

Work Centrality and Post-Award Work Behavior of Lottery Winners

RICHARD D. ARVEY

*Department of Human Resources and Industrial Relations
University of Minnesota*

ITZHAK HARPAZ

*Center for the Study of Organizations and Human Resource Management
University of Haifa, Israel*

HUI LIAO

*School of Management and Labor Relations
Rutgers University*

ABSTRACT. Individuals who had won the lottery responded to a survey concerning whether they had continued to work after winning. They were also asked to indicate how important work was in their life using items and scales commonly used to measure work centrality. The authors predicted that whether lottery winners would continue to work would be related to their level of work centrality as well as to the amount of their winnings. Individuals who won large amounts in the lottery would be less likely to quit work if they had relatively greater degrees of work centrality. After controlling for a number of variables (i.e., age, gender, education, occupation, and job satisfaction), results indicated that work centrality and the amount won were significantly related to whether individuals continued to work and, as predicted, the interaction between the two was also significantly related to work continuance.

Key words: importance of work, job satisfaction, lottery winners, work behavior, work centrality

THE RECENT FRENZY IN THE LOTTERY in which the potential winnings exceeded \$250 million (i.e., Powerball) perhaps induced many people to fantasize about what they would do if they actually won. A popular belief presumes that most people would quit work if they won. But do individuals who win the lottery continue to work, and if so, why? One proposition is that work centrality could play an important role. *Work centrality* has been defined as the degree of general importance that working has in one's life at any given time (MOW—International Research Team, 1987) and can be distinguished from other related

concepts such as work engagement and the inverse concept of work alienation (Hirschfeld & Field, 2000). “People who consider work as a central life interest have a strong identification with work in the sense that they believe the work role to be an important and central part of their lives” (Hirschfeld & Field, p. 790).

Work centrality has been explored by a variety of researchers across a number of cultural settings, and the finding that work plays a central and fundamental role in the life of an individual has been supported empirically in most industrialized countries (Brief & Nord, 1990; England & Misumi, 1986; Mannheim, 1993; Mannheim, Baruch, & Tal, 1997). In addition, work has been found to be of relatively high importance compared with other important life areas such as leisure, community, and religion, and has been found to rank second in importance only to family (Harding & Hikspoors, 1995; Harpaz, 1999; MOW—International Research Team, 1987). Research has also been conducted exploring the antecedents and consequences of work centrality, showing that work centrality is related to a number of personal, demographic, job, and organizational characteristics. See Mannheim et al. (1997) and Sverko & Vizek-Vidovic (1995) for reviews.

Work centrality has been linked to the lottery in several ways. Previously, researchers have asked the so-called *lottery question* to survey participants. The lottery question generally takes the form of asking survey respondents to indicate whether or not they would continue to work if they won a substantial amount of money in the lottery. These responses are then correlated with measures of work centrality as a means of verifying the validity of the work centrality measures and construct. Theoretically, individuals who view work as central and important in their lives will continue to work after winning the lottery.

Prior research shows a significant and positive relationship between the two types of measures in representative samples of the labor force in seven countries (MOW—International Research Team, 1987), although the observed relationship is modest. In addition, prior research has used the proportion of individuals who indicate that they would continue to work if they had won the lottery as evidence for the potential waning value of work over time (Vecchio, 1980) as well as for comparing the importance of work across international cultures (e.g. Harpaz, 1989; Ruiz-Quintanilla & Wilpert, 1991).

There are good theoretical rationales for why such a relationship would exist. Two perspectives have been advanced to explain the centrality of work. The first emphasizes an instrumental or extrinsic perspective in which work is seen as a means to acquire economic security and to secure material needs. The second perspective, an intrinsic one, is that work is important in securing the sociopsychological needs of individuals—that is, work contributes to one’s sense of per-

Address correspondence to Richard D. Arvey, Department of Human Resources and Industrial Relations, 3-279 Carlson School of Management, 321 19th Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55455; rarvey@csom.umn.edu (e-mail).

sonal identity, self-esteem, status, and sense of accomplishment.

The distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic perspectives has received considerable support and discussion in the research literature (Kanungo, 1982; Loscocco, 1989; Pinder, 1998; Ros, Schwartz, & Surkiss, 1999; Warr, 1982). The notion advanced is quite simple: Relative to the work behavior of lottery winners, individuals who win the lottery will have their financial and security needs taken care of but will continue to work if they view work as important or central in their lives, particularly if they view work as providing a sense of identity, esteem, status, and other nonfinancial outcomes.

It is interesting to note, however, that prior research on the relationship between the explicit concept of work centrality and the lottery question has used samples in which no one had actually won the lottery. That is, the question posed was entirely theoretical in nature. The present study differed in that we used an actual sample of lottery winners, some of whom continued to work and some who stopped working.

Although rare, there has been prior research using lottery winners as sample subjects. Kaplan conducted three different research projects on the work behavior of lottery winners, investigating the percentages of winners who chose to continue to work (Kaplan, 1978, 1985, 1988). He showed that continuing to work was related to education and to the type of profession in which the respondents were working at the time they won the lottery. Several additional studies of lottery winners were conducted by economists and psychologists. These studies focused mainly on how winning (the income effect) had affected consumption (Brickman, Coates, & Janoff-Bulman, 1978; Gardener & Oswald, 2001; Imbens, Rubin, & Sacerdote, 2001).

None of these researchers, however, explicitly measured work centrality and its relationship to the decision among lottery winners to continue or discontinue to work. Thus, this study was the first effort to explore the relationship between a direct measure of work centrality and the post-lottery work behavior of actual lottery winners. On the basis of prior research and theorizing, we advanced the following propositions:

Hypothesis 1: Individuals who exhibit relatively high levels of work centrality will be more likely to continue working after winning the lottery than will individuals who exhibit relatively lower levels of work centrality.

Drawing on the earlier description of the extrinsic nature of work in providing financial and economic stability, we also predicted that the greater the amount won, the less likely an individual would continue to work, because financial freedom would be assured. Several researchers have shown a negative relationship between the size of the winnings and the continuance of work. Kaplan (1978) found that nearly 80% of \$1 million dollar winners quit working, whereas only about 25% of the \$50,000 dollar winners resigned from their jobs. Sim-

ilar results were reported by Kaplan (1985). Imbens et al. (2001) conducted a mail survey of lottery winners ($n = 802$) and found that individuals who won relatively larger prizes (\$80,000 rather than \$15,000 per year) reduced the number of hours they worked. Thus, we advanced the following proposition:

Hypothesis 2: There will be a significant relationship between the amount of the lottery prize and continuing to work. Individuals who win relatively large amounts of money will be less likely to continue work.

There is a reason to believe that an interaction would exist between work centrality and the amount of the prize. Although work centrality might be an important variable in predicting whether an individual will continue to work after winning the lottery, it may be that those who win lesser amounts of money will continue to work simply because they cannot afford to quit, whereas for those who win larger amounts, work centrality will become a more important predictor of work continuance.

Hypothesis 3: There will be an interaction between the amount of the lottery prize and work centrality. Individuals who win larger amounts will be less likely to quit work if they have relatively greater degrees of work centrality.

Control Variables

We examined the following additional variables that we felt would be related to the post-lottery work behavior of winners

Gender. Limited evidence suggests that gender is related to whether one quits work after winning the lottery. Kaplan (1978) found that men had a higher tendency than did women to continue working after winning the lottery. In a study by Harpaz (1990), differences also were found between Israeli men and women with regard to the hypothetical lottery question. Although work was considered relatively important for both sexes, significantly more women indicated that they would quit working if they had the opportunity to do so. In neither of these studies, however, were there any controls for work centrality, and there has been some evidence that men exhibit significantly higher work centrality regardless of country of origin or cultural orientation (Harpaz & Fu, 1997; Isaksson & Gunn, 2000). Thus, an analysis of this issue is still in an exploratory phase, but based on these prior studies, we controlled for gender in this study.

Age. Some evidence also exists that age is related to the decision to quit work after winning the lottery. Kaplan's (1985) study of actual lottery winners revealed that a greater proportion of younger individuals (under age 50) stopped working compared with a relatively older group of winners. Kaplan (1988) found similar

results. It is also interesting to note that age cohort differences were observed in terms of a stated desire to continue to work after winning the lottery. An examination of responses to the hypothetical lottery question in Israel revealed that from the early 1970s to the 1990s there was an increase in the wishes of younger individuals (particularly those between the ages of 20 to 29 years) to discontinue working if they won the lottery (Harpaz, 1990; Mannheim & Rein, 1981). However, another study by Kaplan (1985) showed that older winners (over 60) were much more likely to quit or retire from work. Because the results of these studies indicated that age may be related to the continuance of work, we controlled for age in this study.

Education. Evidence also shows that educational level is related to whether individuals continue to work after winning the lottery. Kaplan (1987) found that the lower the educational level of winners, the greater the number of lottery winners who quit, retired, or reduced the number of hours worked. Also, in a study conducted with a representative sample of the Israeli labor force, education was one of the more important variables predicting work continuation in the event of hypothetically winning the lottery. More highly educated individuals indicated that they would be less likely to quit (Harpaz, 1990). Thus, we controlled for level of education in this study.

Occupational status. Kaplan (1987) showed that the greatest proportion of workers who remained in their jobs were professional, managers or proprietors, and craftsmen, but those less likely to remain in their jobs after winning were those in relatively low status occupations (e.g., laborers, operatives, and sales workers). For this reason, we controlled for occupational status in this study.

Job satisfaction. The organizational literature suggests that individuals are more likely to quit if they had been or were dissatisfied with their jobs. Job satisfaction plays a major role in virtually all turnover theories and operates as a key psychological correlate in most turnover studies (see Lee, Mitchell, Holtom, McDaniel, & Hill, 1999). Job satisfaction has shown statistically significant correlations with turnover in several meta-analyses (e.g. Hom, Caranikas-Walker, Prussia, & Griffeth, 1992; Tett & Meyer, 1993). On the basis of this voluminous job satisfaction–turnover research, job satisfaction was controlled for in this study, although no previous research has examined the role of job satisfaction in lottery winners’ decisions to continue or stop working.

Method

Data Collection and Participants

We obtained the mailing addresses for the 1,265 lottery winners in the state

of Ohio for the period of 1989 to 1999 from the Ohio Lottery Commission. In addition, we obtained the mailing addresses for 72 of the lottery winners in Iowa for the period of 1985 to 1999 through the Iowa Lottery Public Affairs Office. We then mailed a packet containing a questionnaire, a cover letter requesting participation in the survey and ensuring strict confidentiality, and a pre-addressed and postage-paid return envelope to each of these 1,337 lottery winners.

Of the packets, 174 were returned for wrong or outdated mailing addresses. Because we had promised the participants anonymity, the return envelopes were not coded with individual identification beforehand to match the returned survey. Two weeks after the first mailing, a reminder was sent. This procedure resulted in 155 returned questionnaires. To increase the response rate, we randomly chose 500 useable addresses from the total list of 1,163 lottery winners, and sent out another questionnaire packet. Because we did not know who had returned their surveys and who had not, the sample of 500 may have contained both the respondents and the nonrespondents in our first mailing. Following the second mailing, 30 additional surveys were returned. Three individuals stated that they had returned their surveys in the first round and did not complete it a second time.

In total, 185 surveys were received out of those 1,163 that were successfully delivered, representing a response rate of 16%. According to Kaplan (1985), winners might be reluctant to respond to any kind of solicitation, given the substantial number of solicitations and requests that fall on them after winning. However, Kaplan (1987) reported a response rate of 24% when surveying lottery winners, whereas Imbens et al. (2001) reported a response rate of 42% when they surveyed lottery winners. Thus, there appears to be considerable variability in response rates when surveying this kind of sample.

To further test the assumption that individuals who responded did not significantly differ from those who declined to participate, and following the suggestion provided by Dooley & Lindner (2003) concerning how to handle nonresponse error, we examined the mean differences on all items of the questionnaire by the 155 respondents of the first round in contrast with the 30 individuals who responded to the second questionnaire. Dooley and Lindner argued that second-round respondents would be more similar in their characteristics to the nonrespondents than would first-round respondents; therefore, by comparing them with the first round respondents, we could speak of possible similarities or differences between the general nonrespondents and respondents.

Out of all 56 possible tests (*t* tests and chi-squares), which included all of the study's variables (including indices to be described later) as well as age, gender, education, occupation, tenure, and amount won, only one item showed a statistically significant difference between the two groups ("How satisfied are you with your current job?"). The early respondents were more satisfied (4.11) than were the late respondents, (3.45), $t(183) = 2.23$, $p < .05$. However, because of the large number of tests computed, this difference could be a chance result.

In addition, 49 respondents provided their names and addresses on return

envelopes, so we were able to match them with the information we obtained from the Ohio State Lottery Commission. We first compared the group of respondents who provided their names and addresses with those who did not provide their names and address and found they did not differ in terms of the amount they won in the lottery, $t(183) = -.176, p > .1$. We then compared this group of respondents with the rest of the winners (including both nonrespondents and those who responded but did not provide their names or addresses) for the variables of gender and amount of the lottery prizes. Again, we found there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups in terms of gender, $t(1,161) = .094, p > .1$, or the amount won, $t(1,161) = 1.29, p > .1$. These results provided additional evidence that the respondent sample was representative of the lottery winners.

After removing from the sample 16 respondents who were retired prior to winning the lottery, and listwise deletion of cases with missing information, the final sample consisted of 117 individuals, 37% women and 63% men. Their mean age at the time of winning the lottery was 43 years, with an average of 14 years of education. The mean number of dependents was two. With regard to occupational category, 17% were managers, 26% were professionals, 26% were engaged in other types of white-collar occupations such as sales and clerical workers, and 31% were blue-collar workers.

The average lottery winning was \$3.63 million in terms of 1999 dollars after adjusting for inflation using the Consumer Price Index (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2002) and winnings ranged from \$23,000 to \$31.8 million.

Measures

Dependent variable. Respondents were asked to answer a question concerning what they did after winning the lottery with regard to their work or job and were given various response options. The first option was “I stopped working altogether.” Six other options offered various types of work activities and arrangements such as part- or full-time employment with the same or another organization as well as starting one’s own business.

Work centrality. We combined two scales to construct the work centrality index. The first scale was adapted from the Meaning of Work study (MOW—International Research Team, 1987) and was a Likert-type scale in which each respondent indicated the general importance of work in one’s life ranging from *low* (1) to *high* (7). This was the standard item used by researchers in the Meaning of Work project.

The second scale was adapted from the Work Involvement Questionnaire (Kanungo, 1982), for which respondents specified their agreement ranging from *strongly agree* (5) to *strongly disagree* (1) to the following six items:

1. The most important things that happen in life involve work;
2. Work is something people should get involved in most of the time;
3. Work should be only a small part of one's life (reverse scored);
4. Work should be considered central to life;
5. In my view, an individual's personal life goals should be work-oriented;
and
6. Life is worth living only when people get absorbed in work.

One important question had to do with the relative stability of this work centrality construct over time, given that the respondents were measured shortly after they had won the lottery as well as a considerable time after their winning, in which the measurement period in some cases was 12 years. We obviously were unable to measure the work centrality of respondents before winning the lottery, but other research supports the view that this construct is relatively stable across time. Mannheim (1993) reported that in her various studies, no significant changes in the work centrality of Israeli men and women occurred between 1971 and 1983. A more recent study assessing the stability of the meaning of work concept among Israeli workers found that the measure was relatively stable over a 12-year time period (Harpaz & Fu, 2002).

Amount won. As noted previously, respondents indicated the total amount they won (before taxes) in the lottery. We adjusted the variable for inflation by using the Consumer Price Index (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2002) because the awards spanned the years between 1985 and 1999.

Control variables. Respondents also indicated their gender (male = 1, female = 0), age (adjusted for what their age was when winning the lottery), number of dependents, years of education, and the job they held when they won the lottery. Jobs were coded by occupational category: blue-collar, professional, managerial, and other white-collar occupations. Blue-collar occupation was used as the comparison group and omitted from the regression analyses.

We also measured respondents' overall satisfaction with their current job (if they continued working after winning the lottery). The item used was "How satisfied are you with your current work/job?" with the measurement scale ranging from *very dissatisfied* to *very satisfied*. A similar item was used to assess satisfaction with the respondents' past job (if they had stopped working after winning the lottery) using the same 5-option scale.

Data Analysis

To test the hypotheses in which the dependent variable of "quit or continue working" was measured as a dichotomous variable, we applied a binomial logistic regression model. A hierarchical multiple regression procedure was used to

estimate the model. First, for each individual we included gender, age, years of education, number of dependents, dummy-coded variables for occupations (with blue-collar jobs as the omitted occupation), and job satisfaction as control variables. We also included a year variable to control for any specific effect associated with the year in which the individual had won the lottery. The amount of the winning prize was then entered into the model, followed by the work centrality variable, and subsequently by the interaction between these two variables. To determine the hypothesized interaction, we first entered the amount won and the work centrality variable by removing the mean to reduce the effect of multicollinearity between the interaction term and the related main effects (Aiken & West, 1991; Smith & Sasaki, 1979).

Finally, we used one-tailed tests to determine the statistical significance of hypothesized relationships and two-tailed tests to determine the significance of control variables.

Results

With regard to the dependent variable of interest, whether individuals quit work or not, the percentage corresponding to the various response options were as follows:

1. "I stopped working for a while then started working again" (6%);
2. "I continued working part time at the same organization" (11%);
3. "I continued working part time at a different organization" (3%);
4. "I continued working full time at the same organization" (63%); "I continued working full time at a different organization" (3%); and
5. "I started my own business" (10%).

Respondents were classified as having discontinued work if they responded affirmatively to the first option. We considered individuals to be working if they were engaged in regular jobs for which wages were being paid, regular hours maintained, and so forth. The majority of lottery winners in our sample continued to work after winning ($n = 100$ or 85.5%); 17 individuals opted to quit working (14.5%).

The percentage of individuals in our sample who quit working was comparable to results in other studies. For example, Kaplan (1985) found that 11% of individuals who won the lottery quit work. Note that the percentages of different options do not add to 100% because several respondents indicated more than one option. However, respondents who chose the first option (i.e., stopped working altogether) did not check any of the other options.

The mean on the first work centrality scale on which respondents indicated the importance of work in their lives was 3.00 ($SD = .77$). An examination of the frequency and percentage scores for a larger U.S. sample on this same item showed that the 117 individuals in our present sample reported a reduced impor-

tance of work centrality. Only 65.8% of our sample responded with 5 or more on this item scale (indicating the relatively greater importance of work) compared with 81.2% of the larger U.S. sample of 1,000. However, this difference was somewhat difficult to interpret because the U.S. sample was surveyed in 1982—almost a 20 year difference. Data that closely matched our current sample of lottery winners from relatively large representative samples in other countries were also available for 1982. In Belgium, 65.6% responded with 5 or more on this item scale; in Germany the percentage was 64.1, in Israel 69.4, in Japan 74.4, and in the United Kingdom, 58% (MOW—International Research Team, 1987).

The six items from the second work centrality scale drawn from the Work Involvement Questionnaire demonstrated an internal consistency reliability estimate of .82. Principle-component factor analysis of these six items together with the 1-item scale described earlier revealed only one factor with an eigenvalue larger than 1, accounting for 50.45% of the variance. All items loaded highly on this factor, ranging from .55 to .82. Therefore we combined the standardized composite score of the 6-item scale with the standardized score of the 1-item scale to form the measure of work centrality. A one-way analysis of variance revealed no significant relationship between the year the individual won the lottery and the work centrality variable.

Table 1 depicts means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study's variables. These results indicated that only the amount of the lottery prize and job satisfaction demonstrated significant binary correlations with the outcome variable of quitting a job after winning the lottery ($r = .40, p < .01$ for amount won, and $r = -.19, p < .05$ for job satisfaction).

Table 2 presents the results from the hierarchical logistical regressions. As a block, the control variables included in the first step explained 14% of the variance for the variable of quit or continue working; the amount of lottery prize explained 15% of the additional variance; work centrality explained a 5% additional variance; and the interaction term explained 4% additional variance.

The last column of Table 2 lists the estimates of the full model, which accounted for 38% of the variance in quit or continue working among the sample of lottery winners. Among the control variables, job satisfaction demonstrated a statistically significant relationship with the quit or continue working variable: Individuals who experienced higher satisfaction with their job were less likely to quit after winning the lottery ($\beta = -.59, p < .05$). Additionally, age and education level were marginally significant. Individuals with higher levels of education were less likely to quit working ($\beta = -.27, p < .10$), whereas older individuals were more likely to stop working ($\beta = .08, p < .10$).

In accordance with our hypothesis, work centrality demonstrated a significant coefficient ($\beta = -.47, p < .05$), indicating that there was a significantly lower probability of quitting work when there were higher levels of work centrality. Similarly, as predicted, the amount of lottery winnings was also significantly

related to whether respondents continued to work ($\beta = .31, p < .001$), with higher amounts associated with a higher probability of quitting work. As predicted, the interaction between the amount of winnings and work centrality was significant ($\beta = -.06, p < .05$). The negative coefficient indicated that the amount of winnings moderated the relationship between work centrality and quitting work. In other words the negative relationship between work centrality and quitting work was stronger among large winners.

To depict the interaction graphically, we plotted slopes at three levels of amount of winnings: at the lowest (\$.02 million), the mean (\$3.63 million), and the highest (\$31.8 million) of the sample. Figure 1 shows that work centrality was more strongly and negatively related to quitting among individuals who won a large amount of money.

In addition to the binomial logistic regression analyses reported here, we also conducted multinomial logistic analyses, with a dependent multi-categorical variable—working status after winning the lottery—coded as 1 if the respondent stopped working altogether, coded as 2 if the respondent stopped working for a period of time and then started working again, coded as 3 if the respondent continued working part time either at the same organization or at a different organization. We used those respondents who continued working full time either at the same organization or at a different organization (including running their own business) as the reference group.

The results were largely consistent with the binomial logistic regression and showed a statistically significant difference between the first category (those who stopped working altogether) and the reference group. In particular, higher job satisfaction and higher work centrality decreased the likelihood of stopping working compared with the likelihood of working full time ($\beta = -.65, p < .05$; $\beta = -.50, p < .05$, respectively). A relatively higher amount won in the lottery increased the likelihood of stopping working compared with the likelihood of working full time ($\beta = .37, p < .001$). There was also a significant negative interaction between amount won and work centrality ($\beta = -.08, p < .05$), indicating that the positive relationship between the amount won and quitting decreased as the level of work centrality increased.

Discussion

The results of this study confirmed the main hypothesis that lottery winners would be less likely to stop working if work was important or central in their lives relative to those who viewed work as less central in their lives. Lottery winners were also more likely to quit working as a function of the amount of their winnings. The greater the award, the more likely they were to stop working. Our third hypothesis concerning an interaction between the amount won and work centrality was also confirmed. Our finding showed that the relationship between work centrality and the discontinuance of work was stronger among those who

won more, but no relationship existed for those who won less. However, the relationships observed, although significant, were relatively modest. It is clear that winning the lottery does not automatically result in individuals' stopping work.

Our findings indicated that the average amount won among those who chose to continue working was relatively high (\$2.59 million), suggesting a relatively high monetary threshold for discontinuing work, and even among these high winners, a sizable number still continued working. For instance, a 64-year old bus driver who won \$20 million dollars stated (in the open ended section of the questionnaire) that the "lottery is just a bonus that came my way, it has not or will not affect my work habits and goals in life."

These results confirm and develop the research based around the meaning and interpretation of work centrality. First, support was provided for the idea that work centrality is related to the decision to continue working among lottery winners, using real winners instead of the hypothetical winners. Second, the finding that the relationship was demonstrated while holding a number of other variables constant (e.g., age, gender, number of dependents, education level, and job satisfaction) provided a relatively stronger test of this relationship than in previous research. Most prior research has examined the single-order correlation between work centrality and the decision to quit after winning the lottery, without controlling for other variables.

There were a number of limitations to our study. The most obvious was whether the sample was representative of a larger population. Although we provided some support for the notion that the sample responding was similar to the larger sample of lottery winners, there was still the possibility that those responding to our survey were different in some ways from a larger population. For example, perhaps those who responded were more conscientious, or perhaps won less, than those who did not respond.

Also, there is a question of whether lottery winners (and those who play the lottery) are different from the general population. They may have different motives from those in the larger population. Perhaps they are more economically needy, find the lottery and other types of gambling more interesting, or simply enjoy taking risks. Although Kaplan (1987) challenged the myth that lottery ticket purchasers are greatly different from those who do not buy tickets, we did not have sufficient data to examine this proposition, and thus the question of potential sampling bias remains.

Another limitation of the present study involved the conditional aspect of the methodology. Individuals responded to our survey and scales after they had won the lottery. Thus, it was possible that individuals changed their perceptions of work centrality and other variables as a result of winning the lottery or as a function of the amount they won. We had no pre-winning assessment that we could use to examine this issue. Nor did we have a control group of individuals who bought lottery tickets but did not win. One indirect manner to examine this issue is to review the relationship between the amount won and work centrality. If indi-

viduals changed their attitudes toward work as a result of winning the lottery, we would also expect these attitudes to be related to the amount of winning. However, the relationship between amount won and work centrality within this sample was not significant, indicating little or no relationship between these two variables. Overall, however, this study was subject to many of the methodological problems that are well known and associated with such a post-test only design (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

Our results suggest that individuals who have won the lottery do not automatically quit working and that the centrality and importance of work in their lives plays an important role in the decision to continue to work. It is also important to note that, in the present study, although individuals may have continued to work, they also may have modified the type and conditions of their work experiences (e.g., by starting another business or by dropping to part-time work). Future researchers might focus on the characteristics of work that predict the alternative work arrangements chosen by lottery winners. In addition, because of the small sample involved in the present study, future researchers should replicate these findings in a larger and perhaps more representative sample.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Brickman, P., Coates, D., & Janoff-Bulman, R. (1978). Lottery winners and accidents victims: Is happiness relative? *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *36*, 917–927.
- Brief, A., & Nord, W. (1990). Work and meaning: Definitions and interpretations. In A. Brief & W. Nord (Eds.), *The meaning of occupational work*. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. (2002). CPI—All Urban Consumers (Old Series) [on line]: <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/cpi.toc.htm>
- Dooley, L. M., & Lindner, J. R. (2003). The handling of nonresponse error. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *14*, 99–111.
- England, G. W., & Misumi, J. (1986). Work centrality in Japan and the United States. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, *17*, 399–416.
- Gardner, J., & Oswald, A. (2001). *Does money buy happiness? A longitudinal study using data on windfalls*. Unpublished manuscript [on line]. Available: <http://www.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/Economics/oswald/marchwindfallsGO.pdf>
- Harding, S. H., & Hiksloops, F. J. (1995). New work values: In theory and in practice. *International Social Science Journal*, *47*, 441–455.
- Harpaz, I. (1989). Non-financial employment commitment: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *62*, 147–150.
- Harpaz, I. (1990). *The meaning of work in Israel: Its nature and consequences*. New York: Praeger.
- Harpaz, I. (1999). The transformation of work values in Israel: Stability and change over time. *Monthly Labor Review*, *122*, 46–50.
- Harpaz, I., & Fu, X. (1997). Work centrality in Germany, Israel, Japan, and the United States. *Cross-Cultural Research*, *31*, 171–200.
- Hirschfeld, R. R., & Field, H. S. (2000). Work centrality and work alienation: Distinct aspects of a general commitment to work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *21*,

- 789–800.
- Hom, P. W., Caranikas-Walker, F., Prussia, G. E., & Griffeth, R. W. (1992). A meta-analytical structural equations analysis of a model of employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 890–909.
- Imbens, G. W., Rubin, D. B., & Sacerdote, B. I. (2001). Estimating the effect of unearned income on labor earnings, savings, and consumption: Evidence from a survey of lottery players. *American Economic Review, 91*, 778–794.
- Isaksson, K., & Gunn, J. (2000). Adaption to continued work and early retirement following downsizing: Long-term effects and gender differences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*, 241–257.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). *Work alienation: An integration approach*. New York: Praeger.
- Kaplan, H. R. (1978). *Lottery winners: How they won and how winning changed their lives*. Harper & Row.
- Kaplan, H. R. (1985). Lottery winners and work commitment: A behavioral test of the American work ethic. *Journal of the Institute for Socioeconomic Studies, 10*, 82–94.
- Kaplan, H. R., (1987). Lottery winners: The myth and reality. *Journal of Gambling Behavior, 3*, 168–178.
- Kaplan, H. R. (1988). Gambling among lottery winners: Before and after the big score. *Journal of Gambling Behavior, 4*, 171–182.
- Loscocco, K. A. (1989). The instrumentally oriented factory worker: Myth or reality? *Work and Occupations, 16*, 3–25.
- Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., McDaniel, L. S., & Hill, J. W. (1999). The unfolding model of voluntary turnover: A replication and extension. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*, 450–462.
- Mannheim, B. (1993). Gender and the effects of demographics status and work values on work centrality. *Work and Occupations, 20*, 3–22.
- Mannheim, B., Baruch, Y., & Tal, J. (1997). Alternative models for antecedents and outcomes of work centrality and job satisfaction of hi-tech personnel. *Human Relations, 50*, 1537–1562.
- Mannheim, B., & Rein, J. (1981). Work centrality and different age groups and the wish to discontinue work. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 13*, 221–232.
- McClelland, D. C. (1967). Money as a motivator: Some research insights. *The McKinsey Quarterly, 10*–21.
- MOW—International Research Team (1987). *The meaning of working*. London: Academic Press.
- Pedhazur, E. J., & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). *Measurement, design, and analysis: An integrated approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pinder, C. C. (1998). *Work motivation in organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rabinowitz, S., & Hall, D. T. (1977). Organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin, 8*, 265–288.
- Ros, M., Schwartz, S. H., & Surkiss, S. (1999). Basic individual values, work values, and the meaning of work. (1999). *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 48*, 49–71.
- Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Wilpert, B. (1991). Are work meanings changing? *European Work and Organizational Psychology, 1*, 91–109.
- Smith, K. W., & Sasaki, M. S. (1979). Decreasing multicollinearity: A method for models with multiplicative functions. *Sociological Methods and Research, 8*, 35–56.
- Sverko, B., & Vizek-Vidovic, V. (1995). Studies of the meaning of work: Approaches, models, and some of the findings. In D. E. Super & B. Sverko (Eds). *Life roles, values, and careers: International findings of the work importance study*. San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass.

Tang, T. L. (1992). The meaning of money revisited. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 197–202.

Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytical findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 259–293.

Vecchio, R. P. (1980). The function and meaning of work and the job: Morse and Weiss (1955) revisited. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23, 361–367.

Warr, P. N. (1982). A national study of non-financial employment commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 55, 297–312.

Original manuscript received June 6, 2003

Final revision accepted November 22, 2003