WORK ATTITUDE DIFFERENCES AMONG SUBGROUPS OF PART-TIME WORKERS: TESTING COMPETING THEORIES

by

MARY ALICE CROWE-TAYLOR

(Under the Direction of Garnett S. Stokes)

ABSTRACT

Survey data were collected from 445 part-time transportation workers to test three sets of competing hypotheses about primary and secondary part-time workers that were developed from Partial Inclusion theory (Allport, 1933), Investment Model theory (Farrell & Rusbult, 1981), and the Part-time Work Arrangements perspective (Feldman, 1990). The Investment Model constructs explaining job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intent received the most support. However, the part-time work arrangements perspective also received some support as there were significant differences in organizational commitment and turnover intentions between primary and secondary part-time workers. The application of Partial Inclusion theory to the part-time worker subgroup context was not supported.

INDEX WORDS: Part-time Employment, Investment Model theory, Partial Inclusion theory, Part-time Work Arrangements, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Turnover Intent, Transportation Industry

WORK ATTITUDE DIFFERENCES AMONG SUBGROUPS OF PART-TIME WORKERS: TESTING COMPETING THEORIES

by

MARY ALICE CROWE-TAYLOR

M.S., The University of Tennessee, 1990

M.S., The University of Georgia, 1999

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2003

WORK ATTITUDE DIFFERENCES AMONG SUBGROUPS OF PART-TIME WORKERS: TESTING COMPETING THEORIES

by

MARY ALICE CROWE-TAYLOR

Major Professor: Garnett S. Stokes

Committee: Karl Kuhnert
Charles Lance
Robert Mahan

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2003

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my husband, William J. Taylor, II and my daughter, Adelaide Brenna Taylor. It could not have been completed without your constant love and support. Thank you. You mean everything to me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to acknowledge Garnett S. Stokes for her constant, encouraging guidance and wisdom during my academic career at the University of Georgia. I will be forever indebted to her. In addition, I would like to acknowledge the huge investment of time and energy that she made to ensure that the utilization of this data was possible.

There are several other people who were a part of the Applied Psychology Department at UGA who I would like to thank for their key assistance with the data. They are Lisa Cooper, Christina Sarabia, Kathryn Thompson-Feith, Ragin Hause, Shana Simon, Jailza Cader, Dirk Baxter, Janet Hecht, Carrie Noble, Nancy Yanchus, Marcus Butts, and Tracy Lambert.

I would also like to acknowledge the support and assistance of Mr. Paul Siemion and Ms. Sylvia Cotton. Your help was essential.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Importance of Studying the Work Attitudes of Part-time Workers

One reason why research on the work attitudes of part-time (PT) workers is important and needed is because PT workers continue to be a growing segment of the workforce. Management of PT workers continues to be an ever larger part of administrators' jobs. In 1957, part-time workers accounted for only 12.1% of the workforce (Tilly, 1991), but according to 1999 figures, they now account for 24.1% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). At first glance, this appears to be indicative of a specific trend in the U.S. economy to move away from labor intensive, expensive manufacturing to a more service based economy, but the growth of PT workers is across more than just the service industry. Tilly (1996) showed that there has been large growth in part-time employment in the construction industry (from 8.6% in 1969 to 11.9% in 1993) and the trade industry (from 26.3% in 1969 to 30.3% in 1993), as well as smaller growth across all other industries, indicating a general move towards the greater use of PT workers.

In addition, the trend towards the greater use of PT workers is occurring in multiple countries, not just in the United States. Barling and Gallagher (1996) document that this trend towards the increased use of PT workers extends up into Canada, across Europe and in the developed economies of Asia. In countries where PT employment data is available (Australia, Canada, Japan, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom and the United States), between 18 and 25% of the workforce was employed PT as of 1996. In addition,

the growth rate of PT employment is clearly greater than the comparable growth rate of permanent full-time (FT) jobs across the globe.

Examining these trends in the growth of part-time employment leads one to ask, "Why is this growth occurring?" Sightler and Adams (1999) and others point out that since the nineteen-seventies there has been a shift in the use of PT workers that might account for this growth. They claim that in the years prior seventies, PT jobs were created to meet the needs of the workforce (i.e. working mothers, students), however, since then PT jobs have been created to meet the cost containment needs of businesses. That is, rising benefits costs, the wage differential between PT workers and FT workers, and the changing economic needs of employers, in part, appear to be driving this trend (Tilly, 1996). As early as 1971, Gannon and Northern noted that businesses found the lower wages and the lack of fringe benefits of PT workers very enticing. The firms were also able to gain flexibility in work scheduling as PT workers typically work irregular hours that vary week by week. Also, the businesses benefited by being able to reduce payroll as needed, by simply having PT employees work fewer hours. From the employee's point of view, accepting a PT position may help them balance work/family issues, and it may keep skilled and valuable employees in the workforce longer (Olmstead & Smith, 1994). There also appears to be a rise in involuntary PT workers (those who prefer to work FT), mirroring the general rise in the use of PT workers (Flood, Gannon, & Paauwe, 1995). As Tilly indicated, additional research on PT workers is needed in order for the business world to understand their work needs better and thus avoid problems with equity concerns and decreased productivity. An obvious example of PT workers' frustrations is the Teamsters Union's large strikes at Trucking Manage ment in 1994 and at United Parcel Service (UPS) in 1999.

From the macro perspective of industrial organizational psychology, the relevance of completing research on PT workers' work attitudes is that it enables scientist-practitioners to understand what drives these attitudes, which is a primary aim, since PT employees' work attitudes are directly related to their on-the-job behaviors. Therefore, this understanding is necessary to develop effective training and employee development practices. The development of theory regarding PT workers' work attitudes has been advancing with the research performed; however, the amount of research that has been performed is small. This study will contribute to this theory development by providing theory-driven, empirical testing of several predictors of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intent for two specific subgroups of PT workers. This testing will involve primary PT workers (i.e. the job is their primary job) and secondary PT workers (i.e. the job is a second priority after another job or school). In this way, the present study will further the development of theory by providing clarification as to which theoretical perspective that has developed regarding PT workers' work attitudes is empirically supported.

The concept of Partial Inclusion, as discussed by Katz and Kahn (1978), has been cited as explaining the work attitudes of subgroups of PT workers, including primary and secondary PT workers. Feldman (1990) has provided a viewpoint that says that differing PT work arrangements will result in differing PT workers' work attitudes. That is, primary and secondary PT workers should have differing work attitudes. Investment Model theory (Rusbult, Farrell, Rogers, & Mainous, 1988) has been utilized as well to explain PT worker's work attitudes (Sinclair, Martin, & Mitchell, 1999). The present study will provide additional tests of these perspectives. All of the pertinent research for the present study will be discussed in detail in the following review of the literature.

To provide the proper frame of reference for highlighting the importance of the present study, it is necessary to briefly review the previous research on PT workers, which has primarily followed along three paths, the latest of which is the most pertinent to the present research. Over the last four decades, a significant percentage of the literature on PT workers has examined the demographics of the PT worker population. The first path that has been followed, then, is "who" PT workers are. Secondly, the literature has focused on making comparisons between PT and FT workers' work attitudes to see if they differ. The line of reasoning for this particular research stream was to see whether the theories explaining FT workers' work attitudes could explain PT workers' work attitudes just as well. Thirdly, and most recently, the research has been examining different types of PT work arrangements (e.g. temporary versus permanent work, main job versus second job) and whether PT workers' work attitudes differ in these different PT worker subgroups.

Describing the PT Worker Population

Much descriptive research has been completed that examines the population of PT workers, and several descriptive, biographical profiles of PT workers have emerged (Gannon & Northern, 1971; Feldman & Doerpinghaus, 1992; Nardone, 1995; Barling & Gallagher, 1996). Gannon and Northern did a study to examine the demographic characteristics of PT workers and how these characteristics related to the PT workers' tenure. They found that the demographics of years of education, marital status, number of children, gender, and current attendance or nonattendance of school did not differentiate between short-term (less than two years of tenure) and long-term (greater than two years of tenure) PT workers. However, age and number of hours worked did differentiate the PT workers' tenure. PT workers who had longer tenure were older and worked 36 hours on average (as opposed to 28.7 hours for short-term PT workers). Gannon

and Northern pointed out that this finding is typical of FT workers as well. Newbolt (1999), in an examination of different tenure groups of PT workers, found that work attitudes declined (became more negative) as tenure increased.

Barling and Gallagher (1996) reported that PT workers are very often married females (25-54 years of age); a large percentage of young people (16-24 years of age); or older men (55 or more years of age). Nardone (1995) specifically detailed the demographic profiles of voluntary and involuntary PT workers. Voluntary PT workers were those who said that they did not want or were unavailable for full-time work or who said that a short number of hours was considered full-time for the job that they worked. They were typically women (age 25 to 54), young people (age 16 to 24), or older people (age 60 or older). Involuntary PT workers share somewhat the same demographics with the exception of gender and those over 60. Men are a more significant proportion of the involuntary part-time workforce and those over 60 are a less significant proportion. The involuntary PT workforce also has a higher percentage of those who are self-employed.

There are several reasons why people are PT workers, and the reasons often given are: supplementing another income; as a transitional stage into or out of FT work; to balance different social roles (i.e. worker plus the role of parent or elder caregiver or student); for flexibility for leisure activities; or due to an inability to find FT work (i.e. involuntary PT workers; Barling & Gallagher, 1996). Nardone (1995) reported that the reason given for working PT for two-thirds of the women surveyed was raising children. For three-fourths of the young people surveyed, the reason given for PT work was school enrollment. For the group of older people surveyed, staying active and generating extra income were the reasons most often given for PT work.

Feldman and Doerpinghaus (1992) also examined the population of the PT workforce and found that the category of women with children had the most positive work attitudes. This category also more often reported having higher wages and permanent (as opposed to temporary) PT jobs. Only 29% of the PT workers who were also students were satisfactorily employed in permanent PT positions, as opposed to the 61% of the married women with children. Feldman and Doerpinghaus also reported that permanent PT workers in their study were paid significantly more, had greater job satisfaction and work motivation, and were more likely to remain in their jobs. They found the same results for PT workers that reported being in PT jobs consistent with their previous experience and training.

Comparing FT and PT Workers' Work Attitudes

As noted earlier, other than examining who the PT worker is, PT worker researchers have tried to determine whether differences exist between FT and PT workers in terms of their work attitudes and behaviors. This work has been done to ascertain whether theories developed to explain FT workers' work attitudes also explain PT workers' work attitudes.

This approach of comparing FT and PT workers was taken in the earliest PT worker literature (Logan, O'Reilly & Roberts, 1973; Miller & Terborg, 1979). As early as 1971, there were calls for research on PT workers (Gannon & Northern, 1971). However, prior to 1982, there was only limited empirical research on PT workers, which resulted in Rotchford and Roberts' 1982 article titled "Part-time Workers as Missing Persons in Organizational Behavior Research." Their article spurred much research comparing PT workers with FT workers as well as additional research describing the PT worker population. As Thorsteinson (2003) noted, much of this early research on PT workers was somewhat atheoretical, thus impeding the progress of

theory development in this area. The body of work comparing PT and FT workers will be reviewed in terms of the theories that were suggested and/or tested.

Comparing FT and PT Workers: Partial Inclusion Theory

The concept of partial inclusion was first introduced by Allport (1933) to explain the segmental involvement of people in social groups. Katz and Kahn (1978) enlarged upon the concept by explaining that people belong to many organizations or social systems and the engagement of their full personalities is rarely required in any given organization to which they belong. Rather, each organizational role that the person plays requires certain behaviors that are just a "psychological slice" of him/her. Katz and Kahn detailed how partial inclusion can result in 'boundary problems' for s ocial organizations. Boundary problems result when a given person is segmented across several organizations, and sometimes, instead of behaving like a member of a particular organization or social system that he/she is in, he/she may act in a way that is a compromise of his/her many segmented commitments. Unless the demands of the current organization or social system are made salient to the individual, this behavioral compromise can occur. The boundary conditions, which insure that the behaviors performed within a given system are appropriate for that system, are largely psychological. So, for the organization to avoid boundary problems (which threaten the very existence of the organization) it must utilize mechanisms to make salient its boundary conditions to the individual. Researchers have suggested that PT workers experience more partial inclusion due to more segmentation than FT workers (Miller & Terborg, 1979). Therefore, they may experience more boundary problems than FT workers. What becomes key for the work organization when dealing with PT workers is that the organization must utilize mechanisms to insure the individual's allegiance (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Without the use of these mechanisms that ensure the individuals behave in the

ways that the system requires, the system will become extinct. That is, the organization will cease to function.

Miller and Terborg (1979) suggested that the theory of partial inclusion (Katz & Kahn, 1978) be used to investigate FT versus PT worker differences in work attitudes. They speculated that PT workers are less included in the work organization's social system because they are more included in social systems outside of the work environment. Therefore, PT workers might be more affected by changes in their outside social systems than by changes in their work environments. Additionally, they suggested that the multiple roles that PT workers have outside of work may allow them only so much tolerance of the organizational demands placed on them. Therefore, they may have a different (lower) tolerance level than FT workers. They also indicated that the number of non-work roles and the relative importance of these roles might indicate the degree of "inclusion in" and "attachment to" the work role that the PT worker has. Miller and Terborg found that PT employees had lower satisfaction with work, benefits and the job overall than FT employees. They did not find any significant differences on satisfaction with pay, advancement or supervision. However, the job content of the PT positions was inferior to the FT positions, and there were no benefits offered with these positions. So, the authors acknowledged that there were fundamental differences that could account for the differences found between PT and FT workers on their satisfaction with the job, the benefits and the work overall.

Logan et al. (1973) suggested that because of their lesser inclusion and involvement with the actual job itself, PT workers respond more to the social context of the job (i.e. relationships with supervisors and coworkers), and that their work attitudes would reflect this stronger focus on the extrinsic job aspects. FT workers would be more focused on the intrinsic job aspects like

the nature of the work itself, opportunities for promotion, and pay. This researcher suggests that PT workers are more focused on the context of the job because they are trying to be aware of the indicators of the required behaviors for the particular social system of the workplace. This awareness of context would help them maintain the proper boundaries, and they could avoid boundary problems that might otherwise occur due to their segmentation.

Partial inclusion framework: PT workers' job satisfaction. What remains unclear from the research is how these boundary problems relate to PT workers' job satisfaction and other work attitudes. A greater focus on the extrinsic job aspects would change the nature of their job satisfaction from FT workers. Also, if the organization utilizes mechanisms to make the necessary behaviors of the organizational role salient for the PT worker, then the PT worker doesn't have to expend a lot of mental energy thinking about what the required behaviors are for their particular role in the organization. This ease of shifting into the organizational role from a different role required by another social system in which the PT worker is a part could increase his/her satisfaction with and commitment to the work organization.

There is research that provides support for PT workers' partial inclusion resulting in a greater focus on their job context, and the job context does provide clues of the required organizational behaviors. Logan et al. (1973) were able to show that although FT workers looked at their job satisfaction along several different facets, PT workers solely looked at co-worker satisfaction as defining their job satisfaction. Also unlike FT workers, PT workers excluded promotional opportunities as part of their job satisfaction. In their research, the demographics of the two groups (PT and FT) were similar. Miller and Terborg (1979) suggested that PT workers may care less about promotional opportunities and more about flexibility in work scheduling than FT workers, which would also reflect their focus on extrinsic aspects of the job.

Eberhardt and Shani (1984), in suggesting the partial inclusion concept to explain their findings of greater job satisfaction for PT workers, suggested that PT workers might have less negative information about the organization than FT workers, since they spend less time in the organization. This lack of information about the organization's problems and politics would result in less negative attitudes. Because PT workers are not present in the workplace as much as FT workers, perhaps it takes them longer to witness actions and behaviors that could result in negative work attitudes. Some other studies have also found that PT workers are more satisfied than FT workers (Peters, Jackofsky, & Salter, 1981; Barker, 1993; Sinclair et al., 1999).

Peters et al. (1981) restated that PT workers (because they may have greater sensitivities to their role requirements in their dominant non-job social systems) may have a different 'philosophy of work' than FT workers, as Rotchford and Roberts (1978) suggested. As researchers following the partial inclusion view, Peters et al. stated that being less included in the organization results in less typical behavioral responses to variables like job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In investigating whether PT workers' turnover could be predicted as well as FT workers' turnover using Mobley's (1977) variables, Peters et al. found that PT workers' turnover was not predicted by Mobley's variables including job satisfaction, intention to quit, thoughts of quitting, expectations of finding alternative jobs, and job search. Their FT worker sample's turnover was significantly predicted by thoughts of quitting and job satisfaction, and the other three variables approached significance as predictors of turnover (job search, $p<0.06$; expectations of finding alternative jobs, $p<0.07$; intention to quit, $p<0.10$). Incidentally, the PT workers did report slightly higher job satisfaction than the FT workers. Peters et al. mentioned that partial inclusion could be a good explanation for these turnover findings showing that FT workers and PT workers do not respond to variables such as job satisfaction,

organizational commitment and job involvement in the same manner. Another study that highlighted this different response was conducted by Barker (1993), which found that women who reported working PT had greater happiness with work and with their home life than the FT working women in the sample, as well as equal job satisfaction as the FT working women. The PT working women also reported greater exclusion from organizational, interpersonal and skill enhancement opportunities, which possibly provides evidence that PT workers don't respond in the same way as FT workers to such variables that would normally predict less job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The PT working women also felt that they had a greater risk of layoff than the FT workers, and they reported equal amounts of role conflict and role overload as the FT working women.

Partial inclusion theory does lead one to conclude that differences in the job satisfaction of FT and PT workers can be expected, reflecting their differences in inclusion. However, Thorsteinson (2003) notes that there are studies that have found no differences in job satisfaction between FT and PT workers (Krausz, Sagie & Biderman, 2000; Levanoni & Sales, 1990; Logan et al., O'Reilly, & Roberts, 1973; Steffy & Jones, 1999).

Partial inclusion framework: PT workers' organizational commitment. Job involvement is defined as identifying with the job itself (Blau, 1985), and organizational commitment is the individual's psychological identification with the organization and its goals (Blau & Boal, 1987). It is not difficult to see that PT workers' job involvement would be lower than their organizational commitment if they are more focused on the extrinsic aspects (i.e. workplace friendships and the organization's values) than the job itself, due to their partial inclusion. In addition, they spend less time actually doing the tasks of the job than FT workers, which could also explain their lesser job involvement than FT workers. Pretty much all the empirical research

has shown that job involvement is typically lower for PT employees than FT employees. Thorsteinson (2003) found significantly less job involvement for PT workers than FT workers in his meta-analysis, but not significantly less organizational commitment.

The small amount of research that has compared the organizational commitment of FT and PT workers is ambiguous at best, with an equal number of studies reporting greater organizational commitment from FT workers (Lee & Johnson, 1991; Martin & Hafer, 1995) and no differences on organizational commitment between FT and PT workers (McGinnis & Morrow, 1990; Shockey & Mueller, 1994).

Partial inclusion framework: PT workers' turnover. Miller and Terborg (1979) speculated that, due to their segmentation, PT workers might be influenced primarily by events external to the organization whereas FT employees may feel more influence of inter-organizational events. Therefore, PT workers' turnover may be driven by events that are external to the work organization.

Martin and Hafer (1995) found different patterns predicting turnover intentions for FT and PT workers using the Blau & Boal (1987) model. PT workers with high organizational commitment and low job involvement (i.e. corporate citizens) had the lowest turnover intentions, a finding which the model didn't predict. They suggest that increasing the organizational commitment of PT employees with low job involvement may reduce their turnover. Partial inclusion theory would say that the organizational commitment of PT employees may be increased by greater identification with the organization and its goals, and through greater satisfaction with coworkers and supervisors.

Regarding the turnover of PT workers, Newbolt and Pierce (1999) found that PT workers had a much stronger, negative relationship between their work attitudes and their turnover than

FT workers did. This finding provides additional support for researchers' suggestion that PT workers' work outcomes like turnover may not be related to their work attitudes, like job satisfaction, in the same manner that FT workers' outcomes are. Martin and Hafer (1995) and Newbolt and Pierce (1999) suggest that there is a more direct relationship between attitudes and turnover for PT workers than there is for FT workers.

A few other studies have also examined PT versus FT workers' withdrawal intentions and behaviors (i.e. turnover, absenteeism) and have found equivocal results (Martin & Hafer, 1995; Bennett, Carson, Carson, & Blum, 1994; Smulders, 1993).

Partial inclusion framework: PT workers' job involvement. Lastly, as previously noted, in examining the work attitude of job involvement, Thorsteinson's (2003) meta-analysis found a small to moderate effect on job involvement (with greater job involvement for FT workers). He stated that his findings lent support to the theory of partial inclusion as it best explains and predicts the levels of job involvement found in research on FT workers versus PT workers. It predicts greater job involvement for FT workers than PT workers, and several studies, in fact, have shown that FT workers typically have greater job involvement than PT workers (Martin & Hafer, 1995; Wetzel, Soloshy & Gallagher, 1990). Thorsteinson suggested that PT workers are less involved with their jobs as though their non-work roles require more involvement. Or, alternatively, it may be that they are less involved in their jobs because they are more tuned in to the extrinsic of their jobs, and the social aspects of the organization.

Newbolt (1999) said that in order to justify attributing attitudinal differences between PT and FT workers to partial inclusion theory, there must be FT/PT differences in attitude structure. Newbolt did not find these differences. Newbolt tested and found little support for the suggestion that PT and FT workers may have measurably distinct maps of the work experience, resulting

from PT workers' partial inclusion in the work organization. "No evidence that work-related attitudes were more highly correlated for FT employees and less highly correlated for PT employees was found." p. 38. In addition, he found no evidence of subgroup differences. That is, the PT workers who were not employed anywhere else were not different in terms of their work attitude correlations or attitude structures from the PT workers with additional employment elsewhere. This finding provides initial empirical evidence that outside employment does not differentiate PT worker subgroups. Although he did not test it, Newbolt suggested that partial inclusion might be better operationalized by race and gender subgroupings as women and ethnic minorities may experience less inclusion (since they are often not the majority group) in their organization.

Comparing FT and PT Workers: Frame of Reference Theory

There is another theoretical perspective about differences between FT and PT workers that is based on equity theory. Equity theory says that an individual's 'comparison other' is someone in a comparable situation. Applied to PT workers, frame of reference theory suggests that PT workers' work attitudes are dependent on which they select as their comparison group (either other PT workers or FT workers). A lot of PT worker researchers assumed that PT workers would use FT workers in the same jobs at their workplace as their referents or 'comparison others.' In other words, the assumption was that all employees in the job classification, either FT or PT, would be used in common by both PT and FT workers as the 'referent' or 'comparison other.' This line of theorizing continued by saying that if this assumption was correct (that PT workers use FT workers as their frame of reference) then PT workers might experience dissatisfaction with their jobs, as their input/output ratios would be different (as they typically receive less pay and fewer benefits than FT workers). If PT workers

only used other PT workers' as their frame of reference, then their ratios would be the same, and no inequities would be perceived that were based solely on work status. Miller and Terborg (1979) pointed out that although they did not collect data on the frame of reference used, their results were consistent with the widely held assumption that FT and PT workers use a common frame of reference (i.e., all employees in that job classification either FT or PT) rather than different frames of reference. They found that FT workers had greater job satisfaction than PT workers, after controlling for demographic differences of gender and tenure, but they couldn't rule out job conditions as a confounding variable in their study.

In contrast, Logan et al. (1973) thought that the use of different referents (PT workers using other PT workers as referents; FT workers using other FT workers as referents) might explain their finding of a lack of difference on job satisfaction between FT and PT workers, however they didn't have the data to support this possibility. Feldman & Doerpinghaus (1992) did however, and found that 82% of PT workers in their sample used other PT workers, rather than FT workers, as their "comparison other." This finding supported Feldman's (1990) suggestion that PT workers generally use other PT workers as their referent others. For the small percentage of PT workers who reported using FT workers as their referents, Feldman and Doerpinghaus found that this group tended to have longer tenure and worked more hours per week. In their exploratory hierarchical multiple regression analysis, Feldman and Doerpinghaus did not find any additional variance in general satisfaction, work motivation, or intent to remain in the job explained by the referent used. In contrast, Eberhardt and Moser (1995) found that 46.4% of their sample of permanent PT workers used FT workers as their frame of reference, while only 16.2% of their sample of temporary PT workers used FT workers as their frame of reference.

Thorsteinson's (2003) meta-analysis results did not suggest that PT workers use FT workers as their comparison others. Although he did not directly test for referent used, he found a relative lack of differences between PT and FT employees on job attitudes, including job satisfaction, suggesting that FT workers used FT workers and PT workers use PT workers as referents.

Comparing FT and PT Workers: Discrepancy Theory Models

Some researchers have theorized that it is not the number of hours that the worker is on the job that makes a difference in work attitudes. Rather, it is the discrepancy or congruency between the number of hours worked and the number of hours that the worker desires to work that influences work attitudes such as satisfaction and commitment (McGinnis & Morrow, 1990; Holtom, Lee, & Tidd, 2002). McGinnis and Morrow suggested that using Lawler's (1973) discrepancy model of job attitudes, one could hypothesize that workers who are employed for the number of hours that they prefer (i.e. work status congruency) may have more satisfaction and commitment than employees that work more or less than they would like. Keil, Armstrong-Stassen, Horsburgh, and Cameron's (2000) research found that both FT and PT workers' job attitudes were significantly related to discrepancies between preferred and scheduled work hours. Those who had work status congruency (they preferred working the number of hours that they were working) reported having greater satisfaction with the financial rewards of the job. Those who reported work status incongruence had greater satisfaction with the work itself. There was no significant difference found between the two groups for overall satisfaction or turnover intent. In fact, most of the research that has been completed on work status congruency has failed to find consistent support for it (Keil et al., 2000; Krausz et al., 2000; Morrow, McElroy & Elliot, 1994). However, Newbolt (1999) did find support for preference congruence. Those who wanted

PT work at the time of organizational entry did have more favorable work attitudes than those who wanted FT work.

Comparing FT and PT Workers: General Conclusions

Thorsteinson (2003) stated that the findings to date on PT worker versus FT worker attitude differences are still mostly equivocal, so there will have to be more research completed before any firm conclusions can be drawn on PT workers' work attitudes such as satisfaction and commitment, and whether they differ from FT workers' satisfaction and commitment. In his meta-analysis, he did not find significant differences between FT and PT workers' attitudes other than on job involvement.

In the last decade, the research on PT workers has been moving away from the comparisons of PT and FT workers to looking at different groups of PT workers within the PT worker population. Perhaps that is because researchers are generally concluding that FT and PT workers may be more alike than different in terms of what is driving their work attitudes. However, the assumption that all PT workers' attitudes are generally the same is being questioned. In the research that has begun examining subgroups of PT workers, there does appear to be some differences on work attitudes. The defining variables that create these subgroups are under investigation.

Variability within the PT Worker Population

McGinnis and Morrow (1990) said that although differences on work attitudes didn't exist between FT and PT workers in their sample, the within-group variability of the PT worker population was too great, suggesting that PT workers are not a homogenous group. Newbolt (1999) reiterated Feldman's (1990) contention that researchers shouldn't assume homogeneity of the PT worker population. Newbolt said that there may be clear differences between subgroups

of PT workers based on the PT workers' psychological contracts or stated length of commitment to the organization at the time of organizational entry.

The present study is focused on whether subgroups of PT workers differ in terms of their work attitudes, and on why theoretically, they might differ. Different theories will be tested regarding the work attitudes of these subgroups. Feldman (1990) specifically said that there are differences on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intent between primary and secondary PT workers. Partial inclusion theory would say there are differences between primary and secondary PT workers as well (assuming that primary PT and secondary PT workers differ in their inclusion), but that these differences are opposite what Feldman's (1990) theorizing predicted. Investment model theory says that the level of investments made by the PT workers (not whether the PT workers are primary PT workers or secondary PT workers) is key.

The focus of the present study requires a review of the third area of research on PT workers, which is the research examining their work attitudes in the differing PT work arrangements. Since this is a new area of inquiry, the literature examining subgroups of PT workers is fairly small. This area of inquiry began with an initial influential article by Feldman (1990).

Comparing Subgroups: PT Work Arrangements Perspective

Subgroups of PT workers have primarily been defined using a taxonomy put forth by Feldman (1990). Feldman voiced a theoretical perspective that says that PT workers may have different work attitudes due to their different PT work arrangements. He argued that different demographic groups may be attracted to differing PT work arrangements, and they may use different frames of reference to evaluate their PT work experiences. Therefore, their work attitudes may systematically differ. He also suggested that they may look at different context

variables in determining whether their partial inclusion in the work force is problematic for them or not. He suggested that the focus of PT worker research move from making comparisons between FT and PT workers' work attitudes to contrasting the work attitudes of subgroups of PT workers. He mentioned the three most prevalent demographic groups of PT workers: married women with children; young people (who are typically students); and older workers. The latest theory-driven research regarding PT workers' work attitudes then is focused in this area as first delineated by Feldman.

Feldman (1990) argued that there are several categories that subgroups of PT workers fall into, which, in part, determine their work attitudes. That is, are the PT workers: permanent or temporary; year-round or seasonal; organization hired or agency hired; voluntarily PT or involuntarily PT; and, lastly, is the PT job the PT worker's primary job or a secondary job? He considers these distinctions key for explaining PT workers' work attitudes. In his view, the different work arrangements attract different types of PT workers and also determine the motivations and satisfactions of these PT workers. Feldman felt that PT workers are more satisfied with their jobs when their employment arrangement is year-round primary job, and they are voluntarily part-time. He claims that these arrangements will result in greater satisfaction because year-round, main jobs will typically be better compensating and more interesting, resulting in greater motivations and satisfactions. He also proposes that PT workers will be less involved and less committed to their job if it is: temporary, agency-hired, seasonal or a second job. He suggests that these work arrangements make PT workers more tangential to the organization that they are working for and, therefore, less involved and committed. He says PT workers are more likely to turnover when their employment arrangement is a second job or they are working involuntarily part-time, as they are the most likely PT workers to be searching for

positions that pay better. Feldman and Doerpinghaus (1992) showed, like previous research, that female PT workers are more satisfied than male PT workers, and women make up two-thirds of the PT worker population.

In looking at the empirical research that has followed Feldman's (1990) article, there does appear to be some support for Feldman's theorizing. An increasing number of studies are investigating the heterogeneity within groups of PT workers, and a few of the subgroups of PT workers that Feldman suggested have been examined (Feldman & Doerpinghaus, 1992; Feldman, Doerpinghaus, & Turnley, 1995; Eberhardt & Moser, 1995; Sinclair et al., 1999; Sightler & Adams, 1999).

For example, one of Feldman's (1990) categories that has gotten considerable attention in existing research is the category of voluntary versus involuntary PT workers (Eberhardt & Moser, 1995; Tansky & Gallagher, 1995; Keil et al., 2000). These studies have generally found small or nonsignificant effects for differences between these two groups. Since only a small percentage of existing PT worker studies distinguished voluntary and involuntary PT workers, Thorsteinson (2003) could only estimate the size of the difference in job satisfaction between voluntary and involuntary PT workers in his meta-analysis. He used his finding of a small significant effect on job satisfaction of voluntary PT employment status to suggest that the few work attitude differences observed between FT and PT workers (i.e. facet satisfactions) may, in fact, be moderated by whether the workers are working PT voluntarily or not. These findings were consistent with Feldman's proposal that PT workers are not a homogenous group; rather, those voluntarily part-time typically have greater job satisfaction than those involuntarily PT.

A second category discussed by Feldman (1990) that has been examined in empirical research is permanent versus temporary PT workers (Feldman & Doerpinghaus, 1992; Eberhardt

& Moser, 1995). As previously mentioned, in the work of Feldman and Doerpinghaus, the permanent PT workers had greater satisfaction, commitment and less turnover intent. Eberhardt and Moser also found that permanent PT workers had greater satisfaction and commitment. Feldman and Doerpinghaus also found that the women in their PT worker sample were more satisfied than the men, which supported Feldman's assertion regarding gender (that is, that female PT workers are generally more satisfied than male PT workers). For the PT working students, only 29% were satisfactorily employed in permanent PT jobs.

As Thorsteinson (2003) indicated, very little research has been completed that compares Feldman's other categories of PT workers. A recent study examined different employment status groups including a group of primary PT workers and groups of PT workers that reported having a PT or FT job elsewhere. There was no difference in work attitude correlations or attitude structures between these groups, suggesting a lack of support for Feldman's (1990) distinctions (Newbolt, 1999).

Thorsteinson states that, "Future work on PT employment should focus on possible differences among PT employees depending on the nature of their employment (e.g. moonlighting, seasonal) and their reasons for working part-time." (p. 23). He also states that, "Research aimed at testing these possible explanations [theoretical explanations (e.g. partial inclusion, frame of reference)] will help provide a greater understanding of the differences and similarities of PT and FT workers." (p. 26). Eberhardt & Moser (1995) state that, "Very little additional PT employee research has been done since the publication of Feldman's (1990) work. In fact, the most prominent pieces are two by Feldman and Doerpinghaus. In these papers, the authors have tested some of the hypotheses proposed by Feldman in 1990. However, they did not test all the hypotheses and these studies have provided only a single test of the hypotheses."

Other studies have looked at some of Feldman's (1990) distinctions (Martin & Hafer, 1995; Steel, 2002; Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; and McComb, 2002). Additionally, there are some studies that provide some support for Feldman's assertion of regular differences in subgroups due to differential attraction of subgroup members (Gannon & Northern, 1971; Bennett et al., 1994; Jamal, 1986; Pearson, Carroll, & Hall, 1994).

Investment Model Theory Explaining PT Workers' Attitude Differences

There is another theoretical perspective that will be tested in the present research, which provides clear indications of how the work attitudes of PT workers develop. This theoretical perspective does not espouse differences between PT workers due to their differing work arrangements. Rather, the investment model approach attributes differences in job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intent to differing levels of investments in the job; the costs and rewards of the job; and the job alternatives.

In one of the earliest pieces of research on PT workers, Gannon and Nothern (1971) suggest that PT workers' personal traits are more explanatory of their turnover than their job-related attitudes because PT workers invest only a minimal amount of their lives in their jobs. However, proponents of the investment model viewpoint suggest that the investment in the job and the organization made by the PT employee, however minimal, may be what determines his/her work attitudes (Sinclair et al.,1999). This viewpoint suggests that it is not the number of hours the PT worker spends on the job or whether the job is his/her primary job or a second job that matters.

The Rusbult and Farrell (1983) investment model theory addresses the costs and rewards of a job and how they affect the incumbent's job satisfaction and organizational commitment. It defines job costs as the difficult irritations of the job such as workload variations, numerous

deadlines, and promotion practices that the job incumbent perceives to be unfair. Job rewards are job characteristics like high pay and a lot of autonomy. According to investment model theory, job satisfaction is simply the product of job rewards minus job costs, but organizational commitment is much more complicated. It is job satisfaction, minus the availability of other job alternatives, plus the investment made by the employee. The investment made by the employee is the sum total of such things as tenure, specific on-the-job training, non-vested parts of retirement plans, friends at work, or benefits unique to the job. From the Investment model perspective, turnover is the direct result of decreased commitment. In a broader sense, turnover is the result of reduced job rewards, increased job costs, a lack of investment in the job and improved alternatives to the job.

Investment Model theory has been suggested to explain job satisfaction, job commitment and turnover of employees. In the Industrial Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior literature, it is generally thought of as a theory of job commitment and turnover (Rusbult & Farrell, 1983). Much research on the investment model supports its use as a theory for investigating key Industrial Organizational Psychology topics (Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Rusbult & Lowery, 1985; Rusbult et al., 1988; Farrell & Rusbult, 1992; Dube & Maute, 1998; Sinclair et al., 1999).

Sinclair et al.'s (1999) research examined differences among subgroups of PT workers using the investment model of Rusbult and Farrell (1983). However, their subgroups of PT workers were not independent groups, rather, their membership in the groups overlapped, violating the group independence assumption that is required by most group difference statistical tests. They acknowledged this violation of assumptions, but they used multiple regression to predict organizational commitment for each of four overlapping subgroups of PT workers (as

defined by Feldman, 1990) using an 1983 archival dataset. Moonlighting part-time workers had the most striking pattern of differences from the other overlapping subgroups. For the subgroup of moonlighters, the results suggest that job satisfaction is less related to their commitment than it is in the other subgroups (students, supplementers, and primaries). In addition, for moonlighters, pay equity was more related to their commitment than their perceptions of promotional opportunities. Their perceptions of labor-management relations were more strongly related to their commitment than for the other subgroups. Thus, the authors concluded that the moonlighters seemed to be more tuned in to compensation and employment relations than to promotional opportunities or alternative employment. Sinclair et al. pointed out that future research should look at the relationship investments for PT workers. They also said that organizational commitment may have different behavioral consequences for different groups of PT workers and that future research should examine these behavioral consequences, such as withdrawal from the organization. The present research will test the ability of the Investment Model to explain PT workers' satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions.

The present research provides answers to several questions about what does or does not determine primary and secondary PT workers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intent through empirical testing. Findings from the present study extend the research on partial inclusion theory, Feldman's (1990) taxonomy, and Investment Model theory. It does this by testing three sets of competing hypotheses derived from these three theoretical perspectives. At the conclusion of the discussion of the testing of PT workers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intent, the present researcher discusses which theoretical perspective tested received the most empirical support. Since the present research is essentially performing three studies at one time by testing three theoretical perspectives in "one fell swoop," it makes a

large contribution to the research explaining primary and secondary PT workers' work attitudes. As previously noted by researchers, there is a dearth of theoretically driven research on PT workers. This is problematic as explanations of behavior (i.e. theories) allow scientist practitioners to predict and ultimately influence behavior.

Regardless of whether there is a significant difference in the job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intent of primary and secondary PT workers, it is likely that the importance of the predictors of these attitudes will differ, as previous research suggests. In this way, this study furthers the development of theory regarding the work attitudes of PT workers. Since theory development ultimately leads to needed understandings of PT workers for the management and training of them, it is key.

Hypotheses regarding Job Satisfaction

To clarify which theory is being tested in each of the following hypotheses, each hypothesis is either labeled "P" for "Partial Inclusion theory," "F" for "Feldman's Part-time Work Arrangements perspective," or "I" for "Investment Model theory".

If differences are found between primary and secondary PT workers on job satisfaction, then either Partial Inclusion theory or Feldman's part-time work arrangements (1990) view is supported. Partial Inclusion theory says that being less included means that PT workers have less negative information about the organization than FT workers, and they, therefore, have more job satisfaction (Eberhardt & Shani, 1984). The dichotomy of primary PT workers and secondary PT workers is similar to the dichotomy of FT workers and PT workers, in terms of being less included. It follows that secondary PT workers have less information about the organization than primary PT workers, since they are less included. Since they have less negative information about the organization, the secondary PT workers will have greater job satisfaction than the

primary PT workers. Therefore, partial inclusion theory predicts that the PT worker's job satisfaction will be greater when the job is his/her secondary job, which is Hypothesis P1.

Hypothesis P1: Secondary PT workers will have significantly greater job satisfaction than primary PT workers.

Feldman (1990) predicts that if the job is the PT worker's main job, then it is more likely to be a better compensating, more interesting PT job within the PT worker's job category, than if it is the PT worker's secondary job. So, the PT worker's job satisfaction will be greater when the job is his/her primary job.

Hypothesis F1: Primary PT workers will have significantly greater job satisfaction than secondary PT workers.

The prediction of the alternative Investment Model hypothesis (Hypothesis I1) is made from the Investment Model perspective, which says that job satisfaction is the result of job rewards minus job costs, neither of which are changed by the job being primary or secondary (Rusbult & Farrell, 1983).

Hypothesis I1: There will not be a significant difference in job satisfaction between primary and secondary PT workers.

From the Investment Model perspective, the rewards and costs of the job should be highly predictive of the PT workers' job satisfaction. So:

Hypothesis I2: Job satisfaction will be positively predicted by job rewards/costs.

Further Direct Model Tests of Job Satisfaction. To provide empirical support for further theory building about the job satisfaction of PT workers, additional hypothesizing from each theoretical perspective regarding PT workers' job satisfaction is required. In the present study, extrinsic job aspects refer to the measures of friendship, interpersonal conflict, coworker support,

supervisory support, organizational support, the physical work environment and interactional justice. The intrinsic job aspects refer to the job characteristic measures of variety, autonomy, feedback, task identity, physical demands of the job, degree of job-related danger, and advancement potential of the job.

From the perspective of Partial Inclusion theory, the less included a PT worker is, the greater his/her focus is on the extrinsic aspects of the job. Therefore, satisfaction with the job becomes very dependent on job context features such as the PT worker's satisfaction with their relationships with coworkers and with the organization (Logan et al, 1973; Miller & Terborg, 1979). Since they are even less included than primary PT workers, secondary PT workers will have even stronger relationships between the extrinsic aspects of their jobs and their job satisfaction. In other words, the extrinsic job aspects will be more important when predicting the job satisfaction of secondary PT workers than of primary PT workers.

Hypothesis P2: For all PT workers, the extrinsic job aspects will be stronger predictors of job satisfaction than the intrinsic job aspects.

Hypothesis P3: Secondary PT workers will have a stronger relationship between their extrinsic job aspects and their job satisfaction than the primary PT workers.

In the investment model viewpoint, job satisfaction is simply job rewards minus job costs. This perspective does not predict that job satisfaction will differ based on primary or secondary job status. Therefore, job status should not moderate extrinsic job aspects predicting job satisfaction.

Hypothesis I3: Secondary PT workers will not have a stronger relationship between their extrinsic job aspects and their job satisfaction than the primary PT workers.

PT workers for whom the job is a second job will consider flexibility in work scheduling to be important according to Feldman (1990). Secondary PT workers who have flexibility in work scheduling will have greater satisfaction and commitment and be less likely to change jobs. Therefore the relationship between flexibility in work scheduling and job satisfaction should be stronger for secondary PT workers than for primary PT workers.

Hypothesis F2: Flexibility in work scheduling will be a positive predictor of job satisfaction for all PT workers.

Hypothesis F3: Secondary PT workers will have a stronger relationship between flexibility in work scheduling and job satisfaction than primary PT workers.

Feldman (1990) also says that gender indicates job satisfaction for PT workers. He says that female PT workers are more satisfied than male PT workers. Some research has shown that female PT workers are more satisfied than male PT workers (Hall & Gordon, 1973; Presser, 1986, Feldman & Doerpinghaus, 1992).

Hypothesis F4: Female PT workers will have significantly greater job satisfaction than male PT workers.

Hypotheses Regarding Organizational Commitment

Since partial inclusion theory says that job satisfaction is greater for secondary PT workers as they have less negative information about the organization, then their organizational commitment will be greater too. This prediction is tested in Hypothesis P4.

Hypothesis P4: Secondary PT workers will have significantly greater organizational commitment than primary PT workers.

That the level of organizational commitment is less when the job is a secondary job, which is predicted by the theoretical perspective of Feldman, is tested in Hypothesis F5.

Hypothesis F5: Primary PT workers will have significantly greater organizational commitment than secondary PT workers.

In Investment Model theory, PT workers' organizational commitment is the level of investment they make in the job combined with the availability of job alternatives, plus their satisfaction with the job. Since none of these factors is dependent on whether the PT worker's job is primary or secondary, the investment model perspective says that there won't be a significant difference in organizational commitment between primary and secondary PT workers. This prediction of no difference is tested in Hypothesis I4.

Hypothesis I4: There will not be a significant difference in the organizational commitment of primary and secondary PT workers.

Traditional measures of organizational commitment should correlate highly with the Investment Model's definition of organizational commitment (reward/cost score plus investment score plus job alternatives score):

Hypothesis I5: Organizational commitment will be significantly predicted by the job rewards and job costs, the investments made in the job, and the job alternatives.

Further Direct Model Tests of Organizational Commitment. Further tests of the theoretical perspectives on what is driving PT workers' organizational commitment will be made.

Partial Inclusion theory researchers explain that PT workers have low job involvement since they are present in the job less and actually perform the job duties less often than FT workers. Therefore, efforts to reduce their turnover intentions must be focused on increasing their organizational commitment rather than their job involvement (Martin & Hafer, 1995). Since their organizational commitment is more affected by the extrinsic job aspects than the job duties

themselves, the organization's focus should be on improving the extrinsic aspects of the job. Furthermore, secondary PT workers will have even stronger relationships between the extrinsic aspects of their jobs and their organizational commitment than primary PT workers will since they would have even lower job involvement than primary PT workers.

Hypothesis P5: For all PT workers, the extrinsic job aspects will be stronger predictors of organizational commitment than the intrinsic job aspects.

Hypothesis P6: Secondary PT workers will have a stronger relationship between their extrinsic job aspects and their organizational commitment than the primary PT workers.

From the Investment Model perspective, organizational commitment does not differ based on job status; therefore job status would not moderate the relationship between the extrinsic and intrinsic job aspects and organizational commitment. The Investment Model perspective does note the importance of the social aspects (i.e. relationship investments) of the job for organizational commitment. Therefore:

Hypothesis I6: Secondary PT workers will not have a stronger relationship between their extrinsic job aspects and their organizational commitment than primary PT workers.

In addition, the Investment Model predicts that since investments tend to accumulate over time, the investment – commitment relationship grows over time as well. Therefore, workers with greater tenure will have stronger correlations between their relationship investments made and their organizational commitment. Previous research has reported a decline in work attitudes with greater tenure for PT workers (Newbolt, 1999). This finding lends credence to an Investment Model explanation of declining organizational commitment as due to reduced job satisfaction or improved alternatives to the job.

Hypothesis I7: PT workers with greater tenure will have a stronger relationship between their relationship investments and their organizational commitment than PT workers with less tenure.

Hypothesis I8: PT workers with greater tenure will have a stronger prediction of their organizational commitment from their job rewards/costs, their relationship investments and their external employability than PT workers with lesser tenure.

As previously mentioned, Feldman postulates that PT workers for whom the job is a second job will consider flexibility important in work scheduling. Secondary PT workers who have flexibility in work scheduling will have greater organizational commitment.

Hypothesis F6: Secondary PT workers will have a stronger relationship between flexibility in work scheduling and organizational commitment than primary PT workers.

Hypotheses Regarding Turnover Intent

Secondary PT workers are likely to be included in more social organizations than primary PT workers, and these additional social systems (home, school, another job) will exert pressures on them for their attention, increasing their turnover intentions (Martin & Hafer, 1995). Partial inclusion also means greater interference by membership in other social systems. Therefore, both Feldman (1990) and Partial Inclusion theorists would predict greater turnover intent for secondary PT workers than primary PT workers.

Hypothesis P(F)7: Secondary PT workers will have greater turnover intent than primary PT workers.

In Investment Model theory, PT workers' turnover intent is the result of their decreased commitment, which is not affected by whether the job is their primary job or a secondary job.

Hypothesis I9: There will not be a significant difference in turnover intent between primary and secondary PT workers.

Instead of job status being a determinant of turnover intent, the Investment Model says that turnover is caused by decreased commitment, which is the result of less satisfaction, a lack of investment in the job or improved alternatives to the job. Turnover intent, then, is predicted by reduced job rewards and/or increased job costs, less investment in the job, or increased job alternatives.

Hypothesis I10: Turnover intent will be predicted by job rewards/costs, job investments, and job alternatives.

The critical test of the differing theoretical perspectives on turnover intent then is to assess whether turnover intent is differentiated by the primary/secondary job status, or whether it is the job rewards/costs, job investments and job alternatives that predict turnover.

Working from a Partial Inclusion viewpoint, Miller and Terborg (1979), in speculating on the differences that inclusion might make for PT workers, suggested that their less inclusion might mean greater influence by external events on their turnover. Peters et al.'s (1981) findings showed this difference for FT and PT workers. They gave a partial inclusion explanation for their turnover findings of response differences for FT and PT workers to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Following this line of reasoning, lesser-included secondary PT workers' turnover intent will be less well predicted by job satisfaction and organizational commitment than primary PT workers' turnover intent. That is, secondary PT workers who are even less included than primary PT workers will have less typical behavioral responses to variables such as job satisfaction and organization commitment. Therefore:

Hypothesis P8: Job satisfaction and organizational commitment will be weaker predictors of secondary PT workers' turnover intent than primary PT workers' turnover intent.

From Feldman's (1990) perspective, secondary PT workers who have flexibility in work scheduling will be less likely to change jobs. Therefore the relationship between flexibility in work scheduling and turnover intent should be stronger for secondary PT workers than for primary PT workers.

Hypothesis F8: Secondary PT workers will have a stronger relationship between flexibility in work scheduling and turnover intent than primary PT workers.

Table 1 groups the hypotheses discussed above by the theory that they are testing, rather than by the work attitude that is being examined.

Takeaways from the Present Study's Hypothesis Tests. The research problem that is being tackled in the present study is that there is a lack of consensus on what is driving the work attitudes of subgroups of primary and secondary PT workers. Until some consensus is reached on what is driving their work attitudes (that is, which theory best explains their work attitudes), no effective interventions to influence their behavior can be developed with any confidence. So, delays in theory development ultimately result in keeping practitioners from managing PT workers any more effectively than they have been.

If the present research finds that Partial Inclusion theory garners the most support, then focusing on improving the extrinsic job aspects rather than the intrinsic job aspects (particularly for secondary PT workers) will be key for practitioners. If Feldman's (1990) perspective receives much support, then developing interventions such as targeting the hiring of those who will only have one PT job (primaries) would be indicated. In this instance, perhaps human resource

managers could target the hiring of people with the demographic characteristics of typical primary PT workers like working mothers or post-retirement men. If it is found that PT workers' work attitudes are best explained by Investment Model theory, then interventions that increase PT workers' investments in the organization are warranted. Providing incentives that encourage the purchase of nearby homes or carpooling are examples of ways the company could increase investments for PT workers. If all three theoretical perspectives receive some support, then perhaps a new theory, composed of pieces of these three is required. The possible end results of the present research underscore the macro importance of theory development. Developing theories to explain behavior is the basis of all science (Kiess & Bloomquist, 1985).

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Participants

A randomly selected sample of N = 445 PT operations employees of a large international package delivery organization headquartered in the southeastern United States completed a research survey (which contained all of the measures to be used in this study) during a three week period in July/August 2000. The sample was stratified by tenure, work shift, and job type (supervisory and nonsupervisory) in order to ensure that the sample was representative of the population of part-time operations staff at the domestic operations of the company. Possible participants were chosen by sorting employee lists by tenure, shift, and job type. Employees were sorted into five tenure groups: 0 to 3 months of tenure; 3 to 6 months of tenure; 6 months to 1 year of tenure; 1 to 2 years of tenure; and 2 years or more of tenure. They were also grouped by shift, as three shifts operated (day, twilight, and midnight). They were either PT supervisors or in PT operations positions. Randomly selected lists of employees that met the tenure, shift and job type requirements were generated. To ensure that the Human Resource managers at each location would have enough names of current employees to meet the desired number of participants, three times as many employee names than were needed were generated. These generated employee lists were given to the Human Resource managers with explicit instructions on how many participants were needed from each list (as defined by shift, tenure and job type). The Human Resource Managers were not given any information on how the lists were generated, they were just told to select a certain number of names from each list, and to ask those employees to

complete the survey. The participants completed the paper and pencil survey during their regular working hours, but away from their normal job duties, in a conference room set up by the Human Resource Manager at each location. The surveys were anonymous and the participants were asked to return the surveys in a sealed confidential envelope, which was provided. The Human Resources managers distributed the surveys and the envelopes to the participants and gave them all the time they needed. The employees decided whether or not to complete the surveys, without any additional instructions from the Human Resource Managers. A cover letter accompanied the survey and provided an explanation of the survey as a tool for research purposes only, as well as assurances of the participants' anonymity. The cover letter is Appendix A. There were 600 surveys that were distributed to the Human Resource managers with the employee lists, and 445 surveys that were completed and returned, for a response rate of 74.2%.

The participants were in five different geographic regions of the United States. There were primary PT workers (n = 240, 54%) who checked the survey box that their job at the company was their primary job, and (n = 182, 41%) secondary PT workers who checked the alternative box indicating that their job at the company was a secondary job for them (a 2nd priority after another job or school). A few of the PT workers who were surveyed chose not to indicate whether their job was primary or secondary (n = 23, 5%). Mean tenure in the primary PT worker group was 2 years, 5 months (SD = 3.464). Mean tenure in the secondary PT employee group was 2 years, 1 month (SD = 3.098). For the overall sample, mean tenure was 2 years, 3 months (SD = 3.297). The three shifts were generally equally represented, with 126 day shift participants, 144 twilight shift participants, and 135 midnight shift participants. Some of the participants (40) chose the option "prefer not to answer" which was included for respondents who feared that they would be identifiable if they stated which shift they worked.

Table 1 shows the breakdown by gender and shift of the primary and secondary PT worker subsamples. The sample was composed of operations employees who handled or delivered packages, some of which had supervisory responsibilities, and they were covered by negotiated labor agreements. They were all eligible for employee benefits including health insurance, stock purchase, and retirement benefits.

Another phrase for the distinction between the two subgroups of PT workers in the present study is "sole employment jobs versus moonlighting jobs," which Feldman & Doerpinghaus (1992) first articulated. Feldman and Doerpinghaus acknowledge that several of Feldman's (1990) dimensions of PT work (e.g., seasonal vs. year-round, temporary vs. permanent, agency-hired vs. organization-hired, involuntary vs. voluntary and main job vs. second job) may overlap for PT workers. An example of this overlap is that permanent PT jobs tend to be organization-hired and year-round. They state that greater attention to these dimensions and the additional information that can be gleaned from studying workers with overlap of these dimensions should be the focus of further research in this area. In the present study, the PT workers under investigation are all year-round, permanent, organization-hired PT workers. They differ in terms of whether the job is their primary job or a secondary priority for them after another job or school.

It should be noted that the sample of PT workers utilized in the present study may not be representative of the general population of PT workers. That is because these PT workers are unionized, receive health insurance benefits, are included in the company's stock purchase plan, and have seniority rights to bid on FT jobs. They also receive tuition reimbursement for specific courses. Some of the locations where the PT workers work also pay them overtime pay if they work more than 25 hours per week. Therefore, the present sample of PT workers may be a

special case of PT workers, since many PT workers do not receive any of these types of benefits, which are typically reserved for FT employees.

Measures

Soundness of measures. An initial analysis of the data assessed the soundness of the measures used. The internal consistency of all the multi-item measures was assessed using Cronbach's alpha (see Table 2). A correlation matrix of all the scales was examined to assess scale redundancies (see Table 3).

Common method bias concerns. Since the data-gathering of the present study was a single survey administration, both procedural methods as well as post hoc statistical checks were required to waylay concerns regarding common method variance (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). Salancik and Pfeffer (1977) suggested that the ordering of items on the questionnaire be done in such a way as to possibly reduce consistency artifacts. Therefore, on the questionnaire, the dependent or criterion variables followed, rather than preceded, the independent variables. Another procedural method that was used was to select scales that did not have overlap of the same or very similar items, in order to increase the discriminant validity of the attitude measures used. Podsakoff and Organ (1986) refer to this as "scale trimming," when it is done on a post hoc basis. In addition, some statistical checks were conducted on a post hoc basis. A factor analysis was conducted on the data, to perform Harman's one-factor test. The results of the unrotated factor solution showed that there was not one general factor accounting for the majority of the covariance in the independent and criterion variables (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). There were five factors with eigenvalues over 1, and the first factor accounted for only 34% of the variance, both results that support an argument against common method bias in the present sample.

Lending credence to this argument is the fact that the data were gathered at five very different geographic locations.

Job characteristics. The job characteristics of variety, autonomy, feedback, and task identity were assessed using four of the scales from Sims, Jr., Szilagyi and Keller' s (1976) Job Characteristic Inventory (JCI). The JCI was developed in order to better measure the job characteristics that are considered important for the satisfaction and performance of workers. The development of the JCI was based on previous work by Turner and Lawrence (1965) and Hackman and Lawler (1971), which identified six job dimensions (variety, autonomy, task identity, feedback, dealing with others, friendship opportunities). Using two samples with several different job classifications, Sims, Jr. et al. (1976) used validity and reliability analyses to develop the JCI. Many of the original items were taken from Hackman and Lawler's (1971) research. Several new items were developed as well. The final JCI included 30 items and a total of six scales. The a priori dimensionality of the JCI was confirmed in both samples, using factor analysis. Later research, using several diverse samples, also confirmed this dimensionality (Pierce & Dunham, 1978; Griffin, Moorhead, Johnson & Chonko, 1980).

It was also important to Sims, Jr. et al. (1976) that this instrument show the power to discriminate between different jobs, since the instrument is a perceptual measurement technique, which may allow the introduction of error due to individual attributes and decrease the validity of the measure. Using an analysis of variance approach, Sims, Jr. et al. reported that the between-group differences were greater than the within-group differences for the different job groups in each sample, indicating that there was a high degree of homogeneity in job perceptions within each job group. A multiple discriminant analysis procedure was also used for one of the samples and provided further evidence for the discriminant validity of the JCI between the different job

groups. Further evidence for the convergent and discriminant validity of four of the six scales (variety, autonomy, feedback and friendship) using criterion variables was also reported by the researchers.

Four scales of the JCI (variety, autonomy, feedback and identity) were part of the research survey to be used for the present research. All of the JCI items had a five point Likert type response scale. The variety scale of the JCI measures the degree to which there is variety in the work performed and in the procedures and type of equipment used by the employee. Sims, Jr. et al. (1976) report a coefficient alpha of .82 for this scale in their research. The autonomy scale measures the amount of control that the employee has over the work scheduling, equipment and procedures used. It had a coefficient alpha of .84 in Sims, Jr. et al.'s research. The feedback scale measures the amount of information received regarding job performance. It had a coefficient alpha of .86 in Sims, Jr. et al.'s research. The task identity scale measures whether the employee completes an entire work process, or if he/she only does a piece of the work and whether he/she can see the results of the efforts made. It had a coefficient alpha of .83 in Sims, Jr. et al.'s research. A high score on each of these scales indicates a greater amount of that particular characteristic.

The job characteristics of job-related danger and physical demands of the job were each assessed with a single item measure. Job-related danger was assessed with a item asking specifically about the level of personal health and safety risk that the employees feel their job involves. This item was based on the work of Zaccaro and Stone (1988) who developed a similar three item measure to assess the level of job-related danger that an employee perceives that he/she is experiencing at work. The employees' perceptions regarding the overall physical nature of their jobs was also assessed with an item regarding the overall physical demand of the job.

This item was based on the research by Zaccaro and Stone, and Stone and Gueutal (1985) and measures the employee' s overall perception of how physically demanding the job is. Both of these measures employed Likert type five option response formats. For the item regarding job-related danger, the response options were: (1) very high; (2) high; (3) moderate; (4) low; (5) very low. Therefore, a high score on this item means that a low amount of risk is perceived. For the item regarding the physical demands of the job, the response options were: (1) much too demanding; (2) too demanding; (3) somewhat too demanding; (4) only slightly too demanding; (5) not too demanding at all. Therefore, a high score on this item means that the respondent does not think that the job was too physically demanding at all.

Supervisory support. Six items from the consideration subscale of an early version of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ; Fleishman, 1957) were used to measure supervisory support. Michaels and Spector (1982) utilized a similar version of this LBDQ subscale to measure supervisory support and found a coefficient alpha of .87 for the scale. Stogdill (1957) states that high scores on this scale are associated with supportive supervisory behavior such as mutual trust, respect and warmth. All six items used a five point likert type response format from 1 = never to 5 = very often.

Coworker support. An eight item scale by Ribsl and Reischl (1993) assessed the level of concern and helpfulness that the participant felt that his/her coworkers showed him/her. The scale used a five point Likert type response format from 1 = almost never to 5 = almost always. A high score indicates high coworker support.

Perceived organizational support. Eisenberger and Huntington's (1986) sixteen-item scale assessed the amount of affective support that the participant felt that the organization gave him/her. It asked specifically about whether the organization is helpful with problems;

appreciative of the participants' efforts; shows concern for [the participant]; and takes pride in the accomplishments of the participant. It used a seven point Likert type scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree with a higher score indicating greater organizational support.

Friendship. Three items from the friendship scale developed by Sims, Jr. et al. (1976), which is part of the JCI, were used to collect the data on friendship perceptions. The friendship scale measures how much employees have the opportunity to develop friendships and talk with one another at work. Sims, Jr. et al. report a coefficient alpha of .84 for this scale, using a sample of 192 manufacturing employees. A fourth item assessed the overall friendliness of the participant's immediate work group. It was taken from Price & Mueller's (1986b) Integration Scale. A high score on this scale indicates more friendship experienced at work.

Interpersonal conflict. The measure that was used is an established measure of interpersonal conflict (Spector, 1987). The original four item scale of interpersonal conflict had a somewhat low coefficient alpha in previous research (alpha = .66 in Spector's research; alpha = .71 in Chen and Spector's 1992 research) and was fairly narrow in focus. It asked specifically about the frequency of experiencing arguments and rude or loud verbal behavior while at work. In order to broaden the measure to include other behaviors which are considered part of the domain of interpersonal conflict at work, one item was included from the work of Keashly, Newman, and Richman (personal communication, March 17, 2000). They had identified several dimensions of negative or hostile work behavior in their research on bullying and workplace hostility. An item representing their identified dimension of exclusion was included. All of these items utilize a 5-point Likert type response scale from never to very often. A high score indicates that the participant experienced greater interpersonal conflict at work.

Organizational politics. Perceptions of organizational politics were assessed using a five item scale created by Ferris and Kacmar (1992). Each of these five items was measured on a five point Likert type scale with response options from strongly agree to strongly disagree. High scores reflect perceptions of less politics occurring in the workplace. This scale was originally created as a concise, construct valid unidimensional measure of general politics perceptions. Internal consistency estimates of this scale in prior research were .75 (Kacmar & Ferris, 1989) and .74 (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992).

Organizational justice. Both distributive justice and two dimensions of procedural justice (formal procedures and interactional) were measured. Perceptions of distributive justice were measured with a six-item index (Price & Mueller, 1986b). The scale was designed to measure the degree to which rewards and punishments are related to performance inputs. Considerable research has accumulated to support the validity and reliability of this scale and internal consistency estimates range from .94 to .95 in four studies reported. This scale uses a response format of 1 = very unfairly to 5 = very fairly. Therefore, a high score indicates perceptions of high distributive justice.

There are two dimensions of procedural justice, identified by Greenberg (1990), and they are formal procedures justice and interactional justice. Perceptions of procedural justice were assessed with six items (three per dimension) from Niehoff and Moorman's (1993) nine-item procedural justice scale. The two dimensions were supported, using CFA, in Niehoff and Moorman's research. The first dimension, formal procedures, is reported to measure the degree to which job decision procedures include: mechanisms that insured employees an appeals process; employees having a voice in these decisions; and, lastly, the use of accurate and unbiased information. A coefficient alpha of .85 was obtained for a six-item version of this scale. Three of

these six items were chosen for use in the research survey on the basis of how well they represented the theoretical dimension they were purported to measure. These items had high factor loadings in previous research. The second dimension of procedural justice, interactional justice, was also measured with three items that were taken from Niehoff and Moorman's nine item scale. This dimension is conceptualized as the degree to which employees feel that their needs are considered in job decisions, and the degree to which employees feel that adequate explanations are made for job decisions. The three items used to represent this dimension had high factor loadings in previous research. The coefficient alpha for the full nine-item scale was .92 in Niehoff & Moorman's research.

The latter two justice dimensions discussed (formal procedures and interactional) utilized five point Likert type scales with 1 = Strongly disagree and 5 = Strongly agree. High scores reflect perceptions of more justice occurring in the workplace.

Flexibility in work scheduling. A single-item measure was used to assess the employees' perception of the amount of flexibility that they had in scheduling their work. It utilized a Likert type scale response format, with five options. A high score indicates a higher overall rating of the amount of flexibility allowed employees in scheduling their work.

Physical work environment. Respondents were asked to rate the following physical aspects of their work environment: the lighting, the temperature, the cleanliness, the necessary equipment, and the breakroom and restrooms for their use. A Likert type scale response format, with five options: (1) poor; (2) inadequate; (3) fair; (4) adequate; and (5) good was utilized. A higher score indicates a higher overall rating of the physical work environment.

Job satisfaction. Global job satisfaction was measured with a five-item index that Price and Mueller (1981; 1986a) adapted from Brayfield and Rothe (1951) to measure the extent of the

employee's global satisfaction with the job. Price and Mueller have demonstrated the reliability and validity of these items as a measure of global satisfaction. Price and Mueller (1986a) found that the six-item version of the scale had a coefficient alpha of .88 (and the six items loaded on a single factor with the following loadings: .81, .70, .66, .54, .79, and .75). The fourth item of the six-item scale was omitted from the research survey to be used in the present study. This is because this item asked specifically whether the employee would consider taking another job and could be considered a measure of turnover intention. Additionally, this item had the lowest factor loading (.54) in previous research. The response anchors of this scale were: (1) strongly disagree; (2) disagree; (3) Neither agree nor disagree; (4) agree; (5) strongly agree. A higher score indicates greater overall satisfaction.

Organizational commitment. To measure organizational commitment, a nine item version of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979; Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). In research comparing the OCQ with several other measures of organizational commitment, Mowday et al. (1979) indicated that their measure focuses on attitudinal commitment, rather than behavioral commitment. They consider attitudinal commitment as a state where an individual identifies with an organization and the organization's goals, and wishes to maintain organizational membership to facilitate the reaching of goals. Mowday et al. reported internal consistency coefficients for the OCQ which ranged from .82 to .93, across nine samples. The nine item version of the scale received coefficient alphas of .84 (Time 1) and .83 (Time 2) in Vandenberg and Lance's (1992) research. Price and Mueller (1986a) also reported the use of this scale, and they chose to use the following five point Likert type scale anchor points: (1) strongly disagree; (2) disagree; (3) neither agree nor disagree; (4)

agree; (5) strongly agree. They report a coefficient alpha of .92 for this scale. The response options in the present data set mirrored those used by Price and Mueller.

Work shift. Work shift was assessed with a single item measure that asked the respondent to indicate which shift he/she primarily worked. Besides day shift, twilight shift and night shift, a fourth option of "prefer not to answer" was available to respondents. This option was intended to help alleviate respondents' concerns that they would be identifying themselves by providing shift information.

External employability. This variable was measured with a two-item scale of opportunity. Price and Mueller (1986a) define opportunity as the availability of other jobs in the same geographical area as the present employer, to the employee. The two items made up a single factor in the factor analysis reported by Price and Mueller, with factor loadings of .85 and .80, and, in their research, the scale received a coefficient alpha of .83. The two items each had the following five response options: (1) very difficult; (2) quite difficult; (3) somewhat easy; (4) quite easy; (5) very easy. A high score indicates a perception of more ease in gaining employment outside the current company, in the same geographical area.

Job status. A single item assessed the status of the job. This item was worded, "My job at [x company] is: [ ] my primary job; [ ] a secondary job for me (a 2nd priority after another job or school). The respondents checked the box beside the option that applied to them.

Advancement potential. Price and Mueller (1986a) reported using the measure of advancement potential or promotional opportunity that was included in the research survey. They defined promotional opportunity as: "degree of potential vertical occupational mobility within an organization" (Price & Mueller, p. 11). This measure was composed of five items that asked about the employee's perceptions of their potential for occupational advancement with their

present employer. Price and Mueller report a coefficient alpha of .92 for the same scale (and respective factor loadings of .58, .66, .81, .91, and .89). The Likert type scale anchors were: (1) strongly disagree; (2) disagree; (3) neither agree nor disagree; (4) agree, (5) strongly agree.

Turnover intentions. The intention to leave the organization was assessed by a single-item measure that has been utilized in several previous studies (Vandenberg & Scarpello, 1990; Vandenberg, Self & Seo, 1994) where it was found to be significantly correlated with actual turnover, at the individual level. At the organizational level, the aggregated score for this item has been shown to be highly correlated with the actual turnover rate of the organization (Vandenberg, Richardson, & Eastman, 1999), providing evidence for the construct validity of this measure. The item specifically asked about the chances of the employee leaving the organization in the next year and had a five point Likert type response format from '0 to 20% chance", to '81 to 100% chance."

Demographic variables. Tenure was assessed with a single item measure of organizational tenure that asked how long the employee had been with the company, and provided blank spaces for the respondents to write in the number of years and the number of months. Gender was assessed by asking the respondent to check the appropriate box: [ ] male or [ ] female.

Composite variables: Extrinsic job aspects. Several extrinsic job aspects were captured on the questionnaire. To facilitate testing hypotheses concerning these extrinsic job aspects, a composite score was formed of all these variables: friendship, interpersonal conflict, coworker support, supervisory support, organizational support, physical work environment and interactional justice. Prior to forming this composite, the correlations among these variables were examined to ensure that multicollinearity of the scales would not be an issue, and it was not.

Composite variables: Intrinsic job aspects. Several intrinsic job aspects were measured, and a composite score of the all of the measures of the job characteristics (autonomy, etc.) along with the only other measure deemed an intrinsic job aspect, the advancement potential measure, was formed. Prior to forming this composite, the correlations among these variables were examined to ensure that multicollinearity of the scales would not be an issue, and it was not.

Investment model variables: Job rewards and costs. As Rusbult and Farrell (1983) indicated, the absence of a specific job reward frequently implies the presence of a job cost. In a similar fashion to their questionnaire, several scales in the present study assessed many of the concrete aspects of the PT worker's job. Just as theirs did, this included the job characteristics of variety, autonomy, feedback, and identity. Again, just as Rusbult and Farrell's study did, it also included the concrete job aspects of promotional opportunities, distributive justice, and flexibility in work scheduling. The worker's levels of friendship and interpersonal conflict at work were also assessed. Lastly, the physical work environment, the physical demands of the job and the degree of job-related danger that the worker experienced was assessed. Similarly to Rusbult and Farrell's work, the present research considers all of these concrete aspects of the job to be rewards or costs, (depending on the respondent's answer). Therefore, all of these scale scores were coded so that higher scores indicate that the participant finds the particular job aspect rewarding. Lower scores indicate that the particular job aspect is costly (it is not rewarding) to the participant.

Investment model variables: Perceived employment alternatives. This was assessed with the previously mentioned two item scale of external employability (Price & Mueller, 1986b) tapping ease of movement within the geographical area, assuming that the worker would be searching for a job that was as good as or better than the present job.

Investment model variables: Investments. The level of investment made by the PT worker was assessed using the measures of tenure and the JCI friendship scale (Sims, Jr., et al., 1976) as previously discussed, which are recognized as two key investments the PT worker can make (Rusbult & Farrell, 1983). In addition, the three support scales indicating the amount of support that the worker felt he/she received from his coworkers, supervisor and from the organization (which were discussed previously) were included in the investment composite score. All of these scales provide indications of the amount of relationship investments that the PT worker had in the organization. Tenure represents the concrete investment that the PT worker has in the organization. Unfortunately, measures were not available to assess whether the PT worker had the following additional concrete investments: vested or nonvested retirement programs, specific or nonportable training, spousal employment in the geographic area, home ownership in the geographic area, or religious or community ties to the geographic area.

Investment model variables: Relationship investments. This is a measure of the participants' investments pertaining to their relationships with others at work so it does not include the concrete investment measure of tenure, but it does include all of the rest of the scales included as investments.

Statistical Analyses. The hypotheses of the present study were tested using simple and multiple regression analyses; moderated regression analyses; independent samples t-tests; and the z-test formula that tests for the significance of the difference of two correlations (using Fisher's r to z Transfo rmation).

Table 1

Sample Gender and Shift Breakdowns

	Gender		Shift	
Primary PT workers	172	males	Day	92
	65	females	Twilight	64
			Midnight	71
			No answer	6
Total Primary PT workers	237			
Secondary PT workers	132	males	Day	31
	48	females	Twilight	78
			Midnight	59
			No answer	5
Total Secondary PT workers	180			

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for All Measures

Scale Name (# of items)	Mean	SD	Coefficient Alpha
Variety (5)	12.73	3.77	.7248
Autonomy (6)	20.43	4.67	.7594
Feedback (5)	16.8	4.88	.9077
Identity (4)	15.23	3.29	.8083
Advancement Potential (3)	10.13	3.07	.8849
Supervisory Support (6)	21.15	4.77	.7617
Friendship (5)	17.41	3.74	.7582
Organizational Politics (5)	14.2	3.41	.5554
Distributive Justice (6)	18.95	5.47	.9141
Formal Procedural Justice (3)	9.42	2.45	.6718
Interactional Justice (3)	9.79	2.62	.8026
Interpersonal Conflict (4)	8.17	3.41	.8301
Physical Work Environment (5)	14.19	4.01	.7304
Organizational Support (16)	69.41	18.08	.9271
Coworker Support (8)	25.5	7.3	.9171
External Employability (2)	5.92	2.27	.8917
Flexibility in Work Scheduling (1)	3.40	1.17	
Job-related Danger (1)	2.79	.94	
Physical Demands of the Job (1)	3.45	1.19	
Global Job Satisfaction (5)	15.89	4.35	.8572
Organizational Commitment (9)	31.19	7.39	.9242
Turnover Intent (1)	1.84	1.34	

Table 3

Correlation Matrix for all Scales and Variables

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Shift	1.000							
2. Gender	-.073	1.000						
3. Tenure	.040	-.067	1.000					
4. Variety	.053	-.025	-.036	1.000				
5. Autonomy	.060	-.023	-.007	.261**	1.000			
6. Feedback	-.044	.006	-.256**	.214**	.300**	1.000		
7. Identity	-.007	.019	-.129**	.148**	.509**	.417**	1.000	
8. Advancement Potential	-.025	-.034	-.213**	.253**	.179**	.348**	.293	1.000
9. Supervisory Support	-.074	.001	-.155**	.188**	.219**	.481**	.243	.266
10. Friendship	-.013	-.086	-.037	.221**	.293**	.186**	.174	.276
11. Organizational Politics	.100*	.026	.240**	-.138**	-.160**	-.331**	-.215	-.392
12. Distributive Justice	-.112*	-.052	-.235**	.249**	.215**	.496**	.311	.590
13. Formal Procedural Justice	-.092	.010	-.276**	.217**	.220**	.462**	.346	.433
14. Interactional Justice	-.050	-.068	-.217**	.207**	.231**	.442**	.307	.424
15. Interpersonal Conflict	.127**	.122*	.082	.036	-.120*	-.197**	-.199	-.228
16. Physical Work Environment	-.123*	.053	-.098*	.189**	.282**	.321**	-.007	.322**
17. Organizational Support	-.124*	-.060	-.252**	.293**	.268**	.489**	.328**	.609**
18. Coworker Support	-.102*	-.041	-.189**	.108*	.184**	.345**	.199**	.293**
19. External Employability	.090	.006	.064	.130**	-.078	-.052	-.062	-.252**
20. Flexibility in Work Scheduling	-.173**	-.083	-.025	.103*	.120*	.243**	.117*	.266**
21. Job-related Danger	-.094	.025	-.070	.090	.089	.116*	.084	.163**
22. Physical Demands of the Job	-.026	-.069	-.057	.165**	.211**	.149**	.181**	.265**
23. Global Job Satisfaction	-.058	-.054	-.061	.383**	.351**	.318**	.262**	.449**
24. Organizational Commitment	-.088	-.014	-.178**	.281**	.251**	.335**	.254**	.525**
25. Turnover Intent	.062	.038	-.060	-.245**	-.129**	-.098*	-.164**	-.321**

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 (continued).

Correlation Matrix for all Scales and Variables

	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.
1. Shift					-.092	-.050	.127**	-.123*
2. Gender					.010	-.068	.122*	.053
3. Tenure					-.276**	-.217**	.082	-.098*
4. Variety					.217**	.207*	.036	.189*
5. Autonomy					.220*	.231**	-.120*	.282**
6. Feedback					.462**	.442**	-.197**	.321**
7. Identity					.346**	.307**	-.199**	.264**
8. Advancement Potential					.433**	.424**	-.228**	.322**
9. Supervisory Support	1				.537**	.514**	-.197**	.301**
10. Friendship	.218	1			.218**	.293**	-.063	.210**
11. Organizational Politics	-.233	-.212	1		-.384**	-.351**	.384**	-.231**
12. Distributive Justice	.393	.294	-.421	1	.597**	.544**	-.280**	.370**
13. Formal Procedural Justice	.537	.218	-.384	.597**	1	.650**	-.226**	.331**
14. Interactional Justice	.514	.293	-.351	.544**	.650**	1	-.196**	.274**
15. Interpersonal Conflict	-.197	-.063	.384	-.280**	-.226**	-.196**	1	-.231**
16. Physical Work Environment	.301**	.201**	-.231**	.370**	.331**	.274**	-.231**	1
17. Organizational Support	.430**	.314**	-.507**	.685**	.583**	.561**	-.339**	.428**
18. Coworker Support	.340**	.510**	-.314**	.417**	.408**	.424**	-.224**	.330**
19. External Employability	-.104*	-.103*	.218**	-.272**	-.153**	-.195**	.172**	-.149**
20. Flexibility in Work Scheduling	.249**	.256**	-.127**	.287**	.259**	.271**	-.095	.249**
21. Job-related Danger	.031	.117*	-.171**	.121*	.099*	.084	-.121*	.134**
22. Physical Demands of the Job	.152**	.099*	-.189**	.354**	.270**	.218**	-.191**	.198**
23. Global Job Satisfaction	.301**	.262**	-.319**	.483**	.414**	.439**	-.181**	.312**
24. Organizational Commitment	.332**	.265**	-.399**	.527**	.499**	.449**	-.197**	.364**
25. Turnover Intent	-.208**	-.089	.166**	-.279**	-.195**	-.167**	.218**	-.207**

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 3 (continued).

Correlation Matrix for All Scales and Variables

	17.	18.	19.	20.	21.	22.	23.	24.
1. Shift	-.124*	-.102*	.090	-.173**	-.094	-.026	-.058	-.088
2. Gender	-.060	-.041	.006	-.083	.025	-.069	-.054	-.014
3. Tenure	-.252	-.189**	.064	-.025	-.070	-.057	-.061	-.178**
4. Variety	.293**	.108*	-.130**	.103*	.090	.165**	.383**	.281**
5. Autonomy	.268**	.184**	-.078	.120*	.089	.211**	.351**	.251**
6. Feedback	.489**	.345**	-.052	.243**	.116*	.149**	.318**	.335**
7. Identity	.328**	.199**	-.062	.117*	.084	.181**	.262**	.254**
8. Advancement Potential	.609**	.293**	-.252**	.266**	.163**	.265**	.449**	.525**
9. Supervisory Support	.430**	.340**	-.104*	.249**	.031	.152**	.301**	.332**
10. Friendship	.314**	.510**	-.103*	.256**	.117*	.099*	.262**	.265**
11. Organizational Politics	-.507**	-.314**	.218**	-.127**	-.171**	-.189**	-.319**	-.399**
12. Distributive Justice	.685**	.417**	-.272**	.287**	.121*	.354**	.483**	.527**
13. Formal Procedural Justice	.583**	.408**	-.153**	.259**	.099*	.270**	.414**	.499**
14. Interactional Justice	.561**	.424**	-.195**	.271**	.084	.218**	.439**	.449**
15. Interpersonal Conflict	-.339**	-.224**	.172**	-.095	-.121*	-.191**	-.181**	-.197**
16. Physical Work Environment	.428**	.330**	-.149**	.249**	.134**	.198**	.312**	.364**
17. Organizational Support	1	.438**	-.382**	.388**	.191**	.319**	.537**	.676**
18. Coworker Support	.438**	1	-.073	.193**	.100*	.120*	.236**	.313**
19. External Employability	-.382**	-.073	1	-.190**	-.141**	-.184**	-.323**	-.383**
20. Flexibility in Work Scheduling	.388**	.193**	-.190**	1	.087	.174**	.265**	.333**
21. Job-related Danger	.191**	.100*	-.141**	.087	1	.193**	.230**	.196**
22. Physical Demands of the Job	.319**	.120*	-.184**	.174**	.193**	1	.379**	.298**
23. Global Job Satisfaction	.537**	.236**	-.323**	.265**	.230**	.379**	1	.691**
24. Organizational Commitment	.676**	.313**	-.383**	.333**	.196**	.298**	.691**	1
25. Turnover Intent	-.331**	-.101*	.384**	-.269**	-.073	-.292**	-.487**	-.490**

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 3 (continued).

Correlation Matrix for All Scales and Variables

	25.
1. Shift	.062
2. Gender	.038
3. Tenure	-.060
4. Variety	-.245**
5. Autonomy	-.129**
6. Feedback	-.098*
7. Identity	-.164**
8. Advancement Potential	-.321**
9. Supervisory Support	-.208**
10. Friendship	-.089
11. Organizational Politics	.166**
12. Distributive Justice	-.279**
13. Formal Procedural Justice	-.195**
14. Interactional Justice	-.167**
15. Interpersonal Conflict	.218**
16. Physical Work Environment	-.207**
17. Organizational Support	-.331**
18. Coworker Support	-.101*
19. External Employability	.384**
20. Flexibility in Work Scheduling	-.269**
21. Job-related Danger	-.073
22. Physical Demands of the Job	-.292**
23. Global Job Satisfaction	-.487**
24. Organizational Commitment	-.490**
25. Turnover Intent	1

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Findings of the Critical Tests regarding Job Satisfaction

Results for the hypotheses regarding whether job satisfaction differs for primary and secondary PT workers (hypotheses P1, F1 and I1) were obtained using a t-test for the equality of the means. The means on job satisfaction for primary and secondary part-time workers were not significantly different, $t(411) = 1.67$, $p = .097$, which meant that hypotheses P1 and F1 were not supported. Hypothesis I1 was supported since it stated that the means would not be significantly different. A linear regression analysis was performed to determine if job satisfaction would be positively predicted by the job rewards and costs (which is hypothesis I2), and this equation was significant (R^2=.363, F(1,360)=204.957, p=.000, see Table 4). Therefore, in the critical test of the three theoretical perspectives regarding job satisfaction, only the Investment Model perspective was supported (hypotheses I1 and I2).

Further Direct Model Testing regarding Job Satisfaction

In an additional test of the partial inclusion perspective, a z-test for the significance of the difference between dependent correlations was performed to assess Hypothesis P2, which begged the question of whether the extrinsic job aspects would have a stronger correlation with PT workers' job satisfa ction than the intrinsic job aspects would. A Fisher *r*-to-*Z* transformation was supplied by Hays (1994) Table VI, and the test statistic was calculated by hand using the equation specified by Hays (1994) and referring it to a *normal* distribution. The value for the test statistic did not reach the specified .05 significance level of $\pm$1.96, and was therefore not

significant (z=-1.72886). The extrinsic job aspects score did not have a stronger correlation with the PT workers' job satisfaction than the intrinsic job aspects score did, which meant that hypothesis P2 was not supported. In order to check these results, a simple regression was run with extrinsic job aspects and intrinsic job aspects as the two predictors of job satisfaction. Again, hypothesis P2 was not supported since the intrinsic job aspects composite was a much stronger predictor of job satisfaction than the extrinsic job aspects. See Table 5 for these results.

In another test of the partial inclusion view, moderated regression was used to test hypotheses P3 and I3, which state whether job status moderates the relationship between extrinsic job aspects and job satisfaction or not. The results (see Table 6) supported I3, not P3. To assess linear effects, job satisfaction was first regressed on job status (primary/secondary) and the extrinsic job aspects composite variable (as a block). The cross-product interaction term (job status by extrinsic job aspects) was then added as a second block. A significant R^2 increment attributable to this interaction term would reveal a moderated relationship (Cohen & Cohen, 1983) or a two-way interaction. The findings indicated that the first block of the two linear effects of job status and extrinsic job aspects added a significant 25% variance explanation ($F(2,353) = 58.54$, $p = .000$). Of the two predictors, only the extrinsic job aspects had a significant linear effect. The block of the two-way interaction term added only a significant .01% of variance ($F(3,352) = 39.136$, $p = .000$). The two-way interaction between job status and extrinsic job aspects was not statistically significant, so no moderation was present. Therefore, secondary PT workers did not have a stronger relationship between their extrinsic job aspects and their job satisfaction than the primary PT workers did.

To summarize, in the further direct model hypothesis testing of the three perspectives regarding PT workers' job satisfaction, Partial Inclusion theory was not supported (P2 and P3) and Investment Model theory was supported (I3).

Additional Testing for Job Satisfaction

Flexibility in work scheduling was a positive predictor of job satisfaction (hypothesis F2) for the PT workers in the sample (R^2=.070, F(1,419)=31.636, p<000), supporting Feldman's (1992) perspective. It accounted for 7% of the variance in job satisfaction in the regression. However, the Feldman view that flexibility in work scheduling was more important for the job satisfaction of secondary PT workers than primary PT workers was not supported. Hypothesis F3 was not supported since the relationship between flexibility in work scheduling and job satisfaction was not significantly different for primary or secondary PT workers. The results for F3 are presented in Table 7. To assess linear effects, global job satisfaction was first regressed on job status and flexibility in work scheduling (as a block). The cross-product interaction term (job status by flexibility in work scheduling) was then added as a second block. The findings indicated that the first block of the two linear effects of job status and flexibility in work scheduling added a significant 6.8% variance explanation ($F(2,408) = 14.908$, $p = .000$) to job satisfaction. Only the linear effect of flexibility in work scheduling was significant. The block of the two-way interaction term did not add any variance. The interaction between flexibility in work scheduling and job status was not significant.

Additionally, the Feldman perspective on gender differences on job satisfaction (hypothesis F4) was not supported. Hypothesis F4 was assessed using a t-test for the equality of the means and the means on global job satisfaction for female and male PT workers, and the means were not significantly different, $t(415) = 1.096$, $p = .274$.

In summary, in the additional tests of each model on job satisfaction, only the prediction that flexibility in work scheduling would be a positive predictor of all PT workers' job satisfaction (F2), which was Feldman's perspective, was supported. The other two hypotheses from Feldman's (1992) perspective were not supported (F3 and F4). It is also of note that neither gender, tenure nor shift was significantly correlated with job satisfaction for all the PT workers (primary or secondary).

Findings of the Critical Tests regarding Organizational Commitment

The critical test of differences on organizational commitment between primary and secondary PT workers supported Feldman's (1992) perspective. That is, hypotheses P4 and I4, representing Partial Inclusion theory and Investment Model theory, were not supported. Hypothesis F5 was supported as primary PT workers had significantly greater organizational commitment than secondary PT workers. These three hypotheses were assessed using a t-test for the equality of the means and the organizational commitment mean for primary PT workers (mean = 3.55) was significantly higher, $t(412) = 2.62$, $p = .009$, than the secondary PT workers' organizational commitment mean (mean = 3.34).

The overall equation for hypothesis I5 predicting that external employability, job rewards/costs, and job investments are statistically important to organizational commitment was significant, accounting for 44% of the variance (R^2=.444, F(3,317)=84.475, p<.000). Table 8 lists these results. However, the job investments composite score was not a significant predictor. Therefore, Investment Model theory was only partially supported since only external employability and job rewards/costs predicted organizational commitment. Job investments should have been the third significant predictor according to Investment Model theory, and it was not.

Further Direct Model Testing regarding Organizational Commitment

Partial Inclusion theory predicted that the extrinsic job aspects would be stronger predictors of PT workers' organizational commitment than the intrinsic job aspects, but this hypothesis (P5) was not supported. A z-test for the significance of the difference between dependent correlations was performed to assess this hypothesis, which stated that the extrinsic job aspects would have a stronger correlation with PT workers' organizational commitment than the intrinsic job aspects would. A Fisher *r*-to-*Z* transformation, supplied by Hays' (1994) Table VI, was used and the test statistic was calculated by hand using the equation specified by Hays (1994) and then referring it to a *normal* distribution. The value for the test statistic did not reach the specified .05 significance level of $\pm$1.96, and was therefore not significant (z=.64832536). The extrinsic job aspects score did not have a stronger correlation with the PT workers' organizational commitment then the intrinsic job aspects score did.

To determine whether job status moderated the relationship between extrinsic job aspects and organizational commitment, which were hypotheses P6 and I6, organizational commitment was first regressed on tenure (to control for its effect). As a second block, job status (primary/secondary) and extrinsic job aspects were added. The cross-product interaction term (job status multiplied by extrinsic job aspects) was then added as a third block. The findings indicated that the first block of the control variable of tenure added a significant 3.7% of variance ($F(1, 351) = 13.499$, $p = .000$), and tenure was a significant predictor. The two linear effects of job status and extrinsic job aspects added a significant 3.3% variance explanation ($F(3,349) = 69.071$, $p = .000$) to organizational commitment. Both extrinsic job aspects and job status were significant predictors. The block of the two-way interaction term did not add any variance. The interaction between extrinsic job aspects and job status was not significant. The

results for P6 and I6 are presented in Table 9. Although organizational commitment is significantly different for secondary and primary PT workers, there is not a significant interaction occurring to indicate a different relationship between extrinsic job aspects and organizational commitment for primary PT workers than secondary PT workers.

Initially, to test hypothesis I7, that tenure would moderate the relationship of relationship investments and organizational commitment, organizational commitment was first regressed on relationship investments and tenure (to assess linear effects). As a second block, the cross-product interaction term (relationship investments multiplied by tenure) was added. The findings indicated that the first block of tenure and relationship investments added a significant 33.7% of variance ($F(2, 358) = 91$, $p = .000$, see Table 10), and only relationship investments was a significant predictor of organizational commitment. The block of the two-way interaction term added only .01% of significant variance ($F(3, 357) = 60.718$, $p = .000$). The interaction between tenure and relationship investments was not significant. Tenure was not a significant linear predictor of organizational commitment in the regression, and the interaction term was also not significant, indicating that there is no interaction between tenure and relationship investments in predicting organizational commitment. Therefore, hypothesis I7 was not supported.

Hypothesis I8 stated that greater tenure would result in a stronger prediction of organizational commitment from job rewards/costs, relationship investments and external employability. To test this hypothesis, it was first necessary to conduct a regression test that would establish whether tenure was a significant moderator in the prediction of organizational commitment. Therefore, organizational commitment was first regressed on tenure, job rewards/costs, relationship investments and external employability (to assess linear effects). As a second block, the cross-product interaction terms (tenure*job rewards/costs, tenure*relationship

investments, and tenure*external employability) were added. The findings indicated that the first block of tenure and relationship investments added a significant 47.1% of variance ($F(4, 316) = 70.311$, $p = .000$, see Table 11), and rewards/costs, external employability, and relationship investments were significant predictors of organizational commitment, tenure was not. The block of the two-way interaction terms added only 1 % of significant variance ($F(7, 313) = 41.493$, $p = .000$), however the interaction between tenure and job rewards/costs was significant. Tenure did moderate the relationship between job rewards/costs and organizational commitment. Since the moderation by tenure was established, it was then necessary to specifically test whether the prediction of organizational commitment was stronger for those with greater tenure as hypothesis I8 stated. Therefore, regressions predicting organizational commitment from the same three Investment Model variables (external employability, relationship investments and job rewards/costs) were conducted for two subsamples composed of the 30% of participants with the highest tenure and the 30% of participants with the lowest tenure). As stated in the hypothesis, the prediction of organizational commitment was stronger for the higher tenure group ($R^2 = .516$) than for the lower tenure group ($R^2 = .432$). Job rewards/costs was a much stronger predictor for the higher tenure group (see Table 12).

Additional Testing for Organizational Commitment

Hypothesis F6, formulated using Feldman's (1990) perspective was that secondary PT workers, not primary PT workers, have greater commitment with greater scheduling flexibility. This statement was hypothesis F6 (the results for F6 are presented in Table 13). Organizational commitment was first regressed on tenure to control for its effect. A second block of flexibility in work scheduling and job status was added to assess their possible linear effects. As a third block, the cross-product two-way interaction term (flexibility in work scheduling by job status)

was then added. The findings indicated that the first block added a significant 3.6% of variance ($F(1, 406) = 15.24$, $p = .000$), and tenure was a significant predictor of organizational commitment. The second block added 12.6% of significant variance ($F(3, 404) = 26.042$, $p = .000$) and both flexibility in work scheduling and job status were significant predictors. The third block of the two-way interaction term added .3% of significant variance ($F(4, 403) = 19.921$, $p = .000$) but the two-way interaction term was not significant, indicating no moderation occurring. Therefore, although job status and flexibility in work scheduling predict organizational commitment, secondary PT workers do not have a stronger relationship between flexibility in work scheduling and organizational commitment than primary PT workers. Hypothesis F6 is not supported.

Findings of the Critical Tests regarding Turnover Intent

The Partial Inclusion viewpoint (P7) and Feldman's perspective (F7) made the same hypotheses on the turnover intent of primary and secondary PT workers which was that secondary PT workers would have greater turnover intent than primary PT workers. Both hypotheses were supported as the t-test for mean differences between primary and secondary PT workers on turnover intent was significant, $t(417)=-2.040$, p=.042, with secondary PT workers having a higher mean (m = 1.97). This t-test did not support hypothesis I9 (that there would not be a significant differences on turnover intent for primary and secondary PT workers). However, the additional critical test of the Investment Model viewpoint (I10) was supported. Hypothesis I10 stated that turnover intent is predicted by job rewards/costs, job investments and job alternatives, and the overall equation was significant ($R^2=.232$, $F(3,316)=31.786$, $p<.000$). All three predictors also had significant betas (see Table 14).

Further Direct Model Testing regarding Turnover Intent

Hypothesis P8 stated that job satisfaction and organizational commitment were weaker predictors of secondary PT workers' turnover intent than primary PT workers' turnover intent. It was tested using moderated regression and the results are listed in Table 15. Turnover intent was first regressed on organizational commitment, job satisfaction and job status to assess their possible linear effects. As a second block, three two-way cross-product interaction terms (organizational commitment by job satisfaction, job satisfaction by job status, and job status by organizational commitment) were then added. Finally, a third block containing the three-way interaction term (organizational commitment by job satisfaction by job status) was added to the regression. The findings indicated that the first block added a significant 28.1% of variance ($F(3, 402) = 52.478$, $p = .000$), and job satisfaction and organizational commitment were significant predictors of turnover intent. The second block added 2.9% of significant variance ($F(6, 399) = 29.834$, $p = .000$) and only the job satisfaction by organizational commitment two-way interaction term was significant. The third block of the three-way interaction term added .1% of significant variance ($F(7, 398) = 25.720$, $p = .000$) and the three-way interaction term was not significant, which showed that hypothesis P8 was not supported. There was not a 3-way interaction occurring between job status, organizational commitment and job satisfaction, in the prediction of turnover intent.

Hypothesis F8, formulated using Feldman's (1990) perspective, was that secondary PT workers, not primary PT workers, have less turnover intent with greater scheduling flexibility. Hypothesis F8 was tested using moderated regression and the results are listed in Table 16. Turnover intent was first regressed on flexibility in work scheduling and job status to assess their possible linear effects. As a second block, the cross-product two-way interaction term (flexibility

in work scheduling by job status) was then added. The findings indicated that the first block added a significant 7.8% of variance ($F(2, 413) = 17.412$, $p = .000$), and flexibility in work scheduling was a significant predictor of turnover intent. The second block added .5% of significant variance ($F(3, 412) = 12.504$, $p = .000$), but the two-way interaction term was not significant. F8 was not supported as there was no interaction between job status and flexibility in work scheduling in predicting turnover intent.

Table 4

Regression Results for Hypothesis I2

Variable Name	β	t	R^2	F
Job Rewards and Costs	.602	14.316*		
Total Equation			.363	204.957*

*p < .01

Table 5

Post-hoc Regression of Extrinsic/Intrinsic Aspects on Satisfaction

Variable Name	β	T	R^2	F
Extrinsic Job Aspects	.225	4.014*		
Intrinsic Job Aspects	.445	7.925*		
Total Equation			.374	97.003*

*p < .01

Table 6

Moderated Regression Results for Hypotheses P3 and I3

	Block Values			Individual Values	
	R^2	$\triangle R^2$	F	β	t
Linear Effects (as a block)	.249		58.537*		
Job Status (S)				-.067	-1.460
Extrinsic Aspects (EA)				.493	10.694*
Two-way Interaction (as a block)	.250	.001	39.136*		
S x EA				.233	.707

* $p < .01$

Table 7

Moderated Regression Analysis Results for Hypothesis F3

	Block Values			Individual Values	
	R^2	$\triangle R^2$	F	β	t
Linear Effects (as a block)	.068		14.908*		
Flex. in Wk. Sched. (F)				.249	5.191
Job Status (S)				-.059	-1.222
Two-way Interaction (as a block)	.068	0	9.918*		
F x S				.020	.102

* $p < .01$

Table 8

Regression Results for Hypothesis I5

Variable Name	β	t	R^2	F
External Employability	-.254	-5.797*		
Job Rewards & Costs	.532	11.469*		
Job Investments	.041	.918		
Total Equation			.444	84.475*

*p<.01

Table 9

Moderated Regression Analysis Results for Hypotheses P6 & I6

	Block Values			Individual Values	
	R^2	$\triangle R^2$	F	β	t
Control Var's (as a block)	.037		13.499*		
Tenure (T)				-.192	-3.674*
Linear Effects (as a block)	.373	.336	69.071*		
Extrinsic Aspects (EA)				.586	13.349*
Job Status (S)				.100	-2.359**
Two-way Interaction (as a block)	.373	0	51.817*		
EA x S				.192	.637

* $p < .01$

** $p < .05$

Table 10

Moderated Regression Analysis Results for Hypotheses I7

	Block Values			Individual Values	
	R^2	$\triangle R^2$	F	β	t
Linear Effects (as a block)	.337		91.000*		
Relation. Invest. (RI)				.566	12.722*
Tenure (T)				-.049	-1.107
Two-way Interaction (as a block)	.338	.001	60.718*		
RI x T				.141	.662

* $p < .01$

Table 11

Moderated Regression Analysis Results for Hypotheses I8

	Block Values			Individual Values	
	R^2	$\triangle R^2$	F	β	t
Linear Effects (as a block)	.471		70.311*		
Job Rewards/Costs (R/C)				.353	5.547*
External Employ. (EE)				-.244	-5.709*
Relation. Invest. (RI)				.248	3.9*
Tenure (T)				-.030	-.705
Two-way Interaction (as a block)	.481	.010	41.493*		
RI * T				-.468	-1.555
R/C * T				.707	2.459**
EE * T				.109	.793

* $p < .01$

** $p < .05$

Table 12

Subsample Regression Analyses Results for Hypothesis I8

	Overall Values		Individual Values	
	R^2	F	β	t
Least Tenure Grp (n = 104)	.432	22.287*		
Relationship Investments			.195	1.811
External Employability			-.294	-3.524*
Job Rewards/Costs			.365	3.343*
Greatest Tenure Grp (n = 115)	.516	34.826*		
Relationship Investments			.051	.454
External Employability			-.199	-2.713*
Job Rewards/Costs			.598	5.170*

* $p < .01$

Table 13

Moderated Regression Analysis Results for Hypothesis F6

	Block Values			Individual Values	
	R^2	$\triangle R^2$	F	β	T
Control Var's (as a block)	.036		15.240*		
Tenure (T)				-.190	-3.904*
Linear Effects (as a block)	.162	.126	26.042*		
Flex. in Wk. Sched. (F)				.328	7.17*
Job Status (S)				-.110	-2.414*
Two-way Interaction (as a block)	.165	.003	19.921*		
F x S				.226	1.212

* $p < .01$

Table 14

Regression Results for I10

Variable Name	β	t	R^2	F
Job Rewards & Costs	-.249	-4.576*		
Job Investments	-.129	-2.467**		
Job Alternatives	.285	5.523*		
Total Equation			.232	31.786*

*p < .01

**p < .05

Table 15

Moderated Regression Analysis Results for Hypothesis P8

	Block Values			Individual Values	
	R^2	$\triangle R^2$	F	β	T
Linear Effects (as a block)	.281		52.478*		
Org. Commit. (OC)				-.271	-4.570*
Job Status (S)				.042	.996
Job Satisfaction (JS)				-.298	-5.049*
Two-way Interaction (as a block)	.310	.029	29.834*		
OC x S				-.249	-.862
JS x S				-.033	-.124
OC x JS				.850	3.572*
Three-way Interaction (as a block)	.311	.001	25.720*		
OC x S x JS				-.873	-1.012

* $p < .01$

Table 16

Moderated Regression Analysis Results for Hypotheses F8

	Block Values			Individual Values	
	R^2	$\triangle R^2$	F	β	T
Linear Effects (as a block)	.078		17.412*		
Flex. in Wk. Sched. (F)				-.262	-5.515*
Job Status (S)				.076	1.595*
Two-way Interaction (as a block)	.083	.005	12.504*		
F x S				-.308	-1.599

* $p < .01$

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Barling and Gallagher (1996) and Thorsteinson (2003) indicated that much of the research on the job attitudes of PT workers to date has been either descriptive or atheoretical in nature. The present research should help eradicate this lack of theoretical research on the work attitudes of PT workers. In addition, this study should help direct future studies by indicating the theoretical perspectives that seem the most viable in terms of studying subgroups of PT workers.

The findings for each of the three theories under consideration in this study are reviewed and discussed (see Table 17 for a concise listing of the hypothesis results). The general findings for the work attitudes of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intent of PT workers are noted. Thirdly, the limitations of this study are reviewed, and this discussion concludes with suggestions for future research on PT worker theory.

Findings for Partial Inclusion Theory

Of the eight hypotheses that were formulated using Partial Inclusion Theory to explain the work attitudes of primary and secondary PT workers, seven of them were not supported. This study put forth the idea that the dichotomy of primary and secondary PT workers was similar to the dichotomy of FT and PT workers, in terms of being less included. It was suggested by the present researcher that the partial inclusion of PT workers, or the segmentation of PT workers across a number of different social systems, is even greater for secondary PT workers than primary PT workers. Therefore, they would have less negative information about the organization than primary PT workers, and they would have greater job satisfaction and

organizational commitment. Instead, this study found that the secondary PT workers did not have significantly different job satisfaction than primary PT workers (failing to find support for hypothesis P1) and had significantly less organizational commitment than primary PT workers (failing to support hypothesis P4). Regarding turnover intent (hypothesis P7), this hypothesis was supported. The secondary PT workers had greater turnover intent than the primary PT workers. This finding is in line with the accepted theoretical partial inclusion idea that PT workers have greater turnover intent due to greater inclusion in social systems outside of work that exert pressure on them for their attention (Martin & Hafer, 1995). Secondary PT workers should have even greater inclusion in outside social systems than primary PT workers. However, this hypothesis also supported Feldman's (1990) perspective; so it was not uniquely supportive of Partial Inclusion Theory. The test of the second Partial Inclusion hypothesis regarding turnover intent was not supported. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment were not weaker predictors of secondary PT workers' turnover intent than primary PT workers' turnover intent as hypothesized in P8.

In their partial inclusion explanation, Logan et al. (1973) said PT workers' work attitudes should reflect their stronger focus on the extrinsic aspects of their jobs while FT workers' attitudes should reflect their stronger focus on the intrinsic job aspects. Therefore, in the present research, the PT workers' satisfaction with the extrinsic job aspects such as coworker relationships and the support of the organization should have been more predictive of their global job satisfaction (and their organizational commitment) than their intrinsic job aspects were. However, this hypothesis (P2) was not supported by the data. The extrinsic job aspects were not stronger predictors of the PT workers' global job satisfaction, rather the intrinsic job aspects were. As for the PT workers' organizational commitment, the extrinsic job aspects did not make

a stronger prediction as expected, not supporting hypothesis P5. A post-hoc regression analysis was conducted to see if the extrinsic or the intrinsic job aspects better predicted the work attitude of turnover intent, since a specific hypothesis was not made for this work attitude. Similar to the results of the same analysis predicting job satisfaction, the intrinsic job aspects were much stronger predictors of turnover intent than the extrinsic job aspects. This result is also contrary to the expectation of Partial Inclusion theory. Additionally, the relationships between extrinsic job aspects and job satisfaction or between extrinsic job aspects and organizational commitment were not stronger for secondary PT workers than primary PT workers (not supporting hypotheses P3 and P6). These results disagreed with Partial Inclusion theory expectations as well.

Coyle-Shapiro and Conway (2002) stated that peripherality might be an outdated concept when describing PT employees in terms of the organization's workforce. It might even be an invalid stereotype, they state. The findings for partial inclusion theory (which is the theory behind peripherality) in the present study definitely do not dispute these statements. Partial Inclusion Theory did not adequately describe or predict the work attitudes of primary or secondary PT workers in the present study, because only one turnover intent hypothesis (P7) was supported. As Newbolt (1999) stated, Partial Inclusion theory might be better applied to PT worker subgroups of race or gender, as ethnic minorities or women may experience more issues pertaining to their lesser inclusion. Or, it may be that Partial Inclusion theory may have outlived its usefulness for the PT worker context in general. In conclusion, the present study definitely did not lend much support to the application of Partial Inclusion theory to explain PT worker subgroup differences.

Findings for the PT Work Arrangements View

Five of the eight hypotheses formulated from the viewpoint of the PT work arrangements perspective (Feldman, 1990) were not supported. Three were supported, including two key hypotheses about primary and secondary PT workers' organizational commitment and turnover intent. According to Feldman's (1990) viewpoint, primary and secondary PT workers should have different work attitudes due to their differing PT work arrangements. Feldman predicted that PT worker's main jobs are more likely to be better compensating and more interesting than PT worker's secondary jobs. Therefore, primary PT workers' job satisfaction should be greater than secondary PT workers' job satisfaction, which was hypothesis F1. This hypothesis was not supported by the current research. There was no significant difference between the job satisfaction of primary and secondary PT workers thus falsifying F1. Also according to Feldman, PT workers are less committed to their secondary jobs than their primary jobs. Support was found for this hypothesis (F5), as the primary PT workers did experience greater organizational commitment than the secondary PT workers in the sample. So, the primary PT workers were not more satisfied, but they were more committed than the secondary PT workers. As for their turnover intent, Feldman's perspective was that greater turnover intent would occur with secondary PT workers, and this hypothesis also was supported. Therefore, primary PT workers had both greater organizational commitment and less turnover intent than secondary PT workers (hypotheses F5 and F7) as predicted by Feldman's viewpoint.

The female PT workers in the sample did not have greater job satisfaction than the male PT workers (hypothesis F4) contrary to Feldman's (1990) assertions and Feldman and Doerpinghaus' (1992) findings. Flexibility in work scheduling was a positive predictor of the job satisfaction of both primary and secondary PT workers (hypothesis F2) as expected by

Feldman's (1990) viewpoint, but it only accounted for 7% of the variance of this prediction. In addition, a stronger relationship between flexibility in work scheduling and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, or turnover intent of secondary PT workers over primary PT workers was not found, not supporting hypotheses F3, F6, and F8. Flexibility in work scheduling was not more important to the work attitudes of secondary PT workers than it was to the work attitudes of primary PT workers.

Therefore, Feldman's (1990) viewpoint was only partially supported by the present research. Greater organizational commitment and less turnover intent were found with primary PT workers as predicted. However, the key job satisfaction hypothesis on primary/secondary differences; the hypotheses on flexibility in work scheduling being more important to the work attitudes of secondary PT workers; and the hypothesis on gender differences in job satisfaction; were not supported.

Findings for Investment Model Theory

Investment Model theory explaining PT workers' work attitudes has been examined in only one piece of recent research (Sinclair, Martin, & Mitchell, 1999), therefore the present research serves as the second application of it to this context. The Investment Model perspective attributes differences in job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intent to different levels of job investments, job rewards/costs, and job alternatives rather than to whether the job is a primary or secondary job for the PT worker. The findings for job satisfaction were supportive of the Investment Model view, as the primary and secondary PT workers did not differ on their job satisfaction. The additional hypothesis regarding job rewards/costs as the determinants of job satisfaction (I2) was also supported. More than 36 percent of the variance in job satisfaction was accounted for by job rewards/costs.

The present research did show differing levels of organizational commitment and turnover intent for primary and secondary PT workers, which did not support two Investment Model hypotheses made by the current researcher (hypotheses I4 and I9). However, organizational commitment was positively predicted by job rewards/costs and job alternatives (in testing I5), which the Investment Model argues are two of the three key factors responsible for organizational commitment. The third key factor, job investments, was not a significant predictor. Tenure did not moderate the relationship between relationship investments and organizational commitment, which was expected by Investment Model theory. However, tenure did moderate the relationship of job rewards/costs and organizational commitment so that higher tenure resulted in a stronger prediction of organizational commitment from job rewards/costs. This outcome was expected and the explanation given by Investment Model theory is that over time, one can expect rewards to remain fairly constant but job costs to become greater. In research by Rusbult and Farrell (1983) the impact of job costs initially was minimal, but became more important over time, in terms of workers' perceptions. The three key factors (job costs/rewards, job investments, and job alternatives) that encompass the Investment Model theory's definition of organizational commitment significantly predicted turnover intent (I10) which Investment Model theory postulates.

Despite finding this support for the Investment Model theory's explanations of what drives organizational commitment and turnover intent, an explanation was lacking for why there were significant differences between primary and secondary PT workers on these variables. In a post-hoc attempt to explain these findings, the same regressions used to test these hypotheses (I5 and I10) were conducted separately for primary and secondary PT workers. For organizational commitment, the overall regression equations were significant. They showed that only the

relationship investments' beta was very different for primary and secondary PT workers. It was considerably lower for the secondary PT workers indicating that it was a weaker predictor of organizational commitment for the secondary PT workers than for the primary PT workers (see Table 18). The conclusion was that the prediction of organizational commitment from relationship investments was not as strong for secondary PT workers as it was for primary PT workers. This finding indicated that primary and secondary PT workers did not respond to friendships at work and coworker/organizational/supervisory support (relationship investments) in the same manner. In other words, for secondary PT workers, these variables were less indicative of their organizational commitment.

For turnover intent, the post-hoc regressions (which were significant) showed that both job rewards/costs and external employability were stronger predictors of turnover intent for secondary PT workers than primary PT workers (see Table 19). The prediction of turnover intent from job rewards/costs and external employability was clearer for secondary PT workers than for primary PT workers. This finding indicated that secondary PT workers more clearly responded to external job availability by expressing intentions of quitting. They also expressed greater intentions of quitting when the job costs went up or the job rewards decreased.

The results of the present study show that investment model theorists are correct in their explanations of what is driving job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intent for PT workers. However, Feldman's (1990) perspective that there are differences between primary and secondary PT workers on organizational commitment and turnover intent is also supported by the current results. Perhaps the failure of the present study to include measures of all the job investments that may have varied between primary and secondary PT workers, such as specific on-the-job training, spousal employment in the geographic area, home ownership in the

geographic area, or religious or community ties to the geographic area, was a pivotal reason for why the organizational commitment and turnover intent differences were not fully explainable using Investment Model concepts.

General Work Attitude Findings

General, practical considerations regarding PT workers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intent can and should be drawn from the results of the present study. There was no significant difference in the amount of job satisfaction experienced by primary and secondary PT workers, so their differing PT work arrangements do not appear to affect their overall job satisfaction. The extrinsic aspects of the job, such as the supervisory support and the physical work environment, were not better predictors of their job satisfaction, organizational commitment or turnover intent than the intrinsic aspects of the job (such as the job characteristics). Also, flexibility in work scheduling was not more important to secondary PT workers than primary PT workers in terms of their satisfaction, commitment or turnover intent. It was a positive predictor of job satisfaction for all the PT workers. Organizational commitment does appear to be greater for primary PT workers, and turnover intent appears to be greater for secondary PT workers. Organizational commitment was positively predicted by job rewards/costs and negatively predicted by the availability of job alternatives. Turnover intent was negatively predicted by the job rewards/costs and the relationship investments made by the PT worker and positively predicted by the availability of job alternatives. Lastly, this research did not indicate any gender differences in the job satisfaction of PT workers.

Limitations

Sample. As previously noted, the sample that was obtained should be considered a special case of PT workers. That is, they were unionized PT workers who were eligible for: health

insurance benefits; the company stock purchase plan; the bidding on FT jobs; and some tuition reimbursement. In addition, all of the PT workers that were surveyed worked for the same company, which also limits the generalizability of the results.

Data-gathering methods. The single method of data collection, and the single administration of the questionnaire to the participants, both used in the present study, can be faulty data gathering strategies. Too often, these methods reflect the constraints posed by the company whose employees are the participants, or by the monetary budget of the researchers. Common method bias concerns were statistically addressed as previously noted, but single survey administration lacks the measurement precision provided by the repeated measures or multiple measurements approaches, so it deserves mention as a limitation of the present study as well.

Measures. As noted in the previous discussion of the findings for Investment Model theory, the present study is lacking measurement of some variables that qualify as investments under this theory. The lack of measurement of these variables may have limited the adequate testing of Investment Model theory in the present study.

Future Research

As for which theoretical perspective received the most support in the present study, it appears to be Investment Model theory, however the PT Work Arrangements perspective also received some support. Three of the eight hypotheses formulated from the PT Work Arrangements perspective received support. Two of these were termed "key" hypotheses since they were regarding organizational commitment and turnover intent contrasts between primary and secondary PT workers. Investment Model theory received the greatest support in terms of the number of hypotheses supported, as six of ten of the Investment Model hypotheses were

supported by the data. It is clear from the present research that Partial Inclusion theory received the least support, with only one of eight of the hypotheses formulated using Partial Inclusion theory receiving support.

To continue theoretical development in this area, researchers need to further investigate why these differences on organizational commitment and turnover intent exist between primary and secondary PT workers. There is also a need for continued research on other subgroups of PT workers as defined by Feldman (1990), since that research area is under-explored. It might be possible to combine some aspects of Feldman's (1990) perspective with Investment Model theory to create a usable framework for future studies of PT workers. Investment Model theory appears quite satisfactory as a general explanation of work attitudes. For additional testing of Investment Model theory applied to primary and secondary PT workers, all of the Investment Model variables defining organizational commitment and turnover intent should be measured. These variables include specific measurements of all the concrete investments like home ownership in the geographic area, and all of the relationship investments made by participants. A multiple predictive discriminant analysis predicting their classification as either a primary or secondary PT worker could be done, and one could examine where the significant differences lie. Perhaps looking at the primary/secondary subgroups again with more measures of their investments would make it possible to determine what specifically is making a difference for the primary PT workers. That is, is it their investments or is it something else about the PT work arrangement that is making a difference for them (in terms of their greater organizational commitment and less turnover intent)?

Feldman's (1990) prediction that primary jobs would result in greater organizational commitment and less turnover intent was supported, but his reasoning for these differences could

not be tested in the present sample. No information was available to ascertain whether the main job of the secondary PT workers was more interesting or better compensating than the secondary job (which were two reasons Feldman gave for the lesser organizational commitment and greater turnover intent of secondary PT workers). Therefore, additional research on these subgroups is warranted, and well as further examination of the other PT worker subgroups as defined by Feldman. To date, limited research has been completed on the voluntary versus involuntary and temporary versus permanent PT worker subgroups (Feldman & Doerpinghaus, 1992) and little other research, except the present study, has been completed that examines the primary versus secondary or the year-round versus seasonal subgroup distinctions.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the results of the present study show that Investment Model theorists are correct about what predicts job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intent of primary and secondary PT workers. However, Feldman's (1990) perspective that there are differences between primary and secondary PT workers on organizational commitment and turnover intent is also correct.

The present researcher echoes the words of many PT worker researchers by noting the importance of empirical research on PT workers for the development of PT worker theory. This importance is ever growing, since PT workers are an ever-growing population within the global workforce (Martin & Hafer, 1995; Sightler & Adams, 1999). The present study provides empirical evidence and furthers theoretical development for explaining PT workers' attitudes.

Table 17

Research Hypotheses Findings

	Partial Inclusion Hypotheses	PT Work Arrangements Hypotheses	Investment Model Hypotheses
Critical Tests of Job Satisfaction	P1 not supported	F1 not supported	I1 supported I2 supported
Further Direct Model Tests of Job Satisfaction	P2 not supported P3 not supported		I3 supported
Additional Tests of Job Satisfaction		F2 supported F3 not supported F4 not supported	
Critical Tests of Organizational Commitment	P4 not supported	F5 supported	I4 not supported I5 not supported
Further Direct Model Tests of Organizational Commitment	P5 not supported P6 not supported		I6 supported I7 not supported I8 supported
Additional Test of Organizational Commitment		F6 not supported	
Critical Tests of Turnover Intent	P7 supported	F7 supported	I9 not supported I10 supported
Further Direct Model Tests of Turnover Intent	P8 not supported	F8 not supported	

Table 18

Post-hoc Subsample Regression to explain Organizational Commitment Findings

	Overall Values		Individual Values	
	R^2	F	β	t
Primary PT Workers (n = 185)	.460	38.546*		
Relationship Investments			.282	3.293*
External Employability			-.211	-3.734*
Tenure			.010	.172
Job Rewards/Costs			.353	4.159*
Secondary PT Workers (n = 129)	.510	32.497*		
Relationship Investments			.200	2.049**
External Employability			-.267	-3.919*
Tenure			-.074	-1.129
Job Rewards/Costs			.377	3.839*

* $p < .01$

** $p < .05$

Table 19

Post-hoc Subsample Regression to explain Turnover Intent Findings

	Overall Values		Individual Values	
	R^2	F	β	t
Primary PT Workers (n = 185)	.158	8.507*		
Job Rewards/Costs			-.259	-2.442**
External Employability			.241	3.401*
Tenure			-.139	-1.934***
Relationship Investments			-.006	-.055
Secondary PT Workers (n = 128)	.336	15.706*		
Job Rewards/Costs			-.386	-3.360*
External Employability			.336	4.231*
Tenure			-.174	-2.274**
Relationship Investments			-.009	-.081

* $p < .01$

** $p < .05$

*** $p = .055$

REFERENCES

Allport, F.H. (1933). *Institutional Behavior*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Arnold, H.J., & Feldman, D.C. (1982). A multivariate analysis of the determinants of job turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*(3)*,* 350-360.

Barker, K. (1993). Changing assumptions and contingent solutions: The costs and benefits of women working full- and part-time. *Sex Roles, 28*, 47-71.

Barling, J., & Gallagher, D.G. (1996). Part-time employment. In C.L. Cooper & I.T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Volume 11, pp. 243-277). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Bennett, N., Carson, P.P., Carson, K.D., & Blum, T.C. (1994). A comparison of "traditional" and "atypical" workers: Demographic, behavioral, and attitudinal differences. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 8*, 467-474.

Blau, G.J. (1985). A multiple study investigation of the dimensionality of job involvement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 27*, 19-36.

Blau, G.J., & Boal, K.B. (1987). Conceptualizing how job involvement and organizational commitment affect turnover and absenteeism. *Academy of Management Review, 12*, 288-300.

Blau, G.J., & Boal, K.B. (1989). Using job involvement and organizational commitment interactively to predict turnover. *Journal of Management, 15*(1), 115-127.

Brayfield, A.H., & Crockett, W.H. (1955). Employee attitudes and employee performance. *Psychological Bulletin, 52*, 396-424.

Brayfield, A.H., & Rothe, H.F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 35*, 307-311.

Chen, P.Y., & Spector, P.E. (1992). Relationship of work stressors with aggression, withdrawal, theft and substance abuse: An exploratory study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 65*, 177-184.

Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression / correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Coyle-Shapiro, J. A-M., & Conway, N.J. (2002, August). *Comparing psychological contracts of part-time and full-time employees: A quasi-experimental study*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Conference, Denver, CO.

Dube, L., & Maute, M.F. (1998). Defensive Strategies for managing satisfaction and loyalty in the service industry. *Psychology & Marketing, 15*(8), 775-791.

Eberhardt, B.J., & Moser, S.B. (1995). The nature and consequences of part-time work: A test of hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Business Research, 11*, 101-108.

Eberhardt, B.J., & Shani, A.B. (1984). The effects of full-time versus part-time employment status on attitudes toward specific organizational characteristics and overall job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal, 27*, 893-900.

Eisenberger, R., & Huntington, R. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 500-507.

Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organization support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 51-59.

Farrell, D., & Rusbult, C.E. (1981). Exchange variables as predictors of job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover: The impact of rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 27*, 78-95.

Farrell, D., & Rusbult, C.E. (1992). Exploring the exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect typology: The influence of job satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 5*(3), 201-218.

Feldman, D.C. (1990). Reconceptualizing the nature and consequences of part-time work. *Academy of Management Review, 15*, 103-112.

Feldman, D.C., & Doerpinghaus, H.I. (1992a). Missing persons no longer: Managing part-time workers in the ‘90s. *Organizational Dynamics, 21*, 59-72.

Feldman, D.C., & Doerpinghaus, H.I. (1992). Patterns of part-time employment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 41*, 282-294.

Feldman, D.C., Doerpinghaus, H.I. & Turnley, W.H. (1995). Employee reactions to temporary jobs. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 7*, 127-142.

Ferris, G.R., & Kacmar, K.M. (1992). Perceptions of organizational politics. *Journal of Management, 18*, 93-116.

Fleishman, E.A. (1957). In R.M. Stogdill, & A.E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement research monograph number 88* (pp. 103-119). Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, Ohio State University.

Flood, P.C., Gannon, M.J., Paauwe, J., (1995). *Managing without traditional methods: International innovations in human resource management.* Wokingham, England; Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1995.

Gannon, M.J., & Northern, J.C. (1971). A comparison of short-term and long-term employees. *Personnel Psychology, 24*, 687-696.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 561-568.

Griffin, R.W., Moorhead, G., Johnson, B.H., & Chonko, L.B. (1980). The empirical dimensionality of the job characteristic inventory. *Academy of Management Journal, 23*, 772-777.

Hackman, J.R., & Lawler, E.E. (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 55*(3), 259-286.

Hall, D.T., & Gordon, F.E. (1973). Career choices of married women: Effects of conflict, role behavior, and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 58*, 38-42.

Holtom, B.C., Lee, T.W., & Tidd, S.T. (2002). The relationship between work status congruence and work-related attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(5), 903-915.

Hom, P.W. (1979). Effects of job peripherality and personal characteristics on the job satisfaction of part-time workers. *Academy of Management Journal, 22*(3), 551-565.

Jaccard, J. & Turrisi, R. (2003). *Interaction effects in mutiple regression (2nd ed.)*. (Sage University Papers Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, series no. 07-072). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jamal, M. (1986). Moonlighting: Personal, social, and organizational consequences. *Human Relations, 39*, 977-990.

Kacmar, K.M., & Ferris, G.R. (1989). Theoretical and methodological considerations in the age-job satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 201-207.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons: New York.

Keil, J.M., Armstrong-Stassen, M., Cameron, S.J., & Hotsburgh, M.E. (2000). Part-time nurses: The effect of work status congruency on job attitudes. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49*(2), 227-236.

Krausz, M., Sagie, A., & Bidermann, Y. (2000). Actual and preferred work schedules and scheduling control as determinants of job-related attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56*, 1-11.

Lawler, E.E. (1973). *Motivation in work organizations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Lee, T.W. & Johnson, D.R. (1991). The effects of work schedule and employment status on the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of full- versus part-time employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 38*, 208-224.

Levanoni, E. & Sales, C.A. (1990). Differences in job attitudes between full-time and part-time Canadian employees. *Journal of Social Psychology, 130*, 231-237.

Logan, N., O'Reilly, C., & Roberts, D. (1973). Job satisfaction among part-time and full-time employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 3*, 33-41.

Martin, T.N., & Hafer, J.C. (1995). The multiplicative effects of job involvement and organizational commitment on the turnover intentions of full- and part-time employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 46*, 310-331.

McComb, S. (2002). *An integrative model of part-time work: Determinants, consequences, and moderators*. Paper presented at Academy of Management Conference 2002, Denver, CO.

McGinnis, S.K. & Morrow, P.C. (1990). Job attitudes among full- and part-time employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 36*, 82-96.

Miller, H.E., & Terborg, J.R. (1979). Job attitudes of part-time and full-time employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 64*(4), 380-386.

Michaels, C.E., & Spector, P.E. (1982). Causes of employee turnover: A test of the Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*, 53-59.

Mobley, W.H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62*, 237-240.

Morrow, P.C., McElroy, J.C., & Elliott, S.M. (1994). The effect of preference for work status, schedule, and shift on work-related attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 45*, 202-222.

Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., & Steers, R.M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.

Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., & Porter, L.W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14,* 224-247.

Nardone, T. (1995). Part-time employment: Reasons, demographics, and trends. *Journal of Labor Research, 16*, 275-292.

Newbolt, W.H. (1999). Differences in work related attitudes of part-time and full-time employees: A test of applied partial inclusion theory. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(06), 3313.

Newbolt, W.H., & Pierce, H.R. (1999, April). *Retention of part-time employees: The relationship between attitudes and turnover*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Industrial Organizational Psychologists, Atlanta, GA.

Niehoff, B.P., Moorman, R.H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. Academy of Management Journal, 36, 527-556.

Olmsted, B. & Smith, S. (1994). *Creating a flexible workplace: how to select and manage alternative work options*. New York: AMACOM.

Pearson, L.C., Carroll, D., & Hall, B. (1994). Analysis of demographic, perceptual, and work-related factors in teacher moonlighting. *Journal of Educational Research, 87*, 304-308.

Peters, L.H., Jackofsky, E.F., & Salter, J.R. (1981). Predicting turnover: A comparison of part-time and full-time employees. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2*, 89-98.

Pierce, J.L., & Dunham, R.B. (1978). The measurement of perceived job characteristics: The job diagnostic survey versus the job characteristics inventory. *Academy of Management Journal, 21*, 123-128.

Podsakoff, P.M., & Organ, D.W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management, 12*, 531-544.

Presser, H.B. (1986). Shift work among American women and childcare. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48*, 551-563.

Price, J.L., & Mueller, C.W. (1981). *Professional turnover: The case of nurses*. New York: Spectrum.

Price, J.L., & Mueller, C.W. (1986a). *Absenteeism and turnover among hospital employees*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Price, J.L., & Mueller, C.W. (1986b). *Handbook of organizational measurement*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing.

Ribsl, M., & Reischl, T.M. (1993). Measuring the climate for health at organizations. *Journal of Occupational Medicine, 35*, 812-824.

Rotchford, N.L. & Roberts, K.H. (1982). Part-time workers as missing persons in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review, 7*, 228-234.

Rusbult, C.E., & Farrell, D. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The impact on job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover of variations in rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 429-438.

Rusbult, C.E., Farrell, D., Rogers, G., & Mainous III, A.G. (1988). Impact of exchange variables on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: An integrative model of responses to declining job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal, 31*(3), 599-627.

Rusbult, C., & Lowery, D. (1985). When bureaucrats get the blues: Responses to dissatisfaction among federal employees. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 15*(1), 80-103.

Salancik, G.R. & Pfeffer, J. (1977). An examination of need-satisfaction models of job attitudes. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 22*, 427-456.

Shockey, M.L., & Mueller, C.W. (1994). At-entry differences in part-time and full-time employees. *Journal of Business & Psychology, 8*, 355-364.

Sightler, K.W., & Adams, J.S. (1999). Differences between stayers and leavers among part-time workers. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 11*, 110-125.

Sims, Jr., H.P., Szilagyi, A.D., & Keller, R.T. (1976). The measurement of job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal, 19*, 195-212.

Sinclair, R.R., Martin, J.E., & Michel, R.P. (1999). Full-time and Part-time subgroup differences in job attitudes and demographic characteristics. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 55*, 337-357.

Smulders, P.G.W. (1993). Absenteeism of part-time and full-time employees. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 43*, 239-252.

Spector, P.E. (1987). Interactive effects of perceived control and job stressors on affective reactions and health outcomes for clerical workers. *Work and Stress, 1*, 155-162.

Steel, R.P. (2002). Turnover theory at the empirical interface: Problems of fit and function. *Academy of Management Review, 27*(3), 346-360.

Steffy, B.D. & Jones, J.W. (1999). Differences between full-time and part-time employees in perceived role strain and work satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*, 321-329.

Stogdill, R.M., & Coons, A.E. (Eds.). (1957). *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement research monograph number 88.* Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, Ohio State University.

Stone, E.F., & Gueutal, H.G. (1985). An empirical derivation of the dimensions along which characteristics of jobs are perceived. *Academy of Management Journal, 28,* 376-396.

Tansky, J.W. & Gallagher, D.G. (1995, January). *Worker attitudes toward employer and union: The impact of voluntary/involuntary part-time employment status.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association, Washington, DC.

Thorsteinson, T. J. (2003). Job attitudes of part-time versus full-time workers: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76,* 151-177.

Tilly, C. (1991). Reasons for the continuing growth of part-time employment. *Monthly Labor Review, 114*(3), 10-18.

Tilly, C. (1996). *Half a job: Bad and good part-time jobs in a changing labor market*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Turner, A.N., & Lawrence, P.R. (1965). *Industrial jobs and the worker*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

U.S. Census Bureau (2000). *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2000* (120th Ed.) (pp. 411-414, Table 665). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau.

Vandenberg, R.J., & Lance, C. E. (1992). Examining the causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Management, 18*(1), 153-167.

Vandenberg, R.J., Richardson, H.A., & Eastman, L.J. (1999). The impact of high involvement work processes on organizational effectiveness a second-order latent variable approach. *Group & Organization Management, 24*, 300-339.

Vandenberg, R.J., & Scarpello, V. (1990). The matching model: An examination of the processes underlying realistic job previews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 60-67.

Vandenberg, R.J., Self, R.M., & Seo, J.H. (1994). A critical examination of the internalization, identification, and compliance commitment measures. *Journal of Management, 20*(10), 123-140.

Wetzel, K., Soloshy, D.E., & Gallagher, D.G. (1990). The work attitudes of full-time and part-time registered nurses. *Health Care Management Review, 15*, 79-85.

Zaccaro, S.J., & Stone, E.F. (1988). Incremental validity of an empirically based measure of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*, 245-252.

APPENDIX A

Part-time Employee Survey
by Mary Crowe-Taylor

Dear Part-time Employee:

You were randomly chosen to complete this survey. By completing it, you will help me understand what part-time employees think and feel about their jobs. This information will help researchers design ways to improve the work life of part-time employees.

The data collected from this survey will be used for research purposes only. Your individual responses are **COMPLETELY ANONYMOUS AND CONFIDENTIAL**. There is no way to identify anyone who completes this survey.

Your management team will receive a summary of the research findings, which **CANNOT** identify individual employees.

Thank you very much for making this research *possible* by filling out this survey, folding the completed survey in half, sealing it in the envelope provided, and returning it to me via Corporate Employee Relations. If you have any questions about the survey, please call me at (706) 542-2174. Leave a message and your call will be returned.

Please begin the survey by turning to the next page. Brief instructions are provided for each section of the survey. ***Please note that the response options change at different parts of the survey. Be sure to read the response options carefully at the beginning of each section.*** Most questions require simply circling your answer, but the last page requires that you check the appropriate boxes. Be sure to answer questions on the **FRONT AND BACK** sides of the survey.

Thank you, again, for your participation in this research project.

Sincerely,

Mary Crowe-Taylor, M.S., University of Georgia, (706) 542-2174