



RETURNING MATERIALS:
Place in book drop to
remove this checkout from
your record. FINES will
be charged if book is
returned after the date
stamped below.

--	--	--

AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGERIAL VACATION
PRACTICES AND MANAGERIAL PERFORMANCE AND ABSENTEEISM

By

Kathleen Mary Utecht

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Management

1985

Copyright by
KATHLEEN MARY UTECHT
1985

ABSTRACT

AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MANAGERIAL VACATION PRACTICES AND MANAGERIAL PERFORMANCE AND ABSENTEEISM

By

Kathleen Mary Utecht

This research examines: 1) the sign of the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism, and 2) the sign of the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism when influenced by specific individual, job and organizational factors.

Managerial vacation practices are measured by the extent to which annual allotted vacation time is used. Managerial performance is measured by three indices: performance evaluations, performance potential and promotability; while absenteeism is measured by incidents of absence. Eight factors are expected to influence the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism, and include the extent to which individuals: 1) feel the vacation time allotted and the opportunities to use the time are fair, 2) believe in the ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic, 3) exhibit Type A behavior, 4) are compatible with their jobs, 5) enjoy and value vacations, 6) are vulnerable to stress, as well as 7) ages and 8) job levels of the individuals.

Data are generated by administering a questionnaire to 118 middle managers of a Fortune 200 manufacturer of paper products. Responses are analyzed in terms of simple descriptive statistics, and correlation and regression coefficients.

Results indicate that there is no statistically significant relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism. However, the results reflect a statistically significant pattern of correlations (as determined by Siegel's Sign Test) when this relationship is influenced by specific factors. In particular, vacation practices are negatively related to performance and positively related to absenteeism when individuals: feel the vacation time allotted and the opportunities to use the time are fair, are older, have strong beliefs in the ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic, exhibit strong Type A behavior, are more compatible with their jobs, do not value and enjoy vacations, are less vulnerable to stress, and occupy low job levels. Appended are results, also, of a descriptive nature which reflect the typical vacation patterns and practices of the managerial employees who participated in this research.

Finally, the implications of this research, as well as recommendations for future research, are provided.

For my parents, Norm and Catherine Utecht

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research project and dissertation could not have been completed without the help of a number of individuals.

First, I am grateful to my dissertation committee members, Professor John A. Wagner and Professor Sigmund Nosow, for their continued interest, insightful input and valuable time in getting this research project underway and on paper. And, I am especially grateful to the Chairman of the committee and my major advisor, Professor John P. Wanous, who endured the "long-distance" relationship, and who provided me with timely ideas, spirited encouragement and honest commitment to not only run the mental marathon, but also to go the distance.

An expression of appreciation is extended to Mr. Ronald P. Gray, Corporate Vice President - Human Resources, at Scott Paper Company, who gave me permission to conduct a survey and whose patience and guidance were instrumental, not only in administering the questionnaire, but also in guaranteeing returns. A warm note of appreciation is due, also, to those employees in the company who took the time to complete the survey--without any guarantee of extra vacations or, indeed, other rewards.

Special thanks also go to my colleagues and friends at Central Michigan University and elsewhere for their support and friendship. In particular, I am grateful to Sylvia Shimmin, Rollin Dunsdon, John Grossa, Marie Dumeney, and especially to Eric Johnson who bore many of the headaches, and to Arnon Reichers who kept reminding me that "the

dissertation doesn't have to be good; it just has to be done."

Finally, I am thankful for my parents and for the rest of my family who, from a distance, offered moral support, and who taught me the real meaning of the relationship between performance and rewards. Indeed, they are the most valuable group of rewards for my performance.

For these special individuals, and for the little bit of luck I have had, I am grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xi
 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	 1
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE, RELEVANT THEORY, AND THEORETICAL HYPOTHESES	6
Performance and Reward Theories	7
Expectancy Theory of Motivation (VIE)	11
Equity Theory of Motivation	13
Theories and Theoretical Hypotheses of Absenteeism (and Job Compatibility)	16
Theories and Theoretical Hypotheses of Work and Leisure	18
Theories and Hypotheses of Individual Differences and Employee Responses	23
Summary	34
 CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND HYPOTHESES	 36
CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY	46
Description of the Research Site	46
Description of the Sample	52
Description of the Measures	55
Reliabilities and Correlations of the Measures	72
Description of the Data Collection Process	75
 CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS	 78
General Hypothesis - Vacations, Performance and Absenteeism Relationship	78
Sub-Hypothesis - Moderating Effects on the Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Relationship	94
Proposition 1 - Felt-fair Vacations as a Moderator	95
Proposition 2 - Belief in the Protestant Work Ethic as a Moderator	112
Proposition 3 - Type A Behavior as a Moderator	127
Proposition 4 - Age as a Moderator	141
Proposition 5 - Job Compatibility as a Moderator	155
Proposition 6 - Value of Vacations as a Moderator	177
Proposition 7 - Stress as a Moderator	200
Proposition 8 - Job Level as a Moderator	215

	Page
Overview of Results	230
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS	241
Lack of Variability in the Measurement of the Independent Variable	241
Alternative Measures of the Dependent Variable--Incidence of Absenteeism and Performance Reflected by Three Different Indices	244
Generalizing Measures of Moderators from Other Research to the Present Research	247
Basing Predictions on Prescriptive Versus Descriptive Research	250
General Hypothesis	256
Sub-Hypothesis	261
Summary	292
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	301
General Hypothesis	301
Sub-Hypothesis	302
Implications and Recommendations for Future Research	306
Summary	314
APPENDIX A: INSTRUCTIONS AND QUESTIONNAIRE	316
APPENDIX B: DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS	343
A Description of Population Characteristics and Vacation Patterns	344
Vacation Practices and Patterns: Comparative Description of Results	358
Actual (Do) Versus Perceived (Would Like) Patterns Regarding Vacations	358
Actual Individual Vacation Patterns Versus Perceived Vacation Patterns of Colleagues	362
Vacation Patterns in Relation to Individual, Job and Organizational Characteristics	364
APPENDIX C: INTER-ITEM AND ITEM-SCALE CORRELATIONS FOR THE INDEPENDENT, DEPENDENT AND MODERATING VARIABLES	373
BIBLIOGRAPHY	380

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2-1	Literature Reviewed in the Study of the Relationship Between Managerial Vacation Practices and Managerial Performance and Absenteeism	35
4-1	Vacation Plan	47
4-2	Description of the Sample	53
4-3	Reliabilities of Measures	73
4-4	Intercorrelations Between Independent, Dependent and Moderating Variables	74
5-1	Descriptive Statistics for Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism	85
5-2	Mean Scores for Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for Vacation Practices	89
5-3	Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism	90
5-4	Regression Statistics of Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism	93
5-5a	Descriptive Statistics for FFV	97
5-5b	Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for FFV	102
5-5c	Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of FFV with Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	103
5-5d	Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for FFV	107
5-5e	FFV: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	109
5-6a	Descriptive Statistics for PWE	113
5-6b	Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for PWE	118

Table		Page
5-6c	Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of PWE with Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	119
5-6d	Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for PWE	122
5-6e	PWE: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	125
5-7a	Descriptive Statistics for TPA	128
5-7b	Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for TPA	133
5-7c	Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of TPA with Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	134
5-7d	Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for TPA	137
5-7e	TPA: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	139
5-8a	Descriptive Statistics for Age	142
5-8b	Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for Age	146
5-8c	Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of Age with Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	147
5-8d	Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for Age	150
5-8e	Age: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	153
5-9a	Descriptive Statistics for JC and JS	158
5-9b	Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for JC and JS	164
5-9c	Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of JC and JS with Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	165
5-9d	Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for JC and JS	170
5-9e	JC and JS: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	174

Table		Page
5-10a	Descriptive Statistics for EVAC 1 and EVAC 2	179
5-10b	Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for EVAC 1 and EVAC 2	186
5-10c	Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of EVAC 1 and EVAC 2 with Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	187
5-10d	Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for EVAC 1 and EVAC 2	193
5-10e	EVAC 1 and EVAC 2: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	196
5-11a	Descriptive Statistics for STS	201
5-11b	Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for STS	206
5-11c	Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of STS with Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	207
5-11d	Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for STS	210
5-11e	STS: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	212
5-12a	Descriptive Statistics for JLEV	216
5-12b	Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for JLEV	221
5-12c	Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of JLEV with Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	222
5-12d	Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for JLEV	225
5-12e	JLEV: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables	228
5-13	Comparative Summary: Relationships Between Independent, Dependent and Moderating Variables	235
5-14	Comparative Summary: Effects of the Moderating Variables on the Relationship between the Independent and Depen- dent Variables	239

Table		Page
6-1a	Moderating Effects of FFV on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism: Regressions, Correlation Coefficients and Potential Signs	263
6-1b	Moderating Effects of EVAC 1 and EVAC 2 on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism: Regressions, Correlation Coefficients and Potential Signs	267
6-1c	Moderating Effects of Age on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism: Regressions, Correlation Coefficients and Potential Signs	272
6-1d	Moderating Effects of PWE on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism: Regressions, Correlation Coefficients and Potential Signs	275
6-1e	Moderating Effects of Stress on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism: Regressions, Correlation Coefficients and Potential Signs	278
6-1f	Moderating Effects of Type A Behavior on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism: Regressions, Correlation Coefficients and Potential Signs	282
6-1g	Moderating Effects of Job Level on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism: Regressions, Correlation Coefficients and Potential Signs	285
6-1h	Moderating Effects of Job Compatibility on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism: Regressions, Correlation Coefficients and Potential Signs	289
6-2	Comparative Statistics of the Moderating Effects on the Relationships Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism: Regression and Correlation Coefficients	296
6-3	Comparative Statistics of the Moderating Effects on the Potential Sign of the Relationships Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism	297
6-4	Moderating Effects on the Predicted Negative Relationship Between Vacation Practices and Performance and on the Predicted Positive Relationship Between Vacation Practices and Absenteeism	299

Table		Page
B-1	Correlations Between Actual (Do) and Perceived (Would Like) Items	360
C-1	Inter-item and Item-scale Correlations for the Independent, Dependent and Moderating Variables	374

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A: INSTRUCTIONS AND QUESTIONNAIRE	316
APPENDIX B: DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS	343
A Description of Population Characteristics and Vacation Patterns	344
Vacation Practices and Patterns: Comparative Description of Results	358
Actual (Do) Versus Perceived (Would Like) Patterns Regarding Vacations	358
Actual Individual Vacation Patterns Versus Perceived Vacation Patterns of Colleagues	362
Vacation Patterns in Relation to Individual, Job and Organizational Characteristics	364
APPENDIX C: INTER-ITEM AND ITEM-SCALE CORRELATIONS FOR THE INDEPENDENT, DEPENDENT AND MODERATING VARIABLES . . .	373

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This research examines the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism.

Performance is critical to the growth and effectiveness of all organizations. Therefore, research studies on a number of operational indicators of individual performance and absenteeism, e.g. employee productivity, performance appraisals, promotability potential, and incidences of absenteeism, and on the relationship of these indicators to a number of individual, job and organizational factors, have been conducted to understand better what leads to effective organizational performance. However, these numerous studies have provided no conclusive evidence of what specific factors consistently influence, reward, or even improve performance.

Since research in this direction has not resulted in a clear understanding of what significantly affects performance in organizations, the present research moves in a different direction by identifying and describing a different set of factors, i.e. managerial vacation practices, and by exploring their relationship to managerial performance as well as to absenteeism. The study of managerial vacation practices in relation to performance and absenteeism is warranted for a number of reasons, which are discussed below.

First, the practice of allotting vacations as a type of "reward" is common to most organizations. Organizations typically provide

employee time off, e.g. vacations, in exchange for employee time on the job, e.g. employee participation reflected in job attendance, job tenure, and job level, etc. Researchers have examined the practice of providing exchanges or rewards such as salary and benefits, and have analyzed them in relation to performance; however, there have been no empirical investigations of vacation practices, either alone--described as a reward or as a feature of organizational life--or in relation to performance or absenteeism. The absence of research may be explained, in part, because the vacation structures that exist in many organizations are less flexible than most reward structures, and are not clearly related to performance. That is, the amount of vacation time allotted to employees often depends on the employee's number of years of service in the organization, and may be guaranteed regardless of the individual level of performance (performance rating, promotability potential, etc.). However, this practice may be inappropriate or even outdated. Hence, allowing more flexibility in both vacation structures (e.g. increasing or withholding vacations) and vacation practices (e.g. allowing more variety or individual choice) may provide a more effective and alternative means of rewarding or improving performance and minimizing or discouraging absenteeism.

Second, society is becoming more consumer and leisure oriented as indicated by a number of factors. For example, economic trends show an accelerating shift from the production of capital goods to the production of consumer goods, with an increasing emphasis on the provision of services and on the development of leisure oriented industries. In addition, technological advancements in terms of automation cybernation, and robotics are changing the nature and type of work available, resulting in a workplace that is more humanized and that emphasizes quality--rather than quantity--of working life. Similarly, political and legal activities are

marked by a growth in legislation and regulation that promotes and actively encourages occupational safety and health among employees. Finally, changing social and cultural attitudes reflect a heightened interest in and concern for consumerism and leisure as individuals attempt to balance the competing commitments of working, to enable the purchase of leisure, with taking time off from work--especially in terms of vacations--to enjoy it (Shimmin, 1980).

Third, there has been a recent surge of interest in the European concept of Quality of Working Life (QWL) and its spillover into quality of life. The QWL ideal maintains that the experience and quality of work is a major determinant of life itself. Therefore, many European QWL programs attempt to balance both work and non-work related aspects to enhance work satisfaction as well as total life satisfaction. A fulcrum for this balance may be provided by vacation time. In particular, the societies of Western Europe (e.g. West Germany, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Sweden, France, Italy) value vacations. In order to maintain consonance with these values, many organizations in these countries adopt vacation practices which promote vacations: allotted time off is maximized (annual vacation time may average eight weeks or more in an employee's first year of service); organizations encourage or promote the taking of vacations (often operations are shut down); and vacations are often endorsed or subsidized by the organization. In sharp contrast, vacation practices adopted by most American organizations often do not promote vacations: allotted time off is minimal (annual vacation time may average two to three weeks for up to twelve years of service); organizations do not always encourage vacations (often employees are allowed and sometimes encouraged to postpone or "bank" them); and, typically, vacations are not endorsed or subsidized.

In the context of this comparison of vacation practices, a comparison of performance patterns shows that many European organizations may be experiencing more consistent and higher levels of performance--reflected by statistics on employee productivity, health, and absenteeism--than are many American organizations. Therefore, the study of vacation practices as a part of quality of life, may lead to a better understanding of their relationship to job performance, an integral part of quality of working life.

Finally, job-related pressure and occupational stress among white collar employees, i.e. managers and professionals, have been cited as contributors to increasing employee fatigue, burnout, and deteriorating physical and mental health. Furthermore, these symptoms often result in higher absenteeism and lower levels of job performance which, in turn, threaten organizational performance and effectiveness. Mechanisms for eliminating, reducing, or coping with pressure and stress include an emphasis on relaxation practices, exercise, recreation, and, of particular interest, on removing oneself from the stress-inducing situation. There have been arguments for taking time off, especially in terms of vacations, as a means of reducing stress and absenteeism and improving job performance; but, the recommendations are of a prescriptive nature. Consequently, this study provides not only a descriptive account of the type of vacation practices and patterns adopted by managerial employees, but also an empirical investigation of their vacation practices and patterns as they affect overall performance.

Therefore, in order for organizations to justify existing, or to develop improved, practices regarding vacations, it is important that research be conducted: 1) to describe managerial vacation practices, 2) to determine the relationship of these vacation practices to managerial

performance and absenteeism, and 3) to identify those individual, job and organizational factors which may affect the relationship. A better understanding of the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism, indeed, may lead to a better understanding of the relationship between the individual and the organization.

A review of the major theories, limited theoretical hypotheses, and literature that are relevant to this research on the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is provided in Chapter Two. The research design employed and the hypotheses generated are presented in Chapter Three; while data collection procedures are outlined and described in Chapter Four. Theoretical results of the data analyses are reported in Chapter Five and discussed in Chapter Six (while descriptive results, i.e. a profile of the typical vacation practices adopted by managerial employees, are discussed in Appendix B). Finally, the conclusions of this research, as well as considerations for future research, are presented in Chapter Seven.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE, RELEVANT THEORY, AND THEORETICAL HYPOTHESES

The study of organizations, from a comparative level of analysis, has been of interest to researchers for the past few decades. Their attention centers, in general, on identifying and describing those features which are germane to most organizations, and on exploring how they affect, or fit into, the organization. Consequently, the present study examines, in particular, vacation practices--a feature common to most organizations--and their effect on performance and absenteeism.

There have been no studies which explore directly the relationship between vacation practices and performance or absenteeism: i.e. there has been no theoretical research on whether or not the use of vacation time affects, fits with, or causes better performance or reduced absenteeism. Similarly, there is an absence of descriptive research on what individual, job or organizational factors affect the use of vacation time and performance or absenteeism, either separately, or in relation to one another: i.e. there has been no documentation on a measure of fit--how or whether certain types of individuals, in certain jobs, and in certain organizations use allotted vacation time, adopt particular vacation patterns, and maintain certain levels of performance or absenteeism.

Following, however, is a review of six theories (or portions of theories) or limited theoretical and prescriptive hypotheses which incorporate variables, relationships and predictions that can be tested, and

that can provide, either separately, or jointly, a framework not only for exploring the General and Sub-Hypotheses of this study, but also for explaining the results.

Performance and Reward Theories

Theories on the relationship between performance and rewards evaluate the variables involved from a number of different perspectives. For example, performance is studied in terms of subjective versus objective measures, individual versus team criteria, or even in terms of attendance versus absenteeism behavior, etc.; or, it is examined in terms of goal attainment, productivity, performance ratings, or performance potential, etc. (Blake and Mouton, 1981; Carroll and Schneier, 1982; Landy and Farr, 1983; Latham and Wexley, 1981; Porter and Lawler, 1968; Porter and Steers, 1973; and Steers and Rhodes, 1978). Similarly, rewards are studied in terms of financial rewards (pay, merit compensation, incentive plans) versus non-financial rewards (recognition, advancement, praise, or extrinsic versus intrinsic rewards, etc.; or, they are explored in terms of schedules and contingencies of reinforcements, etc. (Brief and Aldag, 1977; Cherrington, Reitz and Scott, 1971; Deci, 1972; Patten, 1977; Staw, 1976; and Yukl, Wexley and Seymore, 1972).

Furthermore, the relationship between the two, performance and rewards, is analyzed with regard to the sign of the relationship (whether positive or negative), the direction of causation (whether performance leads to rewards or rewards cause performance), or often with regard to those moderating variables which may affect the relationship (motivation, equity, goal-difficulty, goal-specificity, goal-setting, or feedback, etc.) (Carroll and Schneier, 1982; Deci, 1972; Landy, Barnes and Murphy, 1978; Latham and Wexley, 1981; Lawler, 1971, 1981; Meyer, 1975; Mobley, 1974; and Patten, 1982).

However, the findings from these numerous studies have been contradictory or inconclusive. More specifically, no one concrete approach to identifying and measuring performance in organizations has been developed. Latham and Wexley (1981) believe individual performance appraisals are most representative of performance in organizations and most effective in increasing productivity; while Carroll and Schneier (1982) cite, in addition to performance appraisals, analysis of individual potential as an important index of performance. Similarly, alternatives to identifying and measuring rewards have been adopted. Patten (1977) discusses rewards in organizations as more extrinsic and financial--in terms of compensation and incentive plans. Yet, Deci (1975), Latham and Wexley (1981), and Staw (1976) cite, in addition to extrinsic rewards (e.g. money--which is administered externally), intrinsic rewards (e.g. individual satisfaction--which is derived internally from performing a job well) as important and possibly more important features of effective organizational reward systems.

Also, the specific relationship between performance and rewards has not been clarified. Latham and Dossett (1978) and Yukl and Latham (1975) believe tying money to performance brings about the largest increase in performance. Yet, Latham and Wexley (1981) cite that while money (in terms of rank order) has the largest impact on performance, praise (from a cost-benefit viewpoint) is more effective. Still, Bandura (1977) finds that money as a reward may increase, decrease, or have no relation to performance. Rather, the relationship depends on how the money is used, i.e. other factors such as the individual value of the reward, the contingency of the reward, or the perceived relationship between the reward and performance, may affect the relationship. But, agreement on those particular factors which may affect the relationship is also lacking.

Deci (1972) maintains that the way the reward (especially money) is administered affects performance more than the reward itself. And, more particularly, Yukl, Wexley and Seymore (1972) describe schedules of reinforcement, i.e. the plan or pattern for administering the reward, as the most influential factors. Yet, Latham and Wexley (1981) suggest that the relationship between rewards and performance may be more significantly determined by the extent to which goals are set, rather than by the extent to which rewards and performance may be affected by the degree to which intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is created by the given reward. The varying perspectives and results of these investigations warrant additional research on the relationship.

Hence, this study of the relationship between performance and rewards incorporates variables that are similar to, as well as different from, those found in the research cited. In particular, performance in this study is identified and measured in terms of performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, and absenteeism. As mentioned, these are common indices of performance, i.e. most organizations have formal performance review systems that evaluate performance, promotability and potential on some sort of numerical scale. In addition, absenteeism provides a yardstick of performance by reflecting some sort of numerical comparison between the amount of time spent on the job (to perform) and the amount of time spent off the job (which may interfere with performance).

Rewards in this study, however, are of a different type than those typically investigated. Many studies examine extrinsic rewards (especially in terms of money) in relation to performance. But, this study examines another extrinsic reward (vacations) as an alternative.

Indeed, Drucker (1985) maintains that with the growing mismatch of jobs

and job seekers, other types of rewards---such as extra vacations---may have to be provided. The allotment and use of vacation time, as a type of reward, lends itself to comparative analysis for a number of reasons: it is an extrinsic reward common to most organizations; is administered according to a schedule (set up by the company and/or the individual); is contingent upon participation or service within the organization; and can be measured in numerical terms, i.e. proportion, amount, or extent to which annual allotted vacation time is used by the individual.

Finally, in terms of the relationship between vacations and performance, this study predicts that individuals who use more of their allotted vacation time achieve higher levels of performance, i.e. a positive relationship between performance and rewards. An examination of the results of the previously mentioned studies show, in general, more consistency and agreement on the sign of the relationship---that there is a positive relationship between performance and rewards. Those studies which attempt to identify, in more specific terms, a direction of causation, a particular measure of "rewards and/or performance," or those factors which always affect the relationship, are less consistent and convincing. Furthermore, studies which more directly examine the use of vacation time, but in relation to more indirect features which affect performance, (i.e. especially field survey research studies) show that individuals who use a large amount of vacation time (six weeks or more) are less troubled by fatigue, irritability, and anxiety, which in turn, could affect job performance. In addition, the results indicate that extensive use of vacation time is especially useful to individuals whose jobs are emotionally stressful (Rubenstein, 1980). But, again, no direction of causation is confirmed.

Based on these findings, this study only predicts the sign of the relationship: i.e. individuals who maximize vacation as a reward, e.g.

use more of their allotted vacation time, achieve a high level of performance in terms of high performance evaluations, performance potential and promotability. In contrast, individuals who use less of their allotted vacation time have a low level of performance, reflected in low performance evaluations, performance potential, and promotability. Under these conditions, it is predicted that the relationship between performance and rewards (vacations) is positive.

Expectancy Theory of Motivation (VIE)

The Expectancy Theory of Motivation (Vroom, 1964), or VIE and its variations, is based on a series of assumptions regarding behavior in organizations: individuals believe certain behaviors or performance will lead to certain rewards or outcomes (Performance leads to Outcomes: $P \rightarrow O$); individuals attach a positive value to these rewards or outcomes (Valence: $\pm V$); individuals believe they are able to perform at a desired level (Effort leads to Performance: $E \rightarrow P$) in order to attain or receive these rewards or outcomes; and, finally, individuals can choose, from a number of alternative levels, that level of behavior, or performance, which has the greatest motivational force as indicated by effort, outcome, and valence. So the theory predicts that the best performers in organizations are those who see a strong relationship between performing well and receiving rewards or outcomes that are valued (Nadler and Lawler, 1983).

This theory has been criticized conceptually, empirically, and methodologically; however, many researchers have acknowledged its value and have explored its different aspects. For example, Porter and Lawler (1968) and Pritchard and Sanders (1973) have evaluated the "effort leading to performance" relationship ($E \rightarrow P$); Yukl, Wexley and Seymore (1972) have analyzed the relationship between performance and outcomes

($P \rightarrow O$); and Hackman and Porter (1968) have examined valence (V). These, and others who have evaluated the whole theory, agree that the "performance leading to outcomes" relationship ($P \rightarrow O$) is greatest when linked to extrinsic outcomes. This suggests that if managers in organizations more closely identified and examined the nature and value of alternative extrinsic outcomes, they could design and provide reward systems that more effectively enhance performance.

To test these assumptions, the variables and the relationships of this theory are applied to the present study of the relationship between vacations, as a possible extrinsic reward or outcome, and job performance and attendance. This theory proposes that performance leads to outcomes which are valued by individuals. In this study, these outcomes are expressed in terms of vacations (especially the use of allotted vacation time) which may be of value to individuals. When individuals value and enjoy vacations as a reward or outcome, they may maximize this outcome or make the most of the reward, i.e. use all of their allotted vacation time, or at least a large portion of it, in order to maintain, improve, or be rewarded for attendance and performance. Under these conditions, it is predicted that the relationship between performance and vacations is positive, and the relationship between absenteeism and vacations is negative.

Conversely, individuals may not value or enjoy vacations as a reward or outcome. (Instead, they may select other rewards or outcomes as being of more value). They, therefore, may not maximize this outcome or make the most of the reward, i.e. not use their allotted vacation time, or use little of it, in order to maintain, improve, or be rewarded for performance and attendance. (Instead they may maximize or make the most of other rewards such as money or benefits in exchange for performance). Under these conditions, it is predicted that the relationship between vacations

and performance is negative; while it is expected that the relationship between vacations and absenteeism is positive.

Equity Theory of Motivation

The Equity Theory of Motivation (Adams, 1965) maintains that an individual's input (contributions to carrying out a job) and output (outcome or reward for the application of input) is compared to the input-output ratio of another (individual, group or organization). The input selected by the individual is that which is recognized and relevant: e.g. education, job skill, or amount of effort, etc. The output, or outcome, selected by the individual is that which is also recognized and valued: e.g. pay, status, recognition, etc. Inequity exists if the individual perceives his or her ratio of output to input and the ratio of another's output to input are unequal. The magnitude of inequity depends on the amount of discrepancy between ratios, rather than on the absolute magnitude. The degree of inequity creates a proportional amount of tension which drives or motivates the individual to reduce the inequity or discrepancy. Adams cites a number of modes of inequity reduction, and maintains that when all modes are available, at least psychologically, certain priorities are set. In descending order, individuals will first--maximize the outcomes, second--minimize the input, then--create cognitive changes, change others' cognitions, leave the field, or, finally--change the object of comparison. (Adams claims the threshold for under-equity versus over-equity are different, suggesting the tolerance for the latter is much greater than for the former).

Researchers have criticized the ordering of these priorities, as well as the theory's overemphasis on pay (especially underpayment) as the major theme of equity motivation. Yet, they have also acknowledged general theoretical support and have encouraged additional research (Pritchard, Dunnette, and Jorgenson, 1972). In particular, Tornow (1971)

states that further work in equity theory is needed to distinguish input from output variables, and suggests that individual differences may play a valuable role, i.e. one's input may be another's output. Weick (1966) suggests that in addition to individual characteristics, both organizational and environmental characteristics may influence the equity relationship. And, more recently, others have stressed the need for more research in identifying and distinguishing between types of input-output variables and their relationships. In particular, Carrell and Dittrich (1978) suggest that equity theory deserves more applied research: 1) to include and describe other types of input and output variables and moderating characteristics, 2) to incorporate absenteeism and turnover as methods of coping with inequity, as well as 3) to explore systems design and allocation of rewards.

These suggestions warrant an application of the variables and relationships of Equity Theory to the present study of the relationship between vacations and performance. In particular in this study, job performance and attendance may reflect an input variable for the individual. Maximizing this input may be achieved by performing at a certain level--which is measured by performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, and by maintaining adequate attendance behavior--i.e. minimal absenteeism. (In addition, individuals who are absent less are present more often to perform the necessary technical aspects of a job, etc.). Similarly, vacations, a form of reward different from the pay variables traditionally associated with equity theory, may represent in this study, an output variable for the individual. Maximizing this output may be achieved by the use of allotted vacation time--which is measured by the proportion, extent or amount used.

Equity may be achieved for an individual (Person) when the ratio of input--level of performance and absenteeism (whether low or high) to

output—proportion of vacation time used (whether less or more) is comparable to that of another (Other):

$$\frac{\text{Person Output (Use of Vacation Time)}}{\text{Person Input (Job Performance, Absenteeism)}} = \frac{\text{Other Output (Use of Vacation Time)}}{\text{Other Input (Job Performance, Absenteeism)}}$$

Under conditions of equity, i.e. when individuals believe they have fair vacation time, i.e. adequate allotment, and opportunities to use the time, compared with others (reflected by an equal ratio of output to input for both Person and Other), it is predicted the relationship between use of vacation time and performance is negative; while the relationship between use of vacation time and absenteeism is expected to be positive.

In contrast, inequity may result if the individual (Person) perceives a discrepancy in the input-output ratio, i.e. another (Other) may use a greater proportion of allotted vacation time but may perform at the same or a lower level, i.e. have lower performance evaluations, or a higher incidence of absenteeism, etc.:

$$\frac{\text{Person Output (Use of Vacation Time)}}{\text{Person Input (Job Performance, Absenteeism)}} \neq \frac{\text{Other Output (More Extensive Use of Vacation Time)}}{\text{Other Input (Lower Performance Ratings; or Higher Absenteeism)}}$$

In this case, the individual may be motivated to reduce the inequity via various modes of inequity reduction, cited earlier, e.g. maximizing output (using a greater proportion of allotted vacation time), or minimizing input (decreasing performance evaluations, or increasing absenteeism, etc.). So under conditions of inequity, i.e. when individuals do not feel they have fair vacation time (i.e. adequate allotment) and opportunities to use the time, compared with others (reflected by an unequal input-output

ratio between Person and Other) it is predicted the relationship between use of vacation time and performance is positive; and the relationship between use of vacation time and absenteeism is negative.

Theories and Theoretical Hypotheses of Absenteeism (and Job Compatibility)

A study of the relationship between absenteeism and performance (Staw and Oldham, 1978) maintains there are "two cross-cutting functions" in the relationship: absenteeism may be dysfunctional in that being on the job is necessary for carrying out at least certain aspects of the job. So, being absent may have a negative effect on job performance. In contrast, absenteeism may serve a maintenance function in that individuals who have difficulty coping with work roles may take time off to deal more effectively with feelings of tension or stress, or whatever problems they experience on the job. Under these conditions, absenteeism may have a positive effect on job performance. So, Staw and Oldham indicate that absenteeism may have both positive and negative consequences, and may form a rather complex relationship with many other variables.

Traditional studies of absenteeism support this notion that the relationship between absenteeism and performance is not simple and direct (Argyle, Gardner and Cioffi, 1958; Indik and Georgopoulos, 1960; Lyons, 1972; and Ronan, 1963). And, more recent studies which examine absenteeism in relation to many outcomes (in addition to performance) indicate that more research is needed. For example, Nicholson, Brown and Chadwick-Jones (1976) find no relation between absenteeism and other outcomes. Porter and Steers (1973) also find no consistent relationship, but suggest, as Staw and Oldham do, that other factors, e.g. personal, job, work-environment, or organizational factors should be explored as potential determinants. Steers and Rhodes (1978) reviewed 104 empirical studies that link

absenteeism and turnover to specific outcomes and suggest the models and results are unclear. And, Wanous (1974) finds that the particular type of attendance behavior (e.g. absenteeism) must be explored in the context of particular outcomes (e.g. job satisfaction, performance, etc.). Similarly, March and Simon (1958) examine absenteeism as a measure of, or in relation to, the more global outcome of organizational effectiveness which may include turnover, strikes, grievances, performance, ROI, as well as attendance or absenteeism behavior.

The variables and predictions of these studies on absenteeism, especially with regard to Staw and Oldham's ideas, may be adopted for this study of the relationship between vacation practices and performance. In particular, Staw and Oldham suggest that the "complex relationship" between absenteeism and performance may be explored in terms of a measure of fit between the individual and the job. They highlight one potential moderating variable as "compatibility with the job": i.e. degree to which the content of a job is appropriately matched to the personal characteristics of a job incumbent. Examples of compatible job situations include: 1) individuals with high growth need strength who are placed in complex jobs, 2) individuals with low growth need strength who are placed in simple, boring jobs, or 3) individuals who experience high levels of job satisfaction. In contrast, incompatible job situations would include: 1) individuals with high growth need strength who are placed in simple, boring jobs, 2) individuals with low growth need strength who are placed in complex jobs, or 3) individuals who experience low levels of job satisfaction. Furthermore, Staw and Oldham predict that individuals in compatible job situations perform more effectively when they are absent less (a negative relationship between absenteeism and performance); while individuals in incompatible job situations perform

more effectively when they are absent more (a positive relationship between absenteeism and performance). Such variables and predictions can be applied to the present study as follows.

Absenteeism, or time off the job in this study, may be expressed in terms of use of allotted vacation time. Staw and Oldham predict that individuals in psychologically compatible job situations may not need to be absent or away from the job. So, for individuals in compatible job situations, taking time off, or using a large proportion of allotted vacation time, may be dysfunctional: i.e. there may be disadvantages to not being present to perform the technical aspects of the job. Under these conditions, i.e. when there is compatibility with a job, it is predicted that using more vacation time (as a form of "absenteeism" or time off the job) is negatively related to performance, and positively related to absenteeism.

In contrast, individuals in psychologically incompatible job situations may require high "absenteeism" or time off the job in order to perform. That is, absenteeism, or extended time off in the form of using a large proportion of allotted vacation time, may serve a maintenance function and outweigh the disadvantages of not being present to perform the technical aspects of a job. Consequently, under these conditions, i.e. when there is incompatibility with a job, it is predicted that using more allotted vacation time (as a form of time off) is positively related to performance, and negatively related to absenteeism.

Theories and Theoretical Hypotheses of Work and Leisure

Two contradictory theories have been developed which explore the relationship between work and leisure (non-work, or life outside the job). One theory introduces the "spillover effect" which maintains that there is a positive relationship between work and non-work, i.e. quality of worklife will be carried over into quality of life (Smith, 1965;

Wilensky, 1960). Therefore, a positive attitude or reaction toward worklife (such as job satisfaction) will be carried over into non-work activities of life (such as recreational and leisure pursuits, participation in clubs, etc.). A number of researchers clearly favor this spillover hypothesis. For example, Meissner (1971) studied industrial workers and his findings support, and his conclusions are based on, the "long arm of the job": i.e. the type and nature of an individual's job, reflected in control over "space-time-functions" of work, will carry over into the control over "space-time-functions" of non-work related aspects of life. Meissner believes that individuals in higher level jobs (jobs with more discretion and responsibility) develop more solid ties with the community, resulting in greater integration with outside life. Individuals in lower level jobs, especially those characterized by more spatial and temporal constraints and less discretion and responsibility, allow less time for social and expressive behavior, and, therefore, are less well integrated into outside life. Similarly, Willmott (1971) states that individuals who have "better" jobs (reflected by higher status and income) are more active in leisure and memberships outside of work than those with lower job status and income. And, he finds strong positive relationships among leisure, work and family orientations.

Torbert's study (1972), which developed a theory of man in terms of the concepts of "play, leisure, recreation, and free time," finds that the more play in life (exploration and expression of one's self), the greater the commitment one has to a job, and the more energetic the leisure. The direction of causation (i.e. work spilling over into play, or vice versa) is less clear, but he suggests that those who have more variety at work and experience greater productivity, tend to select

similar recreational pursuits. Parker (1976) confirms these findings, but more strongly maintains that the causal influence is from the "work experience-attitude" to the "leisure experience-attitude" because the work sphere is more structured and more basic to life. Individuals with a positive work experience-attitude will carry over to create a positive leisure experience-attitude. So, individuals who experience more job satisfaction, or more discretion in the job (reflected by job level and accompanying income) may feel more positive about pursuing leisure and recreation outside of the job. Other studies, while focusing on different factors, report conclusions in line with this notion (Cohen and Hodges, 1963; Fisk, 1964; Langner and Muhall, 1963; Pope, 1964; and Van de Vall, 1967). The "spillover theory," therefore, maintains a more positive relationship between work and non-work, i.e. between work and leisure.

In contrast, the other Theory of Work and Leisure introduces a "compensation effect" which hints at a more negative relationship between work and non-work, i.e. what does (or does not) exist in the work environment is made up for outside the work environment (Dubin, 1956). Both Dubin and Jaques (1965) suggest that work confers an element of self respect, status, and self-esteem. Therefore, if individuals encounter a rather negative experience on the job (possibly in terms of job satisfaction, job level, status and income) they may try to make up for it, or compensate, by developing a more positive experience off or outside of the job. Part of this more positive experience may be expressed in terms of leisure and recreational pursuits and participation in clubs, etc. Therefore, individuals who do not experience feelings of job satisfaction, or feelings of "producing" on the job may compensate by being active and "producing" in non-work related activities off the job,

e.g. by joining clubs, engaging in sports, etc. Hence, time spent away from the job may be critical to the well being of the individuals, as well as to maintaining attendance and performance on the job.

This research, as well as other related areas of research such as task design research, maintains that the non-task environment (leisure, vacation time) is related to worker responses such as job satisfaction, performance, etc. (Pierce and Dunham, 1976). So, these perspectives on work and leisure--supporting different signs in the relationship and different directions of causation--provide some impetus for continuing the research and clarifying the relationship between the two, especially in terms of vacations (as a form of leisure) and performance and attendance (an integral part of work). Furthermore, it is believed that both theories suffer from inherent measurement problems: i.e. in particular in measuring non-work experiences. Typically, non-work experiences are reflected in activities such as membership in clubs, participating in sports, community involvement, etc. So, when there is no evidence of such activities, non-work experiences are considered to be negative. But, non-work experiences are really quite vast, and other types of activities not typically investigated (e.g. gardening, reading, traveling--indeed using vacation time) may reflect more positive experiences than those projected or reported. In addition, other individual factors such as age, education, marital status, number of children, may affect the work-leisure relationship. For example, individuals who are continuing their education in the evening, or individuals who have several children may not engage in certain activities during that period in their lives because of financial, time, or other constraints, etc. Similarly, individuals who travel frequently (especially when required by their job), or who take short trips to visit family and friends, or

to enrich their cultural lives, also may not be available to participate in community activities and so may not be perceived as "well integrated into the community." Again, these circumstances should not be perceived as negative to their non-working lives: instead such activities may actually be very healthy and positive.

In light of these considerations, and with respect to other possible limitations peculiar to both theories, it is believed that the arguments for the spillover effect are stronger and more convincing, and should be applied to this research. In particular, most experts on work and leisure favor this hypothesis, especially on the premise that work is basic to life, serving two basic functions: an economic function--producing goods and services for the perpetuation of society, and a social function--setting standards, determining status, and generating lifestyles. Hence, work greatly affects, influences, if not determines, the quality and quantity of life. In addition, more recent investigations of the more recent concept regarding the relationship between quality of working life and quality of life maintain that, ideologically, they are one and the same, i.e. that quality of working life is quality of life (Nosow, 1981). Such beliefs, arguments, and findings lend themselves to additional investigations.

Consequently, applying the spillover hypothesis to this study, it is expected that individuals who have a positive work experience (job satisfaction, effective job performance and attendance, respectable job level, status and income) may have a positive leisure experience (actively engaging in recreation, social activities, and, in particular, in fully utilizing allotted vacation time). Under these conditions, it is predicted that the use of vacation time (leisure) is positively related to job performance (work), and negatively related to absenteeism.

Theories and Hypotheses of Individual Differences and Employee Responses

Theories on individual differences maintain that certain individual characteristics, e.g. age, belief in the ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic, vulnerability to stress, Type A behavior, etc., may affect or be related to certain individual responses or reactions to a job, e.g. job satisfaction, job involvement, absenteeism or job performance. A review of the literature on these theories of individual differences (White, 1977) indicates that numerous studies, which incorporate different designs and examine different independent, dependent and moderating variables, have been conducted by several different researchers; yet there is a lack of consistency in the results. Of particular interest are the following studies and areas of research on individual differences and employee responses which provide a framework for this study of the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism.

Protestant Work Ethic (PWE)

A number of studies have been conducted on the belief in the Protestant Work Ethic--as an individual characteristic and as a potential moderator--in relation to employee responses. Belief in the ideals of the PWE is characterized by a belief in the intrinsic value of hard work: individuals feel they are responsible for their own destiny, and acceptance into heaven depends on hard work on this mortal earth. Hulin and Blood (1968) studied the effects of this characteristic on employee reactions by measuring PWE in terms of alienation from middle class norms. Their results show that the strength of belief in the PWE does affect, in particular, reactions to job enlargement. That is, those with a strong belief in the PWE adopt stronger middle class values, experience less alienation, and react positively to job enlargement. Since this

study, more reliable measures of PWE have been developed (Blood, 1969; Wollack, Goodale and Wijting, 1971). And, additional studies have been conducted to determine the effects of PWE on other employee responses. In particular, Wanous (1974) finds some support for the effects of PWE as a potential moderator in influencing job satisfaction. Merrens and Garrett (1975), in examining job performance of high (strong PWE beliefs) and low (weak beliefs) PWE groups, maintain that individuals with a stronger belief in the PWE are better job performers. Finally, Greenberg (1977) confirms these findings in his study, concluding that PWE and output (performance) are positively and directly related.

Consequently, for this study, PWE has been selected as a potential moderator which influences the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism. More specifically, individuals who have a strong belief in the PWE feel that hard work is rewarding itself and that effective job performance and attendance has built in intrinsic rewards. As a result, extrinsic rewards are not needed or valued in order to maintain or enhance job performance or attendance. As extrinsic outcomes in this study are expressed in terms of vacations, it is expected that individuals with a strong belief in the PWE will not value vacations or need to use a large portion of their allotted vacation time in order to maintain or improve performance or attendance. Under these conditions, it is predicted that vacations and performance are negatively related; while vacations and absenteeism are positively related.

In contrast, individuals who have a weak belief in the PWE feel hard work and performance in a job is not (or less) rewarding intrinsically. As a result, they may search for and value extrinsic rewards. So, individuals with a weak belief in the PWE may value vacations (as

this extrinsic reward) and may need to use a greater portion of their allotted vacation time in order to maintain or improve job performance or attendance. Under these conditions, it is predicted that the relationship between vacations and performance is positive, while the relationship between vacations and absenteeism is expected to be negative.

Personality Theory: Type A Behavior

Studies on Type A behavior characterize the Type A personality as a "workaholic": an individual who spends an excessive amount of time on job-related rather than on non-job-related activities. Accompanying characteristics of the Type A personality include perpetual motion, aggressiveness, competition, time urgency, relaxation guilt, materialism, and evaluating activities in terms of numbers, etc. The classic study on Type A behavior (Friedman and Rosenman, 1974) maintains that individuals behave, or respond, to life by working. They thrive on work, rather than on relaxation or "play," and prefer to spend more time on the "job" rather than off the "job."

The characteristics of this Type A personality can be investigated, further, in this study of the relationship between managerial vacation practices and job performance and absenteeism. More specifically, individuals who are classified as Type A personalities cope with life and its pressures by "working." It is believed that the Type A workaholic prefers to work hard and complete a job; these individuals would see taking time off (especially in terms of vacation) as a waste of time, an interference with work, and possibly even a threat to performance. Indeed, forced leisure may be more stressful and create more conflict than no vacation at all. So, it is expected that individuals who are characterized as Type A personalities would not want to take vacations (and would use less of their allotted vacation time) in order to maintain a high

level of work and job performance and attendance. Under these conditions, it is predicted that the relationship between vacations (time spent away from work) and performance (time spent at work) is negative; while the relationship between vacations and absenteeism is predicted to be positive.

In contrast, individuals who are not classified as Type A workaholics may prefer to spend relatively more time away from the job, and less time on the job. It is expected these individuals would see taking time off (especially using a large portion of their allotted vacation time) as rewarding and as necessary for maintaining or improving performance and attendance. Under these conditions, it is predicted that the relationship between vacations and performance is positive, while the relationship between vacations and absenteeism is negative.

Vulnerability to Stress

Literature on occupational stress, both popular and academic, theoretical and empirical, deals primarily with both the specific and job-related aspects of certain occupations and work environments that create pressure and stress, and the coping behaviors for dealing with the stress (Cooper and Payne, 1980). In particular, many occupations or jobs place pressure on individuals. And, many organizations cultivate stress because of the traditional hierarchical nature of organizations, competition for scarce rewards, and role conflict. In response, individuals develop coping behaviors for responding to stress in order to survive, i.e. to maintain effective, or at least acceptable, job performance. Mechanisms for coping with stress are derived from studies in the fields of psychiatry and behavioral medicine, and clinical and organizational psychology, etc., and include such strategies as increasing self-awareness, diverting attention, taking drugs, relaxing, exercising, engaging in

leisure, and taking vacations. Of particular interest is this last mentioned coping strategy, the taking of vacations and holiday time, which has been cited as an effective way to deal with stress. Some of these studies and strategies which encourage use of vacation time, though more descriptive than empirical, are identified in the following: Richard Walsh (1975) suggests that individuals who feel stress and pressure probably are overworked and overdriven (in both job-related and non-job-related activities). So, he recommends that individuals take time off to recharge the battery as taking needed time off will help restore or maintain performance. Auren Uris (1972) identifies a number of ways to ease job pressures, and cites taking a vacation as a critical activity for dealing with stress. Marks and Banack (1977) recommend relaxation, recreation, and, in particular, taking vacations to prevent performance deterioration. Harvey Shore (1975) describes prevention and cures for employee absenteeism which, in time, destroys job performance. He suggests that organizations should develop more cafeteria-type benefit plans; i.e. giving employees a choice in the form and timing of rewards in exchange for performance. He believes that by allowing individuals to incorporate rewards which are desired and valued, individual experiences on the job (such as satisfaction and performance) may be more positive. Shore further suggests that allowing greater flexibility in vacation time and schedules may be one aspect of the plan; when valued by the individual, it will promote and possibly enhance job performance. Finally, Barbara Cohen (1981) claims that many organizations are recognizing the problems of stress and burnout and are reacting by recommending that employees be given and take more time off. These, and other leisure-time experts, believe that vacations are essential in creating a well-balanced life, and that vacation time helps make work

during the rest of the year, if not enjoyable, at least bearable.

The preceding research, though primarily prescriptive, does suggest that vacations may have some type of effect on job performance and attendance. Empirical credibility may be added to these prescriptions by the proposed study of the relationship between managerial vacation practices and performance and absenteeism. More specifically, individuals who experience excessive job-related pressures, or who are more vulnerable to stress, in general, may need to take time off, either to remove themselves from the stressful situation, or merely to serve as the coping mechanism--e.g. to recharge the battery. Time off, in this study, is expressed in terms of vacation time. So, individuals who are more vulnerable to stress may need and use a greater proportion of their allotted vacation time in order to cope with stress, maintain, and possibly enhance performance and minimize absenteeism. Under these conditions, it is predicted vacation practices are positively related to performance and negatively related to absenteeism.

In contrast, individuals who experience less job-related pressure, or who are less vulnerable to stress, in general, may feel less of a need to take time off. Their situations are less stressful, so coping mechanisms are not so critical. Those who are less vulnerable to stress can maintain effective performance without having to rely on time off (e.g. absenteeism) or without having or wanting to use a large proportion of their allotted vacation time. Under these conditions, it is predicted that vacation practices are negatively related to performance, and positively related to absenteeism.

However, further justification of these expected relationships is warranted. The predictions cited above are based on those variables of stress (especially vulnerability to stress) explored in this study.

But, other variables, which do not lend themselves easily to exploration and which have not been investigated comprehensively here, may generate some different predictions. For example, the issue of choice regarding alternative coping mechanisms--especially voluntary versus involuntary coping mechanisms--may affect the results. In particular, individuals who are more vulnerable to stress may want to use more vacation time (a voluntary coping mechanism) but the boss, company or circumstances may not encourage or permit taking a vacation at a particular point in time. As a result, alternative coping mechanisms (more involuntary) may be substituted to cope temporarily with stress and maintain job performance (and attendance). So, under certain conditions of stress, an individual may perform effectively and not use a large proportion of allotted vacation time--suggesting a different kind of negative relationship than what is explored in this study.

Furthermore, this negative relationship also may be explained from another perspective, i.e. the impact of taking vacations as a "life event." More specifically, Holmes and Rahe (1967) conducted a survey to determine how long it takes to readjust to changes in typical life events such as marriage, divorce, job changes, etc. From the results, they developed a social readjustment scale in which certain typical life events were identified as stress-inducing, and which were arranged in descending order with corresponding points representing levels of stress. One event ranked on the scale is the taking of vacations. A number of explanations can be offered for citing vacations as a stress-inducing event. Many individuals find that too much effort is required, or too much compromising is involved, in the planning or taking of vacations--whether for making arrangements for job coverage while away, or for deciding what to do, where to travel, etc. Other individuals may feel

some guilt in taking a vacation or planning a trip (which may involve too much time planning, too much money and questions about whether or not they deserve it). Still, others may feel that with all of the effort, the vacation may not turn out as planned, or indeed, may be a disappointment and not worth it (Rosenblatt, 1982). This may be true especially if the period of allotted time to settle into and enjoy the vacation is minimal, e.g. only one week. Finally, some individuals may find that after a vacation it is difficult to get back to work; job performance may deteriorate because the cycle of work is broken. (Explanations for this may be derived indirectly from theories of learning, especially with regard to the concept of extinction).

These reactions indicate, therefore, that stress can take many forms: as a function of the job, the individual, or as a function of non-job-related aspects such as vacations as stress-inducing themselves. These different forms have not been consistently measured in this study, nor have they been examined in relation to performance or absenteeism. However, certain items in the survey developed for this study do provide some insight into these perspectives, and their results are reported and discussed with the descriptive results in Appendix B. Hence, the descriptive, as well as the theoretical, results indicate, further, the importance of stress in organizations, and its effects on coping mechanisms (in particular, use of vacation time), performance and absenteeism.

Age

Miscellaneous research and literature, especially in the social sciences, highlight the changes taking place in social and work values and attitudes of twentieth-century society. This research, though not always empirically based, projects the emergence of a new breed of employees who hold values and beliefs that deviate from traditional views,

i.e. expressed in a heightened concern for non-job-related (rather than job-related) aspects of life. Furthermore, recent quality of work life and quality of life issues reflect, among other things, greater emphasis on leisure, recreation, and time spent off (rather than on) the job. These attitudes are reflected in the results of a survey conducted in 1977 (Yankelovich, 1979) which found that when work was compared to leisure as a source of greater satisfaction, only 21 percent selected work as being of more importance. (In contrast, a much larger percentage of those holding traditional views would have made a similar choice). These changes are reflected, also, in other societies. For example, the results of a survey conducted in Sweden in 1955 indicated that work was cited more often than leisure as a source of satisfaction in life. But, when the same questions were asked in 1977, responses indicated that dedication to leisure had more than doubled, while dedication to work had been cut in half (Zetterberg, Busch and De Uham, 1977). Therefore, work psychologists in Europe (De Wolff, Shimmin and De Montmollin, 1981), as well as theorists on work and leisure (Parker, 1971), maintain that the future of work will have to address these demands of a more leisure oriented, and less work oriented, society.

Results from a more recent survey conducted by the National Commission for Employment Policy (World of Work Report, 1980) further confirms this changing orientation. Responding to items regarding reward preferences, the majority of individuals chose time away from work (provided they could choose the particular form of free time) as more important than future pay raises. In particular, the majority were willing to give up 2 percent of their current pay for time off, and approximately 25 percent were willing to give up as much as 10 percent or more of their pay. Furthermore, respondents expressed a greater interest in extended

periods of time off (longer vacations or sabbaticals) rather than in shorter periods of time off (reduced work days or work weeks).

This interest in leisure time and the extent to which individuals work fewer hours to enjoy more leisure has been grounded in traditional labor economic theories. More specifically, the theories analyze the relationship between the income effect (the extent to which individuals consume more leisure time by working fewer hours) and the substitution effect (the extent to which individuals consume less leisure time and work more hours as a substitute). Which effect offsets the other depends on individual preferences for leisure versus income, i.e. working more hours which may increase income (Bellante and Jackson, 1979; Rima, 1981; Samuelson, 1967). Therefore, this previously cited trend toward consuming more leisure may provide additional insight into, or understanding of, individual differences or preferences which affect the relationship. Indeed, the baby boomers moving into middle age indicates that this new group may place different demands which will have to be met by organizations in order to enhance the match between jobs and job seekers. It is possible that these demands may include other types of rewards, e.g. extra vacations (Drucker, 1985). These changes in social and work values reflect a growing interest in life outside of the job, and signal the arrival of a new breed of employees.

However, there is an absence of more direct research on this new breed--specifically on younger versus older employees--and on the respective attitudes and values they have adopted with regard to life outside the job--specifically in the form of leisure or vacation practices. But, one study on the relationship between age and a particular attitude or value, belief in the PWE, produces some indirect implications. In testing the attitudes of older and younger individuals, Cherrington

(1977) found that older workers clearly have a stronger belief in the PWE--the intrinsic rewards of hard work--than younger individuals. Generalizing from these results, and from results of studies on PWE described earlier, this could reflect a shift in emphasis to different types of rewards, i.e. from intrinsic rewards (such as hard work itself) to more extrinsic rewards (such as vacations). It could be interpreted that younger individuals do hold attitudes and values which are different from those traditionally held by older individuals. So, more clearly identifying the changes and describing the differences provides impetus for further investigations.

Consequently, the present study moves in this direction by examining older and younger workers and their corresponding values and attitudes toward leisure and life outside the job, and, in particular, their attitudes toward vacations. It is believed this new breed of employees is younger, place higher value on leisure than on work, and see sources of satisfaction more frequently derived from life outside of (rather than on) the job. They are more concerned about leisure (health, recreation, minimizing stress, etc.) and more often are committed to family, friends, and life, in general, outside of the job. They may desire or need more time off the job (vacations) in order to spend more time on non-work related aspects of life. Fulfillment of time off the job may also provide for (or spillover into) fulfillment of time on the job, i.e. individuals may desire and need vacation time off the job in order to maintain or improve performance and attendance on the job. Under these conditions, it is predicted that vacation practices are positively related to performance and negatively related to absenteeism.

In contrast, it is believed that individuals of the older breed place higher values on work than on leisure, and see sources of

satisfaction more frequently derived from the job (rather than outside of the job). These individuals are less concerned about health, exercise and leisure, and may be less committed to family, friends, or life, in general, outside of the job. So, they may compensate by spending more time on the job. These individuals may have more desire to work and less desire or need to take time off. Taking vacations would only interfere with time that could be spent performing on the job. Under these conditions, when individuals are older--possibly reflecting more traditional values toward work--it is predicted that the relationship between vacation practices and performance is negative, and between vacation practices and absenteeism is positive.

Summary

The variables, relationships and predictions of the studies and research reviewed above provide guidelines and impetus for conducting further studies--such as the study of the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism--to develop similar or alternative predictions and results. Table 2-1 presents a summary list of the theories and theoretical hypotheses reviewed in this research, as well as a corresponding list of hypotheses and propositions generated from such theories for this study. These predictions, hypotheses and propositions, explored in the context of the research design, are presented and described more specifically in Chapter Three.

TABLE 2-1

**Literature Reviewed in the Study of the Relationship Between
Managerial Vacation Practices and Managerial Performance and Absenteeism**

Theories and Theoretical Hypotheses Reviewed	Hypotheses and Propositions Generated*
Performance and Reward Theories	General Hypothesis
Expectancy Theory of Motivation (VIE)	P ₆ of Sub-hypothesis
Equity Theory of Motivation	P ₁ of Sub-hypothesis
Theories and Theoretical Hypotheses of Absenteeism (and Job Compatibility)	P ₅ of Sub-hypothesis
Theories and Theoretical Hypotheses of Work and Leisure	P ₈ of Sub-hypothesis
Theories and Theoretical Hypotheses of Individual Differences and Employee Responses:	
Protestant Work Ethic	P ₂ of Sub-hypothesis
Personality: Type A Behavior	P ₃ of Sub-hypothesis
Vulnerability to Stress	P ₇ of Sub-hypothesis
Age	P ₄ of Sub-hypothesis

*The General Hypothesis and the eight propositions of the Sub-hypothesis are presented and described in more detail in Chapter Three.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND HYPOTHESES

Managerial vacation practices in relation to managerial performance and absenteeism can be explored and explained if one can measure the major variables in the relationship.

Alternative measures of managerial performance and absenteeism have been produced, usually in terms of individual performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, productivity or incidences of absenteeism, etc. Yet, no particular measure consistently stands out as most representative of managerial performance or absenteeism.

Similarly, descriptions of vacation patterns and practices have been documented and discussed, usually in terms of the kinds of vacations that are, or should be, taken by individuals in different occupations and job levels. But, no particular vacation pattern or practice has been isolated or investigated as most peculiar to, or representative of, managerial employees.

As a consequence, there has been no research which directly investigates if, indeed, there is a relationship between the variables. Studying the interaction of vacation practices with performance and absenteeism requires recognition of the several factors and conditions involved in the relationship. More specifically, there are different variables to be identified and described, e.g. vacation behavior, performance behavior, and attendance (or absenteeism) behavior; different measures to be introduced, e.g. actual and perceptual; different results

to be explained, e.g. qualitative and quantitative; as well as different time periods to be considered, e.g. past or typical behavior, current behavior, and expected or future desired behavior. Furthermore, one must recognize that the interaction may be more complex than anticipated, i.e. there may be a unique set of factors or conditions, e.g. individual, job or organizational characteristics, which ultimately affects or determines the specific relationship.

In developing a research strategy for the present study, there is an attempt first: to acknowledge these issues--that there are different factors involved in the study of vacation practices in relation to performance and absenteeism (and all may not be included in the study), and that the interaction may be rather complex (and may not be completely understood in the analyses); and second: to select, given the limitations of field survey research, a realistic research design which is believed to enable an adequate evaluation (though maybe not the most comprehensive evaluation) of the relationship. The present research, therefore, is designed in light of these considerations. More specifically, the purpose of this research is: 1) to explore and describe vacation practices (reflected by the amount of allotted vacation time used per year) as well as vacation patterns (reflected by the length and frequency of vacations, time of year and reasons why vacations are taken, etc.--which are judged to be appropriate measures for this study); and 2) to explain the relationship of certain vacation practices to performance and absenteeism (reflected by performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability and incidences of absenteeism--which are measures typically investigated and which are also judged to be appropriate for this research). The unit of analysis is the individual, and the study is a cross-sectional study involving a pre-determined

group of individuals in a pre-determined setting, where data are collected by administering a survey at one point in time. The motivation for the research is to test portions of comprehensive theories and limited theoretical and prescriptive hypotheses. It is felt that the obvious limitations in the design (e.g. threats to validity, social desirability of responses, problems with operationalization of variables and scale construction, as well as constraints regarding statistical and logical analyses, etc.) are inherent in research strategies such as this (Babbie; 1979); and it is expected that such limitations cannot be resolved in this research context. So, this research design has been adopted to enable the study of vacation practices in relation to performance and absenteeism, and to provide a test of the following General Hypothesis and Sub-Hypothesis:

GENERAL HYPOTHESIS - There is a direct positive relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance; and, there is a direct negative relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial absenteeism.

It is predicted that individuals who perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism use more of their allotted vacation time; and individuals who perform at low levels and have a high incidence of absenteeism use less of their allotted vacation time.

Performance ———⁺——— Vacations ———⁻——— Absenteeism

However, it is also felt that a number of factors or conditions may have an effect on the strength of the positive relationship between vacation practices and performance, and on the strength of the negative

relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism. In recognition of this, the following Sub-Hypothesis was developed:

SUB-HYPOTHESIS - There are specific factors or conditions, determined by individual, job and organizational characteristics which affect the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism, i.e. which determine when managerial vacation practices and performance are positively related (or tend to form a more positive relationship) and when they are less positively related (or tend to form a more negative relationship), or which determine when managerial vacation practices and absenteeism are negatively related (or tend to form a more negative relationship) and when they are less negatively related (or tend to form a more positive relationship).¹

It is predicted that the relationship between managerial vacation practices and performance is positive (or tends to form a more positive than negative relationship) and the relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism is negative (or tends to form a more negative than positive relationship) when the following factors or conditions are strong, or evident to a high degree; individuals: 1) value and

¹The analyses and results of this Sub-Hypothesis are discussed in more relative terms, i.e. positive results reflect results which show support for a positive relationship or which reflect a more positive than negative relationship; negative results reflect results which show less support for a positive relationship or which reflect a more negative relationship. Therefore, certain conditions support or strengthen the positive form of the relationship; while other conditions support or strengthen the negative form of the relationship.

enjoy vacations, 2) are vulnerable to stress, and 3) occupy high job levels. However, the relationship between managerial vacation practices and performance is less positive (or tends to form a more negative than positive relationship) and the relationship between managerial vacation practices and absenteeism is less negative (or tends to form a more positive than negative relationship) when a different set of factors or conditions are strong, or evident to a high degree; individuals: 1) feel that the vacation time allotted and the opportunities to use the time are fair, 2) believe in the ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic, 3) exhibit Type A behavior, 4) are older, and 5) are compatible with their jobs. Based on these factors, this Sub-Hypothesis is divided into the following eight propositions:

P_1 - The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the extent to which an individual feels that the vacation time allotted and the opportunities to use the vacation allotment are fair (i.e. determined equitable when compared to the vacation time and opportunities allotted to other employees or groups of employees either within or outside of the organization.)

It is predicted that individuals who feel they have fair vacation time and opportunity perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time; individuals who feel they do not have fair vacation

time and opportunity perform at high levels
and have a low incidence of absenteeism
when they use more of their allotted
vacation time:

➤ Felt-Fair

Performance $\xrightarrow{+}$ Vacations $\xrightarrow{-}$ Absenteeism

➤ Felt-Fair

P₂ - The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the degree to which an individual believes in the ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic (PWE). It is predicted that individuals who have a strong belief in the ideals of PWE perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time; individuals who have a weak belief in the ideals of the PWE perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time:

➤ PWE

Performance $\xrightarrow{+}$ Vacations $\xrightarrow{-}$ Absenteeism

➤ PWE

P₃ - The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the degree to which an individual exhibits Type A behavior. It is predicted that individuals who exhibit strong Type A behavior perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time; individuals who exhibit weak Type A behavior perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time:

> Type A

Performance $\frac{-}{+}$ Vacations $\frac{+}{-}$ Absenteeism

< Type A

P₄ - The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the age of an individual. It is predicted that older individuals perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time; younger individuals perform at high levels and have

a low incidence of absenteeism when they
use more of their allotted vacation time:

> Age

Performance $\xrightarrow{+}$ Vacations $\xrightarrow{-}$ Absenteeism

< Age

P₅ - The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the extent to which an individual is compatible with a job (i.e. extent to which the characteristics or content of a job are appropriately matched to the personal characteristics of a job incumbent). It is predicted that individuals who are compatible with their jobs perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time; individuals who are incompatible with their jobs perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time:

> Job Compatibility

Performance $\xrightarrow{+}$ Vacations $\xrightarrow{-}$ Absenteeism

< Job Compatibility

- P₆ - The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the degree to which an individual values and enjoys vacations. It is predicted that individuals who value and enjoy vacations perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time; individuals who do not value and enjoy vacations perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time:

> Value

Performance $\xrightarrow{+}$ Vacations $\xrightarrow{-}$ Absenteeism

< Value

- P₇ - The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the degree to which an individual is vulnerable to stress. It is predicted that individuals who are more vulnerable to stress perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time; individuals who are less vulnerable to stress perform at high levels and have a

low incidence of absenteeism when they
use less of their allotted vacation time:

> Stress

Performance $\frac{+}{-}$ Vacations $\frac{-}{+}$ Absenteeism

< Stress

P₈ - The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the job level of an individual. It is predicted that individuals who occupy high job levels perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time; individuals who occupy low job levels perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time:

> Job Level

Performance $\frac{+}{-}$ Vacations $\frac{-}{+}$ Absenteeism

< Job Level

The hypotheses and propositions that have been generated are based on the design of this research, and are tested by collecting data on the variables in the design and by studying the relationships between them. The methodology used in this data collection process is described in Chapter Four.

CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

Description of the Research Site

The research was conducted in a single company, in a single location: Corporate Headquarters of a large multinational, Fortune 200 company which manufactures, primarily, consumer and industrial paper products, and which is located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The firm employs, at Corporate Headquarters, approximately fifteen hundred exempt employees (individuals in jobs which are not subject to the overtime pay provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act) and one thousand non-exempt employees (individuals in jobs subject to overtime pay). The jobs they perform are those typically associated with the traditional business functions. Policies on employment, compensation and benefits, services, health and safety, and miscellaneous general rules are also similar to those found in most manufacturing organizations. Of particular interest are those policies on vacations and performance. These are described below in order to provide an understanding of how the company views (and employees may perceive) vacations and performance within the company.¹

¹Information on these policies was extracted from company documents, including an employee handbook, miscellaneous pamphlets on benefits, and copies of performance, promotability, and career evaluation forms. Conversations with miscellaneous company personnel also supplemented, or confirmed, this information.

Vacation Policies

The company recognizes vacations, not only as a reward for service, but also as a needed period for rest and relaxation. The company believes vacations should give a complete break from on-the-job responsibilities and, therefore, encourages that vacations be taken, with regard to the following.

Length of Vacation. The length of an employee's vacation (amount of annual allotted vacation time) is determined by the years of continuous service completed during a given year, as shown in the following schedule:

Table 4-1
Vacation Plan

Years of Service	Length of Vacation
Those completing 25 or more years	6 Weeks
Those completing 18 or more but less than 25 years	5 Weeks
Those completing 12 or more but less than 18 years	4 Weeks
Those completing 6 or more but less than 12 years	3 Weeks
Those completing 1 or more but less than 6 years	2 Weeks

Hence, employees are allotted two weeks (a full calendar week) of vacation per year for up to six years of service; three weeks for up to twelve years of service, etc. New employees also are eligible for vacation during the first year of employment; the length of vacation (ranging from five to nine days) depends on the month their employment began.

Vacation Banking. Employees entitled to more than four weeks of vacation may "bank" the weeks in excess of the earned four weeks (up to a maximum of sixteen weeks) until retirement or other terms of employment. At retirement, full settlement of banked weeks is made in cash or continuous vacation, as selected by the employee. (If employees are terminated otherwise, full settlement of banked vacation weeks is made in cash). In addition, employees may withdraw up to two banked vacation weeks in vacation pay, at their current salary, in a given year.

Vacation Schedule. No formal vacation period is established at headquarters, so employees are allowed to indicate preferences for vacation schedules. However, final determination and approval of schedules remain with the company. Full use of vacation time is encouraged (and is documented in policies regarding vacations), and it is suggested that employees take vacations in segments of two weeks or more at one time, though a single uninterrupted vacation period should not exceed five weeks. In addition, half-day or single days may not exceed a total of more than five paid days per year. Also, in circumstances when it is necessary for employees to work through a scheduled vacation period, or when company requirements do not permit full use of vacation time during a given year, employees are given the options (at the discretion of the appropriate company officer) either of: 1) receiving a cash payment at the end of a given year to cover vacation time not taken, or of 2) carrying over a maximum of one week of unused vacation time to the next succeeding calendar year and receiving cash payment at the end of the current year only for that part of the vacation not carried over. There are no options for postponing or accumulating vacation time from one year to the next.

Vacation Pay. Employees are entitled to their regular salary for

their full authorized vacation period and receive this, and other salary payments for pay days that may fall within the vacation period, prior to leaving for vacation. Also, any paid holiday that occurs during a vacation period will entitle employees to an extra day off with pay.

Performance Policies

The company recognizes performance as important, not only to the company, but also to the individual. In particular, it is documented that performance on the job will determine an employee's opportunity for personal growth with the company. Therefore, performance is encouraged in terms of the following.

Performance Evaluations. Formal performance evaluations are conducted at least once a year by the appropriate supervisor and assisted by employees in the Personnel Department. Employees are evaluated, primarily, on three sets of criteria: 1) overall attainment of mutually agreed upon objectives and results, 2) selected characteristics such as planning-organizing-controlling, communication, problem solving, decision making, judgment, conflict resolution, etc., and on 3) development and training needs which could provide growth experience for a given employee. Based on these, an overall performance rating is recorded, according to the following: 1) "1" (performance is not acceptable), 2) "2 or 3" (performance does not consistently meet the standards established for the job), 3) "4, 5 or 6" (performance meets the standards established for the job), 4) "7 or 8" (performance frequently exceeds the standards established for the job), and 5) "9 or 10" (performance consistently exceeds the standards established for the job). Employees have an opportunity, each year, to see a copy of the written performance review, to discuss it with an immediate supervisor, and to exchange ideas on how job performance may be improved. This exchange also allows for a career discussion--

identifying short and long term goals, strengths and weaknesses, and possible short, intermediate and long term job progressions. So, in this company, performance evaluations are an important measure of employee performance in a job.

Performance Potential. The measure of responsibility for each employee is reflected in the value of a job held by the employee. The value of a job is determined by a specific yardstick used to measure a job's worth: 1) amount of knowledge or know-how, 2) degree of problem solving, and 3) overall accountability or responsibility required by the job. Point values are assigned to these three criteria and added together for a total point value or worth of a job. (This value is called the Hay Point value because the system was designed by Hay Associates, a consulting firm). Point values range from a couple of hundred points to several thousand points. Subsequently, the point value of each job, in relation to all other evaluated jobs, determines its salary range. Therefore, the value of a job--its worth to the company--is reflected in the number of Hay Points in the job. And, the greater the number of points, the more responsibility in the job, the higher the job level, the more important the job is to the company. The performance of individuals who occupy these jobs, therefore, is critical to the company. Further, it is believed that individuals who occupy these job levels at an early age are those who, no doubt, attain them because of their effective performance (rather than because of years of service with the company, etc.). These "fast trackers," i.e. individuals who are identified as having strong performance potential, are those with the best opportunity to grow both professionally and personally with the company, and to contribute to, if not determine, the overall growth and success of the company. Therefore, performance potential (which may be reflected in terms of a ratio of Hay

Points to age) is another important measure of employee performance.

Promotability

Promotability evaluations of employees are also an integral part of the annual performance review. More specifically, in the previously described performance review process, each employee is designated: 1) an estimated promotability status in a given year--"A" (promotable now); "B" (promotable later); "C" (not promotable, employee decision); and "D" (not promotable, company decision), and 2) a promotability projection which is based on both job level--"Level 1" (corporate vice president); "Level 2" (division vice president); "Level 3" (director); "Level 4" (manager); "Level 5" (department head); and "Level 6" (supervisor), and on time frame--"Short-term" (individual may be considered for promotion to job or level, as indicated); "Intermediate-term" (individual may qualify for promotion to job or level indicated with additional exposure or experience); and "Long-term" (individual may progress in time at least to the job or level indicated). When other factors, such as number of job openings, availability of training opportunities, economic trends, etc. are controlled, promotability evaluations, in this company, represent an additional measure of employee job performance.

Absenteeism Policies

Finally, as documented, the company recognizes that on occasion it may be necessary for employees to be away from work. Policies regarding absenteeism for civil service, personal business and extended leaves, etc. and their relationship to continuation of compensation and benefits, vacation allotment, or other matters, have been developed. These tend to be more "voluntary" and the policies depend on the specifics of the given absence; so, they are not described in detail here. Of more interest,

however, are those policies regarding absences which may be more "involuntary"--i.e. absences due to illness or injury. In particular, employees are required to notify supervisors of such an absence, and when the length of the absence is of three or more days, employees are required to report to the Medical Department for a checkup and authorization before returning to work. This suggests that time away from the job, which sometimes acknowledged, is of concern to the company for reasons which may include concern for the health of the employee, and of the employee's colleagues, or, indeed, concern for the interruption in job performance caused by excessive time off the job. Therefore, incidence of absenteeism, or amount of time off a job, is an important measure, especially in relation to amount of time for employee performance in a job.

Description of the Sample

The population from which the sample was drawn is composed of approximately 118 "middle managers": 1) exempt employees whose Hay Points range from less than four hundred points (e.g. analysts, first line supervisors, etc.) to approximately twelve hundred points (e.g. functional heads, directors, etc.); and 2) who represent all of the major functional areas (e.g. Industrial Relations and Personnel, Finance and Control, Law, Marketing and Sales, Computer Systems and Data Processing, Engineering and Technical, Research and Development, International, Public Affairs and Government Relations, etc.). To ensure variability, the sample was stratified somewhat on those dimensions (age, functional area, length of organizational tenure, and job level) thought to have potential bearing on the vacation and performance relationship. An examination of a more detailed description of the sample, presented in Table 4-2, indicates that the participants in the survey represent the

Table 4-2

Description of the Sample¹

Characteristics	Mean	S.D.	N Cases
Age	40.8	9.8	115
Number of Children	1.6	1.5	112
Organizational Tenure (Years)	12.7	8.6	115
Job Tenure (Years)	3.1	3.0	112
Length of Annual Allotted Vacation Time (Weeks)	3.7	1.3	110
	<u>Frequencies (%)</u>		<u>N Cases</u>
Sex			
Male	66.1		78
Female	30.5		36
Marital Status			
Married	75.4		89
Single	15.3		18
Divorced	5.9		7
Education			
High School Diploma or Equivalent	2.5		3
Some College	8.5		10
Bachelor's Degree	24.6		29
Some Graduate or Professional School	16.9		20
Graduate or Professional Degree	43.2		51
Religion			
Protestant	42.4		50
Catholic	34.7		41
Jewish	5.9		7
Agnostic, Atheist	9.3		11
Other	5.1		6
National Origin			
American	85.6		101
European	5.1		6
Latin/South American	2.5		3
African	.8		1
Indian/Pakistani	.8		1
Other	2.6		3

¹Figures may not add up because of missing data on a given item.

Table 4-2 (continued)

Characteristics	Frequencies (%)	N Cases
Department or Functional Area		
Industrial Relations, Personnel	11.0	13
Public Affairs, Government Relations	1.7	2
Law	2.5	3
Finance	21.2	25
Marketing, Sales	10.2	12
Computer Information Systems	7.6	9
Research and Development	16.1	19
International	3.4	4
Engineering and Technical	19.5	23
Hay Points		
Less than 400	14.4	17
400-699	35.6	42
700-1199	45.8	54
1200 and over	.8	1
Salary Range		
Under \$34,000	20.3	24
\$35-\$49,000	38.1	45
\$50-\$65,000	32.2	38
\$65,000 and over	6.8	8

typical middle manager in the company. They are fairly evenly distributed across "middle management" job levels and salary ranges (only one employee falls in a job level which exceeds twelve hundred points--the usual level at which directors and vice presidents are established). The average number of years of service with the company is approximately thirteen years (suggesting that employees are familiar, and do have some experience, with company policies--especially regarding vacations and performance). The average length of annual allotted vacation time is between three and four weeks which, when compared to the vacation schedule described earlier, falls approximately in the middle--between the minimum annual allotment of two weeks and the maximum annual allotment of six weeks. Similarly, the average age is about forty-one which, again,

is an appropriate midpoint between the younger employees who would be in their early twenties and the older employees who would be around 65 years of age. So, with respect to these and other factors such as education, department represented, etc. it is believed that the employees in the sample provide, not only a realistic profile of the managers in this manufacturing organization, but also an appropriate sample for investigating, in general, the vacation practices of managerial employees in relation to their performance and absenteeism.

Description of the Measures

Approximately 270 variables investigated in this research were obtained from a questionnaire. From these, independent, dependent, moderating and descriptive variables were identified and categorized. Scales for these variables were developed, based on a combination of both qualitative factors--e.g. logically including relevant variables, ensuring a sufficient number of items and cases, etc. and quantitative factors--e.g. adequate statistical results from factor analyses, tests of internal consistency (reliability), inter-item and item-scale correlations, etc. which are reported after the measures are described. The development of each of the independent, dependent, moderating and descriptive variables (or scales) is discussed below.

Independent Variable

The independent variable, vacation practices, is measured by a scale composed of the summation of eleven variables in the questionnaire. The variables provide a measure of the extent to which individuals typically use their annual allotted vacation time, based on their behavior over the past three years (i.e. employees are asked to provide responses which represent an average or which reflect typical behavior in the past three

years. Hence, data for each of the past three years are neither requested nor available; only an average for the three years, based on employee perceptions, is requested and provided). Therefore, "extent" is measured by:

- 1) the percentage of vacation time used each year, as well as that not used--i.e. "banked," sacrificed, exchanged for cash payment, or carried over to the next year, 2) the actual total vacation time in number of weeks used, as well as that not used, and 3) the proportional amount of vacation time used compared to colleagues in similar job levels and with a similar number of years of service with the company.¹

Several versions of this vacation scale were developed in attempting to address and balance a number of concerns: 1) relevance and number of variables, 2) variability in responses, as well as number of responses, and 3) statistical results of factor analyses (which help identify those variables that cluster together), inter-correlations of variables, and reliabilities of scales, etc. The final versions (for this and all scales subsequently described) were determined, therefore, by recognizing, weighing and combining all of these factors from a logical and statistical point of view. For example, questions that did not achieve statistical significance, possibly reflected by correlations or results of factor analyses, but that were identified as logically relevant and

¹A parallel set of "vacation patterns and practices" variables provides a measure of the extent to which individuals would like to use their allotted vacation time, i.e. the same items as those in this "actual" measure appear in a "would like" format. The majority of items in this "would like" scale show fairly strong correlations with the respective items in the "actual" scale, though some deviations are present. The results of this comparison are provided with the descriptive results, discussed in Appendix B. In addition, several other variables in the questionnaire were assigned to provide descriptive information on vacation patterns, e.g. length and frequency of vacations, time of year vacations are taken, reasons for taking or not taking vacations, effects of vacations on job performance, etc. These, too, are discussed in Appendix B.

representative of the measure, were included. However, questions that were relevant but which had very low response rates, possibly because of a "don't know" option in the response format, were not included in the measure in order to guarantee a sufficient number of cases.¹

The result of this lengthy process was the development of two "semi-final" scales which measure vacation practices: 1) an actual measure of "average extent to which vacation time is used" (an average amount used over a given period of time which is expressed in terms of weeks, percentages, etc. and which is determined by the employees), and 2) a perceptual measure of "extent to which vacation time is used" (feeling that one can use vacation time or belief that there is a need to use it). However, it was felt the actual measure was more appropriate as it incorporated a larger number of items and provided more specific, quantitative information on the extent to which vacation time is actually used.² So, this was chosen as the final measure of managerial vacation practices.

Hence the vacation practices scale (VAC) is comprised of the following items from the survey: V2, V10, V12, V14, V16, V44, V46, V48, V50, V93, V94. Because of the nature of these items, it was decided that all would be weighed equally (i.e. it could not be justified, either statistically or logically, why or if certain items were more important).³ Responses are ranked on a combined seven, eight and nine point ordinal

¹This same process, of weighing both statistical and logical factors, was employed for each of the subsequent scales developed in this study.

²Some of the descriptive results of the perceptual scale are presented in Appendix B.

³All items in all scales, subsequently described, also carry equal weights.

scale, and scores range from Low (less use of vacation time) to High (more use of vacation time).¹

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables, performance and absenteeism, are measured by four separate scales. More specifically, three scales were developed to measure performance because they are typical indicators of performance which are of importance to the company investigated in this study (described earlier in this chapter). The fourth scale provides a measure of absenteeism. Each is discussed in the following.

Performance Evaluation. Two variables--an employee's average performance rating over the past three years (an average which is determined by the employee), and an employee's current performance rating-- are summed to form the performance evaluation scale.² It was felt that the combination of these two would reflect more of an "average" or confirmed score, and would minimize the effects of extraneous and intervening factors such as illness, rater bias or job changes, which could cause an atypical rating in a given year. There are other items in the questionnaire which also provide information on performance evaluations, but these tend to be of a more perceptual nature; so, it was felt the final scale should include only these two items. Therefore, the performance evaluation scale (PEV) is composed of V105 and V106. Responses

¹Response items for all of the scales in this study have been recoded or adjusted where appropriate, so that each item or variable is ranked on the same number of points for that particular scale. However, because of the nature of the vacation variables, this scale did not lend itself easily to such an adjustment. A similar problem is encountered with a couple of other scales described later.

²Average performance ratings over the past three years, again, reflect an average as perceived by the employee. Actual ratings for each of the three years are neither requested nor available.

are ranked on a nine-point ordinal scale and scores range from Low (performance evaluations) to High.

Performance Potential. A ratio of two variables, Hay Point range to actual age, forms this scale which represents individual performance potential: those who have achieved a high job level and responsibility at an early age. (This achievement is based on performance, rather than on job tenure, etc., as described earlier in Chapter Four). It was felt that this measure could provide a good indication of those individuals who are on a "fast track," have visibility, and a strong potential for success in the company. The adequacy of this measure may be restricted by the interference of extraneous factors such as availability of higher level jobs, or length of tenure, etc., which were not controlled for in this study. However, this measure does provide an alternative to the many existing measures of performance which also have similar limitations. Therefore, the performance potential scale (PERT) is composed of V243 divided by V238. Responses to V243 are ranked on a four-point ordinal scale; while responses to V238 are reflected by actual age in years. The scale ranges from Low (performance potential) to High.

Promotability. Two variables--the actual total number of promotion opportunities accepted over an employee's past three years, and the number of promotion opportunities expected by the employee over the next three years, as provided by the individual--are summed to form this scale.¹ These are combined to minimize the effects of other factors, such as number of available promotions or job tenure. There is a series of questions in the survey which are designed to provide more specific

¹Responses reflect total number over the three year period, as provided by the individual. The actual number for each of the three years is neither requested nor available.

information on current promotability status, as well as on projections of short-term, intermediate-term and overall promotability potential (measures particular to the company investigated, as described earlier); however, a "don't know" option in the response format often resulted in an insufficient number of individuals providing specific information. Unfortunately, several versions of "promotability" which were generated to include some of these questions could not be used because of the large number of missing cases. So, it was decided that promotability would be measured by these two previously cited items which at least provide some average of actual and potential promotability. The final promotability scale (PROM), therefore, is composed of V101 and V102. Responses are ranked on a six-point ordinal scale and scores range from Low (promotability) to High.

Absenteeism. Five variables in the questionnaire reflect an "actual" rate or incidence of absenteeism and are summed to form this scale. The variables provide quantitative information such as average number of occasions absent over the past three years (an average which is determined by the employee), precise number of occasions absent in the current (past) year, average rate of absenteeism compared to colleagues, as well as information on causes or needs that result in absenteeism.¹ It was felt that absenteeism is an indicator of employee attendance behavior which may be analyzed independently, i.e. as an employee's response in relation to vacation practices, as well as a factor which, in combination with other factors, may affect job performance, i.e. in terms of excessive time off the job (absenteeism) which may

¹ Average number of occasions over the past three years, again, reflect an average as perceived by the individual. The actual number for each of the three years is neither requested nor available.

interfere with carrying out the basic responsibilities and/or technical aspects of a job which are required by employee attendance, thereby having a negative effect on job performance. However, the measurement of absenteeism is challenged by many issues; i.e. whether to measure number of days, number of occasions, or number of spells, etc.; how to distinguish between voluntary and involuntary absences; and how to differentiate between job and non-job related reasons for being absent, etc. There are several items in the questionnaire which provide more specific information on particular reasons for being absent from work--whether absences are voluntary or involuntary, on the perceived consequences of absenteeism, as well as on a comparison of actual past behavior to perceived expected behavior regarding absenteeism (number of occasions, time of year, proximity to vacations). And, a number of different scales were developed (especially a scale on the perceived incidence of absenteeism) in an attempt to produce the best measure. However, many of these scales had too few items, low correlations, and/or illogical groupings of variables; and, many appeared to be more descriptive of absenteeism patterns rather than representative of absenteeism rates. So, the previously cited problems affecting the typical or most reliable measurement of absenteeism were evident here also. Therefore, the final absenteeism scale (AB) is comprised of those items that seem most representative of absenteeism, both statistically and practically: V202, V204, V209, V221, V223. Responses are ranked on a five-point ordinal scale (one item is ranked on a six-point scale) and scores range from Low (incidence of absenteeism) to High.

Moderating Variables

The following eight variables were identified as factors, or moderators which affect the relationship between the independent variable,

vacation practices, and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism. Scales for each moderator were developed as follows.

Felt-Fair Vacations. The felt-fair vacation scale is based on the summation of ten variables which reflect an employee's belief that the amount of vacation time allotted is fair, i.e. in relation to type of work or job; job performance, job level, colleagues, health and absenteeism; and an employee's belief that the opportunities to use the vacation time are fair, i.e. in relation to restrictions from job or non-job related factors. Several versions of this measure also were produced, including and excluding variables, etc. But, these emerging scales were often troubled by an insufficient number of cases caused by variables with "don't know" response items, response items that were too limited or too specific, and poor wording of items which could be misinterpreted. In addition, the large number of items in the questionnaire that did represent, to some extent, this measure of fairness were often unrelated both practically and statistically. Consequently, the final felt-fair vacation scale (FFV) is composed of V55, V56, V70, V92, V95, V97, V98, V154, V206, V224. Responses are ranked on a five-point ordinal scale and scores range from Weak (feeling that vacation time and opportunity are fair) to Strong.

Protestant Work Ethic. The Protestant Work Ethic scale is based on the summation of four variables which represent the strength of belief in the "Pro-Protestant Work Ethic" ideals. This scale, developed by Blood (1969), is complemented by four other items which measure the strength of belief in the "Non-Protestant Work Ethic" ideals. These additional items (Non-PWE) were included in the present survey to provide a measure of comparison to the responses to the Pro-PWE items. (And, analyses of these results produced an expected inverse relationship).

However, one disturbing problem encountered with both scales was the surprisingly low internal consistency between the items (.34 and .40 for the Pro-PWE and Non-PWE scales, respectively). And, when a third scale was developed, by combining these two scales, a more respectable reliability was not achieved, i.e. .37. (As can be seen by the reliability coefficients presented in Table 4-3, this is the only scale with such low internal consistency). Furthermore, these results deviate significantly from those of other studies which report higher reliabilities, e.g. .70 (Wanous, 1974; Brief and Aldag, 1975). No statistical explanation can be offered, so the only logical explanation is that the low reliability is peculiar to the sample surveyed. As this moderator is of importance to this study, it was felt it should be investigated, even with the low reliability (Wagner, 1983). Furthermore, it was decided to use that combination of items, measure or scale typically used in other studies, to enable generalizability of results (from past to future research). Developing a new measure, i.e. a different combination of items, a scale with too few items, etc., would not provide results which would lend themselves easily to comparative organizational analysis. So, as most studies report results from the Pro-PWE scale only, it was decided that the Pro-PWE scale would be the measure used in this study. The final Protestant Work Ethic scale (PWE), therefore, is composed of V181, V183, V185, V186. Responses are ranked on a five-point ordinal scale, and scores range from Weak (belief in the PWE) to Strong.

Type A Behavior. The Type A behavior is based on the summation of thirteen variables which reflect the degree to which individuals identify with such behaviors as vocal explosiveness, impatience, aggressiveness, perpetual motion, competition, etc. (Friedman and Rosenman, 1974).

Another version of this was developed to include an additional question

on this theme; however, the results did not reflect any meaningful differences, so it was decided that the original measure developed by Friedman and Rosenman would be used to enable more comparative organizational analysis and generalizability of results. Therefore, the Type A scale (TPA) is comprised of V155 to V167. Responses are ranked on a five-point ordinal scale and scores range from Weak (Type A behavior) to Strong.

Age. Age is reflected in actual number of years which is made possible by combining two items in the survey. Consequently, the age scale (AGE) is comprised of a final (combined items) V238. Responses are ranked in order from Young (age) to Old.

Job Compatibility. The job compatibility scale is represented by four situations (of compatibility) which are derived by "matching" the results of scores from two scales: a Growth Need Strength (GNS) scale and a Motivating Potential Scale (MPS) scale. Each of these scales is described and developed as follows.

First, the GNS scale measures, generally, the personal characteristics of an employee (e.g. individual needs, expectations, preferences, or the extent to which individuals would like to have certain characteristics in a job). More specifically, this scale is formed by combining results or scores from two mini-scales: 1) the first mini-scale is comprised of six items which reflect the degree to which individuals would like certain characteristics such as opportunities for personal growth and development, opportunities for learning new things from work, or chances to exercise independent thoughts and actions in a job. Responses are ranked on a five-point ordinal scale and are averaged to determine a score for this scale; 2) the second mini-scale is comprised of twelve items which reflect individual preferences for particular job

characteristics. That is, individuals are "forced" to choose between two given job situations such as a job in which there is a real chance for individuals to develop new skills and advance in the organization versus a job which provides lots of vacation time and an excellent fringe benefits package; or a job with little freedom to do work the way the individual feels best versus a job where the working conditions are poor, etc. Responses are ranked on a five-point ordinal scale and are averaged to determine a score for this scale.

Second, the MPS scale measures, generally, employee reactions to these job characteristics (those referred to in the GNS scale--i.e. the extent to which these certain job characteristics are present in the employee's job). In particular, this scale is formed by the following two-step process: 1) first, three items which are ranked on a five-point ordinal scale and which reflect the degree to which the job requires use of complex skills, the extent to which it provides opportunities to complete the work, and the extent to which the performance of the job affects others in the organization, etc., are averaged; 2) second, this average of the three items is multiplied by two other items (also ranked on a five-point ordinal scale) which reflect the degree to which the job offers opportunities for independence and freedom, and the extent to which there are chances for individuals to figure how well they are performing in a job. Results of this process determine the overall MPS scale.

Consequently, two scales emerge, i.e. results of one reflect the extent to which individuals possess certain personal characteristics--would like or would prefer to have certain job characteristics present in their employment situation (GNS scale). Results of the other scale

reflect the extent to which these certain job characteristics are actually (or at least perceived to be) present in their employment situation.

Results or scores from the two scales are then "matched" to determine the extent to which the scores from one scale (GNS) correspond to (or are compatible with) the scores from the second scale (MPS scale), i.e. the extent to which the personal characteristics (GNS scores) are compatible with job characteristics (MPS scores). More specifically, the matching process involves the following: 1) distinguishing between high and low GNS scores and high and low MPS scores (determined at that score for which the cumulative frequency is or approximates fifty percent), and 2) comparing the results of the scores to determine the degree of compatibility (individuals with high GNS scores and high MPS scores, or individuals with low GNS scores and low MPS scores) or degree of incompatibility (individuals with high GNS scores and low MPS scores, or individuals with low GNS scores and high MPS scores). For example, individuals who score high on the GNS scale (would like and prefer certain characteristics to a high degree) and who score high on the MPS scale (perceive the job characteristics actually are present to a high degree) are expected to be more compatible with their jobs. (The need for certain characteristics in a job is being met). Or, similarly, individuals who score low on the GNS scale (would like and prefer these characteristics to a lesser degree) and who score low on the MPS scale (perceive these undesirable characteristics actually are present to a lesser degree) are also compatible. Hence, two situations of compatibility emerge: High GNS/High MPS and Low GNS/Low MPS.

In contrast, individuals who score high on the GNS scale (would like and prefer these certain job characteristics to a high degree) but who score low on the MPS scale (perceive these job characteristics are

actually present to a lesser degree) are not compatible, or are more incompatible, with their jobs. (The need for these job characteristics is not being met). Or, similarly, individuals who score low on the GNS scale (would like or prefer these characteristics to a lesser degree) but who score high on the MPS scale (perceive that these particular job characteristics actually are present to a high degree) are also incompatible with their jobs. Hence, two situations of incompatibility emerge: High GNS/Low MPS and Low GNS/High MPS.

This job compatibility scale (derived from the Job Diagnostic Survey, developed by Hackman and Oldham in 1975) was used in Staw and Oldham's (1978) study of the moderating effects of job compatibility on the relationship between absenteeism and performance (described in Chapter Two). Incorporating this same scale enables additional comparative organizational analysis as well as generalizability of results. Therefore, the final job compatibility scale (JC) is composed of V139 to V149, and V168 to V179. Responses are ranked according to degree of compatibility: Low (Incompatibility reflected by either Low GNS/High MPS or High GNS/Low MPS) and High (Compatibility reflected by either Low GNS/Low MPS or High GNS/High MPS).

In addition to this measure, Staw and Oldham also used another section of the Job Diagnostic Survey as an alternative measure of compatibility, i.e. items that measure growth (or job) satisfaction. They proposed that individuals who have high levels of job satisfaction are more compatible with their jobs, while individuals with low levels of job satisfaction experience more incompatibility. And, as expected, they found the results from both scales to be similar. To enable additional comparisons, between and within studies, this scale was included in this analysis as an alternative measure of compatibility.

However, results are merely reported as a comparison, and are not discussed in detail. Four items which reflect an employee's satisfaction with certain aspects of a job such as personal growth and development, challenge, and feelings of worthwhile accomplishment are summed to form the final job satisfaction scale (JS) which is composed of V150 to V153. Responses are ranked on a five-point ordinal scale and scores range from Low (job satisfaction) to High.

Value and Enjoy Vacations. Two separate scales have been developed to measure the extent to which individuals value and enjoy vacations. Scale 1 is comprised of a summation of five items which reflect the absolute value of vacations--in terms of perceived worth, important and enjoyment derived from them. Included in this scale, also, are questions on how important vacations are to maintaining job performance. Scale 2 is comprised of a summation of four items which reflect the relative value of vacations--in terms of preferences for vacations to other types of rewards such as health insurance, educational assistance, savings plans, promotions. The initial attempt to develop only one scale which could adequately measure the value of vacations was not successful, especially after examining the results of factor analyses. More specifically, obvious strong correlations between certain items resulted in what appeared to be two different clusters or measures. Several versions of each measure, e.g. including or excluding variables, as well as combining both in a number of different ways, emerged, but many, including a combined single scale, were not adequate for a number of reasons: several missing cases results because of inclusion of a number of variables which allowed a "don't know" response item; several had too few items in the scale and low correlations between items, etc. Consequently, in the last analysis, two adequate measures, incorporating different

items in each, emerged which could alternatively reflect value of vacations, i.e. from an absolute perspective and from a relative perspective. And, it was felt that both measures or "scales" were representative, both statistically and logically, and that one scale did not supersede the other. As a result, two final scales were adopted: Scale 1 (EVAC 1) is comprised of V59, V60, V61, V63 and V75. Scale 2 (EVAC 2) comprised of V76, V78, V79, and V80. Both are ranked on five-point ordinal scales, and scores range from Low (value) to High.

Vulnerability to Stress. The vulnerability to stress scale is based on the summation of twenty variables which reflect eating, sleeping and exercise habits, social activities and relationships, etc., which create or affect levels of stress (Miller and Smith, 1983). Again, several versions of a measure of vulnerability to stress were developed to include additional questions on causes of stress, e.g. differentiating between job and non-job related causes, or on coping mechanisms most frequently adopted, e.g. recreation, exercise, medication, etc. The results of these measures were not significantly different: so, it was felt the original scale would be adopted in order to enable more comparative organizational analysis and generalizability of results.¹ Therefore, the vulnerability to stress scale (STS) is composed of V116 to V135. Responses are ranked on a five-point ordinal scale and scores range from Less (vulnerability to stress) to More.

Job Level¹. The job level scale is based on a summation of three variables which reflect the number of job levels between the given job and the Chairman and CEO, as well as the Hay Point ranges and salary

¹Some of the results from analyses of these different items are presented in Appendix B where descriptive results are reported and discussed.

ranges of the employee's present job. (Using all three variables served as a check for reliability of results as two of the three are meant to correspond fairly equally). Consequently, and as expected, deletion of any one of the three produced no different results. So, the final job level scale (JLEV) is composed of V100, V243, and V244. Responses are ranked on a combined four and six-point scale and scores range from Low (job level) to High.

Descriptive Variables

Several variables investigated in this research were identified and categorized as those which provide a description of the types of vacation patterns and practices adopted by managers. These variables, which are judged to be informative and interesting, which are examined individually rather than in combined scales, and which reflect the typical vacation patterns of managerial employees are presented in the following three sections and are discussed in Appendix B.

Description of Population Characteristics and Vacation Patterns.

First, a more detailed description of the population, especially in terms of those factors which may have an effect on vacation patterns adopted, or on the relationship of these vacation patterns to performance, is provided. These include such miscellaneous characteristics as health, life outside of the job, incidences of job-related stress, perceptions regarding the effects of vacations on performance, as well as perceptions regarding organizational vacation and performance policies. Second, an outline of the vacation patterns adopted by this managerial population is presented. Patterns described include frequency, length and types of vacations taken, time of year and reasons why vacations are taken, etc. (Both descriptions are derived from the results of

frequency distributions reflected by items which are scattered throughout the survey and, therefore, which cannot be identified more specifically).

Description of Vacation Patterns from a Comparative Level of Analysis.

The "actual vacation patterns" (what managers do) is compared to "perceptual patterns" (what they would like to do regarding vacations). It was felt that what employees would like to do with their vacations may deviate from what they actually do, for whatever reasons. So, V1 to V58 in the survey represent pairs of items which address the same issues, but from different perspectives--i.e. what employees would like to do regarding vacations versus what employees' actual, typical vacation patterns or behaviors are. Again, vacation patterns are reflected by those categories or items mentioned in the first section. Results are discussed in terms of correlation coefficients between the pairs.

In addition, a more specific, but brief, comparison of the vacation patterns adopted by employees, in relation to colleagues, is presented. This was felt to be of particular interest in reflecting how employees feel about their vacation behavior in relation to others' behaviors. Hence, a series of items, V93, V94, V97, V98, V99, provide information on amount of vacation time allotted and used in comparison to colleagues with similar job levels, number of years of service with the company, performance ratings, etc. Again, frequency distributions reflect the results for these items.

Relationship of Vacation Patterns to Individual, Job or Organizational Characteristics. Finally, it was felt that particular vacation patterns may be peculiar to certain types of individuals in certain types of jobs, or under certain conditions. So, certain individual factors (differences in terms of age, levels of education, marital status, living arrangements, health, etc.) and certain job or

organizational factors (in terms of department, job and organizational tenure, job level, salary, amount of travel in a job, etc.) were selected and examined in relation to vacation practices to identify any patterns of peculiarities. In addition, certain vacation patterns (differences in terms of amount of vacation used, length and types of vacations taken, etc.) were selected and examined in relation to more global characteristics such as performance (as measured in this study), belief in the ideas of the PWE, extent to which Type A behavior is exhibited, vulnerability to stress, etc., again, to determine if there were any noticeable differences in habits or patterns. The variables selected and examined are those judged to be most interesting or informative. Since they are scattered throughout the survey, they cannot be identified more specifically.

Reliabilities and Correlations of the Measures

The following tables provide scale statistics for the independent, dependent and moderating variables investigated in this research. (Descriptive variables are not included as they reflect individual items rather than scales). These results provide further statistical support for the development of the final scales previously described.

Reliabilities of Measures (Table 4-3)

Table 4-3 shows reliability statistics, determined by applying the Spearman-Brown formula, to those scales comprised of three or more items. As shown, scale reliabilities (with the exception of the previously described PWE scale) range from a low of .51 for GNS to a high of .83 for EVAC 1, EVAC 2, and JS; and all achieve a level of significance of $p \leq .01$.

Table 4-3

Reliabilities of Measures

Variable (N Items)	\bar{x}	S.D.	N Cases	r (Spearman-Brown)
VAC (11)	59.2	6.5	114	.60
AB (5)	5.9	4.0	116	.71
PWE (4)	10.8	2.6	117	.34
TPA (13)	21.5	7.4	117	.71
STS (20)	22.9	8.8	117	.60
EVAC 1 (5)	18.5	2.5	118	.83
EVAC 2 (4)	5.6	4.1	118	.83
FFV (10)	23.7	8.0	115	.56
JLEV (3)	5.4	2.1	114	.82
JC				
GNS (17)	70.9	9.4	115	.51
MPS (5)	19.2	3.3	116	.69
JS (4)	10.3	3.6	117	.83

Intercorrelations between Independent, Dependent and Moderating Variables (Table 4-4). Table 4-4 shows an intercorrelation matrix of all of the major scales developed in this research. An examination of the results indicates that strong correlations, achieving statistical significance, are evident between several of the scales.

Inter-item and Item-scale Correlations (Appendix C, Table C-1). Table C-1 shows correlation matrices which reflect: 1) inter-item correlations--correlations between all variables within all scales, and 2) item-scale correlations--correlations of each variable in a given scale with that total scale. Again, strong correlations, achieving statistical significance, are evident in all scales.

Table 4-4

Intercorrelations Between Independent, Dependent and Moderating Variables

Variable	VAC	PEV	PROM	AB	EVAC1	EVAC2	FFV	PWE	JLEV	STS	TPA	MPS	GN	JS	AGE
VAC															
PEV	-.11														
PROM	-.06	.06													
AB	.12	.18*	.34**												
EVAC 1	.12	-.12	.06	.06											
EVAC 2	.10	.20*	-.07	.08	.01										
FFV	.14	-.03	.29**	.24**	.25**	.10									
PWE	.01	.19*	-.32**	-.10	-.20*	.05	-.48**								
JLEV	-.01	.10	.03	-.01	-.21**	.11	-.04	-.08							
STS	-.29**	.04	.57**	-.05	-.17*	-.03	-.02	-.02	.11						
TPA	-.06	-.01	.004	-.11	.04	-.27**	-.01	-.18*	-.06	.08					
MPS	-.03	.06	.11	.08	-.03	-.06	.14	-.20*	.28**	.07	.15				
GN	.17*	.27**	.01	.003	-.11	.16*	-.22**	.28**	.07	.14	-.13	.06			
JS	-.23**	.17*	-.11	.04	-.10	-.001	-.18*	.18*	.06	.12	.03	.09	.34**		
AGE	-.17*	.39**	-.02	.09	-.11	.13	-.19*	.33**	-.004	-.001	-.12	.10	.61**	.15*	
	-.12	.03	-.42**	-.55**	-.24**	.08	-.47**	.38**	.13	.24**	.03	-.10	.22**	.16*	.12

*p = .05

**p = .01

Description of the Data Collection Process

Permission and support to conduct a study at the corporate headquarters of this manufacturing concern was obtained from the Vice-President of Personnel, who provided timely input and information, final approval of the questionnaire, as well as final coordination of the study. Data were collected at one location over a period of three months according to the following:

1. Information with regard to vacation and performance practices and policies was extracted from company documents and from discussions with the Vice-President of Personnel and miscellaneous company managers.

2. A pilot study was introduced to test the content of the questionnaire, interpretation of instructions, and the length of time required for completion. Participants in the pilot study represented different geographical areas, types of organizations, functional areas of the business, job levels, ages, and sexes. In particular, this group included three professors (state universities), two corporate lawyers (pharmaceutical firm), two vice-presidents (insurance company and retail organization), and two top level managers (electrical industry and leisure-oriented industry, i.e. sporting goods franchise). Based on suggestions and comments from this pilot study group, and from the Vice-President of Personnel, several revisions in the questionnaire, including additions, deletions, rewording, and re-ordering of questions were made during a three month period until the final questionnaire was developed.

3. Upon approval of the final questionnaire, the Vice-President of Personnel sent communications to appropriate Personnel Directors responsible for corresponding functional areas of the business within the company to inform them of the upcoming study, to convey organizational

support and commitment to the project, and to encourage participation.

4. Approximately one week after the communication was received, a list of potential participants was drawn from a computer run of exempt employees working in all of the functional areas at headquarters (November 3, 1983). From this list, three hundred participants were randomly selected, though some stratification was introduced to ensure adequate representation from different functional areas of the business, age groups, lengths of tenure, and job levels.

5. One day after the participants were selected, questionnaire packets (including questionnaires, computer sheets, pencils, and addressed return envelopes) were hand-delivered by company secretaries and clerical assistants to the three hundred participants (November 4, 1983). Detailed instructions were provided, explaining the reasons for the study, instructions for completing and returning the questionnaires, as well as a return deadline: November 15, 1983. In addition, the instructions emphasized that participation was voluntary, questionnaires would be anonymous (no names were requested) and that complete confidentiality was guaranteed. (A copy of the instructions and final questionnaire is found in Appendix A).

6. During the next two weeks, completed and sealed questionnaires were returned (via the internal mail system) to this researcher at a temporary company address.

7. Approximately 118 questionnaires (thirty-nine percent return rate) were collected by this researcher and were prepared for analysis (November 18, 1983).

Over the next several months computer analyses were performed on these data using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner and Bent, 1975). The results of the analyses

of the General and Sub-Hypotheses are reported and discussed in Chapters Five and Six, respectively; while descriptive results are presented and discussed in Appendix B.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

General Hypothesis

There is a direct positive relationship between managerial vacation practices, measured by the extent to which individuals use their allotted vacation time, and managerial performance, measured by individual performance evaluations, performance potential, and promotability. And, there is a direct negative relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial absenteeism. It is predicted that individuals who have high levels of job performance and a low incidence of absenteeism use more of their allotted vacation time; while individuals who have low levels of job performance and a high incidence of absenteeism use less of their allotted vacation time.

Results for this General Hypothesis are presented in three sections:

First, descriptive statistics (including means, standard deviations, number of cases, etc.) for both the independent variable (vacation practices) and the dependent variables (performance and absenteeism) are presented and briefly described.

Second, the relationships between these independent and dependent variables are explained using means and Pearson Product Moment correlations.

Third, a summary of the results (including regression statistics), as well as concluding comments on the potential relationship between

managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism, are presented.

Descriptive Statistics: Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism

Vacation Practices. Vacation practices are measured by the extent to which individuals use their allotted vacation time. Eleven items in the survey are summed to form the vacation practices scale (VAC). Descriptive statistics in Table 5-1 show that 114 employees (of a possible 118) responded to these items. Their scores range from a low of 38 to a high of 71 (compared to a possible range of 0-71). The mean score for this group of employees, i.e. the average extent to which vacation time is used, is 59.2 and the standard deviation of 6.5. When examining low and high distributions (determined by dividing the scales into halves--low and high--at that score for which the cumulative frequency is, or approximates fifty percent) results show that 54 employees use less of their vacation time and score 60 or lower; while the remaining 60 employees use more of their vacation time, scoring 61 or higher. Compared to a maximum possible score of 71, this cut off score falls on the high end of the scale. Furthermore, when examining extremely low and high distributions (determined by dividing the scale into thirds--low, medium, and high--at that score for which the cumulative frequency is, or approximates, 33.3 percent and 66.7 percent, respectively) results show that 40 employees use the least amount of their allotted vacation time and score 57 or below; while 31 employees use the most vacation time and score 64 or above.¹ These distributions indicate that the majority of employees who participated in this survey

¹This process of dividing the scales into halves and thirds is employed for all scales subsequently discussed in this study.

score on the higher end of the scale and, in general, tend to use a greater (rather than a lesser) proportion of their allotted vacation time.

Performance

Performance is measured by the following three scales.

Performance Evaluations. Two items in the survey are summed to form the performance evaluation scale (PEV). Descriptive statistics in Table 5-1 show that 115 employees (of a possible 118) responded to these items. Their scores range from a low of 40 to a high of 160 (compared to a possible range of 0 - 160). The mean score for this group of employees, i.e. the average performance evaluation, is 128.9 and the standard deviation is 21.4. When low and high distributions are examined, results show that 56 employees receive low performance evaluations (130 or lower); while the remaining 59 receive high evaluations (140 or higher). Compared to a maximum possible evaluation of 160, this cut off score falls on the high end of the scale. Further, when extremely low and high distributions (lower and upper thirds, respectively) are examined, results show that 49 employees receive the lowest evaluations (120 or below); while 25 receive the highest evaluations (150 or above). In general, it appears that the employees in this survey score higher on the performance evaluation scale and tend to receive higher, rather than lower, evaluations.

Performance Potential. A ratio of two items in the survey (Hay Point range to actual age in years) form the performance potential scale (PERT). Descriptive statistics in Table 5-1 show that 114 employees (of 118) responded to these items. Their scores range from a low of 17 to a high of 111 (compared to a possible range of 14.3 - 190.5, calculated by approximating the minimum age to be 21 and the maximum age to be 70). The mean score or average performance potential for this

group is 59.4 and the standard deviation is 20.7. When low and high distributions are examined, findings show that 57 employees have lower performance potential and score 57 or lower; while the remaining 57 employees have higher potential, scoring 58 or above. Compared to the maximum score for this scale, 190.5, this cut off is rather low. And, when extremely low and high scores are examined, results indicate that 36 employees have the lowest performance potential and score 49 or below; while the remaining 39 employees have the highest potential and score 70 or above. These ranges and frequencies indicate that the majority of employees score lower on the scale and, in general, tend to have lower (rather than higher) performance potential.

Promotability. Two items in the survey are summed to form the promotability scale (PROM). Descriptive statistics in Table 5-1 show that all 118 employees responded to these items. Their scores range from a low of 0 to a high of 6 (compared to a possible range of 0 - 10). The mean score for this group, i.e. their average promotability, is 2.1 and the standard deviation is 1.4. When low and high distributions are examined, results show that 82 employees have low promotability and score 2 or lower, while the remaining 36 employees have high promotability and score 3 or higher. This extremely unequal distribution of cases is a result of the large number of cases (47) with tied scores at the cut off score of 2. The cumulative frequency at this score, therefore, is an unusually high 69.5 percent which does not approximate, very well, the desired 50 percent cumulative frequency. Yet, an alternative cut off score of 1 is also not desirable, representing a cumulative frequency of only 29.7 percent.

These scores reflect a fairly unequal distribution and, when compared to the maximum possible score, suggest that employees in this survey tend to receive fewer rather than several promotions. However, the effects of this unequal distribution of cases can be minimized by dividing the scale into thirds and by examining extremely low and high distributions. In particular, 35 employees receive the fewest promotions and score 1 or lower; while an almost equal number of employees, 36, receive the most promotions, scoring 3 or higher. These results provide a better indication of the ranges and frequencies for promotability, so, where appropriate, additional analyses report results which are derived from this more equal distribution (by dividing the scale into thirds rather than into halves).

Absenteeism

Absenteeism is measured by five items in the survey which are summed to form the absenteeism scale (AB). Descriptive statistics in Table 5-1 show that 116 (of 118) employees responded to these items. Their scores range from a low of 0 to a high of 160 (compared to a possible score range of 0 - 220). The mean scores, i.e. average incidence of absenteeism, for this group is 59.1 and the standard deviation is 40.2. When low and high distributions are examined, 62 employees have a lower incidence of absenteeism, scoring 50 or below; while the remaining 54 employees have a higher incidence of absenteeism, scoring 60 or above. However, somewhat unequal distributions of cases occur because of the larger number of cases with tied scores at or near the 50 percent cut off point. In particular, 14 individuals (representing a cumulative frequency of 53.4 percent) score 50 on the scale; while 14 individuals (representing a cumulative frequency of 41.4 percent) score 40. Consequently, these

results, especially when compared to the maximum possible score, suggest that employees in the survey tend to have, in general, a much lower rather than higher incidence of absenteeism. So, to minimize the effects of this unequal distribution, the same process as that employed for the promotability scale can be applied here. In particular, by dividing the scale into thirds, results show that 34 employees have the lowest incidence of absenteeism and score 30 or below; while an almost equal number of employees, 35, have the highest incidence of absenteeism and score 90 or above. Again, where appropriate, additional analyses report results which are derived from this more equal distribution (by dividing the scale into thirds rather than halves).

Relationship Between the Independent Variable (Vacation Practices) and the Dependent Variables (Performance and Absenteeism)

The relationships between vacation practices and performance and between vacation practices and absenteeism are not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a closer examination of each measure of the dependent variable, i.e. performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, and absenteeism, in relation to vacation practices, reveals more meaningful results. More specifically, the sign of the relationship tends to be consistent (i.e. reflected in both mean scores and correlation coefficients) for each particular measure: vacation practices are positively related to promotability and absenteeism (or the form of the relationship tends to be more positive) and negatively related to performance evaluations and performance potential (or the form of the relationship tends to be less positive and more negative). In addition, three of the four measures of the dependent variable (performance evaluations, performance potential and absenteeism) support similar,

though not predicted, relationships with vacation practices; while only one measure (promotability) supports a predicted positive sign in the relationship. So, it is suggested that the relationship between vacation practices and performance is less positive than predicted; instead, the results reflect a more negative relationship. Similarly, the relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism is also less negative than predicted; instead the results reflect a more positive relationship. The relationship of vacation practices to each performance and absenteeism variable is discussed in the following.

Table 5-1

Descriptive Statistics for Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism

Variable	\bar{X}	S.D.	Cases	N	Scale Range	Scale Distribution					
						Lower Half	Upper Half	Lower Third	Upper Third	n	Range
						n	n	n	n		
Vacation Practices (VAC)	59.2	6.5	114	114	38-71	54	60	40	31		
						38-60	61-71	38-57	64-71		
Performance											
Performance Evaluations (PEV)	128.9	21.4	115	115	40-160	56	59	49	25		
						40-130	140-160	40-120	150-160		
Performance Potential (PERT)	59.4	20.7	114	114	17-111	57	57	36	39		
						17-57	58-111	17-49	70-111		
Promotability (PROM)	2.1	1.4	118	118	0-6	82	36	35	36		
						0-2	3-6	0-1	3-6		
Absenteeism (AB)	59.1	40.2	116	116	0-160	62	54	34	35		
						0-50	60-160	0-30	90-160		

Vacation Practices and Performance Evaluations

The sign of the relationship between vacation practices and performance evaluations is negative (or tends to form a more negative relationship).

First, Table 5-2 presents mean scores for performance evaluations, when controlling for vacation practices.¹ The results show that individuals who use more of their allotted vacation time score, on the average, 126 on the PEV scale; while individuals who use less vacation time score, on the average, 132. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

Second, Table 5-3 shows a correlation of $-.11$ between vacation practices and performance evaluations, which confirms further the negative form of this relationship. In addition, when each of the items in the vacation scale is correlated with the total PEV scale, nine of the eleven items show a negative (and sometimes significantly negative) relationship; similarly, each of the two performance evaluation items also shows a negative correlation with the total VAC scale.

These results, while not all significant statistically, consistently support a negative form in the relationship: individuals who use more of their allotted vacation time tend to have lower performance evaluations than individuals who use less of their allotted vacation time.

Vacation Practices and Performance Potential

Similarly, there is a negative relationship between vacation practices and performance potential.

¹Mean scores are determined by dividing the scale into halves at that score for which the cumulative frequency is, or most closely approximates, 50%. The mean scores for all subsequent scales are determined according to the same process.

First, Table 5-2 presents mean scores for performance potential when controlling for vacation practices. Results show that individuals who use more of their allotted vacation time score, on the average, 56.1 on the performance potential scale; while individuals who use less allotted vacation time score, on the average, 62.8. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

In addition, Table 5-3 shows the correlation between vacation practices and performance potential is $-.06$. Though this is not large, it does reflect a more negative (rather than positive) relationship. And, when each of the eleven vacation items is correlated with the total PERT scale, five show a negative (and sometimes significantly negative) relationship; similarly, the correlations between the two items in the performance potential scale and the total VAC scale are also negative.

These results do support a negative form in the relationship: individuals who use more of their allotted vacation time tend to have lower performance potential than individuals who use less of their allotted vacation time.

Vacation Practices and Promotability

In contrast to the preceding, the relationship between vacation practices and promotability is positive (or tends to form a more positive relationship).

Mean scores for promotability, when controlling for vacation practices, are presented in Table 5-2. The results show that individuals who use more of their allotted vacation time score, on the average, 2.3 on promotability; while individuals who use less of their allotted vacation time score, on the average, 1.9. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

Similarly, Table 5-3 shows the correlation between vacation practices

and promotability is also somewhat positive (.12). In addition, the majority of correlations (six of eleven) between each vacation item and the total PROM scale are positive (and some achieve statistical significance); while each of the two items in the promotability scale, also, is positively correlated with the total VAC scale.

These results, therefore, show a tendency toward a positive relationship: individuals who use more of their allotted vacation time tend to have higher promotability than individuals who use less of their allotted vacation time.

Vacation Practices and Absenteeism

Finally, the relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism is positive.

Table 5-2 presents mean scores for absenteeism when controlling for vacation practices. An examination of the results shows that individuals who use more of their allotted vacation time score, on the average, 64.8 on the absenteeism scale; while individuals who use less vacation time score, on the average, 53.3. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

This positive relationship is also reflected in Table 5-3 which shows that the correlation between vacation practices and absenteeism is .12. In addition, eight of the eleven vacation items show a positive correlation with the total AB scale; while four of the five absenteeism items also show positive correlations (and some are significantly positive) with the total VAC scale.

Hence, these results do support a tendency for a positive relationship: individuals who use less of their allotted vacation time have a lower incidence of absenteeism than individuals who use more of their vacation time.

Table 5-2

Mean Scores for Performance and Absenteeism Variables When Controlling For Vacation Practices

Variables	VAC		PEV		PERT		PROM		AB	
	\bar{X}	N Cases	\bar{X}	N Cases	\bar{X}	N Cases	\bar{X}	N Cases	\bar{X}	N Cases
Low VAC	53.8	54	132.0	55	62.8	56	1.9	58	53.3	57
High VAC	64.0	60	126.0	60	56.1	58	2.3	60	64.8	59
All Cases	59.2	114	128.9	115	59.4	114	2.1	118	59.1	116

Table 5-3

Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism

Variables	PEV	105	106	PERT	238	243	PROM	101	102	AB	202	204	209	221	223
VAC	-.11	-.10	-.11	-.06	-.12	-.19*	.12	.14	.09	.12	.02	.13	.19*	.10	-.04
2	-.05			.07			.05			.01					
10	-.06			-.02			.27**			.03					
12	-.01			.003			-.04			.04					
14	-.10			.14			-.07			-.02					
16	.004			-.17*			-.02			.01					
44	-.01			.12			.41**			.20*					
46	-.14			-.09			.19*			.10					
48	-.10			.18*			.06			.07					
50	-.16*			-.17*			-.12			.15					
93	-.06			-.06			-.07			-.09					
94	.01			.10			.02			-.09					

*p \leq .05**p \leq .01

Summary and Conclusion

The preceding findings show no consistent support for the General Hypothesis, i.e. there is no direct positive relationship between vacation practices and performance, as predicted. Similarly, there is no direct negative relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, as predicted. The statistical differences in means are not significantly different from zero, nor are any of the correlations between the major scales. In addition, an examination of Table 5-4, which shows regression statistics for each performance measure and absenteeism as a function of vacation practices, confirms this further. More specifically, a comparison of the R squares for all performance and absenteeism measures indicates the proportion of variance in any performance or absenteeism variable, which is explained by the extent to which individuals use allotted vacation time, is minimal. (R^2 approximates .01 for all variables). Also, a comparison of the standardized regression coefficients (Betas, which range from -.12 to .10) additionally indicates that the extent to which vacation time is used does not significantly affect performance or absenteeism.

A conclusive statement on a direct relationship between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism, from a statistical level of analysis, cannot be provided. That is, the results of all the relationships examined do not achieve statistical significance. However, a more definitive statement on the more specific relationship between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism variable, from a more practical level of analysis, can be presented.

That is, the results when examined in terms of the consistently in the sign or form provide a more meaningful expression of potential relationships (Wagner, 1984). In particular, in terms of performance

and absenteeism: 1) when performance evaluations are examined, the relationship to use of vacation time tends to be negative, 2) when performance potential is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time also tends to be negative, 3) when promotability is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time tends to be positive, and 4) when absenteeism is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time tends to be positive. Therefore, the particular relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism may actually depend on the type or nature of the dependent variable being measured.

Based on this proposition, and based on the premise that the results, while not achieving statistical significance, do reflect more meaningful significance when expressed in terms of potential relationships, it is believed that individuals tend to achieve high levels of performance, reflected in high performance evaluations and performance potential, and a low incidence of absenteeism, when they use less of their allotted vacation time. However, individuals tend to have high promotability when they use more of their allotted vacation time.

Table 5-4

Regression Statistics of Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism

Variables	PEV			PERT			PROM			AB		
	Beta	R ²	F	Beta	R ²	F	Beta	R ²	F	Beta	R ²	F
VAC	-.12	.01	1.4	-.09	.01	.76	.08	.01	.68	.10	.01	1.05

Sub-Hypothesis

There are specific conditions, determined by individual, job and organizational factors, or conditions, which determine when managerial vacation practices are positively related to performance and negatively related to absenteeism (i.e. individuals perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time, or perform at low levels and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time); and when managerial vacation practices are less positively and more negatively related to performance, and less negatively and more positively related to absenteeism (i.e. individuals perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time, or perform at low levels and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time).

In particular, this Sub-Hypothesis is divided into several propositions which predict that the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the following factors: 1) the extent to which individuals feel that the vacation time allotted and the opportunities to use vacation time are fair, 2) the strength of belief in the Protestant Work Ethic, 3) the extent to which individuals exhibit Type A behavior, 4) the age, 5) the degree to which individuals are compatible with their jobs, 6) the extent to which individuals value and enjoy vacations, 7) the vulnerability to stress, and 8) the job level. Each of these provide a basis for the eight propositions which follow. Results for each proposition appear in four sections:

First, descriptive statistics (including means, standard deviations,

number of cases, etc.) for the given factor or condition (which is identified as a moderator) are presented and briefly described.

Second, this factor or moderator is examined, initially in relation to the independent variable, vacation practices, and then in relation to the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism. Results are explained in terms of means and Pearson Product Moment correlations.

Third, the moderating effects of the given factor on the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism are reported. High and low moderating effects are expressed in terms of Pearson Product Moment correlations.

Fourth, a summary of the results (including regression statistics) and concluding comments (with regard to the strength of the moderator as well as the type or nature of the dependent variable measured) of the impact of the moderator on the potential relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism are presented.

Proposition 1

The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the extent to which an individual feels that the vacation time allotted and the opportunities to use the vacation allotment are fair. It is predicted that individuals who feel they have fair vacation time and opportunity perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have high incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time) while individuals who do not feel they have fair vacation time and opportunity perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism

when they use more of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their vacation time).

Descriptive Statistics: Felt-fair Vacations

Felt-fair vacations reflect the extent to which an individual feels that vacation time allotted by the company, and the opportunities to use this time, are fair and adequate, especially in comparison to other employees. Ten items in the survey are summed to form the felt-fair vacation scale (FFV). Descriptive statistics in Table 5-5a show that 115 (of 118) employees responded to these items, and their scores range from a low of 50 to a high of 380 (of a possible range of 0 to 400). For this group of employees, the means score is 237.2 and the standard deviation is 80.1. When low and high distributions are examined, results show that 56 employees do not feel vacation time and opportunity are fair (or feel they are less fair) and score 230 or lower; while the remaining 59 employees feel vacation time and opportunity are fair (or more fair) and score 240 or above. Compared to the possible score range for this scale, this cut off, while fairly well-positioned, does lean somewhat toward the higher end of the scale. When extremely low and high distributions are examined, results show that 40 employees have the strongest feeling that vacations are fair, scoring 200 or below; while an almost equal number, 39 employees, have the strongest feelings that they are fair, scoring 280 or above. Hence, these frequencies indicate that the employees who participated in the survey, while scoring fairly evenly across the scale, tend to lean toward the higher (more "felt-fair") rather than lower (less "felt-fair") end of the scale.

Table 5-5a

Descriptive Statistics for FFV

	\bar{X}	237.2
	S.D.	80.1
	Score Range	50-380
	N Cases	115

Scale Distribution	Score Range	N Cases
Lower Half	50-230	56
Upper Half	240-380	59
Lower Half	50-200	40
Upper Half	280-380	39

Relationship Between FFV and the Independent Variable (Vacation Practices)Relationship Between FFV and the Dependent Variables (Performance and Absenteeism)

FFV and Vacation Practices. The relationship between FFV and the independent variable, vacation practices, is not significantly different from zero, statistically. First, Table 5-5b presents mean scores for vacation practices when controlling for FFV. The findings show that individuals who feel vacation time and opportunity are fair score, on the average, 58.9 on the vacation scale; while individuals who feel vacation time and opportunity are not, or less, fair score, on the average 59.4. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

Yet, Table 5-5c shows the correlation between FFV and use of vacation time to be virtually non-significant, i.e. .01. Still, when each of the items in the FFV scale is correlated with the total VAC scale, the majority (six of ten) are negatively (and often significantly negatively) correlated. And, the majority (six of eleven) of the items in the VAC scale show a negative, and often significantly negative, correlation with the total FFV scale.

The results, while hinting at a negative relationship, do not clearly support this form. Therefore, there is no clear relationship between the extent to which individuals feel vacation time and opportunity are fair and the amount of allotted vacation time they use.

FFV and Performance and Absenteeism. The relationship between FFV and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism, is not significantly different from zero for all statistical analyses. However, a closer examination of the results for each performance and absenteeism measure reflects more meaningful results, i.e. there is evidence of some form of relationship, and the form depends on each particular measure. More specifically, FFV tends to be positively related to performance evaluations and negatively related to the remaining measures: performance potential, promotability and absenteeism. Each is discussed in the following.

FFV and Performance Evaluations. The relationship between FFV and performance evaluations is positive.

First, Table 5-5b presents mean scores for performance evaluations when controlling for FFV. The findings show that individuals who feel vacation time and opportunity are fair score, on the average,

133.6 on the performance evaluation scale; while individuals who feel vacation time and opportunity are not fair score, on the average, 123.9. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

Second, Table 5-5c shows a significant positive correlation (.19) between FFV and performance evaluations. In addition, when each FFV item is correlated with the total PEV scale, eight of the ten show positive (some significantly positive) correlations. Similarly, when each PEV item is correlated with the total FFV scale, both show significant positive correlations.

Consequently, these results support a positive form in the relationship: individuals who feel vacation time and opportunity are fair tend to receive higher performance evaluations than individuals who feel vacation time and opportunity are not fair.

FFV and Performance Potential. In contrast, the relationship between FFV and performance potential is negative. Mean scores for performance potential, when controlling for FFV, in Table 5-5b show that individuals with strong FFV beliefs score, on the average, 55.1 on the performance potential scale; while individuals with weak FFV beliefs score, on the average, 64.0. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

Similarly, Table 5-5c shows that the correlation between FFV and performance potential is significantly negative (-.32). In addition, when each of the ten variables in the FFV scale is correlated with the total PERT scale, all show negative (and sometimes significantly negative) correlations. And, one of two items in the PERT scale is negatively correlated with the total FFV scale.

These results, especially the significant correlation, clearly support a negative relationship: individuals who believe vacation time and opportunity are fair have lower performance potential than individuals who believe vacation time and opportunity are not fair.

FFV and Promotability. Similarly, the relationship between FFV and promotability is negative. Table 5-5c presents mean scores for promotability when controlling for FFV. Individuals who have strong FFV beliefs score, on the average, 1.9 on promotability, while individuals who have weak FFV beliefs score, on the average, 2.3. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

And, Table 5-5c also shows a negative correlation ($-.10$) between FFV and promotability. In addition, when each of the items in the FFV scale is correlated with the total PROM scale, eight of ten show negative (and often significantly negative) correlations. Similarly, both items in the PROM scale show negative correlations with the total FFV scale.

These results tend to support a negative relationship between FFV and promotability: individuals who believe vacation time and opportunity are fair have lower promotability than individuals who believe time and opportunity are not fair.

FFV and Absenteeism. Finally, the relationship between FFV and absenteeism is also negative. Table 505b presents mean scores for absenteeism when controlling for FFV. The findings show that individuals with strong FFV beliefs score, on the average, 53.7 on the absenteeism scale; while individuals with weak beliefs score, on the average, 64.7. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

In addition, Table 5-5c shows a significant negative correlation between FFV and absenteeism ($-.19$). And, when each FFV item is correlated with the total AB scale, eight of ten show negative correlations,

and some achieve statistical significance. Similarly, four of the five absenteeism items show negative (and sometimes significantly negative) correlations with the total FFV scale.

These results, especially the significant negative correlation, support a negative relationship: individuals who feel vacation time and opportunity are fair have a lower incidence of absenteeism than individuals who feel vacation time and opportunity are not fair.

Table 5-5b

Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for FFV

Variables	VAC		PEV		PERT		PROM		AB		FFV	
	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N
Low FFV	59.4	58	123.9	56	64.0	55	2.3	59	64.7	57	169.5	56
High FFV	58.9	56	133.6	59	55.1	59	1.9	59	53.7	59	301.5	59
All Cases	59.2	114	128.9	115	59.4	114	2.1	118	59.1	116	237.2	115

Table 5-5c
Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of FFV with Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables

Variable/Items	FFV	55	56	70	92	95	97	98	154	206	224
VAC	.01	.07	.26**	-.14	-.01	-.17*	.13	.03	-.13	-.16*	-.01
PEV	.19*	.12	.14	.18*	.14	-.01	-.03	.13	.10	.96**	.13
PERT	-.32**	-.17*	-.11	-.32**	-.18*	-.22**	-.15	-.11	-.28**	-.13	-.06
PROM	-.10	.07	.07	-.17*	-.18*	-.17*	-.02	-.05	-.07	-.12	-.03
AB	-.19*	-.003	-.04	-.21*	-.12	-.14	.09	.13	-.16*	-.54**	-.19*
(VAC) 2	10	12	14	16	44	46	48	50	93	94 (PEV)	105
FFV	.16*	-.18*	-.02	-.12	.08	-.25**	.08	-.22**	.07	.28**	.22**
										.19*	.16*
(PERT) 238	243	(PROM)	101	102	(AB)	202	204	209	221	223	
FFV	.38**	-.09	-.04	-.14		-.24**	-.33**	-.05	-.09	.14	

*p \leq .05

**p \leq .01

Summary

The results of the relationship between FFV and the independent variable and dependent variables depend on the relationships being investigated. For example, there is no clear relationship between FFV and the independent variable, vacation practices. Yet, the relationship between FFV and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism, depends on the specific measure. In particular, the relationship between FFV and the performance evaluations is positive (or potentially positive) while the relationships between FFV and the remaining measures of the dependent variable are negative: individuals who feel vacation time and opportunity are fair tend to have higher performance evaluations and a lower incidence of absenteeism than individuals who feel they are not fair; however, individuals who do not feel vacation time and opportunity are fair have higher performance potential and promotability than individuals who feel they are fair.

Moderating Effects of FFV on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices,

Performance and Absenteeism

The FFV scale is divided into low and high scores which are selected out, individually, and examined as moderators of the relationship between the independent variable, vacation practices, and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism.¹ (In the analyses that follow, the correlations between moderator and the independent-dependent

¹Low and high scores for this, and all scales are determined by dividing the scale into halves at that score for which the cumulative frequency is or approximates fifty percent.

variables are low enough to cause no obvious restrictions in range within moderator sub-groups).¹

High FFV Scores: Moderating Effects on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When high FFV scores moderate, the relationships between vacation practices, performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero for all statistical analyses performed on the data. However, a more specific examination of the relationship between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results, i.e. reflecting a tendency toward some form of relationship. In particular, three of the four measures of the dependent variable are related to vacation practices, as predicted: vacation practices are negatively related to both performance evaluations and performance potential (or tend to show more negative correlations) and positively related to absenteeism (or show a more positive correlation). But, vacation practices, also, are positively related to promotability, unexpectedly. The specific results for each are presented below.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, Pearson Product Moment correlations in Table 5-5d show a negative relationship (-.15). Similarly, when vacation practices are examined in relation to performance potential, correlation in Table 5-5d reflect an even larger, significantly negative relationship, i.e. -.23. In contrast, vacation practices, when examined in relation to promotability, show a positive relationship as indicated in Table 5-5d which

¹Staw and Oldham (1978) report that no restriction in range is evident if the correlations between the moderator and the independent-dependent variables are low enough (e.g. .20 or lower). The correlations between all moderators and the independent-dependent variables in this study are quite low.

shows a significant positive correlation between use of vacation time and promotability (.24). Finally, an examination of the relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, for individuals believing vacation time and opportunity are fair, reveals a more positive relationship. That is, correlation coefficients, in Table 5-5d, reflect a significant correlation between use of vacation time and absenteeism (.26).

Low FFV Scores: Moderating Effects on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When low FFV scores moderate, the relationships between vacation practices, performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a more specific examination of the relationship between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results, i.e. reflecting a trend toward some form of relationship. In particular, vacation practices are negatively related (i.e. show a negative correlation) to performance evaluations and positively related to performance potential; but, there are no clear relationships between vacation practices and the remaining measures: promotability and absenteeism. The specific correlations for each are presented in the following.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, correlations, reported in Table 5-5d, though not large, reflect a more negative than positive relationship (i.e. -.07). In contrast, when vacation practices are examined in relation to performance potential, the correlation in Table 5-5d, though not large, reflects a more positive than negative relationship (i.e. .07). However, when vacation practices are examined in relation to promotability, the results

in Table 5-5d show virtually no correlation (.002). Similarly, there is little evidence of any relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism for individuals who believe vacation time and opportunity are not fair. In particular, Table 5-5d reflects a correlation of -.01 between vacations and absenteeism.

Table 5-5d

Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism
Variables when Controlling for FFV

Variables	PEV	PERT	PROM	AB
Low FFV	-.07	.07	.002	-.01
High FFV	-.15	-.23*	.24*	.26*

*p \leq .05

Summary

The overall results of the moderating effects of FFV on the relationship between the independent and dependent variables are not significant, statistically. However, more specific results expressed in terms of the strength of the moderator, FFV, are more interesting and meaningful. In particular: 1) for individuals believing vacation time and opportunity are fair: there are predicted negative relationships between vacation practices and performance evaluations and performance potential, and a predicted positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism. But, there is an unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability, and 2) for individuals believing vacation time and opportunity are not fair: there is an expected

positive relationship between vacation practices and performance potential, but an unexpected negative relationship between vacation practices and performance evaluations. And, there are no clear relationships between vacation practices and promotability or absenteeism.

Summary and Conclusion

The findings in the examination: 1) of vacation practices, and of performance and absenteeism, in relation to FFV, and 2) of the relationship between these vacation practices and performance and absenteeism variables when moderated by FFV show no consistent support for Proposition 1, i.e. the relationships between vacation practices, performance and absenteeism are not consistently or significantly affected by the extent to which individuals feel the vacation time allotted and the opportunities to use the time are fair, as predicted. The statistical differences in means and resultant correlation coefficients are not significantly different from zero. (However, it should be noted that some correlations between vacation practices and certain performance and absenteeism measures do achieve statistical significance). An examination of Table 5-5e which shows regression statistics for each performance and absenteeism variable as a function of both vacation practices and FFV, confirms further this notion. A comparison of R squares for all performance and absenteeism measures indicates the proportion of variance in any performance and absenteeism variable, which is explained by the extent to which an individual uses vacation time, and the extent to which an individual feels vacation time and opportunity are fair, is minimal (R^2 range from .02 to .09). Also, a comparison of the standardized regression coefficients additionally indicates that the extent to which vacation time is used and the extent to which individuals feel vacation

vacation time and opportunity are fair, do not consistently affect all performance and absenteeism measures. For example, when the dependent variable is reflected in performance evaluations, promotability and absenteeism, standardized regression coefficients (Betas) range from $-.11$ to $.10$ for vacations and from $-.19$ to $.18$ for FFV. However, an examination of the regression coefficients for performance potential, while not extremely large, suggests that FFV, in combination with the extent to which vacation time is used, does have more of an influence than has been expressed (Betas are $-.09$ and $-.28$ for vacations and FFV, respectively). Still, this influence is evident in only one of the four performance/absenteeism indices.

Table 5-5e

FFV: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation,
Performance and Absenteeism Variables

Moderating Variable	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Beta VAC / FFV		R ²	F
FFV	VAC	PEV	$-.11$	$.18$	$.05$	2.5
		PERT	$-.09$	$-.28^*$	$.09$	4.8
		PROM	$.08$	$-.13$	$.02$	1.2
		AB	$.10$	$-.19$	$.05$	2.3

*Beta $\geq .20$

So, a conclusive statement on how FFV affects the relationship between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism cannot be provided from a statistical point of view. That is, the results of all

of the relationships examined do not achieve statistical significance. However, a more definitive statement on how FFV affects the special relationships between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism variable can be presented from a practical point of view. That is, the results, when examined in terms of consistency in the form or sign, provide a more meaningful expression of potential relationships. In particular, with regard to performance and absenteeism: 1) when performance evaluations are examined, the relationship to use of vacation time tends to be negative for individuals believing vacation time and opportunity are fair; in comparison, for individuals believing vacation time and opportunity are not fair, the relationship tends, also, to be somewhat negative (but correlations are of a lesser magnitude), 2) when performance potential is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time tends to be negative for individuals who believe vacation time and opportunity are fair; in contrast, for individuals who believe vacation time and opportunity are not fair, the relationship tends to be more positive, 3) when promotability is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is significantly positive for individuals who believe vacation time and opportunity are fair; in comparison, for individuals who believe vacation time and opportunity are not fair, the relationship is not clear (but shows a less positive correlation), and 4) when absenteeism is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is positive for individuals who believe vacation time and opportunity are fair; in comparison, for individuals who believe vacation time and opportunity are not fair; the relationship to use of vacation time is not clear.

Therefore, the moderating effects of FFV on the relationship between vacation practices and performance or absenteeism are more

meaningful or pronounced when the strength of the moderator (weak or strong) and the dependent variable being measured (performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, or absenteeism) are identified. Based on this proposition, and based on the premise that the results, while not achieving statistical significance, do reflect more meaningful significance when expressed in terms of potential relationships, it is believed that: 1) individuals who feel vacation time and opportunity are fair tend to have high levels of performance, reflected in performance evaluations and performance potential, and a low incidence of absenteeism, when they use less of their allotted vacation time. However, they have high promotability when they use more of their allotted vacation time, and 2) individuals who feel vacation time and opportunity are not fair tend to have high performance, reflected in performance evaluations, also when they use less vacation time. However, they tend to have high performance potential when they use more of their allotted vacation time.

Proposition 2

The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the degree to which an individual believes in the ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic. It is predicted that individuals who have a strong belief in the ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time); while individuals who have a weak belief in the ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time).

Descriptive Statistics: Protestant Work Ethic

Belief in the ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic reflects the degree to which an individual feels that personal worth depends on occupational achievement and hard work. It is measured by four items in the survey which are summed to form the "Pro-Protestant Work Ethic" scale (PWE). Descriptive statistics in Table 5-6a show that 117 employees (of a possible 118) responded to these items, and their scores range from a low of forty to a high of 160 (of a possible range of 0-160). For this group of employees, the mean score, i.e. average strength of belief in the PWE, is 107.8 and the standard deviation is 26.1. When low and high distributions are examined, results show that forty-eight employees have a weak belief in the PWE and score 100 or lower; while the remaining sixty-nine employees have a strong belief in the PWE and score 110 or above. Compared to the maximum possible score of 160, this cutoff score falls on the higher end of the scale. (The unequal distribution of cases

is a result of tied scores at or near the cutoff, i.e. sixteen, twenty-five and twenty cases scored 100, 110 and 120, respectively. When extremely low and high distributions are examined, results show that thirty-two employees have the weakest beliefs in the PWE, scoring ninety or below; while forty-four employees have the strongest beliefs, scoring 120 or above. These ranges and frequencies indicate that the majority of employees who participated in this survey score on the higher end of the scale and, in general, tend to hold stronger, rather than weaker, beliefs in the PWE ideals

Table 5-6a
Descriptive Statistics for PWE

\bar{X}	107.8	
S.D.	26.1	
Score Range	40-160	
N Cases	117	
Scale Distribution	Score Range	N Cases
Lower Half	40-100	48
Upper Half	110-160	69
Lower Third	40-90	32
Upper Third	120-160	44

Relationship Between PWE and the Independent Variable (Vacation Practices)

Relationship Between PWE and the Dependent Variables (Performance and Absenteeism)

PWE and Vacation Practices. The relationship between PWE and the independent variable, vacation practices, is not significantly different from zero, statistically. However a closer examination reflects more meaningful results, i.e. the sign of the relationship tends to be negative.

First, Table 5-6b presents mean scores for vacation practices when controlling for PWE. The findings show that individuals who have a strong belief in the PWE score, on the average, 58.9 on the vacation scale; while individuals who have a weak belief score, on the average, 59.5. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

However, Table 5-6c shows that there is virtually no correlation between belief in the PWE and vacation practices (i.e. $-.01$). Still, when each item in the PWE scale is correlated with the total VAC scale, half show a negative relationship. And, when each item in the VAC scale is correlated with the total PWE scale, the majority, seven of eleven, are negatively correlated.

These results, therefore, hint at a more negative, than positive relationship: individuals who have a strong belief in the PWE tend to use less of their allotted time than individuals who have a weak belief.

PWE and Performance and Absenteeism. The relationship between PWE and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism, are not significantly different from zero for all statistical analyses. However, a closer examination of the results of each particular performance and

absenteeism measure shows more meaningful results, i.e. there is evidence of some form of relationship, and the form depends on each particular measure. More specifically, PWE is positively related to performance evaluations and performance potential (or tends to be more positive than negative) and negatively related to promotability and absenteeism (or is less positive and tends to be more negative). Each is discussed in the following.

PWE and Performance Evaluations. The relationship between PWE and performance evaluations is positive. Table 5-6b presents mean scores for performance evaluations when controlling for PWE. The findings show that individuals who have a strong belief in the PWE, score on the average, 130.1 on the performance evaluation scale; while individuals who have a weak belief in the PWE score, on the average, 127.1 Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

Similarly, Table 5-6c also presents results which reflect a positive correlation between PWE and performance evaluations (.10). In addition, when each item in the PWE scale is correlated with the total PEV scale, two of the four show a positive, and sometimes significantly positive, correlation. And, both items in the total PEV scale are positively correlated with the total PWE scale.

These results support a potentially positive relationship: individuals who have a strong belief in the ideals of the PWE have higher performance evaluations than individuals who have a weak PWE belief.

PWE and Performance Potential. Similarly, the relationship between PWE and performance potential is positive. Table 5-6b presents mean scores for performance potential when controlling for PWE. The results show that individuals who have a strong belief in the PWE score,

on the average, 58.1. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

Second, results in Table 5-6c report that the correlation between PWE and performance potential, though not large, reflects a more positive (than negative) relationship, i.e. .03. In addition, when each item in the PWE scale is correlated with the total PERT scale, two of the four are positively related. And, both items in the PERT scale show positive correlations with the PWE scale.

These results, therefore, indicate the sign of the relationship tends to be positive: individuals who have a strong PWE belief have higher performance potential than individuals who have a weak PWE belief.

PWE and Promotability. In contrast, the relationship between PWE and promotability appears to be negative. Table 5-6b presents mean scores for promotability when controlling for PWE. The results show that individuals who have strong PWE beliefs score, on the average, 2.0 on the promotability scale; while individuals who have weak PWE beliefs score, on the average, 2.2 on the scale. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

However, Table 5-6c shows virtually no correlation between PWE and promotability (-.01). Still, when each of the PWE items is correlated with the total PROM scale, two of the four items lean in a negative direction. And, when the two items in the PROM scale are correlated with PWE, one reflects a negative relationship.

Overall, these results tend to support a more negative (than positive) relationship: individuals who have a strong belief in the PWE have lower promotability than individuals who have a weak belief.

PWE and Absenteeism. Finally, the relationship between PWE and absenteeism is negative. Table 5-6b presents mean scores for absenteeism when controlling for PWE. The findings show that individuals having strong PWE beliefs score, on the average, 54.1 on the absenteeism scale; while individuals having weak PWE beliefs score, on the average, 66.6. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

Furthermore, Table 5-6b shows that the correlation between PWE and absenteeism is significantly negative, $-.21$. And, when each item in the PWE scale is correlated with the total absenteeism scale, all variables are negatively, and sometimes significantly, correlated. Similarly, each item in the AB scale is negatively correlated with the total PWE scale (and four of the five achieve statistical significance).

These results, especially the significantly negative correlation, support a negative form in the relationship: individuals who have strong PWE beliefs have a lower incidence of absenteeism than individuals who have weak PWE beliefs.

Table 5-6b

Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for PWE

Variables	VAC		PEV		PERT		PROM		AB		PWE	
	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N
Low PWE	59.5	47	127.1	48	58.1	46	2.2	49	66.6	47	83.5	48
High PWE	58.9	67	130.1	67	60.3	68	2.0	69	54.1	69	124.6	69
All Cases	59.2	114	128.9	115	59.4	114	2.1	118	59.1	116	107.8	117

Table 5-6c

Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of PWE with Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables

[illegible]

***p < .05**

****p** ≤ .01

Summary

The results of the relationship between PWE and the independent and dependent variables support potential signs in each relationship. For example, the relationship between PWE and the independent variable, vacation practices, is negative, or tends to be more negative than positive: individuals who have strong PWE beliefs use less allotted vacation time than individuals who have weak PWE beliefs. The relationships between PWE and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism, depend on the specific measure. In particular, the relationships between PWE and performance evaluations and performance potential are positive (or tend to be more positive than negative); while the relationships between PWE and promotability and absenteeism are negative: individuals who have strong beliefs in the ideals of the PWE have higher performance evaluations, performance potential, and a lower incidence of absenteeism than individuals with weak beliefs. However, individuals with weak PWE beliefs have higher promotability than individuals with strong PWE beliefs.

Moderating Effects of PWE on the Relationship Between Vacation

Practices, Performance and Absenteeism

The PWE scale is divided into low and high scores which are selected out, individually, and examined as moderators of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. (In the analyses that follow, the correlations between moderator and the independent-dependent variables are low enough to cause no restriction in range within moderator subgroups as described earlier).

High PWE Scores: Moderating Effects on the Relationships Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When high PWE scores moderate, the relationship between vacation practices and performance

and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a more specific examination of the relationship between vacations and each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results, i.e. reflecting a tendency toward some form of relationship. In particular, vacation practices are negatively related to performance evaluations and performance potential (or tend to be more negative than positive), and positively related to absenteeism. However, vacation practices are also positively related to promotability, unexpectedly. The specific results for each are presented below.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, results of correlations, reported in Table 5-6d, reflect a negative sign in the relationship ($-.09$). Similarly, when vacation practices are examined in relation to performance potential, results of Pearson Product Moment correlations in Table 5-6d show that when strong PWE beliefs prevail, the correlation between use of vacation time and performance potential is significantly negative ($-.20$). In contrast, when vacation practices are examined in relation to promotability, results of correlations reflect a more positive relationship, i.e. $.07$. Finally, an examination of the relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism reflects an even stronger positive relationship, as indicated by the positive correlation, $.16$, reported in Table 5-6d.

Low PWE Scores: Moderating Effects on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When low PWE scores moderate, the relationships between vacation practices, performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a more specific examination of the relationship

between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results, i.e. reflecting a tendency toward some form of relationship. In particular, vacation practices are positively related to performance potential and promotability. However, vacation practices are also positively related to absenteeism and negatively related to performance evaluations. The specific results for each are discussed below.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, results of correlations, presented in Table 5-6d, show a somewhat negative relationship, $-.13$. In contrast, when vacation practices are examined in relation to performance potential, the relationship appears to be more positive, i.e. Table 5-6d reports a correlation coefficient of $.14$. Similarly, for individuals holding weak beliefs in the PWE, there is an indication of a positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability as reflected by a correlation coefficient of $.17$. Finally, when vacation practices are examined in relation to absenteeism, results of correlations are less strong, but reflect, in Table 5-6d, a positive tendency in the sign of the relationship ($.06$).

Table 5-6d

Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism
Variables when Controlling for PWE

Variables	PEV	PERT	PROM	AB
Low PWE	$-.13$	$.14$	$.17$	$.06$
High PWE	$-.09$	$-.20$	$.07$	$.16$

Summary

The overall results of the moderating effects of PWE on the relationship between the independent and dependent variables are not statistically significant. However, more specific results, expressed in terms of the strength of the moderator, PWE, are more interesting and meaningful. In particular; 1) for individuals having strong beliefs in the PWE, there are expected negative relationships between vacation practices and performance evaluations and between vacation practices and performance potential, and an expected positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism. But, there is also an unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability; and 2) for individuals having weak beliefs in the PWE, there are expected positive relationships between vacation practices and performance potential and promotability; however, there is an unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, and an unexpected negative relationship between vacation practices and performance evaluations.

Summary and Conclusion

The findings in the examination: 1) of vacation practices, and of performance and absenteeism, in relation to PWE, and 2) of the relationship between these vacation practices and performance and absenteeism variables when moderated by PWE, show no consistent support for Proposition 2, i.e. the relationships between vacation practices, performance and absenteeism are not consistently or significantly affected by the strength of belief in the PWE, as predicted. The statistical differences reflected on means and most resultant correlations, are not significantly different from zero. (However, it should be noted that the correlations between vacations and certain performance or

absenteeism measures do achieve some significance). Similarly, an examination of Table 5-6e shows regression statistics for each performance and absenteeism variable as a function of both vacation practices and PWE, further confirms this general notion. A comparison of the R squares for all performance or absenteeism measures indicates the proportion of variance in any performance or absenteeism variable, which is explained by the extent to which individuals use vacation time and the strength of their belief in the PWE, is minimal (R^2 range from .01 to .07). And, a comparison of the standardized regression coefficients (Betas) additionally indicates that the extent to which vacation time is used and the strength of the belief in the PWE does not consistently affect all performance and absenteeism measures. For example, for performance evaluations, performance potential and promotability, Betas range from -.12 to .10 for vacation, and from -.01 to .11 for PWE. However, an examination of the regression coefficients for absenteeism, while not extremely large, suggest that PWE, in combination with use of vacation time, does have more of an effect on absenteeism than is expressed (Betas are .10 and -.24 for vacations and PWE, respectively). Still, this influence is evident in only one of four measures of the dependent variable.

Table 5-6e

PWE: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation,
Performance and Absenteeism Variables

Moderating Variable	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Beta VAC / PWE		R ²	F
PWE	VAC	PEV	-.12	.11	.02	1.4
		PERT	-.09	-.01	.01	.4
		PROM	.09	-.01	.01	.5
		AB	.10	-.24*	.07	3.7

*Beta \geq .20

A conclusive statement on how PWE ideals affect the relationship between vacations and performance or absenteeism cannot be provided, from a statistical point of view. That is, the results of all of the analyses examined do not achieve statistical significance. However, a more definitive statement on how PWE affects the more specific relationship between vacations and each performance and absenteeism variable can be presented from a practical point of view. That is, the results, when examined in terms of consistency in the form or sign of the relationship, provide a meaningful expression of potential relationships. In particular, with regard to performance and absenteeism: 1) when performance evaluations are examined, the relationship to use of vacation time tends to be negative for individuals having weak beliefs in the PWE; in comparison, for individuals having strong PWE beliefs, the relationship is also negative (but to a lesser degree), 2) when performance potential is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is

negative for individuals having strong PWE beliefs; in contrast, for individuals having weak PWE beliefs, the relationship is more positive, 3) when promotability is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time also tends to be positive for individuals with weak PWE beliefs; in comparison, for individuals with strong PWE beliefs, the relationship is also positive (but of a lesser magnitude), and 4) when absenteeism is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is positive for individuals with strong PWE beliefs; in comparison, for individuals with weak PWE beliefs, the relationship to use of vacation time also tends to be positive (but to a lesser degree).

Therefore, the moderating effects of PWE on the relationships between vacation practices and performance or absenteeism are more meaningful or pronounced when the strength of the moderator (weak or strong) and the dependent variable being measured (performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, or absenteeism) are identified. Based on this proposition, and based on the premise that the results, while not achieving statistical significance, do reflect more meaningful significance when expressed in terms of potential relationships, it is believed that: 1) individuals who have strong PWE beliefs have high levels of performance, reflected in performance evaluations and performance potential, and a low incidence of absenteeism, when they use less of their allotted vacation time. However, they have high promotability when they use more vacation time, and 2) individuals who have weak PWE beliefs have high levels of performance, reflected in performance potential and promotability, when they use more of their allotted vacation time. Yet, they have high performance evaluations and a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time.

Proposition 3

The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the degree to which an individual exhibits Type A behavior. It is predicted that individuals who exhibit strong Type A behavior perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time); while individuals who exhibit weak Type A behavior perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time).

Descriptive Statistics: Type A Behavior

Type A behavior reflects the degree to which an individual is a "workaholic". Thirteen items in the survey are summed to form the Type A behavior scale (TPA). Descriptive statistics reported in Table 5-7a show that 117 employees (of 118) responded to these items, and their scores range from a low of thirty to a high of 420 (of a possible range of zero to 520). For this group of employees, the average score, i.e. average extent to which individuals exhibit Type A behavior, is 215.0 and the standard deviation is 74.4. When low and high distributions are examined, results show that fifty-seven employees exhibit weak Type A behavior, and score 210 or lower; while the remaining sixty employees exhibit strong Type A behavior and score 220 or above. Compared to the possible score range, this cutoff point is on the lower end of the scale. When extremely low and high distributions are examined, it can be seen that forty employees exhibit the lowest Type A behavior, scoring 180 or

below; while the remaining forty-three employees display the strongest Type A behavior, scoring 250 or above. These scores and ranges indicate that the majority of the employees who participated in this survey score on the lower end of the scale and, in general, tend to exhibit weaker (rather than stronger) Type A behavior.

Table 5-7a
Descriptive Statistics for TPA

\bar{X}	215.0	
S.D.	74.4	
Score Range	30-420	
N Cases	117	
Scale Distribution	Score Range	N Cases
Lower Half	30-210	57
Upper Half	220-420	60
Lower Third	30-180	40
Upper Third	250-420	43

Relationship Between Type A Behavior and the Independent Variable
(Vacation Practices)

Relationship Between Type A Behavior and the Dependent Variables
(Performance and Absenteeism)

Type A and Vacation Practices. The relationship between Type A behavior and the independent variable, vacation practices, is not significantly different from zero statistically. However, a closer examination of the results shows a more meaningful relationship, i.e. the sign of the relationship tends to be negative.

First, Table 5-7b presents mean scores for vacation practices when controlling for Type A behavior. The findings show that individuals who exhibit strong Type A behavior score, on the average, 58.8 on the vacation scale; while individuals who exhibit weak Type A behavior score, on the average, 59.5. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

Second, Table 5-7c shows the correlation between Type A behavior and vacation practices is $-.03$. While this is not large, it does suggest a tendency toward a more negative than positive relationship. In addition, when each of the thirteen items in the scale is correlated with the total VAC scale, the majority (seven of thirteen) reflect negative (and sometimes significantly negative) relationships. And, the majority of the VAC items (six of eleven) also show negative correlations with the total TPA scale.

These results, therefore, indicate a somewhat negative relationship: individuals who exhibit strong Type A behavior use less allotted vacation time than individuals who exhibit weak Type A behavior.

Type A Behavior and Performance and Absenteeism. The relationships between Type A behavior and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism, are not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a closer examination of the results for each particular performance and absenteeism measure shows more meaningful results, i.e. there is evidence of some form of relationship, and the relationship depends on each particular measure. More specifically, Type A behavior is positively related to performance evaluations, performance potential and promotability. But, there is no clear relationship between Type A behavior and absenteeism. Each is discussed in the following.

Type A and Performance Evaluations. The relationship between Type A behavior and performance evaluations tends to be positive. First, Table 5-7b presents mean scores for performance when controlling for Type A behavior. Findings show that individuals who display strong Type A behavior score, on the average, 130.9 on the performance evaluation scale; while individuals who exhibit weak Type A behavior score, on the average, 126.8. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

Second, while Table 5-7c reflects a rather low correlation, the coefficient reflects a more positive than negative relationship (.06). In addition, when each of the items in the Type A scale is correlated with the total PEV scale, the majority (nine of thirteen) show a positive relationship. Similarly, both of the PEV items are positively correlated with the total TPA scale.

Hence, these results suggest the relationship tends to be positive: individuals who exhibit strong Type A behavior have higher performance evaluations than individuals who exhibit weak Type A behavior.

Type A and Performance Potential. Similarly, the relationship between Type A behavior and performance potential is positive. Table 5-7b presents mean scores for performance potential when controlling for Type A behavior. Findings show that individuals who are strong Type A personalities score, on the average, 61.6 on the performance potential scale; while individuals who are weak Type A personalities score, on the average, 56.9. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

In addition, Table 5-7c shows the correlation between Type A behavior and performance potential is .11, which provides additional

support for the potentially positive relationship. Also, when each item in the TPA scale is correlated with the total PERT scale, eleven of the thirteen items show a positive relationship. And, one of two items in the PERT scale is positively correlated with the total TPA scale.

These results reflect a positive tendency in the relationship: individuals who are strong Type A personalities have higher performance potential than individuals who are weaker Type A personalities.

Type A and Promotability. The relationship between Type A behavior and promotability is also positive. Table 5-7b presents mean scores for promotability when controlling for Type A behavior. The results show that individuals who are strong Type A personalities score, on the average, 2.3; while individuals who are weak Type A personalities score, on the average, 1.9. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

And, Table 5-7c reports the correlation between Type A behavior and promotability is .08. While not large, it does reflect a more positive than negative relationship. In addition, when each item in the TPA scale is correlated with the total PROM scale, nine of the thirteen show positive (and sometimes significantly positive) relationships. Similarly, both PROM items are positively correlated with the total TPA scale.

These results, therefore, indicate a positive relationship: individuals who exhibit strong Type A behavior have higher promotability than individuals who exhibit weak Type A behavior.

Type A and Absenteeism. Finally, the relationship between Type A behavior and absenteeism is not clear. Table 5-7b presents mean scores for absenteeism when controlling for Type A behavior. Findings show that individuals who exhibit strong Type A behavior score, on the

average, 59.3 on the absenteeism scale; while individuals who exhibit weak Type A behavior score, on the average, 58.9. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

However, Table 5-7c shows that the correlation between Type A and absenteeism, while low, tends to be more negative, i.e. $-.03$. Yet, when each of the items in the TPA scale is correlated with the total AB scale, only five of thirteen show negative relationships to absenteeism; while three of the five absenteeism items are negatively correlated with the total TPA scale.

Consequently, these results do not reflect any clear relationship between Type A behavior and absenteeism.

Table 5-7b

Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for TPA

Variables	VAC		PEV		PERT		PROM		AB		FFV	
	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N
Low TPA	59.5	58	126.8	57	56.9	54	1.9	58	58.9	56	154.9	57
High TPA	58.8	56	130.9	58	61.6	60	2.3	60	59.3	60	272.0	60
All Cases	59.2	114	128.9	115	59.4	114	2.1	118	59.1	116	215.0	117

Table 5-7c

Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of TPA with Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables

Variable/Items	TPA	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162	163	164	165	166	167
VAC	-.03	.04	.10	.20*	-.23**	.06	-.01	-.03	.06	-.18*	-.04	.02	-.12	-.03
PEV	.06	-.06	.06	-.004	.08	.001	.12	.03	-.05	.09	.09	-.05	.01	.01
PRT	.11	.05	.01	.03	.06	.12	-.01	-.04	.09	.18*	.13	.05	.05	.07
PROM	.08	-.03	.13	-.01	.17*	-.01	.02	-.17*	.17*	.04	.07	.11	.02	.06
AB	-.03	-.02	-.15	.04	.003	-.10	-.06	.02	.03	.03	-.07	.14	.02	.02
(VAC) 2	10	12	14	16	44	46	48	50	93	94 (PEV)	105	106		
TPA	-.02	.05	-.02	.17*	-.10	.14	-.09	.12	-.12	.05	-.04	.04	.08	
(PERT) 238	243 (PROM)	101	102 (AB)	202	204	209	221	223						
TPA	-.10	.05	.03	.12	.04	-.05	-.06	-.18*						

*p ≤ .05

**p ≤ .01

Summary

The results of the relationship between Type A behavior and the independent and dependent variables support potential signs in certain relationships. That is, the relationship between Type A behavior and the independent variable, vacation practices, tends to be negative: individuals who exhibit strong Type A behavior use less allotted vacation time than individuals who exhibit weak Type A behavior. The relationship between Type A behavior and the dependent variable, performance, is positive when performance is measured by performance evaluations, performance potential and promotability: individuals who exhibit strong Type A behavior have higher performance evaluations, performance potential and promotability than individuals who exhibit weak Type A behavior. But, there is no clear relationship between Type A behavior and the other dependent variable, absenteeism.

Moderating Effects of Type A Behavior on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism

The Type A scale is divided into low and high scores which are selected out, individually, and examined as moderators of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, as follows.

High Type A Scores: Moderating Effects on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When high Type A scores moderate, the relationships between vacation practices, performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero for all statistical analyses. However, a more specific examination of the relationship between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results, i.e. reflecting a tendency toward some form of relationship. In particular, three of four measures of the dependent variable are related to vacation practices as predicted, i.e. vacation practices are negatively related

to performance evaluations and performance potential, and positively related to absenteeism. But, vacation practices are also positively related to promotability. The specific results for each are presented below.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, correlations in Table 5-7d reflect a somewhat negative relationship, i.e. $-.12$. Similarly, when vacation practices are examined in relation to performance potential, results of correlations in Table 5-7d also reflect a potentially negative relationship, $-.07$. In contrast, when vacation practices are examined in relation to promotability, the relationship is more positive, as reflected by a correlation coefficient of $.13$. Finally, an examination of the relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, reflected in correlation coefficients in Table 5-7d also indicate a potentially positive relationship ($.07$).

Low Type A Scores: Moderating Effects on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When low Type A scores moderate, the relationships between vacation practices, performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a more specific examination of the relationship between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results, i.e. reflecting a tendency toward some form of relationship. In particular, vacation practices are negatively related to performance evaluations and performance potential, and positively related to absenteeism. However, vacation practices are also positively related to promotability. The specific results are presented in the following.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, results from correlations in Table 5-7d show a low, but somewhat negative, relationship ($-.08$). Similarly, when vacation practices are examined in relation to performance potential, correlation coefficients in Table 5-7d reflect a potentially negative relationship, but of a lesser magnitude ($-.03$). In contrast, when vacation practices are examined in relation to promotability, the sign of the relationship tends to be more positive, as reflected by a correlation of $.13$. Finally, the relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism shows a more noticeably positive relationship as reflected by a correlation of $.17$.

Table 5-7d

Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism
Variables when Controlling for TPA

Variables	PEV	PERT	PROM	AB
Low TPA	$-.08$	$-.03$	$.13$	$.17$
High TPA	$-.12$	$-.07$	$.13$	$.07$

Summary

The overall results of the moderating effects of Type A behavior on the relationship between the independent and dependent variables are not significant statistically. However, more specific results, expressed in terms of the strength of the moderator, Type A, are more interesting and meaningful. In particular; 1) for individuals exhibiting strong Type A behavior, there are predicted negative relationships

between vacation practices and performance evaluations and between vacation practices and performance potential, and a predicted positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism. But, there is an unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability, and 2) for individuals exhibiting weak Type A behavior, there is an expected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability. But, there are unexpected negative relationships between vacation practices and performance evaluations and performance potential, and an unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism.

Summary and Conclusion

The findings in the examination: 1) of vacation practices, and of performance and absenteeism, in relation to Type A behavior, and 2) of the relationship between these vacation practices and performance and absenteeism variables when moderated by Type A behavior, show no consistent support for Proposition 3, i.e. the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism are not consistently or significantly affected by the extent to which Type A behavior is exhibited, as predicted. The statistical differences in means and resultant correlation coefficients are not significantly different from zero. Similarly, an examination of Table 5-7e, which shows regression statistics for each performance and absenteeism variable as a function of both vacation practices and Type A behavior, confirms this further. A comparison of the R squares for all performance and absenteeism measures indicates that the proportion of variance in any of the performance or absenteeism variables, which is explained by both the extent to which individuals use vacation time and the extent to which they exhibit Type

A behavior, is minimal (R^2 range from .01 to .02). Also, a comparison of the standardized regression coefficients (Betas) additionally indicates that the degree to which individuals exhibit Type A behavior do not significantly affect their performance or absenteeism. (For performance and absenteeism measures, Betas range from -.11 to .10 for vacations, and from -.06 to .09 for the moderator, Type A behavior).

Table 5-7e

TPA: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation,
Performance and Absenteeism Variables

Moderating Variable	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Beta		R^2	F
			VAC	/ TPA		
TPA	VAC	PEV	-.11	.07	.02	1.0
		PERT	-.08	.08	.01	.7
		PROM	.09	.09	.02	.8
		AB	.10	-.06	.01	.7

Therefore, a conclusive statement on how Type A behavior affects the relationship between vacation practices and performance or absenteeism cannot be provided from a statistical point of view. That is, the results of all of the relationships examined do not achieve statistical significance. However, a more definitive statement on how Type A behavior affects the more specific relationships between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism variable can be offered, from a practical point of view. That is, the results, when examined in terms of consistency in the form or sign of the relationship, provide a more meaningful expression of potential relationships.

In particular, in terms of performance and absenteeism: 1) when performance evaluations are examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is negative, for individuals exhibiting strong Type A behavior; in comparison, for individuals exhibiting weak Type A behavior, the relationship is also negative (but to a lesser degree), 2) when performance potential is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is negative for individuals exhibiting strong Type A behavior; in comparison, for individuals exhibiting weak Type A behavior, the relationship is also negative (but shows a less negative correlation), 3) when promotability is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is positive, for individuals exhibiting strong Type A behavior; in comparison, for individuals exhibiting weak Type A behavior, the relationship is also positive (and of a similar magnitude), and 4) when absenteeism is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is positive, for individuals exhibiting strong Type A behavior; and, for individuals exhibiting weak Type A behavior, the relationship is even more convincingly positive.

Consequently, the moderating effects of Type A behavior are more pronounced when the strength of the moderator (weak or strong) and the dependent variable being measured (performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, or absenteeism) are identified. Based on this proposition, and based on the premise that the results, while not achieving statistical significance, do reflect more meaningful significance when expressed in terms of potential relationships, it is believed that: individuals who exhibit either strong or weak Type A behavior have high levels of performance, reflected in performance evaluations and performance potential, and a low incidence of absenteeism, when they use less of their allotted vacation time. However, they have high promotability when they use more of their allotted vacation time.

Proposition 4

The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the age of an individual. It is predicted that older individuals perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time); while younger individuals perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time).

Descriptive Statistics: Age

Age is measured by a combination of two items in the survey which represent the actual age (as opposed to an age range) in number of years. Descriptive statistics in Table 5-8a show that 115 (of a possible 118) employees responded to these items, and their ages range from twenty-four to sixty-five years. For this group, the average age is 40.7, and the standard deviation is 9.8. When low and high distributions are examined, results show that fifty-nine employees fall in the lower half of the age scale and are forty years or younger; while the remaining fifty-six employees fall in the upper half of the scale and are forty-one or older. Compared to the actual age range (and to the possible range which would be about twenty-one to seventy), this reflects a fairly equal distribution. When extremely low and high distributions are examined, results show that thirty-eight employees comprise the youngest group of employees and are thirty-five years or younger; while forty employees comprise the oldest group and are

forty-four or older. These ranges and frequencies indicate that the employees who participated in this survey are fairly evenly distributed on the age scale and that the sample is representative of both young and old age groups.

Table 5-8a
Descriptive Statistics for Age

\bar{X}	40.7	
S.D.	9.8	
Score Range	24-65	
N Cases	115	
Scale Distribution	Score Range	N Cases
Lower Half	24-40	59
Upper Half	41-65	56
Lower Third	24-35	38
Upper Third	44-65	40

Relationship Between Age and the Independent Variable (Vacation Practices)

Relationship Between Age and the Dependent Variables (Performance and Absenteeism)

Age and Vacation Practices. The relationship between age and the independent variable, vacation practices, is not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a closer examination of the results shows a more meaningful relationship, i.e. that the sign of the relationship tends to be negative.

First, Table 5-8b presents mean scores for vacation practices, when controlling for age. The results show that older individuals score, on the average, 58.8 on the vacation scale; while younger individuals score, on the average, 59.4. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

Second, Table 5-8c shows a somewhat negative correlation between vacation practices and age ($-.12$). In addition, when each of the vacation items is correlated with age, six of eleven show a negative, and for several a significantly negative, relationship.

These results, therefore, support a negative tendency in the sign of the relationship: older individuals tend to use less of their allotted vacation time than younger individuals.

Age and Performance and Absenteeism. The relationships between age and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism, are not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a closer examination of the results for each particular performance and absenteeism measure shows more meaningful results, i.e. there is evidence of some form of relationship, and the form depends on each particular measure. More specifically, age is positively related to performance evaluations and negatively related to performance potential, promotability and absenteeism (or is less positive and tends to reflect a more negative relationship). Each is discussed in the following.

Age and Performance Evaluations. The relationship between age and performance evaluations tends to be positive. Table 5-8b presents mean scores for performance evaluations, when controlling for age. The results show that older individuals score, on the average, 129.8 on the performance evaluation scale; while younger individuals score, on the

average, 128.0. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

In addition, Table 5-8c shows that the correlation between age and performance evaluations, though not large, carries a more positive sign (.03). Also, one of the two items in the performance evaluation scale is positively correlated with age.

These results, therefore, support a positive tendency in the sign of the relationship: older individuals have higher performance evaluations than younger individuals.

Age and Performance Potential. The relationship between age and performance potential tends to be negative. Table 5-8b presents mean scores for performance potential, when controlling for age, and shows that older individuals score, on the average, 53.3 on the performance potential scale; while younger individuals score, on the average, 65.3. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

And, Table 5-8c shows a significant negative correlation between age and performance potential (-.42). This correlation is of particular interest as the performance potential scale is comprised of a ratio of Hay Points to age; consequently, results of item-scale correlations are not really relevant. However, it should be noted that the correlation between age and Hay Points is significantly positive, .24. This indicates that while older individuals occupy high level jobs (reflected by number of Hay points) it is the younger individuals who have the high performance potential.

Overall, these results do support a negative relationship: older individuals have lower performance potential than younger individuals.

Age and Promotability. Similarly, the relationship between age and promotability is negative. Mean scores for promotability, when controlling for age, are shown in Table 5-8b. The results indicate that older individuals score, on the average, 1.6 on promotability; while younger individuals score, on the average, 2.6. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

And, Table 5-8c confirms this, showing a significant negative correlation between age and promotability (-.55). In addition, both items in the promotability scale show significant negative correlations with age.

These results, and in particular the significant negative correlation, support a negative relationship: older individuals have lower promotability than younger individuals.

Age and Absenteeism. Finally, the relationship between age and absenteeism also is negative. Mean scores for absenteeism, when controlling for age, are presented in Table 5-8b. The results show that older individuals score, on the average, 52.5 on the absenteeism scale; while younger individuals score, on the average, 65.3. Compared to all individuals, the sign of this relationship is negative.

Furthermore, Table 5-8c shows that the correlation between age and absenteeism is significantly negative (-.24). And, each of the five absenteeism items shows a negative correlation (and four achieve statistical significance) with age.

These results, especially the significant negative correlation, support a negative relationship: older individuals have a lower incidence of absenteeism than younger individuals.

Table 5-8b

Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for Age

Variables	VAC		PEV		PERT		PROM		AB		AGE	
	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N
Low Age	59.4	60	128.0	60	65.3	58	2.6	62	65.3	60	32.9	59
High Age	58.8	54	129.8	55	53.3	56	1.6	56	52.5	56	49.0	56
All Cases	59.2	114	128.9	115	59.4	114	2.1	118	59.1	116	40.7	115

Table 5-8c

Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of Age with Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables

Variable/Items	VAC	PEV	PERT	PROM	AB								
Age (238)	-.12	.03	-.42**	-.55**	-.24**								
(VAC)	2	10	12	14	16	44	46	48	50	93	94 (PEV)	105	106
Age	-.01	-.31**	.10	-.14	.09	-.57**	-.20**	-.21**	.15	.14	.16*	.07	-.02
(PERT)	238	243 (PROM)	101	102	(AB)	202	204	209	221	223			
Age	1.00**	.24**	-.39**	-.59**	-.22**	-.20**	-.15*	-.21**	-.02				

*p ≤ .05

**p ≤ .01

Summary

The results of the relationship between age and the independent and dependent variables consistently support potential signs in the relationships. That is, the relationship between age and the independent variable, vacation practices, tends to be negative: older individuals use more allotted vacation time than younger individuals. The relationships between age and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism, depend on the specific measure. In particular, the relationship between age and performance evaluations is positive (or tends to be more positive than negative) while the relationships between age and performance potential, promotability and absenteeism are negative: older individuals have higher performance evaluations and a lower incidence of absenteeism than younger individuals. However, younger individuals have higher performance potential and promotability than older individuals.

Moderating Effects of Age on the Relationship Between Vacation

Practices, Performance and Absenteeism

Age is divided into low and high scores which are selected out, individually, and examined as moderators of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, as follows.

Older Age: Moderating Effects on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When older age moderates, the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a more specific examination of the relationship between vacations and each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results, i.e. reflecting a tendency toward some

form of relationship. In particular, three of the four measures of the dependent variables are related to vacation practices as predicted, i.e. vacation practices are negatively related to performance evaluations and performance potential and positively related to absenteeism. However, vacation practices are also positively related to promotability, not as predicted. The results of each are presented below.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, correlation coefficients reflect in Table 5-8d a somewhat negative tendency in the relationship ($-.03$). Similarly, when vacation practices are examined in relation to performance potential, correlations show in Table 5-8d even more strongly that the relationship is negative ($-.19$). In contrast, the relationship between vacation practices and promotability for older individuals is noticeably positive, as reflected by a correlation of $.16$. Finally, a positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism is also evident by an examination of a correlation coefficient of $.15$, shown in Table 5-8d.

Younger Age: Moderating Effects on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When younger age moderates, the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a more specific examination of the relationship between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results, i.e. reflecting a tendency toward some form of relationship. In particular, the results show that the relationship between vacation practices and promotability is somewhat positive, as expected. However, the relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism is unexpectedly positive. And, the

relationship between vacation practices and performance potential is not clear. The results of each are presented below.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, results of correlations show a negative relationship (-.19) as reflected in Table 5-8d. However, when vacation practices are examined in relation to performance potential, correlation coefficients reflect virtually no relationship (.01). Yet, there is some indication of a more positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability as reflected by a correlation of .06 in Table 5-8d. And, similarly, a correlation of .07 also suggests a somewhat positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism.

Table 5-8d

Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism
Variables when Controlling for Age

Variables	PEV	PERT	PROM	AB
Low Age	-.19	.01	.06	.07
High Age	-.03	-.19	.16	.15

Summary

The overall results of the moderating effects of age on the relationship between the independent and dependent variables are not statistically significant. However, more specific results of the relationship, expressed in terms of younger and older individuals, are more meaningful. In particular: 1) for older individuals, there are expected negative relationships between vacation practices and performance

evaluations and performance potential, and an expected positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism. However, there is an unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability, and 2) for younger individuals there is an expected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability; but, there is an unexpected negative relationship between vacation practices and performance evaluations, and an unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism. And, there is no clear relationship between vacation practices and performance potential.

Summary and Conclusion

The findings in the examination: 1) of vacation practices, and of performance and absenteeism, in relation to age, and 2) of the relationship between these vacation practices and performance and absenteeism variables when moderated by age, show no consistent support for Proposition 4, i.e. the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism are not consistently or significantly affected by the age of the individual, as predicted. The statistical differences in means as well as the resultant correlation coefficients, are not significantly different from zero. Yet, an examination of Table 5-8e which shows regression statistics for each performance and absenteeism variable as a function of both vacation practices and age, shows more meaningful results. More specifically, a comparison of the R squares for all performance and absenteeism measures indicates that the proportion of variance in any performance or absenteeism variable which is explained by the extent to which individuals use vacation time and their age, depends on the particular measure. For example, while R^2 for performance evaluations and absenteeism range from .02 to .08, the R^2 for

performance potential and promotability are more noticeable, i.e. .21 and .31 respectively. The high R^2 for performance potential can be explained, in part, because the performance potential scale is comprised of only two items, and one of them is age. However, the high R^2 for promotability indicates that age may have more of a moderating effect than is reflected in the results of the preceding analyses. Furthermore, a comparison of the standardized regression coefficients also indicates that age, in combination with vacations, has a more significant effect on particular performance or absenteeism measures. For absenteeism, standardized regression coefficients (Betas) for vacations and age are .07 and -.26, respectively. (For performance potential, Betas are -.15 and -.46 for vacations and age, respectively; but, again, age is one item which comprises the performance potential scale). Still, for promotability, the Betas for vacations and age are even more significant, i.e. .01 and -.55, respectively. This implies that age, in combination with vacation practices, does have somewhat of an effect on absenteeism, and a more significant effect on promotability, than has been acknowledged in earlier analyses.

Table 5-8e

Age: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation,
Performance and Absenteeism Variables

Moderating Variable	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Beta VAC / Age	R ²	F	
Age	VAC	PEV	-.11	.04	.02	.8
		PERT	-.15	-.46*	.21	13.3
		PROM	.01	-.55*	.31	22.1
		AB	.07	-.26*	.08	4.0

*Beta \geq .20

A conclusive statement on how age affects the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism cannot be provided from a statistical point of view. That is, the results of all of the relationships examined to achieve statistical significance. However, a more definitive statement on how age affects the more specific relationships between vacations and each performance or absenteeism variable can be presented, from a practical point of view. That is, the results, when examined in terms of the consistency in the form or sign of the relationship, provide a more meaningful expression of potential relationships. In particular, with regard to performance and absenteeism: 1) when performance evaluations are examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is negative for older individuals; in comparison, for younger individuals, the relationship is also negative (reflecting an even larger correlation), 2) when performance potential is examined,

the relationship to use of vacation time is negative for older individuals; in comparison, for younger individuals the relationship is not clear (reflecting a less negative correlation), 3) when promotability is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is positive for older individuals; in comparison, for younger individuals, the relationship is also positive (but of a lesser magnitude), and 4) when absenteeism is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is positive for older individuals; in comparison, for younger individuals the relationship is also positive (but to a lesser degree).

Therefore, the moderating effects of age on the relationship between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism are more meaningful or pronounced when the strength of the moderator (young or old) and the dependent variable being measured (performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, or absenteeism) are identified. Based on the proposition, and based on the premise that the results, while not achieving statistical significance, do reflect more meaningful significance when expressed in terms of potential relationships, it is believed that: 1) older individuals tend to have high levels of performance, reflected in performance evaluations and performance potential, and a low incidence of absenteeism, when they use less of their allotted vacation time. However, they tend to have high promotability when they use more of it, and 2) younger individuals, similarly, tend to have high levels of performance, reflected in performance evaluations, and a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time. But, they tend to have high promotability when they use more of it.

Proposition 5

The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the extent to which an individual is compatible with a job. It is predicted that individuals who are compatible with their jobs perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time); while individuals who are less compatible, or incompatible, with their jobs perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time).

Descriptive Statistics: Job Compatibility

Job compatibility reflects the extent to which the content of a job is appropriately matched to the personal characteristics (needs and goals) of a job incumbent. The job compatibility scale (JC) is based on two scales, the growth need scale (GNS), comprised of eighteen items, and the motivating potential score scale (MPS), comprised of five items, which are "matched" so that two subgroups of compatibility (Low GNS/Low MPS; High GNS/High MPS) and two subgroups of incompatibility (Low GNS/High MPS; High GNS/Low MPS) are identified.

With regard to the GNS scale, descriptive statistics reported in Table 5-9a show that 115 (of 118) employees responded to the items in this scale, and their scores range from a low of fifty-three to a high of 100 (of a possible score range of twenty to 100). For this group of employees the average growth need strength is 86.0 and the standard

deviation is 9.2. When low and high distributions are examined, results show that fifty-three employees have low growth need strength and score eighty-five or below; while the remaining sixty-two employees have high growth need strength and score eighty-seven or above. Further, when extremely low and high distributions are examined, thirty-seven employees have the lowest growth need strength, scoring eighty-two or below; while thirty-two employees have the highest, scoring ninety-two or above. While distributions are somewhat unequal because of tied scores at the approximately fifty percent cumulative frequency point, the findings do indicate that, compared to the given possible score range, these scores fall on the high end of the scale. So, the employees who participated in this survey, in general, tend to have higher (rather than lower) growth need strength.

With regard to the MPS scale, the statistics show that 116 employees responded to these items, and their scores range from a low of twenty to a high of 1250 (of a possible range of ten to 1250). For this group of employees, the average motivating potential score of a job is 590.4 and the standard deviation is 321.2. When low and high distributions are examined, results show that fifty-seven employees have low motivating potential scores, and score 520 or below; while the remaining fifty-nine employees have high MPS scores, achieving 533 or above. And, when extremely low and high distributions are examined, thirty-eight employees have the lowest MPS score (390 or lower); while an equal number (thirty-eight) have the highest MPS score (693 or higher). These distributions, in comparison to the possible score ranges, indicate that employees score on the lower end of the scale and, in general, tend to have less (rather than more) motivating

potential in their jobs. It, therefore, appears that with distributions reflecting higher GNS and lower MPS, there may well be more cases of job incompatibility than of job compatibility for this population.

It should be added that job compatibility has also been measured in alternative ways, e.g. using a measure of job (growth) satisfaction. As described earlier, Staw and Oldham's 1978 study of job compatibility included, as a parallel measure of job compatibility, this job satisfaction scale. Consequently, this present research incorporates the same measure of job, or growth, satisfaction (JS)--i.e. four items are summed which reflect the extent to which individuals are satisfied with certain aspects of a job; and the responses to these are examined in relation to vacation practices and performance. Descriptive statistics for this scale are provided, also, in Table 5-9a. When distributions are examined, results show that most individuals fall on the high end of the scale. This indicates that the majority of employees who participated in this survey tend to have a high (rather than low) level of job satisfaction, which may indicate, in contrast to the results of the previously cited measure, more job compatibility than incompatibility. Other statistics such as mean scores, correlations and regression coefficients are presented in subsequent tables (Tables 5-9b through Tables 5-9e). These results, i.e. when job compatibility is measured by job satisfaction, are reported only as a means of comparison to the results when job compatibility is measured by combining the GNS and MPS scales. However, while they are not discussed in detail, miscellaneous comments on interesting comparative results often are provided.

Table 5-9a

Descriptive Statistics for JC and JS

	JC		JS	
	GN	MPS		
\bar{X}	86.0	590.4	103.2	
S.D.	9.2	321.2	35.9	
Score Range	53-100	20-1250	0-160	
N Cases	115	116	117	
Scale Distribution	Range/N Cases	Range/N Cases	Range/N Cases	
Lower Half	53-85 53	20-520 57	0-100 58	
Upper Half	87-100 62	533-1250 59	110-160 59	
Lower Third	53-82 37	20-390 38	0-90 41	
Upper Third	92-100 32	693-1250 38	120-160 46	

Relationship Between Job Compatibility and the Independent Variable
(Vacation Practices)

Relationship Between Job Compatibility and the Dependent Variables
(Performance and Absenteeism)

Job Compatibility and Vacation Practices. The relationship between job compatibility and the independent variable, vacation practices, is not significantly different from zero, statistically. In particular, the results indicate that there is no consistency between the two subgroups within each situation of compatibility (Low GNS/Low MPS; High GNS/High MPS) or incompatibility (Low GNS/High MPS; High GNS/Low MPS). For example, with regard to the incompatible situation, for individuals in the Low GNS/High MPS subgroup, the relationship between incompatibility and vacation practices is positive; however, for individuals in the other subgroup, High GNS/Low MPS, the relationship is negative. Similar inconsistencies occur between the two subgroups within the compatible situation, also. In addition, these inconsistencies are reflected in practically all subsequent analyses of these data (e.g. of the relationship between job compatibility and performance, of the moderating effects of job compatibility on the relationship between vacations and performance, etc.). To enable and justify further investigation of the effects of job compatibility, it was felt that only one subgroup from each situation would be selected and compared. So, those subgroups with the largest number and most equal distribution of cases were selected and analyzed. Consequently, this study discusses only those results which are derived by comparing the incompatible situation (High GNS/Low MPS) with the compatible

situation (High GNS/High MPS). Only these results are reported and discussed throughout the study.

So, examination of the results of the relationship between vacation practices and job compatibility indicates that there is no clear sign in the relationship. Table 5-9b presents mean scores for vacation practices when controlling for job compatibility. The findings show that individuals who are more compatible (High GNS/High MPS) with their jobs score, on the average, 59.2 on the vacation scale; while individuals who are incompatible (High GNS/Low MPS), score, on the average, 56.4. Compared to all individuals, the sign tends to be positive.

Yet, Table 5-9c shows that for individuals in the compatible subgroup, the correlation to vacation practices is not significantly different from zero, i.e. .01; while for individuals in the incompatible subgroup, the correlation is significantly negative, $-.21$. (Item-scale correlations are not reported because of the nature of the job incompatibility scale, i.e. matching, rather than combining, items).

It appears, therefore, that the results of the incompatible subgroup are more consistent, i.e. the relationship between vacation practices and job incompatibility is negative. However, the results of the relationship between vacation practices and job compatibility (which should reflect a converse relationship) are less consistent and clear. Overall, these results are not consistent, or significantly different from zero, and, therefore, do not support any particular relationship between job compatibility and vacation practices.

Job Compatibility and Performance and Absenteeism. The relationships between job compatibility and the dependent variables,

performance and absenteeism, are not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a closer examination of the results in relation to each particular performance and absenteeism measure reflects more meaningful results, i.e. there is evidence of some form of relationship and the form depends on each particular measure. More specifically, job compatibility is positively related to performance potential and negatively related to absenteeism. But, there are no clear relationships between vacation practices and the remaining performance measures. Each is discussed in the following.

Job Compatibility and Performance Evaluations. There is no clear relationship between job compatibility and performance evaluations. Table 5-9b presents mean scores for performance evaluations when controlling for job compatibility. The findings show that individuals in compatible situations score 132.1 on the performance evaluation scale; while individuals who are in incompatible situations score 129.6. Compared to all individuals, there is no clear sign in the relationship.

And, correlations in Table 5-9c show a positive relationship between vacations and job compatibility (.11), but virtually no relationship (or a less positive relationship) between vacations and job incompatibility (.02).

While it appears that the relationship between job incompatibility and performance evaluations (High GNS/High MPS) tends to reflect a positive sign, the results for the incompatible job situations are less clear and conclusive. Consequently, the overall results reflect no consistent relationship between job compatibility and performance evaluations.

Job Compatibility and Performance Potential. In contrast, the relationship between job compatibility and performance potential tends to be more positive. Table 5-9b presents mean scores for performance potential when controlling for job compatibility. Individuals with job compatibility score, on the average, 60.6 on the performance potential scale; while individuals with job incompatibility score 54.0. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

And, Table 5-9c shows that the correlation between job compatibility and performance potential, though small, tends to be more positive than negative (.04); while the correlation between job incompatibility and performance potential is significantly negative, i.e. -.13.

These results, therefore, support a more consistent positive relationship: individuals in compatible job situations have higher performance potential than individuals in incompatible job situations.

Job Compatibility and Promotability. There is no clear relationship between job compatibility and promotability. Mean scores for promotability, when controlling for job compatibility, show, in Table 5-9b, that individuals with more job compatibility score, on the average, 2.2 on the promotability scale, as do individuals in incompatible job situations. Compared to all individuals, this score is higher for individuals in both compatible and incompatible situations and, therefore, reflects no clear sign in the relationship.

In addition, Table 5-9c reflects fairly low correlations that indicate positive relationships for both compatible and incompatible situations (i.e. .05 and .04, respectively).

These results are not significant, nor do they consistently support any clear sign: there is no distinct relationship between job compatibility and promotability.

Job Compatibility and Absenteeism. Finally, there appears to be a negative relationship between job compatibility and absenteeism. Mean scores for absenteeism, when controlling for job compatibility, show in Table 5-9b that individuals who have job compatibility score, on the average, 47.1 on the absenteeism scale; while those who are more incompatible with their jobs score 66.1. Compared to all individuals, this sign is negative.

And, correlations in Table 5-9c show that there is a significantly negative correlation between job compatibility and absenteeism ($-.21$), and a correlation that at least is more positive (than negative) between job incompatibility and absenteeism ($.09$).

Hence, these results support a tendency toward a negative relationship: individuals in compatible job situations have a lower incidence of absenteeism than individuals in incompatible job situations.

Table 5-9b

Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for JC and JS

Variables	VAC		PEV		PERT		PROM		AB		GN		MPS		JC		MPS		JS	
	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N
Low JC	56.4	22	129.6	23	54.0	23	2.2	23	66.1	23	92.2	23	320.0	23	22					
High JC	59.2	38	132.1	38	60.6	38	2.2	39	47.1	38	93.1	39	895.8	39	39					
Low JS	58.2	57	120.7	56	60.7	55	1.9	59	62.1	57									75.2	117
High JS	60.1	57	136.6	59	58.1	59	2.3	59	56.3	59									130.8	59
All Cases	59.2	114	128.9	115	59.4	114	2.1	118	59.1	116	86.0	115	590.4	115	116	103.2	117			

Table 5-9c
Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of JC and JS with Vacation,
Performance and Absenteeism Variables

Variable/Items	VAC	PEV	PERT	PROM	AB
JC					
HGNS/LMPS	-.21*	.02	-.13	.04	.09
HGNS/HMPS	.01	.11	.04	.05	-.21*
JS					
150	.17*	.39**	-.02	.09	-.11
151	.06	.38**	.05	.03	-.06
152	.17*	.37**	-.08	-.02	-.08
153	.20*	.23**	-.02	.13	-.17*
	.11	.29**	-.03	.15	-.06

Table 5-9c (continued)

	(VAC)	2	10	12	14	16	44	46	48	50	93	94	(PEV)	105	106
JS		.27**	.08	-.08	.29**	.14	.10	.03	.18*	.01	.04	.10		.35**	.38**
	(PERT)	238	243 (PROM)	101	102 (AB)	202	204	209	221	223					
JS		.12	.01	.12	.02	-.12	-.14	-.02	-.12	.03					

*p \leq .05**p \leq .01

Summary

The results of the relationship between job compatibility and the independent variable, vacation practices, are not clear. However, it should be noted that the results of the compatible job situation tend to support a more positive relationship; while the results of the incompatible job situation tend to support a more negative relationship. So, there is a potential for a positive relationship between job compatibility and vacation practices. This potentially positive relationship is confirmed when job compatibility is measured by the alternative scale, job satisfaction, mentioned earlier. That is, an examination of means and correlations (shown in Tables 5-9b and 5-9c) for job satisfaction in relation to vacation practices, reflects a clear positive relationship.

The relationships between job compatibility and the dependent variables depend on the specific measure of performance. In particular, the relationship between job compatibility and performance potential is positive (though when job compatibility is measured by the alternative scale, job satisfaction, the results in Tables 5-9b and 5-9c reflect a rather negative relationship). And, the relationship between job compatibility and absenteeism is negative (and is similarly negative between job satisfaction and absenteeism). This indicates that individuals in compatible job situations have higher performance potential and a lower incidence of absenteeism than individuals in incompatible job situations.

The relationship between job compatibility and the remaining performance measures, however, are inconsistent and not clear. In particular, in compatible job situations, the relationship to performance evaluations is positive (this positive relationship is also reflected

in all analyses when job compatibility is measured by job satisfaction). However, in incompatible job situations, instead of a negative relationship, there is no clear relationship. Similarly, with regard to promotability, in compatible job situations, job compatibility is positively related to promotability (and, similar results are found in all analyses when job compatibility is measured by job satisfaction). However, the relationship is also positive (though of a slightly lesser magnitude) in incompatible job situations, as well.

Moderating Effects of Job Compatibility on the Relationship Between
Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism

The GNS and MPS scales are divided into low and high scores in order to identify and distinguish between situations of compatibility and incompatibility, i.e. Low GNS/Low MPS; High GNS/High MPS and Low GNS/High MPS; High GNS/High MPS, respectively. These four conditions are selected out, individually, and examined as moderators of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. As indicated earlier, only one subgroup in the compatible situation (High GNS/High MPS) and one subgroup in the incompatible situation (High GNS/Low MPS) is analyzed, compared and discussed.

Job Compatibility Scores: Moderating Effects on the Relationship
Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When job compatibility moderates, the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero for all statistical analyses. However, a more specific examination of vacation practices in relation to each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results. In particular, three of the four measures of the dependent variable are related to

vacation practices as predicted, i.e. for individuals with high job compatibility, vacation practices are negatively related to performance evaluations and performance potential and positively related to absenteeism. However, vacation practices are also positively related to promotability, not as predicted. The specific results of each are presented below.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, results of correlations show in Table 5-9d, a negative relationship, i.e. $-.17$. Similarly, there is a significant negative relationship between vacation practices and performance potential as reflected by correlation results, i.e. $-.32$, also in Table 5-9d. In contrast, when vacation practices are examined in relation to promotability, the relationship is positive, reflecting a correlation coefficient of $.19$. Finally, there is also a positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, as indicated by a correlation of $.11$.

Job Incompatibility Scores: Moderating Effects on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When job incompatibility moderates, the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a more specific examination of vacation practices in relation to each performance and absenteeism measure indicates that vacation practices are positively related to performance potential and negatively related to absenteeism. However, the relationships between vacation practices and performance evaluations and promotability are also negative. The results of each are presented below.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, results of correlations reflect a negative relationship, i.e. $-.11$, as shown in Table 5-9d. In contrast, when vacation practices are examined in relation to performance potential, the coefficient reflects a more positive relationship, i.e. $.07$. Still, when vacation practices are examined in relation to promotability, correlations indicate a negative relationship ($-.12$). Finally, there tends to be a negative relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism as reflected by a small but somewhat negative correlation, $-.03$.

Table 5-9d

Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism
Variables when Controlling for JC and JS

Variables	PEV	PERT	PROM	AB
Low JC	$-.11$	$.07$	$-.12$	$-.03$
High JC	$-.17$	$-.32^*$	$.19$	$.11$
Low JS	$-.16$	$.004$	$.19$	$.15$
High JS	$-.20$	$-.10$	$-.02$	$.11$

* $p \leq .05$

Summary

The overall results of the moderating effects of job compatibility on the relationship between the independent and dependent variables are not statistically significant. However, more specific results, expressed in terms of the strength of the moderator, job compatibility, are

more meaningful. In particular, for individuals in compatible job situations, there are expected negative relationships between vacation practices and performance evaluations and performance potential and an expected positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism. However, there is an unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability. (Support for these relationships is also reflected, somewhat, in the results when job compatibility is measured by the alternative measure, job satisfaction. In particular, there are expected negative relationships between vacations and performance evaluations, performance potential and promotability, and an expected positive relationship between vacations and absenteeism).

And, for individuals in incompatible situations, there is an expected positive relationship between vacation practices and performance potential, and an expected negative relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism. However, there are unexpected negative relationships between vacation practices and performance evaluations and promotability. (Results of analyses when job satisfaction is used to measure compatibility deviate somewhat. In comparison, there is evidence of an unexpected negative relationship between vacation practices and performance evaluations for this measure. But, in contrast, there are positive relationships between vacations and promotability and absenteeism, and no clear relationship between vacations and performance potential).

It appears, therefore, that not only the strength of the moderator, but also the type of scale used to measure the moderator may have

an effect on the results. These results from the job satisfaction scale, however, are reported in this research only as a means of comparison and not as a topic for discussion.

Summary and Conclusion

The findings in the examination: 1) of vacation practices, and of performance and absenteeism, in relation to job compatibility, and 2) of the relationship between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism variables when moderated by job compatibility, show no consistent support for Proposition 5, i.e. the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism are not consistently or significantly affected by an individual's compatibility with a job, as predicted. The statistical differences in means and resultant correlation coefficients are not significantly different from zero. (However, some correlations do achieve statistical significance). An examination of Table 5-9e, which shows regression statistics for each performance and absenteeism variable as a function of both vacation practices and job compatibility, further confirms this general notion. A comparison of R squares for all performance and absenteeism measures indicates the proportion of variance in any performance or absenteeism variable which is explained by the extent to which individuals use allotted vacation time and their job compatibility, is minimal (R^2 range from .002 to .09, and from .02 to .05 for job compatibility and incompatibility, respectively). And, a comparison of the standardized regression coefficients (Betas) additionally indicates that the extent to which individuals use allotted vacation time and their job compatibility do not consistently affect all performance or absenteeism measures. For example, in compatible job situations, for performance

evaluations, performance potential and promotability, Betas range from $-.15$ to $.12$ for vacations, and from $-.12$ to $-.04$ for job compatibility. Yet, for absenteeism, the Beta coefficients are more pronounced, i.e. $.21$ and $.20$ for vacations and job compatibility, respectively. This suggests that vacations, in combination with job compatibility, may have more of an effect on absenteeism than has been reflected in the preceding analyses. (Similarly, the results when job compatibility is measured by job satisfaction shows that vacations and job compatibility have no effect on performance potential and promotability, but a more noticeable impact on absenteeism. However, what is even more pronounced is the very strong effect of vacation practices and job compatibility on performance evaluations, i.e. Betas for vacations and job satisfaction are $-.19$ and $.40$, respectively. This measure is provided as a means of comparison only; but it does suggest, again, that the way job compatibility is measured may have an important effect on the results). Finally, Beta coefficients for all performance and absenteeism measures when incompatible job situations are examined are not as pronounced, and do not reflect any noticeable differences between the particular measures of the dependent variables, ranging from $-.15$ to $.23$ for vacations, and from $-.18$ to $.06$ for job incompatibility.

Table 5-9e

JC and JS: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation,
Performance and Absenteeism Variables

Moderating Variable	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Beta VAC	/ Mod	R ²	F
JC						
Low (HGNS/LMPS)	VAC	PEV	-.15	-.002	.02	1.2
		PERT	-.05	-.18	.03	1.6
		PROM	.13	.04	.02	.8
		AB	.23	.06	.05	2.7
High (HGNS/HMPS)	VAC	PEV	-.15	-.12	.04	2.0
		PERT	-.02	-.04	.002	.1
		PROM	.12	-.07	.02	1.0
		AB	.21	.20*	.09	4.8
JS	VAC	PEV	-.19	.40*	.17	10.9
		PERT	-.09	.02	.01	.4
		PROM	.09	.03	.01	.5
		AB	.13	-.16	.03	1.8

*Beta \geq .20

So, a conclusive statement on how job compatibility affects the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism cannot be provided from a statistical point of view. That is, the results of all the relationships do not achieve statistical significance. However, a more definitive statement on how job compatibility affects the more specific relationships between vacation and each performance and absenteeism variable can be offered from a practical point of view. That is, the results, when examined in terms of the consistency in the sign or form of the relationship, provide a more meaningful expression of potential relationships. In particular, with regard to performance and absenteeism: 1) when performance evaluations are examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is negative for individuals in compatible job situations; in comparison, for individuals in incompatible job situations, the relationship is also negative (but reflects a negative correlation of a lesser magnitude); 2) when performance potential is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is significantly negative for individuals in compatible job situations; in comparison, for individuals in incompatible job situations, the relationship is slightly positive; 3) when promotability is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is positive for individuals in compatible job situations; in contrast, for individuals in incompatible job situations the relationship is negative; and 4) when absenteeism is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is positive for individuals in compatible job situations; in contrast, for individuals in incompatible job situations the relationship is somewhat negative.

Therefore, the moderating effects of job compatibility are more pronounced when the strength of the moderator (incompatible or compatible) and the dependent variable being measured (performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, or absenteeism) are identified. Based on this proposition, and based on the premise that the results, while not achieving statistical significance, do reflect more meaningful significance when expressed in terms of potential relationships, it is believed that: 1) individuals in compatible job situations have a high level of performance, reflected in performance evaluations and performance potential, and a low level of absenteeism, when they use less of their allotted vacation time. However, they have high promotability when they use more vacation time; and 2) individuals in incompatible job situations have a high level of performance, reflected in performance potential, and a low incidence of absenteeism, when they use more of their vacation time. However, they have high performance evaluations and promotability when they use less of it.

Proposition 6

The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the degree to which an individual values and enjoys vacations. It is predicted that individuals who value and enjoy vacations perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time); while individuals who do not value and enjoy vacations perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time).

Descriptive Statistics: Value and Enjoy Vacations

The degree to which an individual values and enjoys vacations is measured by the following two scales:

1. Five items in the survey are summed to form the first scale which reflects the absolute value of vacations--in terms of worth, importance and enjoyment (EVAC 1). Descriptive statistics in Table 5-10a indicate that all 118 employees responded to these items, and their scores range from a low of ten to a high of 200 (of a possible zero to 200). For these employees, the mean score, i.e. average degree to which individuals value and enjoy vacations, is 185.4 and the standard deviation is 24.8. When low and high distributions are examined, results show that sixty-five employees do not value vacations and score 190 or below; while the remaining fifty-three employees value vacations and score 200. The unequal distribution of cases is

the result of tied scores which occur at and near this approximately fifty percent cutoff point, i.e. twelve, thirty-one, and fifty-three cases at scores 180, 190 and 200, representing cumulative frequencies of 28.8 percent, 55.1 percent and 100 percent respectively. Compared to the possible maximum score, this cutoff point falls at the extremely high end of the scale. When extremely low and high distributions are examined, results show that thirty-four employees value vacations the least and score 180 or below; while fifty-three employees value vacations the most and score 190 or above. These scores and frequencies indicate that employees score on the very high end of this scale and, in absolute terms, tend to value and enjoy (as opposed to not value and enjoy) vacations.

2. Four other items in the survey are summed to form the second scale which reflects the relative value of vacations--in terms of preferences for vacations to other types of rewards (EVAC 2). Descriptive statistics in Table 5-10a show that all 118 employees responded to these items and their scores range from a low of zero to a high of 160 (of the same possible range). The average score for these employees is 55.8 and the standard deviation is 41.3. When low and high scores are examined, results show that fifty-seven employees do not prefer vacations to other types of rewards and score forty or below; while the remaining sixty-one employees prefer vacations and score fifty or above. Again, unequal distributions are the result of tied scores, i.e. fourteen at the fifty percent cutoff. And, compared to the maximum possible score, this cutoff is quite low. When extremely low and high distributions are examined, results show that forty-three employees value vacations the least (preferring other types

of rewards to vacations) and score thirty or below; while the remaining forty employees value vacations the most (preferring them to other rewards) and score eighty or above. These distributions indicate that the majority of employees who participated in this survey score on the low end of the scale and, in general, place a lower relative value on vacations, i.e. preferring other types of rewards.

Hence, these two measures indicate that the employees in this survey do value and enjoy vacations, but that vacations are not necessarily more important or valuable than other types of rewards.

Table 5-10a
Descriptive Statistics for EVAC 1 and EVAC 2

	EVAC 1		EVAC 2	
\bar{X}	185.4		55.8	
S.D.	24.8		41.3	
Score Range	10-200		0-160	
N Cases	118		118	
Scale Distribution	Score Range/N Cases		Score Range/N Cases	
Lower Half	10-190	65	0-40	57
Upper Half	200-200	53	50-160	61
Lower Third	10-180	34	0-30	43
Upper Third	190-200	53	80-160	40

Relationship Between the Value of Vacations and the Independent Variable
(Vacation Practices)

Relationship Between the Value of Vacations and the Dependent Variables
(Performance and Absenteeism)

Value of Vacations and Vacation Practices. The relationship between the value of vacations, when measured by both scales, and the independent variable, vacation practices, is not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a closer examination of the results shows a more meaningful relationship, i.e. that the sign of the relationship tends to be positive.

First, Table 5-10b presents mean scores for vacation practices when controlling for value of vacations. For EVAC 1, findings show that individuals who value vacations score, on the average, 59.2 on the vacation scale; while individuals who do not value vacations score, on the average, 59.1. For EVAC 2, individuals who value vacations score, on the average, 60.8; while individuals who do not value vacations score 57.4. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship, for both scales, is positive.

Similarly, Table 5-10c shows the correlations between value of vacations and vacation practices are also positive, i.e. .10 and .14 for EVAC 1 and EVAC 2, respectively. In addition, when each item in both scales is correlated with the total VAC scale, four of the five items in EVAC 1 and all four items in EVAC 2 show a positive relationship. And, positive correlations are also shown for eight of the eleven vacation items with EVAC 1 and nine of the eleven vacation items with EVAC 2.

Hence, these results clearly support a positive relationship: individuals who value and enjoy vacations use more of their allotted vacation time than individuals who do not value and enjoy vacations.

Value of Vacations and Performance and Absenteeism. The relationships between the value of vacations and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism, are not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a closer examination of the results for each performance and absenteeism measure is more meaningful, i.e. there is evidence of some form of relationship, and the form depends on each particular scale and on each particular measure of the dependent variable. More specifically, for EVAC 1, the value of vacations is positively related to performance evaluations and absenteeism, and negatively related to performance potential. But, there is no clear relationship between the value of vacations and promotability. For EVAC 2, the value of vacations is negatively related to performance evaluations, and positively related to the remaining performance and absenteeism measures. Each is discussed in the following.

Value of Vacations and Performance Evaluations. The relationship between value of vacations and performance evaluations is positive (when measured by EVAC 1) and negative (when measured by EVAC 2). First, Table 5-10b presents mean scores for performance evaluations, when controlling for value of vacations. The findings for EVAC 1 indicate that individuals who value vacations score, on the average, 131.7 on the performance evaluations scale; while individuals who do not value vacations score 126.4. Compared to all individuals the sign of the relationship is positive. In contrast, for EVAC 2, individuals who value vacations score, on the average, 126.2 on the performance evaluations

scale; while individuals who do not value vacations score 131.9. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

Second, Table 5-10c also supports these directions by showing the correlation between the value of vacations and performance evaluations to be .20 and $-.03$ when value is measured by EVAC 1 and EVAC 2, respectively. In addition, when each item in the EVAC 1 scale is correlated with the total PEV scale, all of the items show positive, and often significantly positive, relationships. Similarly both of the PEV items are significantly positively correlated with the total EVAC 1 scale. And, in EVAC 2, half of the items show a negative relationship with the PEV scale; and one of the two performance evaluation items is negatively correlated with EVAC 2.

These results, therefore, support a positive relationship for EVAC 1: individuals who value and enjoy vacations (in absolute terms) have higher performance evaluations than individuals who do not value vacations. Yet, the results support a negative relationship for EVAC 2: individuals who value vacations (in relative terms--preferring them to other rewards) have lower performance evaluations than individuals who do not value or prefer vacations to other rewards.

Value and Performance Potential. The relationship between value and performance potential is negative (when measured by EVAC 1) and positive (when measured by EVAC 2). First, Table 5-10b presents mean scores for performance potential when controlling for the value of vacations. The findings for EVAC 1 show that individuals who value vacations score, on the average, 56.2 on the performance potential scale; while individuals who do not value vacations score 62.2. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative. In

contrast, for EVAC 2, individuals who value vacations score, on the average 64.4, on the performance potential scale; while individuals who do not value vacations score 54.2. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

In addition, Table 5-10 c shows that the correlation between the value of vacations (measured by EVAC 1) and performance potential is $-.07$, which supports a negative relationship. In addition, when each of the items in the scale is correlated with the total PERT scale, all show negative relationships. And, one of the two items in the PERT scale shows a negative correlation with the total EVAC 1 scale. The correlation between value of vacations (measured by EVAC 2) and performance potential is significantly positive ($.29$). In addition, all of the items in the scale show significant positive relationships to the total PERT scale; yet both items in the PERT scale are negatively correlated to the EVAC 2 scale.

These results (for EVAC 1) support a negative relationship: individuals who value vacations on an absolute scale have lower performance potential than individuals who do not value vacations. In contrast, the results support a positive relationship for EVAC 2: individuals who value vacations on a relative scale, preferring them to other rewards, have higher performance potential than individuals who do not value vacations.

Value and Promotability. There is no clear relationship between the value of vacations (measured by EVAC 1) and promotability. However, for EVAC 2, the relationship is positive. Table 5-10 b presents mean scores for promotability when controlling for value of vacations. The results for EVAC 1 show that individuals who value vacations score,

on the average, 2.0 on promotability; while individuals who do not value vacations score, on the average, 2.2. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship tends to be positive, i.e. individuals valuing vacations score 2.4 on the promotability scale, while individuals not valuing vacations score 1.8.

Yet, Table 5-10c shows the correlation between the value of vacations (measured by EVAC 1) and promotability, while not large, supports a less negative and more positive relationship (.08). In addition, each item in the scale shows a positive correlation to the total PROM scale, as does each item in the promotability scale when correlated with the total EVAC 1 scale. Again, this does not correspond with the suggested negative relationship when mean scores are compared. However, for EVAC 2, there is reinforcement for the suggested positive relationship. The correlation between value of vacations and promotability is significantly positive, .23. In addition, each item in the scale is positively correlated with the total PROM scale (and three of four achieve statistical significance); similarly each item in the promotability scale shows significant positive correlations with the total EVAC 2 scale.

These results indicate that for EVAC 1, there is no clear relationship between use of vacation time and promotability. But, for EVAC 2, the relationship is positive: individuals who value vacations on a relative scale, preferring them to other types of rewards, have higher promotability than individuals who do not value vacations.

Value and Absenteeism. The relationship between value of vacations (measured by both scales) and absenteeism is positive. Table 5-10b presents mean scores for absenteeism when controlling for value

of vacations. The findings show that individuals who value vacations (measured by EVAC 1) score, on the average, 61.3 on the absenteeism scale; while individuals who do not value vacations score 57.3. Similarly, individuals who value vacations (measured by EVAC 2) score, on the average, 66.5 on the absenteeism scale; while individuals who do not value vacations score 51.3. Compared to all individuals, the signs of the relationships, for both scales, are positive.

And, while Table 5-10c shows the correlation between the value of vacations (when measured by EVAC 1) and absenteeism, is virtually non-significant, i.e. .01; for EVAC 2 the correlation is significantly positive, .25. In addition, when each of the items in both scales is correlated with the AB scale, four of five items in EVAC 1 show a positive relationship, while all of the items in EVAC 2 show positive (and sometimes significantly positive) relationships. And, when each of the absenteeism items is correlated with both scales, three of five items in EVAC 1, and four items of five in EVAC 2, show positive correlations, with some achieving statistical significance.

Hence, these results support a positive direction for both scales: individuals who value vacations have a higher incidence of absenteeism than individuals who do not value vacations.

Table 5-10b

Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for EVAC 1 and EVAC 2

Variables	VAC		PEV		PERT		PROM		AB		EVAC 1		EVAC 2	
	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N
Low EVAC 1	59.1	61	126.4	62	62.2	61	2.2	65	57.3	63	173.5	65		
High EVAC 1	59.2	53	131.7	53	56.2	53	2.0	53	61.3	53	200.0	53		
Low EVAC 2	57.4	55	131.9	54	54.2	56	1.8	57	51.3	56			20.4	57
High EVAC 2	60.8	59	126.2	61	64.4	58	2.4	61	66.5	60			89.0	61
All Cases	59.2	114	128.9	115	59.4	114	2.1	118	59.1	116	185.4	118	55.8	118

Table 5-10c

Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of EVAC 1 and EVAC 2 with Vacation,
Performance and Absenteeism Variables

Variable/Items	EVAC 1	59	60	61	63	75	EVAC 2	76	78	79	80
VAC	.10	.13	.14	.18*	.08	-.08	.14	.13	.03	.13	.16*
PEV	.20*	.17*	.25**	.10	.18*	.10	-.03	-.14	.09	-.05	.00
PERT	-.07	-.07	-.05	-.10	-.04	-.03	.29**	.19*	.25**	.18*	.28**
PROM	.08	.03	.11	.04	.05	.07	.23**	.17*	.22**	.08	.27**
AB	.01	.01	.03	-.11	.002	.08	.25**	.19*	.11	.12	.37**

Table 5-10c (continued)

	(VAC)	2	10	12	14	16	44	46	48	50	93	94	(PEV)	105	106
EVAC 1		.06	-.12	.08	-.07	.15	.01	.05	-.03	.03	.06	.04		.18*	.18*
EVAC 2		-.10	.21**	.04	.12	-.21*	.37**	.24**	.25**	.03	.02	.05		-.12	.03
	(PERT)	238	243 (PROM)	101	102	(AB)	202	204	209	221	223				
EVAC 1		.08	-.06	.10	.03		-.21**	.15	.08	.09	-.08				
EVAC 2		-.47**	-.05	.19**	.21**		.20**	.41**	.09	.18*	-.09				

*p ≤ .05

**p ≤ .01

Summary

The results of the relationship between value of vacations and the independent and dependent variables support potential directions, depending on the particular relationship and the particular scale used to measure value. For example, the relationship between value of vacations (when measured by both EVAC 1 and EVAC 2) and the independent variable, vacation practices, is positive) or tends to be more positive than negative): individuals who value vacations use more allotted vacation time than individuals who do not value vacations. However, the relationships between value of vacations and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism, depend on the specific measure and scale of the dependent variable. In particular, the relationship between value of vacations and performance evaluations is positive when measured by EVAC 1, but negative when measured by EVAC 2. The relationship between value of vacations and performance potential is negative, when measured by EVAC 1, but positive when measured by EVAC 2. There is no clear relationship between value of vacations and promotability, when measured by EVAC 1; however when measured by EVAC 2, the relationship is positive. Finally, the relationship between value of vacations and absenteeism is positive for both scales.

Based on this, it appears that individuals who value vacations, expressed in both absolute and relative terms, have a higher incidence of absenteeism than individuals who do not value vacations. But, the value of vacations in relation to the remaining performance measures depends on how value is perceived: when value is expressed in more absolute terms, individuals who value vacations have higher performance evaluations and lower performance potential than individuals who

do not value vacations. However, when value is expressed in more relative terms, individuals who value or prefer vacations to other types of rewards have lower performance evaluations but higher performance potential and promotability than individuals who do not value vacations.

Moderating Effects of the Value of Vacations on the Relationship
Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism

Both EVAC 1 and EVAC 2 scales are divided into low and high scores which are selected out, individually, and examined as moderators of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, as follows.

High Value Scores: Moderating Effects on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When high value scores moderate, the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero for all statistical analyses performed on the data. However, a more specific examination of the relationship between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results, i.e. reflecting a tendency toward some form of relationship. Furthermore, the sign of the relationship depends on the scale used to measure value (i.e. absolute or relative). In particular, vacation practices are negatively related to performance evaluations for EVAC 1, while the relationship is not clear for EVAC 2. While vacation practices are negatively related to performance potential for EVAC 1, the relationship is not clear for EVAC 2. For both EVAC 1 and 2, vacation practices are positively related to promotability. Finally, vacation practices are positively related to absenteeism (for EVAC 1) and negatively related to absenteeism (for EVAC 2). The specific results are reported below.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, the relationship is negative for EVAC 1, but unclear for EVAC 2, as reflected by a negative correlation between performance evaluations and vacations for EVAC 1 ($-.18$) and a non-significant correlation for EVAC 2 ($.01$) shown in Table 5-10d. When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance potential, results of correlations indicate a negative relationship, i.e. $-.08$, for EVAC 2, but no clear relationship for EVAC 1, i.e. $.002$. For both EVAC 1 and 2, the relationship between vacation practices and promotability is positive. Correlations in Table 5-10d show that the relationship between promotability and vacation practices (when value is measured by EVAC 1) is significantly positive ($.22$); while the relationship between promotability and vacation practices (when value is measured by EVAC 2) is rather non-significant ($.02$), but still is more positive than negative. Finally, when vacation practices are examined in relation to absenteeism, results of correlations indicate a positive relationship for EVAC 1 and a negative relationship for EVAC 2. In particular, Table 5-10d reflects a significantly positive relationship ($.28$ correlation coefficient) for EVAC 1; while the correlation coefficient for EVAC 2 ($-.08$) is of a lesser magnitude but does reflect a more negative relationship.

Low Value Scores: Moderating Effects on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When low value scores moderate, the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a more specific examination of the relationship between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results, i.e. reflecting a tendency

toward some form of relationship. Furthermore, the direction of the relationship depends on the scale used to measure value (i.e. absolute or relative value). In particular, vacation practices are negatively related to performance evaluations and performance potential and positively related to promotability for both EVAC 1 and EVAC 2. However, the relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism is negative for EVAC 1 and significantly positive for EVAC 2. The specific results of each are presented below.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, results of correlation for both scales reflect a negative relationship. In particular, Table 5-10d shows that the correlations between vacations and performance evaluations for EVAC 1 and 2 are $-.06$ and $-.17$, respectively. Similarly, there is also a negative relationship between vacation practices and performance potential for individuals who do not value vacation in either absolute (EVAC 1) or relative (EVAC 2) terms. Table 5-10d reports that the correlations between vacations and performance potential are $-.14$ for EVAC 1 and $-.19$ for EVAC 2. In contrast, when vacation practices are examined in relation to promotability, there is evidence of a positive relationship for both scales, reflected by correlations of $.03$ and $.12$ for EVAC 1 and 2, respectively. Finally, the relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism is negative for EVAC 1, reflected by a small but somewhat negative correlation of $-.04$. However, for EVAC 2 the relationship is positive, reflected by a correlation of $.20$.

Table 5-10d

Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism
Variables when Controlling for EVAC 1 and EVAC 2

Variables	PEV	PERT	PROM	AB
Low EVAC 1	-.06	-.14	.03	-.04
High EVAC 1	-.18	.002	.22	.28*
Low EVAC 2	-.17	-.19	.12	.20
High EVAC 2	.01	-.08	.02	-.08

*p \leq .05

Summary

The overall results of the moderating effects of the value of vacations on the relationship between the independent and dependent variables are not significant, statistically. However, more specific results, expressed in terms of the strength of the moderator, value, and in the way in which value is measured, i.e. in absolute or relative terms, are more pronounced and meaningful. In particular: 1) for individuals who value vacations, when value is measured in absolute terms (EVAC 1) there is an expected positive relationship between vacations and promotability; but there is an unexpected negative relationship between vacations and performance evaluations, and an unexpected positive relationship between vacations and absenteeism. And, there is no clear relationship between vacations and performance potential. For individuals who do not value vacations, there are expected negative

relationships between vacations and performance evaluations and performance potential. But, there is an unexpected positive relationship between vacations and promotability, and an unexpected negative relationship between vacations and absenteeism, 2) for individuals who value vacations, when value is measured in relative terms (EVAC 2) there is somewhat of an expected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability, and an expected negative relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism. However, there is an unexpected negative relationship between vacation practices and performance potential. And, there is no clear relationship between vacation practices and performance evaluations. For individuals who do not value vacations, there is an expected negative relationship between vacations and performance evaluations and performance potential, and an expected positive relationship between vacations and absenteeism. But, there is an unexpected positive relationship between vacations and promotability.

Summary and Conclusion

The findings in the examination: 1) of vacation practices, and of performance and absenteeism, in relation to the value of vacations, and 2) of the relationship between these vacation practices and performance and absenteeism variables when moderated by the value of vacations, show no consistent support for Proposition 6, i.e. the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism are not consistently or significantly affected by the extent to which an individual values and enjoys vacations, as predicted. The statistical differences in means and most correlation coefficients are not significantly different from zero. (However, it should be noted that

some correlations do achieve statistical significance). An examination of Table 5-10e, which shows regression statistics for each performance and absenteeism variable as a function of both vacation practices and the value of vacations, further confirms this general notion. A comparison of R squares for all performance and absenteeism measures indicates that the proportion of variance in any of the performance or absenteeism variables which is explained by both the extent to which individuals use vacation time, and the extent to which they value vacations (measured in absolute and relative terms), is minimal (R^2 range from .01 to .05 for EVAC 1, and from .01 to .11 for EVAC 2). And, a comparison of the standardized regression coefficients (Betas) additionally indicates that the degree to which vacation time is used and the extent to which individuals value vacations, do not significantly affect all performance and absenteeism measures. That is, for EVAC 1, the Betas range from $-.13$ to $.10$ for the independent variable, vacations, and from $-.06$ to $.19$ for the moderator, value of vacations. However, for EVAC 2, the results are more pronounced for three of four measures of the dependent variables. For promotability, absenteeism and performance potential, Beta coefficients are $.06$, $.07$ and $.18$ for vacations and $.22$, $.26$ and $.32$ for value of vacations, respectively. These results are not significantly large, but they are noticeably higher than those found when value is measured by EVAC 1, and consistently higher, in terms of alternative measures of the dependent variable than those found in analyses of other moderators in this research. It appears, therefore, that when value is expressed in relative terms, i.e. preference for vacations to other types of rewards, and when combined with the extent to which vacation time is used, there is a more significant impact on performance and absenteeism.

Table 5-10e

EVAC 1 and EVAC 2: Moderated Regression Statistics for
Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables

Moderating Variable	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Beta VAC / Mod	R ²	F	
EVAC 1	VAC	PEV	-.13	.19	.05	2.6
		PERT	-.08	-.06	.01	.6
		PROM	.08	.03	.01	.4
		AB	.10	-.03	.01	.6
EVAC 2	VAC	PEV	-.12	-.008	.01	.8
		PERT	-.13	.32*	.11	6.5
		PROM	.06	.22*	.06	3.1
		AB	.07	.26*	.08	4.4

*Beta \geq .20

So, a conclusive statement on how the value of vacations affects the relationship between vacation practices and performance cannot be provided from a statistical point of view. That is, the results of all the relationships examined do not achieve statistical significance. However, a more definitive statement on how value affects the more specific relationship between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism variable can be offered, from a practical point of view. That is, the results, when examined in terms of the consistency in the form or sign of the relationship, provide a more meaningful expression of potential relationship. In particular, in terms of performance and

absenteeism: 1) when performance evaluations are examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is negative for individuals who do not value vacations in both absolute (EVAC 1) and relative (EVAC 2) terms; in comparison, for individuals who do value vacations (measured by EVAC 1) the relationship is negative, but when measured by EVAC 2, the relationship is not consistent or clear (though reflects a less negative correlation); 2) when performance potential is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is negative for individuals who do not value vacations (measured by both EVAC 1 and 2); in comparison, for individuals who do value vacations (measured by EVAC 2), the relationship is negative, but when measured by EVAC 1 the relationship is not consistent or clear (though reflects a less negative correlation); 3) when promotability is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is positive for individuals who value vacations in both absolute and relative terms; in comparison, for individuals who do not value vacations, the relationship is also positive; and 4) when absenteeism is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is positive for individuals who value vacations in absolute terms (EVAC 1) and negative for individuals who value vacations in relative terms (EVAC 2); in contrast, for individuals who do not value vacations in absolute terms (EVAC 1) the relationship is negative; and for individuals who do not value vacations in relative terms (EVAC 2) the relationship is positive.

Therefore, the moderating effects of value of vacations are more pronounced or meaningful when the strength of the moderator (low or high), the measure of the moderator (absolute or relative value, reflected in EVAC 1 and EVAC 2, respectively), and the dependent variable being measured (performance evaluations, performance potential,

promotability, or absenteeism) are identified. Based on this proposition, and based on the premise that the results, while not achieving statistical significance, do reflect more meaningful significance when expressed in terms of potential relationships, it is believed in terms of low and high moderators that: 1) individuals who value and enjoy vacations in absolute terms have high levels of performance, reflected in performance evaluations, and a low incidence of absenteeism, when they use less of their allotted vacation time. Yet, they have high promotability when they use more of their vacation time. When value is measured in relative terms, individuals have high promotability and a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time. However, they have performance potential when they use less of it, and: 2) individuals who do not value vacations in absolute terms have high levels of performance, reflected in high performance evaluations and performance potential, when they use less of their allotted vacation. Yet, they have high promotability and a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their vacation time. When value is measured in relative terms, individuals have high performance, reflected in performance evaluations, performance potential, and a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their vacation time. Yet, they have high promotability when they use more of it.

These results, therefore, depend on the dependent variable identified, the strength of the moderator examined, and perspective or scale used to explore the relationship. Based on this, and based on the additional premise that the value of vacations is reflected in combined absolute and relative terms, it is believed that: 1) individuals who value and enjoy vacations tend to attain high levels of performance,

reflected in promotability, when they use more of their allotted vacation time, and 2) individuals who do not value and enjoy vacations tend to attain high levels of performance, reflected in promotability, also, when they use more of it. However they attain high performance evaluations and performance potential when they use less of it.

Proposition 7

The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the degree to which an individual is vulnerable to stress. It is predicted that individuals who are more vulnerable to stress perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their vacation time); while individuals who are less vulnerable to stress perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their vacation time).

Descriptive Statistics: Vulnerability to Stress

Twenty items in the survey are summed to form the vulnerability to stress scale (STS). Descriptive statistics in Table 5-11a show that 117 (of 118) employees responded to these items, and their scores range from a low of seventy to a high of 500 (of a possible range of zero to 800). For this group of employees, the mean score, i.e. average degree to which individuals are vulnerable to stress, is 229.2 and the standard deviation is 88.3. When low and high distributions are examined, results show that fifty-eight employees are less vulnerable to stress and score 210 or lower; while the remaining fifty-nine employees are more vulnerable to stress and score 220 or above. Compared to the possible score range, this cutoff is really quite low. When extremely low and high distributions are examined, results show that thirty-eight employees have the least vulnerability to stress, scoring 190 or below; while an almost equal number, thirty-seven employees, are most vulnerable

to stress and score 260 or above. These distributions indicate that these employees score on the low end of the scale, and, in general, tend to be less (rather than more) vulnerable to stress.

Table 5-11a
Descriptive Statistics for STS

\bar{X}	229.2	
S.D.	88.3	
Score Range	70-500	
N Cases	117	
Scale Distribution	Score Range	N Cases
Lower Half	70-210	58
Upper Half	220-500	59
Lower Third	70-190	38
Upper Third	260-500	37

Relationship Between Stress and the Independent Variable (Vacation Practices)

Relationship Between Stress and the Dependent Variables (Performance and Absenteeism)

Stress and Vacation Practices. The relationship between stress and the independent variable, vacation practices, is not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a closer examination of the results shows more meaningful results, i.e. the sign of the relationship tends to be negative.

First, Table 5-11b presents mean scores for vacation practices when controlling for stress. The findings show that individuals who are more vulnerable to stress score, on the average, 58.4 on the vacation scale; while individuals who are less vulnerable to stress score 59.8. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

Second, Table 5-11c shows the correlation between stress and the use of vacation time is $-.06$. Although this is not large, it suggests the relationship is more negative than positive. In addition, when each item in the stress scale is correlated with the total VAC scale, the majority (thirteen of twenty) show negative correlations. Similarly, nine of the eleven vacation items show negative (and sometimes significantly negative) correlations with the total STS scale.

Hence, these results support a negative tendency in the sign of the relationship: individuals who are more vulnerable to stress tend to use less of their allotted vacation time than individuals who are less vulnerable to stress.

Stress and Performance and Absenteeism. The relationships between stress and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism, are also not significantly different from zero, statistically. However, a closer examination of the results for each performance and absenteeism measure shows more meaningful results, i.e. there is evidence of some form of relationship and the form depends on each particular measure. More specifically, stress is negatively related to promotability and positively related to absenteeism; however, there are no clear relationships between stress and the remaining performance measures. Each is discussed below.

Stress and Performance Evaluations. There is no clear relationship between stress and performance evaluations. Table 5-11b presents mean scores for performance evaluations when controlling for stress. The findings show that individuals who are more vulnerable to stress score, on the average, 127.7 on the vacation scale; while individuals who are less vulnerable to stress score 130.0. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

However, Table 5-11c shows the correlation between stress and performance evaluations is not significantly different from zero, $-.01$. And, when each of the stress items is correlated with the total PEV scale, only eight of twenty items show a somewhat negative correlation. In addition, the correlations between the two performance evaluation items and the total STS scale are both positive and negative.

These results are not significantly different from zero, and do not support any distinct form, i.e. there is no clear relationship between stress and performance evaluations.

Stress and Performance Potential. Also, there is no clear relationship between stress and performance potential. Mean scores for performance potential when controlling for stress, in Table 5-11b, show that individuals who are more vulnerable to stress score, on the average, 59.7 on the performance potential scale; while individuals who are less vulnerable to stress score 59.1. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

Yet, Table 5-11c shows a non-significant correlation between stress and performance potential ($.004$). And, when each of the stress items is correlated with the total VAC scale, only a slight majority (eleven of twenty) show positive correlations. While the separate items

of Hay Points and age correlate positively with the total STS scale, the correlations are quite low.

These results are not significantly different from zero and do not support any distinct sign: there is no clear relationship between vulnerability to stress and performance potential.

Stress and Promotability. In contrast, there appears to be a negative relationship between stress and promotability. Table 5-11b presents mean scores for promotability when controlling for stress, and shows that individuals who are more vulnerable to stress score, on the average, 2.2 on the promotability scale; while those who are less vulnerable to stress score 2.0. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

In addition, Table 5-11c shows a somewhat negative correlation between stress and promotability ($-.11$). Also, when each item in the stress scale is correlated with the total PROM scale, twelve of twenty show negative correlations, often achieving statistical significance. Similarly, both items in the promotability scale show negative correlations with the total STS scale.

Hence, there is evidence of a negative relationship: individuals who are less vulnerable to stress have higher promotability than individuals who are more vulnerable to stress.

Stress and Absenteeism. Finally, the relationship between stress and absenteeism is positive. Table 5-11b presents mean scores for absenteeism when controlling for stress. The findings show that individuals who are more vulnerable to stress score, on the average, 60.2 on the absenteeism scale; while individuals who are less vulnerable to stress score, on the average, 58.1. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

Similarly, Table 5-11c shows that the correlation between stress and absenteeism, though not large, reflects a more positive than negative relationship, i.e. .04. In addition, when each of the stress items is correlated with the total AB scale, thirteen of twenty show positive correlations. And, the majority of absenteeism items (three of five) show positive correlations with the total STS scale.

These results, therefore, support a positive tendency in the sign of the relationship: individuals who are more vulnerable to stress have a higher incidence of absenteeism than individuals who are less vulnerable to stress.

Table 5-11b

Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for STS

Variables	VAC		PEV		PERT		PROM		AB		STS	
	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N
Low STS	59.8	57	130.0	58	59.1	56	2.2	59	58.1	58	161.6	58
High STS	58.4	57	127.7	57	59.7	58	2.0	59	60.2	58	295.8	59
All Cases	59.2	114	128.9	115	59.4	114	2.1	118	59.1	116	229.2	117



Table 5-11c

Table and Item-scale Correlations of STS with Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables

	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135
	-.15	.04	.08	.10	-.09	-.10	.03	.07	-.12	.18*	-.05	-.07	-.12	.15	-.09	-.01	-.14	-.10	-.06
	.08	.01	-.02	-.02	.16*	.01	.03	-.08	-.08	.06	.02	-.02	.05	.00	.06	.04	-.17*	-.19*	-.13
	-.04	.03	.23*	-.13	-.21*	-.12	-.20*	-.16*	.12	.02	.25**	.11	.07	-.02	.11	-.07	.10	.03	-.10
	-.11	.01	.05	-.18*	-.03	-.16*	-.17*	.03	.10	.03	.06	-.05	-.05	-.08	.03	-.10	-.07	-.08	-.12
	-.003	.12	.001	.08	-.02	-.15	.03	.15	.09	.04	-.08	-.20*	.11	.11	.12	.05	.19*	.03	-.18*

	2	10	12	14	16	44	46	48	50	93	94 (PEV)	105	106
	-.17*	-.01	-.17*	-.08	.15	-.09	-.12	-.03	.06	-.17*	-.02	-.04	.02
	238	243	(PROM)	101	102	(AB)	202	204	209	221	223		
	.03	.05		-.09	-.09		.15	-.09	.03	-.03	.11		

Summary

The results of the relationship between stress and the independent and dependent variables support potential signs of certain relationships. For example, the relationship between stress and the independent variable, vacation practices, is negative (or has a negative tendency): individuals who are more vulnerable to stress use less allotted vacation time than individuals who are less vulnerable to stress. However, the relationships between stress and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism, depend on the specific measure of performance. In particular, the relationship between stress and promotability is negative, and between stress and absenteeism is positive: individuals who are less vulnerable to stress have higher promotability and a lower incidence of absenteeism than individuals who are more vulnerable to stress. But, there are no clear relationships between stress and performance measured by performance evaluations or performance potential.

Moderating Effects of Stress on the Relationship Between Vacation

Practices, Performance and Absenteeism

The stress scale is divided into low and high scores which are selected out, individually and examined as moderators of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables as follows.

High Stress Scores: Moderating Effects on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When high stress scores moderate, the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero for all statistical analyses. However, a more specific examination of the relationship between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results,

i.e. reflecting a tendency toward some form of relationship. In particular, vacation practices are negatively related to performance evaluations and positively related to promotability. But, there are no clear relationships between vacation practices and performance potential or absenteeism. The specific results of each are discussed below.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, results of correlations show, in Table 5-11d, that the relationship tends to be somewhat negative ($-.07$). Yet, when vacation practices are examined in relation to performance potential, results of correlations reported in Table 5-11d show that the relationship is not significantly different from zero ($.001$). In contrast, when vacation practices are examined in relation to promotability, results reflect a more positive relationship, i.e. a correlation of $.11$. Yet, once again, there is no evidence of any relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism. In particular, correlation coefficients in Table 5-11d indicate that the correlations between use of vacation time and absenteeism is virtually nil, $.01$.

Low Stress Scores: Moderating Effects on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When low stress scores moderate, the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero for all statistical analyses. However, a more specific examination of the relationships between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results, i.e. reflecting a tendency toward some form of relationship. In particular, three of the four measures of the dependent variable are related to vacation practices as predicted, i.e. vacation practices

are negatively related to performance evaluations and performance potential, and positively related to absenteeism. But, there is also evidence of a positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability. The results of each are presented below.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, results of correlations, presented in Table 5-11d, reflect a noticeably negative relationship (-.18). Similarly, when vacation practices are examined in relation to performance potential, correlation coefficients show that the sign of the relationship also appears to be somewhat negative, i.e. -.11. In contrast, the relationship between vacation practices and promotability appears to be more positive, as indicated by a correlation coefficient of .12. Finally, as expected, when vacation practices are examined in relation to absenteeism, correlation coefficients in Table 5-11d reflect a strong positive relationship, i.e. .24.

Table 5-11d

Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism
Variables when Controlling for STS

Variables	PEV	PERT	PROM	AB
Low STS	-.18	-.11	.12	.24*
High STS	-.07	.001	.11	.01

* $p \leq .05$

Summary

The overall results of the moderating effects of stress on the relationship between the independent and dependent variable are not significant, statistically. However, more specific results, expressed in terms of the strength of the moderator, stress, are more meaningful. In particular: 1) for individuals who are more vulnerable to stress, there is an expected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability, but an unexpected negative relationship between vacation practices and performance evaluations. And, there are no clear relationships between vacation practices and performance potential or absenteeism, and 2) for individuals who are less vulnerable to stress, there are predicted negative relationships between vacation practices and performance evaluations and between vacation practices and performance potential, and a predicted positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism (reflecting a significantly positive correlation). But, there is an unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability.

Summary and Conclusion

The findings in the examination: 1) of vacation practices, and of performance and absenteeism, in relation to vulnerability to stress, and 2) of the relationship between these vacation practices and performance and absenteeism variables when moderated by vulnerability to stress, show no consistent support for Proposition 7, i.e. the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism are not consistently or significantly affected by an individual's vulnerability to stress, as predicted. The statistical differences in means and resultant correlation coefficients are not significantly

different from zero. (However, it should be noted that some correlations between vacations and certain measures of the dependent variables do achieve statistical significance). A final examination of Table 5-11e, which shows regression statistics for each performance and absenteeism variable as a function of both vacation practices and stress, further confirms this general notion. A comparison of R squares for all performance and absenteeism measures indicates that the proportion of variance in any performance or absenteeism variable which is explained by the extent to which individuals use vacation time, and their vulnerability to stress, is minimal (R^2 range from .01 to .02). And, a comparison of the standardized regression coefficients (Betas) additionally indicates that the extent to which vacation time is used and their vulnerability to stress do not significantly affect performance or absenteeism (Betas range from -.12 to .10 for vacations, and from -.12 to .05 for stress for all performance/absenteeism measures).

Table 5-11e

STS: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation,
Performance and Absenteeism Variables

Moderating Variable	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Beta		R^2	F
			VAC	/ STS		
STS	VAC	PEV	-.12	-.04	.02	.8
		PERT	-.09	.02	.01	.4
		PROM	.08	-.12	.02	1.1
		AB	.10	.05	.01	.6

So, a conclusive statement on how stress affects the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism cannot be provided from a statistical point of view. That is, the results of all the relationships examined do not achieve statistical significance. However, a more definitive statement on how stress affects the more specific relationship between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism variable can be offered, from a practical point of view. That is, the results, when examined in terms of the consistency in the form or sign of the relationship, provide a more meaningful expression of potential relationships. In particular, with regard to performance and absenteeism: 1) when performance evaluations are examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is significantly negative for individuals less vulnerable to stress; in comparison, for individuals more vulnerable to stress, the relationship is also negative (but shows a negative correlation of lesser magnitude), 2) when performance potential is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is negative for individuals less vulnerable to stress; in comparison, for individuals more vulnerable to stress, the relationship is not consistent or clear (but shows a less negative correlation), 3) when promotability is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is positive for individuals who are less vulnerable to stress; in comparison, for individuals who are more vulnerable to stress, the relationship is also positive and of a similar magnitude, and 4) when absenteeism is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is significantly positive for individuals who are less vulnerable to stress; in comparison, for individuals more vulnerable to stress the relationship is also positive (but of a much lesser magnitude).

Therefore, the moderating effects of stress are more pronounced or meaningful when the strength of the moderator (low or high) and the dependent variable being measured (performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability or absenteeism) are identified. Based on this proposition, and based on the premise that the results, while not achieving statistical significance, do reflect more meaningful significance when expressed in terms of potential relationships, it is believed that: 1) individuals who are more vulnerable to stress tend to have high levels of performance, reflected in performance evaluations, when they use less of their allotted vacation time. Yet, they have high promotability when they use more of it, and 2) individuals who are less vulnerable to stress tend to have high levels of performance, reflected in performance evaluations and performance potential, and a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time. Yet, they tend to have high promotability when they use more of it.

Proposition 8

The relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by the job level of an individual. It is predicted that individuals who occupy high job levels perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their vacation time); while individuals who occupy low job levels perform at high levels and have a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time (or perform less effectively and have a high incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their vacation time).

Descriptive Statistics: Job Level

Three items in the survey are summed to form the job level scale (JLEV). Descriptive statistics in Table 5-12a indicate that 114 (of 118) employees responded to these items, and their scores (or levels) range from a low of twenty to a high of 120 (of a possible range of twenty to 130). For this group of employees the average job level is 53.7 and the standard deviation is 21.3. When low and high distributions are examined, the results show that sixty-one employees occupy low job levels of fifty or below; while the remaining fifty-three employees occupy high job levels of sixty or above. Compared to the possible range of jobs, this fifty percent cutoff is close to the midpoint; however the distribution of cases is unequal due to the tied scores at and near this cutoff, i.e. twenty-two, seventeen, eighteen and eighteen cases at job levels forty, fifty, sixty and seventy, respectively. When extremely low and high distributions are examined,

results show that forty-four employees occupy the lowest job levels, i.e. forty or below; while the remaining thirty-five employees occupy the highest levels, i.e. seventy or above. These scores and frequencies indicate that the majority of employees who participated in this survey score on the lower end of the scale and, in general, tend to occupy lower (rather than higher) job levels.

Table 5-12a
Descriptive Statistics for JLEV

\bar{X}	53.7	
S.D.	21.3	
Score Range	20-120	
N Cases	114	
Scale Distribution	Score Range	N Cases
Lower Half	20-150	61
Upper Half	60-120	53
Lower Third	20-40	44
Upper Third	70-120	35

Relationship Between Job Level and the Independent Variable (Vacation Practices)

Relationship Between Job Level and the Dependent Variables (Performance and Absenteeism)

Job Level and Vacation Practices. The relationship between job level and the independent variable, vacation practices, is not significantly different from zero for all statistical analyses performed on

the relationship. However, a closer examination of the results shows more meaningful results, i.e. the sign of the relationship tends to be negative.

First, Table 5-12b reflects meanscores for vacations when controlling for job level. The findings show that individuals who occupy high job levels score, on the average, 57.9 on the vacation scale; while individuals who occupy low levels score, on the average, 60.2. Compared to all individuals, the sign is negative.

Second, Table 5-12c shows a significant negative correlation between vacation practices and job level ($-.29$). In addition, when each of the job level items is correlated with the total VAC scale, two of the three show significant negative correlations; similarly, the majority of vacation items (eight of eleven) show negative, and often significantly negative, correlations with the total JLEV scale.

These results, therefore, clearly support a negative sign in the relationship: individuals who occupy high job levels tend to use less allotted vacation time than individuals who occupy low job levels.

Job Level and Performance and Absenteeism. The relationships between job level and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism, are not significantly different from zero, for all statistical analyses. However, a closer examination of the results for each performance and absenteeism measure reveals more meaningful results, i.e. there is evidence of some form of relationship and the form depends on each particular measure. More specifically, job level is positively related to performance evaluations and performance potential and negatively related to absenteeism. But, there is no clear relationship

between job level and promotability. Each is discussed in the following.

Job Level and Performance Evaluations. There tends to be a positive relationship between job level and performance evaluations. Table 5-12b presents mean scores for performance evaluations when controlling for job level. The findings show that individuals who occupy high job levels score, on the average, 129.2 on the performance evaluation scale; while individuals who occupy low levels score 128.6. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

Similarly, results of correlation coefficients, though low, show in Table 5-12c that the relationship tends to be somewhat positive (.04). In addition, the majority of job level items (two of three) reflect positive correlations with the total PEV scale. And, each performance evaluation item show a positive correlation with the total JLEV scale.

Hence, these results support a somewhat positive relationship: individuals who occupy high job levels have higher performance evaluations than individuals who occupy low job levels.

Job Level and Performance Potential. Similarly, the relationship between job level and performance potential is also positive. Table 5-12b, reflecting mean scores for performance potential when controlling for job level, shows that individuals who occupy high job levels score, on the average, 70.2 on the performance potential scale; while individuals who occupy low job levels score 50.0. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is positive.

Furthermore, Table 5-12c shows a significant positive correlation of .57 between job level and performance potential. However, it should be noted that one item is shared by both scales. So, each of the job level items shows significant positive correlations with the total PERT scale; similarly the Hay Point and age items of the PERT scale show significant positive correlations with the total JLEV scale.

These results, therefore, support a positive sign: individuals who occupy high job levels have higher performance potential than individuals who occupy low job levels.

Job Level and Promotability. There is no clear relationship between job level and promotability. Mean scores for promotability when controlling for job level are shown in Table 5-12b. The findings indicate that individuals occupying high job levels score, on the average, 2.2 on the promotability scale; while individuals occupying low levels score 2.1. Compared to all individuals the sign of the relationship is slightly positive.

Yet, Table 5-12c shows a non-significant, though somewhat negative, correlation between job level and promotability (-.05). And, while two of the three job level items show negative correlations with the total PROM scale, the two promotability items reflect both positive and negative correlations with the total JLEV scale.

These results are not statistically significant, nor do they logically reflect any clear sign in the relationship between job level and promotability.

Job Level and Absenteeism. Finally, the relationship between job level and absenteeism is negative. First, mean scores for absenteeism, when controlling for job level, are presented in Table 5-12b. The findings show that individuals who occupy high job levels score, on the average, 51.7 on the absenteeism scale; while individuals who occupy low job levels score 65.4. Compared to all individuals, the sign of the relationship is negative.

Furthermore, Table 5-12c shows a significant negative correlation between job level and absenteeism (-.17). In addition, all of the job level items are negatively correlated with the total AB scale; and four of the five absenteeism items show negative correlations with the total JLEV scale, with some achieving statistical significance.

These results clearly support a negative relationship: individuals who occupy high job levels have a lower incidence of absenteeism than individuals who occupy low job levels.

Table 5-12b

Mean Scores for Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism Variables when Controlling for JLEV

Variables	VAC		PEV		PERT		PROM		AB		JLEV	
	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N	\bar{X}	N
Low JLEV	60.2	64	128.6	64	50.0	61	2.1	65	65.4	63	37.4	61
High JLEV	57.9	50	129.2	51	70.2	53	2.2	53	51.7	53	72.5	53
All Cases	59.2	114	128.9	115	59.4	114	2.1	118	59.1	116	53.7	114

Table 5-12c
Inter-scale and Item-scale Correlations of JLEV with Vacations, Performance and Absenteeism Variables

Variable/Items	JLEV	100	243	244
VAC	-.29**	-.18*	.19*	-.30**
PEV	.04	-.02	.04	.08
PRT	.57**	.31**	.75**	.39**
PROM	-.05	.11	-.11	-.14
AB	-.17*	-.12	-.08	-.17*
<hr/>				
(VAC)	2 10 12 14 16 44 46 48 50 93 94	106		
JLEV	-.07 -.33** -.12 .02 -.11 -.36** -.36** .03 -.16* -.06 .15	.07	.02	
(PRT)	238 243 (PROM) 101 102 (AB) 202 204 209 221 223			
JLEV	.24** .80** -.10 .05 -.14 -.08 -.27** -.23** .12			

*p ≤ .05

**p ≤ .01

Summary

The results of the relationship between job level and the independent and dependent variables support potential signs in certain relationships. For example, the relationship between job level and the independent variable, vacation practices, is negative (or tends to be more negative): individuals who occupy high job levels use more allotted vacation time than individuals who occupy low job levels. However, the relationships between job level and the dependent variables, performance and absenteeism, depend on the specific measure. In particular, the relationship between job level and performance evaluations and performance potential is positive, and between job level and absenteeism is negative: individuals occupying high job levels have higher performance evaluations and performance potential and a lower incidence of absenteeism than individuals occupying low job levels. But, there is no clear relationship between job level and performance when measured by promotability.

Moderating Effects of Job Level on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism

The job level scale is divided into low and high scores which are selected out, individually, and examined as moderators of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, as follows.

High Job Level: Moderating Effects on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When high job levels moderate, the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero for all statistical analyses performed on the relationships. However, a more specific examination of the relationship between vacation

practices and each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results, i.e. reflecting a tendency toward some form of relationship. In particular, vacation practices are negatively related to performance evaluations and positively related to performance potential, promotability and absenteeism. The results of each are presented below.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, results of correlations show in Table 5-12d that the relationship is somewhat negative ($-.08$). In contrast, when vacation practices are examined in relation to performance potential, correlation coefficients in Table 5-12d reflect virtually no relationship, though the correlation is more positive than negative, i.e. $.02$. Yet, when vacation practices are examined in relation to promotability, there is evidence of a strong positive correlation of $.17$. Finally, there is also evidence of a positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism as indicated by a correlation coefficient of $.13$.

Low Job Levels: Moderating Effects on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism. When low job levels moderate, the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism, in general, are not significantly different from zero for all statistical analyses. However, a more specific examination of the relationship between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism measure yields more meaningful results, i.e. reflecting a tendency toward some form of relationship. In particular, vacation practices are negatively related to performance evaluations and positively related to performance potential, promotability and absenteeism. The results of each are presented in the following.

When vacation practices are examined in relation to performance evaluations, results of correlations in Table 5-12d express a negative

relationship (-.13). Yet, when vacation practices are examined in relation to performance potential, the results reflect a less negative and more positive relationship. In particular, Table 5-12d shows a non-significant, though somewhat positive, correlation between vacations and performance potential (.04). Similarly, there is also evidence of a positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability as reflected by a low but positive correlation coefficient of .08. Similarly, there is also evidence of a positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, i.e. correlations presented in Table 5-12d reflect a low but somewhat positive correlation of .06.

Table 5-12d

Correlations of Vacation, Performance and Absenteeism
Variables when Controlling for JLEV

Variables	PEV	PERT	PROM	AB
Low JLEV	-.13	.04	.08	.06
High JLEV	-.08	.02	.17	.13

Summary

The overall results of the moderating effects of job level on the relationship between the independent and dependent variables are not significant, statistically. However, more specific results, expressed in terms of the strength of the moderator, job level, are more meaningful. In particular: 1) for individuals occupying high job levels, there is an expected positive relationship between vacations and performance potential and promotability; but there is an unexpected negative relationship between vacations and performance evaluations, and an unexpected positive

relationship between vacations and absenteeism, and 2) for individuals occupying low job levels, there is an expected negative relationship between vacations and performance evaluations, and an expected positive relationship between vacations and absenteeism. But, there are unexpected positive relationships between vacations and performance potential and promotability.

Summary and Conclusion

The findings in the examination: 1) of vacation practices, and of performance and absenteeism, in relation to job level, and 2) of the relationship of these vacation practices and performance and absenteeism variables when moderated by job level, show no consistent support for Proposition 8, i.e. the relationships between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism are not consistently or significantly affected by the job level of an individual, as predicted. The statistical differences in means and resultant correlation coefficients, are not significantly different from zero. And, an examination of Table 5-12e, which shows regression statistics for each performance and absenteeism variable as a function of both vacation practices and job level, further confirms this general notion. A comparison of R squares for all performance and absenteeism measures indicates that the proportion of variance in any performance or absenteeism variable which is explained by the extent to which individuals use vacation time and the level of the job they occupy, is minimal (R^2 range from .01 to .05. The R^2 for performance potential is .35, but it must be noted that a common item comprises both the job level and performance potential scales). And, a comparison of the standardized regression coefficients (Betas) additionally indicates that the extent to which individuals use allotted vacation time and the job level they occupy

do not consistently affect all performance and absenteeism measures. For example, for performance evaluations and promotability, respectively, Betas are $-.10$ and $.08$ for vacations, and $.04$ and $-.02$ for job level. However, for absenteeism, Betas are $.03$ and $-.21$ for vacations and job level, respectively. The Beta coefficient for the moderator, in particular, is more noticeable and suggests that job level, in combination with vacation practices, may have more of an effect on absenteeism than on the other performance indicators, and than has been expressed in preceding analyses. (The Beta coefficients for performance potential are not impressive because, as explained, the job level and performance potential scales share an item).

Table 5-12e

JLEV: Moderated Regression Statistics for Vacation,
Performance and Absenteeism Variables

Moderating Variable	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Beta		R ²	F
			VAC	/ JLEV		
JLEV	VAC	PEV	-.10	.04	.02	.8
		PERT	.14	.63*	.35	27.0
		PROM	.08	-.02	.01	.4
		AB	.03	-.21*	.05	2.6

*Beta \geq .20

So, a conclusive statement on how job level affects the relationship between vacation practices and performance and absenteeism cannot be provided from a statistical point of view. That is, the results of all of the relationships examined do not achieve statistical significance. However, a more definitive statement on how job level affects the more specific relationship between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism variable can be offered from a practical point of view. That is, the results, when examined in terms of the consistency in the sign or form of the relationship, provide a more meaningful expression of potential relationships. In particular, in terms of performance and absenteeism: 1) when performance evaluations are examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is negative for individuals occupying high job levels; in comparison, for individuals occupying low job levels, the relationship is also negative (though the correlation is of

a somewhat larger magnitude); 2) when performance potential is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is somewhat positive for individuals occupying high job levels; in comparison, for individuals occupying low job levels, the relationship is also somewhat positive (but of a larger magnitude), 3) when promotability is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is positive for individuals occupying high job levels; in comparison, for individuals occupying low job levels, the relationship is also positive (though the correlation is of a lesser magnitude); and 4) when absenteeism is examined, the relationship to use of vacation time is positive for individuals occupying high job levels; in comparison, for individuals occupying low job levels, the relationship is also positive (but the correlation is of a somewhat lesser magnitude).

Therefore, the moderating effects of job level are more pronounced when the strength of the moderator (low or high) and the dependent variable being measured (performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, or absenteeism) are identified. Based on this proposition, and based on the premise that the results, while not achieving statistical significance, do reflect more meaningful significance when expressed in terms of potential relationships, it is believed that: individuals who occupy both low and high job levels tend to have high levels of performance, reflected in performance evaluations, and a low incidence of absenteeism, when they use less of their allotted vacation time. However, they tend to have high performance potential and promotability when they use more of their vacation time.

Overview of Results

An examination of the results of the preceding tests of the General Hypothesis, which predicts a negative relationship between vacation practices and performance and a positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, indicates that the General Hypothesis is not supported, and that no statistically significant relationships exist.

Similarly, an examination of the results of the preceding tests of the Sub-Hypothesis, which predicts particular relationships between vacation practices and performance and between vacation practices and absenteeism depending on the degree to which certain moderating factors or conditions are present, also indicates that the Sub-Hypothesis, generally, is not supported and that not all relationships achieve statistical significance.

However, the tests of the General Hypothesis and the propositions of the Sub-Hypothesis generate descriptive, as well as other, statistics and, when examined from a comparative level of analysis, are useful in evaluating and understanding better the findings of this study and, in particular, the potential or pattern of relationships that tend to emerge. These particular statistics are presented in summary below.

General Hypothesis

Several tests of the General Hypothesis generate statistics regarding means, score distributions, correlation and regression coefficients, etc., which provide data on employee responses to the measures of the independent and dependent variables, and from which results are determined.

First, with regard to the individual measures of the independent variable and of the dependent variable, statistics indicate that the

employees who participated in this survey tend to use more (rather than less) of their allotted vacation time, have high performance evaluations, low performance potential, low promotability, and a low incidence of absenteeism.

Second, when these independent and dependent variables are examined jointly, i.e. in relation to each other, results indicate that the individuals in the survey who use more of their allotted vacation time tend to have high promotability, as expected. However, unexpectedly, they also tend to have low performance evaluations, low performance potential and a high incidence of absenteeism, as presented in Table 5-13. While these results are not statistically significant, they do reflect a pattern of relationships opposite to what was predicted.

Sub-Hypothesis

Several tests of the eight propositions of the Sub-Hypothesis generate statistics regarding means, score distributions, correlation and regression coefficients, etc., which provide data on employee responses to measures of the moderating variables, and on the moderating effects of these variables on the relationship between vacation practices and performance and between vacation practices and absenteeism.

Descriptive Statistics and Relationships Between Independent, Dependent and Moderating Variables

First, with regard to the individual measures of the eight moderating factors or conditions, statistics indicate that the employees who participated in this survey tend to believe vacation time allotted

and the opportunities to use the time are fair (as opposed to not fair); hold strong beliefs in the ideals of the PWE; exhibit weak Type A behavior; value and enjoy vacations more in absolute terms but less in relative terms (i.e. preferring other types of rewards or benefits); are less vulnerable to stress; and occupy low job levels.¹

Second, when these moderating factors are examined in relation to the independent and to the dependent variables, results reflect a number of relationships, depending on the particular moderators examined. These results are presented in Table 5-13 (reflecting potential, not necessarily statistically significant, relationships) and are briefly discussed below.

1. Individuals who feel vacation time allotted and opportunities to use the time are fair (FFV--felt-fair vacations) tend to have higher performance evaluations and a lower incidence of absenteeism than individuals who do not believe vacation time and opportunity are fair. However, individuals who do not feel vacation time and opportunity are fair have higher performance potential and promotability. The relationship between FFV and vacation practices is unclear.

2. Individuals who hold strong beliefs in the ideals of the PWE tend to use more allotted vacation time and tend to have higher performance evaluations and performance potential, and a lower incidence of absenteeism, than individuals who hold weak beliefs. However, individuals with weak PWE beliefs have higher promotability.

¹Results for the job compatibility scores are less clear due to the nature of the measure, i.e. matching two different scales.

3. Individuals who exhibit weak Type A behavior tend to use more allotted vacation time than individuals exhibiting strong Type A behavior. However, individuals who exhibit strong Type A behavior tend to have higher performance evaluations, performance potential and promotability. The relationship between Type A behavior and absenteeism is unclear.

4. Older individuals tend to use more allotted vacation time and tend to have higher performance evaluations and a lower incidence of absenteeism than younger individuals. However, younger individuals tend to have higher performance potential and promotability.

5. Individuals who are compatible with their job situations experience higher performance potential and a lower incidence of absenteeism than individuals in less compatible job situations. However, the remaining relationships are unclear.

6. Individuals who value and enjoy vacation in both absolute (EVAC 1) and relative (EVAC 2) terms tend to use more allotted vacation time and tend to have a lower incidence of absenteeism than individuals who value or enjoy vacations less. In addition, individuals who value and enjoy vacations in absolute terms have higher performance evaluations than their counterparts; however, individuals who value and enjoy vacations in relative terms tend to have lower performance evaluations. Finally, some conflicting results emerge with the particular measure of value (i.e. EVAC 1 or EVAC 2) in relation to performance potential. More specifically, individuals who value and enjoy vacations in absolute terms experience lower performance potential than their counterparts; yet, individuals who value and enjoy vacations in relative terms experience higher performance potential. For promotability, the only clear relationship that emerges is with

individuals who value and enjoy vacations in relative terms enjoying more promotion opportunities.

7. Individuals who are less vulnerable to stress tend to use more allotted vacation time and tend to have higher promotability and a lower incidence of absenteeism than individuals who are more vulnerable to stress. However, the remaining relationships are unclear.

8. Finally, individuals who occupy lower job levels tend to use more allotted vacation time. However, individuals who occupy higher levels tend to have higher performance evaluations and performance potential and a lower incidence of absenteeism. The relationship between job level and promotability is unclear.

Table 5-13

Comparative Summary: Relationships Between Independent,
Dependent and Moderating Variables¹

Variables	VAC	PEV	PERT	PROM	AB
VAC ²		-	-	+	+
FFV	?	+	-	-	-
PWE	+	+	+	-	-
TPA	-	+	+	+	?
AGE	+	+	-	-	-
JC	?	?	+	?	-
EVAC 1	+	+	-	?	-
EVAC 2	+	-	+	+	+
STS	-	?	?	-	+
JLEV	-	+	+	?	-

¹Signs reflect potential, not necessarily statistically significant, relationships.

²These reflect relationships of the General Hypothesis. All others pertain to the Sub-Hypothesis.

Effects of Moderating Variables on the Relationship Between the
Independent and Dependent Variables

Each of the moderating variables discussed previously were examined in terms of their influence on the relationship between vacation practices and performance and between vacation practices and absenteeism. The results, presented in Table 5-14 and discussed below, represent a tendency for the relationships to reflect a particular sign; not all achieve statistical significance. The significance of these potential relationships, or patterns of correlations, is addressed in Chapter Six where results of Siegel's Sign Test are presented and discussed.

1. Individuals who feel vacation time allotted and the opportunities to use the time are fair tend to have higher performance evaluations and performance potential and a lower incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time. However, they tend to have high promotability when they use more of it. In comparison, individuals who do not feel vacation time and opportunity are fair tend to have higher performance evaluations, also, when they use less of their allotted vacation time. However, they tend to have high performance potential when they use more of it.

2. Individuals who have strong PWE beliefs tend to have higher performance evaluations and performance potential and a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time; yet they have high promotability when they use more of it. In comparison, individuals with weak PWE beliefs tend to have high performance potential and promotability when they use more of their allotted vacation time; yet, they have high performance evaluations and a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of it.

3. Individuals who exhibit either strong or weak Type A behavior tend to achieve high performance evaluations and performance potential, and maintain a low incidence of absenteeism, when they use less of their allotted vacation time. However, they tend to have high promotability when they use more of it.

4. Older individuals tend to have high performance evaluations and performance potential and a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time; yet they tend to have high promotability when they use more of it. In comparison, younger individuals also have high performance evaluations and a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less allotted vacation time; yet, they tend to have high promotability when they use more of it.

5. Individuals who are compatible with their jobs tend to have high performance evaluations and performance potential and a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less of their allotted vacation time; yet they tend to have high promotability when they use more of it. In comparison, individuals in incompatible job situations have high performance potential and a low incidence of absenteeism when they use more of their allotted vacation time; yet, they tend to have high performance evaluations and promotability when they use less of it.

6. Individuals who value and enjoy vacations (in both absolute and relative terms) tend to have high promotability when they use more of their allotted vacation time. In comparison, individuals who do not value and enjoy vacations (in both absolute and relative terms) also tend to achieve high promotability when they use more of it. However, in addition, they attain high performance evaluations and performance potential when they use less of it.

7. Individuals who are more vulnerable to stress tend to have high performance evaluations when they use less allotted vacation time; however, they tend to have high promotability when they use more of it. In comparison, individuals who are less vulnerable to stress tend to have high performance evaluations and performance potential and a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less allotted vacation time; yet, they tend to have high promotability when they use more of it.

8. Finally, individuals who occupy either high or low job levels tend to have high performance evaluations and a low incidence of absenteeism when they use less allotted vacation time. However, they tend to have high performance potential and promotability when they use more of it.

These tests of the General Hypothesis and of the Sub-Hypothesis, therefore, generate some informative statistics which provide additional meaning to the results of this research. From an individual level of analysis it is evident that not all of the results are statistically significant. However, from a comparative level of analysis it is evident that certain patterns or potential relationships tend to emerge (e.g. reflecting consistent signs in the relationships). This is especially noticeable when the results of the propositions of the Sub-Hypothesis are examined. More specifically, there appears to be a definite trend or pattern of correlations between vacation practices and performance (reflecting a negative relationship) and between vacation practices and absenteeism (reflecting a positive relationship) when influenced by certain moderating factors. This pattern is statistically significant when analyzed using Siegel's Sign Test. A discussion of these particular results, as well as of other more general results, is presented in Chapter Six.

Table 5-14

Comparative Summary: Effects of the Moderating Variables on the Relationship between the Independent and Dependent Variables

Moderating Variable	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Moderating Variable	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable
High FFV	VAC	- PEV -* PERT +* PROM +* AB	Low FFV	VAC	- PEV + PERT ? PROM ? AB
High PWE	VAC	- PEV - PERT + PROM + AB	Low PWE	VAC	- PEV + PERT + PROM + AB
High TPA	VAC	- PEV - PERT + PROM + AB	Low TPA	VAC	- PEV - PERT + PROM + AB
High AGE	VAC	- PEV - PERT + PROM + AB	Low AGE	VAC	- PEV ? PERT + PROM + AB
High JC	VAC	-* PEV - PERT + PROM + AB	Low JC	VAC	- PEV + PERT - PROM - AB
High EVAC (1 and 2)	VAC	? PEV ? PERT + PROM ? AB	Low EVAC (1 and 2)	VAC	- PEV - PERT + PROM + AB
High STS	VAC	- PEV ? PERT + PROM ? AB	Low STS	VAC	- PEV - PERT + PROM +* AB

Table 5-14 (continued)

Moderating Variable	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Moderating Variable	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable
High JLEV	VAC	- PEV + PERT + PROM + AB	Low JLEV	VAC	- PEV + PERT + PROM + AB

*p \leq .05

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

The results of the statistical tests of the hypotheses of this study indicate that there is no overwhelming support for either the General Hypothesis, or the propositions of the Sub-Hypothesis: the findings are not consistent or significant, statistically, for all relationships, all measures and all analyses. These results may be explained both in general terms, i.e. by the limitations in the research design, e.g. the validity of the questionnaire, the social desirability of responses, the study being conducted at only one point in time, and in more specific terms, i.e. by the following four factors or conditions which may be peculiar to this particular study and which may have affected the overall results.

Lack of Variability in the Measurement of the Independent Variable

There is not a great deal of variability in individual responses to the vacation items which measure the independent variable, vacation practices. The majority of individuals in the survey indicate that they use all or almost all of their allotted vacation time each year. This may be explained from a number of different perspectives.

First, most of the employees who participated in the study are entitled to about the same number of weeks vacation, i.e. averaging three to four weeks annually. (The ratio of number of years of service to allotted vacation time, on which vacation policies are based, is very large). As three to four weeks is not considered an "excessive" amount

of time off in one year, it is possible that individuals do use the time (whether they want to or not) as it does not really reflect a noticeable time away from the job, especially if the vacation is taken in segments of one day at a time over a 365 day period.

Second, lack of variability may be attributed to the way in which vacation practices are measured, i.e. by the extent to which vacation time is used (e.g. amount or proportion), rather than by how or why it is used (e.g. performing job-related tasks, doing household chores, travelling, scheduling doctors' appointments), or by the way in which it is used (e.g. a few days at a time, in one week segments, or all at once). For example, all individuals may indicate that they use all or most of their allotted vacation time; but while some may engage in rest and relaxation or participate in recreational or leisurely activities, others may engage in more "work-related" activities (to catch up on or get ahead of work) while on vacation. Or, some individuals may take a big chunk of their vacation at one time to completely break the work routine; while others may tack on individual vacation days to weekends, to avoid breaking the work cycle. These alternatives or additional measures of vacation practices are especially meaningful when examined in relation to performance and absenteeism, i.e. job performance and attendance behavior may be a function of how or why vacation time is used, rather than, or in addition to, how much is used. For example, an examination of a more comprehensive measure of vacation practices, in relation to performance and absenteeism, may very well indicate that the best performers are those who take the complete break from work in order to maintain or enhance performance. In contrast, those who do not take a complete break, or instead view vacation time as an opportunity to engage in

job-related activities, may return to work without feeling refreshed or ready to resume the demanding responsibilities of the job; as a result, performance may not be enhanced, and, indeed, may deteriorate over time. In addition, such feelings of fatigue may result in an increase in incidence of absenteeism. So, a measure of vacation practices which utilizes information on how or why vacation time is used, as well as on the extent to which it is used, may yield more variability in individual vacation practices adopted, and enable a better assessment of how vacation practices relate to job performance and absenteeism.

Finally, additional limitations of the measure which may minimize variability pertain to particular vacation items which comprise the scale. Some of the items in the measure are too specific, thereby excluding too many individuals and inhibiting a variety of responses. More specifically, some questions request informations on whether or not individuals bank vacations, exchange them for cash payment, or carry them over into the next year. However, these questions pertain to only a minority of individuals who eventually participated in the survey as these practices, while established policy, are not common, and often require a certain number of years of service before they are employed. For example, the opportunity to bank vacations is possible only when individuals have four or more weeks of vacation per year. As the mean number of vacation weeks allotted per year for this sample is only three to four weeks, not many individuals in this sample can respond favorably to such items, thereby reducing variability. In contrast, while these items exclude too many individuals, or are too specific, other items include too many individuals, or are too general. For example, responses to questions on the extent to which individuals use their allotted

vacation time are measured in an "amount" response-format that minimizes variability, i.e. in general terms such as "almost all" or "little or none" rather than in more specific terms such as "all" or "none." Based on these, and other possible flaws, it is believed that a more comprehensive measure of the independent variable, vacation practices, i.e. which would have included different types of questions, a different response format, and which could have been applied more appropriately to the resultant population, may have guaranteed more variability.

Alternative Measures of the Dependent Variable--Incidence of
Absenteeism and Performance Reflected
by Three Different Indices

Second, there are four measures of the dependent variable in this study (performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, and absenteeism) which often produce inconsistent, dissimilar, or contradictory results. Since there is no one index that comprehensively measures performance, it was decided to include a number of measures, i.e. those that were determined to be most relevant, both theoretically and practically. It was expected or hoped that similar results would be reproduced by each measure, thereby producing one "combined" measure of performance: subsequently vacation practices would be examined in relation to this "global" measure. In addition, it was expected that when vacation practices are examined in relation to absenteeism, the results would be consistently opposite to those for the relationship between vacation practices and performance. However, these expectations that all (or at least three of the four measures of the dependent variable) would produce consonant results was unmet. A number of explanations are offered in the following.

First, all of these measures are necessary for, and contribute to, overall performance--as perceived by the company. However, it is possible that only some of these measures may be recognized and relevant to performance--as perceived by the individual. For example, some employees may be more concerned about their annual performance evaluations than about their performance potential. While they may indeed want and have high performance evaluations (e.g. a top ten rating) which represents stellar performance, they may not feel the need to supplement this by striving for the top jobs in the company. Rather, they are less ambitious in the long run and more satisfied with respectable performance evaluations in the short run. Such individuals would not be identified as those on a fast track or as the potential leaders of the company. Hence, for these individuals, independent of the extent to which vacation time is used, performance evaluations may be high, but performance potential relatively low. Similar arguments can be made for relative comparisons of the remaining performance measures, also. Consequently, it may have been unrealistic to expect that the analyses of all performance measures would produce the same or similar results, and that these combined results would reflect a more global, effective measure of performance.

Second, the subjectivity of the performance and absenteeism measures may also have produced inconsistent results. In particular, responses to performance and absenteeism questions rely on employee perceptions and recollections of performance evaluations, promotability, and incidence of absenteeism over given periods of time. There was no opportunity to confirm these responses with more objective criteria, e.g. by extracting information from personnel files or by interviewing

employees. So, it is possible that these "perceptual" measures of performance may deviate from the "actual" or "potential" measures for any one variable. The results, therefore, could create inconsistencies or contradictions, further threatening the reliability, or internal consistency, of the hoped for "global" measure of performance and the measure of absenteeism.

Finally, the measures had to pass tests of statistical and practical significance. Statistical operations such as tests of internal consistency, factor analyses and Pearson Product Moment correlations were performed to assess the adequacy of each measure from a statistical point of view. Similarly, the relevance of, and the number of responses to, these items were evaluated from a practical point of view to determine, further, the appropriateness of the measure, especially with regard to the population studied. However, recognizing and weighing the importance of all of these factors, and creating a perfect balance among them was not readily achieved. This was particularly true for the hoped for measure of promotability: several items in the survey request specific quantitative information on employee promotability potential (expressed in numbers and terminology adopted by the company) to adequately reflect promotability, both theoretically and practically--as it pertains to this company. However, a "don't know" option in the response format resulted in an insufficient number of responses for many of these items. Unfortunately, while these were initially included as the most representative measures of promotability, they had to be discarded. Fortunately, however, other items in the survey were combined to develop an alternative scale. Still, tied scores resulted in an unequal distribution of cases across the scale. As a consequence, it was impossible

to divide the scale into appropriate "low" and "high" cells, further challenging the distinction between individuals with low and those with high promotability, and the additional analyses of moderating effects on the relationship between vacations and performance. So, subsequent analyses, involving this promotability scale, often reflect skewed results throughout the study. Similarly, though not as severely, tied scores and an unequal distribution of cases often influence the results from analyses involving the absenteeism scale. So, while all of these measures are believed to be relevant and common indices of performance and absenteeism, some, especially promotability and absenteeism, may not have been adequately represented or applied in this study.

Generalizing Measures of Moderators from Other Research to the Present Research

Some of the moderating effects in this study are investigated by applying measures or scales of moderators generalized from other research; and, it is believed that some of these scales may be unsuitable or inadequate when applied to the eventual subjects of this present research. In particular, half of the scales used to represent the moderators in this study are based on measures developed in other studies. Since most of the previous studies deal with different populations and settings, and test different relationships, the measures may be more suitable or peculiar to those particular investigations. Following is a brief discussion of some of the scales included in this research which may provide some justification for this argument.

First, Protestant Work Ethic, explored in terms of its moderating effects on the relationship between vacation practices and performance, and vacations and absenteeism, is measured by Blood's scale which was

developed in 1969. The wording of some of the items in the scale may be a bit outdated, and, indeed, did elicit comments from some of the employees in the present study. For example, there were "sexist" reactions to the item phrased "Hard work makes a man a better person." And, an additional examination of the wording and implied attitudes suggests that this scale may not appropriately reflect the ideals of the PWE as perceived in the 1980's. Further, it should be noted that in this study, the scale itself lacks internal consistency, achieving a reliability coefficient of only .40. In other research, reliability coefficients as high as .70 have been reported (Wanous, 1974). So, this scale may not have been an appropriate measure of PWE, or its application may not have been appropriate for this particular group of employees or for this research.

Similarly, the job compatibility scale has been developed and tested in other research, and results usually have supported those predicted. However, incorporating the scale in this particular study, while achieving high internal consistency, may not have been as effective due to the comparatively small number of cases, i.e. 118. Other studies report at least twice as many cases (Staw and Oldham, 1978). Hence, dividing the scale into two situations--compatibility and incompatibility, with two subgroups in each--High GNS/High MPS, Low GNS/Low MPS and High GNS/Low MPS, Low GNS/High MPS, respectively, resulted in tied scores, unequal distributions, and an extremely small number of, or no, cases in some subgroups. Comparative analyses for all subgroups was often not possible, and consequently, inconsistent and inconclusive results were produced.

Other generalized scales, such as the Type A scale and the stress scale, while also achieving high internal consistencies, have other peculiarities associated with them which may suggest they are unsuitable, or which may account for their inappropriateness for this particular population. For example, results from the Type A scale were originally examined in relation to factors such as health (i.e. individuals who exhibit strong Type A behavior have a greater chance of developing early coronary artery disease). The nature of the questions, therefore, may not lend Type A behavior easily to investigation in relation to other factors such as performance, absenteeism or vacation practices. Similarly, the stress scale was developed in other research and provides a general measure of vulnerability to stress, which is reflected in typical life habits and patterns such as eating, sleeping, socializing. The measure does not focus on any particular cause of stress, e.g. it does not distinguish between job and non-job related sources. Rather, it is a general measure meant to be applied to no particular group of individuals, no particular occupation or job level, and no particular geographical location. So, it was believed to be suitable for this study for these very reasons--as it would provide a general measure of stress, and not hint at any specific sources, especially job-related sources, which could influence responses. Consequently, the expectation was that individuals who are more vulnerable to stress, for whatever reasons, will use most or all of their allotted vacation time as a coping mechanism, and as a means of maintaining or enhancing job performance and reducing absenteeism. But, in retrospect, this measure may have been too general, especially for this population of middle managers. It is possible that employees in this survey may experience stress in certain ways, to

certain degrees, or because of certain circumstances that are not expressed in this scale. For example, employees may adopt fairly normal patterns in life, i.e. sleeping, exercising, socializing, etc., which would be reflected in low scores on this general stress scale. But, these same individuals may also feel excessive job-related pressure and if they were presented with questions on stress of a more job-related nature, responses may indicate a higher level of stress, and subsequently would be reflected in higher scores on the corresponding scale. These results, based on different measures of stress, represent different levels of stress and, when examined as moderators, would indeed have different effects on the relationship between use of vacation time and performance and use of vacation time and absenteeism. Hence, the stress scale used in this study, while measuring general vulnerability to stress, does not address the more specific causes of stress, nor the degree to which stress (actual, not potential) is experienced which, ultimately, may be more influential in affecting the performance-vacation and absenteeism-vacation relationships.

Further comments on these scales, as well as on miscellaneous other moderating scales, accompany the discussion of each proposition.

Basing Predictions on Prescriptive Versus Descriptive Research

Finally, the hypotheses investigated in this study, and the results predicted, are based on prescriptive orientations--in some situations, and on descriptive orientations--in other situations. It is believed that in many situations (investigations of particular relationships), alternative predictions could have been adopted, thereby producing different results. The impact of these alternative

predictions and results is felt, not only in terms of the support for (or against) specific predicted relationships, but also in terms of the support for (or against) the General and Sub-Hypotheses. A more detailed explanation of this follows.

The absence of research on the topic of vacations, especially on vacation practices as they relate to performance and absenteeism and as they are affected by other factors, precludes an adequate assessment of what the relationships would (or should) be. While popular literature on this topic leans in a more prescriptive direction, i.e. suggesting what employees should do, e.g. engaging in leisure and recreation, or taking vacations, in order to maintain job attendance and performance, there is little documented on what employees actually do, especially regarding vacation time. Similarly, literature on empirical investigations, while more descriptive, usually involves different variables (e.g. pay as a reward instead of vacations), different relationships, and applies to several or different occupations and job levels. Therefore, while some comparisons can be made, not all can be generalized to this study. Consequently, the predictions in this study are developed with respect to the results that have been produced (and proven statistically) in other research, as well as to the results that are expected to be produced (and judged to be practical) in the present research.

However, alternative predictions may challenge those adopted. In particular, some of the predictions for certain relationships in this study are based on prescriptions rather than descriptions. Yet, many of these relationships can (and do) go in directions opposite to what is prescribed. For example, it is predicted in this study that individuals

who are more vulnerable to stress do (and should) use vacation time--implying they need it--to maintain or enhance job performance and reduce absenteeism. However, it is also possible that these very same individuals do not (and/or cannot) use vacation time because they are under a lot of pressure or stress, especially job-related stress; therefore the only way to relieve the pressure is to put in more time on the job (not take more time off) in order to get the job done.

Similarly, it is predicted that individuals occupying high job levels may experience more weighty job responsibilities and challenges, or may be subject to more demands which are accompanied by job-related pressure and stress. It is expected that these individuals do (and should) take time off--implying they need it--as a coping mechanism and as a means of keeping on top of the requirements of such high-powered jobs and of maintaining job attendance and performance. Still, it is possible that these very same individuals do not (and/or cannot) use vacation time because of the perceived urgency and importance of their work, or because of the critical nature of the work in terms of timely decision making. So, what these managers should do may not be consonant with what they actually do. Consequently, the achieved results of the relationships between vacation practices and performance and between vacation practices and absenteeism may be different from those predicted.

In contrast, other predictions of the relationships between vacations and performance and between vacations and absenteeism are based on descriptive rather than prescriptive research. For example, this study predicts that individuals who exhibit Type A behavior do not use vacation time. Their effective job performance is a function of spending more, rather than less, time on job-related activities. Yet, from a

different perspective, it can be argued that individuals who are workaholics should use all of their allotted vacation time--implying they need it--because of their driven, competitive nature that indeed may result in early coronary artery disease. For individuals with strong Type A personalities, vacation time can be prescribed in order to promote good health, ensure survival, and, in turn, maintain job attendance and job performance.

These, and possibly other examples, indicate that alternative results for many of the relationships can be produced, depending on whether predictions are based on prescriptive or descriptive research. As a consequence, many of the results of the relationship found in this study often reflect inconsistencies, contradictions, and lack of support for what is predicted.

The discussion of these four general conditions provides some insight into or justification for, the lack of statistical significance for many of the relationships investigated in this study. However, it also provides an opportunity for justifying why many of the remaining relationships are meaningful and significant, especially from a practical point of view. More specifically, a number of analyses, e.g. correlations, regressions, etc., have been performed on these relationships. Yet, no one of these statistical analyses has been judged, individually, as the most powerful in determining results on which firm conclusions are based. However, by evaluating the results of these statistical analyses jointly, i.e. by assessing the results of all analyses in terms of their mutual support for a preferred sign in a given relationship, a clearer understanding of the relationship, from a practical point of

view, is identified, and a more meaningful discussion of the results is generated, in the following.

First, results of the General Hypothesis are discussed in terms of the strength of, or support for, the more specific relationships between vacation practices and each measure of the dependent variable, i.e. vacation practices in relation to performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, and absenteeism. Arguments for the relationships are based on both statistical inferences (whether or not the results of all analyses, including correlations and regressions performed on each relationship consistently reflect a clear sign in the relationship) and meaningful significance.

Second, results for the Sub-Hypothesis are discussed, but only in terms of the strength of, or support for, the more general relationship between vacation practices and overall performance and absenteeism.¹ Again, arguments for the relationships are based on both statistical and practical inferences. Furthermore, the propositions of the Sub-Hypothesis are discussed in descending order: from those propositions that seem to have the greatest or most pronounced influence on the general relationship between vacation practices and overall performance and absenteeism (not singling out any performance or absenteeism measure in particular) to those that have the least impact. The "impact" or influence of a moderator (which accounts for the order in which the propositions are discussed) is determined by four sets of criteria:

¹Because of so many propositions (moderators with different strengths and scales) and so many measures of the dependent variable, it was decided that a more global comparison of the moderating effects on the general relationship between vacations, performance and absenteeism would provide a more meaningful discussion.

first, while no one test of significance can be argued as being the most powerful in this context, it is believed that regression statistics do provide a clean measure of the combined effects of vacation practices and each moderator on performance and absenteeism. Therefore, attention is given, first, to the regression results for "overall" performance and absenteeism (i.e. reflected in three of four measures of the dependent variable). Second, correlation coefficients produced from the investigation of the relationship between vacation practices and performance, and between vacation practices and absenteeism, when low and high moderating scores are selected out, are evaluated. These correlations, while possibly subject to some restriction in range in moderator subgroups, provide a good yardstick for determining the moderating effects on the general performance-vacation and absenteeism-vacation relationships. Third, the number of relationships which support or consistently reflect clear signs (i.e. those relationship in which correlations reflect either a positive or negative sign, whether predicted or not) is examined. And, specific attention is given to those signs which are peculiar to, or consistent for, either low or high moderating scores, and for particular performance and absenteeism measures. (Comparative summary tables of these criteria--regression coefficients, correlation coefficients, potential signs of the relationships--on which judgments are based, i.e. Tables 6-2 through 6-4, are found at the end of this chapter). Fourth, the final determination of the ranking of each proposition is based on a rational judgment of which moderator provides (theoretically and practically) the most meaning to and makes the most sense for the relationships investigated in this research.

General Hypothesis

The predicted positive relationship between vacation practices and performance, and the predicted negative relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, in general, is not confirmed. In relation to more specific measures of the dependent variable, vacation practices are positively related to promotability only. For the remaining measures, the results are opposite to those expected (i.e. vacations are negatively related to performance evaluations and performance potential, and positively related to absenteeism). Possible explanations for these unexpected results follow.

First, the negative relationship between vacation and performance evaluations may be explained, in part, because performance is usually evaluated or appraised by another individual, e.g. by superiors, Personnel Department representatives, etc. (as in the company investigated in this study). Oftentimes, evaluations are not accurate or representative of employee performance because of the subjectivity, not only of criteria of performance being measured, but also of both the individual conducting the appraisal and the context in which the appraisal takes place. For example, in this company individuals are evaluated on subjective characteristics which include team participation, initiative, innovativeness, judgement, etc. and which are difficult to measure quantitatively. Hence, these characteristics may be measured in terms of more indirect behaviors that are more easily identified or quantified, e.g. number of new innovations (rather than quality or degree of innovativeness), or number of times individuals are involved in team efforts or projects--indeed being visible and on the job to participate and provide input (rather than on the quality of the input). In addition,

the subjectivity of the rater, e.g. personal characteristics, often interferes with ratings, causing errors. For example, ratings are often influenced by first impressions, central tendency, the halo and contrasting effects, or especially by the "similar-to-me" syndrome. Indeed, if superiors do not or cannot take vacations, or do not encourage time off the job, subordinates may adopt similar actions or attitudes, as any deviation from what is expected may negatively affect the resultant performance appraisals. Consequently, being visible (in particular, taking less time off) may be critical to cultivating and maintaining high performance on the job, which is subsequently reflected in high performance evaluations.

Similar explanations can be offered for the unexpected negative relationship between vacation practices and performance potential. Individuals with high performance potential are those who are on a fast track, hard working, and seen as the future leaders of the company. They must be on the job, not only to maintain this fast pace, but also to be visible to top level management who make decisions on which individuals earn the prized, yet scarce "leadership" positions. Indeed, these individuals are of worth to the company; therefore, jobs can (and will) be created, as necessary, in order to perpetuate the pace of performance and to challenge the individual. For those ambitious individuals striving for such goals, taking time off may not be the most direct path leading to that goal.

This reasoning may be justified further by the results of an investigation of performance (reflected in performance evaluations and performance potential) in relation to vacation practices (reflected by a perceptual, rather than actual, measure of behavior). As mentioned

earlier, an alternative measure of "extent to which vacation time is used" (which includes a summation of variables sixty-seven, seventy-three, seventy-four, and 208 in the survey, which achieves a reliability of .68, and the results of which are discussed in Appendix B) provides a measure of use of vacation time as perceived by the employee (e.g. feeling that time off can be and is taken, or willingness to take time off from job responsibilities). The results of the examination of this perceptual measure in relation to performance and absenteeism, in comparison to the results of the examination of the actual measure in relation to performance and absenteeism, reflect two deviations. In particular, when vacation practices are measured in perceptual terms, the relationship to performance evaluations and performance potential is positive; in contrast, when vacation practices are measured in actual terms, the relationship to performance evaluations and performance potential is negative. Furthermore, it should be noted that the results from the perceptual measure are as predicted (not upheld by the results from the actual measure used in this study). In addition, results of a more descriptive nature (presented in Appendix B), which provide further insight into employee perceptions regarding vacations, performance and absenteeism, indicate that employees do value vacations, and firmly believe (as predicted) that vacations provide an opportunity to recharge the battery and to take a complete break from job responsibilities. And, these employees responded overwhelmingly that the use of vacation time is necessary for effective job performance. Hence, these descriptive results, as well as the theoretical results, when performance is examined in relation to a perceived vacation measure, do support the predicted positive relationship. So,

it appears that the perceived relationship between vacations and performance is not consonant with what is actually practiced. That is, from an employee's perspective, vacations may be perceived as being necessary for performance; hence, there is an expected positive relationship between vacations and performance evaluations and performance potential. But, from an employer's perspective, the actual use of vacation time may not be encouraged, or indeed may be frowned upon as being detrimental to performance; therefore the results actually achieved reflect an unexpected negative relationship.

Similar reasoning can be applied, also, to the unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism. Being absent from work is another form of time off which, again, poses a threat to perceived visibility, which influences performance reviews. Hence, the less time spent off the job (in terms of vacations and absenteeism) the more time spent on the job to maintain and heighten performance.

As these explanations provide some justification for the unexpected results found in the investigation of the General Hypothesis, other explanations must be presented to justify the expected results found in the study, i.e. the predicted positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability. First, the measure of promotability, on a continuum, seems to fit between performance evaluations and performance potential. Performance evaluations are more short-term, annual events which are prerequisites for receiving a promotion. Promotions, on the other hand, are more long-term and depend on the cumulative effects of performance evaluations over a given period of time. So, in comparison to performance evaluations, there is less

constant "daily" pressure to attain a promotion. Subsequently, promotions are a prerequisite for performance potential, i.e. performance potential is characterized by individuals achieving high job levels, possibly via promotions, at early ages. But, there are only a certain number of high level jobs and only a certain number of individuals representing different age groups. So, while both promotions and performance potential are long-term, in comparison to achieving the status and position of high performance potential, achieving a promotion is less difficult and opportunities are available to a less select group of employees. In addition, while competition for these scarce high level jobs may place more daily pressure on the individual to achieve, especially by being visible, relatively less competition for relatively more jobs places less constant pressure on merely attaining a promotion. So, it is possible that taking time off (especially over a period of a few years) will have less of a negative effect on promotions (and indeed may have a more positive effect) than on performance evaluations, performance potential or absenteeism.

Second, arguments may be presented from the perspective that decisions on promotions, while affected by the subjectivity of the criteria being rated, as well as of the rater, also depend on more extraneous, "objective" factors. For example, the number of job openings, the availability of and access to job training, and the willingness to relocate are all decisive factors in determining whether or not individuals are eligible for promotions. These uncontrollable factors, therefore, may have much more of an impact on promotability than the ratings by superiors or the vacation practices of subordinates.

So, reflecting on the results achieved in this study, it can be argued that performance evaluations, performance potential, and absenteeism reflect a sense of short-term presence, effort and visible performance and attendance on the job--as perceived by significant others. To be judged adequate or favorable, individuals may need to spend more time on the job (rather than more time off the job, especially in terms of vacations): hence, vacation practices are negatively related to performance evaluations and performance potential, and positively related to absenteeism. In contrast, promotions reflect more long-term presence in and performance on a particular job--as determined by significant others as well as by significant other factors. The adequacy of performance and of the eligibility for promotions, therefore, may be subject more to external constraints and objective circumstances, and less to subjective superior characteristics or subordinate vacation practices: hence, vacation practices are positively related to promotability.

Sub-Hypothesis

The propositions of the Sub-Hypothesis are presented and discussed according to the degree of impact that each moderator has on the relationship between vacation practices and performance and between vacation practices and absenteeism. Those moderators judged to have the greatest impact or influence on the relationship, including the extent to which individuals feel the vacation time allotted and the opportunities to use it are fair, the extent to which individuals value and enjoy vacations, the age of the individual, and the strength of an individual's belief in the ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic, are discussed first--followed by the second group of moderators, including vulnerability to stress, Type A behavior, job level, and degree of compatibility with a job, which are

believed to have a more moderate, or a lesser, influence on the relationship.

Felt-Fair Vacations

Four sets of criteria (regression statistics, correlation coefficients, the number of relationships that consistently reflect particular signs in the relationships, and practical relevance) provide a framework for confirming the predicted negative relationship between vacation practices and performance, and the predicted positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, determined by the extent to which individuals feel the vacation time allotted and the opportunities to use vacation time are fair (FFV).¹ An examination of regression coefficients in Table 6-1a indicates that FFV, in combination with vacations, does have a noticeable effect on performance and absenteeism measures (and the effect is more consistently pronounced for this moderator than for most other moderators). Furthermore, an examination of the correlation coefficients shows significant correlations between vacation practices and three of the four performance and absenteeism measures, especially when high FFV scores moderate. Finally of eight possible relationships (i.e. vacation practices in relation to four performance and absenteeism measures, and when moderated by low and high FFV scores) six consistently reflect particular signs in the relationship.² Also, when FFV moderates, a

¹These same criteria provide a framework for discussing all of the remaining propositions, as well.

²These relationships are presented to reflect potential signs in particular relationships, i.e. the signs of the correlation coefficients. They do not reflect levels of significance; rather, significant relationships are presented in Table 6-4, described later.

large number of relationships reflect signs as predicted, especially when high FFV scores moderate. These results, especially in comparison to other moderators and with regard to theoretical and practical considerations, indicate that the effects of FFV on the relationship between vacations and performance, and between vacations and absenteeism, reflect several predicted relationships, and hence provide very promising results.

Table 6-1a

Moderating Effects of FFV on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism:
Regressions, Correlation Coefficients
and Potential Signs

Variables	PEV		PERT		PROM		AB	
	r	Sign	r	Sign	r	Sign	r	Sign
Low FFV	-.07	-	.07	+	.002	?	-.01	?
High FFV	-.15	-	-.23*	-	.24*	+	.26*	+
Beta FFV (VAC)	.18		-.28**		-.13		-.19	

* $p \leq .05$

**Beta $\geq .20$

However, it should be noted that many, but not all, results are in the predicted directions. Hence, some explanations are necessary for those relationships that are unclear, or indeed that go in opposite directions. For example, vacation practices are unexpectedly negatively related to performance evaluations, when low FFV scores moderate; and vacations are unexpectedly positively related to promotability, when high FFV scores moderate. Part of the explanation for these results can be

derived from previously cited arguments that performance evaluations are greatly a function of individual factors, i.e. perceived as being present on the job, and not off the job in the form of vacation. In contrast, promotions are greatly a function of situational factors, i.e. availability of job openings, etc. Therefore, time off may have a negative effect on performance evaluations, and a positive, or no, effect on promotability. (Also, as cited previously, raw scores and distributions of promotability were skewed toward the high end of the scale).

In addition, there are some results which produce no clear signs in the relationships, especially when low FFV scores moderate. These may be explained, in part, because the majority of employees in this survey responded more favorably--in terms of scores and distributions--rather than less favorably to the FFV scale. That is, scores were on the high, rather than low, end of the scale. This may be explained, further, in terms of the nature of the items in the scale which measure FFV. In particular, some of the items ask individuals to rate fairness of allotted vacation time and opportunity in relation to the work they do. However, in practice, vacations are really related to an employee's number of years of service with the company rather than to their work--job, type, level, or performance. So, responses to these items may have been based on perceived fairness in relation to the "given" year of service structure established by the company, rather than in relation to the "hoped for" level of responsibility and performance which makes one worthy of rewards (vacations).

Similarly, other items in the scale request that employees perceive amount of vacation they receive in comparison to other colleagues, i.e. to determine whether they receive more, the same, or less vacation time.

These items may also not accurately represent fairness as it was to be investigated in this study. In particular, the average annual allotment for vacation time for the employees in this survey is 3.7 weeks, and the average number of years of service is 12.7. (It takes less than five years of service to receive less than three weeks of vacation, and over eighteen years of service to receive more than four weeks). So, most individuals receive three to four weeks of vacation per year. Hence, when individuals examine their allotted vacation time in comparison to others, the amount of vacation time would be perceived and rated as about the same. Also, the wording of these, and other, items may compound the problem further, i.e. some questions ask for an actual, present comparison (e.g. how does the amount of vacation time allotted to you compare to another's?) rather than for a perceptual, future comparison (e.g. what do you think should be the amount of vacation time allotted to you, compared with your colleagues?). Finally, the response-choice formats, in conjunction with these items, may not lend themselves readily to an appropriate measure of fairness, especially for these employees who have a similar amount of vacation time. More specifically, it may have been better to incorporate more qualitative criteria in the responses, such as "more fair" or "less fair" rather than more quantitative criteria, such as "more time" and "less time."

These problems, especially the implied versus perceived issues, and the appropriateness of questions and response formats for the population studies, may explain why employees provide more favorable responses to this scale (i.e. score higher rather than lower) and why results are somewhat skewed or inconsistent.

Finally, it should be noted that while this measure of fairness may indeed reflect the extent to which individuals feel vacation time and opportunity are fair--given organizational policies; it may not reflect what they actually do feel or would like to feel about fairness--given individual preferences for vacation time and opportunity and individual performance.

Value of Vacations

Results from analyses of the relationship between vacations and performance and between vacations and absenteeism show that the value of vacations, when measured in relative terms, i.e. preferences for vacations to other rewards (EVAC 2), has a more pronounced effect on the predicted relationships; while when measured in absolute terms, i.e. importance or worth (EVAC 1), the effects are only moderate. Regression coefficients when value is measured in relative terms, especially in relation to the impact on performance potential, promotability and absenteeism, are noticeably higher than they are when value is measured in absolute terms, as reflected in Table 6-1b that follows. And, sizeable correlation coefficients between vacations and performance and absenteeism are evident when moderated by low EVAC 2 scores, but by high EVAC 1 scores. Finally, when value is measured by EVAC 2, the total number of relationships consistently reflecting clear signs in the relationship is seven of a possible eight (with five of the seven relationships as predicted). Similarly, when value is measured by EVAC 1, the number of relationships that reflect clear signs is seven (of eight), with three of the seven supporting predicted signs. The remaining relationships for both scales are unclear.

Table 6-1b

Moderating Effects of EVAC 1 and EVAC 2 on the Relationship
Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism:
Regressions, Correlation Coefficients
and Potential Signs

Variables	PEV		PERT		PROM		AB	
	r	Sign	r	Sign	r	Sign	r	Sign
Low EVAC 2	-.17	-	-.19	-	.12	+	.20	+
High EVAC 2	.01	?	-.08	-	.02	+	-.08	-
Beta EVAC 2 (VAC)	-.01		.32**		.22**		.26**	
Low EVAC 1	-.06	-	-.14	-	.03	+	-.04	-
High EVAC 1	-.18	-	.002	?	.22	+	.28*	+
Beta EVAC 2 (VAC)	.19		-.06		.03		-.03	

*p \leq .06

**Beta \geq .20

These: 1) opposite signs in the relationships, 2) the unclear results, and 3) other miscellaneous inconsistencies, can be attributed to a host of factors, discussed below.

First, the unexpected negative relationship between vacation practices and performance evaluations, when individuals value vacations (reflected in high scores for the absolute scale), and the unexpected negative relationship between vacation practices and performance potential (reflected in high scores for the relative scale) may be a function of the previously mentioned arguments that superiors often evaluate performance in terms of visibility, presence and attendance on the job.

Hence, taking vacations may interfere with perceptions, which is subsequently reflected in lower evaluations and performance potential. In addition, the unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability for individuals not valuing vacations (measured by both scales) may be attributed to the previously cited argument that the distribution of scores on promotability were skewed toward the high end of the scale.

Second, the two scales which originated in this study really measure different aspects of "value or enjoyment" as seen by the different results which have emerged. Both scales were judged, initially, to be statistically and practically appropriate and representative of value and worth of vacations. However, while the results produced by the two scales were expected to be similar, they were really quite different. The explanations may rest with the dissimilar nature of the scales: one scale measures value in terms of enjoyment and worth (EVAC 1); the other measures value in terms of preferences for vacations to other types of rewards (EVAC 2). It can be argued that both do represent, in general, value and worth. But, in more specific terms and in retrospect, they probably represent two different aspects of it. And, results show that while individuals value and enjoy vacations on an absolute scale (EVAC 1), on a relative scale (EVAC 2) vacations are not ranked as more important than other types of rewards such as benefits, salary, etc.; and indeed, employees would not go so far as to exchange other rewards for more vacation time. Consequently, the employees in this survey scored on the higher end of the absolute scale, but on the lower end of the relative scale. The effects of these scores are important for two reasons. First, the unequal distribution of scores and cases across both

scales often resulted in a lack of any clear signs in several relationships. Furthermore, the absence of these relationships precluded any opportunity for results to be consistent or similar for both scales. And, second, and possibly even more important, even if scores and cases were evenly distributed, it may have been unrealistic to expect that both measures should produce similar results in the first place. (And, evidence from some of the emerging relationships, i.e. in absolute terms the unexpected negative relationship between vacations and absenteeism for individuals not valuing vacations, and the unexpected positive relationship for individuals valuing vacations, seems to support this notion). Often there is a thin line between what individuals do or believe and do not do or do not believe; but the line becomes much more pronounced when alternative forms of behavior or options are presented. Indeed, including the relative measure of value, as a supplement to or reinforcement for the absolute measure (which is the typical perspective used to test Expectancy Theory of Motivation), may have created such a pronounced barrier that precluded the formation of any meaningful relationships. Consequently, a more refined understanding and measure of value, e.g. distinguishing between absolute and relative perspectives, may provide a better understanding of motivation from an expectancy theory perspective, and, when applied to this study, may indeed produce more pronounced or meaningful results.

Finally, from a more general perspective, it is possible that individuals who do not value and enjoy vacations may have other associated characteristics, e.g. being driven, hardworking, or a workaholic, which could be perceived as unfavorable or undesirable under certain circumstances. For example, descriptive (and some empirical) research

on executives or managers in organizations present profiles of the effective executive, citing such common characteristics as decision making, communication and leadership skills, as well as an ability to balance work with non-work related activities such as community involvement, leisure, exercise, etc. So, the image of the corporate leader is one who is well-balanced and well-rounded, and who engages, and performs well, in a variety of activities both on and off the job. Such individuals represent the ideals of the "organization man" and indeed of the future leaders of the company. While "craftsmen," "jungle-fighters," and "company men" are valuable employees, it is the "games-man" with a variety of talents who reaches the top (Maccoby, 1976). Further, those who adapt most successfully to life are those who integrate job with non-job related activities (Valliant, 1977). In particular, Valliant found in a thirty-year study of the lives of Harvard College graduates, that the capacity to take and enjoy imaginative vacations is an indication of good mental health. Similarly, leisure-time experts maintain that for most individuals, vacations are an essential ingredient in an emotionally well-balanced life (Brody, 1984). So, it is possible that individuals who are not well-rounded or well-integrated, i.e. who have not really developed themselves beyond their jobs, and indeed have not taken the time to do so, and who do not enjoy vacations or take them (even though they are hard working), may not present the most positive or well-balanced image to the company or project the most potential. Perceived in this light, individuals who do not value and enjoy vacations, and do not use them, may indeed inhibit their performance potential.

Age

The predicted negative relationship between vacation practices and performance, and the predicted positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, determined by age, are not confirmed. However, the results of this analysis generate support for the signs of the relationships as predicted. Regression coefficients show in Table 6-1c that age, in conjunction with vacations, significantly affects performance potential, promotability and absenteeism. (However, the effects on performance potential may not be so significant as age is one item comprising the performance potential scale). And, an examination of correlation coefficients in the same table reveals that correlations between vacation practices and performance potential and absenteeism, especially for older individuals, and between vacation practices and performance evaluations, especially for younger individuals, are noticeably high. In addition, when specific relationships are examined, the findings show that seven of eight relationships reflect clear signs. In particular, for older individuals, three of the four signs are as predicted; while for younger individuals, only one of three relationships reflects the predicted sign. Such results warrant additional explanations.

Table 6-1c

Moderating Effects of Age on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism: Regressions, Correlation Coefficients and Potential Signs

Variables	PEV		PERT		PROM		AB	
	r	Sign	r	Sign	r	Sign	r	Sign
Low AGE	-.19	-	.01	?	.06	+	.07	+
High AGE	-.03	-	-.19	-	.16	+	.15	+
Beta AGE (VAC)	.04		-.46**		-.55**		-.26**	

**Beta \geq .20

First, and most obviously, the unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability for older individuals may be acknowledged by the possibility that individuals who are older--are more seasoned, have logged more years of service with the company, and have more job security. In addition, at this stage, the majority may not be actively seeking any promotions or changes in their employment. Consequently, these individuals, for whatever combination of reasons, may be less concerned about their promotability and future career development in the organization. (Also, arguments regarding the skewed distribution of promotability scores may also explain this relationship).

In addition, it seems appropriate to present some other general comments about the results of analyses involving older age groups. It is possible that individuals who are older may have more years of service with the company, and may have earned more annual allotted vacation time. They may use a large portion of their allotted vacation time

(e.g. five of six weeks), so their responses to those items measuring proportion of vacation time used would be reflected in higher scores on these items in this scale. However, these same individuals may also not use the remaining vacation time (e.g. they may bank the sixth week or exchange it for cash payment). Therefore, responses to these items which request information on proportion of vacation time not used or postponed, would be reflected in lower scores. Consequently, for such individuals, the final score on the vacation scale may be reflected in a "middle range" score which may not adequately represent the extent to which their allotted vacation time is used. (While this group of employees may only represent a minority of this population, it is important to acknowledge that such circumstances could affect the results).

With regard to those relationships which go opposite to those predicted (for younger individuals), some justification can be presented. For example, there is an unexpected negative relationship between vacation practices and performance evaluations. This may be a function of rater bias, based on the issue of visibility described earlier. More specifically, younger individuals (who are often new employees) are just beginning to carve a career. Characteristics associated with the newer or younger breed of employees include ambition, a desire to get ahead and maximize opportunities, and a need to develop job security. Consequently, their visibility and obvious effort, as well as attendance and performance on the job--as perceived by the supervisor in terms of time on, not off, the job--may be rewarded with higher evaluations.

In addition, the unexpected positive relationship between vacations and absenteeism, for younger individuals, may be attributed to the new breed of employees who are younger, who have adopted different attitudes

toward sources of life satisfaction, and who value and enjoy leisure and recreational pursuits, and, in general, time outside of or away from the job (especially in terms of vacations). The more enjoyment derived from this time off (vacations), the better vacation time is perceived and the more it is pursued. Therefore, in order to maximize these outside pursuits, younger employees may maximize time away from the job by augmenting authorized time off (vacation time which amounts to only three to four weeks a year) with unauthorized time off (absenteeism).

Finally, for younger individuals there is also no clear relationship between vacation practices and performance potential. Possibly this should have been anticipated as it does take time, and some years of seasoning, to be eligible for top jobs and to be pegged as promising, prospective leaders of the company. Therefore, younger individuals may not yet have had sufficient time to develop their potential. Hence, an absence of opportunities to develop performance potential would make an accurate investigation of the vacation practices in relation to performance, for such an age group, impossible.

Protestant Work Ethic

The results show moderate support for a predicted negative relationship between vacation practices and performance, and a predicted positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism. determined by the extent to which individuals believe in the ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic (PWE). Regression and correlation coefficients in Table 6-1d are respectable and show some significance, especially in comparison to those results achieved by other moderators. Of the eight

possible relationships between vacations and performance and absenteeism, all reflect particular signs, and five of these eight are as predicted.

Table 6-1d

Moderating Effects of PWE on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism: Regressions, Correlation Coefficients and Potential Signs

Variables	PEV		PERT		PROM		AB	
	r	Sign	r	Sign	r	Sign	r	Sign
Low PWE	-.13	-	.14	+	.17	+	.06	+
High PWE	-.09	-	-.20	-	.07	+	.16	+
Beta PWE (VAC)	.11		-.01		-.01		-.24**	

**Beta \geq .20

First, the unexpected negative relationship between vacation practices and performance evaluations for individuals having weak PWE beliefs may be explained, in part, by the previously cited argument that performance evaluations are largely determined by the visibility of the individual, i.e. superiors may evaluate the subordinate based on presence or attendance on the job. Hence, younger individuals who take more time off in terms of vacations may not be viewed as visible, which may be reflected in lower performance evaluations.

Also, justification for the unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability for individuals holding strong beliefs in the PWE may be maintained from previously cited arguments that the distribution of promotability scores is skewed, i.e. most scores fall on the high end of the scale. In addition, the unexpected

positive relationship between vacations and absenteeism when individuals have weak beliefs in the ideals of the PWE may be explained, in part, by arguments cited earlier, which explain a similar unexpected negative relationship between vacations and absenteeism for younger age groups. More specifically, individuals who have weak PWE beliefs may indeed want to devote less time working on the job and more time pursuing activities outside of the job. The opportunity to pursue such activities and to maximize time away from the work environment is provided with vacation time. But, as vacation time typically does not amount to much each year, it may not be sufficient. Hence, individuals may supplement their authorized time off (vacations) with unauthorized time off (absenteeism).

Finally, other unexpected relationships or the lack of signs in the remaining relationships may be attributed to the lack of fit between the measure and the sample, as discussed earlier. More specifically, the scale, developed by Blood in 1969, may not adequately measure PWE as it is applied to the population and the time period of this study. The inadequacy of the measure may be reflected in the content and nature of the questions, as well as in the response format. As mentioned earlier, the questions appear to be outdated in terms of both wording and attitudes. And, the expressions used in the items may be confusing. For example, interpretations of the statement "People who do things the easy way are the smart one" may depend on what is implied by "easy" (e.g. using short-cuts, unethical means, etc.) or "smart" (e.g. fast, quick, sneaky, etc.); and reactions to the item "Hard work makes a man a better person" center on the use of "man" versus "person," on what represents "hard work" (e.g. amount of effort, amount of time spent on the job), etc. In addition, the response format adopted by this scale also may

not provide an accurate measure, i.e. it is reflected in more qualitative (or global) responses--such as "strongly agree" or "strongly disagree"--rather than in more quantitative (or situational) responses--such as "sometimes, always, or never." For example, responses to the statement "When the workday is finished, a person should forget his job and enjoy himself" are measured in terms of general agreement or disagreement. But, more appropriate responses may have been reflected in more specific terms of how often one agrees or disagrees: i.e. it is possible that on certain, though not all, days it may be necessary to work in the evening (whether voluntarily or involuntarily); on other days there may be less of a need to do work and more of a need (and time) to relax. Similarly, responses to the item "Wasting time is as bad as wasting money" may be more appropriately measured in relation to specific situations, especially if the time referred to is "wasted" while on vacation. Therefore, responses of a more relative nature, rather than of a more absolute nature, may more adequately measure belief in the ideals of the PWE. Hence, generalizing from one situation to another may have inhibited more meaningful results in these particular relationships.

And, on a final note, unequal distributions of cases due to tied scores when the scales were divided may also provide additional explanations for those relationships, especially those involving promotability and absenteeism, which results in signs opposite to those predicted.

Stress

The predicted positive relationship between vacation practices and performance and the predicted negative relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, determined by vulnerability to stress, is only weakly

supported. Regression coefficients are not different from zero, virtually and correlation coefficients, while more pronounced when low stress scores moderate, are generally low as reflected in Table 6-1e. More encouraging results, however, are derived from the total number of relationships which reflect clear signs (i.e. six of eight). More specifically, under conditions of low stress, three of the four signs in the relationships are as predicted; however under conditions of high stress, most of the relationships are not as predicted or unclear. Rationales for the unexpected and unclear relationships are presented below.

Table 6-1e

Moderating Effects of Stress on the Relationship Between
Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism:
Regressions, Correlation Coefficients and
Potential Signs

Variables	PEV		PERT		PROM		AB	
	r	Sign	r	Sign	r	Sign	r	Sign
Low STS	-.18	-	-.11	-	.12	+	.24*	+
High STS	-.07	-	.001	?	.11	+	.01	?
Beta STS (VAC)	-.04		.02		-.12		.05	

*p \leq .05

First, justification for the unexpected negative relationship between vacation practices and performance evaluations for individuals experiencing high levels of stress may be explained in terms of the visibility argument (i.e. being present to perform often results in higher performance evaluations); while justification for the positive

relationship between vacation practices and promotability for individuals experiencing low levels of stress may be explained in terms of the skewed measures and distributions of promotability scores.

Similarly, the unclear relationships which are most evident under conditions of high stress may be attributed to the skewed distribution of cases when dividing the scales into halves, i.e. most employees in the survey scores lower, rather than higher, on the scale. This low score may be explained, in part, because of the nature of the scale, as described earlier. Consequently, unequal distributions resulted in frequency distributions that were lopsided and reflected no particular sign. Hence, inconsistent results were reported. In particular, the unclear relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, under conditions of high stress, may be attributed to factors not controlled for in this study. As described earlier, this study measures level of stress in terms of vulnerability (reflected in life patterns or habits) and predicts that individuals who are more vulnerable to stress use more allotted vacation time and are absent less. However, the study does not pay particular attention to the causes of stress (e.g. job versus non-job related) or to the amount of stress experienced (actual versus potential). If stress were measured in more specific terms, especially with regard to job-induced stress, a more meaningful measure of stress, especially for the population studied, may have produced more concrete results. For example, individuals who are more vulnerable to stress may indeed experience extremely high levels of it; and even if they use all of their allotted vacation time, they may still be absent either voluntarily (as supplemental time off to cope or adapt) or involuntarily (because of stress-related illnesses or problems). Consequently, the

relationship between vacations and absenteeism would be positive. So, by incorporating a more comprehensive measure, either in terms of job-related causes of stress, or in terms of how much stress is actually experienced, such unexpected results may have been eliminated. This argument is supported further by responses to descriptive items in the survey which measure the extent to which individuals experience job-related stress. That is, the majority of employees responded to questions that they do experience job-related pressure, stress, burnout and fatigue; and some believe that such stress may have a slight effect on their incidence of absenteeism.

Finally, a last comment should be made on the general predictions of the effects of stress in this study. It is predicted that individuals who are vulnerable to stress will need to take time off to cope, rest or relax; therefore they will take the time off in the form of vacations. As a consequence, effective job performance and attendance is maintained. (While signs in the relationships are predicted, no directions of causation are investigated or implied in this study). Yet, it is also felt that individuals who are vulnerable to stress, while needing time off, actually may not take it, either because of too many pressures on the job (i.e. individuals do not take time off, involuntarily) or indeed because of sources of stress at home (in which cases individuals do not take time off, voluntarily). These latter cases are becoming more prevalent according to leisure-time experts who indicate that the most common difficulty in taking vacations with family or friends is that individuals suddenly must interact with others twenty-four hours a day. For the majority, too much togetherness is stifling and overwhelming, and often results in conflict,

tension, and unnecessary stress. Consequently, it can be predicted that the individuals subject to these circumstances are under stress, but do not (or cannot) take time off; they, therefore, may become even more stressed and even more convinced that they will not take time off, perpetuating a cycle of increased stress and decreased use of vacation time. This line of thinking deserves attention as it may provide an alternative explanation for some of the unexpected results encountered in the test of this proposition. However, while these circumstances may be evident, especially in this survey, the measurement and predictions of stress in this study did not recognize these as major criteria on which predictions would be based. Rather, the predictions adopted were those that seemed to receive more theoretical and practical support (as cited in the review of the literature). Consequently, a more positive relationship between vacation and performance (rather than a negative relationship) and a more negative relationship between vacations and absenteeism (rather than a positive relationship) when moderated by stress was expected.

Type A Behavior

The predicted negative relationship between vacation practices and performance, and the predicted positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, determined by an individual's Type A behavior, also receives only moderate support. Regression statistics are presented in the following table and, in comparison to those of other moderators, are not large; and noticeable correlations between vacation practices and the dependent variables are evident only when reflected in promotability and incidence of absenteeism, and only when low Type A behavior is exhibited. Still, when all of the results

between vacations and each performance and absenteeism measure are examined, all eight relationships reflect clear signs; and four are as predicted. Hence, the remaining unexpected and unclear relationships are discussed below.

Table 6-1f

Moderating Effects of Type A on the Relationship Between
Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism:
Regressions, Correlation Coefficients and
Potential Signs

Variables	PEV		PERT		PROM		AB	
	r	Sign	r	Sign	r	Sign	r	Sign
Low TPA	-.08	-	-.03	-	.13	+	.17	+
High TPA	-.12	-	-.07	-	.13	+	.07	+
Beta TPA (VAC)	.07		.08		.09		-.06	

First, the unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability, for individuals exhibiting strong Type A behavior, may be explained by the limitations of the measure of promotability, i.e. the unequal distribution of scores and cases, previously described. Second, the unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, when weak Type behavior is exhibited, may be explained, in part, because individuals who are not workaholics may use more of their vacation time. And, the more time off the individual takes, or the more time spent away from the job, the more the individual benefits from it, either professionally or personally. As authorized time off (in the form of vacations) cannot be increased in

any given year, unauthorized time off (in the form of absenteeism) may be.

Finally, the unexpected negative relationships between vacation practices and the remaining performance measures, i.e. performance evaluations and performance potential for individuals exhibiting weak Type A behavior, as well as additionally observations of the limitations of the measure of Type A behavior in this study, deserve comment. First, such relationships may stem, specifically, from the previously cited notion that visibility and presence on the job are crucial to heighten performance evaluations and performance potential. However, other general arguments, also, can be offered. Tied scores at that point where the scale is divided into low and high scores resulted in an unequal distribution of cases and scores so that individuals ranked in the higher, rather than lower, end of the scale. As a consequence, analyses of the relationship indicate that when low Type A scores moderate there often is an insufficient number of cases (especially when dividing the scale into thirds, as was common practice), and therefore, insufficient evidence of results. Second, this study predicted that individuals who are workaholics do not take vacation time in order to maintain job attendance and performance. (The prediction is for a sign in the relationship only, and not for a direction of causation). However, the relationship may be more complex, i.e. other factors may ultimately determine whether or not Type A personalities use vacation time and maintain attendance and performance. In particular, how Type A personalities use vacation time, rather than the extent to which they use it, may more significantly affect the relationship. It is possible that individuals who are workaholics, who do put in a lot of time on

the job, may be willing to use vacation time as an opportunity to perform more intense job-related activities at home or away from the hectic office environment. Indeed, this could enable individuals to catch up on work, get ahead, and enhance performance. Alternatively, vacation time may be seen as an opportunity to take care of typical life necessities, such as doctors' appointments or house repairs. In this case, vacation time may be seen as a necessary activity to meet the basic requirements of survival and, therefore, not as a detriment to job performance (and indeed beneficial in minimizing future absences to meet such requirements). Or, an additional explanation may be that the total amount of vacation time allotted and the schedule for using it may affect the relationship. The average amount of vacation time for employees in this survey ranges from three to four weeks. This is really not much time in a given year. And, if the vacation is used in terms of isolated days over a period of a year, the individual may never be away from the job for more than one day at a time.

Finally, from a more rational perspective, many leisure experts believe that workaholics often get caught in a vicious cycle of decreasing efficiency and increasing hours of work. And, while a vacation may seem "anathema" to a workaholic, many may find that once they do take time off, they can begin to enjoy their total break from the work routine (Brody, 1984).

Under circumstances such as these, Type A personalities may use allotted vacation time, and performance and job attendance may be maintained or enhanced (suggesting a positive relationship, not predicted in this study). But, the reasons why this vacation time is used, and the ways in which it is used--which may have the most significant

effect on the relationship--have not been addressed or explored in this research.

Job Level

The predicted positive relationship between vacation practices and performance, and the predicted negative relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, determined by an individual's job level, also receives only weak support. Regression coefficients and correlation coefficients for most performance and absenteeism measures (except for the performance potential measure which shares an item with the job level scale) are negligible, as shown in Table 6-1g. However, all eight relationships consistently reflect clear signs, indicating that job level has some impact on the vacation-performance and vacation-absenteeism relationships. The following explanations can be offered for four of the eight relationships which support signs opposite to those predicted.

Table 6-1g

Moderating Effects of Job Level on the Relationship Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism: Regressions, Correlation Coefficients and Potential Signs

Variables	PEV		PERT		PROM		AB	
	r	Sign	r	Sign	r	Sign	r	Sign
Low JLEV	-.13	-	.04	+	.08	+	.06	+
High JLEV	-.08	-	.02	+	.17	+	.13	+
Beta JLEV (VAC)	.04		.63**		-.02		-.21**	

**Beta \geq .20

It is possible that the unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability, and between vacation practices and performance potential, for individuals occupying low job levels, should have been expected. That is, individuals occupying low job levels logically have available to them more opportunities for promotions, and opportunities to develop their potential. Consequently, at least for a given period of time, receiving promotions, which in turn is related to developing performance potential, may really be more a function of the number of jobs available, and less a function of the amount of vacation time used by the individual.

The unexpected negative relationship between vacations and performance evaluations, for individuals occupying high job levels, may be explained in terms of the level of responsibility, challenge, accountability and locus of decision making that accompanies high level jobs. Individuals in high-powered jobs, because of their weighty job responsibilities, may be less inclined to take time off, especially during critical time periods (which often characterize most organizations on most days). This is supported further by the previously cited arguments that being visible in the job (as perceived by superiors) may result in high performance evaluations. Hence, these individuals may not use a large proportion of their vacation time (whether voluntarily or involuntarily) in order to keep on top of job responsibilities, and to heighten performance, especially in terms of performance evaluations.

The unexpected positive relationships between vacation practices and absenteeism for individuals in high job levels is not easily justified. However, it may be explained from a prescriptive point of view that individuals with weighty responsibilities need time off to relieve

pressures or to cope with the demands of the job. Further, they may need time off in excess of that allotted by annual vacations. Consequently, unauthorized time off (absenteeism) may provide the necessary supplement.

On a more general note, the nature of "job level" itself, i.e. its peculiarities and its subsequent relationships to other factors, may explain, further, some of the unexpected results that have emerged. In this study, job level represents the worth of the job, expressed in terms of Hay Points and salary ranges, and the position in the hierarchy, expressed in terms of the number of job levels between a given job and the CEO and President. Predictions for a positive relationship between vacations and performance, i.e. individuals in high job levels need and therefore use more allotted vacation time, and consequently, maintain performance--are based solely on this perception (i.e. these characteristics) of job level. However, a closer examination of job level indicates that there are many other characteristics associated with the term that may more comprehensively reflect its nature, and which may form more complex effects on the relationship between vacation practices and performance, and between vacation practices and absenteeism. More specifically, job level often reflects not only position in the hierarchy, but also a level of status and challenge, and a degree of job satisfaction and possibly job compatibility. Individuals in low level jobs may experience low status and less challenge, job satisfaction and compatibility. Consequently they may need to get away from the "negative" job situations and use vacation time in order to sustain job attendance and maintain job performance. In contrast, individuals in high level jobs may enjoy high status, and

more challenge, job satisfaction and more compatibility with their jobs. Consequently, they may not need to get away from a "positive" work situation; so they may not fully utilize their vacation time. Yet, their performance is maintained. Under these circumstances, vacation practices are negatively related to performance. Some research provides support for this predicted negative relationship, however usually the research investigates, primarily, the effects of other factors which appear to be associated with job level, e.g. task characteristics, job satisfaction, time span of discretion. There is an absence of research that attempts to investigate a simpler measure of job level in relation to performance and rewards (as was attempted in this research). And, realistically, there may be no simple measure of job level. So, these alternative predictions which are based on somewhat different variables and relationships were judged to be inappropriate for this investigation. However, additional research on either a simple measure of job level, or on the more complex set of factors which are associated with job level, may provide a better understanding of its moderating effects on the relationship between vacation practices and performance, and between vacation practices and absenteeism.

Job Compatibility

The predicted negative relationship between vacation practices and performance, and the predicted positive relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism, determined by an individual's compatibility with a job, receives moderate support. Results from regression statistics are presented in Table 6-1h and, when examined in comparison to those of other moderators, indicate that job compatibility does have

somewhat of an impact on performance and absenteeism, reflected in performance evaluations, performance potential, and incidence of absenteeism. Correlation coefficients, as well, reflect significant relationships between vacation practices and some of the performance and absenteeism measures, especially under conditions of high job compatibility. And, of eight possible relationships between vacations and performance and absenteeism, all reflect clear signs (and five of these support signs as predicted); for the remaining relationships, the signs are opposite to those predicted.

Table 6-1h

Moderating Effects of Job Compatibility on the Relationship
Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism:
Regressions, Correlation Coefficients
and Potential Signs

Variables	PEV			PERT			PROM			AB		
	r	Beta	Sign	r	Beta	Sign	r	Beta	Sign	r	Beta	Sign
Low JC	-.11	-.002	-	.07	-.18	+	-.12	.04	-	-.03	.06	-
High JC	-.17	-.12	-	-.32*	-.04	-	.19	-.07	+	.11	.20**	+

*p \leq .05

**Beta \geq .20

From a more general viewpoint, the unexpected results for certain relationships may be explained, in part, by an insufficient number of cases in relevant subgroups. As mentioned earlier, analyses were performed on four subgroups of data, and since there are only 118 cases in this study, the total possible number of cases that could fall in each

subgroup, based on ideal equal distributions, would be small. Furthermore, when analyses were conducted, several unequal distributions resulted because of tied scores. Hence, some subgroups have very few cases. And, when low and high scores were selected out, some of the groups had no cases. Even though only those two subgroups with the largest number of cases were selected, eventually, for analyses in this study, the results may not really be representative of the true effects and significance of job compatibility on vacations and performance or absenteeism, and, therefore, may account for the unexpected relationships between them.

The unexpected positive relationship between vacation practices and promotability, under conditions of high job compatibility, may be explained, again, by the previously cited argument that promotions are more long-term (rather than short-term) and a function of external situational constraints (rather than of individual perceptions). As a consequence, taking time off, in the long run, may not be a detriment to promotability, and, indeed, may actually enhance it.

Similarly, the unexpected negative relationship between vacation practices and promotability for individuals experiencing less job compatibility may be explained along the same lines and argued that individuals not compatible with their jobs have little chance anyway for attaining promotions. Hence, opportunities for getting promotions may be independent of use of vacation time. In addition, the skewed distribution of scores on promotability may also have affected such results, as stated earlier. Also, the unexpected negative relationship between vacation practices and performance evaluations, for individuals compatible with their jobs, may be justified by the previously cited

argument that visibility and presence on the job (i.e. not being on vacation) may indirectly influence resultant employee evaluations.

Finally, a comment on the general measure of job compatibility, itself, may provide additional insight into, or further justification for, the disappointing moderating effects of job compatibility on the relationship between vacations, performance and absenteeism. As mentioned earlier, alternative measures of job compatibility are available. Consequently, while this research adopted and analyzed only one measure in detail (a measure which matches an individual's growth need strength with the motivating potential of a job), an additional measure (job satisfaction) was introduced and examined as a basis for comparison. (The job satisfaction measure involves only four items and was felt to be inferior to the more specific, yet more comprehensive, alternative measured adopted). Still, it was expected that both would produce similar results. However, results from both measures were often inconsistent, dissimilar, or contradictory. This may suggest that the measure of job compatibility may not be an appropriate measure; and/or it may not be suitable for the population investigated in this research. In particular, this population represents white collar, managerial employees, and many of the items in the job compatibility scale (in terms of wording and comparisons made) may be more suitable to or appropriate for blue collar employees. Indeed, the alternative measure of job satisfaction would have yielded different results for many analyses. (Some correlations are noticeably large and/or go in different directions; moderated regression statistics show a Beta coefficient of .40 when the impact of vacations and job satisfaction on performance evaluations is examined). So, for this study at least, identifying

and using the most appropriate measure of job compatibility or job satisfaction (i.e. distinguishing between these and possibly others) may have yielded more significant, meaningful, or different results than those achieved.

Summary

The preceding has provided some alternative explanation or justifications for why the results of the relationships between vacation practices and performance and between vacation practices and absenteeism are often unclear or reflect signs opposite to those predicted. A comparison, from both a statistical and practical point of view, of overall regression and correlation coefficients, for the relationships between vacation practices and each performance and absenteeism measure, as well as for each moderator, provides a framework for assessing the vacation-performance and vacation-absenteeism relationships, the extent to which each moderator affects the relationships and the extent to which meaningful results are produced. While not all of the results achieve statistical significance, many are meaningfully significant. Based on the strength of the latter, and based on the premise that the results, when examined in terms of the signs of the relationships, provide a more meaningful expression of the potential relationships, projections for these potential relationships are stated in the following:

1. Vacation practices and performance, in general, are negatively related; while vacation practices and absenteeism, in general, are positively related.

2. There are several factors which affect the strength of the relationship (i.e. whether it reflects a more negative or a more positive sign).

First, it was determined that four factors or conditions have the strongest impact (though not necessarily as predicted) on the relationship between vacations and overall performance and absenteeism: these include the extent to which an individual feels vacation time allotted and the opportunities to use it are fair, the extent to which an individual values and enjoys vacations, the age of the individual, and the extent to which the individual believes in the ideals of the PWE.

Second, it was determined that four other factors have a more moderate impact, or a weaker influence, on the extent to which vacation time is used and overall performance and absenteeism: these include the extent to which an individual is vulnerable to stress, the extent to which an individual exhibits Type A behavior, the job level of an individual, and the extent to which an individual is compatible with a job. (Table 6-2 enables a comparative examination of regression and correlation coefficients for all moderators; while Table 6-3 provides a comparative examination of the effects of all moderators on the potential signs of the relationships between vacation practices, performance and absenteeism).

3. Finally, as seen in Table 6-4, evidence of potential relationships between vacation practices and all performance and absenteeism measures is most pronounced, and as expected, and the pattern of correlations is statistically significant, when the relationships are predicted to be negative for the performance measures and positive for the absenteeism measure, and when affected by these factors or conditions: individuals feel vacation time allotted and the opportunities to use it are fair, are older, believe in the ideals of the PWE, exhibit Type A behavior, or are compatible with their jobs, and individuals do not

value vacations, are less vulnerable to stress, or occupy low job levels. (Only relationships involving promotability are less consistent, i.e. reflecting unexpected positive relationships for all moderators).

In contrast, evidence of clear or consistent relationships between vacation practices and all performance and absenteeism measures is least pronounced, and not as expected (some relationships are unclear or are opposite to what is expected), and the pattern of correlations is not statistically significant, when the relationships are predicted to be positive for the performance measures and negative for the absenteeism measure, and when affected by the following factors or conditions: individuals do not feel vacation time and opportunity are fair, are younger, do not believe in the ideals of the PWE, do not exhibit Type A behavior, or are not compatible with their jobs, and individuals who value vacations, are more vulnerable to stress, or occupy high job levels. (Only relationships involving promotability are more consistent, i.e. reflecting expected positive relationships for six of eight moderators).

Evidence of the statistically significant pattern of correlations between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism (i.e. whether positive or negative) when affected by specific factors or conditions is confirmed by employing Siegel's Sign Test which enables an examination of signs of relationships to determine patterns of correlations.¹ Using the formula,

¹Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1965; pp. 68-75.

$$z = \frac{(x \pm .5) - \frac{1}{2} N}{\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{N}}$$
 for a large sample ($N > 25$) and an accompanying table of probabilities associated with z values, it was determined that there is a statistically significant pattern of correlations when vacation practices are negatively related to performance variables and positively related to absenteeism, when affected by the specific factors cited earlier ($z = 2.16$; $p \leq .02$).¹

In addition, the same sign test was employed to determine to which degree (high versus low) moderating factors affect the pattern of correlations or the signs of the relationships between vacation practices, performance and absenteeism (i.e. whether consistently positive or negative). Results indicate that the pattern of correlations approaches statistical significance when moderators are evident to a high, rather than low, degree. ($z = 1.6$; $p \leq .0495$).²

¹Using the same sign test for relationships expected to be positive between vacation practices and performance and negative between vacation practices and absenteeism, results do not achieve statistical significance.

²Results are not statistically significant when moderators are evident to a low degree.

Table 6-2

Comparative Statistics of the Moderating Effects on the Relationships Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism: Regression and Correlation Coefficients

Variables	PEV			PERT			PROM			AB		
	Beta ¹	L	H	Beta	L	H	Beta	L	H	Beta	L	H
FFV	.18	-.07	-.15	-.28**	.07	-.23*	-.13	.002	.24*	-.19	-.01	-.26*
EVAC 2	-.01	-.17	.01	.32**	-.19	-.08	.22**	.12	.02	.26**	.20	-.08
EVAC 1	.19	-.06	-.18	-.06	-.14	.002	.03	.03	.22	-.03	.04	.28*
AGE	.04	-.19	-.03	-.46**	.01	-.19	-.55**	.06	.16	-.26**	.07	.15
PWE	.11	-.13	-.09	-.01	.14	-.20	-.01	.17	.07	-.24**	.06	.16
STS	-.04	-.18	-.07	.02	-.11	.001	-.12	.12	.11	.05	.24*	.01
TPA	.07	-.08	-.12	.08	-.03	-.07	.09	.13	.13	-.06	.17	.07
JLEV	.04	-.13	-.08	.63**	.04	.02	-.02	.08	.17	-.21**	.06	.13
JC2	-.12	-.11	-.17	-.04	.07	-.32*	-.07	-.12	.19	.20**	-.03	.11
	-.002			-.18			.04			.06		

¹ Beta coefficients reported are for moderators only.

² Beta coefficients reported are for compatible and incompatible situations, respectively.

*p \leq .05

**Beta \geq .20

Table 6-3

Comparative Statistics of the Moderating Effects on the Potential Sign of the Relationships Between Vacation Practices, Performance and Absenteeism¹

Vacations/ Performance, Absenteeism	Low Moderator					High Moderator				
	FFV	AGE	PWE	TPA	JC	FFV	AGE	PWE	TPA	JC
PEV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PERT	+	?	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-
PROM	?	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
AB	?	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+
(Predicted + Relationship Between Vacations and PEV, PERT, PROM. Predicted - Relationship Between Vacations and AB).					(Predicted - Relationship Between Vacations and PEV, PERT and PROM. Predicted + Relationship Between Vacations and AB).					

¹Signs reported reflect potential relationships. Not all potential relationships are statistically significant. Those achieving statistical significance are reported in Table 6-4.

Table 6-3 (continued)

Vacations/ Performance, Absenteeism	Low Moderator				High Moderator			
	EVAC 2	EVAC 1	STS	JLEV	EVAC 2	EVAC 1	STS	JLEV
PEV	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	-
PERT	-	-	-	+	-	?	?	+
PROM	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
AB	+	-	+	+	-	+	?	+
(Predicted - Relationship Between Vacations and PEV, PERT, PROM. Predicted + Relationship Between Vacations and AB).					(Predicted + Relationship Between Vacations and PEV, PERT, and PROM. Predicted - Relationship Between Vacations and AB).			

Table 6-4

Moderating Effects on the Predicted Negative Relationship Between Vacation Practices and Performance
and on the Predicted Positive Relationship Between Vacation Practices and Absenteeism

Vacations/ Performance, Absenteeism	Low Moderator				High Moderator			
	EVAC 2	EVAC 1	STS	JLEV	FFV	AGE	PWE	TPA
PEV	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-*
PERT	-	-	-	+	-*	-	-	-
PROM	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
AB	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+

(Predicted - Relationship for PEV, PERT, and PROM. Predicted + Relationship for AB).

*p \leq .05

Table 6-4 (continued)

Moderating Effects on the Predicted Positive Relationship Between Vacation Practices and Performance
and on the Predicted Negative Relationship Between Vacation Practices and Absenteeism

Vacations/ Performance, Absenteeism	Low Moderator					High Moderator			
	FFV	AGE	PWE	TPA	JC	EVAC 2	EVAC 1	STS	JLEV
PEV	-	-	-	-	-	?	-	-	-
PERT	+	?	+	-	+	-	?	?	+
PROM	?	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
AB	?	+	+	+	-	-	+	?	+

(Predicted + Relationship for PEV, PERT, and PROM. Predicted - Relationship for AB).

*p \leq .05

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Several conclusions of the study of the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism are presented; theoretical and practical implications of these conclusions which generate directions for future research are discussed; and, finally, a brief summary of the impact of this research is provided.

General Hypothesis

The relationship between managerial vacation practices, i.e. the extent to which allotted vacation time is used, and managerial performance and absenteeism, i.e. performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, and the incidence of absenteeism, is not significantly different from zero statistically. However, a closer examination of the results of the statistical analyses performed on the relationships--reflecting potential signs or forms--provide a more meaningful expression of emerging or potential relationships. In particular, it appears that employees who are the most effective performers in organizations and who have the lowest incidence of absenteeism are those who use less of their allotted vacation time. (Of the four measures of the dependent variable measured in this study, only one, promotability, reflects a tendency toward a less negative, and a more positive, relationship, as predicted). Indeed, the results appear to be opposite to the relationship predicted by the General Hypothesis: that employees

who are the most effective performers and who have the lowest incidence of absenteeism, are those who use more of their allotted vacation time.

Based on the premise that the results of the General Hypothesis reflect potential signs in the relationships (i.e. results of statistical analyses performed on the data support particular forms--though not necessarily achieving statistical significance), the following conclusions regarding the Sub-Hypothesis are drawn.

Sub-Hypothesis

1. The sign of the potential relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism is affected by certain factors or conditions. In particular, the relationship is more pronounced, i.e. three of the four measures of the dependent variable are related to vacation practices as predicted when employees: a) feel vacation time allotted and the opportunities to use the vacation time are fair, b) are older, c) have strong beliefs in the Protestant Work Ethic, d) exhibit strong Type A behavior, e) are more compatible with their jobs, f) do not value and enjoy vacations in relative terms, and g) are less vulnerable to stress.

(The expected opposite positive relationship between vacation practices and performance, and the expected opposite negative relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism when these preceding moderators--or any other moderators or factors examined in this research--are evident or exist to the opposite degree are less pronounced, i.e. fewer than three of the four measures of the dependent variable are related to vacation practices are predicted. Yet, there are unexpected opposite relationships between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism, i.e. those which are opposite to

what is predicted. These are more pronounced, i.e. three of four measures of the dependent variable are related to vacation practices opposite to that predicted, only when individuals exhibit weak Type A behavior. Finally, all other factors or conditions tested as moderators of the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism produce no noticeable or pronounced effects, i.e. fewer than three of the four measures of the dependent variable are consistently related to, or clearly reflect, either a potentially positive or negative relationship to vacation practices).

2. The extent to which the factors, or moderators, affect the sign of the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism depends on two conditions: a) the strength of the particular moderator, e.g. high or low, strong or weak; and b) the particular measure of the dependent variable, e.g. performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, or absenteeism. Of the possible seventy-two relationships investigated in this study, i.e. nine moderators, two moderating strengths, and four indices of performance and absenteeism, sixty-five reflect potential signs in the relationships (though not necessarily statistically significant relationships) as indicated by correlation coefficients. However, the particular potential signs do vary--depending on which moderating strengths and indices of the dependent variable are being tested.

3. Evidence of potential, clear signs in the relationship between vacation practices and all performance and absenteeism measures, when affected by all moderating factors and strengths, is most noticeable and as expected, when the relationship between vacation practices and

performance is predicted to be negative, and the relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism is predicted to be positive. In particular, twenty-five of thirty-six relationships are as predicted, and results of Siegel's Sign Test indicate that this pattern of correlations is statistically significant. More specifically, vacation practices tend to be negatively related to performance and positively related to absenteeism when individuals feel vacation time and opportunity are fair, are older, have strong beliefs in the Protestant Work Ethic, exhibit strong Type A behavior, or experience job compatibility, as well as when individuals do not value vacations, are less vulnerable to stress, and occupy low job levels. (Evidence of clear, potential signs in the relationship between vacation practices and all performance and absenteeism measures, when moderated by conditions opposite to those cited above, is less pronounced or noticeable and often not as expected, when the relationship between vacation practices and performance is predicted to be positive, and the relationship between vacation practices and absenteeism is predicted to be negative. In particular, only thirteen of thirty-six relationships are as predicted, and results of Siegel's Sign Test do not reflect a statistically significant pattern of correlations).

In addition, it can be noted that results of the Sign Test also reflect some evidence that a pattern of correlations between vacation practices, performance and absenteeism approaches statistical significance when moderating factors are present to a high, rather than low, degree.

4. The vacation patterns and practices described in this research, i.e. the proportional amount of allotted vacation time used,

not used, sacrificed or exchanged; frequency; length; time of year and reasons why vacations are taken; preferences for vacations to other types of rewards or benefits; and reactions to vacation policies adopted by the organization which affect vacation practices and preferences adopted by the organization which affect vacation patterns and preferences adopted by individuals, are believed to be representative of those vacation practices adopted by typical managerial employees.

First, clear vacation patterns are evident for the general population. The only noticeable deviations are reflected in individual preferences for vacations to other types of rewards such as health insurance, educational assistance, savings plans and promotions. Reactions to relative preferences, especially with respect to exchanging some of these current rewards for more vacation time, reflect more variability.

Second, similar vacation patterns are evident even when certain subgroups of the general population, e.g. identified by differences in age, sex, marital status, Hay Points, salary, and department, are selected and examined. The only noticeable deviations involve a small subgroup of employees, i.e. those who receive the largest amount of annual vacation time (which is often related to organizational tenure, age and job level), who are able to take longer or more frequent vacations, and who are more opposed to changing vacation policies.

Third, the vacation practices and patterns adopted by these employees are perceived to be the same as, or similar to, those adopted by fellow employees within the company.

5. Finally, the vacation patterns and behaviors actually adopted by managerial employees are the same as, or similar to, what employees

would like to do regarding vacations. There is very little discrepancy between what managers actually do with and feel about vacations and what they perceive they would like to do and feel, if given other options, alternatives, or more flexibility.

Implications and Recommendations for Future Research

A number of implications from these conclusions, both theoretical and practical, are identified and provide directions for future research in the study of individuals and organizations.

1. The description of managerial vacation practices and patterns provides insight, not only into how and why employees use allotted vacation time, but also into what absolute value or significance individuals place on vacations in our society. Furthermore, an examination of these practices in relation to performance and absenteeism provides additional information on which rewards affect or improve performance and reduce absenteeism.

However, this research should be replicated in other American organizations to develop a more reliable and comprehensive profile of vacation patterns, and to determine the significance of this typical feature of organizational life in relation to the critical requirements of job performance and job attendance.

Similarly, cross-cultural research should be conducted to enable an even more extensive comparative analysis of vacation patterns in relation to performance and absenteeism. This seems warranted as many American organizations are examining the policies and levels of performance and absenteeism in organizations in other societies, and are actively adopting similar practices in order to achieve parallel levels of performance and attendance. In particular, an emphasis on integrating

quality of working life and quality of life, which began in European societies such as West Germany, Sweden, France, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Italy, is now of growing concern to American organizations. Many quality of work life programs in these Western European societies place, among other priorities, greater emphasis on the value of vacations: organizations in these societies adopt vacation practices, e.g. allot significant amounts of vacation time annually and encourage and subsidize vacations, that contrast sharply with those of American companies. Consequently, studying vacation practices in these societies may provide more relative information on the importance of vacations in the United States, and may enhance the understanding of the value of vacations, especially as it relates to or rewards job performance and attendance. Results of such research may, in turn, provide impetus for practitioners to examine and possibly revise existing policies and practices regarding vacations, performance and absenteeism.

2. The most noticeable individual difference in vacation patterns adopted by managers, in general, are reflected in the value or importance that individuals place on vacations, especially in relative rather than absolute terms. In particular, there is evidence of more variability in employee preferences for vacations to other types of rewards such as salary, health and life insurance, educational assistance, savings plans and promotions, and in their willingness to exchange some of these for more vacation time. Very few differences are reflected in other patterns such as lengths, amount, frequency and types of vacations taken.

Hence, scholars should be encouraged to investigate further the importance or value of vacations in more relative terms, i.e. as an

alternative type of reward. In most organizations vacations are usually given, or expected, regardless of job performance or attendance; however, research on the motivational aspects of vacations, especially in the context of Expectancy Theory of Motivation, and especially on how vacations reward performance or attendance, may provide additional input into a better understanding and application of Performance-Reward Theories. In particular, research which focuses on the value of vacations, especially in terms of relative value versus absolute value (an issue in this study which has produced different results) may generate a clear understanding of the true valence of certain types of rewards. This is especially important as valence, explored and explained by Expectancy Theory of Motivation, is perceived in more absolute terms. Similarly, research on the relationship of this reward, vacations, to performance and attendance--especially in terms of contingent versus non-contingent relationships--may provide additional insight into the expectations that individuals have, or would like to have, regarding the allotment of vacation time based on job performance and attendance behavior. This, too, is especially important as vacation allotments are usually based on number of years of service, rather than on performance and attendance in a company.

Subsequently, the results of such research would be useful to practitioners in examining the structure and content of contemporary reward systems in organizations, and in revising or revamping them, especially by allowing more flexibility or by adopting more cafeteria-style benefit programs which could include an exchange of current benefits for more vacation time. In addition, practitioners may examine the structure of their policies regarding vacations and may introduce

revisions which make annual vacation allotments contingent upon performance and perhaps attendance. Indeed, further investigation of vacations, especially in terms of individual preferences, may generate new designs in reward systems which include more or better utilization of vacation time and which are based on, and more effectively motivate, reward, or improve performance and reduce absenteeism.

3. An examination of the "performance-reward" relationship has produced a profile of the vacation practices and behavioral patterns which are typical of the most effective performers. That is, this test of the relationship between managerial vacation practices and managerial performance and absenteeism has identified those types of individuals who, under certain conditions, adopt certain vacation practices and have high performance evaluations, performance potential, promotability, and less absenteeism.

However, a more comprehensive investigation of vacation practices, i.e. an examination of other practices or behaviors, in addition to the proportional amount used, which was measured in this study, and a more specific identification and examination of those characteristics or conditions which may affect the relationship, i.e. an examination of other moderators in addition to those explored in this study, may produce a broader profile and a better understanding of what characteristics, conditions, and vacation patterns are most closely associated with the best performers.

In addition, such a comprehensive investigation may provide additional insight into a direction of causation in the relationship between managerial characteristics (in particular, vacation practices) and performance and absenteeism levels, and, further, may provide a test of

the "upper echelon theory," i.e. that organizations are reflections of the characteristics of their top managers (Hambrick and Mason, 1984). Indeed, the results of such research could produce a managerial profile of relatively simple characteristics which significantly affect individual decisions and strategies, and which determine overall organizational performance.

And, such a profile would be useful to practitioners in identifying and understanding the characteristics and behaviors of those who are the best performers (and maintain the most respectable job attendance) which, over time, could improve selection processes by more effectively matching individual characteristics with organizational performance. Similarly, the profile would also help practitioners to identify less effective performers and, subsequently, to help improve their performance by suggesting more appropriate training and development needs. In turn, organizations could offer more or improved programs or seminars which deal with more effective utilization of vacation time, with ways of accepting or changing particular characteristics or conditions such as coping with stress, relieving tension, or improving health, and with whatever other characteristics or circumstances, beyond this research, affect performance and absenteeism.

4. This research confirms the expectation that there are alternative ways to measure individual performance in organizations. The theoretical results indicate that the sign of the relationship between vacation practices and performance depends on the given measure of performance being investigated, i.e. performance evaluations, performance potential, or promotability. Furthermore, the descriptive results indicate that all of these alternative measures are perceived by

employees to be appropriate measures, and representative of individual performance: most employees indicate that performance evaluations and promotions are important and valuable, and provide accurate measures of their performance.

Consequently, from a theoretical perspective, additional research on the measurement of performance (whether to identify one comprehensive measure or to confirm several alternative measures) is warranted so that more meaningful research on performance, especially in relation to rewards, can be conducted. And, because of the perceived value of performance evaluations and promotions reflected in this study, scholars should be concerned, particularly, with continued research on performance appraisal systems, especially to minimize their subjectivity and to ensure formal objective appraisals.

Hence, over time, organizations may be able to develop or adopt improved performance appraisal systems which are meaningful to employees and which reflect fairly their performance.

5. Further investigations on the use of vacation time as a form of, or alternative to, absenteeism (or vice versa), as well as on the prevalence of absenteeism among managerial employees, is also suggested by this research.

First, this study examined absenteeism, as a dependent variable, in relation to vacations, as an independent variable. However, vacations may represent an alternative form of absenteeism (some employees in the survey respond that they do not take vacations because their "absence" creates too much work when they return). Or, absenteeism may represent an alternative to vacations (employees respond that on occasion they have a feeling or need to be absent from work, even if not

ill). Hence, additional research is needed to distinguish between absenteeism and vacations as forms of unauthorized and authorized time off.

Second, absenteeism in organizations, especially when caused by job-related pressures, tension or stress, is of heightened concern to organizations, especially when it affects levels of performance among managerial and professional employees. This study provides some information on managerial or "white collar" (as opposed to the typically studied "blue-collar") absenteeism, and, results indicate that managers, on occasion, do experience job-related stress and, on occasion, are absent from work. Furthermore, the theoretical results reflect that both stress and Type A behavior are positively related to absenteeism. In addition, employees indicate that being absent has no effect, or indeed sometimes a positive effect, on performance. Consequently, further investigation of absenteeism among white collar or managerial employees, in the context of job-related pressures and stress, and on how it affects job performance, is warranted.

Finally, additional research on what causes absenteeism among these employees is recommended by this research. While this study does not examine, in detail, the causes of absenteeism, some results indicate that absenteeism may be voluntary (a choice behavior because of competing commitments such as doctors' appointments or because of a need for "mental health" days due to job-related pressures or stress) as opposed to involuntary (illness). Hence, more specific research on the causes of absenteeism may describe, more clearly, or account for the incidence of absenteeism among managerial employees.

A better understanding of absenteeism among white collar employees, in terms of incidence or reasons for being absent, may encourage and enable organizations to develop mechanisms, strategies or programs for minimizing it. It is possible that allowing more "absenteeism" or vacation days off the job may lead to less absenteeism or more days spent performing on the job.

6. Last, the general findings of this study indicate that employees are concerned about, and respond favorably to, their non-work related aspects of life, i.e. their lives outside of the job which is reflected in social activities, recreation, friendships, and, most particularly, in full and optimal utilization of their allotted vacation time. But, the findings also indicate that these employees do not respond as favorably to some of the organizational policies or practices which guide their lives outside of the job, especially those regarding vacations. Many employees would like policy changes which include a) reducing the years of service structure, which determine how much vacation time is allotted each year, so that increased allotments come sooner, and b) making the amount of annual allotted vacation time contingent upon performance. That individual preferences are not consistent with organizational policies and practices warrants additional research, first, to determine the effects of these traditional business policies, i.e. typically tying allotted vacation time to number of years of service, on contemporary employee beliefs and behaviors, and, second, to understand, further, the complex relationship between organizational processes and individual reactions.

Such research may provide an impetus for practitioners to review and revise their current policies and practices regarding vacations. In

particular, changing the structure and administration of vacation policies by allowing more authorized time off each year (e.g. increasing annual vacation allotments), by encouraging more and better utilization of vacation time (e.g. endorsing, subsidizing, or at least promoting vacations), and by motivating employees with vacations as a reward for job performance and attendance (e.g. introducing incentive plans or bonuses in the form of vacations), organizations, indeed, may experience, in both financial and non-financial terms, reduced employee absenteeism, improved job performance, and spirited organizational effectiveness, productivity and growth.

Summary

Organizations are designed to tap the energy and commitment of individuals who are hired to perform. Since organizational characteristics, policies, and practices are based on a model of the individual, it is imperative a) to recognize and describe, separately, some of the characteristics of the model, which may include ages and job levels of individuals, as well as the extent to which individuals feel the vacation time allotted and opportunities to use the time are fair, value and enjoy vacations, believe in the ideals of the Protestant Work Ethic, exhibit Type A behavior, and are compatible with a job, and b) to explore these characteristics in relation to a host of job and organizational factors in order to understand, evaluate and predict job and organizational performance and absenteeism.

However, performance in, or absenteeism from, the job may be a function of factors far removed from the job itself, i.e. non-job related factors such as the extent to which individuals engage in leisure

and recreation, or the quality and quantity of their time spent off the job. Therefore, organizations should address, and be aware of, these non-work related variables, especially time off the job expressed in the form of vacation patterns, and the impact that they have on individual performance and absenteeism, and, indeed, on organizational effectiveness.

By developing and adopting organizational policies and practices consistent with the relationship between time off the job (vacations) and time on the job (attendance and performance), between work and non-work, and between quality of working life and quality of life, organizations, indeed, may breed healthy performance and effectiveness for the future.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS AND QUESTIONNAIRE

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT (517) 353-5415

EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824-1121

November 3, 1983

Dear Scott Paper Employees,

I am a former employee of Scott Paper Company and am presently completing a Ph.D. in Business at Michigan State University. In order to receive the degree, I must fulfill the last requirement of conducting research for a dissertation.

The topic of my research deals with an investigation of corporate employee vacation patterns and practices, and their relationship to the stress, health and performance of employees, as well as to the overall productivity of the company.

Scott Paper Management has given me permission to conduct this research at Corporate Headquarters. I, therefore, am asking you to please participate in this study by filling out the attached questionnaire. I guarantee complete confidentiality, and can assure you that no one at Scott Paper will see your responses. The completed questionnaire can be sealed in the envelope provided and sent to me c/o Plaza II, Suite 100. I would like to collect all of these by Tuesday, November 15, and then return to Michigan State to analyze the results.

Your participation is voluntary, but it would be of great benefit to both the scholarly and business communities as no one has ever studied the taking of vacations, which is such a common feature to all organizations. And, your time, effort and cooperation would be appreciated, especially, by me as you help me to complete my degree.

Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely,



Kathleen Utecht

INSTRUCTIONS

This survey is an effort directed at finding out about your vacation practices and their relationship to the productivity and performance of the Company. The survey is divided into the following two parts:

Part I (Questions 1-138) focuses on vacation patterns and health, and your responses are to be recorded on the first computer sheet marked Part I.

Part II (Questions 1-117) focuses on absenteeism patterns, job characteristics and personal factors. Your responses are to be recorded on the second computer sheet marked Part II.

All questions should be completed by filling in only one of the answer spaces per line. The survey is designed for machine scoring. Therefore, please use the soft lead pencil provided, make heavy black marks that fill the circles, erase clearly any answers you wish to change, and make no stray markings of any kind. And, while completing the questionnaire, be sure to read any special instructions that are included.

The value of your answers depends on your being frank in completing this survey. Your answers are completely confidential. The completed surveys will be processed by computer; your survey copy will be destroyed; and the information analyzed and reported will be treated as group information. Under no circumstances will any information collected here be identified with the individual respondent. Therefore, please do not write your name on the form.

On the average, the survey takes about 30 minutes to complete; however, use whatever time you find necessary. When you have completed the survey, please seal the computer sheets and questionnaire in the envelope provided and return it to Kathy Utecht, c/o Plaza II, Suite 100, by Tuesday, November 15, 1983.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

A SURVEY OF MANAGERIAL VACATION PRACTICES

PART I

- A) The following questions appear in "pairs". Please answer the first question based on what you would like to do regarding vacation practices; and then answer the second question based on what you actually do (i.e. typical or average behavior over the past three years). Select the most appropriate response and blacken the corresponding number on the computer sheet provided.
1. How much of the vacation time allotted to you each year would you like to use?
 - 0) Almost All
 - 1) About Half
 - 2) Less than Half
 - 3) Little or None
 2. How much do you use?
 - 0) Almost All
 - 1) About Half
 - 2) Less than Half
 - 3) Little or None
 3. How much of the vacation time allotted to you each year would you like to use to travel away from home?
 - 0) Almost All
 - 1) About Half
 - 2) Less than Half
 - 3) Little or None
 4. How much do you use to travel?
 - 0) Almost All
 - 1) About Half
 - 2) Less than Half
 - 3) Little or None
 5. How much of the vacation time allotted to you each year would you like to use to engage in activities or events which require extended time off (i.e. several days off in a row)?
 - 0) Almost All
 - 1) About Half
 - 2) Less than Half
 - 3) Little or None
 6. How much do you use to engage in such activities or events?
 - 0) Almost All
 - 1) About Half
 - 2) Less than Half
 - 3) Little or None
 7. While on vacation, how much of the time would you like to spend on job-related work?
 - 0) Almost All
 - 1) About Half
 - 2) Less than Half
 - 3) Little or None
 8. How much do you spend on job-related work?
 - 0) Almost All
 - 1) About Half
 - 2) Less than Half
 - 3) Little or None

9. How much of the vacation time allotted to you each year would you like to "bank"?
 - 0) Almost All
 - 1) About Half
 - 2) Less than Half
 - 3) Little or None
10. How much do you "bank"?
 - 0) Almost All
 - 1) About Half
 - 2) Less than Half
 - 3) Little or None
11. How much of the vacation time allotted to you each year would you be willing to not use or sacrifice?
 - 0) Almost All
 - 1) About Half
 - 2) Less than Half
 - 3) Little or None
12. How much do you not use or sacrifice?
 - 0) Almost All
 - 1) About Half
 - 2) Less than Half
 - 3) Little or None
13. How much of the vacation time allotted to you each year would you like to exchange for cash payment, if you had a choice?
 - 0) Almost All
 - 1) About Half
 - 2) Less than Half
 - 3) Little or None
14. How much do you exchange for cash payment?
 - 0) Almost All
 - 1) About Half
 - 2) Less than Half
 - 3) Little or None
15. How often would you like to carry over your unused vacation time into the next calendar year (if circumstances prevented you from using it in the current calendar year)?
 - 0) Almost Always
 - 1) Sometimes
 - 2) Almost Never
16. How often do you carry over any unused vacation time?
 - 0) Almost Always
 - 1) Sometimes
 - 2) Almost Never
17. How often would you like to use the vacation time allotted to you each year all, or mostly, at one time?
 - 0) Almost Always
 - 1) Sometimes
 - 2) Almost Never
18. How often do you use the vacation time all, or mostly, at one time?
 - 0) Almost Always
 - 1) Sometimes
 - 2) Almost Never
19. How often would you like to use the vacation time allotted to you at the same time(s) every year (e.g. Summer, Winter, etc.)?
 - 0) Almost Always
 - 1) Sometimes
 - 2) Almost Never
20. How often do you use the vacation time at the same time(s) every year?
 - 0) Almost Always
 - 1) Sometimes
 - 2) Almost Never

21. How often would you like to plan, in advance, for your longest vacation?
- 0) Almost Always
1) Sometimes
2) Almost Never
22. How often do you plan in advance?
- 0) Almost Always
1) Sometimes
2) Almost Never
23. If you were encouraged to take off one week at one time, how would your job performance be affected? It would have
- 0) A Positive Effect
1) No Effect
2) A Negative Effect
3) Don't Know
24. When you do take off one week, how is your job performance affected? It has
- 0) A Positive Effect
1) No Effect
2) A Negative Effect
3) Don't Know
25. If you were encouraged to take off two weeks at one time, how would your job performance be affected? It would have
- 0) A Positive Effect
1) No Effect
2) A Negative Effect
3) Don't Know
26. When you do take off two weeks, how is your job performance affected? It has
- 0) A Positive Effect
1) No Effect
2) A Negative Effect
3) Don't Know
27. If you were encouraged to take off three weeks or more at one time, how would your job performance be affected? It would have
- 0) A Positive Effect
1) No Effect
2) A Negative Effect
3) Don't Know
28. When you do take off three weeks or more, how is your job performance affected? It has
- 0) A Positive Effect
1) No Effect
2) A Negative Effect
3) Don't Know
29. How often would you like to take a vacation (i.e. at least three consecutive days, not including weekends)?
- 0) More than three times a year 1) At least twice a year
2) At least once a year 3) About every other year
4) About once in three years 5) Almost Never
30. How often do you take a vacation?
- 0) More than three times a year 1) At least twice a year
2) At least once a year 3) About every other year
4) About once in three years 5) Almost Never

31. How often would you like to take a vacation of one week duration?
- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0) More than three times a year | 1) At least twice a year |
| 2) At least once a year | 3) About every other year |
| 4) About once in three years | 5) Almost Never |
32. How often do you take a one week vacation?
- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0) More than three times a year | 1) At least twice a year |
| 2) At least once a year | 3) About every other year |
| 4) About once in three years | 5) Almost Never |
33. How often would you like to take a vacation of two weeks duration?
- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0) More than three times a year | 1) At least twice a year |
| 2) At least once a year | 3) About every other year |
| 4) About once in three years | 5) Almost Never |
34. How often do you take a two week vacation?
- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0) More than three times a year | 1) At least twice a year |
| 2) At least once a year | 3) About every other year |
| 4) About once in three years | 5) Almost Never |
35. How often would you like to take a vacation of three weeks or more duration?
- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0) More than three times a year | 1) At least twice a year |
| 2) At least once a year | 3) About every other year |
| 4) About once in three years | 5) Almost Never |
36. How often do you take a three week or more vacation?
- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0) More than three times a year | 1) At least twice a year |
| 2) At least once a year | 3) About every other year |
| 4) About once in three years | 5) Almost Never |
37. How often would you like to take an interesting or exciting vacation?
- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0) More than three times a year | 1) At least twice a year |
| 2) At least once a year | 3) About every other year |
| 4) About once in three years | 5) Almost Never |
38. How often do you take an interesting or exciting vacation?
- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 0) More than three times a year | 1) At least twice a year |
| 2) At least once a year | 3) About every other year |
| 4) About once in three years | 5) Almost Never |

39. What would be the longest period of time that you could maintain effective job performance before needing a vacation (i.e. at least three consecutive days, not including weekends)?
- 0) Up to three months 1) Up to six months 2) Up to nine months
3) Up to one year 4) Longer than one year
40. What is the longest period of time you do work effectively before taking a vacation?
- 0) Up to three months 1) Up to six months 2) Up to nine months
3) Up to one year 4) Longer than one year
41. What is the average length of the longest period of time you would like to take for a vacation?
- 0) Six weeks or more 1) Five weeks 2) Four weeks 3) Threeweeks
4) Two weeks 5) One week 6) Less than one week
42. What is the average length of the longest period of time you do take for a vacation?
- 0) Six weeks or more 1) Five weeks 2) Four weeks 3) Threeweeks
4) Two weeks 5) One week 6) Less than one week
43. How much vacation time would you like to "bank" each year, if you had a choice?
- 0) None 1) Less than one week 2) One week 3) Two weeks
4) Three weeks 5) Four weeks 6) Five weeks 7) Six weeks or more
44. Over the past three years, how much total vacation time have you "banked"?
- 0) None 1) Less than one week 2) One week 3) Two weeks
4) Three weeks 5) Four weeks 6) Five weeks 7) Six weeks or more
45. How much vacation time each year would you be willing to not use or sacrifice?
- 0) None 1) Less than one week 2) One week 3) Two weeks
4) Three weeks 5) Four weeks 6) Five weeks 7) Six weeks or more
46. Over the past three years, how much total vacation time have you not used or sacrificed?
- 0) None 1) Less than one week 2) One week 3) Two weeks
4) Three weeks 5) Four weeks 6) Five weeks 7) Six weeks or more
47. How much of the vacation time allotted to you each year would you exchange for a cash payment, if you had a choice?
- 0) None 1) Less than one week 2) One week 3) Two weeks
4) Three weeks 5) Four weeks 6) Five weeks 7) Six weeks or more

48. How much do you exchange for cash payment each year?
- 0) None 1) Less than one week 2) One week 3) Two weeks
4) Three weeks 5) Four weeks 6) Five weeks 7) Six weeks or more
49. How much unpaid vacation time would you be willing to take each year?
- 0) None 1) Less than one week 2) One week 3) Two weeks
4) Three weeks 5) Four weeks 6) Five weeks 7) Six weeks or more
50. Over the past three years, how many times have you carried over any unused vacation time into the next calendar year (because circumstances prevented you from using it in the current year)?
- 0) None 1) Once 2) Twice 3) Three times
51. What would be the most common reason for taking a vacation in the future? Select only one.
- 0) Rest and relaxation 1) Recharge battery, get renewed 2) Be with family, friends 3) Do something exciting, interesting, different from routine 4) Attend business convention or conference 5) Improve health 6) Be alone 7) Other 8) Not applicable--I don't take vacations
52. Over the past three years, what has been the most common reason for taking a vacation? Select only one.
- 0) Rest and relaxation 1) Recharge battery, get renewed 2) Be with family, friends 3) Do something exciting, interesting, different from routine 4) Attend business convention or conference 5) Improve health 6) Be alone 7) Other 8) Not applicable--I don't take vacations
53. What would be the most common reason for not taking a vacation in the future? Select only one.
- 0) They waste time and are unproductive 1) They make me nervous 2) I have too much work to do 3) I don't like to spend so much time with my family 4) Other 5) Not applicable--I always take vacations
54. Over the past three years, what has been the most common reason for not taking a vacation? Select only one.
- 0) They waste time and are unproductive 1) They make me nervous 2) I have too much work to do 3) I don't like to spend so much time with my family 4) Other 5) Not applicable--I always take vacations
55. In the next few years, do you expect the length of your vacation will be restricted by any of the following? Select only one--the most significant restriction.
- 0) Job 1) Spouse's job 2) Family 3) School year 4) Finances
5) Other 6) Not applicable--no restrictions

56. Over the past three years, has the length of your vacations been restricted by any of the following? Select only one.

- 0) Job 1) Spouse's job 2) Family 3) School year 4) Finances
5) Other 6) Not applicable--no restrictions

57. At what time of the year would you like to use the major portion of the vacation time allotted to you?

- 0) Summer 1) Spring 2) Winter 3) Fall 4) It varies
5) Not applicable--I don't take vacations

58. At what time of year do you generally use the major portion of your vacation time?

- 0) Summer 1) Spring 2) Winter 3) Fall 4) It varies
5) Not applicable--I don't take vacations

B) Please answer the following questions based on the extent you agree or disagree with each statement. Using a scale of 0 to 4, select the most appropriate number next to each item as follows:

	Strongly Disagree (SDA) 0	1	Neither Agree or Disagree (N) 2	3	Strongly Agree (SA) 4
	SDA	N	SA		
59. Vacations are important and valuable to me.	0	1	2	3	4
60. Vacations are worth the effort, time and money.	0	1	2	3	4
61. I enjoy using the vacation time allotted to me.	0	1	2	3	4
62. The week prior to taking a vacation I feel good.	0	1	2	3	4
63. When I'm on vacation, I feel good.	0	1	2	3	4
64. The week after I take a vacation and return to work, I feel good.	0	1	2	3	4
65. I like to spend my vacation time with family or friends.	0	1	2	3	4
66. My religious beliefs do not interfere with the taking of vacations.	0	1	2	3	4
67. I am willing to take vacations from my job responsibilities.	0	1	2	3	4
68. In my work experience I find employees are encouraged to take vacations.	0	1	2	3	4

	SDA	N	SA
69. I feel the amount of vacation time allotted to employees should be tied to job performance rather than tied to number of years of service with the company.	0	1	2 3 4
70. The amount of vacation time I now receive is "fair" for my job performance.	0	1	2 3 4
71. I do not like to take vacations because when I return to my job there is too much work to catch up on.	0	1	2 3 4
72. I often feel guilty when I take a vacation.	0	1	2 3 4
73. I feel I cannot take time off because of job-related pressures.	0	1	2 3 4
74. I feel I cannot take time off because someone might replace me if I'm gone.	0	1	2 3 4
75. I need vacation time in order to maintain effective job performance.	0	1	2 3 4
76. I would join another company if they offered nothing better than significantly more vacation time.	0	1	2 3 4
77. I prefer fewer, longer vacations to more frequent, shorter vacations.	0	1	2 3 4
78. I prefer an increase in vacation time to an increase in salary.	0	1	2 3 4
79. I prefer vacations to other types of benefits (such as health insurance, educational assistance, savings plans, etc.).	0	1	2 3 4
80. If there were more flexibility in benefit plans (e.g. cafeteria-style which allow more employee choice and several alternatives), I would exchange some of my current benefits for more vacation time.	0	1	2 3 4
81. I believe performance evaluations are linked to rewards (e.g. good evaluations lead to promotions, salary increases, etc.).	0	1	2 3 4
82. Performance evaluations are valuable in providing feedback for job performance.	0	1	2 3 4
83. On the average, the performance evaluations I receive are representative of my job performance.	0	1	2 3 4

	SDA	N	SA	
84. Promotions are based on performance evaluations.	0	1	2	3 4
85. Promotions are important and valuable to me.	0	1	2	3 4
86. In my work experience, I find employees are encouraged to seek promotions.	0	1	2	3 4
87. I often feel job-related pressure of stress.	0	1	2	3 4
88. I often feel job-related burnout or fatigue.	0	1	2	3 4
89. I often feel stress caused by factors other than (or outside of) my job.	0	1	2	3 4
90. Generally, my physical health has been good.	0	1	2	3 4
91. Generally, my mental health has been good.	0	1	2	3 4
92. If I had more vacation time, I might be healthier.	0	1	2	3 4
C) Please answer by selecting the most appropriate response.				
93. How much vacation time do you use compared with colleagues of a similar job level in the company? Do you use				
0) More 1) Same 2) Less 3) Don't Know				
94. How much vacation time do you use compared with employees who have about the same number of years of service in the company? Do you use				
0) More 1) Same 2) Less 3) Don't Know				
95. Considering the work that you are doing, what do you think is the proper amount of vacation time for your type of job? Should you get				
0) More 1) Same 2) Less 3) Don't Know				
96. How have your views toward vacations changed in the past ten years? Do you <u>now</u> enjoy or value vacations				
0) More 1) Same 2) Less 3) Don't Know				
97. Think of a person who has the same (or similar) job level as you. How does the amount of vacation time allotted to you each year compare with this person's? Do you get				
0) More 1) Same 2) Less 3) Don't Know				

98. Think of a person who has the same (or similar) job level as you and the same (or similar) job performance rating. How does the amount of vacation time allotted to you each year compare with this person's? Is yours
- 0) Higher 1) Same 2) Lower 3) Don't Know
99. Think of a person, either within or outside of the company, who gets about the same amount of vacation time each year as you. How does your job level compare with this person's? Is yours
- 0) Higher 1) Same 2) Lower 3) Don't Know
100. How many job levels are there between you and the Chairman (i.e. how many people do you have to go through in order to get to the Chairman)?
- 0) 0 1) 1 2) 2 3) 3 4) 4 5) 5 or more
101. How many promotion opportunities have you had over the past three years?
- 0) 0 1) 1 2) 2 3) 3 4) 4 5) 5 or more
102. How many promotion opportunities do you expect over the next three years?
- 0) 0 1) 1 2) 2 3) 3 4) 4 5) 5 or more
103. How many promotions have you turned down during your years of service with the company?
- 0) 0 1) 1 2) 2 3) 3 4) 4 5) 5 or more
104. How many different jobs have you had during your years of service with the company?
- 0) 0 1) 1-2 2) 3-5 3) 6-9 4) 10-12 5) Over 13
105. What is the average of your performance ratings over the past three years?
- 0) 1 1) 2 2) 3 3) 4 4) 5 5) 6 6) 7 7) 8 8) 9 9) 10
106. What is your latest performance rating?
- 0) 1 1) 2 2) 3 3) 4 4) 5 5) 6 6) 7 7) 8 8) 9 9) 10

107. Based on your latest performance and promotability evaluation, what is your promotability status? (Please refer to your performance and promotability evaluation form, if necessary).
- 0) A--Promotable Now 1) B--Promotable Later 3) C--Not Promotable, employee decision 3) D--Not Promotable, company decision
4) Don't Know
108. Based on your latest performance and promotability evaluation, what is your short-term promotability projection (in terms of level/SIRIS code number)?
- 0) 001 1) 002 2) 003 3) 004 4) 005 5) 006 6) 010
7) Don't Know
109. Based on your latest performance and promotability evaluation, what is your intermediate-term promotability projection?
- 0) 001 1) 002 2) 003 3) 004 4) 005 5) 006 6) 010
7) Don't Know
110. Based on your understanding of your job performance, how would you rate your overall promotability potential?
- 0) Very High 1) Somewhat High 2) Average 3) Somewhat Low
4) Very Low
111. Based on your latest performance and promotability evaluation, what is the most important training that you need? Select only one.
- 0) Developing People 1) Selecting People 2) Working with People
3) Communicating 4) Problem Solving 5) Organizing, Planning and Controlling Work 6) Self-Development 7) Other 8) None
112. Which of the following would you select as the most important type of "reward" for performing your job? Select only one.
- 0) Salary 1) Health Insurance 2) Life Insurance 3) Educational Assistance 4) Savings Plans 5) Vacation Time 6) Promotions
7) Other
113. If the present reward system in your Company were improved, which of the following rewards would you select as the most valuable to you? Select only one.
- 0) Increase in Salary 1) Better Health Insurance 2) Better Life Insurance 3) More Educational Assistance 4) Better Savings Plans
5) More Vacation Time 6) More Chances for Promotions 7) Other

114. For more vacation time, which of the following would you be most willing to partly exchange or sacrifice? Select only one.

0) Salary 1) Health Insurance 2) Life Insurance 3) Educational Assistance
4) Savings Plans 5) Promotions 6) Other 7) None

115. Which of the following recommendations regarding vacation policies would you select as the best for improving overall productivity?

0) Increasing amount of vacation time allotted each year
1) Reducing years of service structure so that increased vacation allotments come sooner
2) Remaining the same
3) Other

D) Please answer the following questions based on how much of the time each statement applies to you. Using a scale of 0 to 4, select the most appropriate number next to each item as follows.

Almost Always (A)		Sometimes (S)		Nearly Never (N)	
0	1	2	3	4	
					A S N
116.	I eat at least one hot, balanced meal a day.				0 1 2 3 4
117.	I get seven to eight hours sleep at least four nights a week.				0 1 2 3 4
118.	I give and receive affection regularly.				0 1 2 3 4
119.	I have at least one relative within fifty miles on whom I can rely.				0 1 2 3 4
120.	I exercise to the point of perspiration at least twice a week.				0 1 2 3 4
121.	I smoke less than half a pack of cigarettes a day.				0 1 2 3 4
122.	I take fewer than five alcoholic drinks a week.				0 1 2 3 4
123.	I am the appropriate weight for my height.				0 1 2 3 4
124.	I have an income adequate to meet basic expenses.				0 1 2 3 4
125.	I get strength from my religious beliefs.				0 1 2 3 4
126.	I regularly attend club or social activities.				0 1 2 3 4
127.	I have a network of friends and acquaintances.				0 1 2 3 4
128.	I have one or more friends to confide in about personal matters.				0 1 2 3 4

- | | | | | | | |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 129. | I am in good health (including my eyesight, hearing, teeth). | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 130. | I am able to speak openly about my feelings when angry or worried. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 131. | I have regular conversations with the people I live with about domestic problems, e.g. chores, money and daily living issues. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 132. | I do something for fun at least once a week. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 133. | I am able to organize my time effectively. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 134. | I drink fewer than three cups of coffee (or tea or cola drinks) a day. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 135. | I take quiet time for myself during the day. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 136. | When I get home, I think about problems, errors, frustrations that occurred during the day at work. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 137. | My work interferes with my homelife. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 138. | My homelife interferes with my work. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

PART II¹

- A) Please answer the following questions based on degree. Using a scale of 0 to 4, select the most appropriate response next to each item as follows and blacken the corresponding number on the second computer sheet provided.

Low Degree (LD)				High Degree (HD)
0	1	2	3	4

To what degree would you like to have each of the following characteristics in a job:

- | | LD | HD | | | |
|--|----|----|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| (139) 1. Stimulating and challenging work. | | | | | |
| 2. Opportunities to learn new things from my work. | | | | | |
| 3. Chances to exercise independent thought and action in my job. | | | | | |

¹To facilitate computer analyses of the variables, the items in Part II have been re-numbered (as indicated). Therefore, the total number of variables investigated in this research is approximately 270.

	LD			HD		
4. Opportunities to be creative and imaginative in my work.	0	1	2	3	4	
5. Opportunities for personal growth and development in my job.	0	1	2	3	4	
6. A sense of worthwhile accomplishment in my work.	0	1	2	3	4	

To what degree do you think each of the following job descriptions accurately describes the job you now have:

(145) 7. The job requires me to use a number of complex or high level skills.	0	1	2	3	4
8. The job provides me the chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin.	0	1	2	3	4
9. The job is one where a lot of other people can be affected by how well the work gets done.	0	1	2	3	4
10. The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.	0	1	2	3	4
11. Just doing the work required by the job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.	0	1	2	3	4

To what degree are you satisfied with this aspect of your job:

(150) 12. The amount of personal growth and development I get in doing my job.	0	1	2	3	4
13. The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment I get from doing my job.	0	1	2	3	4
14. The amount of independent thought and action I can exercise in my job.	0	1	2	3	4
15. The amount of challenge in my job.	0	1	2	3	4
16. The amount of vacation I get for the work I do.	0	1	2	3	4

To what degree do you identify with each of the following behaviors:

(155) 17. Vocal explosiveness: habitually accentuating key words even when no real need exists.	0	1	2	3	4
18. Perpetual motion: always moving, walking, eating rapidly.	0	1	2	3	4

		LD				HD			
19.	Impatience: belief that most events (such as others' speech) take place too slowly; undue irritation at poor drivers, waiting in lines, performing repetitious duties.	0	1	2	3	4			
20.	Polyphasic activity: striving to think about or do two or more things simultaneously.	0	1	2	3	4			
21.	Singular interests: difficulty in refraining from guiding a conversation to subjects of extreme interest to you; pretending to listen if unsuccessful at accomplishing this goal.	0	1	2	3	4			
(160) 22.	Relaxation guilt: feeling guilty when you do absolutely nothing for hours or days.	0	1	2	3	4			
23.	Environmental observations: failure to observe/recall important objects encountered in various environments (office, home, store).	0	1	2	3	4			
24.	Materialism: preoccupation with things worth having to the exclusion of becoming the things worth being.	0	1	2	3	4			
25.	Time urgency: attempting to schedule more and more in less and less time, with fewer allowances for unforeseen contingencies.	0	1	2	3	4			
26.	Aggressiveness: meeting a highly competitive person arouses you to challenge him or her.	0	1	2	3	4			
(165) 27.	Gesture: extensive use of dramatic and habitual gestures such as clenching fist, pounding fist on palm, clenching jaw, or grinding teeth.	0	1	2	3	4			
28.	Self-sufficiency: belief that your success has been due to your ability to get things done faster than your colleagues.	0	1	2	3	4			
29.	Numbers: finding yourself committed to evaluating your own (and others') activities in terms of numbers.	0	1	2	3	4			

B) Please answer the following questions based on which of the jobs you would prefer if you had to make a choice between them. Please choose either 0 or 1.

0

1

30. A job where the pay is very good. vs. A job where there is considerable opportunity to be creative and innovative.

01

- | | | | | |
|-------|-----|--|-----|--|
| | 31. | A job with a supervisor who respects you and treats you fairly. | vs. | A job which provides constant opportunities for you to learn new and interesting things. |
| (170) | 32. | A job where you are often required to make many important decisions. | vs. | A job with many pleasant people to work with. |
| | 33. | A job in which greater responsibility is given to those who do the best work. | vs. | A job in which greater responsibility is given to loyal employees who have the most seniority. |
| | 34. | A job in an organization which is in financial trouble--and might have to close down within a year. | vs. | A job in which you are not allowed to have any say whatever in how your work is scheduled, or in the procedures to be used in carrying it out. |
| | 35. | A very routine job. | vs. | A job where your co-workers are not very friendly. |
| | 36. | A job with a supervisor who is often critical of you and your work in front of other people. | vs. | A job which prevents you from using a number of skills that you worked hard to develop. |
| (175) | 37. | A job where there is a real chance that you could be laid off. | vs. | A job with very little chance to do challenging work. |
| | 38. | A job in which there is a real chance for you to develop new skills and advance in the organization. | vs. | A job which provides lots of vacation time and an excellent fringe benefit package. |
| | 39. | A job with little freedom and independence to do your work in the way you think best. | vs. | A job where the working conditions are poor. |
| | 40. | A job with very satisfying team work. | vs. | A job which allows you to use your skills and abilities to the fullest extent. |
| | 41. | A job which offers little or no challenge. | vs. | A job which requires you to be completely isolated from co-workers. |

- (C) Please answer the following questions based on the extent you agree or disagree with each statement. Using a scale of 0 to 4, select the most appropriate number next to each item as follows:

		Neither			Strongly Agree		
		Strongly Disagree	Agree or Disagree		(SA)		
		(SDA)	(N)				
		0	1	2	3	4	
		SDA	N	SA			
		0	1	2	3	4	
(180)	42.	When the workday is finished, a person should forget his job and enjoy himself.					0 1 2 3 4
	43.	Hard work makes a man a better person.					0 1 2 3 4
	44.	The principal purpose of a person's job is to provide him with the means for enjoying his free time.					0 1 2 3 4
	45.	Wasting time is as bad as wasting money.					0 1 2 3 4
	46.	Whenever possible a person should relax and accept life as it is, rather than always striving for unreachable goals.					0 1 2 3 4
(185)	47.	A good indication of a person's worth is how well he does his job.					0 1 2 3 4
	48.	If all other things are equal, it is better to have a job with a lot of responsibility than one with little responsibility.					0 1 2 3 4
	49.	People who "do things the easy way" are the smart ones.					0 1 2 3 4
	50.	I prefer to work with others in an organization than to work alone.					0 1 2 3 4
	51.	An organization is more productive when its members do what they want to do rather than what the organization wants them to do.					0 1 2 3 4
(190)	52.	An organization is more productive when its members follow their own interests and concerns.					0 1 2 3 4
	53.	I like it when members of an organization do things on their own, rather than working with others all the time.					0 1 2 3 4
	54.	People in an organization should recognize that they are not always going to get what they want.					0 1 2 3 4

		SDA		N		SA
55.	An organization is most efficient when its members do what they think is best, rather than what the organization wants them to do.	0	1	2	3	4
56.	People in an organization sometimes want to do things that the organization as a whole doesn't want to do.	0	1	2	3	4
(195) 57.	People in an organization should be willing to make sacrifices for the sake of the organization (such as working late now and then; going out of their way to help, etc.).	0	1	2	3	4
58.	People should be made aware that if they are going to be a part of an organization, they are sometimes going to have to do things they don't want to do.	0	1	2	3	4
59.	What individuals in an organization want are usually the same as what the organization as a whole wants.	0	1	2	3	4
60.	Given the choice, I would rather do a job where I can work alone, rather than do a job where I have to work with others.	0	1	2	3	4
61.	People in an organization should realize that they sometimes are going to have to make sacrifices for the sake of the organization.	0	1	2	3	4
(200) 62.	People in an organization should do their best to cooperate with each other instead of trying to work things out on their own.	0	1	2	3	4
63.	In an organization, there seems to be a continual battle between what is best for the organization versus what is best for individuals.	0	1	2	3	4
64.	Job-related stress, burnout, fatigue have caused me to be absent from work on occasion.	0	1	2	3	4
65.	Sometimes absenteeism from work may be voluntary (e.g. mental health days, competing commitments, etc.) as opposed to involuntary (illness).	0	1	2	3	4
66.	On occasion I have a "feeling or need" to be absent from work, even if not ill.	0	1	2	3	4

		SDA	N	SA
(205) 67.	I think companies should authorize more absences than they usually do.	0	1	2 3 4
68.	If I had more vacation time, I might be absent from work less.	0	1	2 3 4
69.	I cannot be absent from work because there is too much to do.	0	1	2 3 4
70.	I often do not take vacations because my absence would create more work when I return.	0	1	2 3 4

D) Please answer the following questions on absences (not including time off for vacations) by selecting the most appropriate response.

Based on your actual, typical behavior over the past three years:

71. What is the average number of occasions you were absent (excluding vacations) per year?
- 0) None 1) 1 2) 2-3 3) 4-6 4) 7-9 5) 10 or more
- (210) 72. How many absences (total number in past three years excluding vacations) have been extended, i.e. more than five days at one time?
- 0) None 1) 1 2) 2-3 3) 4-6 4) 7-9 5) 10 or more
73. What time of the year were you most likely to be absent (excluding vacations) from work?
- 0) Summer 1) Spring 2) Winter 3) Fall 4) It Varies
5) I have not been absent
74. What day were you most likely to be absent (excluding vacations) from work?
- 0) Monday 1) Tuesday 2) Wednesday 3) Thursday 4) Friday
5) It varies 6) I have not been absent
75. When were you most likely to be absent from work?
- 0) Nearer to vacation 1) Farther from vacation 2) It varies
3) I have not been absent
76. What was the typical reason for being absent from work?
- 0) Physical health 1) Mental health 2) Family responsibilities
3) Other 4) I have not been absent

If you had an inclination to be absent (not including vacations) from work:

- (215) 77. What time of the year would you want to be absent?
 0) Summer 1) Spring 2) Winter 3) Fall 4) It would vary
78. What day of the week would you want to be absent?
 0) Monday 1) Tuesday 2) Wednesday 3) Thursday 4) Friday
 5) It would vary
79. When would you want to be absent?
 0) Nearer to vacation 1) Farther from vacation
 2) It would vary
80. What would be the typical reason for being absent?
 0) Physical health 1) Mental health 2) Family responsibilities
 3) Other 4) It would vary

Based on your current situation:

- (220) 81. How would you rate the present state of your physical health?
 0) Excellent 1) Good 2) Fair 3) Poor 4) Don't Know
82. How would you rate the present state of your mental health?
 0) Excellent 1) Good 2) Fair 3) Poor 4) Don't Know
83. In the past year (Oct.-Oct.), on how many occasions (excluding vacations) were you absent from work?
 0) None 1) 1 2) 2-3 3) 4-5 4) 6-7 5) 8 or more
84. In the past year, what was your most typical reason for being absent from work?
 0) Physical health 1) Mental health 2) Family responsibilities
 3) Other 4) I have not been absent
85. Compared to your colleagues, on the average are you absent
 0) More 1) Same 2) Less 3) Don't Know
86. If you were given more vacation time off, would your incidence of absenteeism be
 0) More 1) Same 2) Less 3) Don't Know

- (225) 87. How does being absent from work affect your job performance?
- 0) Positive--it may be necessary and helpful
 - 1) No effect
 - 2) Negative--it may be harmful
 - 3) Don't know--I have never been absent
88. How often does your job require you to travel more than 100 miles from your place of work?
- 0) Quite often
 - 1) Frequently
 - 2) Sometimes
 - 3) On occasion
 - 4) Nearly never
89. On the average, how many hours per week do you put into the office?
- 0) Less than 30
 - 1) 30-40
 - 2) 41-60
 - 3) 61-70
 - 4) More than 70
90. On the average, how many hours per week do you do job-related work at home (i.e. evenings and weekends)?
- 0) Less than 5
 - 1) 6-10
 - 2) 11-20
 - 3) 21-30
 - 4) Over 30
91. How does your work affect your personal life? It has
- 0) A Positive Effect
 - 1) No Effect
 - 2) A Negative Effect
- (230) 92. How many miles do you live from work?
- 0) Less than 5
 - 1) 6-10
 - 2) 11-20
 - 3) 21-30
 - 4) Over 30
93. How many times have you relocated (to a new city, state or geographical area) in the past three years?
- 0) None
 - 1) 1
 - 2) 2
 - 3) 3
 - 4) 4
 - 5) 5
 - 6) 6 or more
94. What type of living arrangements do you have?
- 0) Live with family
 - 1) Live with friend
 - 2) Live alone
 - 3) Other
95. Which provides a greater source of satisfaction in your life?
- 0) Work
 - 1) Personal life outside of work (e.g. leisure, family, friends, etc.)
 - 2) Both work and personal life are equal
96. How often do you engage in activities outside of work, e.g. leisure, hobbies, recreation, relaxation, etc.?
- 0) Daily
 - 1) At least a few times a week
 - 3) About once a month
 - 4) Less than once a month

(235) 97. Do you have any pets?

0) Yes 1) No

98. Is your boss Male or Female?

0) Male 1) Female

99. People relieve job-related stress in a number of ways. Which of the following behaviors are you most likely to engage in as a result of job-related tension? Select all that apply. (This question will be "hand" scored).

0) Have an alcoholic drink 1) Use drugs (e.g. tranquilizers, etc.) 2) Smoke 3) Eat 4) Participate in therapy
5) Exercise or play sports 6) Spend time with video games or personal computers 7) Seek entertainment (T.V., movies, dances, etc.) 8) Go to church 9) Attend meetings, e.g. Rotary, PTA, political, consumer-oriented, etc.

E) Please answer the following by blackening the appropriate number on the computer sheet. Please blacken only one number on each line, as follows:

If your age is 42: 0 1 2 3 ● 5 6 7 8 9
 0 1 ● 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

If you have 2 children: ● 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
 0 1 ● 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

100-101. Age? (Please remember to blacken only one number on each line).

102-103. Number of children?

(240) 104-105. Number of years of service with this Company?

106-107. Number of years in present job?

108-109. Number of weeks of vacation allotted to you this year?

110. Hay Points of present job?

0) 1-399 1) 400-699 2) 700-1199 3) 1200 and over

111. Present salary?

0) Under \$35,000 1) \$35-49,000 2) \$50-64,000
3) \$65,000 and over

(245) 112. Marital status?

0) Married 1) Single 2) Divorced 3) Separated
4) Widowed 5) Other

113. Religion?

- 0) Protestant 1) Catholic 2) Jewish 3) Agnostic, Atheist
4) Other

114. Sex?

- 0) Male 1) Female

115. National origin?

- 0) American 1) European 2) African 3) Oriental 4) Latin/
South American 5) Indian/Pakistani 6) Arab 7) Other

116. Education?

- 0) Some High School 1) High School Diploma or Equivalent
2) Some College 3) Bachelor's Degree
4) Some Graduate or Professional School
5) Graduate or Professional Degree (MBA, JD, PhD, etc.)

117. Functional area in which you presently work?

- 0) Industrial Relations, Personnel Administration, etc.
1) Public Affairs, Government Relations, Communications, etc.
2) Law
3) Finance, Logistics, Accounting, Procurement, Control, etc.
4) Consumer/Commerical Marketing and Sales, New Business Development, etc.
5) Computer Management, Information Systems, etc.
6) R & D
7) International Operations
8) Engineering, Technical Services, etc.
9) Other

Additional comments describing vacation practices, preferences, etc. ____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this. Please seal your computerized response sheets and the accompanying questionnaire in the envelope provided and return it to Kathy Utecht, c/o Plaza II, Suite 100.

APPENDIX B
DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS

APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS

This study of managerial vacation practices provides not only theoretical results, which explain vacation practices in relation to performance and absenteeism, but also descriptive results, which outline vacation patterns adopted by managerial employees. The theoretical results have been reported and discussed in two preceding chapters. Hence, the descriptive results are reported and discussed in three sections that follow.

First, a more elaborate description of this population of managers, and of the vacation practices and patterns they adopt, is presented. In particular, the population is described in terms of those characteristics which have not been explored previously (e.g. health, quality of life outside of the job, reactions to vacation policies) and which are believed to have a particular bearing or influence on the kinds of vacation patterns adopted. Then, the actual vacation patterns of these managerial employees are discussed in terms of length and frequency of vacations, time of year and reasons why vacations are taken, etc. Frequency distributions and miscellaneous correlations, while not reported, reflect these results.

Second, the vacation patterns of these managers are examined from a comparative level of analysis to reflect any peculiarities and to reinforce the findings reported in the first section. In particular, the actual vacation patterns adopted by these managers (what employees

actually do) are examined in relation to perceptual practices (what employees would like to do) regarding vacations. Items one to fifty-eight in the survey appear in pairs (i.e. a "do" versus "would like" format) and results are compared in terms of correlations. Those pairs of items showing the largest deviations (reflected by lower correlation coefficients) are discussed. Then, from a similar perspective, a description of the perceived vacation patterns of co-workers is presented. That is, participants in the survey are asked to compare their vacation patterns with those of fellow workers. Again, the results (reflected in frequency distributions not reported) represent the extent to which the vacation patterns adopted by the employees in the survey are perceived as representative of, or similar to, those of most managerial employees in the company.

Third, certain vacation patterns are examined in relation to a) specific individual, job or organizational characteristics and b) more global characteristics (scales) such as performance and absenteeism, belief in the PWE, extent to which Type A behavior is exhibited. Relevant population characteristics, such as age, number of children, department represented, length of tenure with the company, as well as relevant vacation patterns, such as length of vacations and reasons why vacations are taken, are selected out to determine if certain kinds of individuals, in certain jobs, adopt certain or peculiar vacation patterns, and/or other patterns of behavior e.g. high absenteeism, extreme workaholism, strong beliefs in the PWE. Again, frequency distributions, while not reported, reflect these results.

A Description of Population Characteristics and Vacation Patterns

Population Characteristics. A more detailed description of the population is presented in this study, to develop a broader profile of those

managerial employees who participated in this study, and to identify those factors or conditions which could affect the types of vacations taken and the practices adopted. Frequency distributions in Table 4-2, discussed in Chapter Four, provide a general description of the sample, especially in terms of age, sex, marital status, education, etc. But, a more specific description, which provides information on additional characteristics which are relevant to this research and which are believed to have a bearing on the results, is presented below.

First, it was felt that the health of the employees (including more specific levels of stress caused by the job) may have an effect on whether or not individuals can or do take vacations, and on how the vacations are spent. For example, if an unusually large number of employees provide less favorable responses to health, then their vacation habits may be affected by the state of their health, and may not be representative of those patterns adopted by their healthier counterparts.

An examination of responses to several items on health indicate that the majority of the employees in the survey rate both their physical and mental health as excellent. With respect to stress, most indicate that they do not experience stress caused by factors of life outside of the job. However, they often do feel stress caused by the job and, in turn, experience burnout and fatigue. While such stress has not caused employees to be absent from work, most report that they do carry the problems home, often thinking about errors or frustrations that occurred on the job during the day. As a consequence, most employees report that they try to cope with job-related stress, or try to relieve it, by engaging frequently in a number of activities which

include, in descending order, seeking entertainment (e.g. TV, movies, dancing), exercising or playing sports, taking an alcoholic drink and eating. Less frequently, employees engage in other behaviors such as going to church, spending time with video games or personal computers, smoking, attending meetings, participating in therapy, and, finally, using drugs.

It, therefore, appears that the employees in this study are basically healthy and, while they experience job-related stress, they do cope by engaging in activities outside of the stress-inducing situation. Hence, it is believed that using vacation time may provide an alternative means of coping with stress; so, no unusual circumstances or conditions seem to affect the vacation patterns subsequently adopted.

Second, the quality or type of life outside of the job, experienced by these employees, was examined to identify any peculiarities which could affect their vacation habits. Quality or type of life outside of the job is reflected in terms of social activities, participation in clubs, or the extent to which individuals do job-related work at home.¹ For example, if the majority of employees in this survey indicate that they derive greater satisfaction from work and put in an excessive number of hours on the job, then they may take fewer, shorter vacations, and, indeed, may prefer them less. Similarly, if a large percentage of employees have relocated a number of times in the past few years, it is possible that they may adopt unusual vacation patterns (e.g. travelling

¹Three scales (reflected in three different combinations of items) were developed to measure life outside the job, and to explain it, theoretically, as a moderator of the relationship between vacations and performance (and to provide a test of the Theories of Work and Leisure). However, the scales achieved reliabilities of only .15, .37, and .43; so it was decided that only individual items would be examined.

less, or spending an unusually large amount of time settling into or fixing up the new place of residence). So, responses to several items measuring life outside of the job were examined.

In particular, the findings reflect that the majority of individuals derive the greatest source of satisfaction in life from an equal combination of work experiences and personal experiences. (One is not more important than the other). The majority of employees work forty-one to sixty hours per week in their office (which is determined to be an average amount of time), and do less than five hours per week at home. And, while the majority indicate that their home life rarely interferes with work, work sometimes interferes with their home life. Still, the general notion is that the interference is not noticeable, and that work has no pronounced effect, either positive or negative, on personal life.

Consequently, employees are able to manage their personal lives, or time spent away from the job. They do engage in leisure, hobbies and recreation at least a few times a week, attend clubs or social activities on occasion, and they do something for fun at least once a week. The majority also indicate that they have a network of friends or acquaintances with whom they can confide about personal matters. Most employees live with family; half of the employees surveyed have pets; and the majority commute approximately eleven to twenty miles to work (which is determined not to be excessive as the company is located in an industrial park). Finally, responses reflect that the majority of employees have not been subject to any relocations in the past three years.

Based on these responses, it appears that the profile of life outside of the job, for these employees, is one which involves typical activities (family, friends, social activities); and there appear to be no

constraints or unusual circumstances, e.g. excessive number of relocations or hours doing job-related work at home, which could noticeably limit or affect the use of vacation time and practices adopted.

Third, it was determined that certain job-related aspects, such as the travel requirements of a job, the number of different jobs held, or the number of promotions declined, may have an effect on the extent to which vacation time is used or on the preferences for vacation time to other types of rewards (especially promotions). But, responses to these corresponding items reflect no peculiarities. In particular, the amount of travel in their jobs is not excessive, i.e. most individuals indicate they travel only on occasion. And, the majority of individuals have had about three to five jobs, and have turned down no promotions, during their tenure with the company (average 12.7 years). This indicates that unusual circumstances such as lack of visibility in the company which could affect reactions--especially to organizational policies such as vacations--do not exist.

Similarly, it was expected that reactions to other policies may have an effect on behavior patterns adopted. For example, employee perceptions regarding absenteeism policies may indirectly affect, and explain, the extent to which vacation time is used; or reactions to performance policies may affect whether or not vacations are determined more important than other rewards such as promotions or performance appraisals. However, an investigation of these reactions, again, produced no unusual findings.

In particular, responses to performance evaluations are quite favorable, i.e. the majority of individuals feel fairly strongly that performance evaluations are valuable in providing feedback for job

performance, that they are linked to rewards such as salary increases and promotions, and that the performance evaluations they receive are representative of their job performance. This positive reaction to performance evaluations (especially when perceived as an accurate measure of individual performance) provides additional support for using evaluations as an index of performance in this study.

Similarly, there is an overwhelming response that promotions are important and valuable, which may explain why most indicate they have not turned down any promotions since they have been with the company. The majority also feel that their promotability potential is somewhat high, and indicate short- and intermediate-term promotability projections may reach Level 4, i.e. corporate or division manager (of a possible high of one to a low of six). Responses also indicate that most are eligible for promotions, either now or later, and that the most frequent training needs center on developing planning-organizing-controlling skills, which are typical managerial functions. So, it appears that they are active in continuing and developing their careers as managerial employees. Finally, while the majority feel fairly strongly that employees are encouraged to seek promotions, the majority are neutral on whether or not promotions are based on performance evaluations. This is of particular interest as it may reinforce, further, the previously cited explanations of the unexpected findings of the General Hypothesis (i.e. vacations are negatively related to performance evaluations and positively related to promotability). In particular, it was suggested, in Chapter Six, that the visibility of employees is important, and their presence on the job--and not off on vacation--as perceived by the superior may have an impact on performance evaluations (i.e. a negative

relationship between vacations and performance evaluations). In contrast, it is suggested that promotions are less a function of visibility and of the perceptions of superiors (indeed, employees indicate that promotions are not based on performance evaluations), and may be more a function of external factors such as availability in job openings. So, the relationship between vacations and promotability is less negative (and may be more positive).

Finally, employee responses reflect no peculiarities regarding absenteeism practices or policies. Incidence of absenteeism is not excessive or unusual, either in terms of frequency or length, in terms of when it occurs, i.e. season, day of the week, proximity to vacation, or in comparison to colleagues. While most employees cite physical health as the most common reason for being absent, the majority also believe fairly strongly that sometimes absenteeism may be due to reasons other than illness (e.g. it may be due to competing commitments or a need for "mental health" days). The employees also respond that they have a feeling or need to be absent from work on occasion, and that being absent has no effect on job performance (and many indicate it has a positive effect). Finally, employees respond quite favorably to absenteeism policies, clearly indicating that they do not think the company should authorize more absences than they usually do. Such responses indicate that there are no unusual circumstances which directly affect absenteeism, or indirectly affect vacations, as an alternative form of absenteeism or time off.

Summary

These characteristics, in addition to those presented in Chapter Four, indicate that the population of this study is not atypical, nor are

they subject to any unusual circumstances or peculiarities which could directly affect the vacation patterns they adopt (and indirectly affect their performance in and absenteeism from the job). Consequently, it is expected that their vacation practices and patterns are representative of the typical managerial employee; these vacation patterns are presented and discussed below.

Vacation Practices and Patterns

The vacation practices and patterns adopted by the managers in this study are described in terms of length, frequency and time of year in which vacations are, and would like to be, taken; the type of vacations taken and the reasons for taking them; the extent to which vacations are sacrificed or exchanged; individual preferences for vacations to other types of rewards; and, finally, in terms of miscellaneous perceptions about vacations with regard to individual, job or organizational characteristics.

Length and Frequency of Vacations. Managerial employees use all or almost all of their annual allotted vacation time, which averages from two to four weeks per year. While they take a "vacation" (at least three consecutive days, not including weekends) at least twice a year, they would like to take vacations more than three times a year. The average longest period of time taken for a vacation is one week, though employees indicate that they would prefer to take a two-week vacation. Hence, while the majority of employees take a one-week vacation at least twice a year, they almost never take a two-week vacation. But, given a choice, employees respond that they would like to take a two-week vacation at least once a year. The majority also indicate that they never take a three-week vacation and would prefer not to, though there is

a noticeable indication that several feel that a three-week vacation would be desirable, periodically. These results contrast somewhat with those predicted by other researchers who maintain that most individuals need a minimum of two weeks away from the usual routine to unwind, and to feel completely restored (Rosenblatt, 1983). Finally, with regard to overall frequency and length, employees indicate no preference for fewer, longer vacations to more frequent, shorter vacations.

Time of Year When Vacations Are Taken. The majority of employees almost never use their allotted vacation time all at one time (and they indicate no desire to do so). However, they usually use the major portion of their allotted vacation time at the same time every year, i.e. during the summer. But, if given a choice, they would prefer to vary the times when they could take vacations, especially indicating they would like to take more time off in the Fall.

Types of Vacations Taken. Most employees do, and prefer to, plan for their vacations in advance, which are almost always spent with family and friends. About half of the allotted vacation time is spent traveling, and responses reflect almost as strong a desire to spend more time traveling, if given the option. Similarly, about half of the time is spent engaging in activities or events which require extended time off; yet, there is a strong indication that employees would like to spend more of their vacation time on such activities. While most indicate that they take an interesting or exciting vacation at least once a year, a noticeable percentage indicates that they would like to take an exciting vacation more often, i.e. at least twice a year. Finally, these employees respond, overwhelmingly, that little or none of their

vacation time is spent (nor do they desire to spend it) doing job-related work.

Reasons for Taking Vacations. The most common reasons individuals do take a vacation are, first, either to be with family and friends or to rest and relax, and, second, to do something exciting and interesting. These results are similar to those found in a survey on the distinct needs which motivate vacations, i.e. relief of tension, relaxation, exotic adventure, family togetherness, etc. (Rubenstein, 1980). However, when the employees in the present survey were asked what is the most common reason they would like to take a vacation, the majority responded first, to do something exciting and interesting, and, second, to get rest and relaxation. Surprisingly, the desire to be with friends and family, as a reason for taking a vacation in the future, is a distant third choice. This may reinforce Rosenblatt's beliefs that "the American togetherness ethic" often ruins relationships and vacations (Brody, 1984).

When asked about the most common reasons for not taking a vacation, most employees cite no reasons as they always take vacations. However, of those who do not take vacations, the majority indicate that too much work was the major reason. And, when asked if the length of their vacations has ever been restricted, the majority respond positively, and cite their jobs as the major restriction. Furthermore, they indicate that they expect similar restrictions will affect the length of future vacations.

Extent to Which Vacations are Postponed, Sacrificed, or Exchanged. Most employees in the survey bank and sacrifice (or do not use) little or none of their vacation time, reflected in terms of total proportion

of allotted vacation time, and in terms of actual weeks. Further, they indicate no desire to do so.

Similarly, little or no vacation time is exchanged for cash payment, and most employees have never carried over unused vacation time into the next calendar year. However, a noticeable percentage indicates that if given the choice, they would like to exchange up to one week of vacation time for cash; and if circumstances prevented them from using their vacation time in a given year, they would like to carry it over into the next year.

Finally, while the majority are not willing to take unpaid vacation time, there is evidence that some would do so. (It is expected that this positive reaction is based on the interpretation that the option would include unpaid vacation time in addition to the allotted paid vacation time).

Preferences for Vacations to Other Types of Rewards. With respect to the general importance of, or preference for, rewards usually given by a company, the employees in this survey indicate, overwhelmingly, that salary is the most important type of reward for performing a job. This is chosen over other rewards such as health and life insurance, educational assistance, savings plans, promotions, and vacations, which are rewards typically found in most organizations. The second most important reward, though a distant second, is promotions.

Similarly, when asked what improvements in the present reward structure would be of most value to them, employees cite an increase in salary (over improvements in the rewards previously cited). Again, the second most valuable improvement, though a far second, is an increase in promotion opportunities.

More specific questions on preferences for vacations, especially in relation to other types of rewards and benefit plans, provide similar negative responses to the value of vacations. For example, the majority indicate fairly strongly that they do not prefer an increase in vacation time to an increase in salary, and they would not join another company if the company offered nothing better than significantly more vacation time. Further, when individuals are forced to choose between a job which provides chances for advancement and development, or a job which offers a lot of vacation time and an excellent fringe benefit package, employees respond, unequivocally, that they would rather have a job which enables individual growth, development and advancement.

However, some specific questions do elicit more positive responses to the value of vacations. For example, when employees are asked if they prefer vacations to other specific types of rewards such as health, educational assistance and savings plans, responses (while leaning in a negative direction) show signs of indecision or uncertainty, i.e. many are neutral. And, when employees are asked if they would exchange some current benefits for more vacation time, especially if cafeteria-style benefit plans allowed this, the majority respond they would not; however noticeable percentages are either neutral or more positive.

Finally, when employees are asked if they would sacrifice any benefits for more vacation time, the overwhelming response is that they would indeed sacrifice educational assistance. (A far second choice is that they would sacrifice nothing). Responses to this last item give some indication that the value of, or preferences for, vacations is relative to the particular reward or benefit to which it is being compared.

General Perceptions About Vacations in Relation to Specific Individual,
Job, and Organizational Characteristics

Individual Characteristics and Vacations Practices. Employees indicate quite strongly that during the week prior to taking vacations, as well as while on vacation, they feel good. Similarly, the responses to how they feel the week after their vacation, and when they return to work, are still favorable, though of a less positive magnitude.

When asked about how vacation time affects health and absenteeism, i.e. if given more vacation time would health improve and absenteeism decline, most responses indicate uncertainty about the effects on health, but reflect, overwhelmingly, a negative reaction to absenteeism: absenteeism would not decline, but would remain the same, if given more vacation time.

Finally, with respect to taking vacations, the employees indicate very clearly that they do not experience guilt when on vacation, nor do their religious beliefs interfere with taking time off. And, employees enjoy and value vacations more now than they have in the past ten years.

Job-Related Characteristics and Vacation Patterns. When employees are asked about their willingness to take vacations from job responsibilities, responses are overwhelmingly positive. And, in particular, employees feel they can take vacations without worrying about job-related pressures, about their absence creating too much work for them when they return, or about being replaced when they are gone.

With respect to the effects of vacations on job performance, the majority very clearly indicate that they need vacation time in order to maintain effective job performance, and that the longest period of time

they can work effectively, and do like to work, before taking a vacation is up to six months.

When asked about the effects of specific lengths of vacations on job performance, most respond that a one-week vacation has no effect on job performance, i.e. neither negative nor positive. While a large percentage indicates that a two-week vacation has a positive effect, an almost equal percentage indicates that they do not really know, probably because of never having taken a two-week vacation. Yet, when asked about the effects on job performance if encouraged to take a two-week vacation, responses are fairly evenly distributed, i.e. indicating a two-week vacation would have no effect or a positive effect; and, a close third choice is that it would have a negative effect.

With regard to the effects of a three-week vacation on job performance, most indicate they do not know, probably because they have never taken this length of a vacation. Still, the majority expect that if they were encouraged to take three weeks off, it would have a negative effect on job performance. These responses contrast somewhat with the results of an alternative survey of vacations which reflect that individuals who take a lot of vacation time, e.g. six weeks or more a year, tend to be less troubled by fatigue, irritability, and anxiety (Rubenstein, 1983). Consequently, extensive use of vacation time, in turn, could have a positive effect on job performance.

Finally, the employees in the survey are moderately satisfied with the amount of vacation time allotted for the work they do, and judge it to be fair in relation to their job performance. And, considering the work they are doing, they believe they ought to get the same amount of vacation time as the company is currently allotting to them. However,

it should be noted that a considerable percentage indicate that the company ought to allot more vacation time).

Organizational Characteristics and Vacation Patterns. Finally, a few items in the survey provide information on vacation patterns with regard to organizational policies or conditions. In particular, when asked about vacation practices, i.e. if the company (via documented policies) or superiors encourage the use of vacation time, employees respond affirmatively. And, when asked if the amount of vacation time allotted to employees should be tied to performance, rather than to number of years of service with the company (typical company policy), while the largest percentage responds negatively, almost as large a percentage as neutral, i.e. indicating some uncertainty regarding the possibility of a policy change.

Furthermore, when asked which changes in vacation policies would be best, the majority indicate a need for reducing the years of service structure so that increased vacation allotments come sooner. These responses to the latter two items indicate that some policy changes regarding vacations, e.g. how and why they are rewarded--especially with respect to individual preferences, rather than organizational practices --may deserve further investigation.

Vacation Practices and Patterns: Comparative Description of Results

A further investigation of the vacation practices and patterns, described previously, is conducted from a comparative level of analysis, as follows.

Actual (Do) versus Perceived (Would Like) Patterns Regarding Vacations. A series of questions in the survey enable a comparative analysis of what employees actually do, with what they would like to

do, regarding length, frequency, time of year, and reasons for taking vacations (i.e. those discussed in the preceding section, items one to fifty-eight in the survey). An examination of correlation coefficients for all parallel pairs of items, i.e. items one and two, three and four, five and six, etc. indicate, in Table B-1, that all but three pairs show significant correlations ($p \leq .01$); while two of these remaining three are significantly correlated at $p \leq .05$. Some general comments and observations on these minor deviations follow.

Table B-1

Correlations Between Actual (Do) and Perceived (Would Like) Items

Pairs of Items	r
1-2	.37**
3-4	.58**
5-6	.79**
7-8	.52**
9-10	.53**
11-12	.26**
13-14	.18*
15-16	.19*
17-18	.64**
19-20	.70**
21-22	.59**
23-24	.38**
25-26	.58**
27-28	.69**
29-30	.40**
31-32	.66**
33-34	.47**
35-36	.33**
37-38	.57**
39-40	.65**
41-42	.42**
43-44	.34**
45-46	.49**
47-48	.22**
49-50	.12
51-52	.48**
53-54	.57**
55-56	.43**
57-58	.63**

* $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$

First, all five pairs of items which reflect lower correlations deal with questions on the extent to which allotted vacation time is not used, i.e. the extent to which it is exchanged, sacrificed, or carried over into another year. For example, items thirteen and fourteen, and items forty-seven and forty-eight are similar in that both pairs deal with exchanging vacations for cash payment, measured either in percentage of total vacation time, or in actual number of weeks. Similarly, items fifteen and sixteen, and items eleven and twelve, deal with carrying over vacations or sacrificing them. All four pairs of items, while reflecting policy or standards set up by the company, pertain to only a minority of the employees who eventually participated in this study. So, the majority of employees respond negatively to these items, resulting in a lack of variability and in less meaningful correlations.

Second, while these items represent organizational policy and allow little variability in what employees actually can do regarding such practices, it is important to note that when these same items are presented in a "would like" format, there is considerably more variability in responses, i.e. a noticeable percentage indicate they would like to exchange vacations for cash, or they would carry over vacation time if circumstances prevented them from using vacation time in a given year. Such responses indicate that individual preferences, especially regarding the exchange or sacrifice of vacation time, may not be consonant with organizational practices.

Finally, with regard to the remaining pair of items which reflects the weakest correlation, i.e. items forty-nine and fifty, it is apparent that the low correlation between them ($r=.12$) may be explained, in part,

because these questions are not really parallel, i.e. one item requests information on unpaid vacations, while the other requests information on carrying over unused vacation time. Consequently, they really are measuring different aspects of vacation practices.

With respect to these minor deviations, therefore, it can be concluded that the majority of the items in this survey, paired to measure actual behavior with desired behavior, are significantly correlated, and that the vacation practices adopted by managers, e.g. length and frequency, time of year, type, reasons and preferences for vacations, represent not only what employees actually do regarding vacations, but also what they would like to do, given alternatives.

Actual Individual Vacation Patterns versus Perceived Vacation Patterns of Colleagues

A series of questions in the survey enable further comparative description of vacation patterns adopted by managerial employees. In particular, employees who participated in the survey are asked to compare their vacation behaviors with the behaviors of other colleagues to determine if practices are similar. Responses to these pertinent questions indicate that the population surveyed perceive that their vacation patterns or practices are similar to, and typical of, those adopted by other employees in the company (including managers who may not have participated in the study). For example, employees are asked about the extent to which they use vacation time in comparison to colleagues in similar job levels, and in comparison to colleagues with the same number of years of service. In both comparisons, the majority clearly indicate that they use the same proportion of allotted vacation time as their colleagues. Very few indicate a "don't know" response.

Similarly, when asked about the amount of annual vacation time they receive in comparison to individuals in similar job levels, and in comparison to those with similar performance ratings, the majority respond, in both cases, that the amount of vacation time they receive is the same as that allotted to their colleagues.

Finally, when employees are asked to compare their job levels with other individuals, either within or outside of the company, who receive the same amount of vacation time, most indicate that individuals with the same amount of vacation time occupy similar job levels.

Some additional comments on these perceived comparisons seem appropriate. First, it appears that most employees perceive their vacation practices, in terms of time allotted and proportion used, to be similar to those of other employees in the company. This suggests that the participants in this study are a fairly homogeneous group of employees, especially with regard to their vacation patterns, and reinforces the notion that the vacation patterns described here are representative of typical managerial employees in this company. In addition, it encourages a closer investigation of any differences or deviations which might occur within particular subgroups, e.g. different age groups, departments, job levels, of the general population.

Second, it appears that employees perceive vacations as a "given," i.e. independent of other factors such as job level, job performance, or even tenure with the company. For example, most employees produce some sort of a response, rather than an optional "don't know" response, to items requesting a comparative analysis of their vacation patterns with those of others, especially with regard to job level and performance ratings (even though vacation time allotted is known to be based on

years of service with the company). Such responses may hint that employees have not given much thought to (nor have they attempted to challenge) established organizational practices and policies regarding vacations--in which vacation time is allotted as a non-contingent reward (based on a pre-determined given) rather than as a contingent reward (based on individual performance).

Vacation Patterns in Relation to Individual, Job and Organizational Characteristics

Finally, several individual, job and organizational characteristics have been identified and examined in relation to specific vacation patterns to see if any patterns are representative of, or peculiar to, certain groups or conditions. More specifically, vacation patterns, reflected by length, frequency, reasons for taking, time of year taken, etc., have been examined in relation to a) individual characteristics which include age, sex, national origin, marital status, number of children, religion, living arrangements, pets, commuting distance to work, number of relocations; and b) job or organizational characteristics such as department represented, Hay Points, salary, number of hours spent on the job, amount of travel required by a job, the sex of the boss, amount of tenure in a job, number of different jobs held, number of promotions declined, number of years of service with the company, and annual allotment of vacation time.

Generally, the results of these investigations reflect no outstanding or significant differences in, or peculiarities to, the vacation habits adopted by certain groups. However, a more specific examination of the results do reflect some differences in vacation patterns

for certain types of individuals or groups. Those of particular interest are discussed below.

Education

When groups with different educational levels are examined, those with less education, i.e. less than a college degree (N=13) tend to take more frequent, longer vacations, i.e. two-week vacations rather than one-week typically taken by the general population. Yet, these individuals also indicate more strongly that vacations are less important to them, that they prefer other benefits to vacations, and would not exchange other benefits for more vacation time even if cafeteria-style plans were offered. These responses are noticeably more negative than those of the general population. But, probably the most obvious deviation for this group is that they respond very strongly that they would not be willing to sacrifice or partly exchange any benefits for more vacation time. (All other groups strongly indicate that they would exchange educational assistance). So, for this group of less educated employees, educational assistance is a more important type of reward or benefit.

Those with more education more clearly parallel the responses of the general population (probably because this general population is, on the average, more educated). However, those with the most education, i.e. holding a graduate or professional degree (N=51), do deviate somewhat in responses to the use of vacation time, i.e. several indicate that they often do not take vacations because there is too much work when they return. (Most groups of individuals reflect responses opposite to this).

Annual Amount of Allotted Vacation Time and Organizational Tenure

An examination of groups with different vacation allotments shows that those receiving less annual vacation time, i.e. three weeks or less (N=51) put more emphasis on vacations, i.e. they may prefer vacations to other benefits, and are more willing to consider exchanging other benefits for more vacation time. Also, they would sacrifice, not only educational assistance, but also life insurance, for more vacation time. They indicate, also, a strong preference for promotions as a reward for performance, while most groups choose salary. Individuals with less vacation time also feel that the amount of vacation time they receive is not fair, believing they ought to receive more vacation time, and respond more favorably to basing the amount of vacation time allotted on performance rather than on the number of years of service with the company. This contrasts sharply with those employees who believe vacation time allotted is fair, and who prefer not to tie vacation time to performance.

Employees with more annual allotted vacation time, i.e. four weeks or more (N=59), tend to take longer and more frequent vacations (probably because they receive more time off). But, they travel less and engage in fewer activities, while on vacation, than most employees. These employees also bank, or do not use all of, their vacation time. Indeed, they would exchange vacations for cash if given more opportunities. Consequently, they do not prefer vacations to other types of rewards, nor are they willing to sacrifice other rewards for more vacation time. The majority do not want vacation time tied to performance, and those with the most allotted vacation time, i.e. five weeks or more, indicate no policy changes regarding vacations are necessary. This

contrasts with the majority who prefer changes in terms of reducing the year of service structure so that increased vacation allotments come sooner.

Similar results are found for organizational tenure, by distinguishing between those with less tenure, i.e. twelve years or less (N=60), and those with more tenure, i.e. thirteen years or more (N=55). This is expected as vacation allotments are usually based on organizational tenure.

Age

An examination of the results among different age groups reflects slight differences between older individuals, i.e. those forty years or older (N=60), and younger individuals, i.e. those less than forty years (N=55). First, in terms of vacation patterns, older individuals indicate that they take more frequent, longer, and more interesting vacations than do younger employees. However, they also indicate that they travel and engage in special activities less often. Older individuals feel more strongly that the vacation time they receive is fair, and indicate less preference for vacation time, especially for more vacation time. Hence, they would be willing to exchange vacation time for cash payment, if given more opportunities to do so. In contrast, younger employees feel vacation time is less fair and that they should receive more time off for the work they are doing. While older individuals feel the boss or company encourages use of vacation time, younger individuals are less convinced of this. Similarly, older individuals are more accepting of vacation policies as they stand, recommending no changes, and are more emphatic about not tying vacation allotment to performance than are younger individuals.

While contrasts between older and younger employees do exist, they must be viewed in light of other intervening factors such as organizational tenure or amount of allotted vacation time, etc., which may affect the resultant patterns and preferences.

Marital Status, Number of Children, and Living Arrangements

When single and married groups are compared, some differences are evident. For example, single individuals (N=18) respond more positively to vacations as a preferred reward, especially in terms of increasing vacation time as opposed to increasing salary. In addition, they are more willing to sacrifice life insurance, as well as educational assistance, for more vacation time.

In contrast, vacations are a less preferred reward to married individuals (N=89). However, other factors such as number of children may confound the relationship and may account for the conflicting results. For example, those married with no children (N=39) prefer vacations to other benefits and would exchange some rewards for more vacation time if given the opportunity. In contrast, those with children, i.e. one to three children (N=60), are more willing to exchange vacation time for more rewards, especially cash. And, it can be noted that while most individuals prefer to take vacations in the summer, those with more children indicate that they would like to take more time off in the Fall, possibly when children return to school.

Finally, similar responses are found when living arrangements are examined. In particular, individuals living alone (N=14), rather than individuals living with family or friends (N=99), prefer vacations to other benefits and would more readily exchange other benefits for more valued vacation time.

Hay Points and Salary Ranges

When Hay Points and salary ranges are examined in relation to vacation patterns, only minor deviations are noticeable. For example, those in jobs with more Hay Points and a higher salary bank more vacation time than other employees. And, those with more Hay Points do not feel as convinced that the boss or company encourages the use of vacation time. (This contrasts with the general population who feels that the company or boss do encourage vacations). And, those with higher salaries feel more strongly about not changing vacation policies, i.e. that policies regarding the amount of allotted vacation time should remain the same. These results, however, are not that surprising as those with higher job levels and salaries probably do receive more vacation time and other rewards (perks), so are more content with current company policies.

Department

The different departments represented in this study also were examined to detect any differences in vacation patterns. While most responses are similar, some differences are apparent. For example, individuals in Public Affairs, Industrial Relations/Personnel, and in Marketing and Sales (N=27) indicate that promotions are as important as salary in terms of rewarding job performance. (Most employees respond overwhelmingly that salary is the most important). And, those in Marketing and Sales, Law, and International (N=19) are less positive about the company or boss encouraging the use of vacation time. (The general population believes vacations are encouraged). There may be more competition in these particular functional areas which could, in part, explain such results.

And, those in Law, International, Computer Services, and Engineering/Technical (N=38) respond more favorably to tying vacation time to performance; while those in most other departments respond more negatively to this policy change. Again, these results may be explained, in part, by comparing the competitive nature--especially in terms of decision making, time constraints, and goals--of these functional areas involved.

Finally, no peculiarities in vacation patterns for employees in either Finance and Accounting or Research and Development (N=44) are evident.

Sex

Finally, the only major differences in vacation practices between sexes is noted in terms of preferences for vacations to other rewards. In particular, females (N=36) indicate a stronger preference for vacations, especially in terms of increasing vacation time rather than in increasing other benefits, than do male counterparts (N=78). And, females would like to exchange certain benefits for more vacation time if cafeteria-style plans were available. The desire for more vacation time may reflect the need for working women to be given more time off in order to balance, more equally, personal and professional responsibilities. Furthermore, these results may be even more significant over time as the work force of the future will include an increasing number of female managerial employees. If their individual preferences are not consonant with, or met by, established organizational policies and practices, then they may, indeed, have an impact on, and possibly bring about changes in, organizational policies of the future. And, policies on the amount of allotted time off (vacations) may be a primary target.

Summary

An examination of certain individual, job and organizational characteristics in relation to particular vacation patterns and practices, indicates, in general, that the vacation patterns adopted by most employees are similar. However, a more specific examination does reflect that certain deviations do occur: under certain conditions (reflected in education, amount of annual allotted vacation time, age, marital status, number of children, living arrangements, Hay Points and salary ranges, department, and sex) differences in vacation patterns (reflected in frequency and length, preferences for vacations, and reactions to vacation policies) do exist. Still, these differences are minor and not significant enough to affect the outline of vacation patterns of the general population, as has been described.

Finally, in addition to the previously described process of selecting out individual, job and organizational characteristics, and examining them in relation to vacation patterns, a similar process of selecting out miscellaneous vacation patterns and examining them in relation to more global characteristics or factors which include performance, belief in the PWE, extent to which Type A behavior is exhibited, vulnerability to stress, feeling that vacation time and opportunity are fair, job level, extent to which vacations are valued, and compatibility with a job, was conducted to determine if those adopting certain vacation patterns experience certain levels of performance, exhibit strong Type A behavior, believe in PWE ideals, are more vulnerable to stress, etc. However, the results reflect no interesting or outstanding deviations or peculiarities, i.e. responses for these subgroups are similar to those average responses of the general population. Consequently, it

appears that clear vacation patterns and practices are adopted, similarly, by this general population of managerial employees.

APPENDIX C

INTER-ITEM AND ITEM-SCALE CORRELATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT,
DEPENDENT AND MODERATING VARIABLES

Table C-1
Inter-item and Item-scale Correlations for Independent, Dependent and Moderating Variables

Variable	(VAC)	2	10	12	14	16	44	46	48	50	93	94
2	.52**											
10	.47**	.23**										
12	.38**	.30**	.16*									
14	.32**	.18**	.33**	-.07								
16	.54**	.12	-.04	-.06	.06							
44	.45**	.20*	.66**	.11	.26**	-.09						
46	.57**	.42**	.39**	.39**	.04	-.01	.35**					
48	.37**	.15	.45**	-.01	.79**	-.05	.46**	.09				
50	.68**	.18*	.01	.22**	.03	.54**	-.05	.24**	.03			
93	.37**	.35**	.05	.28**	.02	-.14	-.03	.29**	.01	.18*		
94	.46**	.34**	.08	.13	0	.06	.03	.18*	.08	.35**	.47**	

Variable	(PEV)	105	106	Variable	(PERT)	238	243	Variable (PROM)	101	102
105	.95**			238	-.42**			101	.91**	
106	.96**	.83**		243	.75**	.24**		102	.81**	.48**

*p ≤ .05

**p ≤ .01

Table C-1 (continued)

Variable	(FFV)	55	56	70	92	95	97	98	154	206	224
55	.45**										
56	.50**	.48**									
70	.59**	.05	.23**								
92	.57**	.10	.15	.38**							
95	.65**	.15	.25**	.50**	.41**						
97	.42**	.12	.03	-.02	.02	-.06					
98	.50**	.13	.08	.08	.15	.02	.75**				
154	.62**	.07	.08	.59**	.43**	.60**	.07	.12			
206	.47**	-.07	.06	.43**	.34**	.40**	-.06	-.07	.32**		
224	.47**	.15	.15	.07	.30**	.19*	.04	.11	.22**	.43**	

Variable	(PWE)	181	183	185	186	Variable (JLEV)	100	243	244
181	.50**					100	.77**		
183	.68**	.12				243	.80**	.33**	
185	.53**	-.06	.12			244	.86**	.44**	.71**
186	.64**	.15	.26**	.17*					

*p ≤ .05

**p ≤ .01



Variable (STS) 116

116	.18*	
117	.17*	.19*
118	.49**	.20*
119	.25**	.18*
120	.34**	-.01
121	.26**	-.23**
122	.28**	-.03
123	.45**	.02
124	.31**	.02
125	.36**	.02
126	.44**	.06
127	.36**	.16*
128	.41**	-.00
129	.46**	.08
130	.52**	.13
131	.46**	.18*
132	.57**	.09
133	.44**	-.09
134	.46**	-.11
135	.22**	-.04

*p = .05

**p = .01

Table C-1 (continued)

	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135
.01																		
.18*		-.07																
-.02		-.21**	.11															
.08		-.14	.07	.13														
.29**		-.11	.26**	.22**	.13													
.22**		-.10	-.06	.09	.02	.23**												
.09		.13	.03	-.05	.09	-.01	-.03											
.23**		-.03	.11	.12	.12	-.00	.06	.33**										
.11		.23**	.09	-.12	-.14	.02	.04	.19*	.29**									
.09		.21**	.04	-.16*	.09	.01	.03	.19*	.13	.59**								
.11		.30**	.17*	-.04	-.06	.32**	.17*	.04	-.02	.19*	.17*							
.29**		.08	.23**	-.04	.10	.13	.12	.18*	.29**	.12	.26**	.23**						
.40**		.14	-.05	-.03	.02	.12	.11	.19*	.21*	.10	.18	.30**	.42**					
.36**		.05	.19*	.12	-.02	.23**	.24**	.10	.15	.26**	.28**	.34**	.31**	.28**				
.18*		-.08	.07	.13	.11	.12	.32**	.10	.14	.09	.12	.29**	.20*	.14	.25**			
.10		.11	.06	.26**	.10	.21*	.03	.10	.10	-.003	-.03	.22**	.08	.11	.19*	.23**		
.06		-.13	-.01	.11	.09	.08	.12	-.08	.02	-.18	-.08	-.07	.04	-.05	.21**	.23**	.25**	

Table C-1 (continued)

Variable	(TPA)	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162	163	164	165	166	167
155	.48**													
156	.59**	.38**												
157	.62**	.41**	.33**											
158	.61**	.21*	.37**	.38**										
159	.55**	.22**	.38**	.35**	.24**									
160	.49**	.18*	.14	.22**	.29**	.15*								
161	.40**	.08	.07	.17*	.10	.21*	.18*							
162	.54**	.19*	.21*	.26**	.23**	.29**	.10	.08						
163	.47**	.13	.14	.26**	.36**	.19*	.13	.03	.34**					
164	.59**	.26**	.31**	.33**	.30**	.26**	.24**	.18*	.27**	.28**				
165	.51**	.07	.16*	.28**	.36**	.37**	.15	.44**	.24**	.07	.30**			
166	.43**	.02	.21*	.10	.18*	.12	.08	.04	.27**	.06	.17*	.13		
167	.50**	.18*	.20*	.14	.15	.10	.25**	.16*	.29**	.20*	.09	.09	.46**	

Variable	(MPS)	145	146	147	148	149	Variable	(JS)	150	151	152	153
145	.51**						150	.87**				
146	.58**	.25**					151	.84**	.67**			
147	.46**	.34**	.30**				152	.78**	.55**	.55**		
148	.75**	.28**	.40**	.15*			153	.78**	.60**	.53**	.47**	
149	.87**	.38**	.41**	.30**	.50**							

\leq *p < .05
 \leq **p < .01



Variable	(GN)	168
168	.44**	
169	.34**	.12
170	.41**	-.08
171	.16*	.13
172	.30**	.06
173	.52**	.08
174	.47**	.24**
175	.55**	.12
176	.51**	.21*
177	.46**	.01
178	.33**	.12
179	.44**	.20
139	.46**	.24**
140	.33**	.09
141	.44**	.12
142	.53**	.24**
143	.34**	.10
144	.37**	.19*

*p \leq .05**p \leq .01

Table C-1 (continued)

	169	170	171	172	173	174	175	176	177	178	179	139	140	141	142	143	144
3																	
7		.16*															
2		.21*	.25**														
02		.31**	.12	.08													
2**		.15	-.11	.01	.15												
1		.20*	.11	.28**	.37**	.26**											
8*		.25**	.24**	.25**	.06	.13	.25**										
8*		.19*	-.06	.02	.19*	.10	.34**	.29**									
8*		.10	.12	.08	.17*	.11	.17*	.06	-.01								
5		.18*	.15	.18*	.25**	.04	.26	.22**	.28**	.21*							
8		0	-.05	.07	.10	.06	-.001	.24	.07	-.10	.02						
0		-.03	-.04	-.06	.08	.04	-.04	.97	-.01	-.12	-.13	.69**					
6		-.07	-.05	-.01	.10	.16*	.04	.15	.09	-.09	-.05	.60**	.59**				
04		.02	-.05	.02	.18	.18*	.09	.16*	.16	-.03	-.05	.61**	.55**	.85**			
5		-.01	-.04	-.003	.08	.01	-.13	.10	-.03	-.16	-.12	.69**	.70**	.67**	.62**		
1		-.06	-.04	.03	.07	-.07	-.11	.13	.10	-.09	-.08	.66**	.65**	.69**	.69**	.73**	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J. Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advancements in Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1965.
- Argyle, M., Gardner, G. and Cioffi, F. Supervisory methods related to production, absenteeism, and labour turnover. Human Relations, 1958, 11, 23-40.
- Babbie, E.R. The Practice of Social Research. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1979.
- Bandura, A. Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Bellante, D. and Jackson, M. Labor Economics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.
- Blake, R. and Mouton, J. Productivity: The Human Side. New York: AMACOM, 1981.
- Blalock, H.M. Social Statistics. U.S.A.: McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Blood, M. "Work values and job satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 456-459.
- Brief, A. and Aldag, R. "Correlates of work values." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 757-760.
- _____. "The intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomy: Toward conceptual clarity." Academy of Management Review, July 1977, 496-500.
- Brody, J. "Vacation time: How to play it up." Detroit Free Press, July 15, 1984.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1982.
- Carrell, M. and Dittrich, J. "Equity theory: The recent literature, methodological considerations and new directions." Academy of Management Review, 1978, 202-210.
- Carroll, S. and Schneier, C. Performance Appraisal and Reward Systems: The Identification, Measurement and Reward of Performance in Organizations. Illinois: Scott Foresman, 1982.

- Cherrington, D., Reitz, H.J. and Scott, W.E. "Effects of contingent and non-contingent rewards on the relationship between satisfaction and task performance." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 531-536.
- _____. "The values of younger workers." Business Horizons, 1977, 20, 18-20.
- Cohen, A. and Hodges, H. "Characteristics of the lower-blue collar class." Social Problems, 1973, 303-334.
- Cohen, B. "Burnout: The malaise that affects growing numbers of super achievers." World of Work Report, 1981, 6, 81-84.
- Connolly, T. "Some conceptual and methodological issues in expectancy theory research." Psychological Bulletin, 1976, 37-47.
- Cooper, C. and Payne, R. Current Concerns in Occupational Stress. Great Britain: John Wiley and Sons, 1980.
- _____. "Humanizing the work place in Europe: An overview of six countries." Personnel Journal, 1980, 488-491.
- Davis, L. "Enhancing the quality of working life: Developments in the U.S." International Labour Review, July-August, 1977, 116.
- _____, and Cherns, A. The Quality of Working Life. Vol. I and II. New York: The Free Press, 1975.
- Deci, E.L. "The effects of contingent and non-contingent rewards and controls on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1972, 8, 217-229.
- _____. "Notes on the theory and metatheory of intrinsic motivation." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1975, 15, 130-145.
- de Wolff, C., Shimmin, S. and de Montmollin, M. Conflicts and Contradictions. New York: Academic Press, 1981.
- Dillman, D. Mail and Telephone Surveys. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.
- Drucker, P. "A growing mismatch of jobs and job seekers." Wall Street Journal, March 26, 1985.
- Dubin, R. "Industrial workers' worlds: A study of the central life interest of industrial workers." Social Problems, 1956, 3, 131-142.
- Fisk, G. The Frontiers of Management Psychology. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

- Friedman, M. and Rosenman, R. Type A Behavior and Your Heart. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974.
- Gabor, D. Inventing the Future. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964.
- Ginzberg, Eli. The Manpower Connection. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Greenberg, J. "The protestant work ethic and reactions to negative performance evaluations on a lab task." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, 682-690.
- Hackman, J.R. and Lawler, E. "Employee reactions to job characteristics." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 259-286.
- _____, and Oldham, G.R. "Development of the job diagnostic survey." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 159-170.
- _____, and Porter, L. "Expectancy theory predictions of work effort." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1968, 3, 417-426.
- Hambrick, D. and Mason, P. "Upper-echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers." Academy of Management Review, 1984, 9, 193-206.
- Holmes, T. and Rahe, R. "The social readjustment rating scale." Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 1967, 11, 213-218.
- Hulin, C. and Blood, M. "Job enlargement, individual differences, and worker responses." Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 69, 41-55.
- Jaques, E. The Measurement of Responsibility. London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1956.
- _____. "The mental processes in work." In W. Brown and E. Jaques (Eds.), Glacier Project Papers. London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1965.
- _____. Interview on Vacation Practices in Europe and Time Span of Discretion Theory. Uxbridge, U.K.: Director, Institute of Organization and Social Studies, Brunel University, June 26, 1982.
- Kendrick, J. "Productivity trends and prospects." In U.S. Economic Growth for 1976 to 1986: Prospects, Problems and Patterns, Vol. 1. U.S.: Joint Economic Commission, Congress of U.S., October 1, 1966.
- Kerr, C. and Rosow, J. Work in America: The Decade Ahead. New York: Van Nostrand, 1979.
- Kiechel, W. "What your vacation says about you." Fortune, 1983, 205-207.

- Landy, F., Barnes, J. and Murphy, K. "Correlates of perceived fairness and accuracy of performance evaluation." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, 751-754.
- _____, and Farr, J. The Measurement of Work Performance. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press, 1983.
- _____, Zedeck, S. and Cleveland, J. Performance Measurement and Theory. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1983.
- Langner, T. and Muhall, S. Life Stress and Mental Health. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1963.
- Latham, G. and Dossett, D. "Designing incentive plans for unionized employees: A comparison of continuous and variable ratio reinforcement schedules." Personnel Psychology, 1978, 31, 47-61.
- _____, and Wexley, K. Increasing Productivity Through Performance Appraisals. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1981.
- Lawler, E. Pay and Organizational Effectiveness: A Psychological View. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- _____. Pay and Organization Development. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1981.
- Lyons, T. "Turnover and absenteeism: A review of relationships and correlates." Personnel Psychology, 1972, 25, 271-281.
- Maccoby, M. The Gamesman. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.
- March, J. and Simon, H. Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Marks, C. and Banack, A. "Help yourself to health." The Canadian Banker and the Institute of Canadian Banking Review, 1977, 84, 48-50.
- Marshall, J. and Cooper, C. Executives Under Pressure. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1979.
- Meissner, M. "The long arm of the job: A study of work and leisure." Industrial Relations, 1971, 10, 239-260.
- Merrens, M. and Garrett, J. "The Protestant ethic scale as a predictor of repetitious work performance." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 125-127.
- Meyer, H. "The pay-for-performance dilemma." Organizational Dynamics, Winter, 1975, 39-50.
- Miller, L. and Smith, A. "How vulnerable are you to stress?" Time, 1983, 121, 54.

- Mobley, W. "The link between MBO and merit compensation." Personnel Journal, 1974, 53, 423-427.
- Nadler, D. and Lawler, E. "Motivation: A diagnostic approach." In J. Hackman, E. Lawler and L. Porter (Eds.), Perspectives in Behavior in Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983.
- Nicholson, N., Brown, C. and Chadwick-Jones, J. "Absenteeism from work and job satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61, 728-737.
- Nie, N., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K. and Bent, D. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. U.S.A.: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Nosow, S. Man, Work and Society. U.S.A.: Basic Books, 1962.
- _____. Quality of Work Life Seminar. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1981.
- Parker, S. The Future of Work and Leisure. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.
- _____. The Sociology of Leisure. London: Allen and Unwin, 1976.
- Patten, T. Pay: Employee Compensation and Incentive Plans. New York: The Free Press, 1977.
- _____. A Manager's Guide to Performance Appraisals: Pride, Prejudice and the Law of Equal Opportunity. New York: The Free Press, 1982.
- Pennings, J. and Goodman, P. New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness. San Francisco, Cal.: Josey-Bass, 1977.
- Pierce, J. and Dunham. "Task design: A literature review." Academy of Management Review, 1976, 83-97.
- Pope, H. "Economic deprivation and social participation in a group of middle class factory workers." In Reprint Series No. 9. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, Center for Research and Social Organization, Department of Sociology, 1964.
- Porter, L. and Lawler, E. Managerial Attitudes and Performance. U.S.A.: Irwin Dorsey Press, 1967.
- _____, and Steers, R. "Organization, work and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism." Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 151-176.
- Pritchard, R., Dunnette, M. and Jorgenson, D. "Effects of perception of equity and inequity on worker performance and satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 75-94.
- Pritchard, R. & Sanders, M. The influence of valence, instrumentality and expectancy on effort and performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 55-60.

- Richardson, R. Fair Pay and Work. Illinois: Southern Illinois Press, 1971.
- Rima, I. Labor Markets, Wages and Employment. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1981.
- Ronan, W. "A factor analysis of eight job performance measures." Journal of Industrial Psychology, 1963, 1, 107-110.
- Rosenblatt, P. Survey. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, Family and Social Services Department, 1983.
- Rousseau, D. "Characteristics of departments, positions, and individuals: Context for attitudes and behavior." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1978, 63, 213-218.
- Rubenstein, Carin. "Psychology Today's survey report on how Americans view vacations." Psychology Today, May, 1980, 62-66, 71-76.
- Samuelson, P. Economics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Schwab, D. and Cummings, L. "Theories of performance and satisfaction." Industrial Relations, 1970, 9, 408-430.
- Seashore, S., Indik, B. and Georgopoulos, B. "Relationships among criteria of job performance." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1960, 44, 195-202.
- Shimmin, S. "The future of work." In K. Duncan, et. al. (Ed.), Changing Working Life. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1980.
- _____. Interview on Vacation Practices in Europe, Absenteeism, and the Future of Work. Lancaster, England: Professor, University of Lancaster, June 7, 1982.
- Shore, H. "Absenteeism--Part 2: Prevention and cures." Supervisory Management, 1975, 20, 22-30.
- Siegel, S. Non-parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. U.K.: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Smith, K.U. Behavior, Organization and Work: A New Approach to Industrial Science. Madison, Wisconsin: College Printing and Typing, 1965.
- Staw, B. Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, Silver-Burdett Company, 1976.
- _____, and Oldham, G. "Reconsidering our dependent variables: A critique and empirical study." Academy of Management Journal, 1978, 21, 539-559.

- Steers, R. and Rhodes, S. "Major influences on employee attendance: A process model." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, 391-407.
- Taylor, C.V. and Moulding, T. Interview with Confederation of British Industries on Vacation Patterns and Absenteeism. London: Social Affairs Department, CBI, June 1, 1982.
- Torbert, W. Being for the Most Part Puppets Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1972.
- Tornow, W. "The development and application of an input/outcome moderator test on the perception and reduction of inequity." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1971, 6, 614-638.
- Triandis, H. "Work and non-work: Intercultural perspectives." In M. Dunnette (Ed.), Work and Non-work in the Year 2000. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1973.
- Uris, A. "How managers ease job pressures." International Management, 1972, 27, 45-46.
- Valliant, G. Adaptation to Life. Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown and Company, 1977.
- Van de Vall, M. "Voluntary participation in democratic studies." Studies in Psychology, Buffalo Studies, 1967, 3.
- Vroom, V. Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.
- Wagner, J. Conversations on the Vacation and Performance Relationship: Statistical Analyses and Moderating Effects. East Lansing, Michigan: Professor, Michigan State University, 1983, 1984.
- Wallis, C. "Stress: Can we cope?" Time, 1983, 121, 48-54.
- Walsh, R. "You can deal with stress." Supervisory Management, 1975, 20, 16-21.
- Wanous, J. "Individual differences and reactions to job characteristics." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 616-622.
- _____. Organizational Entry. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Press, 1980.
- _____, and Zwany, A. "A cross-sectional test of need hierarchy theory." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1977, 18, 78-97.
- Weick, K. "The concept of equity in the perception of pay." Administrative Science Quarterly, 1966, 11, 413-419.
- Wexley, K. and Latham, G. Developing and Training Human Resources in an Organization. U.S.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1981.

- White, J. "Individual differences and the job quality-worker response relationship: Review, integration and comments." Academy of Management Review, April, 1978, 267-280.
- Wilensky, H. "Work, careers, and social integration." International Social Science Journal, 1960, XII, 543-560.
- Willmott, P. "Family, work and leisure conflicts among male employees." Human Relations, 1971, 24, 575-584.
- Wollack, S., Goodale, J. and Wijting, J. "Development of the survey of work values." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 331-338.
- World of Work Reports. Washington, D.C.: Work in America Institute, Inc., Vol. 6, no. 10, October 1981; Vol. 6, no. 7, July 1981; Vol. 5, no. 10, October 1980; Vol. 5, no. 5, May 1980; Vol. 6, no. 8, August 1981.
- Yankelovich, D. "Work, values and the new breed." In C. Kerr and J. Rosow (Eds.) Work in America: The Decade Ahead. New York: Van Nostrand, 1979.
- Yukl, G. and Latham, G. "Consequences of reinforcement schedules and incentive magnitudes for employee performance: Problems encountered in an industrial setting." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 294-298.
- Yukl, G., Wexley, K. & Seymore, J. "Effects of pay incentives under variable ratio and continuous reinforcement schedules." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 19-23.
- Zammuto, R. Assessing Organizational Effectiveness. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York at Albany Press, 1982.
- Zetterberg, H., Busch, K. and De Uham, M. "Work as a life style in competition with other life styles: Some observations from the Swedish scene." (Unpublished manuscript, 1977). In C. Kerr and J. Rosow (Eds.), Work in America: The Decade Ahead. New York: Van Nostrand, 1979.