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Abstract

This study built upon research by Martin and Sinclair (2007) who found the part-time employee group is made up of distinct groups that differ in their responses across a range of attitudinal variables (e.g. measures of job satisfaction and commitment). Part-time employees typically have higher employee turnover rates than full-time employees and this study investigated this issue by collecting data on attitudinal variables known to predict employee turnover intentions.

The 311 participants of this study were from different branches across a large retail organisation in New Zealand. The results show that the high-school and tertiary student part-time groups often responded to scales similar to each other, while the ‘PT (other)’ and full-time employee groups were more similar in their responses. These results show a pattern of responses for the part-time group called ‘PT (other)’ that suggests they are less likely to quit compared to the two student part-time groups. Work status (part-time or full-time) was found to moderate the relationship between fulfilment of psychological contract with both turnover intentions (job search behaviours) and overall satisfaction. This study also developed and tested two new measures expected to relate to employee turnover. The first was pre-planned intention to quit, which successfully predicted differences between groups and had correlations with other scales. The second measure was social network strength, but this did not predict differences between groups or have correlations with other variables.

The main implication was that retail organisations should be aware that the student part-time groups are more likely to have a higher turnover rate than other groups. This information might be useful when recruiting for positions where an employee quit has significant negative effect on the operation of the organisation.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

High employee turnover/quit rates are a problem faced by many organisations across many industries in New Zealand and world-wide. Out of the fourteen major industries in New Zealand, the retail trade industry has the fifth highest employee turnover rates of 18% per year where others ranged from 33.3% (in agriculture, forestry and fishing) to 10% (in government administration and defence) (Statistics New Zealand, 2005). As well as varying across industries, turnover rates also vary across different age groups, with 15-19 years having the highest turnover rates of 31.5%, which steadily declines as age increases to the age group of 55-59 years (10.5%) and from there turnover increases for the older age groups (Statistics New Zealand, 2005). These high turnover rates and the large cost associated with recruiting, selection and the training of new employees have meant the issue of turnover has received wide-spread international attention (Jones & Starlicki, 2003). At the time this study was conducted (November 2008), a potential contributing factor was New Zealand’s low unemployment rate of around 3.6% which meant that employers were finding it difficult to attract new employees and to retain them when there was much choice in the job market (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). With shortages in workers across most industries, employees had many opportunities of alternative employment which has made a change in job a lot less difficult or daunting. Another implication of the tight labour market is that organisations may often have to relax their selection criteria and take on less ideal employees when positions remain vacant for extended periods of time. The effect this can have is a
reduced person and/or organisation fit which can lead to even more eventual turnover. All these issues highlight the importance of organisations finding methods to retain their skilled employees in order to minimise direct and indirect costs of high turnover rates in highly competitive modern markets.

An important part of the workforce is the large proportion of people who are part-time (PT) employees (defined as working less than 30 hours p/week), which for the last 15 years has remained stable, roughly around 22% in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). The younger employees who have the highest turnover rates mentioned earlier are also the group that make up the majority of PT employees, and because many organisations rely on PT employees, it makes them particularly important in turnover research. For many large retail organisations, PT employees have an important role as the organisations often have hours that extend beyond the five day, eight hour day work week and they also create flexibility for organisations to keep their labour force proportional to sales for fluctuations in service demands. Given the high turnover rates of PT employees (Martin and Sinclair, 2007), and their significance to organisations, PT employees and what makes them leave was the main focus of this study. Many previous studies focusing on predicting turnover often do not consider PT employees as being different to full-time (FT) employees, so the current study also looked to further develop research around potential differences these groups may show.

The role of the part-time employee

PT employees often work much fewer hours than full-time (FT) employees but they often cost an organisation similar amounts of time and money in terms of recruitment, selection and initial training. These similar costs imply similar
importance to the issue of reducing PT employee turnover as to that for FT employees. PT positions have also become considerably important to the workforce too as there are many groups (e.g. high-school and tertiary students) who have other commitments and heavily rely on the flexibility of PT positions in order to have some form of income as they are unable to commit to full-time hours. The middle aged groups often supplement their other sources of income with PT work or use it to accommodate child care arrangements and so forth. Older groups, such as the semi-retired, also rely on PT income to supplement pensions while still gaining the social and identity benefits that work brings. PT employees often work at peak service times (e.g. weekends) where the base of FT employees cannot meet the increase in service demands. This allows organisations to keep a minimum of FT employees and to maintain adequate amounts of service to meet demand across the variations in service demand (Sinclair, Martin & Michel, 1999).

The types of PT employees and their turnover rates

PT employees are often incorrectly considered as being a homogeneous single group by researchers and organisations when in reality they comprise different sub-groups that differ across many demographics and attitudes (Martin & Sinclair, 2007; Sinclair, Martin & Michel, 1999). More specifically, Martin and Sinclair (2007) validated a typology of the PT workforce which included the following distinct groups:

- Primaries (earn more than 50% of household income from the job)
- Married supplementers (earn 50% or less of household income from the job)
- Single supplementers (earn 50% or less of household income from the job and have investment/benefit income)
• High school students (job is discretionary income)
• Tertiary students (job is discretionary income)
• PT moonlighters (they have another PT job)
• FT moonlighters (they have another FT job).

Martin and Sinclair tracked turnover for each group within their PT typology and found that all PT groups had higher turnover rates (ranging from 30% to 80%) than that of the FT group (29%). Turnover rates for the high school students (80%) and tertiary students (67%) were the highest; this is typical of students who often want to work only holidays or just until their graduation (Martin & Sinclair). Although Martin and Sinclair tracked actual turnover of their sample and some job attitudes also, there has been very little research around why the different types of PT employee turn over.

The present study investigated some of the many other variables that predict employee turnover and turnover intentions across the different PT types outlined by Martin and Sinclair to develop theory around how to better manage turnover for each of the PT types.

Predicting turnover in organisations

Previous studies have found that turnover and turnover intention have many correlates, the cause however is intuitively and most likely a combination of attitudes, events and experiences leading up to the withdrawal, intention and then turnover itself (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Some examples of common predictors were summarised by Tett and Meyer (1993) in their meta-analysis of turnover intention and actual turnover. They found that turnover intention was negatively correlated with job satisfaction (-.58) and job commitment (-.54), and also that actual turnover was correlated with turnover intention (.45), organisational commitment (-.33) and job
satisfaction (-.25) (Tett & Meyer, 1993). A later and more thorough meta-analysis on correlates of actual turnover by Griffeth, Hom and Gaertner (2000) had similar but generally weaker findings, turnover intention (.38) was still the strongest predictor of turnover and job commitment (-.23) was stronger than that of job satisfaction (-.19).

The impact of stress on turnover varied between facets with role clarity (-.21) having the largest correlation followed by role conflict (.20), overall/general stress (.14) and role overload (.10) (Griffeth et al., 2000). Also, as expected, tenure was found to be negatively related to turnover (-.20), suggesting that people who stayed longer with an organisation were less likely to quit (Griffeth et al., 2000).

Given the many correlates that actual turnover and turnover intention have, it is apparent that predicting employee turnover is not a simple task. Any organisational intervention targeted at addressing high turnover problems has to be developed while keeping all these known turnover correlates in consideration as each variable will vary between employees and working environments. The present study investigated how those variables predicting employee turnover or turnover intention can affect types of PT employees differently in order to discover relationships and patterns for more relevant prediction of employee turnover intention towards those PT employee types. The variables predicting turnover intention that were focused on in this study were affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment, overall satisfaction, pay satisfaction, supervision satisfaction, quantitative role overload and qualitative role overload.

*Job attitudes and turnover intentions between employee types*

Previous research focusing on job attitudes across different types of work status (PT versus FT) has had very inconsistent results. Findings between studies
appear to contradict each other or they were highly contingent on the situation, which casts doubt on their external validity. Studies examining differences in job satisfaction between PT and FT employees have found contradictory results, with some suggesting that PT employees are more satisfied (e.g. Fenton-O’Creevy, 1995; Jackofsky & Peters, 1987; Sinclair, Martin, & Michel, 1999) while others suggest that PT employees are less satisfied (e.g. Hall & Gordon, 1973; Miller & Terborg, 1979). The same inconsistency also applies to comparisons in PT and FT levels of organisational commitment, with again some studies suggesting PT employees are more committed (Martin & Peterson, 1987; Sinclair et al., 1999) and others suggesting the opposite (Lee & Johnson, 1991; Martin & Peterson, 1987; Morrow, McElroy, & Elliott, 1994). Martin and Sinclair’s (2007) research helps to clarify the contradictory results between other researchers’ findings by providing evidence that the PT group of employees is actually made up of distinctly different groups who vary in their attitudes, behaviours and proportions between organisations. Instead of considering the PT group as being homogenous, the differences between the various PT groups in terms of their attitudes and the proportion of people in each group could potentially further explain some of the contradictions between the results of previous researchers when the PT group is considered a single group (Martin and Sinclair).

This new perspective (the PT typology) has been validated by Martin and Sinclair as being representative of the PT population, but it still remains to be thoroughly explored in terms of a wider range of attitudinal and behavioural differences between the PT types. The current study aimed to further investigate potential differences between PT groups with previously unexplored variables (e.g. stress and psychological contract) while replicating the findings of previous studies.
Measuring actual turnover in an organisation requires the time and resources to conduct a longitudinal study, and unfortunately this was not viable in the current study. Previous studies have found that turnover intention is the best known predictor of actual turnover, and since actual turnover could not be measured, turnover intention was used as a substitute criterion variable instead of actual turnover in this study (Griffeth, Hom & Gaertner, 2000; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Martin and Sinclair (2007) measured actual turnover (as opposed to turnover intentions) and found that all types of PT employees included in their study had higher turnover rates than that of FT employees. More specifically, Martin and Sinclair found that high-school students and tertiary students had the highest rates of turnover while primaries and FT employees had the lowest. An explanation Martin and Sinclair gave for the higher turnover rates of the high-school and tertiary students was that they join the organisation with a pre-planned intention to quit. A pre-planned intention to quit was described by Martin and Sinclair as occurring when a person enters their employment with the organisation with a plan to quit, and quitting can be contingent on something happening such as school holidays or graduating from university and so forth. Given the finding by Martin and Sinclair that high-school and then tertiary student PT groups had the highest actual turnover rates, and also considering the seasonal and temporary nature of their employment, it was expected that the high-school and tertiary student PT groups would also have the highest ratings of having a pre-planned intention to quit. The pattern found by Statistics New Zealand (2005) that turnover rates decline as age increases (from the 15-19 to the 55-59 year old group), supported by the actual PT turnover rates findings of Martin and Sinclair, suggested that turnover intentions and pre-planned intention to quit would be the highest for the high-school group, and then second highest for the tertiary student group. This study sought to repeat the findings
by Martin and Sinclair but measuring turnover intention in place of actual turnover and also to validate the theory that some PT groups have a greater likelihood of a pre-planned intention to quit than others.

*Hypothesis 1a:* All PT employee groups will have significantly greater ratings of turnover intentions than the FT group.

*Hypothesis 1b:* The High-school student PT group will have the significantly highest ratings of turnover intentions of all groups.

*Hypothesis 1c:* The Tertiary student PT group will have the significantly second highest ratings of turnover intentions of all groups.

*Hypothesis 2a:* All PT employee groups will have significantly higher ratings of pre-planned intentions to quit than FT employees.

*Hypothesis 2b:* The High-school student PT group will have the significantly highest ratings of pre-planned intentions to quit than all the other PT groups.

*Hypothesis 2c:* The Tertiary student PT group will have the significantly second highest ratings of pre-planned intentions to quit of all the PT groups.
Organisational commitment between different employee types

This study further investigated the problem of contradictory results between previous studies in work status (PT versus FT) with differences in organisational commitment. For this study, the three component theory of organisational commitment by Meyer and Allen (1991) was used to measure organisational commitment. Meyer and Allen described the three components of organisational commitment as being: affective commitment (the employee’s emotional attachment or want to stay), normative commitment (feelings of obligation to stay) and continuance commitment (perception of the costs of leaving as being high). Of the three commitment types, Martin and Sinclair (2007) only measured affective commitment in their study and they found that most PT employee types (apart from the younger married supplementers, PT moonlighters and tertiary students) reported stronger affective commitment than FT employees. Even though Martin and Sinclair found significant differences between the groups, they offered no explanation as to why these differences occurred. The present study furthered the exploration of differences between PT employee types by also assessing the other different types of organisational commitment (normative and continuance commitment). For this study, considering their typically high rates of turnover, it was expected that most PT employees would report lower levels of each type of organisational commitment compared to FT employees. This hypothesis is generally contradictory to the results found by Martin and Sinclair that most employees have greater affective commitment. This hypothesis is based on the premise that PT employees have less interaction with the organisation to develop emotional attachment and also that there are less costs/consequences to most PT employees of leaving the organisation (as income is discretionary for some PT employees who have other primary sources of incomes).
was also expected that the PT (high school student) and PT (tertiary student) groups would have the lowest ratings of each type of organisational commitment given their typically high turnover rates.

**Hypothesis 3a:** All PT groups will have significantly lower ratings of affective commitment than FT employees.

**Hypothesis 3b:** All PT groups will have significantly lower ratings of normative commitment than FT employees.

**Hypothesis 3c:** All PT groups will have significantly lower ratings of continuance commitment than FT employees.

**Hypothesis 3d:** The PT (high school student) group will have significantly lower ratings of all three commitment types than the other PT groups and FT employees.

**Hypothesis 3e:** The PT (tertiary student) group will have the second significantly lowest ratings of all three commitment types than the other PT groups and FT employees.

*Job satisfaction between different employee types*

This study examined the differences between employee types on a global job satisfaction measure similar to Martin and Sinclair (2007) but it went further by also measuring satisfaction with pay and supervision. Pay satisfaction was measured to
determine if there were any differences between the different types of PT employees and FT employees in terms of their perception of their pay and rewards. For the current organisation, PT employees work less hours and have fewer responsibilities than FT employees while still gaining similar pay rates and benefits to that of FT employees. Whereas for FT employees they generally work longer hours and take on more responsibility and potentially more stress for similar pay and benefits compared to PT employees.

Satisfaction with pay can be described as the discrepancy between how much a person perceives they should receive versus what they actually receive (Heneman & Schwab, 1985). The minimum wage rate in New Zealand has been increased incrementally by 70% since 1999 and this has had the consequence of reducing the differences in pay rates between many employees in the current organisation who are often paid at or close to minimum wage. FT employees who have had incremental pay increases (based on good performance appraisals) over an extended period of years have in many cases been caught up to in terms of pay by newer FT or PT employees who have had their starting pay rates increased with the increases in the minimum wage rate. At the time of each minimum wage increase, the current organisation has not increased the wage rates of employees who were already above the new minimum wage, instead only increasing wage rates of those below the new minimum wage. As a result, FT employees who have been with the organisation for years who are now performing at higher levels (due to training and experience) are effectively being paid similar amounts to people who are not performing at a similar level i.e. less trained and experienced new and PT employees. FT employees generally have more responsibilities, experience and training which could lead to them have a perception of being better performers than new or PT employees (considered with their similar
wage rates). From this perspective, it is expected that what FT employees expect they should receive will be higher than what they actually receive when compared to PT employees. It is expected that FT employees will be less satisfied with their pay and rewards compared to PT employees in the current organisation.

For satisfaction with supervision, PT employees may differ from FT employees as they have less opportunity for leader-member exchange (or supervisor interaction) due to their reduced work hours. This reduced interaction could potentially lead to less productive relationships with their supervisors through having less communication, support and training, which could ultimately lead to less satisfaction with their supervisor. Leader-member exchange includes the quantity and quality of the exchange relationship (e.g. attention, support, sensitivity and trust) which have been shown to lead to productive relationships with employees (Schriesheim, Castro & Cogliser, 1999). Leader-member exchange meta-analyses have shown that leader-member exchange correlates well (.71) with satisfaction with supervision (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Although the quality of the exchange relationship between a leader and a PT employee might be high, it was expected that the reduced quantity of interaction (compared to FT employees) would have a negative impact on satisfaction with supervision for PT employees. The reduced quantity of interaction and given that PT employees typically work at peak times could limit the opportunity for quality interaction for PT employees compared to FT employees. Because PT employees have less interaction with their supervisors and therefore less leader-member exchange, it is expected that PT employees will report less satisfaction with their supervisor compared to FT employees.

Although it is theorised that PT employees will have less satisfaction with supervision, previous studies (e.g. Fenton-O’Creevy, 1995; Jackofsky & Peters, 1987;
Martin and Sinclair, 2007; Sinclair, Martin, & Michel, 1999) have found that PT employees usually report slightly greater global/general job satisfaction than FT employees. One explanation given by Eberhardt and Shani (1984) is that PT employees are less exposed to some negative aspects of the organisation causing them to have more favourable views of the organisation and their job. Because PT employees usually lack involvement in organisational functioning, they do not get much exposure to information or issues concerning organisational problems, bureaucracy and politics which can lead to negative attitudes towards their job and the organisation (Eberhardt & Shani, 1984). Given that wages and benefits are similar for both FT and PT employees in the current organisation, and also considering that PT employees have less exposure to some negative aspects of the organisation, it is expected that PT employees will rate their global/general job satisfaction as being higher than that of FT employees.

_Hypothesis 4a:_ PT employees will report significantly greater satisfaction with pay than FT employees.

_Hypothesis 4b:_ PT employees will report significantly less satisfaction with supervision than FT employees.

_Hypothesis 4c:_ PT employees will report significantly greater global job satisfaction than FT employees.
Differences in the experience of strain between employee types

PT employees usually do similar work to that of their FT counterparts, but organisations in the retail industry normally utilise PT employees at times of peak service demand (e.g. weekends and public holidays), so it can be expected that on average PT employees will proportionally work more hours of peak service time than would a normal FT employee. The higher proportion of intense work completed by the PT employees combined with less training and experience might potentially lead them to experience strain differently from FT employees. Steffy and Jones (1990) looked at the differences between health-care FT versus PT employees in terms of their role stressors, job tension and satisfaction and found that PT employees reported significantly higher levels of role overload and role ambiguity. Steffy and Jones’ suggestion as to why this may have occurred was that PT employees may not effectively manage the ebb and flow of their work as well as FT employees can. They also went on to explain the lack of effectiveness of PT employees as probably being related to PT employees not receiving the same levels of informal training, supervision, social support and job pertinent information as FT employees (Steffy & Jones). The study by Steffy and Jones was the only study found on the differences between PT versus FT employees on measures of strain and it was only done on the healthcare industry, limiting what can be generalised from the findings.

Role overload was defined by Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) as having both qualitative and quantitative dimensions. Qualitative role overload was defined as the employee’s perception that their work tasks are too difficult or they don’t have the skills/training to effectively deal with them whereas quantitative role overload is defined as their perception of having too much work to do in too little time (Ivancevich and Matteson). Also, role ambiguity was defined as the employee’s
perceived clarity of their job’s objectives and duties (Ivancevich and Matteson). Role conflict was not included in this study because there was no expected differences between groups and it was outside the intended scope of this study.

Given that PT employees generally receive less formal and informal training and also because of their reduced working hours they gain less experience than their FT counterparts, it is intuitive that PT employees will generally have less developed work related knowledge and skills compared to FT employees. This fundamental difference between PT and FT employees might lead to a difference between PT and FT employees in terms of their experience of qualitative role overload. Because PT employees generally have less developed work skills and knowledge, it is expected that PT employees will find tasks generally more difficult compared to FT employees. Also, because PT employees generally work at peak service times it is expected that this would add to make their experience of finding tasks more difficult and more intense compared to FT employees. And as a result of this, it is expected that PT employees will report greater qualitative role overload when compared to FT employees.

For quantitative role overload, FT employees in the current organisation usually are given areas of responsibility that require a wide range of tasks and monitoring to ensure they are maintained on top of meeting customer service requirements. For PT employees, they usually have a smaller job description that does not include an area of responsibility in terms of stock maintenance; rather their areas of responsibility are usually more customer service orientated. Because most PT employees are employed to work at peak service times they often do not have time to take on extra tasks or responsibilities that FT employees can. Given that FT employees are responsible for an area of stock maintenance as well as serving
customers, whereas PT employees have more limited responsibilities, it is expected that PT employees will report less quantitative role overload compared to FT employees.

*Hypothesis 5a:* PT employees will report significantly greater qualitative role overload than FT employees.

*Hypothesis 5b:* PT employees will report significantly less quantitative role overload than FT employees.

*Strength of social networks across work status*

The good or bad relationships a person has with their colleagues in the workplace could potentially influence their decision of whether to quit an organisation. If a person has strong social bonds with their colleagues then it is intuitive that the cost of leaving the organisation/group will be higher for that person compared to someone that does not. If a person has dysfunctional or negative relationships with their colleagues, it is intuitive that when the person considers leaving the organisation/group the loss of those relationships will be seen as a positive reason to quit.

Group socialisation theory suggests that as people join a group and assimilate to become a full member, their levels of commitment to the group increase (Vaughan & Hogg, 2005). Given the reduced time and opportunity that PT employees have to become socialised to the larger FT group and build individual relationships, it is probable that PT employees will experience less individual socialisation (or evidence of strong social bonds to the rest of the employees as a group). Given that PT
employees usually only work peak times, this could also reduce their capacity to
socialise and build strong relationships with the other employees, as their focus is on
delivering service for most of their work hours. In the case of the FT employee, the
higher proportion of off-peak times they work provide a much larger opportunity for
social interaction (or more conversation) with other employees, which could lead to
stronger social bonds with the group and individual relationships compared to the PT
group. This difference appears to be unexplored within organisational psychology
research and the current study explored this potential relationship. From social
psychology literature, the definition of socialisation strength is focused on
assimilation to group norms as being the measure of socialisation (Vaughan & Hogg,
2005). The operational definition of individual socialisation or social network strength
in this study differed from that typically found in social psychology in that the focus
is on social pressures to maintain membership or expected social loss to the individual
as a reason against quitting (and therefore leaving the group). More specifically,
social network strength in this study will be measured and defined in terms of the
strength of the individual’s social network (i.e. quantity of ‘friends’ in the
organisation) as well as quality of their social network (i.e. level of social support
available). It is expected that all PT types will report less social network strength
when compared to their FT counterparts.

Hypothesis 6: PT employees will report significantly less strength of social
networks compared to FT employees.
Social network strength and turnover variables

As well as potentially explaining differences between FT and PT employees, employee social network strength might also be able to help explain employee responses on other variables that relate to turnover. This study sought to explore the correlations that social network strength might have with turnover related variables. If significant relationships exist, then the social network strength concept might potentially be able to be used as a predictor of turnover in employees in the retail sector.

At the individual level, one extreme is that an employee who does not have many friends within the organisation (or has low social network strength) could be more likely to experience less social costs of quitting. These employees would also have less social support when dealing with stressful events and tasks which could lead them to experience these events more negatively compared to those employees with strong social networks in the organisation. In this scenario, these deficits in an employee’s social network might act as a motivational factor for a decision to quit for an employee.

Another scenario is that an employee has many good friendships within an organisation (or has high social network strength) which would increase the social costs of quitting for that employee. These employees would be more likely to socialise with other employees outside of work hours and would perceive the social costs of quitting as being quite high. Quitting for these employees would likely be more aversive than for those with lower social network strength because quitting would cause a larger reduction in their perceived social support. In this scenario, these potential losses might act as a motivational factor against a decision to quit for an employee.
If the contingences in the scenarios outlined above are correct then it is expected that as social network strength increases, an employee’s intention to quit will decrease. Or more specifically it is expected that employee social network strength will be significantly negatively correlated with turnover intentions.

Social psychology literature states that increased individual socialisation by a person in a group will normally lead to increased commitment to that group (Vaughan & Hogg, 2005). Given the negative correlation found in meta-analyses (e.g. Tett & Meyer, 1993; Griffeth et al., 2000) of turnover intention and organisational commitment, it is also expected that social network strength will correlate with turnover intentions due to social network strength having some conceptual similarities with normative and affective commitment. Meyer and Allen (1991) defined and measured normative commitment as relating specifically to an employee’s feelings of obligation to stay in the organisation. It is expected that part of the ‘obligation to stay’ will be made up of obligation to maintain social group membership and bonds. For affective commitment, it is also expected that some of the emotional attachment for the organisation will be made of emotional attachment for the other employees they have social bonds with. For continuance commitment which relates to the costs of leaving the organisation, it was not expected to relate to social network strength due to a lack of conceptual overlap. If it is the case that the social network strength variable has some conceptual overlap with normative and affective commitment then it is expected that they will have significant correlations accordingly. More specifically, it is expected that social network strength will be significantly positively correlated with both normative and effective commitment.
Hypothesis 7a,b,c: Social network strength will have a significant negative correlation with (a) turnover intention, (b) normative commitment and (c) affective commitment.

Turnover intentions and employee pre-planned intention to quit

An employee having a pre-planned intention to quit is a concept which has received very little previous research attention. Martin and Sinclair (2007) and Maertz and Campion (2004) founded research on the topic by both identifying that particular groups (particularly tertiary students) are more prone to having a pre-planned intention to quit than others. The effect that a pre-planned intention to quit has on other important turnover and performance variables remains largely unexplored. The current study explored the possible predictive qualities it has.

From a behavioural psychology perspective, having a pre-planned intention to quit might alter the contingencies that influence an individual’s behaviour. Because an employee knows that they are going to leave an organisation, they will be aware that it will essentially make long term reinforcers (e.g. performance/development related pay increases/incentives and promotion) inaccessible due to an imminent quit.

Expectancy-value theory also supports this theory as it suggests that if an employee expects that work effort will lead to performance and that performance will lead to attractive consequences, that person will then be motivated to perform (Brewer & Skinner, 2003). If an employee does not believe that performance will lead to attractive consequences (i.e. longer term benefits being available), then he or she may lower their levels of performance to compensate, as well as organisational commitment and satisfaction. For example; this contingency could manifest itself in the form of an “I don’t care about this job, I’m just going to leave anyway” type of
attitude in some employees who have a pre-planned intention to quit. For those employees who have a pre-planned intention to quit, it is expected that this breakdown of expectancy will negatively impact on their organisational commitment and job satisfaction. As well as this, it is expected that employees who have a pre-planned intention to quit will also rate high on the turnover intention measure as they are both measuring different forms of similar an intention to quit construct.

Hypothesis 8a,b,c,d: Employee pre-planned intention to quit will have a significant negative correlation with (a) affective commitment, (b) normative commitment, (c) continuance commitment, (d) overall satisfaction and (e) turnover intentions.

FT versus PT differences in their psychological contracts

Psychological contracts are defined as being an employee’s beliefs about the reciprocal obligations between them and their organisation (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). The fulfilment of employee psychological contracts has been demonstrated to be an important influence on variables such as employee performance, commitment and involvement (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). More specifically, when an employee perceives a violation of the organisation’s obligations towards them, the employee may change their contribution to the relationship to reflect that change by reducing performance, commitment and possibly through sabotage and withdrawal (Robinson & Rousseau).

Spending less time in and having less involvement with an organisation may reduce the number and the clarity of perceived promises in the psychological contract for PT employees (Conway & Briner, 2002). This reduction in communication and
interaction will likely lead to PT employees having a less developed or clear psychological contract with their employer which will likely reduce the effect on work attitudes (Conway & Briner). Conway and Briner researched the possibility of the psychological contract being a moderator between work status and attitudinal differences. Conway and Briner found that it could explain some differences between FT and PT employees such as job satisfaction but not others such as affective commitment. Of Conway and Briner’s two samples (a bank and supermarket), the moderation relationship was only present in the bank sample for job satisfaction and the intention to quit while there was only some partial support for a moderation relationship from the supermarket sample.

The current study explored the relationships between psychological contract fulfilment, work status (FT and PT) and turnover related outcomes differently from Conway and Briner (2002). In the current study, instead of treating psychological contract fulfilment as the moderating variable, work status (FT and PT) will be the moderating variable between psychological contract fulfilment and other turnover predicting variables (see figure 1). It is more intuitive that work status be the moderating variable in this case because it is a nominal variable that can not correlate with either psychological contract fulfilment or any turnover outcomes.

The relationships between psychological contract fulfilment and turnover related outcomes are expected to vary between the two groups because of the differences in experiences of PT versus FT employees. These differing experiences include having reduced responsibilities, training and less interaction with their supervisors which could lead to lower levels of expected performance and less expected support from their supervisor. These differences between the FT and PT group would mean that the quantity of promises made to FT employees should be
greater than that of the PT employees. For the FT employees, it is expected that their level of psychological contract fulfilment will predict larger differences in outcome variables compared to PT employees because they have more interaction with the organisation and will have more promises made toward them. That is, the consequences of breaches and fulfilment of the psychological contract are expected to be greater for the FT group. Or more specifically, it is expected that lower and higher levels of psychological contract fulfilment will have a greater effect on outcome variables for FT employees compared to PT employees (i.e. the main effect for FT employees will have a steeper gradient or a larger beta than that for PT employees).

![Figure 1: Moderation of the relationship between psychological contract fulfilment and turnover related variables by work status (FT and PT).](image)

The aim of the study here was to explore the possibility that the relationship between psychological contract fulfilment and various outcomes (i.e. job satisfaction and turnover intentions) would vary between FT and PT employees. These expected moderation relationships will take the form of an interaction between the main affects of the FT and PT groups between the independent and dependant variables.
Hypotheses 9a,b,c,d: Work status (FT or PT) will moderate the relationship of psychological contract fulfilment with (a) overall job satisfaction, (b) satisfaction with pay, (c) satisfaction with supervision and (d) turnover intentions. That is, it is expected that the relationship between psychological contract fulfilment and each criterion variable will be greater for FT employees than PT employees.

In summary, there were three main aims to this study. The first aim was examine differences between the FT and PT groups across a wide range of variables that previous research has shown to predict employee turnover. The second aim was to develop two new variables being pre-planned intention to quit and social network strength in order to find further differences between groups and establish potential new relationships with other variables. And the third aim was test the moderating properties that work status (FT or PT) has on the relationship between psychological contract fulfilment and some turnover predicting variables. Together these aims will direct this research into collecting evidence to better understand the reasons why the different types of employees quit in the way they do.
Summary of Hypotheses

1a) All PT employee groups will have significantly greater ratings of turnover intentions than the FT group.

1b) The High-school student PT group will have the significantly highest ratings of turnover intentions of all groups.

1c) The Tertiary-student PT group will have the significantly second highest ratings of turnover intentions of all groups.

2a) All PT employee groups will have significantly higher ratings of pre-planned intentions to quit than FT employees.

2b) The High-school student PT group will have the significantly highest ratings of pre-planned intentions to quit than all the other PT groups.

2c) The Tertiary student PT group will have the second highest ratings of pre-planned intentions to quit of all the PT groups.

3a) All PT groups will have significantly lower ratings of affective commitment than FT employees.

3b) All PT groups will have significantly lower ratings of normative commitment than FT employees.

3c) All PT groups will have significantly lower ratings of continuance commitment than FT employees.

3d) The PT (high school student) group will have significantly lower ratings of all three commitment types than the other PT groups and FT employees.

3e) The PT (tertiary student) group will have the second significantly lowest ratings of all three commitment types than the other PT groups and FT employees.
4a) PT employees will report significantly greater satisfaction with pay than FT employees.

4b) PT employees will report significantly less satisfaction with supervision than FT employees.

4c) PT employees will report significantly greater global job satisfaction than FT employees.

5a) PT employees will report significantly greater qualitative role overload than FT employees.

5b) PT employees will report significantly less quantitative role overload than FT employees.

6) PT employees will report significantly less strength of social networks compared to FT employees.

7a) Social network strength will have a significant negative correlation with turnover intention.

7b) Social network strength will have a significant positive correlation with normative commitment.

7c) Social network strength will have a significant positive correlation with affective commitment.

8a) Employee pre-planned intention to quit will have a significant negative correlation with affective commitment.

8b) Employee pre-planned intention to quit will have a significant negative correlation with normative commitment.

8c) Employee pre-planned intention to quit will have a significant negative correlation with continuance commitment.
8d) Employee pre-planned intention to quit will have a significant negative correlation with overall satisfaction.

8e) Employee pre-planned intention to quit will have a significant positive correlation with turnover intention.

9a) Work status (FT or PT) will moderate the relationship of psychological contract fulfilment with overall job satisfaction. That is, the interaction will be significant and the regression gradient of the line for the main effect of the FT group will be larger than that of the main effect for the PT group.

9b) Work status (FT or PT) will moderate the relationship of psychological contract fulfilment with satisfaction with pay. That is, the interaction will be significant and the regression gradient of the line for the main effect of the FT group will be larger than that of the main effect for the PT group.

9c) Work status (FT or PT) will moderate the relationship of psychological contract fulfilment with satisfaction with supervision. That is, the interaction will be significant and the regression gradient of the line for the main effect of the FT group will be larger than that of the main effect for the PT group.

9d) Work status (FT or PT) will moderate the relationship of psychological contract fulfilment with turnover intentions. That is, the interaction will be significant and the regression gradient of the line for the main effect of the FT group will be larger than that of the main effect for the PT group.
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Organisational Context

A questionnaire was administered to shop-floor level non-managerial employees of a large multi-store retail organisation in New Zealand. This retail organisation employees approximately 2430 people nationally between 16 large format stores and 25 small format stores. The stores included in the study were all large format and included one from Whangarei and Mt Maunganui and three from the Auckland area. Part-time and full-time employees from across all departments in the organisation were the focus of this study, as this was to gain a cross-section of all employees working for the organisation.

Participants

Every employee (excluding management team members) from each of the five stores involved was invited to participate in the study. Of the 595 employees who were working at the five stores at the time of the study, 318 actually completed surveys creating a response rate of 53%. Of the 318 employees that completed questionnaires, 311 were used in the study due to the remaining 7 being only very partially completed. Table 1 represents the number and percentage of respondents in each major type of work in the organisation. Employees who described themselves as working at ‘Point of Sales’ are those who are primarily based at the checkouts in the organisation, ‘Sales Person’ were mainly people who had an aisle they were responsible for and also gave product advice to customers, ‘Administration’ were
people who worked in reception and accounts, and ‘Stock Work’ were people who worked in night-fill or inwards goods. Table 2 represents the number and percent of employees in terms of their work status (FT or a PT type). The respondents’ average age was 35 years ranging from 14 to 78 years. The average total tenure of employees in the organisation was 2.16 years and the average tenure of employees in their roles was 1.55 years. The average tenure for FT employees was 2.45 years while it was 1.64 years for PT employees. The sample comprised 57.1% males and 42.9% females.

### Table 1 Number of respondents for each type of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Point of Sales</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Person</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Work</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2 Number of respondents for each employee type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FT or PT Type</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT – Full-timer</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT – High School Student</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT – Tertiary Student</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT - Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Measures**

The questionnaire measured many established and two new predictors of employee turnover and was presented as a “team retention survey” to the employees of the organisation. The data were collected via a questionnaire made up of a total of 89 questions. The predictors included in the questionnaire were pay satisfaction, supervision satisfaction, overall satisfaction, affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment, turnover intentions, social network strength, pre-planned intention to quit, and stress/strain. All scale scores were computed by taking the mean score across item responses. All items in the questionnaire were answered using a 7-point scale apart from the background questions. Demographic information (Type of work, Age, Total Tenure, Role Tenure and Gender) were all collected at the end of the questionnaire.

**Criterion Measures**

*Turnover Intention* was measured using Bozeman and Perrewe’s (2001) intention to quit scale. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’ with statements relating to their future intentions to quit their job in the organisation. The scale contained five items and examples of items are “I will probably look for a new job in the near future” and “I am not thinking about quitting my job at the present time”. The reliability analysis for this scale produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .48. A rotated factor analysis (using Principal Axis Factoring and Direct Oblimin rotation) of the scale produced two factors within the items where items one and two belong to the first factor and items three, four and five belong to the second factor. The obvious observable difference between the two factors is that items in the first factor are positively worded and items in the second factor were ones that were negatively worded and were reverse coded.
for the analysis. A second observable difference is that items from the first factor relate to job search behaviour whereas items in factor two relate to intentions to quit. As a result of this, for future analysis this intention to quit scale will be separated into two separate scales to maintain an acceptable level of reliability. The reliability analysis for the first factor of positively worded intention to quit items produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .75. The reliability analysis for the second factor of negatively worded intention to quit items produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .75.

Pay Satisfaction was measured using Heneman and Schwab’s (1985) pay satisfaction scale. Participants were asked to rate their level of satisfaction ranging from extremely dissatisfied through to extremely satisfied about common pay related issues in their experience within the organisation. This scale contained 13 items and examples of items are “My take-home pay” and “The raises I have typically received in the past”. The wording of some items in this scale was changed from using the word ‘salary’ to ‘wage rate’ to make it more relevant to the organisation. The reliability analysis for this scale produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .93.

Satisfaction with Supervision was measured using Scarpello and Vandenberg’s (1997) satisfaction with my supervisor scale. Participants were asked to rate their level of satisfaction ranging from extremely dissatisfied through to extremely satisfied about their interactions with their supervisor. This scale contained 18 items and examples are “The way my supervisor listens when I have something important to say”, “The way my supervisor treats me when I make a mistake” and “The way my supervisor shows concern for my career progress”. The reliability analysis for this scale produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .97.

Overall Job Satisfaction was measured using Cammann, Fichman, Fenkins and Flesh’s (1983) overall job satisfaction scale. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’ with statements
relating to their overall satisfaction with their job and the organisation. The scale contained 3 items and they are: “All in all, I am satisfied with my job”, “In general, I don’t like my job” and “In general, I like working here”. The reliability analysis for this scale produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .69. A more detailed analysis showed that the Cronbach’s Alpha of .69 could be improved by the removal of item 2 (Q33). Item 2 (“In general, I don’t like my job”) was the only reversed item of the scale, and even after being reversed scored it did not correlate particularly well with the other two items. The removal of item 2 would only increase the Cronbach’s Alpha from .69 to .71 which would make it acceptable, but due to the scale consisting of only three items, it would also change the scale too much from its original form. As a result of this, the scale was kept in the original form with the three items.

Organisational Commitment (affective, normative and continuance commitment) were all measured Meyer and Allen’s (1997) revised and shortened version of their organisational commitment scale. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’ for each of the three commitment scales.

For affective commitment, participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with statements about their emotional sense of commitment to the organisation. The scale contained 6 items and examples are “I really feel as if (the organisation’s) problems are my own” and “(The organisation) has a great deal of personal meaning for me”. The reliability analysis for this scale produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .59. A rotated factor analysis (using Principal Axis Factoring and Direct Oblimin rotation) of the scale produced two distinct factors within the items. The obvious observable difference between the two factors is that items in the first factor are positively worded and items in the second factor were ones that were negatively worded and were reverse coded for the analysis. As a result of this, for
future analysis this affective commitment scale will be separated into two separate scales to maintain an acceptable level of reliability. The reliability analysis for the first factor of positively worded affective commitment items produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .71. The reliability analysis for the second factor of negatively worded affective commitment items produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .65. The low coefficient of the second factor is a cause for concern and results relating to affective commitment will be interpreted while considering this problem.

For **Normative Commitment** participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with statements relating to whether they feel they ought to be committed to the organisation. The scale contained 6 items and examples are “(The organisation) deserves my loyalty” and “I owe a great deal to (the organisation)”. The reliability analysis for this scale produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .69. Further analysis concluded that item one (which is the only negatively worded item) does not correlate well with the other items in the scale (-.17), so for future analysis item one (Q41) will not be included in the scale mean score used in the main analysis later. The Cronbach’s Alpha for the remaining items when item one is deleted is .78.

For **Continuance Commitment** participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with statements relating to the costs to the participant if they left the organisation. The scale contained 6 items and examples are “Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave (the organisation) now” and “One of the few serious consequences of leaving (the organisation) would be the scarcity of available alternatives”. The reliability analysis for this scale produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .79. A rotated factor analysis (using Principal Axis Factoring and Direct Oblimin rotation) of the scale produced two factors within the items. The Factor Correlation Matrix and Pattern Matrix show that the two factors are negatively related to each other where items 3, 4 and 5 belong to factor one and items 1, 2 and 6 belong
to factor two. No easily observable differences in content or wording can be noted between the groups of items in each factor so the differences between the factors can not be explained. As a result of this, further results using these scales must be interpreted cautiously. The reliability analysis for the first factor produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .73 and .74 for the second factor.

*Psychological Contract Fulfilment* was measured using Conway and Briner’s (2002) kept promises scale. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’ with statements relating to their perception of promises kept or broken by the organisation. The scale contained four items and examples are “In general, this organisation has kept its promises to me about what I will get from them” and “This organisation says it will do things for you and then never gets around to doing them”. The reliability analysis for this scale produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .48. A rotated factor analysis (using Principal Axis Factoring and Direct Oblimin rotation) of the scale produced two factors within the items where items one and two belong to factor one and items three and four belong to factor two. Continuing the theme from the previous scales, the obvious observable difference between the items in the different factors is that items in the first factor are positively worded compared to the negatively worded items in the second factor. Items in the second factor also target issues of un-kept promises compared to items in the first factor mainly targeting kept promises by the organisation. These separate factors will be treated differently in the rest of the analysis in this study. The reliability analysis for the two factors gave a Cronbach’s Alpha of .88 for the first factor and .74 for the second factor.

*Employee social network strength* was measured using a purpose made scale developed for this study, with some items based on Anderson and Martin’s (2000) strength of individual socialisation scale. Participants were asked to rate their level of
agreement from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’ with statements relating to their level of social involvement with other employees in the organisation. The scale contained six items and examples are “I have someone in the organisation who could provide me with emotional support” and “I socialise with employees from the organisation outside of business hours”. The reliability analysis for this scale produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .78 and a factor analysis showed the scale to have a only a single factor.

*Pre-planned Intention to Quit* was measured by a single item question developed for this study. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’ in the statement: “When you started this job, did you have a plan to quit at a particular time or when an event happened? (E.g. When you have: saved enough money, finished high-school, finished university or summer holidays have finished etc.)”. As this scale has only one item, no reliability or factor analysis can be completed for it.

*Qualitative/quantitative role overload* was measured by Ivancevich and Matteson’s (1980) stress in the workplace scale. For both separate scales, participants were asked to indicate the frequency in which they experienced each situation from ‘never’ to ‘always’ for each of the three stress scales.

For *Quantitative Role Overload* participants were asked to rate the frequency in which they experience particular situations that relate them experiencing role overload by not having enough time to complete tasks. The scale contained five items and examples are “I have to take work home in the evenings or on weekends to stay caught up” and “I feel that I just don’t have time to take an occasional break”. The reliability analysis for the scale produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .76.

For *Qualitative Role Overload* participants were asked to rate the frequency in which they experience particular situations that relate them experiencing role overload
by not having adequate skills or effort to deal effectively with tasks. The scale contained five items and examples are “My assigned tasks are sometimes too difficult and/or complex” and “I have insufficient training and/or experience to discharge my duties properly”. The reliability analysis for the scale produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .83.

**Predictor Measures**

*Part-time typology* was measured by a single item developed for this study based upon the part-time typology by Martin and Sinclair (2007). Participants were asked to choose a category that best describes their working status. Participants could choose from being one of the following:

- Full-time employee (works over 30 hours per week)
- Part-time high-school student
- Part-time tertiary student

*Or non-student part-time types:*

- Over 50% of your income comes from this part-time job
- Sharing income with a partner and 50% or less of household income comes from this part-time job
- Your not sharing income and 50% or less of income comes from this job (has investments or benefits etc)
- This part-time job is one of multiple part jobs you have
- You also have a full-time job apart from this part-time one

After all the data for the study were collected, and the resulting sample sizes for each part-time type were known, a problem was noted in that the non-student part-time types of employees had very small numbers of participants (only 33 across all the
non-student part-time types). Due to some of the non-student part-time types having an N of only 3 or 4, it was decided that the non-student part-time groups should be combined into one larger group.

To determine whether it is statistically viable to combine the part-time types that had a small sample size into a larger group, the following analysis was completed: To test whether the groups were significantly different from each other a 1-way ANOVA was completed across all the non-student part-time types for all questions. The resulting 1-way ANOVA for all questions resulted in having only three significant 1-way ANOVAs for all the 88 questions. Considering that for 88% of the questions there was no significant difference in responding between the groups of PT (Primary) (N = 9), PT (Married Supplemener) (N = 12), PT (Single Supplemener) (N = 4), PT (Part-time Moonlighter) (N = 3) and PT (Full-time Moonlighter) (N = 5) they were combined into a single group called ‘PT (Other)’ for the purpose of this study.

**Procedure**

The study began with the development of a research proposal which was sent to the Human Resources Manager of the organisation. A dialogue of clarifying concerns and queries followed and eventually a finalised research proposal and questionnaire was also sent to the Human Resources Manager as well as the New Zealand Management Team of the organisation. After being given consent by the organisation, contact was established with every store that was to participate in the study. The times and dates were negotiated with each store manager and training rooms at each store were booked to be used to administer the questionnaires.

A Gantt chart was developed (See Appendix A) and was distributed which outlined the standard timings and structure to the administration of the questionnaires.
at each store. A week was allocated to each store involved to cover the variety of shifts that the organisation uses to maintain coverage.

Prior to arriving at each store, a one page overview was sent to each management team member at each store involved (See Appendix B). This highlighted the issues of the whole questionnaire process that were relevant to them. For the employees or potential participants, a separate one page overview (See Appendix C) for every employee at the stores involved was printed out a week prior to the beginning of the questionnaires and attached to their payslips for them to read. This overview alerted employees to the upcoming questionnaire, what the key variables were that were being assessed, the anonymity of their responses and their right to not participate.

For the FT employees, their responses were collected between Tuesday and Thursday due to an overlap of shifts creating better coverage. Peak service times (around 11am to 3pm) were also avoided so questionnaires were typically conducted in the morning (7am to 11am) and afternoon (3pm to 5:30pm).

For the PT employees, questionnaires were conducted on Saturdays and Sundays at each store. At most stores the questionnaires were conducted only in the mornings (8am to 11am) and only sometimes in the afternoons (3pm to 5:30pm, only if all the PT employees working on that day were not completed in the morning).

Only one participant would be called up from any department at any time and only if there was at least one other employee working in that department at the time to maintain coverage in the department. From several trial administrations of the questionnaires on people outside of the organisation, it was established that it would take around 15-25 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Groups were allocated 30 minute intervals to complete the questionnaires which also allowed for 5 minutes of setting up for the next group coming through.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

This chapter presents the outcomes of the statistical analyses, which are separated into four main sections: (a) descriptive statistics, (b) means tests, (c) correlations and regressions and (d) moderated regression analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics for all variables, including means, standard deviations, skew and Cronbach’s alphas are presented in Table 3. For details of the factor analyses, refer to the method section.

The mean score for each scale varied a lot across the different scales. The mean score for most scales was close to 4 (neutral) but there were some scales that had mean scores much higher (i.e. turnover intentions factor 2, affective commitment factor 2, overall satisfaction and psychological contract factor 2). The means for these scales ranged from 3.71 through to 5.67, showing higher than neutral agreement/satisfaction. However the mean scores for qualitative role overload, quantitative role overload and role ambiguity were all much lower than the other scales as they ranged from 2.45 to 2.65 showing relatively low levels on these.

The variances differed greatly between the scales as they ranged from .77 through to 2.14. Some scales had larger standard deviations (i.e. turnover intentions factor 1 and pre-planned intention to quit) while others had smaller standard deviations (i.e. affective commitment factor 2, turnover intentions factor 2 and
psychological contract factor 2). The variances for the other scales were generally average or neither particularly large or small as they generally ranged from around 1 to 1.5.

The amount of skewness between the scales also varied considerably. Some scales (i.e. turnover intentions factor 1 and psychological contract factor 2) had very low levels of skewness whereas others (i.e. qualitative role overload and role ambiguity) were highly skewed. Of the 17 scales, 10 were positively skewed and 7 were negatively skewed. There was a trend of being highly positively skewed across the three strain scales (qualitative and quantitative role overload and role ambiguity) which shared the different response scale (i.e. responses ranged from 1 (never) through 4 (sometimes) and up to 7 (always)) when compared to the other scales in the survey. Because some of the variables were highly skewed, correlations were compared with and without transformations for skewness, and because there were no real differences in the size of correlations, the original (untransformed) scores were retained. The square root transformation was used for mildly skewed scales and a log 10 transformation as used for highly skewed scales. Because the nature of the data was ordinal, the Spearman’s correlation was used instead of the Pearson’s correlation to calculate the correlations later in this section.
Table 3 Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions F1</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions F2</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-planned Int. to Quit</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Comm. F1</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Comm. F2</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Comm.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Comm. F1</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Comm. F2</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload (Qual.)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload (Quant.)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social network strength</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych. Contract F1</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych. Contract F2</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- * Shows a significant level of Skewness.
- F1 = Factor 1 and F2 = Factor 2.
- Responses were from 1 to 7 for all variables.

Means Tests for Between Group Differences

A one-way ANOVA with post-hoc analysis was completed to determine significantly different means between PT groups. A Levene’s test for homogeneity of variances was also completed to establish whether equal variances between the groups could be assumed. Field (2000) recommended using the Hochberg GT2 post-hoc comparison method to determine significant differences between groups as it has the best performance when the sample sizes between groups are very different (i.e. between FT and the smaller PT groups) and also when variances are considered to be homogenous. In the situation where the variances between groups could not be
considered to be the same, the Games-Howell post-hoc method was used as recommended by Field as being the best performing post-hoc test for this situation. For a test to be considered significant, 95% confidence was required (i.e. \( p < .05 \)).

**Table 4** Means and standard deviations for employee groups and variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>FT M (SD)</th>
<th>PT Highschool M (SD)</th>
<th>PT Tertiary M (SD)</th>
<th>PT Other M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions F1</td>
<td>4.09 (.74)</td>
<td>4.33 (1.55)</td>
<td>4.83 (1.68)</td>
<td>2.59 (1.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions F2</td>
<td>5.59 (.92)</td>
<td>5.66 (.85)</td>
<td>5.79 (.74)</td>
<td>6.04 (.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-planned Int. to Quit</td>
<td>3.56 (2.02)</td>
<td>5.14 (1.87)</td>
<td>4.91 (2.40)</td>
<td>3.47 (2.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Comm. F1</td>
<td>3.67 (1.38)</td>
<td>2.55 (.87)</td>
<td>2.57 (.96)</td>
<td>4.24 (1.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Comm. F2</td>
<td>5.29 (.75)</td>
<td>5.64 (.72)</td>
<td>5.45 (.83)</td>
<td>5.61 (.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Comm.</td>
<td>3.76 (1.23)</td>
<td>3.38 (1.20)</td>
<td>3.30 (1.35)</td>
<td>4.26 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Comm. F1</td>
<td>4.08 (1.43)</td>
<td>3.70 (1.48)</td>
<td>4.10 (1.48)</td>
<td>3.34 (1.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Comm. F2</td>
<td>3.76 (1.39)</td>
<td>3.21 (1.41)</td>
<td>3.40 (1.45)</td>
<td>3.48 (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.55 (1.06)</td>
<td>4.28 (.92)</td>
<td>3.91 (.98)</td>
<td>4.10 (1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.35 (1.38)</td>
<td>4.63 (1.31)</td>
<td>4.36 (.92)</td>
<td>4.77 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.93 (.98)</td>
<td>5.00 (1.08)</td>
<td>4.86 (.87)</td>
<td>5.56 (.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload (Qual.)</td>
<td>2.51 (1.15)</td>
<td>2.29 (1.25)</td>
<td>2.28 (.97)</td>
<td>2.44 (.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload (Quant.)</td>
<td>2.72 (1.11)</td>
<td>1.97 (1.06)</td>
<td>2.01 (.92)</td>
<td>2.34 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>2.64 (1.20)</td>
<td>2.77 (1.19)</td>
<td>2.59 (.94)</td>
<td>2.53 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social network strength</td>
<td>4.59 (1.06)</td>
<td>4.79 (1.19)</td>
<td>4.87 (1.01)</td>
<td>4.31 (.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych. Contract F1</td>
<td>3.96 (1.66)</td>
<td>4.31 (1.55)</td>
<td>4.03 (1.60)</td>
<td>4.91 (1.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych. Contract F2</td>
<td>5.41 (.95)</td>
<td>5.76 (.78)</td>
<td>5.30 (.83)</td>
<td>5.38 (.98)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 1a**

The results did not support the hypothesis that all PT employee groups (i.e. PT \{tertiary student\}, PT \{high-school student\} and PT \{other\}) would have higher ratings of turnover intentions than the FT group. The ANOVA for the first factor (job search behaviours/positively worded items) produced a significant result so there was a significant difference between the groups, but post-hoc examination of differences between groups were not supportive of the hypothesis. From the Levene’s test it was found that the first factor had a homogenous variance across groups so the Hochberg GT2 post-hoc comparison method was used. For the first factor, only the PT (other)
group was significantly different from the FT group and other PT groups. The PT (other) group in fact had significantly lower ratings of turnover intention than all the other groups including the FT group contrary to the hypothesis.

The ANOVA for the second factor (intention to quit items/negatively worded items) also produced a significant result and the variance for this factor was also homogenous. The post-hoc comparisons between groups showed that only the PT (other) group had significantly higher ratings of turnover intention compared with the FT group and the others were not significantly different from each other.

For both factors the means for the high-school and tertiary groups were higher than the FT groups but not significantly higher, so as a result the hypothesis could not be supported.

Hypothesis 1b

The results of the ANOVA did not support the hypothesis that PT (high-school students) would have the highest ratings of turnover intention. For both factors of turnover intention, the high-school group did not have the highest mean score compared to the other groups. Also, the mean scores for the high-school group were not significantly different from that of the other groups.

Hypothesis 1c

The results of the ANOVA also did not support the hypothesis that PT (tertiary students) would have the significantly second highest ratings of turnover intention. For the first factor of turnover intention, PT (tertiary students) had the highest ratings of turnover intention but the mean score was not significantly different from those of the other groups. For the second factor of turnover intentions, PT (tertiary students) did have the second highest rating but again the mean scores were not significantly different from that of the other groups.
Hypothesis 2a

The results did not fully support the hypothesis that all PT employee groups would have significantly higher ratings on pre-planned intention to quit. The ANOVA produced a significant result and the Levene’s test found that the groups did not have homogenous variance between them. Post-hoc analysis revealed that both the PT (high-school) and PT (tertiary student) groups were significantly higher than the FT and PT (other) groups. The PT (other) group however had a mean similar to the FT group and those two groups were not significantly different from each other so the hypothesis could not be supported.

Hypothesis 2b

The results partially supported the hypothesis that PT (high-school students) would have the highest ratings of having a pre-planned intention to quit compared to the other groups. From the post-hoc analysis following the ANOVA, it was found that the PT (high-school student) group had significantly higher ratings than both the FT and PT (other) groups. Although the mean for the PT (high-school student) group was the highest of all groups, it was not significantly higher than the PT (tertiary student) group so the hypothesis could not be fully supported.

Hypothesis 2c

The results partially supported the hypothesis that PT (tertiary students) would have the second highest ratings on pre-planned intention to quit compared to the other groups. From the post-hoc analysis it was found that the PT (tertiary students) group did have the second highest mean of all four groups but it was only significantly different from the FT group and not the other PT groups. The PT (tertiary students) was not significantly different from the other two groups, so full support for the hypothesis could not be found.
Hypothesis 3a

The results did not support the hypothesis that all PT employee groups would have significantly lower ratings of affective commitment compared to the FT group. From the Levene’s test it was found that the first factor did not have a homogenous variance across groups given the significant result of the test. The ANOVA for the first factor, (positively worded affective commitment items) produced a significant result. Post-hoc examination of differences between the groups was not supportive of the hypothesis as not all PT groups were significantly lower than the FT group. Both the PT (high-school student) and PT (tertiary student) groups had significantly lower levels of affective commitment compared to the FT group but the PT (other) group was not significantly lower.

The Levene’s test for the second factor did not produce a significant result so the variances for this variable were considered to be homogenous. The ANOVA for the second factor (negatively worded affective commitment items) also produced a significant result. However, the post-hoc comparisons between groups showed no significant differences between any groups. The reliability analysis of this factor produced a low reliability coefficient of .65 which will have had a negative impact on obtaining any significant results in the ANOVA. As a result of this, the results for this factor also did not support the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3b

The results did not support the hypothesis that all PT employee groups would have lower ratings of normative commitment compared to the FT group. From the Levene’s test it was found that the variable had a homogenous variance across groups. The ANOVA between groups produced a significant result but post-hoc examination of the differences between groups were not supportive of the hypothesis because not
all of the PT groups were significantly lower than the FT group. The FT group was not significantly different on normative commitment from any of the three other groups; the only significant differences were that both the PT (high-school student) and PT (tertiary student) groups were significantly lower than the PT (other group).

Hypothesis 3c

The results did not support the hypothesis that all PT employee groups would have lower ratings of continuance commitment than the FT group. The Levene’s test for both factors was not significant so both factors were considered to have homogenous variance. The ANOVA for both factors of continuance commitment were not significant so no differences across groups for both factors were found. As a result of this it could not be concluded that any of the PT groups were significantly lower than the FT group so the hypothesis could not be supported.

Hypothesis 3d

The results only partially supported the hypothesis that the PT (high-school student) and PT (tertiary student) groups would have the lowest ratings of all three commitment types compared to the PT (other) group and FT employees. For affective commitment, the results for the first factor of positively worded items fully supported the hypothesis, whereas for the second factor of negatively worded items the results did not support the hypothesis as all group means where too similar for any to be considered significantly different from one another. For normative commitment, the results show partial support for the hypothesis. The PT (high-school) student and PT (tertiary student) groups did have the two lowest means but they were only significantly lower than the PT (other) group but not the FT group so the hypothesis is not fully supported. For continuance commitment, for both factors there were no significant differences between any of the groups as both ANOVAs were not
significant. As a result of this, the hypothesis was not supported for continuance commitment.

Hypothesis 4a

The results only partially supported the hypothesis that PT employees would report greater satisfaction with pay compared with FT employees. The result from the Levene’s test was that the different groups could be considered to have homogenous variances. The ANOVA across the groups produced a significant result and from post-hoc examination it was found that the pattern of mean scores partially supported the hypothesis. All three PT groups had means higher than the FT group, but of the three groups, only the PT (high-school student) and PT (other) groups were significantly higher the FT group. Because the PT (tertiary student) group was not significantly different it cannot be concluded that the results fully support the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4b

The results did not support the hypothesis that PT employees would report less satisfaction with supervision compared to FT employees. The ANOVA across the groups was not significant so there was no significant difference between groups meaning the hypothesis could not be supported.

Hypothesis 4c

The results did not support the hypothesis that PT employees would report greater overall job satisfaction compared to FT employees. The Levene’s test produced an insignificant result which meant that the groups had homogenous variances between them. The ANOVA was significant and from the post-hoc comparisons it was found that only the PT (other) group had a significantly higher mean than the FT and other PT groups. Both the PT (high-school student) and PT
(tertiary student) groups did not have significantly higher means than the FT group so the hypothesis could not be supported by the results.

Hypothesis 5a

The results did not support the hypothesis that PT employees would report significantly higher levels of qualitative role overload than FT employees. The ANOVA test produced an insignificant result so no significant differences could be determined between the groups so the hypothesis could not be supported.

Hypothesis 5b

The results only partially supported the hypothesis that PT employees would report significantly less quantitative role overload than FT employees. The Levene’s test produced an insignificant result which meant that the different groups had homogenous variances between them. The post-hoc analysis following the significant ANOVA showed that both the PT (high-school student) and PT (tertiary student) groups reported significantly lower levels of role ambiguity than the FT group. The PT (other) group also had a mean lower than the FT group but it was not significantly lower so the hypothesis could not be fully supported.

Hypothesis 6

The results did not support the hypothesis that PT employees would have significantly less strength of social networks compared to FT employees. The ANOVA comparing the FT and combined PT group was insignificant so no differences between the two groups could be found. The mean for the PT group on social network strength was actually slightly higher than that of the FT group which was opposite to what was expected. When the FT group was compared with the various PT groups (not combined) in a second investigative ANOVA, there were also no significant differences between any groups too. The hypothesis was not supported
as the FT group did not significantly differ from the PT group on social network strength.

Overall, there were many differences across the attitudinal variables between the FT and PT types. The results for the PT student groups were often as expected but the results for the PT (other) group were usually and unexpectedly more similar to the FT group. Due to the PT (other) group displaying a different trend than from the two PT student groups, many of the hypotheses could not be supported.

**Correlations**

The correlations for the following section were calculated using the Spearman’s method as apposed to the Pearson’s method because of the ordinal nature of the data and potential problems with normality due to high skewness of some variables. Pearson’s correlations were also calculated between all variables and highly skewed variables were transformed to correct for their skew. The resulting Pearson’s correlations with the transformed variables yielded only marginally stronger correlation coefficients compared to the original Spearman’s correlations, so the untransformed scores were retained for the correlation analysis. Table 5 contains all Spearman’s correlations between each major variable in this study and the correlation coefficients for hypotheses 7 and 8.
### Table 5: Correlations for study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social network strength</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Turnover Intentions F1</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Turnover Intentions F2</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affective Commitment F1</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affective Commitment F2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Normative Commitment</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Continuance Commitment F1</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Continuance Commitment F2</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pay Satisfaction</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Supervision Satisfaction</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Psychological Contract F1</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Psychological Contract F2</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Role Overload Quantitative</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Role Overload Qualitative</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Pre-planned Intention to Quit</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** * = Significant Spearman’s Correlation (p < .05), F1 = Factor 1, F2 = Factor 2.
Hypothesis 7a

The results did not support the hypothesis that social network strength would be significantly negatively correlated with turnover intention. For the first factor of turnover intention, the significant correlation coefficient was .13. This significant correlation (being positive) was opposite to what was expected. For the second factor of turnover intention, the coefficient was -.01 which was insignificant. Given the opposite to expected direction of the correlation for the first factor and also the insignificant correlation for the second factor, the hypothesis could not be supported.

Hypothesis 7b

The results did not support the hypothesis that social network strength would have a significant positive correlation with normative commitment. The insignificant correlation coefficient between the two variables was .02.

Hypothesis 7c

The results did not support the hypothesis that the social network strength would be significantly positively correlated with affective commitment. For both factors of affective commitment the correlation coefficient was insignificant with -.05 for the first factor and .06 for the second factor. As both these correlations were insignificant, the hypothesis could not be supported.

Hypothesis 8a

The results partially support the hypothesis that employee pre-planned intention to quit will have a significant negative correlation with affective commitment. For the first factor of affective commitment, the correlation coefficient was -.34 which was significant and supported the hypothesis. The correlation coefficient with the second factor of affective commitment was -.06 which was not
significant. Because only the first factor of affective commitment had a significant negative correlation the hypothesis could not be fully supported.

*Hypothesis 8b*

The results supported the hypothesis that employee pre-planned intention to quit would have a significant negative correlation with normative commitment. The significant correlation coefficient was -.28.

*Hypothesis 8c*

The results partially supported the hypothesis that employee pre-planned intention to quit would have a significant negative correlation with continuance commitment. The correlation with the first factor of continuance commitment had an insignificant correlation coefficient of -.06. The correlation with the second factor of continuance commitment had a significant negative correlation of -.15. The hypothesis could not be fully supported because only the second factor of continuance commitment had a significant negative correlation with employee pre-planned intention to quit.

*Hypothesis 8d*

The results supported the hypothesis that employee pre-planned intention to quit would have a significant negative correlation with overall satisfaction. The significant correlation coefficient for employee pre-planned intention to quit and overall satisfaction was -.17.

*Hypothesis 8e*

The results partially supported the hypothesis that employee pre-planned intention to quit would have a significant positive correlation with turnover intention. The significant correlation coefficient with the first factor of turnover intention was .30, whereas for the second factor it was not significant and it was only -.03. Because
only the first factor of turnover intentions significantly correlated with employee pre-planned intention to quit, the hypothesis could not be fully supported.

**Moderation Relationships**

The moderation effects of job status on the relationships between psychological contract fulfilment and the several turnover predicting variables were explored by calculating a two step regression using work status as a moderator (Baron & Kenny, 1986). In the first step, the criterion was regressed on the predictor and the moderator. For the second step, the criterion was regressed on the interaction term between predictor and moderator. The interaction term was created by multiplying the raw scores of the psychological contract fulfilment variable with the raw scores of the work status (FT or PT) variable. For the interaction to be considered significant, then \( p < .10 \) due to the difficulty in finding significant moderation relationships created by the regression procedure. Where the regression of the interaction was significant, the main effects for the FT and the PT group were drawn to illustrate the relationship. For all moderation analyses, only the first factor of psychological contract fulfilment significantly correlated with the other turnover predicting variables so it was used as the measure of psychological contract fulfilment. The first factor of psychological contract fulfilment related specifically to kept promises whereas the second related to un-kept promises, this is discussed in more detail as a limitation in the discussion chapter.
**Hypothesis 9a**

The results did not fully support the hypothesis. The interaction term was significant in the regression which shows a significant moderation effect (see Table 6). But from figure 2, the slope of the regression line for the FT group is observably less than the PT group, opposite than what was expected in the hypothesis.

Table 6: Regression betas, R²s, F levels and their significance levels for both steps of the moderation model where overall satisfaction was the criterion variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Psyc. Contract</td>
<td>.452**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Status</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall for step</td>
<td></td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>39.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work status X Psyc. Contract (interaction)</td>
<td>.396*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall for step</td>
<td></td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>27.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.87**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** = p < .05, * = p < .10.

![Figure 2: Main effect regression lines for overall satisfaction predicted by psychological contract for FT and PT groups.](image-url)
Hypothesis 9b

The results did not support the hypothesis. The hypothesis required that work status would moderate the relationship of psychological contract fulfilment with pay satisfaction, this was not supported shown by the non-significant interaction (see Table 7).

Table 7: Regression betas, $R^2$s, F levels and their significance levels for both steps of the moderation model where pay satisfaction was the criterion variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Psyc. Contract</td>
<td>0.557**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Status</td>
<td>0.116**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall for step</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work status X Psyc. Contract (interaction)</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>57.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall for step</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>142.57**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** = $p < .05$, * = $p < .10$. 
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Hypothesis 9c

The results did not support the hypothesis. The hypothesis required that work status would moderate the relationship of psychological contract fulfilment with supervisor satisfaction, this part was not supported shown by the non-significant interaction (see Table 8).

Table 8: Regression betas, $R^2$s, F levels and their significance levels for both steps of the moderation model where supervision satisfaction was the criterion variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Psyc. Contract</td>
<td>.553**</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>67.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Status</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Overall for step</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work status X Psyc. Contract (interaction)</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>45.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Overall for step</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Total</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>112.70**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** = p < .05, * = p < .10.
Hypothesis 9d

The results did not fully support the hypothesis. The interaction term was significant in the regression which shows a significant moderation effect (see Table 9). But from figure 3, the slope of the regression line for the FT group is observably less (a greater negative slope) than the PT group, opposite to what was expected.

Table 9: Regression betas, R²s, F levels and their significance levels for both steps of the moderation model where turnover intentions was the criterion variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Psyc. Contract</td>
<td>-.287**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Status</td>
<td>-.098*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall for step</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>16.86**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work status X Psyc. Contract (interaction)</td>
<td>.296*</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>12.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall for step</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.37**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** = p < .05, * = p < .10.

Figure 3: Main effect regression lines for turnover intention predicted by psychological contract over each employee type.
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The primary aim of this study was to test theory of why full-time and the different types of part-time employees display different employee turnover intentions. This was accomplished by comparing these different groups across a variety of variables that have been previously demonstrated to predict or contribute to employee turnover. The secondary aim of this study was to develop and test two new variables, employee pre-planned intention to quit and social network strength, which were previously unmeasured in research literature. The data from these two new variables were used to establish further differences across groups and correlations with other variables relating to employee turnover intention. The third aim of this study was to test work status as a moderator between psychological contract fulfilment and a range of outcomes.

Overall, the results suggest that there were some significant differences between FT and the different types of PT employees across the attitudinal variables but not all expected differences were found. In some cases the direction of the difference was opposite to what was expected. For the correlations calculated in the study, there was also mixed results, with some significant while there were several correlations in a direction opposite to what was expected. Of the two new variables developed (pre-planned intention to quit and social network strength), there were some mixed results. Employee pre-planned intention to quit displayed some significant differences between groups while social network strength did not. Finally, some moderation relationships were found but the moderation was in the opposite
direction to what was expected. This study also had several methodological issues that are discussed in detail later in this chapter.

**Differences between groups**

The main aim of this part of the study was to examine the PT typology developed by Martin and Sinclair (2007) through testing for differences between FT and the different types of PT employees across a range of variables that relate to employee turnover intention. Early in the data collection phase of the study, a statistical problem became apparent where there were not sufficient numbers of participants for each of the original seven types of PT employees described by Martin and Sinclair. Therefore, the non-student PT types were combined into a single group called PT (other) (N = 33) so that the three PT groups had at least 30 participants in each group (see the method section for full details of the justification). The limitations of this procedure are discussed later while the results are discussed in terms of the three combined PT groups.

**Turnover intentions**

The results were generally unsupportive of PT employees having greater turnover intentions than FT employees. This was not expected, as Martin and Sinclair (2007) found PT employees have the highest turnover rates among the workforce. Given that meta-analyses have found that turnover intentions were the best predictor of actual turnover (e.g. Griffeth, Hom & Gaertner, 2000; Tett and Meyer, 1993), it was expected that turnover intentions would have been higher for PT employees, consistent with what Martin and Sinclair found for actual turnover. What was found
was that the PT groups reported higher mean levels of turnover intentions but they were not significantly higher.

The results for the first factor of turnover intentions (job search behaviours) were not as expected as the expected differences between groups did not exist or were in the opposite direction. For this factor only the PT (other) group was significantly different from the other groups; participants from this group reported much lower levels on these items. This suggests that participants belonging to this group were engaging in job search behaviours less than participants from the other groups. The PT (other) group was mainly made up of older people who were supplementing their incomes with the current job. The lower amount of job search behaviours and the higher age for the PT (other) groups were consistent with the Statistics New Zealand (2005) finding that turnover rates decline as age increases. The PT (other) group having less job search behaviours than the other groups indicates that they are less likely to be actively looking for other jobs, and this implies that they are less likely to quit in the near future. This finding for the PT (other) group was the first in a pattern across many of the variables that suggest the PT (other) group will have more positive attitudes and will be less likely to turnover compared to the other PT groups.

The results for the second turnover intention factor (quit intention) show that all three PT groups reported higher mean scores than the FT group but only the PT (other) was significantly higher than the FT group. The means for the three PT groups were not significantly different from each other, contrary to predictions. Because there were no significant differences between the PT groups, no implications could be made about whether any of the PT groups would be more likely to turnover than others.
Pre-planned intention to quit

The results showed that there were significant differences between the groups in their mean levels of pre-planned intention to quit. Those differences were not always as expected as the amount of difference between groups was not always statistically significant. The PT (tertiary student) and PT (secondary school) groups reported significantly higher frequencies of having a pre-planned intention to quit compared to the other groups, and the PT (other) group was however much lower and similar to that of the FT group.

It was expected that all PT groups would report higher frequencies of having a pre-planned intention to quit compared to the FT group. The fact that the PT (other) group was significantly lower than the other PT groups and was similar to the FT group shows a clear difference between the PT (other) group and the two PT student groups. The high likelihood that employees from the PT (other) group enter the organisation with more open-ended plans as opposed to having a pre-planned intention to quit suggests that their decisions to quit should be more comparable to that of the FT group. This finding suggests that the PT (other) group will be likely to turnover less than the other PT groups, consistent with the finding for turnover intentions (job search behaviours). The PT (other) group having less pre-planned intention to quit suggests that they have more open-ended plans compared to the other two PT groups, and this suggests that they are likely to stay with the organisation for longer than the PT student groups.

These results built on what Maertz and Campion (2004) found in their research, but this study collected data on pre-planned intention to quit using a questionnaire design. Maertz and Campion (2004) primarily used interviews to determine that some employees were prone to having a pre-planned intention to quit
whereas this study has demonstrated that pre-planned intention to quit can be measured in a questionnaire format. The findings from the pre-planned intention to quit variable discussed here have demonstrated that this new variable potentially has some practical use in organisational research. The presence of a pre-planned intention to quit for some groups more than others also has implications for organisations in their planning for turnover in their business. The theoretical and practical implications of this pre-planned intention to quit variable are discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

*Affective commitment*

Comparisons between groups on the first factor of affective commitment (positively worded items) produced results similar to what was expected, with a few exceptions. The first factor of affective commitment related to positively worded items, whereas the second factor related to negatively worded items and no other observable differences between them could be found. It was hypothesised that all PT groups would report lower affective commitment than the FT group, but the results show that both the student PT groups had significantly lower affective commitment (positively worded items) while the PT (other) group did not. A higher level of affective commitment suggests that the PT (other) group will be more likely to experience greater emotional attachment to the organisation which will likely make quitting more aversive for these employees. This in turn should contribute to a lowering of the turnover rates for employees in this group. This finding is consistent with the pattern of results found for the PT (other) group on many of the other scales.

The results for affective commitment (negatively worded items) were quite problematic. The reliability of this factor was low and the ANOVA showed no significant differences between groups, which was unexpected considering the results
for affective commitment (positively worded items). For many of the variables where
two factors were found in this study (and they were differentiated by positively versus
negatively worded items), it was a common theme that the results from the negatively
worded items (factor 2) would be less reliable and unsupportive of the hypotheses.
This is discussed as a limitation of the results later in this chapter.

The results for affective commitment (positively worded items) were
contradictory to the findings of Martin and Sinclair (2007) who basically found the
opposite pattern. Martin and Sinclair found that most PT employee types reported
stronger affective commitment than FT employees. Unfortunately Martin and Sinclair
did not offer any explanation for their results as it is counterintuitive that PT
employees who typically have the highest rates of turnover would also have the
highest rates of affective commitment. The results from this study that the two PT
student types have the lowest affective commitment are more consistent with the high
turnover rates typically associated with these groups.

**Normative commitment**

The results for normative commitment between the groups were generally
inconclusive as none of the PT groups was significantly different from the FT group.
The only significant difference was that the PT (other) group reported significantly
higher levels of normative commitment than the two PT student groups. These higher
levels of normative commitment suggest that the PT (other) group has increased
feelings of obligation to stay with the organisation compared to the other student PT
groups. The PT (other) group being more likely to have feelings of obligation to stay
in the organisation is likely to make quitting more aversive for them, and this will
likely contribute to reducing turnover rates for this group. This could also mean that
the PT (other) group has more invested into the relationship and has more to lose from
ending it. This finding further contributes to the pattern that the PT (other) had more desirable attitudes, in that they are likely to predict lower turnover rates than the other two PT student groups.

**Continuance commitment**

The results were very inconclusive as between group differences across both continuance commitment factors were not significant. Similar to the two factors of affective commitment, the only observable difference between the two factors of continuance commitment was that one was positively worded items and the other was negatively worded items. All that can be generalised from this finding is that there is no evidence to suggest that there is any difference between groups on continuance commitment. This suggests that the FT and different PT groups perceived the costs of leaving the organisation as being similar.

**Satisfaction with pay**

There was general support for the prediction that all PT employee groups would be more satisfied with their pay than FT employees. The only exception to this was the PT (tertiary student) group, which had a mean higher than that of the FT group but it was not significantly higher. This finding is consistent with the theory that minimum wage has increased at a faster rate than general wages and has had an effect on the perception of pay for FT employees. Whether or not this was the actual cause for this difference remains untested and could be the topic of future research. What can be concluded is that the FT employees in the organisation were effectively reporting a greater discrepancy between how much they perceive they should receive versus what they actually receive compared to PT employees.
Satisfaction with supervision

The results were unsupportive of the prediction that PT employees would report less satisfaction with supervision compared to FT employees. There were no significant differences between groups for satisfaction with supervision. The prediction that PT employees would report less satisfaction with supervision was based on the theory that although the quality of the relationship could be high, the lack of quantity of interaction or exchange would have a negative effect on a PT employee’s satisfaction with their supervisor. The fact that no significant differences were found suggests that the quantity of exchange in the relationship has little effect on differences in satisfaction with supervision; rather it is likely that the quality of relationship the main source of variance.

Global job satisfaction

The results did not support the prediction that all PT employees would report greater global job satisfaction than FT employees. Only the PT (other) group reported significantly higher levels of global satisfaction than the other groups, whereas the FT and two student PT groups all reported similar levels of global satisfaction. The finding that the PT (other) group had the highest levels of overall satisfaction contributes more support to the pattern demonstrating the PT (other) group had more desirable attitudes than the other two PT student groups. These higher levels of global satisfaction suggest that members of the PT (other) group enjoy their work more and are more content with their jobs.

Qualitative role overload

There were no differences found between groups on qualitative role overload. This finding implies that the FT and different PT groups were experiencing the difficulty of their tasks in a similar way. A possible explanation for this is that FT
employees receive more training and support but they are assigned more difficult tasks compared to PT employees. PT employees receive less training and support but they are assigned tasks that are less difficult and less is expected from them by their supervisors compared to the FT employees. So the levels of training/task difficulty could be proportionally the same between FT and PT employees, diminishing any differences between groups.

Quantitative role overload

The results show some general support for the theory that PT employees would experience less quantitative role overload compared to FT employees. The only exception to this was that the PT (other) group was lower than the FT group but not significantly lower. This finding suggests that FT employees feel that they have more tasks to complete in less time compared to what the PT employees experience.

The finding that the PT (other) group was not significantly lower than the FT group suggests that the PT (other) group experiences quantitative role overload similar to that of the FT employees. This could mean one of two possibilities; Firstly, those employees in the PT (other) group were not coping with the amount of tasks as effectively as employees in the other PT student groups or secondly that they were taking on more responsibility and were experiencing more quantitative role overload in order to meet those responsibilities. From my subjective experience as an employee in this organisation, I have experienced first hand evidence to suggest the second possibility is more likely. Employees from the PT (other) group are often those who are motivated to look for tasks to keep them busy whereas employees from the PT student groups are often looking to keep their job as stress-free as possible. This observation would be something that would need further investigation to be conclusive.
**Social network strength**

The social network strength variable was developed for this study as it had not been tested prior to this study. It was expected that there would be significant differences between the FT and the combined PT group. The results show there was no difference between any of the groups (FT and PT types). This outcome was unexpected given that PT employees have a more limited opportunity to develop strong and supportive social networks within the organisation due to constraints on their time and working at peak times. The four employee groups all had mean scores slightly above the neutral/mid point on the scale and all had similar amounts of variance. This suggests most employees in the current organisation had positive social relationships with other employees and those relationships provided them with social support as well as friendship outside of business hours. All that can be concluded from this finding is that no particular group (FT and PT types) reported particularly low or high social network strength. This suggests that there would be little or no benefit from a social network building initiative targeted at a specific FT or PT group. It appears that the PT employees still manage to develop satisfactory social networks even with their constraints on time and having to work at peak service times. PT employees might also possibly form their social networks within their PT group.
Correlations

The aim of this section was to examine the relationships between the two new variables that were developed for this study (pre-planned intention to quit and social network strength) and between existing predictors of employee turnover intention.

Social network strength and turnover related variables

The results did not support the hypothesis that social network strength would be negatively correlated with turnover intention. There was a significant positive correlation between social network strength and turnover intention (job search behaviours) while the relationship with turnover intention (intention to quit) was not significant. The positive correlation with turnover intention (job search behaviour) suggests that as employee social networks get stronger, they are more likely to engage in job search behaviours. The strength of the relationship here was not strong as it only explained 1.7% of the variance; rather it just raises more questions about the salience of the social network strength variable because there is no obvious logical explanation for this relationship.

It was expected that social network strength would be positively correlated with normative commitment but this was not supported by the results. Meyer and Allen’s (1991) definition of normative commitment relates to an employee’s feeling of obligation to stay with the organisation. It was theorised that the feelings of obligation to stay were in part obligation to maintain the social relationship in the organisation. The non-significant correlation suggests that, in the present organisation, an employee’s sense of obligation is not partly comprised of obligation to maintain social relationships with other employees within the organisation.
It was also expected that social network strength would correlate positively with affective commitment. Similar to what was found with normative commitment, social network strength did not significantly correlate with either of the two factors of affective commitment. The social network strength scale had items relating to social support obtained from other employees. It was expected that this social support could partly predict affective commitment as high or low levels of social support might influence emotional attachment to the organisation. These results do not support the theory that affective commitment is actually partly comprised of emotional attachment toward the other employees in the workplace.

An additional finding from the correlation analysis was that there was a significant positive correlation between social network strength and employee pre-planned intention to quit. This was the only other significant correlation apart from turnover intention (job search behaviour). This finding suggests that the stronger an employee’s social network is, the more likely they are to having a pre-planned intention to quit. There does not appear to be any logical explanation for this relationship so other distortions of the data had to be considered. On closer examination of the survey, the fact that the two variables were towards the end of the survey and on the same page highlights the possibility that some form of participant response pattern may have occurred. This possibility is discussed further as a limitation of this study.

Pre-planned intention to quit and turnover predicting variables

The results show some partial support for the expectation that pre-planned intention to quit would have a negative correlation with affective commitment. Given that only affective commitment (positively worded items) significantly correlated with employee pre-planned intention to quit, only partial support was found. This
finding provides some evidence to suggest that an employee who has a pre-planned intention to quit will be more likely to be less emotionally attached to the organisation. An employee having a pre-planned intention to quit might potentially feel less attached to the organisation because they know the relationship they have with the organisation is only temporary. These claims will need more research to be conclusive though, as they are not fully supported by the results from affective commitment (negatively worded items). The significance of this finding is that it provides some initial evidence to support the theory that having a pre-planned intention to quit may have effects on other work related attitudes such as affective commitment.

The results supported the expectation that employee pre-planned intention to quit would have a significant negative correlation with normative commitment. This finding suggests that employees who have a pre-planned intention to quit will be more likely to have lower levels of normative commitment. Meyer and Allen (1991) described normative commitment as an employee’s feelings of obligation to stay in the organisation. The negative correlation found suggests that having a pre-planned intention to quit could disrupt this feeling of obligation. An employee who knows they have an imminent quit approaching could potentially feel fewer obligations because they are consciously aware that the exchange relationship they have with the organisation will be coming to an imminent end. This withdrawal leading up to an imminent quit could potentially be what is happening with employees who have a pre-planned intention to quit. This finding provides more supporting evidence to show that employee pre-planned intention to quit could potentially have a wide range of effects on employee work related attitudes. Whether or not having a pre-planned
intention to quit actually causes these changes in work related attitudes is another
matter, as causation can not be determined from these correlations.

There was only very weak support for pre-planned intention to quit having a
negative correlation with continuance commitment. Of the two factors of continuance
commitment, only one had a significant correlation but that only explained a small
amount of the relationship between the two variables. These results show that there is
a relationship between pre-planned intention to quit and continuance commitment but
it is not practically significant. Future research might find a more stable relationship
when there are less methodological problems with the continuance commitment
variable.

The results supported the expectation that pre-planned intention to quit would
negatively correlate with overall satisfaction. This finding supports the theory that
having a pre-planned intention to quit could reduce an employee’s overall job
satisfaction through an imminent quit restricting their access to long term reinforcers
(i.e. expectancy-value theory, Brewer & Skinner, 2003). Those long term reinforcers
include future pay, pay increases and bonuses which will be lost due to an imminent
quit. The strength of the correlation between the two variables was not strong but this
might have been in part due to the marginal reliability of the overall satisfaction
variable. Again future research might be able to get stronger results after
methodological issues are resolved, but this significant relationship still adds to the
evidence that having a pre-planned intention to quit might have effects across a wide
range of work attitude variables.

It was expected that pre-planned intention to quit would be positively
correlated with turnover intention and the results partially supported this. There was a
strong positive correlation with turnover intention (job search behaviour), but an
insignificant correlation with turnover intention (intentions to quit). Given that turnover intention and pre-planned intention to quit measure similar constructs, it was not expected that only one of the two factors of turnover intention would significantly correlate. Because only turnover intention (job search behaviour) correlated well with pre-planned intention to quit, it suggests that there is an un-expected relationship happening. One possibility is that many employees with a pre-planned intention to quit could be basing their plan to quit on finding a superior job (which involves searching for the new job). The finding that turnover intentions (intention to quit) did not correlate with pre-planned intention to quit suggests that although an employee might have a pre-planned intention to quit, that does not mean that they are actively thinking about quitting. However, these results indicate that employees with a pre-planned intention to quit are more likely to be searching out other potential jobs and this does appear somewhat contradictory if they do not have an intention to quit. More research is needed to investigate and clarify these findings as they do not align well with what was logically expected.

Moderations

A further aim of this research was to explore the relationship between psychological contract fulfilment and various turnover predicting outcome variables using work status (FT and PT) as a moderator. Only the first factor of psychological contract fulfilment (kept promises) was included in the analysis due to the second factor of psychological contract fulfilment (un-kept promises) not correlating well with the criterion variables.
Moderating effects on overall satisfaction

The results show that the relationship between psychological contract fulfilment (kept promises) and overall satisfaction was moderated by work status. It was expected that the relationship between psychological contract fulfilment (kept promises) and overall satisfaction would be greater for FT employees, however, it was found to be greater for PT employees. This suggests that psychological contract fulfilment (kept promises) predicts overall satisfaction differently between FT and PT groups. For FT employees, a shift in psychological contract fulfilment predicted a smaller change in overall satisfaction compared to PT employees.

The expectation that psychological contract fulfilment would predict a larger change in overall satisfaction for the FT group was based on the theory that FT employees have more interaction with the organisation which should lead to more promises being made. Also, if there were more promises being made then it was expected that breaking those promises would lead to greater consequences in the form of greater reductions in overall satisfaction. However, the results suggest the opposite of this. The PT group reported larger shifts in their overall satisfaction to changes in their psychological contract fulfilment. A possible explanation for this could be that PT employees having the less content in their psychological contract (i.e. less promises made) could be reacting more severely to broken promises as they do not have as many other promises proportionally compared to FT employees to fall back on. Another possibility could be that because the PT group was much younger on average than the FT group (mean age: PT = 27.8, FT = 38.4 years), the PT group’s emotional reaction to un-kept or kept promises might be larger and this could mean larger changes in overall satisfaction. There is insufficient data from this study to
conclude exactly why this difference has occurred, rather exploring this in future research might uncover what is actually happening here.

*Moderation effects on pay satisfaction*

The results show that the relationship between psychological contract fulfilment and pay satisfaction was not moderated by work status. This result suggests that although psychological contract does partially predict pay satisfaction, this prediction does not differ between FT and PT employees.

*Moderation effects on supervision satisfaction*

The results show that the relationship between psychological contract fulfilment and supervision satisfaction was not moderated by work status. Similar to what was found with pay satisfaction, these results suggest that psychological contract fulfilment can partially predict supervision satisfaction but that prediction does not differ between FT and PT employees.

*Moderation effects on turnover intentions (job search behaviours)*

The results show that the relationship between psychological contract fulfilment (kept promises) and turnover intentions (job search behaviours) was moderated by work status. Only turnover intention (job search behaviours) was included in the analysis because turnover intentions (intention to quit) did not correlate with psychological contract fulfilment (kept promises) strongly enough to run the analysis. Also, it was expected that the relationship between psychological contract fulfilment (kept promises) and turnover intention (job search behaviour) would be greater for FT employees, however the opposite of this was found. This relationship suggests that fulfilment of psychological contract predicts job search behaviours differently between FT and PT groups. The difference being that for FT
employees, a shift in psychological contract fulfilment predicted a smaller change in job search behaviours compared to PT employees.

This finding was similar to the moderation results for overall job satisfaction, as psychological contract fulfilment (kept promises) predicted a greater change in job search behaviours for PT employees. This finding supports the possibility that PT employees will react more to kept or un-kept promises for some outcomes. Future research might be able to find more moderation effects of work status across a wider range of variables. This study suffered from several methodological problems which may have reduced the possibility of discovering these moderation relationships.

Limitations

This study suffered from a number of limitations that restricted the results and what can be generalised from them. The first issue which made the results of this study difficult to compare with the results of Martin and Sinclair’s (2007) study was the problem of sample sizes for some PT groups. The PT (other) group used in this study originally comprised 5 smaller groups from Martin and Sinclair’s PT typology but those 5 smaller groups had sample sizes ranging from 3 to 12, which is too small for most statistical analysis (see method chapter p### for justification of combining into a single group). Martin and Sinclair had over 2000 surveys completed by PT employees so they were much more likely to find significantly different groups. The effect this combining of smaller groups had on the results of this study was that it limited the comparisons between groups. This has meant that some of the findings about the PT (other) group in relation to other groups could be more conclusive, as not all original 5 subgroups within the PT (other) group would most likely respond the same. A much larger sample would have been required to find differences between
the original 5 subgroups of the PT (other) group, as this was outside the resources and scope of this study.

A second major problem with the data was the multiple factors found for many of the pre-validated variables used in this study. All scales used in this study (apart from the two developed for this study) were popular scales that had been pre-validated as having single factors and acceptable reliability. The fact that 4 out of 10 of these scales produced multiple factors is a threat to validity for this study. Spector, Van Katwyk, Brannick and Chen (1997) summarised research around the problem of multiple factors arising from scales with some negatively worded items. Spector et al. found that multiple factors are a common issue found for many of the popular scales (e.g. Meyer and Allen’s (1991) commitment scales) in the organisational domain. Early research suggested that the issue was a methodological artefact, whereas more recent research suggests that the factors are created by how participants respond to items, rather than the factors being independent constructs (Spector et al.). Spector et al. theorised that people will tend to an ideal positive or negative point on a scale, and this could mean that participants will not score as extremely on negatively worded items as they might for positively worded items. Of the 10 pre-validated scales used in this study, 5 of them had some negatively worded items, and 4 of those 5 scales produced more than one factor in the factor analysis. The factor loadings for these 4 scales clearly showed that the positively worded items loaded onto one factor while the negatively worded items loaded onto another. Similar to what Spector et al. found, for many of the participants who responded closer to one extreme of the scale for positively worded items, they did not respond as close to the opposite extreme when the items were negatively worded. This presents a response pattern where some participants seemed more reluctant to disagree and appeared somewhat biased toward
agreement for some items. This pattern supports the theory of Spector et al. that responses to oppositely worded items are not always mirror images of one another; rather, participants will tend towards their ideal point for reverse scored items.

Another response pattern observed from the raw scores was that there were several participants who would respond to negatively worded items in a similar way to the positively worded items (i.e. going down the page selecting the same score for each item, regardless of being negatively or positively worded). In surveys where there was evidence of this response pattern, this pattern was observed mostly towards the end of the survey. This suggests that the participant was either not paying attention or was simply rushing through the remainder of the survey. There was also several surveys that were not included in the data because they were less than three-quarters filled out, it is probable that participants ran out of patience, time or motivation on these. This indicates that the survey might have taken up too much time for some participants who were under time pressure to perform other tasks. The scales with negatively worded items that produced multiple factors made the analysis of the data more difficult as often the factor relating to the negatively worded items produced un-supportive results, and this was also found by Spector et al. The effect that all these problems had was to distort the data, which weakened correlations and the strengths of differences between groups.

This study made several suggestions about the PT (other) group being less likely to turnover than the other two PT student groups. A limitation here is that only turnover intentions and other variables that have been shown to at least partially predict turnover were measured. Actual turnover was not measured for each group so conclusive evidence was not found to conclude that the PT (other) group will have a lower turnover rate than the other two PT student groups.
The findings from this study might not be able to be generalised to other organisational contexts apart from organisations similar to the organisation used in this study. Given the methodological problems this study had, findings will need to be replicated in other organisations from other industries before they can be established as being universal. These should also be combined with longitudinal studies that involve measuring actual turnover.

Two new scales (social network strength and pre-planned intention to quit) were developed for this study and were previously un-validated in any other research. The pre-planned intention to quit measure comprised only one item so no reliability or factor analysis was conducted. Expanding this measure into multiple items, each measuring different parts of the pre-planned intention to quit concept might have captured this concept more completely. The social network strength measure did not show differences between groups and correlated un-expectedly with the pre-planned intention to quit scale. The fact that these two variables were on the same page, toward the end of the survey and correlated un-expectedly suggests that they may have also suffered from the response patterns mentioned above.

The findings from the moderation relationships analysed in this study were limited as they only included psychological contract fulfilment (kept promises). Psychological contract fulfilment (un-kept promises) did not correlate well with any of the criterion variables so it was not used as a predictor.

**Practical Implications**

Throughout the results of the between group differences analysis, a pattern emerged where the PT (other) group responded more desirably in terms of suggesting lower turnover on many scales. These responses were indicative of potentially lower
turnover rates for this group compared to the two other PT student groups. This pattern was observable for variables such as pre-planned intention to quit, affective commitment (positively worded items) and normative commitment. The PT (other) group also reported the highest levels of overall satisfaction and lowest levels of turnover intentions (job search behaviour). The strongest predictor was that the PT (other) group had much lower levels of pre-planned intention to quit than the two PT student groups. When this pattern of results for the PT (other) group is compared to that of the two PT student groups, the overall trend is that the PT (other) group shows responses consistent with predicting lower employee turnover rates than the other two PT student groups. This suggestion is based on the results of meta-analyses (e.g. Tett and Meyer, 1993), which show that many of the variables (e.g. overall job satisfaction and job commitment) predict a large amount of the variance in actual turnover. The suggestion that the PT (other) group will have lower actual turnover will require a longitudinal study measuring actual turnover for each group to conclude it. The finding by Statistics New Zealand (2005) also supports this as it shows employee turnover rates steadily decline as age increases. The mean ages for the two PT student groups were 19 and 21 years compared to 47 years for the PT (other) group.

These findings have practical implications for the selection and retention strategies of the current organisation and others similar to it. Maertz and Campion (2004) suggest that pre-planned quitting is the least manageable and avoidable, but an awareness of how and when groups prone to pre-planned quitting actually quit will allow the impact to be minimised. Having a better understanding of the typical turnover characteristics of the different PT groups will help the organisation to effectively manage and predict turnover. A potential strategy could be that organisations should establish how many PT positions they require on a year-round
basis, and secondly establish how many PT positions are required to meet seasonal (summer) fluctuations in demand. If the organisation targets people who fit into the PT (other) group to fill the year-round positions and PT student groups for the seasonal positions then they will maximise the beneficial characteristics of both types of groups. If this strategy is completed, the PT (other) group should provide a stable base all year round while the PT student groups will work seasonally, leaving when the sales drop away towards the end of that season. This way the higher turnover characteristics of the PT student groups are utilised as a positive characteristic and the PT (other) group can be invested into with higher amounts of training and development that will bring longer running returns on investment.

Practitioners working with any organisation to diagnose and resolve their problems with high employee turnover rates need to consider the composition of their workforce. If an organisation such as a supermarket employs a lot of young PT students because they are able to pay them at minimum wage, then it can expect high turnover rates to be the standard. If an organisation employs mainly FT and older PT non-student types of employees and it has high employee turnover rates, then it is likely that something else (e.g. low satisfaction) is causing the high rates of employee turnover. Practitioners need to be aware that a standard rate of turnover is not applicable to most organisations and the relative size of groups comprising their workforce and average ages should be taken into consideration among other things.

At the time the data for this study were collected (November 2008), New Zealand was in the early stages of an economic recession. At this time there was still a relative shortage of labour in the work force and un-employment rates were very low at around 3.6%. Most of the economic turmoil at that time was confined to losses on the stock markets due to the global ‘credit crunch’ rather than job losses and rising
un-employment. The results of this study should be considered as being more relevant to more ‘affluent’ times for business where there was a large amount of opportunity in the labour market for most employees. Considering the current global recession, if the surveys were to be completed again now, there is a chance that they might significantly differ to what was found previously.

**Theoretical Implications**

This study found strong evidence that there are differences between groups of employees in terms of having a pre-planned intention to quit. The theoretical implication of this finding is that it demonstrates that the pre-planned intention to quit construct is measurable, differs between groups and correlates in a logical way with other variables. This study demonstrates that the pre-planned intention to quit variable explains differences between employees that the turnover intentions variable does not. If pre-planned intention to quit was integrated with turnover intentions scale, this potentially could add predictive validity to turnover intention scales. However, the pre-planned intention to quit variable will need further development such as developing it into a multi-item scale before it could become a sub-scale or complementary variable of an intentions to quit scale.

This study also adds some theoretical support for Martin and Sinclair’s (2007) PT typology. This study found evidence to support further differences between the PT groups described by Martin and Sinclair across a wider range of variables. However, a finding contrary to Martin and Sinclair’s was the lack of participants belonging to the 5 PT groups that were combined into the PT (other) group. This finding implies that these 5 groups are not practically significant to research as such a small number of employees will belong to them. Some organisations might employee a larger number
of PT employees who are not students, but for the New Zealand retail industry it is likely that the five non-student PT types described by Martin and Sinclair will need to be combined into a PT (other) group to have practical and statistical significance.

The finding that satisfaction with supervision did not differ between FT and PT groups also had a theoretical implication. It was expected that the amount of interaction with supervisors would differ between FT and PT employees and this would affect satisfaction with supervision, however this relationship did not exist. This suggests that satisfaction with supervision may be primarily determined by the quality of the exchange relationship whereas the quantity of the exchange is less significant. A separate study examining this closer would be needed to test this implication.

**Future research**

In general, this research raised more questions that it answered. Future research is needed to confirm the differences found between the PT groups from this study. The methodological problems this study had also reduced the significance of findings and cast an element of doubt over what was found. Future research is needed to repeat some of the findings from this study before they can be considered to be conclusive. In particular, the differences between the PT (other) group and the other groups need further investigation to establish why they actually differ on many of the attitudes.

The social network strength variable developed for this study did not produce any useful results; future research is needed to re-approach this. It could simply be a matter of including the scale towards the beginning of the survey or it might need to be completely redeveloped before any useful results are found.
The pre-planned intention to quit variable developed for this study did produce some useful results and this is something that future research could build upon and develop further. Future research could develop a multi-item version of the scale and also integrate it into an intention to quit scale as a sub-scale or keep it as a complementary scale. It would be interesting to see whether a turnover intentions scale with the pre-planned intention to quit sub-scale would provide greater predictive ability of actual employee turnover compared to a turnover intention scale without the pre-planned intention to quit component. The pre-planned intention to quit variable also had many correlations with other variables in this study and future research is needed to determine more about the nature of their relationship, whether or not there is an element of causation in some of the relationships. Another possibility for research would be to compare the responses of employees who are employed on fixed term contracts with employees who have a pre-planned intention to quit. Both groups of people are expecting an imminent quit and it would be interesting to find out if there are commonalities between their responses on work attitude variables.

This study found evidence of work status being a moderator between psychological contract fulfilment (kept promises) and overall satisfaction and also turnover intentions (job search behaviours). It was expected that there would be more significant moderation effects by work status between other attitudinal variables and future research could explore these to find out more ways in which FT employees differ from PT employees.
Conclusion

This study had three major aims which were all largely achieved. The first aim was to investigate differences between the FT and PT groups; this was achieved but the differences between groups were not always as expected. The two PT student groups often responded similar to each other whereas the PT (other) group responded in a pattern more similar to the FT group. The second aim of the study was to develop two new variables (social network strength and employee pre-planned intention to quit) and to test those variables for differences between groups and relationships with other variables. The pre-planned intention to quit variable produced a variety of useful results whereas the social network strength scale did not. Future research is needed to develop these variables for practical and theoretical use. The third aim was to establish if work status moderated the relationship between psychological contract fulfilment and a range of variables. The results show that work status was a moderator for two of the four relationships tested, but future research with fewer methodological problems is expected to find a wider range of relationships moderated by work status.

The PT (other) group was established as being likely to have a lower turnover rate than the other PT groups based on their responses across all the attitudinal scales. This finding creates an opportunity for organisations similar to the current one to better align their selection strategy with trends in their seasonal demand by utilising the typical turnover characteristics of each group to their advantage.

Overall this study did not always find what was hypothesised but it did discover a wide range of group differences and relationships between variables that can help better explain a variety of workplace outcomes. The most important finding was the distinctions made between the PT (other) and two PT student groups.
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5-Week 5-Store Survey Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Store Group</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Whangarei Full-timers</td>
<td>26/10/2008</td>
<td>30/10/2008</td>
<td>2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Whangarei Part-timers</td>
<td>1/11/2008</td>
<td>2/11/2008</td>
<td>2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Botany Full-timers</td>
<td>11/11/2008</td>
<td>13/11/2008</td>
<td>3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Botany Part-timers</td>
<td>16/11/2008</td>
<td>19/11/2008</td>
<td>2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mt Maunganui Full-timers</td>
<td>16/11/2008</td>
<td>20/11/2008</td>
<td>5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mt Maunganui Part-timers</td>
<td>22/11/2008</td>
<td>23/11/2008</td>
<td>2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mt Roskill Full-timers</td>
<td>25/11/2008</td>
<td>27/11/2008</td>
<td>3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mt Roskill Part-timers</td>
<td>26/11/2008</td>
<td>30/11/2008</td>
<td>2d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daily Plan For Each Store:

**Tuesday**
Morning (7am – 10am) – Review store rosters and create lists of team members to be surveyed on each day (while focusing on maintaining coverage).  
Afternoon (4pm – 6pm) – Start first surveys of full-time team members.

**Wednesday**
Morning (7am – 10am) – Continue surveys of full-time team members.  
Afternoon (7am – 10am) – Continue surveys of full-time team members.

**Thursday**
Morning (7am – 10am) – Continue surveys of full-time team members.  
Afternoon – Finish surveys of full-time team members.

**Saturday**
Morning (7am – 10am) – Start surveys of part-time team members.  
Afternoon (7am – 10am) – Continue surveys of part-time team members.

**Sunday**
Morning (7am – 10am) – Continue surveys of part-time team members.  
Afternoon (7am – 10am) – Finish surveys of part-time team members.
Upcoming Surveys Announcement

Between October 28th and December 7th I will be doing surveys of the upper north island Bunnings Warehouse stores. I will be in contact over the next few days to organise and book your training room for up to five days for the purpose of administering the surveys. These surveys are about team-member’s attitudes towards their work and which include questions about: their job satisfaction, job commitment, intentions to quit, promises made by, social networks and experiences of stress. The aim of this research is to collect data on why organisations like Bunnings Warehouse have such high staff turnover rates while paying particular attention to part-time employees who often turnover the most. This research will potentially give incite to organisations to better meet the demands of their team-members and hopefully reduce their rates of staff-turnover.

At the conclusion of the research (April 2009), I will present my summarised findings and conclusions to the NZ management team so that it can be considered in their future work.

Some key points to consider:

• Team member names will not be recorded at any point and the completed questionnaires will not be seen by any member of Management as to maintain confidentiality of responding.
• There will be questions about team-member attitudes towards supervision but individual supervisors or stores will not (and can not) be identified at any point in the research, results will be summarised for Warehouse in general.
• Completing these questionnaires is not compulsory so any person can opt-out at any point before or during the questionnaire.
• Questionnaires will be filled out in groups of team-members in the training room, the times and combination of people in groups will be targeted at making sure there is always coverage on the floor.
• On the first day of surveying, I will meet the store’s management team and work with them as to plan which team members and what times are best for surveying to maintain coverage on the floor.
• Surveying will be done in the early morning and afternoon off-peak times over five days to avoid disruption of customer service, I am also happy to work around other in-store events or unforeseen high customer numbers etc.

This research is the core part of a master’s thesis in Organisational Psychology at the University of Waikato. I (Hamish Whistler) am currently a part-time team-member at Bunnings Warehouse in Hamilton who has been with the company for 4 years.

If you have any queries, please contact me:
Phone: 07 8592445 or 021301954
Email: hw57@waikato.ac.nz

Thank you for your cooperation,

Hamish Whistler.
Appendix C – Team Member Overview

Upcoming Survey

Over the next week there will be some surveys of team members happening in the training room. These surveys are about your experiences as team-members in Bunnings Warehouse which include questions about: your job satisfaction, job commitment, intentions to quit, promises made by Management, social networks and experiences of stress. The aim of this research is to gather data on why organisations like Bunnings have such high staff turnover rates while paying particular attention to part-time employees who often turnover the most. This research will potentially give insight to organisations to better meet the demands of their team-members and hopefully reduce their rates of staff-turnover.

Some key points to consider:

- Your individual names will not be recorded at any point and your questionnaires will not be seen by any member of Management so you can respond freely without being identified personally.
- Completing these questionnaires is not compulsory so any person can opt-out at any point before or during the questionnaire.
- Questionnaires will be filled out in groups of team-members in the training room, the times and combination of people in groups will be targeted at making sure there is always coverage on the floor.
- Your name will be called over the PA system and you will be asked to come to the training if you are willing to complete the survey.
- After the research is complete, a summary will be sent out to each store involved so you will have some feedback on key findings.

This research is the core part of a master’s thesis in Organisational Psychology at the University of Waikato. I (Hamish Whistler) am currently a part-time team-member at Bunnings Hamilton who has been with the company for 4 years.

If you have any queries, please contact me via:
Phone: 021301954
Email: hw57@waikato.ac.nz

Or alternatively you can contact my supervisor:
Dr Mike O’Driscoll
Phone: 07 838 4466 extension 8899
Email: psyc0181@waikato.ac.nz

Thank you for your participation,

Hamish Whistler.
UNIVERSITY THESIS SURVEY

Employee Experiences in the Workplace

I am a Masters student in Organisational Psychology at the University of Waikato conducting thesis research and I am interested in the experiences of people who work for Bunnings Warehouse. This mainly involves measuring people’s motivations to stay in or leave the organisation through their feelings of satisfaction, commitment, intentions to quit and stress associated with their jobs. The Research and Ethics Committee of the Psychology Department at the University of Waikato approved this questionnaire as it meets their guidelines. The results of the surveys will be analysed to find patterns useful in building theory around why people quit their jobs. On the completion of the research in April 2009, aggregated findings will be presented to team-members and management.

There are no right or wrong answers, and your name will not be recorded. Please answer all the questions in the way you really feel, as quickly and freely as you can.

For the first part of the questionnaire there are a range of seven possible answers to choose from. Choosing 1 would suggest you are extremely dissatisfied, choosing 4 would suggest you are neutral and choosing 7 would suggest that you are extremely satisfied.

Please read each statement in the survey carefully and circle the number which comes closest to the way you feel.

By completing this survey you are giving consent for your responses to be included in this study.

You may leave now or at any point during the survey if you are not willing to be included.

If you have any concerns or queries, my contact details are as follows:
Hamish Whistler
6 Yorkshire Road
Silverdale
Hamilton
Phone: 021301954 or 07 8592445
Email: hw57@waikato.ac.nz

Or alternatively you can contact my supervisor:
Dr Mike O’Driscoll
Phone: 07 838 4466 extension 8899
Email: psyc0181@waikato.ac.nz

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
Please read each statement in the survey carefully and circle the number which comes closest to the way you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = extremely dissatisfied</th>
<th>2 = dissatisfied</th>
<th>3 = slightly dissatisfied</th>
<th>4 = neutral</th>
<th>5 = slightly satisfied</th>
<th>6 = satisfied</th>
<th>7 = extremely satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Feelings Towards the Job**

1. My take-home pay
2. My benefit package
3. My most recent raise
4. Influence my supervisor has on my pay
5. My current wage rate
6. Amount the company pays towards my benefits
7. The raises I have typically received in the past
8. Information the company gives about pay issues of concern to me
9. My overall level of pay
10. Pay of other jobs in the company
11. Consistency of the company’s pay policy
12. The number of benefits I receive
13. How my raises are determined
14. The way my supervisor listens when I have something important to say
15. The way my supervisor sets clear work goals
16. The way my supervisor treats me when I make a mistake
17. My supervisor’s fairness in appraising my job performance

*Continued...*
18. The way my supervisor is consistent in his/her behaviour toward subordinates
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. The way my supervisor helps me to get the job done
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. The way my supervisor gives me credit for my ideas
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. The way my supervisor gives me clear instruction
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. The way my supervisor informs me about work changes ahead of time
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. The way my supervisor follows through to get problems solved
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. The way my supervisor understands the problems I might run into doing the job
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. The way my supervisor shows concern for my career progress
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. My supervisor’s backing me up with other management
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. The frequency with which I get a pat on the back for doing a good job
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

28. The technical competence of my supervisor
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. The amount of time I get to learn a task before I’m moved to another task
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30. The time I have to do the job right
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

31. The way my job responsibilities are clearly defined
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
32. All in all, I am satisfied with my job
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

33. In general, I don’t like my job
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

34. In general, I like working here
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of Bunnings Warehouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 = strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = slightly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = slightly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 = agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 = strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with Bunnings
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

36. I really feel as if Bunnings’ problems are my own
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37. I do not feel like “part of the family” at Bunnings
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

38. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to Bunnings
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

39. Bunnings has a great deal of personal meaning for me
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

40. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to Bunnings
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

41. I do not feel any obligation to remain with Bunnings
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

42. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave Bunnings now
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Continued...
43. I would feel guilty if I left Bunnings now
44. Bunnings deserves my loyalty
45. I would not leave Bunnings right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it
46. I owe a great deal to Bunnings
47. It would be very hard for me to leave Bunnings right now, even if I wanted to
48. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave Bunnings now
49. Right now staying with Bunnings is a matter of necessity as much as desire
50. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving Bunnings
51. One of the few serious consequences of leaving Bunnings would be the scarcity of available alternatives
52. One of the major reasons I continue to work for Bunnings is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice – another organisation may not match the overall benefits that I have here
### Thoughts about the Job

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>slightly disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. I will probably look for a new job in the near future
54. At the present time, I am actively searching for another job in a different organisation
55. I do not intend to quit my job
56. It is unlikely that I will actively look for a different organisation to work for in the next year
57. I am not thinking about quitting my job at the present time

### Promises made by

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>slightly disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. In general, this organisation has kept its promises to me about what I will get from them
59. Managers in this organisation have honoured the commitments they have made to me
60. This organisation says it will do things for you and then never gets around to doing them
61. I am often told I will receive things from this organisation that in the end never materialise
### Mixing with other People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>slightly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>slightly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. I have someone in the organisation who could provide me with emotional support  
63. I depend on other employees for support in the organisation  
64. I socialise with employees from the organisation during breaks and quiet times  
65. I have someone from the organisation whom I could depend on for support  
66. I socialise with employees from the organisation outside of business hours  
67. I have someone from the organisation with whom I could discuss personal matters

### Plans of when to Quit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>slightly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>slightly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68. When you started this job, did you have a plan to quit at a particular time or when an event happened? (E.g. When you have: saved enough money, finished high-school, finished university, or summer holidays have finished etc.)  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Experiences in the Workplace

(Note: Change of scale and new instructions)

For each item you should indicate the frequency with which the condition described is a source of stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = never</th>
<th>2 = rarely</th>
<th>3 = occasionally</th>
<th>4 = sometimes</th>
<th>5 = often</th>
<th>6 = usually</th>
<th>7 = always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

69. My job duties and work objectives are unclear to me

70. I am unclear about whom I report to and/or who reports to me

71. I lack the authority to carry out my job responsibilities

72. I do not fully understand what is expected of me

73. I do not understand the part my job plays in meeting overall organisational objectives

74. I have to take work home in the evenings or on weekends to stay caught up

75. I spend too much time in unimportant meetings that take me away from my work

76. I am responsible for an almost unmanageable number of projects or assignments at the same time

77. I simply have more work to do than can be done in a ordinary day

78. I feel that I just don’t have time to take an occasional break

79. The demands for work quality made upon me are unreasonable

80. My assigned tasks are sometimes too difficult and/or complex

81. Tasks seem to be getting more and more complex

Continued...
82. The organisation expects more of me than my skills and/or abilities provide

83. I have insufficient training and/or experience to discharge my duties properly

Background Information

The following items are important so that I can describe the characteristics of the research sample

Type of employee

84. Please read all of the following and select one of the following categories that best reflects your situation by ticking the box next to it:

Full-time type:

   Full-time employee (works over 30 hours per week)......................[ ]

Part-time student types:

   High-school student................................................................. [ ]
   Tertiary student......................................................................... [ ]

Non-student part-time types:

   Over 50% of your income comes from this part-time job...............[ ]
   Sharing income with a partner and 50% or less of household income comes from this part-time job.............................................[ ]
   Your not sharing income and 50% or less of income comes from this job (has investments or benefits etc).................................[ ]
   This part-time job is one of multiple part time jobs you have.......[ ]
   You also have a full-time job apart from this part time one...........[ ]
Type of work

85. Please read all of the following and select one of the following categories that best reflects your situation by ticking the box next to it:

Point of sales (checkouts and service desk)………………………………..[ ]
Sales (salesperson in a department or special orders)…………………….. [ ]
Administration (PALS office and reception)…………………………….. [ ]
Stock work (night-fill and inwards goods)……………………………….. [ ]

Other information

86. What is your age?.................................................................[   ]Years
87. How long have you been working for the organisation?.... [   ]Years, [   ]Months
88. How long have you been in your current role?............... [   ]Years, [   ]Months
89. What is your gender?..........................................................Male [  ] or Female [  ]

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME!