

Kennesaw State University
DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University

Faculty Publications


Spring 1999

Differences between Stayers and Leavers among Part-Time Workers

Kevin W. Sightler
Kennesaw State University

Janet S. Adams
Kennesaw State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/facpubs>

 Part of the [Human Resources Management Commons](#), and the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sightler, Kevin W., and Janet S. Adams. "Differences between Stayers and Leavers among Part-Time Workers." *Journal of Managerial Issues* 11.1 (1999): 110-25. Print.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@kennesaw.edu.

JOURNAL OF MANAGERIAL ISSUES
Vol. XI Number 1 Spring 1999:110-125

Differences Between Stayers and Leavers Among Part-Time Workers*

Kevin W. Sightler

Associate Professor of Management and Entrepreneurship
Kennesaw State University

Janet S. Adams

Associate Professor of Management and Entrepreneurship
Kennesaw State University

A notable change in the U.S. labor force is the increased number of part-time, temporary, or contingent workers and those who hold multiple jobs (Belous, 1989; Feldman, 1990; duRivage, 1991; Callaghan and Hartmann, 1991; Tilly, 1991; Nardone, 1995, 1986; Danner, 1996; Lester, 1996; Segal, 1996; Brotherton, 1997). Between the mid-1950s and the mid-1980s, the estimated proportion of part-time workers to the total workforce has doubled, stabilizing over the past decade at approximately 17.5% of U.S. workers (Kahne, 1985; Segal, 1996). Currently, about 23 million U.S. workers are employed part-time (Brotherton, 1997). Some have predicted that part-timers and contingent workers (workers who contract their services to different organizations on an as-needed basis) will outnumber permanent full-time workers

by the end of the 1990s (duRivage, 1991). A growing number of part-time workers hold managerial or professional positions. The number of part-time professionals has grown by 50% between 1989 and 1997 to approximately 4.5 million workers, an average annual increase of 5.2% (Brotherton, 1997). Although many workers prefer part-time jobs for a variety of reasons, a growing number of those working part-time do so despite their preference for full-time employment (duRivage, 1991, 1992).

In this article we will briefly examine the phenomenon of part-time U.S. workers and discuss advantages and disadvantages for individuals and for organizations. Then we will present an analysis of the characteristics of leavers versus stayers among part-time hospital workers. Finally, we will discuss managerial and research im-

* The authors acknowledge the helpful comments of two anonymous journal referees on the original version of this paper.

plications of turnover among part-time employees.

Theory of Part-Time Work

Theory development in part-time work issues is scarce. Existing work theories—such as job satisfaction, job involvement, and work centrality—may be extended to incorporate both full-time and part-time workers. For example, Fenton-O’Creevy (1995) found higher job satisfaction among part-time employees compared to their full-time counterparts, moderated by career ambition. Tilly (1996) found turnover among part-time workers to be a function of job content, dichotomizing part-time jobs as “good” (i.e., well paid, skill diverse with opportunities for development) or “bad” (low skill, training, and responsibility, entry-level, low pay).

Most of the theory development and theory-based empirical research of part-time work is attributed to Daniel Feldman. He proposed a model for examining relationships among part-time work and employee attitudes and behaviors (Feldman, 1990). Five dimensions of part-time work arrangements (temporary or permanent work, company-hired or agency-hired, year-round or seasonal, main job or second job, and voluntary or involuntary) are suggested that differentially attract people to either full- or part-time work and differentially motivate and satisfy them. Combined with demographic and work-context factors, Feldman proposed a framework to move part-time work research toward theory-based, multivariate models of reciprocal causation. Feldman and Doeringhaus (1992a, 1992b) and Eberhardt and Moser (1995) tested subsets of Feldman’s (1990) 13 hypotheses. Their evidence

suggests permanent (compared to temporary) part-time workers have higher levels of job satisfaction and that permanent part-time workers are more likely to construct a package of referent others composed mostly of full-time workers when compared to temporary part-timers. However, Eberhardt and Moser’s (1995) evidence did not support the hypothesis that voluntary part-timers would be more satisfied and less likely to quit than involuntary part-timers. Among temporary employees, Feldman *et al.* (1995) found positive job attitudes to be most closely associated with temporary employment by choice, consistency between prior work and current work, and employee desire to remain in a temporary job. Feldman (1996) has also tied this framework to the study of underemployment.

Thus, limited evidence suggests support for theory-based contentions of differences between full-time and part-time workers. Theory suggests differential motivations for both attraction to and retention in part-time jobs. These differences have a potentially significant impact on managerial issues such as employee recruitment (e.g., different recruitment sources), compensation (different levels of importance attached to pay), work arrangements (job sharing, job rotation of an agency hire), type of work (a high or low level of responsibility), and the nature of employee-employer psychological contracting (convenience employment versus employment based on shared common goals).

Impact of the Part-Time Workforce

Historically, part-time employment in the U.S. increases during economic recessions and decreases dur-

ing economic expansions. An acceleration in the rate of increase of part-time work began in the 1970s. Prior to the 1970s, most part-time employment was created in response to labor force preferences by the young and old and by women with family responsibilities. Since that time, however, the balance has arguably shifted from part-time work as an accommodation to workforce needs to part-time work as a means of meeting organizational needs—primarily cost-containment. Thus, the rising proportion of part-time jobs may represent involuntary part-time work (Tilly, 1991).

Part of the growth in part-time employment reflects the structural shift in the economy from manufacturing to trade and service industries, areas in which part-time employment has historically been higher than in manufacturing. The labor market in these industries has traditionally been lower wage and lower skill, with high turnover. For service industries that must provide long hours of worker availability to the public, the use of part-timers has been a long-standing means of dealing with scheduling difficulties. The practice also has provided organizations the means to match market demand and staffing levels at minimal cost (Tilly, 1991). However, many professionals—physicians, lawyers, engineers—are now among the ranks of part-time and contingent workers (Morrow, 1993; Fierman, 1994). This phenomenon is not limited to the U.S. (cf. Houseman and Osawa, 1995).

The health care field has long employed part-timers in both lower level and professional jobs. Nursing, for example, historically has been a profession in which part-time work has been offered as a means to provide

twenty-four hour, seven-day-a-week service. Wetzel *et al.* (1990) note that nursing careers frequently show the pattern of full-time work in early career stages, followed by a move into part-time work during years of primary family responsibilities. The health care industry has actively recruited part-time nurses as a way of managing vacillating staffing demands (Munroe, 1988). This use of a mix of full-time and part-time professionals working together has led to questions about what differences might exist between the two groups in job satisfaction, job involvement and job commitment.

Feldman (1990) observed that the variables affecting part-time workers that have been studied most often are age, gender, marital status and number of children. Older part-time workers have been shown to have higher levels of job satisfaction (Bosworth and Holden, 1983); female part-timers report higher levels of job satisfaction (Hart, 1987); and those part-time workers experiencing higher levels of role conflict (work-family conflict or student-employee role conflict) are less satisfied than those who experience little role conflict (Greenberger and Steinberg, 1986).

Turnover of Part-Time Workers

Feldman (1990) called for research that explores the relationship between part-time work and important job outcomes. He suggested that simple bivariate comparisons of full-time and part-time workers might be masking other phenomena. He recommended discriminant and cluster analysis be used "to explore the impact of groups of demographic variables across a wide array of attitudinal

and behavioral outcomes" (Feldman, 1990:108).

A frequently cited negative consequence of turnover is cost, including recruiting, training, and lost sales or opportunities. Nationally, average annual turnover for all companies is 12% (Pinkovitz *et al.*, 1997). While all turnover has some associated costs, we are addressing here the costs of dysfunctional turnover, or the loss of valued employees. Turnover may disrupt performance in loss of efficiency of the leaver prior to separation and in performance lost while the position is vacant and while the replacement is not fully functional. Social and communication networks in which the leaver participated are disrupted. Lower morale and group cohesion may result. Dissonance may be created for the stayers, depending on what they perceive to be the reasons for the turnover. Inappropriate managerial responses to turnover may create problems. Across-the-board responses on the basis of insufficient information and poor diagnosis can further degrade performance of those who remain (Moblely, 1982). For example, Cascio (1987) discusses the managerial implications of turnover, suggesting that simple tabulation of leavers is insufficient as it may mask serious problems underlying turnover. He suggests that all positions within a firm be evaluated with respect to current level of performance and ease of replacement. Turnover among high-performers and average performers who are difficult to replace is considered dysfunctional, whereas that among low performers and average performers who are easy to replace is considered functional turnover. These differences may be used to monitor turnover and be incorporated into overall strategic hu-

man resource planning and programs such as training, recruitment, and career development. Indeed, Jackofsky *et al.* (1986a) predicted a curvilinear relationship between performance and turnover, with higher turnover for low and high performers than for average performers. This was empirically validated by Trevor *et al.* (1997), who also found the relationship moderated by salary growth and promotions.

Part-time employees have been found by some to have higher turnover rates than full-time employees (Jackofsky *et al.*, 1986b). However, individuals who work part-time may differ on biographic and attitudinal dimensions (cf. Fenton-O'Creedy, 1995; Leeds, 1990). It therefore seems important to identify patterns of characteristics of part-time workers that are associated with turnover in this increasingly important segment of the workforce. Variables found in previous studies to be related to turnover were selected as potential discriminant factors among stayers and leavers in our sample: age, gender, pay level, length of employment, management status, marital status, number of dependents and race. Younger, lower paid, unmarried employees without dependents and with shorter job tenure have been found to be those most likely to leave a job. Since at least one study also finds that race is a factor in part-time employment (Leeds, 1990), with black workers more likely than white workers to be part-time employees, we have included race as a possible discriminant variable.

Based on our reading of the pervasiveness and importance of the part-time workforce, we undertook the research reported here. The increasing number of part-time workers and the possible managerial implica-

tions associated with this increase are what motivated this study. We selected turnover of part-time employees as the outcome variable because turnover has important consequences for organizational performance and creates a substantial managerial challenge. We have used discriminant analysis to identify sets of demographic characteristics of stayers and leavers among part-time hospital employees. That is, we looked for patterns of variables to discriminate between those part-time workers who stayed employed and those who left the organization. Independent of the change in composition of the part-time workforce from unskilled or semi-skilled to professional, and whether the proportion of the workforce represented by part-timers is increasing, decreasing, or constant, it appears as if the limited research on part-time employees suggests differences between full- and part-time employees on managerially significant factors. To this end, we have investigated turnover within the ranks of part-time workers as a preliminary, exploratory step in the development of part-time work theory and in managing its practical consequences.

Method

Sample

Data were collected from a large, acute care, teaching hospital located in the southeastern U.S. The data are from the hospital's human resource information system and may, therefore, be judged highly accurate and complete. Data were collected representing a five year period of all hiring, promotion, compensation, and termination actions. Three thousand and ninety-three employees are rep-

resented in this longitudinal data set. Of those, 1,053 (34% of the total) were part-time employees and were retained for analysis in this study.

Procedure

We used multiple discriminant analysis to assess the demographic differences between stayers and leavers. We selected this technique based on the relationships under study: a dependence relationship (versus interdependence such as in clusters or factors) in which the prediction of a single nonmetric dependent measure (staying versus leaving) is made with multiple independent measures (biographic characteristics; cf. Hair *et al.*, 1995).

The dependent grouping variable was derived by assigning a value of "0" to stayers (i.e., employees still employed by the hospital) and "1" to leavers (i.e., employees who had been terminated, either voluntarily or involuntarily). For the discriminant or independent variables, we selected eight biographic characteristics consistent with our review of the literature as possibly related to turnover. The variables are: age, gender (binary coded: 1 = female; 0 = male), hourly pay rate, length of employment (time since hire for stayers; time between hire and termination for leavers), management status (1 = middle- or executive-level manager; 0 otherwise), marital status (1 = not married; 0 = married), number of dependents, and race (1 = white; 0 = other). Table 1 shows comparative descriptive statistics for the eight independent variables and Table 2 shows the bivariate correlations for both stayers and leavers.

The discriminant analysis was performed using a stepwise entry option

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

<i>Biographic Characteristic</i>	<i>Stayers (n = 540)</i>	<i>Leavers (n = 513)</i>
Age	Average = 36.3 years SD = 14.7	Average = 31.6 years SD = 11.6
Gender	Male: 70 (13%) Female: 470 (87%)	Male: 104 (20.3%) Female: 409 (79.7%)
Hourly Pay Rate	Average = \$8.14 SD = \$3.46	Average = \$6.26 SD = \$2.30
Length of Employment	Average = 3.5 years SD = 4.3	Average = 1.5 years SD = 2.2
Management Status	Middle or Executive: 13 (2.4%) All Others: 527 (97.6%)	Middle or Executive: 6 (1.2%) All Others: 507 (98.8%)
Marital Status	Married: 257 (47.6%) Not Married: 283 (52.4%)	Married: 185 (36%) Not Married: 328 (64%)
Number of Dependents	Average: 0.98 SD = 4.35	Average: 0.66 SD = 1.36
Race	White: 477 (88.3%) Nonwhite: 63 (11.7%)	White: 469 (91.4%) Nonwhite: 44 (8.6%)

(SPSS Release 4.1). Minimization of Wilks' lambda was the entry criterion. The sample size of 1,053 with eight independent variables passes the recommended 20-to-1 observation-to-variable ratio by a substantial margin (Hair *et al.*, 1995). Assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and equal variance-covariance matrices are met at acceptable levels.

Results

Table 3 shows the results of eight independent tests of differences between stayers and leavers for each of the independent variables and the results of the multivariate discriminant analysis. Univariate F tests reveal significant differences between the two

groups based on age, gender, hourly pay rate, length of employment, and marital status. The univariate tests are shown here to illustrate the nature of the first-order relationships, and as points of comparison and contrast with the results obtained from the multivariate discriminant analysis. Combined with the varying levels of bivariate correlation as shown in Table 2, the data indicate that univariate tests alone will not indicate the true nature of differences between the groups when variables are considered simultaneously. For that reason, we used a forward stepwise procedure to estimate the discriminant function with independent variables that are significant at the margin; that is, they

Table 2. Biographic Correlations

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Age	--							
2. Gender	-.09	.03						
3. Hourly Pay Rate	.21 ***	-.01	.22 ***	.40 ***	.03	-.40 ***	.10	-.02
4. Length of Employment	.48 ***	.11 *	.13 *	-.02	-.04	-.13 *	-.02	.09
5. Management Status	.05	-.19 ***	--	.32 ***	.52 ***	-.29 ***	.16 ***	.08
6. Marital Status	-.28 ***	-.01	.58 ***	.03	.17 ***	-.14 **	-.09	-.06
7. Number of Dependents	.04	-.14 **	-.21 ***	-.18 ***	--	-.03	.01	.03
8. Race	-.03	.08	.20 ***	.02	-.09	-.12 *	-.20 ***	-.07
			.17 ***	-.03	.30 ***	.00	--	-.05
					.02		-.01	--

Notes: 1. Dummy variables are coded as follows:

- Gender: 1=Female; 0=Male
- Management Status: 1=Middle/Executive Management; 0=Nonmanagement
- Marital Status: 1=Not married=1; 0=Married
- Race: 1=White; 0=All others.

2. Correlations below the diagonal are for stayers (n=540). Correlations above the diagonal are for leavers (n=513).

* p < .01

** p < .001

*** p < .0001

Table 3. Summary of Stepwise Discriminant Analysis Results

Wilks' Lambda = .8470, Chi-squared = 174.10, 5 df, $p < .0001$

Canonical Correlation = 0.3911

Eigenvalue of the Discriminant Function = .1806

<i>Biographic Characteristic</i>	<i>Univariate F Ratio</i>	<i>Standardized Weight</i>	<i>Discriminant Loading</i>
Age	31.84 ** (3)	N.S.	0.37157 (3)
Gender	10.27 * (5)	0.13845	0.23261 (5)
Hourly Pay Rate	107.10 ** (1)	0.85199	0.75109 (1)
Length of Employment	95.46 ** (2)	0.48245	0.70914 (2)
Management Status	2.28 (8)	-0.37324	0.10948 (7)
Marital Status	14.53 ** (4)	N.S.	-0.25761 (4)
Number of Dependents	2.43 (7)	N.S.	0.05762 (8)
Race	2.75 (6)	-0.22097	-0.12042 (6)

Notes:

1. "N.S." indicates the biographic characteristic was not swept into the discriminant function because it did not meet the minimum significance inclusion criterion.
2. Numbers in parentheses indicate the relative order of absolute magnitude.

* $p < .01$ ** $p < .0001$

significantly discriminate between groups while controlling for the effects of multicollinearity. These results are also shown in Table 3.

A significant ($p < .0001$) discriminant function was derived. Five of the eight independent variables entered the function as significant discriminators. The absolute value of the standardized (i.e., unit-free) weights indicate the relative discriminant power of the variable. In order of discriminant strength, the biographic characteristics able to differentiate stayers versus leavers are: hourly pay rate, length of employment, management status, race, and gender. Age, marital

status, and number of dependents did not provide a unique and statistically significant source of discriminant power. Compare these results and rankings to the univariate rankings and to the discriminant loadings. The discriminant loading is the correlation between the biographic characteristic and the canonical discriminant function.

The classification matrix in Table 4 indicates the predictive accuracy of the discriminant function. Because the data represent the entire population of part-timers at the sample hospital, the analysis sample proportions—51.3% stayers ($n=540$) and

48.7% leavers ($n=513$)—are used as the *a priori* probabilities for classification purposes. Overall, 66.5% of employees were correctly classified using the derived discriminant function. The performance of the discriminant function can be compared to the likelihood of correctly classifying employees without the discriminant function using the proportional chance criterion. Whereas the discriminant function correctly classified 66.5% of employees, only 50% would be correctly classified without using the discriminant function (see notes in Table 4). The maximum chance criterion, in which all employees are assigned to the group with the greatest chance of occurrence (in this case, stayers) would correctly classify 51.3% of the employees. Therefore, the discriminant function is able to correctly classify an additional 15.2% of the employees (cf. Hair *et al.*, 1995).

Stayers and leavers differed significantly on five biographic characteristics (reference also Table 1). Females represented a significantly larger proportion of stayers than leavers. In other words, females were more likely to stay, males more likely to leave. Thirteen percent of stayers were male, whereas slightly over 20% of leavers were male. Not surprisingly, lower-paid employees were more likely to leave, as were nonmanagerial employees. The average hourly pay rate for stayers was 30% higher than that of leavers. Of the stayers, 2.4% held middle-level or executive management positions; only 1.2% of the leavers had been in such positions. Employees who left had fewer years of work experience with the hospital than those remaining. Stayers had been with the hospital, on average, two years longer than those who had

terminated. Lastly, race differed between stayers and leavers. A larger proportion of nonwhite employees was stayers (11.7%) compared to nonwhite leavers (8.6%).

Discussion

A discriminant analysis of biographic characteristics of stayers and leavers from a sample of 1,053 part-time hospital employees identified five factors that significantly differentiated the two groups. Those who left were more likely to be lower-paid, of shorter organizational tenure, male, in a nonmanagerial or lower-level management position, and white. These findings are fundamentally consistent with existing literature on turnover. While this study was largely exploratory and did not advance specific hypotheses, several interesting relationships were observed.

Differentiating Factors

Hourly Pay Rate. The relationship between pay rate and turnover is consistent with much of the literature on full-time employees. Higher-paid employees are more likely to remain than lower-paid employees. It may be that low pay is not the primary cause of turnover, but that low pay is mostly associated with positions that have little or no room for advancement or development. If so, turnover may be exacerbated in circumstances where jobs with few advancement opportunities are disproportionately populated with part-time workers.

Length of Employment. We found length of employment for those still working to be significantly longer than for those who had already quit. This may suggest a form of organizational or professional commitment or "locking in." Also, this result may be

Table 4. Classification Matrix

<i>Actual Group Membership</i>	<i>Number of Employees</i>	<i>Predicted Group Membership</i>	
		<i>Stayers</i>	<i>Leavers</i>
Stayers	540 (51.3%)	320 (59.3%)	220 (40.7%)
Leavers	513 (48.7%)	133 (25.9)	380 (74.1%)

Notes:

1. Total number of employees = 1,053.
2. 66.5% of grouped employees are correctly classified: $(320 \text{ stayers} + 380 \text{ leavers}) / 1,053$ total number of employees = 66.5%.
3. Proportional chance criterion = $p^2 + (1-p)^2$ where p is the proportion of stayers:
 $(.513)^2 + (.487)^2 = 50\%$.

confounded with the type of job the stayer or leaver occupied (except from the management position distinction for which our analysis allowed). It is quite possible that job type systematically differs between stayers and leavers, a distinction we were not able to make in this study. It would also be helpful to know if length of employment holds the same level of discriminant power for full-time employees as we found for part-timers.

Gender. We found males were more likely to leave than females. However, this sample was overwhelmingly female (as are most hospital workforces) and, therefore, generalizing from this sample to other settings that are more gender-balanced would not be appropriate. An additional interpretation of more females staying is that they may have "locked in" to their part-time work. This is

consistent with traditional interpretations of female preference for part-time work to accommodate child-rearing or other care-giving responsibilities versus societal expectation that males will be full-time workers. However, gender is a significant discriminator beyond its covariation with marital status and number of dependents.

Management Status. Our finding on management status (or organizational level) is consistent with much of the literature on full-time workers: higher-level, higher-status employees are less likely to leave. This partially supports the contention we stated earlier, that turnover may largely be a function of position type in addition to the factors included in this study. We differentiated positions only on the basis of their management status, which significantly discriminated stayers from leavers. Differentiating pro-

fessional versus nonprofessional, medical versus nonmedical, exempt versus nonexempt, etc., may provide additional insight into position effects on turnover. It also would be interesting to find out if position effects are identified and if they equally apply to full-time and part-time jobs.

Race. We found a higher proportion of whites among leavers than among stayers. This difference may suggest differential job mobility and/or motivations for working part-time. Leeds (1990) found black males twice as likely as white males to be part-time employees. He explains this as a segmentation issue, with white part-timers more likely to be transient part-timers and black part-timers more likely to remain in part-time positions. The findings of our study are consistent with that interpretation. Recall that in this sample, race covaried with pay level, management status, and length of employment. However, even while controlling for this covariance, race was a significant discriminator between stayers and leavers. Neither theoretical nor empirical evidence in this study allows us to explain why race is a significant discriminator.

Managerial Implications

As with any economic, technological or social trend, the changing character of part-time workers should be productively managed for the mutual benefit of employees and employers. The results of our study suggest that management should be aware of several factors that may be related to part-time worker turnover. We found lower pay associated with higher part-time turnover. Management may want to determine if lower paying (and possibly lower status) part-time

jobs provide proportionate opportunity for advancement compared to their full-time counterparts. Otherwise, organizations may unwittingly "build-in" turnover by associating part-time jobs with "dead-end" jobs. Relatedly, organizations should ensure equitable pay (or total compensation) for part-time work such that it is not at a comparable pay disadvantage relative to full-time work. Indeed, part-time work may demand a premium over full-time work as part-time workers are often used to fill less desirable work schedules and command off-shift and weekend pay differentials. This may help to eliminate perceptions of pay inequity that may induce turnover.

This research also found that part-timers quit relatively early in their organizational tenure. Managerial interventions such as realistic job previews, well established as effective in reducing full-time worker turnover, may be effectively applied to part-timers if they address issues uniquely relevant to part-time work. For example, scheduling flexibility would seem particularly important for part-timers, especially among those working part-time to accommodate family responsibilities. Management should be aware of possible differences in work motivation of part-timers compared to full-timers and adjust their retention efforts accordingly.

We are hesitant to offer suggestions relative to gender because of the non-representative gender composition of the sample as discussed earlier. Likewise, the race difference between stayers and leavers is enigmatic. It appears as if white employees may not commit to part-time work. This may or may not be problematic; this research does not address that consequence. At a minimum, management

should ensure that employees are not systematically directed to either full-time or part-time work on the basis of race, all other things equal, particularly if there is a perception that part-time jobs are "dead-end" jobs with little or no opportunities for advancement or development.

Research Implications and Need for Future Research

Although we were able to identify significant discriminant factors between stayers and leavers, the question of causation remains. Demographic differences alone are insufficient justification to call for the development of an integrated theory of part-time work. But it does suggest that more theory-based and exploratory investigation of additional demographic characteristics, work-related behaviors, and attitudes is needed to understand part-time worker turnover.

There is a need for additional exploratory research on demographic, attitudinal, and behavioral differences between part-time and full-time workers. Specifically, there is a need to understand the differential motivations for working part-time versus full-time. It would seem that a fundamental component in understanding part-time turnover as well as differences between full-time and part-time workers is factors influencing their attraction to and retention in these alternative work arrangements. The interpretations of differences between part-time and full-time workers have potentially significant managerial implications. For example, traditional performance and reward systems may have differing (and possibly undesirable) consequences. Reward by recognition or promotion

could have differing effects when administered to a full-time employee who is very career-oriented with high work centrality compared to a part-time employee who works to supplement a partner's income or who works a part-time job in addition to a full-time job (i.e., moonlighting). Also, the use of multiple part-timers to fill a full-time equivalent position (i.e., job sharing) could negatively impact training costs and the costs of direct supervision (more people, more potential employee/manager interactions). Likewise, we might expect lower levels of commitment to the goals and values of the employer among part-timers, decreasing the likelihood of extra-role or organizational citizenship behaviors.

While there are benefits to both employees and employers from the use of part-timers that are often mutually acceptable, reliance on part-time employees has been a growing source of contention between employees and employers. This seems particularly the case for those working part-time involuntarily, that is, those preferring to work full-time. It also seems to be a point of contention when the general perception by employees is that their (involuntary) status as a part-time employee is motivated solely by employers' desire to avoid paying benefit costs. Over time, this motivation to control costs may be seen as unreasonably manipulative of employees (the merits of this point are not argued here) with the negative consequences (loss of goodwill, higher turnover, work disruptions, company/union antagonism) accruing to the company over the longer term.

The 1997 Teamsters Union strike against United Parcel Service is a case in point. While the strike was not over

a single issue, the use of part-time employees was a major point in the dispute (Bernstein, 1997). Although the company argued its use of part-timers was necessary to manage variance in staffing levels, employees and the labor union argued it was to perpetuate a wage structure in which part-timers were paid less than their full-time counterparts per hour and to avoid paying for benefits. In fact, AFL-CIO President John Sweeney called the use of part-time workers an "ugly trend" (Negroni, 1997).

The use of part-time employees, therefore, challenges managers' immediate work environments in operational areas such as employee recruitment, retention, and development. Yet it also challenges longer-term strategic issues such as labor relations, employee goodwill, and the public's overall perception of the firm.

An additional research issue is that differences within the stayer and leaver groups not discussed here provide additional research questions. Specifically, several interesting relationships are observed *within* the stayer and leaver groups on factors that significantly distinguish *between* the groups. For instance, gender is a significant discriminator between the groups (i.e., females are more likely to stay; males more likely to leave), but within the groups, females are more likely to be in nonmanagerial positions among the stayers while gender and managerial status are not significantly related among the leavers. Also, nonwhite employees are more likely to stay, but they are paid significantly less than white stayers; however, race and pay are unrelated for leavers.

Research Limitations

There are a number of limitations to this study, some of which we have already discussed. While mostly exploratory, we identify some characteristics of the study that limit its interpretation and applicability. Two global measures may confound the relationships observed. We did not know from the data at hand whether the subjects were working part-time voluntarily or involuntarily. As Feldman (1990) proposed, such differences in attraction to a job could have quite different effects on work attitudes and behaviors, particularly on turnover behavior. Also, we did not know from the data whether separation was voluntary or involuntary, potentially confounding differences in turnover behavior. In addition, we did investigate a position effect and found management status to significantly differentiate stayers from leavers. However, this categorization may have been too general to capture more representative position effects. Especially given the nature of this sample, identification of medical versus nonmedical employees may have been useful in separating stayers from leavers, as would professional versus nonprofessional and high-skill versus low-skill. Also, for the differentiating factors identified, their relation to turnover should be compared vis-à-vis full-time employees. That is, how do the factors differentiating turnover for part-timers compare to full-timers? Do they differ on the same factors?

There seems to be some definitional confusion in both the academic and popular literature over "part-time." Levenson (1996) made this observation in attempting to explain the gap between popular per-

ceptions of increasing reliance on part-time employees and empirical evidence to the contrary. He suggests that "part-time" is often definitionally and conceptually confused with "temporary." Part-time jobs are defined as requiring less than thirty-five hours of work per week. Temporary jobs, in contrast, provide work for only short periods of time and may be either full-time or part-time. Feldman (1990) noted this distinction in proposing his five dimensions of part-time work arrangements. In this study, we accurately identified part-time versus full-time, but were not able to distinguish temporary from permanent employees.

Several characteristics of the sample may limit the generalizability of the results. Already noted is the gender imbalance of this sample relative to the general population. While generalizing from hospital employees to all part-time employees may be questionable, it seems reasonable to generalize to other work settings—notably service delivery—that require 24-hour staffing. For example, caregivers (such as home health care), hospitality, and food service providers, like healthcare, have traditionally relied heavily on part-time employees and require 24-hour staffing.

References

- Belous, R.S. 1989. *The contingent economy: The growth of the temporary, part-time and subcontracted workforce*. Washington, D.C.: National Planning Association.
- Bernstein, A. 1997. "At UPS, part-time work is a full-time issue." *Business Week (Industrial/Technology Edition)* 3531 (June 16): 88-92.
- Bosworth, T.W. and K.C. Holden. 1983. "The role part-time job options play in the retirement timing of older Wisconsin state employees." *Aging and Work* 6 (1): 31-36.
- Brotherton, P. 1997. "For many part-timers, less is more." *HR Magazine* 42(6): 102-106.
- Callaghan, P. and H. Hartmann. 1991. *Contingent work: A chart book on part-time and temporary employment*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Cascio, W.F. 1987. *Costing human resources*. Boston, MA: PWS-Kent.
- Danner, D.A. 1996. "The flexible workforce." *Journal of Labor Research* 17: 523-524.
- duRivage, V.L. 1991. *New policies for the part-time and contingent workforce*. Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute.
- . 1992. "Flexibility trap: The proliferation of marginal jobs." *American Prospect* 9: 84-93.
- Eberhardt, B.J. and S.B. Moser. 1995. "The nature and consequences of part-time work: A test of hypotheses." *Journal of Applied Business Research* 11: 101-108.
- Feldman, D.C. 1990. "Reconceptualizing the nature and consequences of part-time work." *Academy of Management Review* 15: 103-112.
- . 1996. "The nature, antecedents and consequences of underemployment." *Journal of Management* 22: 385-407.

- _____ and H.I. Doeringhaus. 1992a. "Missing persons no longer: Managing part-time workers in the '90s." *Organizational Dynamics* 21: 59-72.
- _____. 1992b. "Patterns of part-time employment." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 41: 282-294.
- _____, and W.H. Turnley. 1995. "Employee reactions to temporary jobs." *Journal of Managerial Issues* 7: 127-141.
- Fenton-O'Creevy, M. 1995. "Moderators of differences in job satisfaction between full-time and part-time female employees: A research note." *Human Resource Management Journal* 5(5): 75-81.
- Fierman, J. 1994. "The contingency workforce." *Fortune* January 24: 30-36.
- Greenberger, E. and L. Steinberg. 1986. *When teenagers work*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Hair, J.F., Jr., R.E. Anderson, R.L. Tathan, and W.C. Black. 1995. *Multivariate data analysis* 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hart, R. A. 1987. *Working time and employment*. Boston, MA: Allen and Unwin.
- Houseman, S. and M. Osawa. 1995. "Part-time and temporary employment in Japan." *Monthly Labor Review* 118(10): 10-18.
- Jackofsky, E.F., K.R. Ferris, and B.G. Breckenridge. 1986a. "Evidence of a curvilinear relationship between job performance and turnover." *Journal of Management* 21: 105- 111.
- _____, J. Salter, and L.H. Peters. 1986b. "Reducing turnover among part-time employees." *Personnel* 63 (1): 41- 43.
- Kahne, H. 1985. *Reconceiving part-time work*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld.
- Leeds, M.A. 1990. "Part-time status and hourly earnings of black and white men." *Economic Inquiry* 28: 544-554.
- Lester, B.Y. 1996. "Part-time employment of married women in the USA: A cross-sectional analysis." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 55: 61-72.
- Levenson, A.R. 1996. "Recent trends in part-time work." *Contemporary Economic Policy* 14: 78-89.
- Mobley, W.H. 1982. *Employee turnover: Causes, consequences, and control*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Morrow, L. 1993. "The temping of America." *Time* March 29: 40- 47.
- Munroe, D.J. 1988. "Commitment of part-time nursing personnel: A challenge." *Nursing Management* 19 (12): 59-61.
- Nardone, T.T. 1995. "Part-time employment: Reasons, demographics, and trends." *Journal of Labor Research* 16: 275-292.
- _____. 1986. "Part-time workers: Who are they?" *Monthly Labor Review* 109 (1): 13-19.
- Negrone, C. 1997. "Part-time jobs: Exploitation or choice? UPS strike sets off debate over hiring practices." Cable News Network (CNN) internet web site (<http://www.cnn.com>). August 6.
- Pinkovitz, W.H., J. Moskal, and G. Green. 1997. "How much does your employee turnover cost?" *Small Business Forum* 14(3): 70-71.
- Segal, L.M. 1996. "Flexible employment: Composition and trends." *Journal of Labor Research* 17: 525-542.
- Tilly, C. 1996. *Half a job: Bad and good part-time jobs in a changing labor market*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

- _____. 1991. "Reasons for the continuing growth of part-time employment." *Monthly Labor Review* 114(3): 10-18.
- Trevor, C.O., B. Gerhart, and J.W. Boudreau. 1997. "Voluntary turnover and job performance: Curvilinearity and the moderating influences of salary growth and promotions." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82: 44-61.
- Wetzel, K, D.E. Soloshy, and D.G. Gallagher. 1990. "The work attitudes of full-time and part-time registered nurses." *Health Care Management Review* 15 (3): 79-85.