994), and Robinson (1996) found a negative association between perceived inequity and employees' performance, their civic virtue behavior, and their intentions to remain with the organization. Other studies have also shown that inequity is associated with fewer job investments, e.g., less commitment and lower job performance (Lester, Turnley, Bloodgood, & Bolino, 2002), and more dissatisfaction, more thoughts of quitting, and more actual turnover (Bunderson, 2001).

The reduction of contributions as a reaction to experienced inequity is especially relevant to an understanding of the withdrawal of discretionary behaviors at work, i.e., OCBs (Coyle-Shapiro, 2002). The discretionary nature of OCBs signifies that these behaviors may easily be given or withheld (Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996). The withdrawal of OCBs is likely to have fewer negative repercussions than the lowering of in-role performance (Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; Turnley, Bolino, Lester, & Bloodgood, 2003). Hence, experienced inequity may primarily affect discretionary behaviors such as OCB (Organ & Ryan, 1995), and these behaviors were the focus of the present study.

In the present study, we also differentiated between two different types of resulting behaviors: OCBs directed toward the supervisor and OCBs directed toward colleagues. The reduction of contributions as a reaction to experienced inequity is thought to be differentially related to OCBs directed at different targets within the organization. Employees may have different commitments to supervisors and to colleagues, and this may have consequences for their contributions (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Reichers, 1985; Settoon et al., 1996). For instance, Turnley et al. (2003) found that inequity is more strongly related to OCBs directed toward the organization than to OCBs directed at colleagues. The most direct source that requires reciprocation can probably be found in the behaviors of the supervisor, more than in the behaviors of colleagues (Bateman & Organ, 1983). One could argue that the supervisor is viewed as the reason for the experienced inequity, thus the withholding of OCBs would primarily be directed at him or her. On the other hand, since the supervisor has power over the employee, it may be riskier to withhold OCBs toward the supervisor.

Therefore, the employee may transfer his or her aggression such that it is directed at coworkers rather than the intended target (i.e., the supervisor). Given this, the variable of “relationship with supervisor” must be accounted for. Thus, it was expected that, after the relationship with the supervisor was controlled for, OCBs directed toward the supervisor – as the most direct source that requires reciprocation – would suffer more from perceived inequity than OCBs directed toward peers.

Hypothesis 1: Perceived inequity, i.e., working more hours than preferred and initially agreed upon, will be negatively associated with (a) OCBs directed toward the supervisor, and (b) OCBs directed toward colleagues.

Importance attached to working conditions

The psychological model proposes that, at the basic level, employees are expected to contribute within reasonable levels of pressure and responsibility, e.g., reasonable hours, a manageable workload, in return for appropriate levels of rewards, e.g., an appropriate level of pay, suitable working conditions (Maguire, 2002). The perception of inequity or psychological contract breach because of working more hours than preferred may have different significance for various groups of employees. It is possible that those employees who attach more importance to their working conditions, such as number of hours, will be more affected by perceived contract breach brought about by working long hours or mandatory overtime, and consequently are more likely to reduce their contributions drastically. Below, we elaborate on this issue for two specific groups of employees: gender and employment status.

Gender

Employees may react differently to inequity. It can be expected that those who attach great importance to working conditions will be affected more negatively by inequity than those who attach less importance to the number of hours worked. Women’s time commitments to paid employment are more influenced by the need to reserve time for dependent care and other family responsibilities than those of men (Fagan, 2001). Moreover, there is overwhelming evidence that the burden of dependent care falls disproportionately on women, therefore women are more likely than men to restructure their work activities around family needs (Buffardi, Smith, O’ Brien, & Erdwins, 1999). Because of these domestic and child-care responsibilities, it was expected that women would find it more important that the number of working hours not exceeds the number of working hours agreed upon in the employment contract. And, that women would evaluate working more hours than preferred more negatively than men. Therefore, it was expected that women would be more sensitive to violations

of the agreement on number of working hours, such that this specific type of inequity would have a greater negative impact on their job contributions.

Hypothesis 2: The negative relationship between perceived inequity and engagement in (a) OCBs directed toward the supervisor, and (b) OCBs directed toward colleagues will be stronger for women than for men.

Employment status

It has been acknowledged that part-time employees differ in several aspects from full-time employees, and attitudinal and behavioral differences between part-time and full-time employees are supposed (Sinclair, Martin, & Michel, 1999). Conway and Briner (2002) give a number of reasons for supposing that part-time employees may have a different psychological contract than full-time employees. These differences can be located at the organizational level (e.g., differential treatment by the employer), at the individual level (e.g., different career orientations), and at the interpersonal level (e.g., differential treatment by the supervisor and colleagues), or can be related to the reduced time spent in the workplace. Given that most part-time employees nowadays explicitly choose to work fewer hours, the time commitments of part-time employees may also be different from those of full-time employees. It is likely that part-time employees will find it more important that the number of working hours does not exceed the number of hours that is agreed upon in the employment contract. Thus, those who attach more importance to working the agreed upon hours, i.e., part-time employees, will be affected more negatively by inequity than those who value specific working conditions less. Consequently, we expected that the perception of this specific type of inequity would have greater impact on contributions of part-time employees than on the contributions of full-time employees.

Hypothesis 3: The negative relationship between perceived inequity and engagement in (a) OCBs directed toward the supervisor and (b) OCBs directed toward colleagues will be stronger for part-time than for full-time employees.

Gender and employment status

It was argued above that the relationship between working more hours and OCBs would be stronger for women and for part-time employees. To further test the predictions with regard to the importance attached to working conditions, we examined the possibility that the combination of gender and employment status is also associated with engagement in OCBs, such that especially the contributions of female part-timers are sensitive to working more hours than preferred.

Hypothesis 4: There will be a three-way interaction for gender and employment status and the relationship between perceived inequity, i.e., working more hours than preferred, and (a) OCBs directed toward supervisor, and (b) OCBs directed toward colleagues, such that this relationship will be strongest for part-time women employees.

Method

Participants

Data were obtained from a sample from a university (N = 156) and a printing works (N = 99) in the Netherlands. Participants were requested to complete a written questionnaire. A total of 255 questionnaires was returned (response rate 37%) and after the questionnaires with missing values on the research variables were removed, a total of 178 remained: 93 men (52%) and 85 women (48%). The mean age of the respondents was 42 years (*SD* = 11.17). The university sample consisted of 67 (48%) men and 73 (52%) women. The mean age of these respondents was 41.9 years (*SD* 11.8). The printing works sample consisted of 26 men (68%) and 12 women (32%). The mean age of these respondents was 40.7 years (*SD* 8.8). A total of 24% of the respondents was classified as working more hours than they preferred. Eighteen percent of the male part-timers (N = 22, 12% of the total sample, the mean age of this group was 46.3 years, and their mean number of children was 1.5), 22% of the female part-timers (N = 41, 23% of the total sample, the mean age of this group was 40.5 years, and their mean number of children was 1.3), 14% of the male full-timers (n=71, 40% of the total sample, the mean age of this group is 43.6 years, and their mean number of children was 1.6), and 45% of the female full-timers (N = 44, 25% of the total sample, the mean age of this group is 37.3 years, and their mean number of children was .9) indicated working more hours than preferred and agreed upon in the employment contract. The mean number of hours for which part-time working men were appointed was 26.3 hours, in reality they indicate working 29.9 hours, part-time working women are appointed for 27.3 hours, in reality they indicate working 29.8 hours. The mean number of hours for which full-time working respondents were appointed was 38 hours, in reality full-time working men indicated working 44.9 hours, and full-time working women indicated working 40.0 hours. To control for possible differences between the two settings, a dummy variable for organization was included in the analyses.

Measures

Engagement in OCBs directed toward the supervisor was measured using four items, and engagement in OCBs directed toward colleagues was measured using three items adopted from previous studies (Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Van Dyne & Ang, 1998). The results of factor analysis on the seven items are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Results of factor analysis (PCA, varimax rotation) for engagement in two types of OCBs.

| | Factor 1 | Factor 2 |
|--|----------|----------|
| <i>Alpha = .74</i> | | |
| OCBs directed toward supervisor | | |
| Taking interests of supervisor into account | .80 | .01 |
| Helping supervisor to finish the job | .80 | .04 |
| Willing to help supervisor when necessary | .79 | .03 |
| Apologizing to supervisor when a mistake is made | .68 | .06 |
| <i>Alpha = .71</i> | | |
| OCBs directed toward colleagues | | |
| Helping others who have been absent. | .10 | .90 |
| Meeting performance expectations, and adequately fulfilling responsibilities | .05 | .83 |
| Orienting new colleagues | -.02 | .77 |
| Eigenvalue | 2.37 | 2.09 |
| Cumulative % Explained variance | 34 % | 64 % |

Factor 1 (eigenvalue = 2.37, $R^2 = 34\%$) consisted of the four items of OCBs directed toward the supervisor (Alpha = .74). Factor 2 (eigenvalue = 2.09, $R^2 = 30\%$) consisted of the three items of OCBs directed toward colleagues (Alpha = .71). A seven-point Likert response format was used (1, strongly disagree, to 7, strongly agree). The items were summed and divided by the number of items (1 = low and 7 = high OCBs).

Working more hours than preferred and initially agreed upon was computed by subtracting the preferred number of working hours from the number of hours agreed in the employment contract, and was mean centered prior to the analyses (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). Gender was measured using 0 = male and 1 = female. Employment status was measured using 0 = working part-time and 1 = working full-time.

A number of variables were used as controls. We controlled for the number of children because child-care responsibilities indicate that it is important that working hours do not exceed the number of hours agreed upon in the employment contract. Organizational tenure, measured in years, was controlled for because employees with less organizational tenure are perhaps somewhat less willing to exert extra effort on their organizations' behalf (Feldman, 2002). Because jobs with long hours may be more complex and require a higher level of autonomy than jobs with short hours (Barnett, 1998), we controlled for autonomy. This was measured using two items ('I am responsible for resolving matters that have to do with my work' and 'I can determine what is part of my job and what is not part of my job') with Alpha = .79. A seven-point Likert response format was used (1, strongly disagree, to 7, strongly agree). The items were summed and

divided by the number of items. Finally, affective commitment and relationship with the supervisor were controlled for because these variables may affect the withdrawal of contributions. Affective commitment was measured using three items adopted from Allen and Meyer (1990). An example is 'I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization' (1 = completely disagree, 7 = completely agree). Cronbach's alpha of this scale was .79. Relationship with the supervisor was measured using five items: 'My supervisor is open to me', 'My supervisor is honest to me', 'My supervisor always treats me fairly', 'My supervisor is reasonable', and 'The behavior of my supervisor to me is always consistent' (1 = completely disagree, 7 = completely agree). Cronbach's alpha of this scale was .97. For both scales, the items were summed and divided by the number of items.

Results

Means, standard deviations, and correlations are reported in Table 2.

Both types of OCBs were weakly correlated ($r = .07, p < .01$), showing that these are relatively independent concepts. Hierarchical regression analyses were performed for OCBs directed toward the supervisor and for OCBs directed toward colleagues. Model 1 and Model 2 in Tables 2 and 3 show the results for men and women separately; Models 3 and 4 show the results for part-time and full-time working respondents, and Model 5 shows the results for the total population. To test specifically for interaction effects, the variables were entered in three steps. In Step 1, gender, employment status, and the control variables were entered. In Step 2, working more hours than preferred was entered. In Step 3, the product variables, computed by multiplying working more hours by gender, multiplying working more hours by employment status, and multiplying working more hours with gender and with employment status, were added. Table 3 shows the results of the regression analyses.

Working more hours than preferred appeared to be negatively related to OCBs directed toward the supervisor ($b = -.132, p < .01$), but was not related to OCBs directed toward colleagues ($b = -.644, ns$). Hypothesis 1a, that working more hours than preferred is associated with fewer OCBs directed toward the supervisor, was supported. Hypothesis 1b, that working more hours than preferred is associated with fewer OCBs directed toward colleagues was not supported.

The specified interaction between working more hours and gender was significant for OCBs directed toward the supervisor ($b = -.154, p < .01$). Inspection of separate regression analyses for men and women (see Models 1 and 2) showed that the slope of the regression equation for women ($b = .028$) was steeper than that for men ($-.008$), thus the negative relationship between working more hours and OCBs appeared to be stronger for women than for men.

Table 2: Descriptives and correlations (N=255).

| | Mean | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|------------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| 1. OCBs directed toward supervisor | 5.32 | 1.10 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. OCBs directed toward colleagues | 5.87 | 8.19 | .07 | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Gender | .48 | .50 | .07 | -.08 | | | | | | | |
| 4. Fulltime | .65 | .48 | -.05 | -.13 | -.26** | | | | | | |
| 5. Children | 1.33 | 1.24 | .08 | .03 | -.19** | -.03 | | | | | |
| 6. Tenure | 9.98 | 9.19 | .01 | .20** | -.24** | -.01 | .27** | | | | |
| 7. Autonomy | 4.99 | 1.51 | .18* | .02 | -.17* | -.02 | .15* | .15* | | | |
| 8. Affective commitment | 4.15 | 1.33 | .23** | .02 | -.20** | .11 | .23** | .20** | .26** | | |
| 9. Relationship with supervisor | 5.22 | 1.37 | .29** | -.07 | .03 | -.05 | .01 | -.03 | .40** | .07 | |
| 10. Overtime (centered) | .30 | 4.26 | .01 | -.05 | .04 | .07 | -.13 | .00 | -.04 | -.06 | -.16* |

Sign. * p < .05; ** p < .01

Table 3: Results of regression analyses for OCBs directed toward supervisor (unstandardized regression coefficients) ($N = 255$).

| | Model 1 (Men) | | Model 2 (Women) | | Model 3 (Part-time) | | Model 4 (Full-time) | | Model 5 (Full) | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|--------|--------------------|--------|------------------------|--------|------------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|---------|
| - Gender (G) | . | | | | .265 | .219 | .263 | .224 | .310 | .300 | .336* |
| - Employment status (E) | -.039 | -.039 | -.359 | -.343 | | | | | -.270 | -.247 | -.223 |
| - Children | .016 | .040 | .019 | .020 | .139 | .130 | -.024 | -.002 | .033 | .042 | .039 |
| - Organization | -.355 | -.352 | -.091* | -.964* | .127 | .236 | -.704** | -.685** | -.664** | -.657** | -.586** |
| - Tenure | -.008 | -.009 | .011 | .011 | -.025 | -.024 | .007 | .006 | -.002 | -.002 | .001 |
| - Autonomy | .024 | .024 | .139 | .141 | -.011 | .006 | .123 | .115 | .067 | .083 | .091 |
| - Affective commitment | .252** | .245** | .051 | .048 | .225* | .219* | .170* | .174* | .149* | .152* | .164** |
| - Relationship with superv. | .190* | .221* | .219* | .220* | .337** | .320** | .156* | .182* | .226** | .236** | .231** |
| <i>Step 2</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - Working more hours | | .028 | | -.008 | | -.065 | | .040* | | .016 | -.132** |
| <i>Step 3</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - More hours * G | | | | | | | | | | | .154* |
| - More hours * E | | | | | | | | | | | .191** |
| - More hours * G * E | | | | | | | | | | | -.236* |
| R ² Step 1 | .199** | | .226** | | .280** | | .190** | | .193** | | |
| ΔR^2 Step 2 | .015 | | .000 | | .035 | | .028 | | .005 | | |
| ΔR^2 Step 3 | | | | | | | | | .062** | | |

Sign. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Hypothesis 2a, that gender moderates the relationship between working more hours and engagement in OCBs directed toward the supervisor, such that this relationship is stronger for women than for men, was supported. The specified interaction for OCBs directed toward colleagues was not significant. Therefore, Hypothesis 2b, relating to OCBs directed toward their colleagues, was not supported.

From the inspection of the separate regression analyses for part-time and full-time employees, the expected relationship appeared to be stronger for part-time respondents ($b = -.065$) than for full-time respondents ($b = .040$) (see Models 3 and 4). Hypothesis 3a, that employment status moderates the relationship between working more hours than preferred and engagement in OCBs directed toward the supervisor, such that this relationship is stronger for part-time than full-time working employees, was supported. Again, the specified interaction for OCBs directed toward colleagues was not significant. Therefore, Hypothesis 3b, relating to OCBs directed toward colleagues, was not supported.

There was also a significant three-way interaction between working more hours \times gender \times employment status ($b = -.236$, $p < .05$). The negative relationship between extra working hours and OCBs directed toward the supervisor appeared to be strongest for male part-timers ($b = -.065$, see Model 1 to 4). Hypothesis 4a, that there would be a three-way interaction between gender, employment status, and working more hours than preferred and agreed upon for OCBs directed toward supervisor, such that this relationship would be strongest for female part-timers, was not supported. Again, the specified interaction for OCBs directed toward colleagues, was not significant. Therefore, Hypothesis 4b, relating to OCBs directed toward colleagues, was not supported.

Discussion

In the present study, the association of a specific instance of inequity, i.e., working more hours than preferred and agreed upon, with engagement in OCBs directed toward the supervisor and OCBs directed toward colleagues was examined. The results showed that this type of inequity is associated with the withdrawal of engagement in OCBs directed toward the supervisor. No such relationship with OCBs directed toward colleagues was found. Women and part-time employees, representing employees who attach particularly importance to the number of hours they work, appeared to be more sensitive to working more hours than agreed, such that the negative relationship between working more hours and OCBs directed toward the supervisor was stronger for women and part-time employees than for men and full-time employees. Apparently, working more hours than preferred and agreed, as an instance of inequity, is most strongly associated with the reduction of contribution by those who value their time most.

Table 4: Results of regression analyses for OCBs directed toward colleagues (unstandardized regression coefficients) (N = 255).

| | Model 1 (Men) | | Model 2 (Women) | | Model 3 (Part-time) | | Model 4 (Full-time) | | Model 5 (Full) | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|--------|--------------------|--------|------------------------|--------|------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|--------|
| - Gender (G) | | | | | -2.467 | -2.820 | -.089 | -.048 | -.1315 | -1.258 | -1.300 |
| - Employment status (E) | -4.280 | -4.280 | -.126 | .162 | | | | | -2.436 | -2.371 | -2.516 |
| - Children | -.565 | -.759 | .254 | .271 | -.567 | -.639 | -.345 | -.369 | -.272 | -.324 | -.366 |
| - Organization | 1.430 | 1.408 | .119 | .228 | 2.045 | 2.886 | -.804 | -.825 | .344 | .302 | .448 |
| - Tenure | .142 | .151 | .220** | .222** | .586** | .597** | -.001 | -.001 | .170* | .172* | .184* |
| - Autonomy | -.139 | -.143 | .194 | .224 | .116 | .245 | .461 | .470 | .049 | .074 | .090 |
| - Affective commitment | .236 | .292 | -.294 | -.350 | -1.286 | -1.338 | .390 | .385 | -.033 | -.050 | .020 |
| - Relationship with superv. | -1.024 | -1.274 | .079 | .082 | -.461 | -.589 | -.256 | -.283 | -.454 | -.514 | -.565 |
| <i>Step 2</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - Working more hours | | -.221 | | -.136 | | -.497 | | -.043 | | -.112 | -.644 |
| <i>Step 3</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - More hours * G | | | | | | | | | | | .711 |
| - More hours * E | | | | | | | | | | | .596 |
| - More hours * G * E | | | | | | | | | | | -.702 |
| R ² Step 1 | .076 | | .229** | | .165 | | .069 | | .068 | | |
| Δ R ² Step 2 | .009 | | .012 | | .180 | | .004 | | .003 | | |
| Δ R ² Step 3 | | | | | | | | | .011 | | |

Sign. * p < .05; ** p < .01

Typically, studies of OCBs consider different content dimensions of this construct (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Van Dyne & Ang, 1998). Our results suggest that it is also useful to treat OCBs directed toward the supervisor and OCBs directed toward colleagues as separate phenomena. Working more hours than preferred was only related to OCBs directed toward the supervisor, and not to OCBs directed toward colleagues. This finding underscores that employees have multiple commitments and that they choose to target their contributions at specific people (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Reichers, 1985; Settoon et al., 1996). In this case, engagement in OCBs was especially associated with the nature of the relationship with the supervisor (Settoon et al., 1996). (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Reichers, 1985; Settoon et al., 1996), and the supervisor was regarded as the most direct source that requires reciprocation (Bateman & Organ, 1983).

An unexpected finding of this study was that an alarmingly high percentage of 45% of the female full-timers worked more hours than preferred. This figure is double that of all the other groups. This means that female full-timers are twice as likely to experience inequity as other groups. Theorizing about this finding could contribute to the literature. Research questions to examine include; Why are full-time women more likely to experience inequity? Are there factors other than working more hours than preferred and agreed upon that lead woman to experience inequity more frequently than men? Is work-family conflict an issue here (given that women often carry the brunt of child care and household responsibilities)? Given that female full-timers were more likely to experience inequity, yet less likely to react as negatively as male part-timers to this inequity (i.e., they did not decrease their OCBs toward their supervisors or their coworkers to the same extent that men did), it may be that work is more central to these women. The fact that these women remain loyal and dedicated to their organizations (as indicated by their more consistent levels of OCBs) supports this explanation. An alternative explanation for this finding is that women tend to deal with inequity in ways other than through OCBs. Examining these results with regard to experienced inequity through the lens of gender would be very interesting, and may have the potential to increase our understanding of perceived inequity, especially given that organizations are continually trying to "do more with less."

The results of the present study have a number of practical implications for organizations seeking to lessen the negative consequences of overtime, and which want to promote OCBs. Long working hours generally do not reflect employee preferences, but frequently result from today's workplaces (Clarkberg & Moen, 2001). The results of the present study show that it is important that managers pay attention to managing beliefs regarding mutual obligations and, in particular, to how employees may regard working long hours as potential inequity when they initially agreed upon working fewer hours. Thus, although organizations are increasingly faced with decisions to produce mean and lean,

and to rely on (mandatory) overtime, in the long run this may turn against them (Ettner & Grzywacz, 2001).

Although the findings of the present study stress that being required to work more hours than preferred can fuel resentment expressed in decreased contributions, e.g., among those who would rather have more time off (Babbar & Aspelin, 1998), this is not necessarily the case. The study of Worrall and Cooper (1999) showed that employees acknowledged the adverse effects of working more than preferred on health, morale, productivity, and their family lives, but many still felt compelled to work long hours. Thus, the fact that employees work long hours may not necessarily mean that they resent doing it. However, if working more hours than preferred and agreed upon is unavoidable, it is important that organizations provide realistic job previews; to make it less likely that employees will perceive inequities. An important implication of this study is that it provides additional support for the value of realistic job previews. It can be important too, for organizations to get their employees to appreciate working overtime more by offering enough material compensation or by offering special fringe benefits. Also, it is important to decide how overtime can best be scheduled, on what basis, and for whom, in order to get the job done effectively (Babbar & Aspelin, 1998). Another implication of this study follows from the idea that the engagement in OCBs is more frequent when the relationship with the supervisor is good. OCB can be stimulated by management investing in good relationships with their employees in order to increase OCBs.

Some words of caution regarding the results of this study are necessary. One limitation of this kind of research, already raised by Morrison and Phelps (1999), is that not all of the individuals approached responded to the survey. It is possible that individuals who engage less in OCBs are also less likely to respond, thereby creating potential selection bias. Also, the cross-sectional design precludes causal relationships. Further, the data were collected using self-report measures, and common method variance can easily become a problem within such designs. The different results for OCBs directed toward the supervisor and those directed toward colleagues, make this less likely. Future research efforts need to consider using longitudinal and multi-actor data, for instance, information on both supervisor and employee. There can be a selection bias. For instance, employees who do not leave an organization for which they have to work more hours than they prefer, might be conformists or might not have the resources to find another job. This can lead to an underestimation of the effects.

Additionally, it must be acknowledged that the sample size was rather small and this may have affected the statistical power: a larger sample size would have provided greater power to detect additional effects not detected in the current study (e. g., interaction effects). If we had had a larger sample and more organizations, it would also have been possible to compare the effects of the different organizational settings on OCBs more extensively, in order to deter-

mine whether the organizational setting has a greater effect on affecting OCBs than the individual level variables we used in the present study. Suggestions for addressing these problems in future research, besides having a greater sample size and investigating more organizations, include basing the search for moderator variables on substantive individual and organizational level theories, and paying more attention to the interplay of individual and organizational level variables and their effects on OCBs.

Even with these limitations, we believe we achieved our purpose in this study. First, we showed that working more hours than preferred and agreed upon hours as a specific instance of inequity was negatively associated with subsequent contributions, i.e. less engagement in OCBs directed toward the supervisor. Second, those who attached most importance to working conditions, i.e., women and part-time employees, were shown to be most sensitive to perceived inequity, and reduced their contributions more than men and full-time employees. Following Robinson (1996), it is likely that this type of inequity and its negative consequences will remain common in organizations. If this continues to be a fact of organizational life, then the real challenge for managers is to learn how to overcome such perceptions of inequity by effectively managing working hours for different groups of employees.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*, 422-436.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 63*(1), 1-18.
- Arnold, (1996). The psychological contract: A concept in need of closer scrutiny. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5*, 511-520.
- Babbar, S., & Aspelin, D. J. (1998). The overtime rebellion: Symptom of a bigger problem? *Academy of Management Executive, 12*(1), 68-76.
- Balfour, D. L., & Neff, D. M. (1993). Predicting and managing turnover in human service agencies: A case study of an organization in crisis. *Public Personnel Management, 22*(3), 473-486.
- Barnett, R. C. (1998). Toward a review and reconceptualization of the work/family literature. *Genetic, Social & General Psychology Monographs, 124*(2), 125-152.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4), 587-595.
- Buffardi, L. C., Smith, J. L., O'Brien, A. S., & Erdwins, C. J. (1999). The impact of dependent-care responsibility and gender on work attitudes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*(4), 356-367.
- Bunderson, J. S. (2001). How work ideologies shape the psychological contracts of professional employees: Doctor's responses to perceived breach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22*(7), 717-741.
- Clarkberg, M., & Moen, P. (2001). The time-squeeze: Is the increase in working time due to employer demands or employee preferences? *American Behavioral Scientist, 44*(7), 1115-1136.

- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Mahwan, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Conway, N., & Briner, R. B. (2002). Full-time versus part-time employees: Understanding the links between work status, the psychological contract, and attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(2), 279-301.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. M. (2002). A psychological contract perspective on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(8), 927-946.
- Crouter, A. C., Bumpus, M. E., & Head, M. R. M. (2001). Implications of overwork and overload for the quality of men's family relationships. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 63(2), 404-416.
- Ettner, S. L., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2001). Workers' perceptions of how jobs affect health: A social ecological perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6(2), 101-113.
- Feldman, D. C. (2002). Managers' propensity to work longer hours: A multilevel analysis. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(3), 339-357.
- Gephart, R. P. (2002). Introduction to the brave new workplace: Organizational behavior in the electronic age. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 327-344.
- Harpaz, I., & Snir, R. (2003). Workaholism: Its definition and nature. *Human Relations*, 56(3), 291-319.
- Lester, S. W., Turnley, W. H., Bloodgood, J. M., & Bolino, M. C. (2002). Not seeing eye to eye: Differences in supervisor and subordinate perceptions of and attributions for psychological contract breach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(1), 39-56.
- Maguire, H. (2002). Psychological contracts: are they still relevant? *Career Development International*, 7(3), 167-180.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171-194.
- Merli , D., & Paoli, P. (2001). *Ten years of working conditions in the European Union*. Dublin: European foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions.
- Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extrarole efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4), 403-419.
- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 157-164.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775-803.
- Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(3), 465-476.
- Robinson, S. L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(4), 574-600.
- Robinson, S. L., Kraatz, M. S., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Changing obligations and the psychological contract: A longitudinal study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(1), 137-152.
- Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15(3), 245-259.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2, 121-139.
- Rousseau, D. M., & Tijoriwala, S. A. (1998). Assessing psychological contracts: Issues, alternatives and measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 679-695.
- Savery, L. K., & Luks, J. A. (2000). Long hours at work: Are they dangerous and do people consent to them? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 21(6), 307-310.
- Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3), 219-227.