

099386 *RE OVER* *C-3*

099386

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS



BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES



LM099386

UNITED STATES
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

APR 3 1976

Contractors' Use Of Altered Work Schedules For Their Employees-- How Is it Working?

Department of Labor *AGC00009*
DOD AGC00005
GSA AGC00017

Using altered work schedules can benefit employees and employers. Revisions to several Federal laws are needed if employees of Government contractors are to be permitted to use certain altered work schedules.

703007
099386



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-151261

To the President of the Senate and the
Speaker of the House of Representatives

This is our second report on flexible and compressed work schedules. It discusses reasons they are used, experiences of organizations that have used them, and some of the Federal laws which limit their use by Government contractors. Our first report discussed the possible application of flexible and compressed work schedules to Federal employees.

We made our survey pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67).

We are sending copies of this report to the Secretary of Labor and to the heads of other departments and agencies having an interest in the use of altered work schedules by Government contractors.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "James A. Stacks".

Comptroller General
of the United States

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S
REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

CONTRACTORS' USE OF ALTERED
WORK SCHEDULES FOR THEIR
EMPLOYEES--HOW IS IT
WORKING?

Department of Labor

D I G E S T

In recent years there has been considerable interest in the use of altered work schedules, such as flexible and 4-day work schedules.

Under some altered schedules the 40-hour workweek of five 8-hour workdays is compressed into four 10-hour workdays or three 12-hour workdays. Other altered schedules give employees flexibility in choosing their hours of work.

GAO surveyed 20 organizations' use of altered work schedules and discussed the potential for their use with 44 Government contractors and 4 employee labor unions. GAO also reviewed recent studies and literature on the subject.

Altered work schedules can

- improve employee morale and attendance,
- reduce overtime expenses,
- increase employee productivity,
- increase the use of capital assets,
- reduce energy consumption,
- enable better service to the public,
- permit better use of transportation and recreation facilities, and
- open job opportunities for additional persons.

For others, however, altered work schedules can be detrimental in that

- employee fatigue can result,
- work scheduling can become more difficult,

--overtime costs can increase, and

--productivity can decrease.

GAO found the use of altered work schedules to be more difficult for Government contractors than for other employers, because the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Act require payment of overtime premiums whenever employees work more than 8 hours a day.

The Fair Labor Standards Act requirement to pay overtime premiums whenever employees work over 40 hours a week limits work-hour schedule flexibility for employees of Government contractors and other employers. (See p. 22.)

Some organizations believed the current legal requirements should be revised to permit greater use of altered work schedules. One organization believed that current Federal requirements made it economically more difficult for organizations using altered work schedules to do business with the Government. (See p. 10.)

Employee labor unions generally have opposed permitting or requiring employees to work over 8 hours a day without payment of overtime premiums of at least 1-1/2 times the employees' basic hourly salaries. However, a few union contracts have provided for using or testing altered work schedules. (See pp. 14 to 16.)

Revisions to Federal laws are needed if employees of Government contractors are to be permitted to use certain altered work schedules. Nevertheless, the need remains to protect employees when long hours of work could be detrimental to their well-being.

GAO concluded that strict adherence to fixed 5-day schedules was not always to the advantage of employees and employers. Although not all organizations benefit from or can use altered work schedules, employees and employers have benefited.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CONGRESS

GAO recommends that, when considering proposed legislation to amend the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Act, the Congress include provisions to:

an amendment to current

--Require Government contractors *should be required to:* using compressed schedules for their employees to pay overtime premiums when a 4-day schedule is used and the number of hours worked exceeds 10 a day or when a 3-day schedule is used and the number of hours worked exceeds 12 a day, except as discussed below with respect to banking and borrowing time under flexible schedules.

--Permit Government contractors ⁽²⁾ to use flexible work schedules, allowing employees to bank and borrow time by working more or less than 8 hours a day at the employees' convenience without the contractors' being required to pay overtime premiums for the hours worked in excess of 8 a day or 40 hours a week. To maintain the integrity of the 40-hour workweek provided for in these acts, a provision should be included requiring that the number of hours worked without payment of overtime premiums not average more than 40 hours a week over a specified period, possibly a month or several months. This would also require exempting the Government contractors involved from the 40-hour workweek requirement of the Fair Labor Standards Act or changing that act to allow employees to bank or borrow time.

The above recommendations concern the overtime payment requirements that apply to Government contractors. Although their adoption would give Government contractors additional opportunities to use altered work schedules, separate overtime payment requirements for Government contractors still exist.

GAO believes more uniformity in Federal overtime requirements may be desirable so that employees are not under one policy when they work on Government contracts and another



policy for their other work. Uniformity would eliminate differences in pay between persons working on Government contracts and persons doing the same work who are not working on Government contracts.

Therefore GAO also recommends that the Congress consider, as a long-range objective, establishing more uniform Federal policies on overtime requirements in view of the advantages of altered work schedules cited in this report.

The Department of Defense and the General Services Administration support GAO's recommendations concerning legislative changes. The Department of Labor could not comment formally within the time specified (7 days). (See p. 24.)

C o n t e n t s

	<u>Page</u>
DIGEST	i
CHAPTER	
1	INTRODUCTION 1
	Types of altered work schedules 1
	Compressed work schedules 1
	Flexible work schedules 2
	Effects of altered work schedules on employees, employers, and society 3
	Legislative requirements 4
	Scope of survey 5
2	EXPERIENCES OF 20 ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE USED ALTERED WORK SCHEDULES 6
	Energy impact 9
	Statutory overtime payment provisions 9
	Banking and borrowing of time 10
3	EXPERIENCES OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS 12
4	LABOR UNIONS 14
	American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organiza- tions 14
	International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union 15
	Teamsters Union 15
	United Auto Workers 16
5	RESEARCH STUDIES OF ALTERED WORK SCHEDULES 17
	University of Pennsylvania 17
	Business and Professional Women's Foundation 18
	Department of Labor 19
	Environmental Protection Agency 19
6	LEGISLATION UNDER CONSIDERATION 21
	Conclusions 21
	Recommendations to the Congress 23
	Agency comments 24
APPENDIX	
I	Twenty organizations GAO surveyed that used altered work schedules 25

APPENDIX

Page

II	Forty-four Government contractors GAO surveyed	26
III	Selected publications relating to altered work schedules	27
IV	Principal officials of Department of Labor responsible for adminis- tering activities discussed in this report	32

ABBREVIATIONS

AFL-CIO	American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organiza- tions
GAO	General Accounting Office
ILGWU	International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union
UAW	United Auto Workers

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1967 a German aerospace company tried a flexible work schedule for employee arrival and departure times, to relieve late arrival of company employees due to heavy traffic congestion on highways near the plant. The company found that employees' lateness and use of sick leave were reduced and that employees' morale and productivity were improved.

Since 1967 the acceptance of flexible work schedules has grown in Europe and elsewhere. Their use has spread from Germany to Austria, Switzerland, Scandinavia, France, Benelux, Italy, Spain, the United Kingdom, Japan, Canada, and the United States.

Some employers use compressed work schedules under which 5-day workweeks of 35 to 40 hours have been compressed into workweeks of less than 5 full workdays.

We surveyed the use of these altered work schedules to inquire into their potential for use by Government contractors. We wanted to know (1) what altered work schedules were, (2) the reasons for using them, (3) the experiences of organizations that had used them, and (4) the position of contractors, employee unions, and others on their use and on existing Federal legislation affecting their use.

TYPES OF ALTERED WORK SCHEDULES

From the late 1700's to today, employee working hours have been reduced from a 6-day workweek of 72 hours to a 5-day workweek generally of 35 to 40 hours. The reduction in work hours has resulted from mechanization, the industrial and technological revolutions, the labor movement, and legislation. The 5-day, 40-hour workweek, with established starting and stopping times, is the most common workweek for employees in the United States.

During the past decade considerable interest has arisen in the use of compressed schedules and flexible schedules. Although other types of work schedules exist, these two are the subject of this report.

Compressed work schedules

The most common compressed variation of the 5-day, 40-hour workweek is the 4-day, 40-hour weekweek. For example, the workweek may be Monday through Thursday or Tuesday through

Friday, 10 hours a day, which gives employees a 3-day weekend. These schedules result in additional productive time by reducing startup and shutdown time for both employees and equipment by 20 percent. And it is frequently possible to do plant maintenance entirely outside the productive hours.

Some organizations have reduced the number of hours in the workweek as well as the number of workdays. As organizations have reduced their workweeks, several other types of compressed schedules have emerged, including:

- a 36-hour workweek of three 12-hour days,
- a 36-hour workweek of four 9-hour days,
- a 36-hour workweek of 8 hours a day, Monday through Thursday, and a half a day on Friday, and
- a 38-hour workweek of four 9-1/2-hour days.

Flexible work schedules

There are numerous variations of flexible schedules (sometimes called flexitime) in use. Flexitime basically replaces fixed times of arrival and departure with two different types of time: core time and flexible time. Core time is the time during which all employees must be present. Flexible time is the time within which employees may choose their time of arrival and departure.

An example of a flexible work schedule follows.

<u>Arrival time</u>		<u>Lunchtime</u>		<u>Departure time</u>	
6:00	9:00	11:30	1:30	2:30	8:00
a.m.	a.m.	a.m.	p.m.	p.m.	p.m.
-----		-----			
Core time		Core time			

As the above example shows, employees may arrive for work anytime between 6 a.m. and 9 a.m. All employees are required to be on duty between 9 a.m. and 11:30 a.m. and between 1:30 p.m. and 2:30 p.m. Employees could choose up to a 2-hour lunch period between 11:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. Employees may depart anytime between 2:30 p.m. and 8 p.m. The facility would be open between 6 a.m. and 8 p.m.

The flexibility of the schedule could be increased to permit employees the option of banking and borrowing time, that is, to work more or less time a full day, so long as they

worked a prescribed number of hours within an established period. For example, an employee required to work 40 hours a week could arrange the number of hours worked as follows: Monday, 8 hours; Tuesday, 8-1/2 hours; Wednesday, 9 hours; Thursday, 8-1/2 hours; and Friday, 6 hours.

Variations of flexitime range from staggered-hours schedules, where employees are required to follow the work schedule they select, to complete flexibility, where employees are required to work a specified number of hours during an established period. The established period may vary, but a week, pay period, or month are common periods.

EFFECTS OF ALTERED WORK SCHEDULES ON EMPLOYEES, EMPLOYERS, AND SOCIETY

Studies of altered work schedules have reported the following effects.

On employees

- Expansion of individual responsibility.
- The possibility of adjusting worktimes to individual biological rhythm and personal needs.
- Reductions in stress and time when commuting between home and work.
- Improved chances for further education.
- Greater right of choice between worktime and free time.
- Reduction in the number of employees failing to take vacation time.
- Permits satisfaction of individual desires.
- Difficulty in determining compensation for overtime.

On employers

- Reduced absenteeism, overtime, and employee turnover.
- Increased productivity and morale.
- Eases employee recruitment.
- Permits adaptation to changes in labor productivity.

- Permits greater communication with customers and between plants.
- Permits longer operating day with increased use of capital assets.
- Can cause communication difficulties particularly if core hours are short.
- Can cause jealousy among employees not on liberal schedule arrangements.
- May cause work scheduling problems with team work.
- May result in increased administrative costs for recording employee worktimes.

On society

- Increases job opportunities for some persons.
- Permits less rush-hour traffic congestion, reducing energy consumption.
- Permits better use of recreational facilities.
- Improves employee status within society.
- Permits growth in the gross national product.

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

The 5-day, 40-hour workweek resulted from legislative response to demands for work sharing as a cure for the unemployment of the 1930's. Various laws were enacted providing for overtime premiums, to encourage employers to hire more employees when they had a need for labor in excess of 40 hours a week.

Since the 1930's, employer and employee needs and desires have changed, and certain laws may now be acting as a deterrent to employees and employers for whom the standard work-hour schedules are no longer satisfactory. Federal statutes, such as the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40 U.S.C. 328), the Fair Labor Standards Act (29 U.S.C. 201), and the Walsh-Healey Act (41 U.S.C. 35), govern the work-hour schedules used by employees of Government contractors.

The Walsh-Healey and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Acts require Government contractors to pay employees

a minimum of 1-1/2 times the basic hourly rates for time worked in excess of 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week. The Walsh-Healey Act applies to employers who have contracts with the Government exceeding \$10,000 to manufacture or furnish materials, supplies, articles, and equipment to the Government. The Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act applies to the contractors who employ mechanics and laborers in constructing public works.

The Fair Labor Standards Act requires employers engaged in interstate commerce or the production of goods for interstate commerce to pay employees who work in excess of 40 hours a week a minimum of 1-1/2 times the basic hourly rates. The act applies to employers who are Government contractors as well as those who are not.

SCOPE OF SURVEY

During our survey we spoke with officials of 20 organizations which had used some form of altered work schedules. (See app. I.) Of these organizations, 18 were private companies, 1 was a regional planning commission, and 1 was a county library system.

We also spoke with 44 Government contractors selected from a list of contractors with individual procurements of over \$1 million. (See app. II.) The contractors had operations in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland. We discussed the use of altered work schedules with union officials and with other knowledgeable individuals.

In addition, we studied various newspaper and magazine articles, research papers, and books on altered work schedules. (See app. III.)

CHAPTER 2

EXPERIENCES OF 20 ORGANIZATIONS

THAT HAVE USED ALTERED WORK SCHEDULES

We spoke with officials of 20 organizations that had used altered work schedules, to determine why they had used the schedules and the results of their use. Three of the organizations had used more than one altered work schedule. A total of 25 altered work schedules had been used by the 20 organizations. For example, one organization used a flexible schedule, a 3-day compressed schedule, and a 4-day compressed schedule at its central office. Seven of the organizations had contracts with the Government.

The status of the 25 altered work schedules used by the organizations follows.

<u>Schedule type</u>	<u>Number active</u>	<u>Number discontinued</u>
Flexible	9	1
3-day compressed	4	1
4-day compressed	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	<u>18</u>	<u>7</u>

Management officials of the 20 organizations told us they had established altered work schedules for the following reasons, and 17 organizations realized the advantages shown in the table on the following page.

As shown in the table on page 7, flexible work schedules resulted in benefits, such as increased productivity and decreased absenteeism, in addition to those contemplated. For example, one manufacturer had used a flexible schedule in its central office to achieve higher employee morale. The manufacturer found that increased productivity and reduced overtime cost also had resulted. Another unforeseen benefit was that much decisionmaking was moved downward to the employees most familiar with individual job requirements.

	Reasons for establishing (note a)		Advantage realized (note a)	
	<u>Flex- ible sched- ules</u>	<u>Com- pressed sched- ules</u>	<u>Flex- ible sched- ules</u>	<u>Com- pressed sched- ules</u>
Better capital asset utilization	0	4	0	4
Employee suggestion	3	3	0	0
Better employee morale	2	0	8	6
Reduced absenteeism	1	2	5	3
Ease traffic congestion, easier commuting	2	0	4	1
Ease elevator peak load	1	0	0	0
Increase productivity	1	2	4	4
Better service to west coast	1	1	0	0
Improved customer service	0	0	0	1
Assign administrative de- cisions to lower level	1	0	1	0
Practice what we preach	1	0	0	0
Innovative company	1	0	0	0
Reduce overtime costs	0	1	3	3
Energy conservation	0	1	0	2
Recruiting advantage	0	1	1	1
Decrease tardiness	0	0	4	1
Increased employment of working mothers	0	0	1	0
Allows more frequent pickup and delivery of mail	0	0	1	0
Free publicity	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>27</u>

a/ Some officials cited more than one reason or advantage.

Organizations that used compressed work schedules also realized unexpected benefits. For example, a manufacturer used a 4-day, 40-hour compressed schedule during 1974 to conserve energy. The manufacturer found energy consumption was down as expected, but he also found that productivity, attendance, and employee morale had improved.

We also inquired into the disadvantages experienced by the organizations. Officials at six organizations told us they had not experienced any disadvantages. However, officials of 14 organizations told us that the following disadvantages occurred from using the altered work schedules.

<u>Disadvantage</u>	Number of citations (note a)	
	<u>Flexible schedules</u>	<u>Compressed schedules</u>
Initial supervisory fear of loss of control	5	0
Employees sometimes not available when needed	2	0
Initial confusion	2	1
Increase in energy consumption	3	1
Employee resentment of mechanical time recorders	2	0
Production scheduling and customer contact problems	1	1
Reduced productivity	0	2
Increased absenteeism and sick leave use	0	1
Lower machine use	0	1
Fatigue	0	4
Company policy to pay overtime costly during business slump	0	1
Walsh-Healy Act requirement to pay overtime	0	1
Commuting tiresome with a longer workday	0	1
Loss of seniority rights for job assignments	0	1
Difficulty in sharing overtime among employees	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	<u>15</u>	<u>16</u>

a/ Some officials of the 14 organizations cited more than one disadvantage.

Most of the disadvantages cited from flexible schedules occurred when the schedules were initiated. We were told that supervisors' fear of loss of control and confusion on the schedules soon cleared up. Officials believed that other disadvantages of flexible schedules, such as the increased energy consumption and the production scheduling and customer contact problems, were outweighed by the advantages.

One organization discontinued using its flexible schedule because of the professional employees' resentment of time-recording devices. The six organizations which discontinued using compressed schedules gave the following reasons.

- Employee fatigue.
- Drop in workload.
- Legal requirements to pay overtime for hours worked over 8 hours a day became too costly due to the economic impact of the recession.
- Employee fatigue and reductions in employee productivity.
- Employee fatigue and resentment to job reassignments under the schedules.
- Customer contact problems.

ENERGY IMPACT

Two organizations using compressed schedules cited reduced heat, light, and power consumption as advantages resulting from production facilities' being closed down 3 days a week rather than 2 days a week. These organizations also said that employees' commuting time and related gasoline consumption were reduced by 20 percent as the result of using the compressed schedules.

Three organizations using flexible schedules and one organization using a compressed schedule told us they had experienced slight increases in energy consumption from using the altered schedules. The organizations attributed the increased energy consumption to operating the facilities more hours each day or an additional day a week.

STATUTORY OVERTIME PAYMENT PROVISIONS

We asked each organization its opinion of the current Federal requirements for payment of overtime in conjunction with using altered work schedules. Six organizations said that they would like to see the present requirement changed--three to permit more use of flexible schedules, one to permit more use of compressed schedules, and two to permit the use of both flexible and compressed schedules.

Two of the six organizations believed that, if changes were made, provisions should be included to prevent unscrupulous employers from taking advantage of their employees. One of the six organizations believed that, when employers requested employees to work more than 8 hours a day, overtime premiums should be paid for the excess time and that, when an employee requested to work more than 8 hours to take time off

more convenient to personal needs, payment of overtime premiums should not be required.

The remaining 14 organizations did not express any opinions on current legal requirements, and none of these organizations expressed the opinion that legal requirements should remain unchanged.

One organization using a 4-day, 40-hour compressed schedule cited problems with the Walsh-Healey Act requirement to pay overtime for hours worked in excess of 8 hours a day. The organization had a negotiated contract with the Government and had included about \$240,000 in overtime and associated costs in the contract price because of the overtime payment requirement.

Because of the Walsh-Healey Act overtime payment requirement, organization employees working on the Government contract were paid for 32 hours a week at their basic hourly rates and for 8 hours a week at 1-1/2 times their basic hourly rates. However, other employees not working on the Government contract were paid for 40 hours at their basic hourly rates. Organization officials told us that the overtime payment requirement had resulted in extra cost to the Government and had caused resentment among the organization's employees because employees doing similar work received different rates of pay.

The organization also believed it had lost an award of a competitive Government contract because its bid had included overtime payment costs its competitors did not have. The organization told us of one bid of \$6.98 a unit, which included \$0.30 a unit overtime costs, that was too high to receive a contract award. A competitor's successful low bid was \$6.84 a unit. The organization believed that, in evaluating the bids, the Government should have given special consideration to the overtime payment requirements in the Walsh-Healey Act. The organization found that, although the 4-day compressed schedule provided advantages for commercial sales, it worked to the organization's disadvantage for Government sales.

BANKING AND BORROWING OF TIME

Three of the nine organizations using flexible schedules permitted employees to vary the number of hours worked each day in accord with their individual needs and desires, provided that legal requirements on the number of permissible hours worked were not exceeded. At each of these organizations, employees normally worked less than 8 hours a day and 40 hours a week.

Six of the organizations using flexible schedules did not permit employees to bank and borrow time. However, four of the organizations permitted employees to vary working hours under certain situations. For example, one organization permitted its employees to work Saturdays to make up for time borrowed, provided that a production team, consisting of a group of employees making up borrowed time, was working that day.

CHAPTER 3

EXPERIENCES OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS

We asked officials of 44 Government contractors whether they had used, or had considered using, altered work schedules for their employees. Three of the contractors said that they were using flexible schedules for some of their administrative employees, and one contractor said it was using a 3-day, 36-hour compressed schedule for headquarters employees in a data processing facility.

The flexible schedules were used to improve employee morale and productivity, satisfy employee requests for the revised schedules, and help in recruiting new employees. The three contractors believed that the schedules had achieved the desired results. The compressed schedule was being used because it permitted rotating work schedules equitably.

None of the contractors were using altered work schedules for their production employees, for the following reasons.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Number of contractors</u>
Union agreements in effect did not provide for using flexible and compressed schedules	29
Scheduling problems would occur because facilities operated 24 hours a day	17
Overtime payment requirements discouraged using flexible and compressed schedules	15
Contractor had worldwide operations and needed to contact overseas operations at specified times	3

We asked each of the 44 contractors whether it believed the current overtime payment requirements affecting the use of compressed and flexible schedules should be changed. Of the 44 contractors, 2 said they believed no changes should be made to the current requirements, 30 said they did not wish to express opinions, and 12 said they believed the requirements should be changed for the following reasons.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Number of contractors</u>
Permit increased use of flexible and compressed schedules	8
Permit increased use of compressed schedules	2
Permit increased use of flexible schedules	1
Provide for payment of overtime only when the number of hours worked exceeds 40 hours a week	<u>1</u>
Total	<u><u>12</u></u>

CHAPTER 4

LABOR UNIONS

Employee labor unions generally have opposed proposals to permit or require employees to work over 8 hours a day without compensation at overtime rates of 1-1/2 or more times the employees' basic hourly rates. Labor unions had sought adoption of the 8-hour workday for over 100 years. Many of the current legal requirements regarding the length of workdays and workweeks came about as a result of the influence of labor unions upon various legislative bodies.

Some union agreements provide for workdays of less than 8 hours or for workweeks of less than 40 hours. Few union contracts have provided for using or testing compressed schedules or flexible schedules.

During our survey we obtained the views of several employee unions, to determine their opinions on the use of altered work schedules.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) said it believed that all work in excess of 8 hours a day should require overtime premium pay to employees, regardless of the type of work schedules. The union was opposed to use of compressed schedules which required a workday longer than 8 hours, because it believed these schedules interfered with employees' family and social lives and, in some jobs, would lead to excessive fatigue with possible health and safety problems.

The AFL-CIO was not opposed to altered work schedules which limited employees to workdays of 8 hours or less. However, it believed that altered schedules should provide for overtime premium payments whenever employees worked more than 8 hours a day, regardless of whether the excess time was at the request of an employer or at the option of an employee.

The AFL-CIO told us it had the objective of establishing for its membership a 4-day, 32-hour workweek with no loss of pay. It believed this goal was desirable both as a work-sharing goal and as a means of making life more pleasant for its membership.

INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT
WORKERS' UNION

The International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union (ILGWU) said that it was opposed to the use of 4-day compressed schedules because ILGWU was concerned about the detrimental effects of a long workday on employees. ILGWU members currently work a 5-day, 35-hour workweek, and union officials see no need to further rearrange or shorten the average workweek.

The ILGWU told us that no flexible schedules were provided for in any of its bargaining agreements and that the union had not formally studied the matter, although the tasks done by some garment workers did not require the precise scheduling required in many other industries.

The ILGWU also told us that about 80 percent of its members were women with household responsibilities in addition to their jobs who occasionally made arrangements with supervisors to permit them to handle their domestic needs. Such arrangements are possible because of flexibilities in production scheduling.

TEAMSTERS UNION

We were told that each Teamsters Union local was permitted to establish its own policies on the use of altered work schedules. One local, whose membership consisted of some truckdrivers who worked a 4-day compressed work schedule and others who worked a 5-day schedule, said that compressed schedules had been used by certain oil-haul truckdrivers for over 40 years. We were told that the oil-haul truckdrivers were satisfied with the compressed schedule, particularly because it gave them a 3-day weekend, and that return to a 5-day work schedule would be unacceptable to them.

At one company having a Teamsters Union contract, we were told that drivers on the compressed schedules were normally paid at regular hourly rates for their 40-hour workweek. However, when they drove under Government contract they were paid at overtime rates, in accordance with the Walsh-Healey Act overtime payment requirements.

A union official told us also that freight-haul truckdrivers who worked a 5-day schedule would resist any efforts to place them on a 4-day compressed schedule. He was unable to explain the differences in attitudes of the two groups within the local. The local had not studied the use of flexible schedules and had no opinion on their use.

UNITED AUTO WORKERS

The United Auto Workers (UAW) told us it was not opposed to experiments involving the use of compressed schedules. During 1974 it cooperated in a 2-month experiment with a 4-day, 40-hour compressed schedule at a parts depot. Under the schedule, about one-half of the depot employees worked Monday through Thursday and one-half worked Tuesday through Friday.

The depot discontinued the experiment due to employee dissatisfaction, because (1) many employees had long distances to commute since the work location had recently moved about 30 miles and the long commuting was found fatiguing in conjunction with the 10-hour workday, (2) employee seniority rights were eliminated to provide for rescheduling work assignments, and (3) Saturday overtime work was generally offered to employees working Tuesday through Friday, which caused resentment among other employees who did not have the opportunity to work overtime.

The UAW told us it would be willing to participate in another experiment to test the feasibility of a compressed 4-day, 40-hour workweek at another location. It believed that, with better planning and communication by the parties involved, a 4-day compressed schedule could be successful.

The UAW also told us it would favor a 4-day, 36-hour compressed schedule with 40 hours' pay, to create more jobs for its members. The UAW had no position on the use of flexible hours, because it had not studied the matter sufficiently.

CHAPTER 5

RESEARCH STUDIES OF ALTERED WORK SCHEDULES

We obtained four reports published during 1975 resulting from studies of the use and impact of altered work schedules.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

In May 1975 Dr. Harriet Faye Goldberg of the Industrial Research Unit, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, published a doctoral dissertation entitled "A Comparison of Three Alternative Work Schedules: Flexible Work Hours, Compact Work Week, and Staggered Hours." Her report covered 81 organizations in the United States and Canada which had replied to questionnaires she sent in July 1974 on compressed and flexible schedules. Her report identified types of work-hour schedules in use, reasons for establishing them, and the advantages and disadvantages experienced by the organizations.

Of the organizations Dr. Goldberg studied, 57 had used compressed schedules and 24 had used flexible schedules. Under 18 percent of the organizations with compressed schedules and nearly 74 percent of those with flexible schedules had started using them during 1973 and 1974. She found that most organizations used flexible schedules to improve employee morale and to relieve employee commuting problems and used compressed schedules to increase productivity and employee morale and to make greater use of capital equipment.

Organizations using compressed schedules generally had fewer than 100 employees; most of those using flexible schedules had over 1,000 employees. Employees working the altered schedules generally were not members of labor unions. Of the organizations Dr. Goldberg studied, only 1 had discontinued using flexible schedules but 17 of the 57 using compressed schedules had discontinued using them.

Supervisors at flexible schedule organizations expressed concern that they would lose control over their employees or would have to work more hours. Dr. Goldberg found no evidence that these problems had occurred. Problems with employee absences during working hours were worked out among employees or the length of the core periods were extended. Employees working flexible schedules reported they liked the schedules.

Dr. Goldberg observed that the amount of manual labor required by the job was the major difference between the organizations where compressed schedules succeeded or failed. For example, she found that compressed schedules were successful in data processing operations because the work is

not physically strenuous. For these firms, compressed schedules permitted greater use of capital equipment. Compressed schedules were used successfully when the length of the work-week was reduced.

Dr. Goldberg considered flexible schedules an additional benefit to employees involving little or no cost to the organization. She found that flexible schedules were used generally for white-collar workers. However, their use was unworkable in operations that depended on the presence of coworkers. Her study reported a general increase in job satisfaction by employees at organizations using altered schedules.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S FOUNDATION

In 1975 the Business and Professional Women's Foundation published a research report entitled "Hours of Work When Workers Can Choose: The Experience of 59 Organizations with Employee-Chosen Staggered Hours and Flexitime." Of the organizations studied, 40 were using flexible schedules and 19 were using staggered schedules under which employees could select their own fixed times of arrival and departure.

The major objectives given for establishing flexible schedules were to improve employee morale, and for closely related reasons, such as bringing equity between professional and nonprofessional staffs, and to allow employees more freedom to control the work situation and assume responsibility for their own actions. Other objectives sought were traffic relief, easier commuting, and reduced tardiness. Four firms adopted flexible schedules in response to employee requests.

The foundation reported that employers usually obtained greater advantages than those sought and that benefits were about equally divided between employees and employers. Employees benefited in that morale and job satisfaction were increased, they were better able to integrate their work and personal lives, and their commuting was made easier. Employers benefited in that absenteeism decreased in 65 percent of the firms, tardiness decreased in 89 percent, and productivity increased in 55 percent.

No organization reported worsened productivity, absenteeism, tardiness, turnover, or fatigue. The major problem reported was initial management resistance because supervisors feared that they would have to be in attendance for long hours or that they would lose supervisory control. The supervisory fears were found solvable. A few firms reported employees' resistance to introduction of time-recording devices; 16 firms reported no problems.

No appreciable changes in operating expenses were reported by the organizations studied. However, 11 organizations reported reductions in overtime costs.

The foundation concluded that technology alone had less potential for increasing productivity than technology coupled with other steps that increase productivity. It believed that flexible hours might offer one means. The foundation also concluded that conversion to flexible schedules was providing long-term benefits in many cases in that none of the organizations studied discontinued using flexible schedules.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Early in 1975 the Department of Labor published a report, "The Revised Workweek: Results of a Pilot Study of 16 Firms," concerning the experiences of 5 manufacturing firms, 3 banks, 2 insurance companies, 2 automobile dealers, 2 Government agencies, 1 wholesale trade firm, and 1 hospital using compressed schedules. All the organizations had used the compressed schedule for over a year; 12 considered it a permanent arrangement, 3 considered it experiments, and 1 was considering discontinuing it.

The organizations had established the compressed schedules to ease recruitment, to provide better service by extending daily or weekly hours, to maximize equipment use, to improve organizational image, to reduce overtime or absenteeism, and to improve employee morale. The study showed that among the firms productivity generally increased, employee turnover was thought to be improved, some reductions in absenteeism occurred, and there was some improvement in the use of plants and equipment. In general, employees of the organizations seem to like the compressed schedules and did not wish to change back to their former 5-day schedules.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

In May 1975 the Environmental Protection Agency issued a report, "Impacts of Energy Conservation Measures Applied to Commuter Travel," which assessed, among other things, the impact of altered schedules on energy consumption by commuters in urban areas. The study estimated that, when commuting trips were made during times when there was less traffic congestion, up to a 37-percent savings in energy consumption was possible because of improved traffic flow.

The report showed that using 4-day, compressed schedules could result in a 20-percent reduction in energy consumption because of the reduced number of trips made. The report also showed that flexible schedules could result in reduced energy

consumption because of the ease of forming carpools. Both compressed and flexible schedules could result in reduced energy consumption for commuters because of increased travel speed from improved traffic flow.

CHAPTER 6

LEGISLATION UNDER CONSIDERATION

The 94th Congress is considering two bills, H.R. 6350 and H.R. 9043, which would authorize agencies and employees of the Federal Government to experiment with flexible and compressed work schedules. During hearings held on these bills in September 1975, support was expressed by Members of Congress and by Administration officials on the experimental use of altered work schedules for Federal employees.

Two other bills proposing to amend the Federal overtime payment requirements applicable to Government contractors have also been introduced in the 94th Congress. These bills, H.R. 2625 and H.R. 4814, would amend the Walsh-Healey Act and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act to provide that Government contractors whose employees work a 4-day compressed schedule would be required to pay employees at overtime premium rates only when the number of hours worked exceeds 10 hours a day or 40 hours a week. Current provisions would remain in effect for employees continuing to work a 5-day workweek.

CONCLUSIONS

Our survey showed that not all organizations benefited from or could use altered work schedules. However, we, and others who have studied their use, found that a number of organizations using such schedules realized benefits for themselves and for their employees. Society in general could also benefit.

Because altered work schedules have not been in use long, conclusive evidence on the effects of their long-term use is not available. In many organizations using altered schedules, employees' morale and productivity were increased and absenteeism and overtime costs were reduced. Altered schedules can permit better use of transportation and recreation facilities. Many employees appear satisfied with altered work schedules.

Compressed schedules, particularly 3-day compressed schedules, appear most successful for employees, such as computer operators, whose work is not physically strenuous and has built-in rest periods during the workday, which reduces the severity of fatigue. Compressed schedules appear successful in achieving increased use of capital facilities

and in providing opportunities for energy savings by both organizations and employees. However, problems have occurred at some organizations because of employee fatigue, and many of the organizations that have discontinued using compressed schedules have done so for this reason.

Flexible schedules appear to be more successful. However, since most flexible schedules have not been in use long, their long-term impact is not known. Flexible schedules appear to be successful in employment situations where employees work on a somewhat independent basis, such as in administrative operations. Flexible schedules also provide some opportunities for energy savings by employees and opportunities for employees to adjust their work schedules to their family and other needs. Flexible schedules also provide opportunities for some persons in our society to work, such as mothers who find fixed schedules difficult.

The Fair Labor Standards Act, which applies to employers that are Government contractors as well as those that are not, provides that overtime premiums be paid whenever employees work more than 40 hours a week. The Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Act, which apply to Government contractors, require the payment of overtime premiums whenever employees work more than 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week. Together, these acts limit employee flexibility to bank and borrow time when desired.

Many persons believe that overtime premiums should be paid for all time worked in excess of 8 hours a day and 40 hours a week. Some persons would like to see current legislative requirements remain unchanged, and others would like to see legislation enacted to reduce the number of hours in a workday or in a workweek.

However, a growing number of others believe that payment of overtime premiums should not be required for work in excess of 8 hours a day or 40 hours a week when employees desire to alter their work schedules to work at times more convenient to their needs and desires. Also many persons believe that overtime payment requirements should be revised to permit additional use of compressed schedules.

We found that adherence to fixed, 5-day work schedules was not always best for employees and employers. For persons desiring changes to certain altered work schedules, the current overtime payment requirements do not always work to their best advantage. Therefore we believe the Congress should revise the current laws to permit greater use of altered work schedules.

Since the need remains to protect the health and safety of employees, however, we believe the revisions made should continue to protect employees from long hours of labor that could be detrimental to their well-being. Also, since many employees and employers are satisfied with their current schedule arrangements, care should be taken not to place these persons and organizations at a disadvantage.

We also believe more uniformity in Federal overtime requirements is desirable so that employees are not under one policy when they work on Government contracts and another policy for their other work. Uniformity would eliminate differences in pay between persons working on Government contracts and persons doing the same work who are not working on Government contracts.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CONGRESS

We recommend that, when considering the proposed legislation to amend the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Act, the Congress include provisions to:

- Require Government contractors using compressed schedules for their employees to pay overtime premiums when a 4-day schedule is used and the number of hours worked exceeds 10 a day or when a 3-day schedule is used and the number of hours worked exceeds 12 a day, except as discussed below with respect to banking and borrowing time under flexible schedules.
- Permit Government contractors to use flexible work schedules allowing employees to bank and borrow time by working more or less than 8 hours a day at the employees' convenience without the contractors' being required to pay overtime premiums for the hours worked in excess of 8 a day or 40 hours a week. To maintain the integrity of the 40-hour workweek provided for in these acts, a provision should be included requiring that the number of hours worked without payment of overtime premiums not average more than 40 hours a week over a specified period, possibly a month or several months. This would also require exempting the Government contractors involved from the 40-hour workweek requirement of the Fair Labor Standards Act or changing that act to allow employees to bank and borrow time.

The above recommendations concern the overtime requirements that apply to Government contractors. Although their

adoption would give Government contractors additional opportunities to use altered work schedules, separate overtime requirements for Government contractors still exist.

Therefore we also recommend that the Congress consider, as a long-range objective, establishing more uniform Federal policies on overtime requirements in view of the advantages of altered work schedules cited in this report.

Agency comments

On March 15, 1976, we gave our proposed report to the Department of Labor for comment because of its responsibilities for the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the Walsh-Healey Act. We also gave copies to the Department of Defense and the General Services Administration for comment because of the large amount of contracting they do for the Government. So that we could issue our report to the Congress early in April 1976, we asked them for comments by March 22, 1976.

The Department of Labor told us it could not comment formally within the time specified. Department officials told us, however, that they believed the Department would be reluctant to support legislative changes without further studying the impact of altered work schedules on employees of Government contractors.

The Department of Defense and the General Services Administration told us they favored our recommendations. The General Services Administration also told us it believed (1) that legislation might be needed that would enable certain Government employees to work contractors' altered work schedules and (2) that altered work schedules could result in increased energy consumption for building operations but that the advantages of using altered schedules would outweigh the disadvantage of increased energy consumption.

TWENTY ORGANIZATIONS GAO SURVEYED
THAT USED ALTERED WORK SCHEDULES

Atlantic Products Corp.
Bata Shoe Co., Inc.
Beckman Instruments, Inc.
Chrysler Corporation
Day & Zimmerman, Inc.
Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission
Food Fair Stores, Inc.
General Electric Company
Hewlett-Packard Co.
Kyanize Paints, Inc.
Paul O. Young Company
Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company
Prince Georges County Memorial Library System
Provident National Bank
Prudential Insurance Company of America
Samsonite Corporation
Scott Paper Company
Smithkline Corporation
Sun Oil Company
Texas Instruments, Inc.

FORTY-FOUR GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS GAO SURVEYED

AAI Corp.
Aeronutronic Ford Corp., Division of Ford Motor Co.
Aiken Industries Inc.
Aluminum Company of America
American Electronics Laboratories Inc., AEL Service Corp.
American Oil and Supply Co.
Aydin Corp.
Bendix Corp.
Bethlehem Steel Corp.
Boeing Vertol Co., Division of Boeing Co.
Booz Allen and Hamilton Inc., Booz Allen Applied Research
Campbell Soup Co.
Colgate-Palmolive Co.
Curtiss-Wright Corp.
Dale Fashions Inc.
DeLaval Turbine Inc., Turbine Division
D'Lauro Frank A. Co.
Gichner Mobile Systems Division of Union Corporation
Green Construction Co.
Hoffman-LaRoche Inc.
Honeywell Inc.
Hydronautics Inc.
International Signal and Control
International Telephone Telegraph, Defense Comm. Div. of
Kessell Kitchen Equipment Co.
Kidde Walter and Co., Inc.
Kraftco Corp.
Lansdowne Steel and Iron Co.
Leland Tube Co.
Litton Industries Inc., Litton Systems Inc.
Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Lockheed Electronics Co., Inc.
Mine Safety Appliances Co.
Newell Clothing Co.
Operations Research Inc.
Pennsylvania State University
QUS Inc.
REDM Corp.
Rois Manufacturing Co.
Royal Lubricants Co.
Seatrains Lines Inc.
Washington Technological Associates Inc.
Westinghouse Electric Corp.
Wilbur Chocolate Co., Inc.
Yarway Corp.

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO
ALTERED WORK SCHEDULES

RESEARCH STUDIES CITED IN THE REPORT

Goldberg, Harriet Faye, A Comparison of Three Alternative Work Schedules: Flexible Work Hours, Compact Work Week, and Staggered Hours. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Industrial Research Unit, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 1975.

Hartley, Jo ed. and Martin, Virginia Hider, Hours of Work When Workers Can Choose: The Experience of 59 Organizations with Employee-Chosen Staggered Hours and Flexitime. Washington, D.C., Business and Professional Women's Foundation, 1975.

Swerdloff, Sol, The Revised Workweek: Results of a Pilot Study of 16 Firms. Bulletin 1846, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1975.

Sharko, John R. and Price, Jeffrey P., Impacts of Energy Conservation Measures Applied to Commuter Travel. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Mathematica, Inc., prepared for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, May 1975.

OTHER REFERENCES CONSULTED DURING THE SURVEY

INDUSTRY USE OF COMPRESSED SCHEDULES

"A Shorter Week Gets Priority," Business Week, September 29, 1975, p. 29.

"A Vote for Togetherness," Wall Street Journal, October 4, 1974, p. 8.

"Chrysler Corp. Initiates a 4-day, 40-Hour Week," Wall Street Journal, July 19, 1974, p. 17.

"80% Work a 5-Day Week; Trend to 4 Days Is Seen," The New York Times, April 20, 1975, p. 44.

Feron, James, "A Chrysler Union Drops 4-Day Week," The New York Times, October 6, 1974, p. 57.

"Four-Day Week: How Widespread by 1990?" Commerce Today,
February 7, 1972, pp. 37-44.

"Four-Day Week Pressure Grows From an Influential UAW Coalition,"
Wall Street Journal, June 17, 1975, p. 1.

"Four-Day Week (40 Hours) Three Day Weekend (Fri., Sat., Sun.),"
The Harford Democrat-Upper Bay Citizen-APG News (MD),
February 13, 1974.

"4-day Workweek Spreading Against Tide of Opposition,"
Philadelphia Inquirer, September 13, 1973, p. 11-BNE.

Hedges, Janice Neipert, "A Look at the 4-day Workweek,"
Monthly Labor Review, October 1971, p. 33.

"How Many Days Make a Workweek? The Answer Isn't Always Five,"
Wall Street Journal, June 24, 1975, p. 1.

"Is a 4-Day Week the Answer? Latest Findings in Canada,"
U.S. News and World Report, November 6, 1972, p. 104.

"Latest on the Four-Day Week," U.S. News and World Report,
March 20, 1972, p. 82.

Macut, John J., "Measuring Productivity Under a 4-day Week,"
Monthly Labor Review, April 1974, p. 55.

McCorkel, Franklin M., "The Four-Day Work Week: Management
Scores a Success," AMS Report, September 1973, p. 63.

Mortimer, Louis R., "The Four-Day Week Recent Trends in Workweek
Rescheduling," Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress
HD 5106, U.S., 71-215E, September 30, 1971.

Pearson, John Ward, The 8-Day Week, New York, Harper and Row
Publishers, 1973.

Poor, Riva ed., 4-Days, 40 Hours Reporting a Revolution in
Work and Leisure, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Bursk and Poor
Publishing, 1970.

"Progress on the 4-Day Week," NAM Reports, July 19, 1971, p. 12.

Raskin, A.H., "Whatever Happened to the 4-Day Week?", The New York
Times, January 19, 1975, part IV, p. 20.

Rosenthal, Edmond M., "Are Workers up to the Four-Day Workweek?" Management Review, July 1972, p. 14.

Sellars, Thomas V., "The 4/40: Does it Raise Personnel Costs?" Hospitals, September 1, 1973, p. 94.

"Whatever Happened to . . . ?" Industry Week, January 6, 1975, p. 46.

Wheeler, Kenneth E.; Gurman, Richard; and Tarnowieski, Dale, The Four-Day Week An AMA Research Report, New York: American Management Association, Inc., 1972.

Wheeler, Kenneth E., "Small Business Eyes the Four-Day Workweek," Harvard Business Review, XLVIII (May/June 1970), p. 142.

Wilson, James A. ed., Assisted by Byham, William C., The Four-Day Workweek--Fad or Future? Proceedings of a conference conducted by the Graduate School of Business, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1973.

INDUSTRY USE OF FLEXIBLE SCHEDULES

Begley Kathy, "Flexi-Time: It Helps Some Workers Beat the Traffic," Philadelphia Inquirer, March 4, 1973, pp. 1-A and 16-A.

Eddy, Brenda, "9 to 5 is Obsolete," Georgetown Today, Washington, D.C., Georgetown University, November 1974, p. 3.

Elbing, Alvar O., Herman Gadon and John R. Gordon, "Flexible Working Hours: It's About Time," Harvard Business Review January/February 1974, pp. 18 and 154.

"Europe Likes Flexi-Time Work," Business Week, October 7, 1972, p. 80.

Fields, Cynthia J., "Variable Work Hours--The MONY Experience," Personnel Journal, September 1974, p. 675.

"Flexible Hours Found Beneficial," The New York Times, July 7, 1975, p. C37.

Harkness, Robyn, "An Experiment With Flexitime," Personnel Practice Bulletin, vol. 29, No. 4, December 1973, p. 326.

Hedges, Janice Neipert, "Q&A on Flexitime," Supervisory Management, October 1974, p. 9.

"John Hancock Will Test Flexible Work Schedules," Wall Street Journal, April 15, 1974, p. 4.

Juster, Jacqueline, "Flexible Time," New Jersey Business, August 1975, p. 28.

Langholz, Bernd, "Variable Working Hours in Germany," Journal of Systems Management, August 1972, p. 30.

"Rubber Hours," Newsweek, September 10, 1973, p. 66.

Zagoria, Sam, "When Work Schedules Are Flexible," The Washington Post, September 9, 1973, pp. G4 and G10.

INDUSTRY USE OF COMPRESSED AND FLEXIBLE SCHEDULES

Hedges, Janice Neipert, "New Patterns for Working Time," Monthly Labor Review, February 1973, p. 3.

"Scrapping the 9 to 5 Routine: What Some Firms Have Found," U.S. News and World Report, August 20, 1973, p. 64.

Walker, W. E. under direction of Porter, Allan A., Trends in Working Time, Labour Canada, June 1974.

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT USE OF COMPRESSED AND FLEXIBLE SCHEDULES

Gordon, Suzanne, "Upper Darby Tests 4-Day Work Week," The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Suburban West Edition, October 22, 1975, p. 1.

Kenney, Martin T., "Public Employee Attitudes Toward the Four-Day Work Week," Public Personnel Management, March and April 1974, p. 159.

"Pemberton Aide Hails Success of 4-Day Work Week," The Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, New Jersey News Edition, August 17, 1975, sec. 1, part three, p. 1.

Ward, C.D.E., "Flexible Working Hours in Operation The Cheshire County Council Experiment," Administrative Management, Summer 1973, p. 38.

Zagoria, Sam, "Flexitime: A City Employee Pleaser," Nations Cities, February 1974, p. 42.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT USE OF COMPRESSED
AND FLEXIBLE SCHEDULES

Andronicos, Bill, "Flexitime Threat," Federal Times, October 13, 1975, pp. 3 and 16.

Andronicos, Bill, "CSC Seeks Test Okay: 4-Day Week Revival?" Federal Times, August 20, 1975, pp. 1 and 6.

Causey, Mike, "Flexible Time Work May Save Money," The Washington Post, The Federal Diary, October 8, 1974, p. B13.

Causey, Mike, "U.S. Wants to Try 4-Day Work Week," The Washington Post, The Federal Diary, August 7, 1975, p. E17.

Causey, Mike, "Four-Day Week Effort Off Target," The Washington Post, The Federal Diary, May 27, 1975, p. B9.

Causey, Mike, "Flexible Hours," The Washington Post, The Federal Diary, April 21, 1975, p. C21.

Causey, Mike, "Flexitime Could Aid Icy Rush Hours," The Washington Post, The Federal Diary, February 12, 1976, p. F8.

Cramer, John, "2 Bills May Signal Wave of the Future," The Washington Star-News, Federal Column, October 8, 1975, pp. D1 and D4.

"CSC Cites Benefits More Flexitime Testing Sought," Federal Times, August 27, 1975, p. 7.

"Flexitime Could Erode Current Laws," The Washington Letter, October 10, 1975, p. 4.

"Flexitime Experiment Is Set for SSA Office in Baltimore," Federal Employee, April 10, 1974.

"Stringent Fuel Conservation Measures Vitrally Necessary NFFE Proposes 4-Day Week for Federal Government; Energy Savings Substantial," Federal Employee, January 10, 1974, pp. 1 and 3.

Young, Joseph, "4-Day Week Test OKd by White House," The Washington Star-News, February 6, 1975, p. 1.

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
RESPONSIBLE FOR ADMINISTERING ACTIVITIES
DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT

	<u>Tenure of office</u>	
	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
William J. Usery, Jr.	Feb. 1976	Present
John T. Dunlop	Mar. 1975	Jan. 1976
Peter J. Brennan	Feb. 1973	Mar. 1975

Copies of GAO reports are available to the general public at a cost of \$1.00 a copy. There is no charge for reports furnished to Members of Congress and congressional committee staff members. Officials of Federal, State, and local governments may receive up to 10 copies free of charge. Members of the press; college libraries, faculty members, and students; non-profit organizations; and representatives of foreign governments may receive up to 2 copies free of charge. Requests for larger quantities should be accompanied by payment.

Requesters entitled to reports without charge should address their requests to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Distribution Section, Room 4522
441 G Street, NW.
Washington, D.C. 20548

Requesters who are required to pay for reports should send their requests with checks or money orders to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Distribution Section
P.O. Box 1020
Washington, D.C. 20013

Checks or money orders should be made payable to the U.S. General Accounting Office. Stamps or Superintendent of Documents coupons will not be accepted. Please do not send cash.

To expedite filling your order, use the report number in the lower left corner and the date in the lower right corner of the front cover.

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

UNITED STATES
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE



THIRD CLASS

Library
Room 7056