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ABSTRACT

To date, research that examines individuals who work and go to school generally aims to examine the effects of doing so on their academic performance. Little literature is available that examines the effects that these dual roles can have on the organization (e.g., lower levels of commitment and higher rates of absenteeism and turnover). Understanding such effects can assist organizations in managing their employees and developing programs tailored to them, such as career counseling. A literature review is presented which examines both the constructs of the multiple forms of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover, and the research currently available on student workers. A study was conducted which examined the differences in levels of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover intentions in employees who attend school as compared to employees who do not. It was hypothesized that student workers and participants enrolled in school would differ in their commitment levels, absenteeism rates, and turnover intentions. The sample consisted of 364 participants. In this sample, 314 participants were currently enrolled in college-level classes, where 169 of the participants were categorized as students who worked, and 85 participants were categorized as workers who studied. Results suggest that employees of an organization who are not enrolled in school are likely to have higher levels of affective commitment, lower turnover intentions, and are likely to miss work more frequently. Additionally, it was found that students who work have lower overall
organizational commitment and higher academic commitment compared to workers who study. Implications and directions for future research are discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Rates of absenteeism and turnover are areas of major concern for organizations in every corner of the world. Of additional concern to organizations is the level of commitment exhibited by its employees, as this has a direct relation to subsequent absenteeism and ultimately, turnover. Absenteeism and turnover have definite implications for organizations, mainly being that they are both expensive phenomena to have to manage. It is estimated that on average, absenteeism amounts to approximately $3.6 million per year in direct payroll costs for large corporations (Cialdini, 2004). In addition, turnover is estimated to cost United States organizations approximately $25 billion per year (Karsan, 2014).

Research to date (e.g., Allen & Meyer 1990; Cohen 1993; Meyer et al. 2002; Somers 2010) has extensively examined absenteeism, turnover, and commitment levels in employees of various industries, career stages, and geographical locations. However, missing from the literature is information on how these rates differ in employees of the organization who also attend school, as compared to those employees who do not. A review of the theory and research pertaining to the different forms of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover in employment of both students and non-students is presented, in order to establish understanding of the need for all of these variables to be examined in a single research study.
Commitment refers to the degree to which an individual feels attached to a cause, activity, or object. Commitment has been assessed in multiple ways, including commitment to an organization, one’s profession, university, or their academic entities. While the main focus of the present study is to assess organizational commitment in student workers and non-student workers, other forms of commitment will be measured as well. The purpose of this study is to examine whether current enrollment in school is related to the various levels of commitment, and how these levels of commitment relate to one another. In addition, the relationship between various commitment levels and outcomes such as turnover intentions and absenteeism was also explored. In order to answer these questions, a thorough review of organizational commitment is followed with literature on professional, university, and academic commitment.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment refers to the degree to which an employee feels attached to an organization. Using an attitudinal conceptualization of the concept, it is commonly defined as the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in an organization (Mowday et al., 1979). An employee’s degree of attachment to an organization is commonly linked to the presence of withdrawal behaviors such as absenteeism and turnover. Absenteeism refers to the pattern of failing to appear for work, while turnover is defined as the voluntary or involuntary withdrawal of an individual from an organization. Absenteeism and turnover are only two of the numerous forms of
withdrawal (e.g., tardiness and psychological withdrawal such as lack of engagement) and are expensive for organizations. However, these two forms of withdrawal can be minimized through an understanding of their employees’ levels of attachment, or commitment, to their employer.

Because of the link between turnover, absenteeism, and commitment, organizations are inherently concerned with the level of commitment possessed by their employees as it is going to have a direct effect on their likelihood to identify with the organization, their performance, and length of employment. Commitment has been measured and defined in several different ways. A common framework for understanding organizational commitment is through the use of Allen and Meyer’s (1990) three-component conceptualization. According to Allen and Meyer (1990), employees can experience attitudinal commitment in terms of affective, continuance, and normative attachment.

Affective attachment is the most prevalent approach to studying organizational commitment. When an employee displays this type of attachment, they identify with, are involved in, and enjoy membership in the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). This type of attachment represents a strong commitment to the organization. Employees possessing affective attachment are going to perform well and stay with the organization because they genuinely want to. Results from various studies indicate that affective commitment/attachment is the strongest and most consistent predictor of
turnover intentions and employee turnover (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002).

Continuance or “perceived cost” attachment refers to individuals who stay with the organization because they need to. This type of attachment is defined as a tendency to engage in the activity because of the costs associated with discontinuing the activity (Allen & Meyer, 1990). An example of an employee remaining with an organization simply because they need the paycheck and have no other options for employment represents an individual with continuance commitment. Recent research on the different types of commitment suggests that individuals with low levels of continuance commitment are the most likely to leave the organization, with an annual turnover rate of approximately 30% in the hospital used in the study (Somers, 2010).

Normative, or obligation, commitment refers to an individual who views commitment as a belief of their responsibility to the organization. This is not a common view of commitment but is still referenced in literature. Employees with a normative form of commitment for the organization believe that they need to remain with the organization because it is the right and moral thing to do (Allen & Meyer, 1990). An example of a display of this kind of attachment would include an employee who has a strong normative commitment to the organization because significant others such as parents had been long-term
employees of an organization and have stressed the importance of loyalty to an organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

In a study in which the different components of commitments were combined to create commitment profiles, the strongest intentions to remain with the organization were observed among highly committed employees, or those with the affective and normative commitment profiles (Somers, 2010). This is not surprising, as these are the two components of commitment that reflect staying with the organization for reasons other than feeling trapped within the organization by the perceived costs associated with leaving. Somers (2010) suggested that his results provide organizations with reason for building an employee’s affective and normative commitment levels. This increased commitment would lead the organizations to retain employees who accept the organization’s values (Somers, 2010).

Outcomes of low commitment levels include turnover and absenteeism. These are negative outcomes for organizations and are commonly studied in an attempt to manage their occurrence. Highly committed employees typically wish to remain with the organizations that employ them. Early research on the concept of turnover included the comparison of “stayers and leavers” at three time points, each of which was prior to a set of leavers terminating their employment with the organizations. It was found that leavers who were a month and a half or less away from actually terminating reported significantly less commitment than stayers. When leavers were 2 to 3.5 months from
terminating, they showed less commitment than stayers, but the difference was not significant (Porter, Crampon, & Smith, 1976). This suggests that the decline in the attitude of attachment can be very rapid.

Based on the results of the Porter, Crampon, and Smith (1976) study, additional research found that the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover was stronger the shorter the time elapsed between measurements of the two variables. In addition, the relationship is significantly stronger when the individual is in the early career stage than in the later stages (Cohen, 1993). Results from this research suggest that younger individuals are more likely to have a strong commitment-turnover relationship due to their early career stages. These results are reinforced through research which states that individuals who are early in their careers are going to have varying levels of commitment and subsequent turnover because of their differing propensities to become committed to an employing organization and the opportunities and availabilities of attractive alternatives (Mowday, Koberg, & McArthur, 1984). Results from this study suggest that the external environment, such as the current unemployment rate, could be an important factor in the relationship between commitment and turnover. If there is not adequate availability of attractive alternatives (e.g., another job due to the current job market), then this relationship would be affected. This is important research to reference in considering the commitment and turnover rates of students in that they are a group that may potentially be representative of
individuals in an early career stage or in a “pre-career” stage, such as working at a fast food chain in order to pay for college.

Additional research that can be related to career stage and intention to leave is that of job embeddedness. This is defined as the combined factors that tend to keep an individual from leaving their job. In their 2008 article, Halbesleben and Wheeler cite research regarding the conceptualization of job embeddedness (e.g., Holtom et al. 2006; Mitchell et al., 2001) that includes one’s links to other aspects of the job, perceptions of person-job fit, and sacrifices involved in leaving the job. The links aspect suggests that employees have formal and informal connections with other entities on the job. As the number of links increases, embeddedness tends to be higher (Holtom et al., 2006). Fit refers to the match between an employee’s goals and values and those of the organization. A higher fit indicates higher embeddedness and lower likelihood of the employee vacating their job. The reference to sacrifice in the conceptualization of job embeddedness refers to the perceived costs of leaving the organization, both in terms of financial and social; the higher the perceived costs, the greater the embeddedness (Holtom et al., 2006). This conceptualization of job embeddedness helps to demonstrate the link between it and career stage. If an individual is at a later career stage, the more likely they are to be embedded in the organization (e.g., more links, higher fit). The more embedded an individual is, the less likely they are to leave employment with the organization.
Academic, University, and Professional Commitment

Academic commitment is defined as the commitment to higher education in a general sense, whereas university commitment is defined as one’s commitment to a specific university (Dolen & Shultz, 1998). Professional commitment (sometimes referred to as occupational or career commitment) focuses on an employee’s profession, career, or occupation, and refers to the commitment to an individual’s selected profession (Dolen & Shultz, 1998). In his book titled “Multiple Commitments in the Workplace: An Integrative Approach,” Aaron Cohen (2003) cites Morrow (1983) in stating that professional commitment is an important commitment focus. It captures the devotion to a craft, occupation, or profession apart from a specific work environment, over an extended period of time. This form of commitment has two main conceptual approaches. The first approach is based on the concept of professionalism, or the extent to which individual members identify with their profession and endorse its values (Cohen, 2003). Four elements of identification with an occupation have been identified: occupational title and the associated ideology, commitment to task, commitment to particular organizations or institutional positions, and significance for one’s position in the larger society (Cohen, 2003). The second approach to professional commitment is derived from the notion of career. This approach defines professional commitment as the magnitude of an individual’s motivation to
work in a career he or she chose, or as the degree of centrality of an individual’s career for their identity (Cohen, 2003).

Research on the relationship between working students and their commitment to their university or academic programs and work/profession is limited. However, Dolen and Shultz (1998) developed scales for academic, university, and professional commitment by modifying Mowday et al.’s (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. The word “organization” in each question was replaced with “profession,” “university,” or “major” for each of the new scales being constructed. Scores on the Academic Commitment Questionnaire and the University Commitment Questionnaire, as well as the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire and the Professional Commitment Questionnaire were significantly correlated. The results also indicated evidence of convergent and discriminant validity for the new scales that were constructed (Dolen & Shultz, 1998). These scales can be utilized to effectively assess organizational, professional, academic, and university commitment, and the relationships between each. These scales will be used in the present study to assess such relationships and whether current school enrollment is related as well.

Employee Withdrawal Behaviors

Researchers of turnover and absenteeism have broken the concepts into different categories based on their reasons and functions in the organization. Hom, Mitchell, Lee, and Griffeth (2012) discuss research on the
various components of turnover, including how it is generally distinguished; turnover is viewed as either employer-initiated (involuntary turnover) or employee initiated (voluntary turnover). Employee dismissals, layoffs, retirements, disability, and death are generally classified by employers as involuntary turnover. Voluntary turnover (employee initiated) can be due to family reasons or other employers (Hom et al., 2012). In regard to the functionality of turnover, there have been two different types proposed: dysfunctional and functional (Dalton, Todor, & Krackhardt, 1982). Dysfunctional turnover occurs when good or hard-to-replace performers voluntarily quit. Conversely, functional turnover occurs when an employee who is a poor performer voluntarily quits (Hom et al., 2012). Obviously, the organization is more negatively impacted by the occurrence of dysfunctional turnover as compared to functional turnover.

Absenteeism has been conceptualized as consisting of two types of absence. Blau (1985) initially distinguished the types of absence as organizationally excused versus organizationally unexcused. Organizationally excused absences include categories such as personal sickness, jury duty, religious holiday, funeral leave, and transportation problems (Blau & Boal, 1987). Unexcused absences are likely to be due to reasons that fall outside of the aforementioned categories. An example of an unexcused absence would include absence due to a career-enhancing activity directed outside of the organization, such as a job interview with another company or missing work to
attend classes. Similar to turnover, the idea of absenteeism has been expanded to include voluntary and involuntary absences. Involuntary absences are due to legitimate reasons to miss work, such as a genuine illness (Wegge et al., 2007). An involuntary absence would likely be viewed as organizationally excused. Conversely, voluntary absences are likely to be viewed as organizationally unexcused, such as absence due to low motivation or an employee just “taking a sickie” (Wegge et al., 2007).

Blau and Boal (1987) proposed a framework for the effect of commitment on outcome variables such as turnover and absenteeism. This framework contained a four-category model for further understanding the “true” (if different from employee-cited) meanings behind employee absenteeism. The four categories include medical, career-enhancing, normative, and calculative. In the medical category, absence is viewed as a response to various infrequent and uncontrollable events including illness, injury, fatigue, and family demands such as a sick spouse or child. These types of absences would typically be operationalized as sporadic and organizationally excused (Blau&Boal, 1987). This category is also characterized as being used when the ratio between frequency and total days absent are less than one, when the absolute values in this ratio are small, and when a time series of analysis of the data suggests that the absenteeism is a random occurrence (Blau&Boal, 1987). This is an interesting category of absenteeism to consider in relation to student workers, as employees who are
working and going to school may have elevated levels of stress and medical-related sicknesses as a result of the stress.

The career-enhancing category includes absence as a mechanism that allows the employee to further their task- and career-related goals. This category is stated as difficult to detect. If the career-enhancing activity is directed toward and benefits the organization, the frequency of excused absences is likely to peak before transfer to another position within the same organization (Blau & Boal, 1987). If the career-enhancing activity is directed outside, and as such does not benefit the organization, unexcused absences are likely to peak shortly before an instance of turnover (Blau & Boal, 1987).

The career-enhancing category for employee absence is important to understand in that it is likely to be an excuse that is used often by employees in an organization whom are also students. Student workers may have higher instances of absences within the career-enhancing category as a result of the need to attend class, complete assignments, or study for exams.

The normative category of absence views the occurrence less as a motivated behavior and more as a habitual response to the norms of the work group, or organization, regarding absence (Blau & Boal, 1987). This type of absence would probably be operationalized as a consistently occurring excused absence. An example of this type of absence would be a “personal day” which many organizations allow employees to take a certain number of per year. Rather than absenteeism occurring as a random occasion (e.g., the
medical category) definite patterns would emerge within the normative category of absence. It would be expected not only to predict the frequency of the absence, but when it will happen (Blau & Boal, 1987). This again represents an interesting category of absence that could be examined in relation to student workers in that they may require or take advantage of their allotted personal days as a result of the stress they may experience from both working and going to school.

The final category of absence is calculative absence. In this category, absence is viewed as an exchange either in fulfilling or modifying the implicit social contract between the employee and employer, and as a time allocation strategy for enhancing non-work outcomes (Blau & Boal, 1987). This type of absence would be viewed as the employee using a certain amount of the excused and unexcused absences, as permitted by the organization. This is depending on how much the employee felt they should modify the implicit social contract. The researchers state that an extremely apathetic employee would take full advantage by using both kinds of absences as long as the sanctions imposed were not too severe, such as termination. The absolute frequency and total number of days absent would be greater for workers who were the most apathetic or not involved with their jobs and not committed (Blau & Boal, 1987).

Blau and Boal (1987) stated that organizations should keep detailed records regarding the type and timing of an employee’s absence behavior, as
well as the employee absence behavior overall for the organization. If detailed records are kept on absenteeism, the four absence categories can be operationalized and used to the organizations advantage in making various decisions. Blau and Boal (1987) distinguish normative absences from career-enhancing and calculative absences based on the patterns. Normative absences should be specific and more predictable and career-enhancing and calculative should be broader and less predictable. Unfortunately, many organizations do not keep sophisticated absence records that show the type or time of absence, which makes dealing with absenteeism measures problematic for researchers (Blau & Boal, 1987).

Few studies have examined the interaction of absence and turnover in organizations with employee commitment (Wegge et al., 2007). Blau and Boal’s (1987) model is still referenced in research today, however, there are suggested limitations of the model. For example, in his research article comparing models of commitment, Cohen (2000) argues that while there is support for the model in terms of the effect of commitment on absenteeism and turnover, the conceptualization ignores other important factors in commitment, such as occupational commitment. The article calls for a model to understand commitment and its relation to turnover and absenteeism by utilizing a multivariate approach, which considers multiple commitment foci (Cohen, 2000).
Student Employment

Much research has been conducted on commitment and its relation to absenteeism and turnover in organizations. Research includes how to assess commitment, how to best define it, how to predict it, and the outcomes associated with commitment, namely the withdrawal behaviors of absenteeism and turnover. In regard to the literature on commitment, absenteeism, and turnover within specific groups, there is an abundance of research for those in health professions, specifically nurses and physicians. Commitment and subsequent withdrawal behaviors are also studied extensively in regard to teachers and other professions within the educational setting. However, one group that is consistently absent from studies examining commitment is employees who also attend school, whether full or part-time. Research available to date (Howieson et al., 2012; Lang, 2012; Warren, 2002) examines students who work and its effect on their educational outcomes (e.g., grades, absenteeism in terms of class attendance) but not the effect that their schooling may have on the organization or their performance at work.

The proportion of high school and college students who work while attending school has been increasing at a steady rate since the 1960s. This rising rate of “student workers” has been attributed to the rising costs of college tuition relative to family income, the decreased availability of subsidies for college students, an increased desire for students to be financially independent, and a reduced willingness among parents to foster the
dependency of their children attending college (Lang, 2012). In October of 2005, 44.3 percent of full-time undergraduates were either working or looking for work, and 79 percent of part-time undergraduates were either working or looking for work (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2006).

In Lang’s (2012) study, the aim was to determine the differences between working and non-working students at a mid-sized American public university. The declared purpose of the study was to test the effect of employment upon working students’ grades (Lang, 2012). Studies such as this one represent the tendency in this general area of research to examine student employment in terms of its effects on academic outcomes instead of the organization. Lang (2012) cites two models of student employment in his study. These two models of student employment are the zero-sum model and the primary orientation model, both of which are models used to examine the relationship between employment intensity and school performance. In the zero-sum model, increased attachment to employment leads directly to decreased attachment to school. Proponents of this model view it in terms of an hour spent bagging groceries is an hour not spent studying or doing homework (Warren, 2002). The alternative model is primary orientation, which holds that the employment intensity only matters if it is accompanied by disinterest in or disengagement from school (Warren, 2002). Proponents of this model claim that students’ psychological orientation toward work is what affects their schooling outcomes.
There is not a firm consensus as to which model is superior. Some studies have found that student employment negatively affected academic performance, while others found that the impact of work was neutral or beneficial (Lang, 2012). Findings that support the zero-sum model includes a study of 300 undergraduate social work majors in which the average number of hours worked had a negative effect upon the GPAs of the students (Hawkins et al., 2005). In his article on the similarities and differences between working and non-working students, Lang (2012) cites a study examining the major of college students and their employment. It was found that the grades of arts and science majors were negatively affected by paid employment while the grades of business majors were not. This finding seems to lend support for the primary orientation model of student employment.

Many results of studies support the theory of primary orientation. In a study of students attending 11 colleges and universities in Illinois, there was a positive relationship between respondents’ GPAs and their degree of participation in paid employment (Canabal, 1998). Lang’s (2012) study found that neither employment nor the number of hours worked per week affected the grades of the college students in the sample when controlling for race, sex, and other variables included in the study. The researcher claims that his findings support the primary orientation model of student employment in that the hours worked (employment intensity) did not have a significant impact on
grades because it was not accompanied by disinterest or disengagement from school (Lang, 2012).

Henke, Lyons, and Krachenberg (1993) analyzed existing literature on working and the effect on academic performance and concluded that there is no consensus of opinion and little convergence of research evidence regarding the effects of working on academic performance. Additional studies also seem to align with the theory of primary orientation in that their findings suggested that working does not have a negative effect on the student’s learning. A study using undergraduates to examine the relationship between hours spent working and learning reported that although working prevents students from participating in non-classroom educational activities, working does not hinder learning (Lundberg, 2004).

Additional research in regard to these two theories includes the employment trends among student workers and their age, gender, and drop-out or graduation rates. It has been found that students between the ages of 25 and 34 have historically been more likely to engage in paid employment than students between the ages of 20 and 24. Students between the ages of 20 and 24 are more likely to work than students between the ages of 16 and 19 (Stem & Nakata, 1991). When considering gender, male students are more likely to work than women (Hawkins et al., 2005). College students who work are also more likely to drop out of school than non-working students (Gleason, 1993). In relation to drop-out rates is the rate of timely graduation by
students who are also employed. Timely graduation is found to be negatively impacted by employment (Lang, 2012). The literature available to date on the effect that student employment has on academic performance is varied. There is not a firm consensus as to whether academic performance is affected, as there are many variables that may influence the relationship. As discussed, these variables can include amount of hours spent working, gender, age, and major.

Research on students who work has examined not only the possible effects on their academic performance, but the effects on their health as well. In a study by Nagai-Manelli et al. (2012), the results indicated that students had a reduction in sleep length and an increase of sleepiness levels on workdays, and a sleep rebound during their free days. Alertness improvement was observed only on Sundays. The researchers claimed that the excessive daytime sleepiness data from Monday through Saturday and a sleep rebound during free days is indicative that students who work are chronically sleep deprived (Nagai-Manelli et al., 2012). The results of this study are important when considering absenteeism exhibited by student workers in organizations. Absences from work by student workers could be attributed to the reported levels of sleepiness on workdays. The information on these repeated absences may be recorded by organizations as a medical absence, as discussed previously.
Research on simultaneous school and work has also investigated whether or not there is an effect on social life. Howieson et al. (2012) found that working did not appear to be associated with any lessening in an individual’s social commitment. However, based off of their results they did propose the concept of an “active student” who is more likely to engage in work as well as other out of school activities than their peers (Howieson et al., 2012). Results suggested that students who were more active in terms of participating in a group or society had higher odds of having a part-time job than those who were not as active. Conversely, a social life that was not as active (more TV watching and computer use) was related to lower odds of having a part-time job (Howieson et al., 2012). From an organizational viewpoint, the results from this study provide a means for understanding how the hobbies or activities of an applicant or employee can affect their likelihood of not only obtaining a job but retaining it as well.

Additional research on the effects on a student worker’s social life was conducted by O’Connor and Cordova (2010) and examined the experiences of adults who worked full-time while attending graduate school part-time. Their results indicated that in their graduate studies, most of the student workers did not feel that they had the peer network that they expected or wanted (O’Connor & Cordova, 2010). Additionally, all of the participants reported that they regretted not being more involved socially and several reported that they did not have time to attend extracurricular events, take advantage of campus
facilities, or establish friendships (O’Connor & Cordova, 2010). These feelings of frustration with their schedule and lack of social interaction at school could possibly have an effect on their experiences at the organizations where they are employed. However, this article and many others do not examine this possibility.

There is little literature on simultaneous school attendance and engaging in work by an individual and the effect it may have on their employer. Of the small amount of research available, Pereles’ (2007) study is one that is worth mention. The study aimed to examine the differences in organizational commitment of students who work and workers who study. “Students who work” were defined in the study as individuals who were full-time undergraduate students and were working part-time. “Employees who study” were defined as individuals who were part-time undergraduate students and were working full-time, in an effort to seek career advancement (Pereles, 2007). It was found that employees who studied had higher levels of “moral commitment” than students who worked. In this study, employees who possessed moral commitment followed the directives of their supervisors and performed their work because they identified with the goals of the organization and wanted the organization to be successful (similar to affective commitment). However, in extrapolating the results it appeared that neither group of workers felt a sense of personal responsibility for the success of the organization (Pereles, 2007).
It was theorized that both groups of students in the study had decided that the jobs they currently held were temporary and having made that decision, the student workers then performed their job at a level that was simply adequate. This allowed them to focus on their educational activities and think about the jobs they will have after the completion of their education (Pereles, 2007). Upon graduation the student workers planned to seek other work, so they had no reason to develop a strong relationship with the organizations for which they worked and they did not feel trapped in the jobs (Pereles, 2007). While this is an interesting suggestion, it is necessary to question whether or not the students had the opportunity to seek other higher level jobs with the same employer. This would have provided them with a reason to develop a stronger relationship with the organization, thus contributing to a higher level of commitment. Additionally, the study did not take into account levels of turnover and absenteeism, and the different categories of both. Doing so would have been beneficial in that it would have demonstrated whether the lower levels of commitment that the student workers felt was leading them to be absent more frequently and ultimately, leave their jobs.

Additional research which can aid in understanding individuals who simultaneously work and attend school is in regard to role theory. Role theory is concerned with the study of behaviors that are characteristics of individuals within contexts, and with the processes that produce, explain, or are affected
by the behaviors (Major, 2003). A “role” is an expected pattern or set of behaviors that is associated with a given position or status. There is a focus on roles in the family and work domains, as these are the two central institutions in an individual’s lives (Major, 2003). Examples of roles include ‘parent’ and ‘employee’. People whose expectations shape and define an individual’s role are referred to as the “role set” and the role holder is referred to as the “focal person” (Major, 2003). Research has investigated the relationship between the roles of “student” and “employee”. Swanson, Broadbridge, and Karatzias (2006) found that students in their study perceived their employment and university roles to be in balance, or “congruent” with one another. It was found that psychological factors such as positive affect and stress were important mediators in the relationship between role congruence and adjustment (Swanson, Broadbridge, & Karatzias, 2006).

Hypotheses

There is no question that research on students and the academic effects of employment while attending school is useful for the students themselves, and for those with careers in education. However, research examining the effect of attending school on various employment outcomes is generally absent from the literature. Much research has suggested that there maybe an effect (whether positive or negative) of employment on academic performance. Grades, GPAs, drop-out and graduation rates can fluctuate between students who work as opposed to those who do not. Research must
now examine the other side of the coin. What is the effect of attending school on employment? More specifically, does the organization suffer as a result of their employees attending school, in regard to commitment and increased rates of withdrawal behaviors such as absenteeism and turnover? Do student workers exhibit more academic and university commitment, rather than organizational commitment?

With a focus on the effects at the organizational level, it was hypothesized that there would be significant differences in types of commitment and rates of absenteeism and turnover intentions when comparing both full-time and part-time employees who attend school (either full-time or part-time), as opposed to full-time and part-time employees who do not. With regard to the research that is currently available on student workers, the following hypotheses were proposed:

H1: Employees of an organization who also attend school will have lower levels of organizational commitment compared to employees who do not currently attend school.

H2: Employees of an organization who also attend school will have higher levels of professional commitment compared to employees who do not currently attend school.

Furthermore, it was expected that the employees who attended school would also have higher rates of absenteeism in their respective positions with their current organization. It was also expected that turnover intentions would be
higher for employees that were currently enrolled in school, when compared to employees who were not currently enrolled in school.

**H3:** Participants who attend school will have higher rates of absenteeism compared to employees who are not currently enrolled in school.

**H4:** Participants who attend school will have higher turnover intentions compared to workers who are not currently enrolled in school.

These were hypothesized due to the reviewed research which suggested that individuals who simultaneously attend work and school are subject to a range of possible effects such as decreased organizational commitment, decreased health, and impacted academics. Research on the demographics of student workers was considered as well, with research stating that those in early career stages (e.g., students) are likely to have lower levels of commitment and higher turnover intentions.

Additionally, this study aimed to examine the various commitment levels between two related groups: students who work and workers who study. Absenteeism and turnover intentions were not included in this set of hypotheses, as there is simply not enough literature between these similar, yet distinct, groups to justify such hypotheses. In considering the participants who were currently enrolled in school, the following relationships were hypothesized:
H5: Students who work will have lower levels of professional commitment compared to both workers who study and workers who do not attend school.

H6: Students who work will have lower levels of organizational commitment compared to both workers who study and workers who do not attend school.

H7: Students who work will have higher levels of university commitment compared to workers who study.

H8: The difference in academic commitment between students who work and workers who study will not be statistically significant.

These hypotheses were proposed based on literature (e.g., Cohen, 2003; Cohen, 1993) which suggests that the various commitment levels are affected by factors including age and career stage, both of which are important when examining differences between students who work and workers who study. Additional literature that was considered in formulating these hypotheses (Lang, 2012; Stem & Nakata, 1991) states that student employment may affect individuals differently depending on their age and hours worked per week.
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants

Participants in this study were 18 years of age or over and employed working at least 10 hours per week. Both full-time and part-time employees who were either not enrolled in school or enrolled in school full-time or part-time served as the sample. The sample consisted of three groups: Participants who work but do not attend school, students who work, and workers who study. In the sample, all employees had to have been employed at their current organization for at least 12 months. GPower (Faul et al., 2007) was used to conduct a power analysis. Using one-way ANOVA with three groups and fixed effects, it was indicated that a sample of 252 participants was required to provide sufficient statistical power with an alpha level of .05, moderate effect size of .25, and power of .95.

There were a total of 364 participants who initially completed our survey. The female (80%) and male (20%) participants ranged in age from 18 to 60 years old. The average age of the participants was 25.5 years old. The sample was constituted primarily of Hispanic (56.8%) and Caucasian (26.1%) participants. The average hours worked per week by participants in the sample was 26.6 hours. On average, participants reported that they had been with their current organization for 3.7 years and had been in their current
position an average of 3.0 years. A detailed demographic breakdown is presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Categorical Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Race</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living together</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of job currently held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally-related internship</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Sales</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Secretarial work</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/labor/craft</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Forces</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major of participants enrolled in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts/Liberal Studies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other major</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer/Not enrolled in school</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree being pursued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not pursuing a degree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently enrolled in college-level classes</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently enrolled in college-level classes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student at CSUSB</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student at other university</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in a work-study program</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently receiving financial aid</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed on campus</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed off campus</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently job related to profession intended to pursue after graduation</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current job not related to profession intended to pursue after graduation</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently received reimbursement from employer to attend school</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Continuous Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td>25.57</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living in household</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked per week</td>
<td>26.57</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (in years) at current organization</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (in years) in current position</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (in years) within current occupation</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures

This study used several psychological scales that had been obtained from published studies in the commitment and employee withdrawal behavior literature. These self-report measures were administered via Qualtrics software between March 14 and April 10, 2014, in one web-based survey. All of these measures are provided in the Appendix.

Demographics

Participants were asked to report demographic information including their age, gender, occupations, household size, the length of time they have been in their job, current career/occupation, and how many hours per week they work on average. Participants also answered a self-categorization item which asked them to describe their current status, on a sliding scale: A student who does not work, a student who works, a worker who does not go to school, or a worker who attends school. The category that the participant rated as the
highest was used as their category. If the participant indicated that they were split between categories, their answer to the question “Is your current job related to the profession you intend to pursue after graduation” was used to categorize them as either a student who works or a worker who studies. An answer of “yes” placed them in the worker who studies category, and an answer of “no” placed them in the student who works category. Questions in regard to school were directly asked of the participants, including the following: if they were currently in a work-study program, if their employer provided reimbursement for school, and whether they were employed on-campus or off-campus. Current students were also asked to report the type of job they currently held, for example, responses included a professionally-related internship, fast food/retail, or clerical/secretarial work.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment was assessed using Allen and Meyer’s (1990) Affective Organizational Commitment Scale, Continuance Organizational Commitment Scale, and Normative Organizational Commitment Scale. The scales each contain 8 items where participants read statements and indicate their level of agreement using a Likert-type scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree. Sample items include, “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization” and “I feel I have too few options to consider leaving this organization”. Several items were asked in such a nature that they needed to be “reverse” scored.
(e.g., Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me). Responses to all items were averaged to obtain an organizational commitment score for affective, continuance, normative commitment, and an overall organizational commitment score. Higher scores correspond with a higher level of organizational commitment. This scale is commonly utilized and was acceptable for use in this study. Reliability (coefficient alpha) for each scale as reported by Allen and Meyer (1990) as follows: Affective Commitment Scale, .87, Continuance Commitment Scale, .75, and Normative Commitment Scale, .79 (Allen & Meyer, 1990). A reliability analysis conducted with data from the present study indicated reliability (coefficient alpha) for each scale as follows: Affective Commitment Scale, .83, Continuance Commitment Scale, .72, and Normative Commitment Scale, .70. Three items from both the Normative (1, 7, and 8) and Affective (1, 4, and 5) scales were removed prior to computing the scale scores, in order to increase reliability estimates for each of the respective scales, based on results using the SPSS Scale procedure.

**Professional Commitment**

Professional commitment was assessed using Dolen and Shultz’s (1998) Professional Commitment Questionnaire (PCQ). The questionnaire contains 15 items and asks participants to read statements and indicate their level of agreement using a Likert-type scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree. Sample items include, “I am willing to put in a great deal of
effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this profession be successful” and “I find that my values and the profession’s values are very similar”. Several items were asked in such a nature that they needed to be “reverse” scored (e.g., I feel very little loyalty to this profession). Responses to all items were averaged to obtain a professional commitment score. Higher scores correspond with a higher level of professional commitment. This scale was acceptable for use, in that as reported by Dolen and Shultz (1998), it has an internal consistency reliability estimate of .94. A reliability analysis conducted with data from the present study indicated a reliability coefficient alpha of .91.

University Commitment

For participants who were currently enrolled in school, university commitment was assessed using Dolen and Shultz’s (1998) University Commitment Questionnaire (UCQ). The questionnaire contains 15 items and asked participants to read statements and indicate their level of agreement using a Likert-type scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree. Sample items include, “I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this university be successful” and “I am proud to tell others that I am part of this university”. Several items were asked in such a nature that they needed to be “reverse” scored (e.g., I feel very little loyalty to this university). Responses to all items were averaged to obtain a university commitment score. Higher scores correspond with a higher level of
university commitment. This scale was acceptable for use in the present study, in that Dolen and Shultz (1998) reported an internal consistency reliability estimate of .89. A reliability analysis conducted with data from the present study indicated a reliability coefficient alpha of .83.

**Academic Commitment**

For participants who were currently enrolled in school, academic commitment was assessed using Dolen and Shultz’s (1998) Academic Commitment Questionnaire (ACQ). The questionnaire contains 15 items and asks participants to read statements and indicate their level of agreement using a Likert-type scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 7 = Strongly Agree. Sample items include, “I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this major be successful” and “I am proud to tell others my major”. Several items are asked in such a nature that they needed to be “reverse” scored (e.g., I feel very little loyalty to this major). Responses to all items were averaged to obtain an academic commitment score. Higher scores correspond to a higher level of academic commitment. This scale was acceptable for use, in that Dolen and Shultz (1998) reported an internal consistency reliability estimate of .90. A reliability analysis conducted with data from the present study indicated a reliability coefficient alpha for the scale of .87.
Absenteeism

In order to assess absenteeism, participants were asked two questions. These questions asked the participant to estimate how many times they had been absent from work in the last 12 months, and to pick from a list of options the primary reason they generally missed work (e.g., school related reasons, sickness, family related reasons). On average, participants reported that they had missed work an average of 4.26 days in the past 12 months. The most common reasons cited for missing work included sickness/medical reasons (N = 210), school-related reasons (N = 127), and family-related reasons (N = 117). Reasons that were not as common included conflict with coworkers/unhappiness with job (N = 12) and transportation reasons (N = 12). Thirty eight participants indicated that the question was not applicable to them, as they had not been absent from work in the last 12 months. Twenty six participants indicated that they were absent from work for other reasons.

Turnover intentions

Turnover intentions in all participants were assessed using Jaros’ (1997) measure. The questionnaire contains three items and asks participants to answer questions such as “How likely are you to search for a position with another employer?” and respond using a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 = Not at all likely and 5 = Very likely. Responses to all items were averaged to form a turnover intention score. Higher scores correspond to higher turnover intentions. Jaros (1997) reported that this scale has an acceptable level of
internal consistency, with a coefficient alpha of .82. A reliability analysis conducted with data from the present study indicated a reliability coefficient alpha for the scale of .85.

Procedure
Participants were solicited via email and social media using a snowball sampling technique. Some participants were also directly invited to take the survey, and were encouraged to invite others to do so as well, if they qualified. Participants were asked to complete the online survey using the previously discussed measures. Due to the large number of “students who work” and “workers who study” on a college campus, participants were recruited from California State University, San Bernardino both directly via a campus faculty and staff listserv, as well as via the Sona Systems research participation software used by the Psychology Department.
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RESULTS

Demographics

Participants were asked a categorization item, in order to identify them as students who do not work, students who work, workers who do not go to school, or workers who study. Eight (2.2%) of participants were categorized as students who do not work. Because of the low amount of responses received from students who do not work, this group was not included in any analyses. 169 (46.4%) of the participants were categorized as students who work, 33 (9.1%) as workers who do not go to school, and 85 (23.4%) as workers who study. Sixty nine (19%) of the participants were not able to be categorized due to missing data. Of the participants who identified themselves as students, 308 (84.6%) indicated that they were a student at CSUSB. Five participants (1.4%) indicated that they were a student at another university. Reported universities included California Baptist University, University of California Santa Cruz, Brandman University, and Cal Poly Pomona.

Table 3 below displays the inter-correlations among the predictor and criterion variables.
Table 3. Correlation Matrix of Predictors and Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>Absenteeism</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>Continuance</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Normative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>-512&quot;</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.485&quot;</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.535&quot;</td>
<td>.708&quot;</td>
<td>.803&quot;</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>Affective</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>-564&quot;</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.490&quot;</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.415&quot;</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>Normative</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-323&quot;</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.396&quot;</td>
<td>.172&quot;</td>
<td>.075</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>Continuance</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.046</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>UC</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.338&quot;</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>PC</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-374&quot;</td>
<td>-.225&quot;</td>
<td>.288</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>AC</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.058</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>-.052</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.05</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of Hypotheses

Prior to testing the hypotheses, data cleaning and screening was conducted. A total of eight outliers were identified. These outliers and the amounts identified were as follows: days absent from work in the last 12 months (5), university commitment score (1), professional commitment score (1), and academic commitment score (1). A cut off of a z score greater than +/-3.3 was used to identify outliers. The outliers identified on the variables of participant professional commitment score and academic commitment score were not removed or filtered out of analyses, as their z scores were at or near the cut point, -3.33 and -3.91. The outliers on the variables of days absent from work in the last 12 months (with z scores of 5.38 and up) and university commitment score (z score = -4.04) had a filter applied and to them and were not considered in analyses. Histograms for each variable to be included in
analyses were evaluated for the assumption of normality. The variable of “turnover intentions” was skewed and transformed using Log10. A missing value analysis (MVA) was used to determine that the data was missing completely at random. The variables of participant total organizational commitment score, total professional commitment score, and total turnover intention score all had less than five percent missing data. The variables of total university commitment score and total academic commitment score had 17.2% and 16.2% missing data, however, this is largely due to these scales only being shown to participants who indicated they were currently enrolled in college-level classes, as a result they were not estimated. Therefore, as a result of data screening and cleaning, a final sample of 274 participants resulted, which was used on all subsequent analyses.
Table 4. Group Means for all Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Continuance</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
<th>Absenteeism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in college</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled in college</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student who works</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker who studies</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker who does not go to school</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>9.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 1**

It was hypothesized that employees of an organization who also attended school would have lower levels of organizational commitment (OC) than employees who did not currently attend school. An independent samples t-test using current college enrollment status and participants’ overall organizational commitment score was computed to test this hypothesis. The 246 participants who indicated they were currently enrolled in college-level classes had an average OC score of 4.31 (SD = .85). The 28 participants who indicated they were not currently enrolled in college-level classes had an average OC score of 4.28 (SD = .84). Results of the independent samples t-test suggest that there was not a significant difference in OC scores between the participants who were currently enrolled in college-level classes and
participants who were not currently enrolled in college-level classes,

\[ t(272) = .154, \ p = .439, \ \eta^2 = .00. \] As a result, Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Table 5. Independent t-test using Organizational Commitment (OC) Score and Current College Enrollment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OC Score</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three independent samples t-tests were conducted on each of the three organizational commitment subscales (normative, affective, and continuance) to investigate if there were any differences based on the type of commitment depending on current college enrollment status. Results suggested that there was a significant difference in affective commitment between participants who were enrolled in school (\( M = 4.51, \ SD = 1.41 \)) and participants who were not (\( M = 5.16, \ SD = 1.32 \)), \[ t(281) = -2.354, \ p < .05, \ \eta^2 = .019. \] There was also a significant difference in normative commitment between participants who were enrolled in school (\( M = 3.86, \ SD = 1.11 \)) and those who were not (\( M = 3.45, \ SD = 1.20 \)), \[ t(277) = 1.836, \ p = .034. \]
Participants who indicated they were enrolled in school had significantly higher levels of normative commitment than participants who were not enrolled in school. The effect size was very small, $\eta^2 = .01$. There was not a significant difference in continuance commitment between participants who were enrolled in school ($M = 4.56, SD = 1.10$), and participants who were not enrolled ($M = 4.23, SD = 1.29$), $t(278) = 1.517, p = .065, \eta^2 = .01$. These results provide partial support for Hypothesis 1.

Table 6. Independent t-test using Affective Commitment and Current College Enrollment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig. t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.407 .524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Independent t-test using Normative Commitment and Current College Enrollment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Independent t-test using Continuance Commitment and College Enrollment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hypothesis 2**

To determine if employees of an organization who also attended school would have higher levels of professional commitment (PC) than employees who did not currently attend school, an independent samples t-test was computed using participants’ overall professional commitment score and whether or not they indicated they were enrolled in school. The 244 participants who indicated they were currently enrolled in college classes had an average PC score of 5.02 (SD = 1.13), while the 28 participants who indicated they were not currently enrolled in college classes had an average PC score of 4.90 (SD = 1.31). Results of the t-test suggest that there is not a significant difference in PC score between these two groups, t(270) = .527, p = .300, $\eta^2 = .00$. As a result, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

**Table 9. Independent t-test using Professional Commitment (PC) Score and Current College Enrollment Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC Score Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.229</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 3

It was hypothesized that participants who attended school would have higher rates of absenteeism than employees who were not currently enrolled in school. To test this hypothesis, an independent samples t-test was performed. In the sample, 255 participants indicated that they were enrolled in school, and they were absent from work an average of 3.83 (SD = 5.34) days in the previous 12 months. Twenty nine participants indicated they were not currently enrolled in school. These participants were absent an average of 7.21 (SD = 7.43) days in the previous 12 months. Results suggest that there was a significant difference in scores between the two groups, \( t(31.365) = -2.380, \ p < .05, \ \eta^2 = .02 \). This significant result is contrary to the hypothesis, in that participants who were not enrolled in school missed work significantly more than participants who were enrolled in school.
Table 10. Absenteeism and Current College Enrollment Status Independent Sample t-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days absent from work</th>
<th>Equal variances not assumed</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>95% Conf. Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.794</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-2.380</td>
<td>31.365</td>
<td>-6.274 to -.485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research suggests that there is a link between career stage or age and withdrawal behaviors such as absenteeism and turnover (Cohen, 1993). However, there is a lack of studies that examine age and withdrawal behaviors exhibited by workers who are enrolled in school. An ANCOVA controlling for age was performed to investigate if participant age could help to explain absenteeism in the two groups. When controlling for age, there was a significant effect, $F(2, 281) = 11.144, p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$. These results indicate that participant age is a better predictor of absenteeism than the participant’s college enrollment status. Table 11 below details the results of the ANCOVA.
Table 11. Absenteeism Analysis of Covariance with Age as Covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>666.718</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>333.359</td>
<td>11.144</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.408</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.408</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Age</td>
<td>369.339</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>369.339</td>
<td>12.347</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College enrollment</td>
<td>12.936</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.936</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>8405.828</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>29.914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14017.000</td>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>9072.546</td>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 4

An independent samples t-test was performed to determine if participants who attended school would have higher turnover intentions than participants who were not currently enrolled in school. The 251 participants who indicated they were enrolled in school had an average turnover intention score of 3.04 (SD = 1.02), while the 29 participants who indicated they were not currently enrolled in school had an average turnover intention score of 2.57 (SD = 1.23). Prior to running the t-test, the turnover intention variable was transformed using Log10. There was a significant difference in scores between the two groups, t(31.629) = 2.295, p < .05. The magnitude of differences in the means was small however ($\eta^2 = .02$). This result is in support of Hypothesis 4, in that participants who did currently attend school had significantly higher turnover intention scores than participants who were not currently enrolled in school.
Research to date has suggested that younger individuals are more likely to have stronger turnover intentions due to their early career stages (Porter et al. 1976; Cohen, 1993; Mowday et al. 1984). An ANCOVA controlling for age was performed to investigate any alternative explanation as to why participants who currently attended school would have higher turnover intention scores than participants who were not currently enrolled in school. When controlling for age, there was a significant effect, $F(2, 277) = 5.87$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .01$. However, neither participant age nor their college enrollment status was a significant predictor of turnover intentions. Table 13 below details the results of the ANCOVA.
Table 13. Turnover Intentions Analysis of Covariance with Age as Covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>5.886</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.930</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.930</td>
<td>104.410</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Age</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>3.217</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College enrollment</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>1.969</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>7.772</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.784</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>8.103</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 5**

It was hypothesized that students who worked would have lower levels of professional commitment (PC) than both workers who studied and workers who did not attend school. A one-way ANOVA was used to test this hypothesis. In the sample, the 158 students who worked had an average PC score of 4.96 (SD = 1.18), the 31 workers who did not go to school had an average PC score of 4.81 (SD = 1.30), and the 83 workers who studied had an average PC score of 5.17 (SD = 1.00). The hypothesis is not supported in that there was not a significant effect, $F(2, 269) = 1.46$, $p = .117$, $\eta^2 = .01$. This indicates that there is not a significant difference in overall professional commitment between students who work, workers who do not go to school, and workers who study.
Table 14. Participant Category and Professional Commitment (PC) One-Way ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.849</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.924</td>
<td>1.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>353.675</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1.315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>357.523</td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A pre-planned contrast between PC scores for workers who did not go to school and the workers who studied was investigated to compare the groups in H5. There was not a significant difference in PC between the groups, $t(269) = .638, p = .262$.

Table 15. Contrast Test using Professional Commitment (PC) and Participant Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Commitment</th>
<th>Contrast Value of Contrast</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (1-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assume equal variances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1436</td>
<td>.22524</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 6

An independent samples t-test was performed to determine if students who worked had lower levels of organizational commitment (OC) than workers who studied. In the sample, the 161 students who worked had an average OC score of 4.24 (SD = .83), and the 82 workers who studied had an average OC score of 4.43 (SD = .84). Results are in support of the hypothesis. There was
a significant effect, t(241) = -1.751, p = .041. The difference in OC levels between the two groups was significantly different. However, the effect size was small, ($\eta^2 = .01$).

Table 16. Organizational Commitment (OC) and Participant Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Sample t-test</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC Score</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>-1.751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three independent sample t-tests were conducted on each of the three organizational commitment subscales (normative, affective, and continuance) to investigate if there were any differences in the types of commitment between students who worked and workers who studied. Results indicated that, similar to follow-up analyses to H1, there was a significant difference in affective commitment between students who worked (M = 4.34, SD = 1.44) and workers who studied (M = 4.84, SD = 1.31), t(249) = -2.664, p < .05, $\eta^2 = .03$. However, there was not a significant difference in normative commitment scores between students who worked (M = 3.80, SD = 1.10) and

workers who studied \((M = 3.94, SD = 1.08), t(246) = -0.957, p = .170, \eta^2 = .00\).

There also was not a significant difference in continuance commitment scores, between students who worked \((M = 4.59, SD = 1.07)\) and workers who studied \((M = 4.52, SD = 1.14), t(246) = 0.478, p = .317, \eta^2 = .00\). As a result, Hypothesis 6 was supported, however the lone effects for overall organizational commitment and affective organizational commitment were relatively small.

Table 17. Independent t-test using Affective Commitment and Participant Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>-2.664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows the results of the independent t-test using Affective Commitment and Participant Category.
Table 18. Independent t-test using Normative Commitment and Participant Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Independent t-test using Continuance Commitment and Participant Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 7

An independent samples t-test was computed to determine if students who worked had higher levels of university commitment (UC) than workers who studied. The 159 students who worked had an average UC score of 4.97 (SD = .77), while the workers who studied had an average UC score of 4.86 (SD = .80). There was not a significant effect and the hypothesis was not supported, t(235) = 1.065, p = .144, $\eta^2 = .00$. There was not a significant difference in UC between students who worked and workers who studied. It is necessary to note that a large majority of the workers who study in the sample both work and study at CSUSB, meaning that their school and organization are the same. This will be discussed further in the Discussion section.

Table 20. University Commitment (UC) and Participant Category Independent Sample t-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Commitment</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>1.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 8

It was hypothesized that the difference in academic commitment between students who worked and workers who studied would not be statistically significant. To determine this, an independent samples t-test was performed using participants’ overall academic commitment (AC) score and their category (student who works or worker who studies). In the sample, the 161 students who worked had an average AC score of 5.68 (SD = .85), while the 79 workers who studied had an average AC score of 5.39 (SD = .84). The hypothesis was not supported in that there was a significant difference in AC between students who worked and workers who studied, t(238) = 2.510, p < .05. However, the effect size was relatively small at $\eta^2 = .03$. The mean difference (.293) between the two groups falls within the 95% confidence interval range of .063 and .522.

Table 21. Academic Commitment (AC) and Participant Category Independent Sample t-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Commitment</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment assumed</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proportion of high school and college students who work while attending college has been steadily increasing since the 1960’s (Lang, 2012). The proportion of workers who study is rising as well, as there is an increased need for continued education and maintenance of certain knowledge, skills, and abilities. Workers who study expect that what they learn will enhance their knowledge of their field and the practices they see and apply at the workplace (O’Connor & Cordova, 2010). Research that investigates these individuals who concurrently work and go to school generally aims to examine the effects that working has on their educational outcomes such as GPA, time to degree completion, and absenteeism from class. Seldom in this line of research are the effects of organizational level variables such as turnover intentions, absenteeism, and organizational commitment examined. The present study examined organizational commitment, professional commitment, university commitment, academic commitment, absenteeism, and turnover intentions in workers who are currently enrolled in school, compared to those who are not. Additionally, the groups of “students who work” and “workers who study” were compared in order to gain a better understanding of how these two groups differ in commitment, absenteeism, and turnover intentions. This study is a direct extension of Pereles’ (2007) study, where he compared these two groups but focused on academic outcomes. As a result, this study contributes
to the literature by comparing these two groups and focusing on organizational outcomes.

Findings

There were several hypotheses formulated prior to conducting this study. As per Pereles’ (2007) study, students who worked were defined as participants who were enrolled in school full time and worked part time. Workers who studied were defined as participants who worked full time and were enrolled in school part time. Student workers were anticipated to have lower levels of organizational commitment and higher levels of professional commitment than employees of the organization who do not attend school. Additionally, it was expected that student workers would have higher levels of academic and university commitment than their level of organizational or professional commitment. These results were expected due to literature (e.g., Cohen, 1993, 2003) which indicates that commitment levels can be affected by various factors pertaining to students who work and workers who study, such as age and career stage. Previous research (e.g., Gleason 1993; Lang 2012; Nagai-Manelli et al., 2012) has also found that individuals who attend work and school are subject to impacted academics, decreased health, and various other negative outcomes. Based on this previous research, it was expected that absenteeism and turnover intentions would be higher for the student worker groups, compared to workers who study or workers who do not attend school.
Four different types of commitment were examined in this study. The first type of commitment, organizational commitment, is the degree to which an employee feels attached to an organization (Mowday et al., 1979). When examining organizational commitment, it was found that there was not a difference in overall organizational commitment scores when looking at participants who were currently enrolled in college level classes, compared to those who were not currently enrolled. However, upon further investigation, results indicated that there was a significant difference in affective and normative organizational commitment between these two groups. As discussed in the literature review section, affective commitment is displayed when an employee identifies with, is involved in, and enjoys membership in an organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Normative commitment is displayed when an employee believes that they need to remain with the organization because it is the right and moral thing to do (Allen & Meyer, 1990). These results suggest that individuals who are not currently enrolled in college-level classes are likely to display higher levels of affective commitment, and lower levels of normative commitment.

The affective commitment result could potentially be due to the increased amount of time that individuals who do not attend school are likely spending at their organization, compared to individuals who are enrolled in school and may be working only part-time. Since individuals who are not enrolled in school are displaying higher levels of affective commitment to an
organization, which is the most desirable form of commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990), it is understandable that they would have lower levels of normative commitment. The “workers who study” group in this study were more affectively committed to their organizations, and as such, displayed lower levels of the less desirable normative commitment than the “students who work” group. Individuals who possess normative commitment simply stay with the organization because it is viewed as the right thing to do (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Participants in the current study were asked on average how many hours they currently worked per week. Participants who indicated they were currently enrolled in college classes worked an average of 24.56 hours per week (SD = 10.80). Participants who indicated they were not currently enrolled in college classes indicated they worked an average of 42.59 hours per week (SD = 12.19). This offers support to the possible explanation that participants who do not currently attend school have higher affective commitment than those who are currently enrolled due to their time spent at the organization. Those who are not enrolled in school are spending a greater amount of time each week at the organization and have more opportunities to identify with it, become involved, and to enjoy membership in it (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

Additionally, it was found that students who worked had significantly lower organizational commitment scores than workers who studied. Upon further investigation, it was found that workers who studied had significantly higher affective commitment than students who worked. Students who worked
had an average affective commitment score of 4.34 (SD = 1.44), while workers who studied had an average affective commitment score of 4.84 (SD = 1.31). Research shows that employees who possess affective commitment perform well and stay with the organization because they genuinely want to (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). Pereles (2007) defines workers who study as individuals who are likely to work more hours than students who work. As such, it could be hypothesized that a worker who studies would have significantly higher affective commitment than a student who works because they are spending more time at the organization, and thus, exhibiting a greater level of commitment for it. However, an independent sample t-test comparing average hours worked per week using students who work and workers who study was not significant, \( t(138.87) = .657, p = .512 \). This suggests that the difference in affective commitment between students who work and workers who study may be attributed to a factor besides the amount of time they spend at the organization.

Conversely, Pereles (2007) defines students who work as spending more time on their studies than their work. To test whether or not affective commitment in students who work and workers who study may be associated with the amount of time an individual spends on their school work, an independent sample t-test comparing the two groups and their current unit enrollment was computed. However, there was not a significant difference
between the two groups, $t(86.404) = -0.970$, $p = .335$. As a result, the difference in affective commitment between the two groups is not related to either average hours worked per week or an individual's current unit enrollment. These results and additional analyses help us to understand the concept of affective commitment at a deeper level, what may or may not be predictive of it, and help us to determine the categories of employees who are likely to possess it.

Professional commitment is the commitment that one possesses toward their profession. It is viewed as an individual’s devotion to their craft, occupation, or profession (Cohen, 2003). This study examined professional commitment and how it differs between participants who are enrolled in school and between students who worked and workers who studied. It was hypothesized that employees of an organization who also attended school would have higher levels of professional commitment than employees who did not currently attend school. Results were not in support of this hypothesis, as there was not a significant difference in professional commitment between these two groups of participants. It was also hypothesized that students who worked would have lower levels of professional commitment than both workers who studied and workers who did not attend school. Results did not support this hypothesis either, as there was not a significant difference in professional commitment between these three groups of participants.
It is surprising that there was not a significant difference in professional commitment between these three groups, as students who work are generally working part time and attending school full time (Pereles, 2007). As such, it was thought that their professional commitment would be different from workers who studied or workers who do not attend school at all, as they devote a greater amount of time to their work or profession (Pereles, 2007). Cohen (2003) defines professional commitment as the magnitude of an individual’s motivation to work in a career that he or she chose. An ANCOVA between participant category and participant professional commitment score, and whether or not their current job was related to the profession they intended to pursue after graduation as a covariate, was significant, \( F(3, 240) = 4.364, p < .05 \). Specifically, whether or not a participant indicated that their current job was related to the profession they intended to pursue after graduation was a significant predictor of their total professional commitment score. This result allows for an understanding of why students who worked, workers who studied, and workers who did not study did not have significantly different professional commitment scores. Instead of participant category predicting their professional commitment scores, it appears that the nature of their current job is a more important predictor.

Professional commitment scores between workers who did not go to school and the workers who studied were also investigated. There was not a significant difference in commitment level between these two groups either.
This comparison between these two latter groups was conducted as it was thought that perhaps participants who were not attending school or attempting to enhance their career would exhibit higher commitment for their profession, when compared to workers who studied. Workers who study attend school at least part time and could potentially be doing so in an attempt to change their profession (Pereles, 2007). However, these results indicate that there is not a significant difference in professional commitment between these two latter groups. This result can again be attributed to whether or not their current job is related to the profession they intend to pursue after graduation, as discussed in the ANCOVA results above.

University commitment is the commitment that an individual possesses toward a specific university (Dolen & Shultz, 1998). In this study it was hypothesized that students who worked would have higher levels of university commitment than workers who studied. However, the results failed to support this hypothesis. There was not a significant difference in university commitment between students who worked and workers who studied. This is surprising, as it was hypothesized that students who worked would have a higher level of university commitment due to their larger amount of time spent on campus when compared to the “workers who study” group, who would likely only be enrolled in school part time (Pereles, 2007). However, these results suggest that university commitment is not significantly different when comparing students who work and workers who study.
It is interesting to note that both students who work and workers who study did not differ significantly in their level of overall organizational commitment as well as university commitment. This combination of results can be interpreted in the context of role theory, or the study of behaviors that are characteristics of individuals within contexts (Major, 2003). Perhaps because of the dual roles of both students and workers, these two groups can be equally committed to the institutions (e.g., their organization and university) that allow them to fulfill their different roles.

Academic commitment is the fourth and final type of commitment that was assessed in this study. Academic commitment is defined as a commitment to higher education in general (Dolen & Shultz, 1998). It was hypothesized that the difference in academic commitment between students who worked and workers who studied would not be statistically significant. The hypothesis was not supported, in that there was a significant difference in academic commitment scores between these two groups. However, it is important to note that the effect size was small, ($\eta^2 = .03$). Students who worked had a significantly higher level of academic commitment than workers who studied. This may be attributed to the likelihood that the “students who work” group is potentially going to school full time and working part time (Pereles, 2007), thus creating a stronger commitment toward their academics. Workers who study may not have high academic commitment scores because of their choice to enroll in school only part time, and continue
to devote the majority of their time to work (Pereles, 2007). As such, their academic commitment is not as high as their “students who work” counterparts, who devote more time weekly to their academics than their work.

Alternatively, students who work may have higher academic commitment because they may view their academics as the prevailing, or most important, duty in their life. Broadbridge and Swanson (2006) state that students tend to work in the service industries, as they have a need for flexible scheduling. Student workers are typically found in retailing, catering, bars, and hotels. Jobs in this sector are characterized as being poorly paid, low skilled, insecure with high turnover rates, and low unionization (Broadbridge & Swanson, 2006). This offers an explanation as to why students who work (e.g., full time schooling and part time work) would be more committed to their academics than a worker who studies. A worker who studies (e.g., full time work and part time school) could potentially have a job that is not characteristic of the above-referenced service industry jobs, and as such not have such a focus or commitment to their academics. In the present sample, the most common type currently held by participants was service/sales, as it was selected by 103 participants (28.3%). Of these 103 participants, 75 were students who worked, and only 19 were workers who studied. This lends support to the hypothesis that students who work may have a higher commitment to their academics than workers who study, due to the type of job they currently hold.
Absenteeism is the pattern of failing to appear for work. Absenteeism was examined in this study, in order to examine the potential differences between the participants who were currently enrolled in college-level classes and the participants who were not. It was hypothesized that participants who indicated they were currently enrolled in school would have higher rates of absenteeism than participants who were not currently enrolled. Interestingly, participants who were not enrolled in school missed work more frequently than participants who were currently enrolled. There was a significant difference in days absent from work in the last 12 months between these two groups. Participants who were currently enrolled in school missed work significantly more than participants who were not currently enrolled in school. It was hypothesized that participants who were enrolled in school would miss work more frequently as they would have school-related matter to attend to (e.g., class attendance and homework). It was expected that participants’ absenteeism would be representative of organizationally unexcused absences, as it would consist of a career-enhancing activity directed outside of their organization (Blau & Boal, 1985). However, these results suggest that this is not the case. Participants who are enrolled in school may not miss work significantly more than participants who are not enrolled in school due to their overall level of organizational commitment. Results discussed earlier indicated that participants who were enrolled in school did not have significantly different levels of organizational commitment.
than participants who were not enrolled in school. This may serve as an explanation for the current results, as participants who are enrolled in school are still committed to their organization, and as such, are not failing to show up for work. Alternatively, employees who are also enrolled in school may simply possess more motivation than an individual who does not go to school, and as such, attend work more frequently. An individual that voluntarily takes on the dual roles of both student and worker may have a higher level of motivation than someone who only occupies the role of “worker” and is more motivated to show up to work on a daily basis.

In addition, since the vast majority of respondents to this study consisted of staff at CSUSB, it is likely that they are taking classes during lunch breaks or after work. As a result, they do not need to “miss work” to attend class since classes are held at their workplace, unlike most other “workers who study”.

Additional analyses were run in regard to absenteeism and school enrollment while controlling for age. It has been suggested that an individual’s age or current career stage may be linked to withdrawal behaviors, such as absenteeism (Cohen, 1993). It was found that age was a better predictor of absenteeism than whether or not a participant was enrolled in school. As discussed earlier, participants who were not enrolled in school missed work more frequently than participants who were currently enrolled in school. When accounting for age, participants may miss work more frequently due to
age-related factors such as sickness, or having to care for their young children. These absences would be considered organizationally excused, whereas absences due to school-related factors would be organizationally unexcused (Blau & Boal, 1987).

To examine why participants who were not enrolled in school may miss work more than participants who were currently enrolled in school, an additional independent sample t-test was computed comparing these two groups and their household size. It was hypothesized that participants who were enrolled in school would have a larger household size and children to care for, thus making them miss work more frequently. Participants who indicated they were currently enrolled in college-level classes had an average household size of 4.07 people (SD = 1.66). Participants who indicated they were not currently enrolled in college-level classes had an average household size of 2.71 (SD = 1.43). There was a significant difference between the two groups, t(303) = 4.636, p < .001. These results suggest that participants who are not currently enrolled in college-level classes are likely missing work due to other reasons (e.g., sickness) as they are the group that has a lower average household size.

Olsen and Dahl (2010) found that education reduced absences due to sickness, and that absence due to sickness increases with age. This previous research is in line with the results obtained in the present study, as participants who were not currently enrolled in school missed work more
frequently and usually due to sickness. In this sample, 210 participants reported sickness/medical reasons as one of their most common reasons for missing work in the last 12 months. This was the most common reason cited for missing work, with school-related reasons the second most common reason.

Turnover is the voluntary or involuntary withdrawal of an individual from an organization (Hom, Mitchell, Lee, & Griffeth, 2012). Turnover intentions were assessed in this study, in order to compare scores between participants who were currently enrolled in school, and those who were not currently enrolled in school. It was hypothesized that participants who attended school would have higher turnover intentions than workers who were not currently enrolled in school. This hypothesis was supported, in that participants who indicated they were currently enrolled in college-level classes had significantly higher turnover intentions than participants who were not currently enrolled in school. This result suggests that the participants who were enrolled in school may plan on leaving their current employers after graduation, similar to the student workers in Pereles’ study (2007). Participants in this sample who indicated they were currently enrolled in school may be attending school in order to secure a better, higher-paying job in the future that is not available with their current employer. As such, they would be enrolled in school with the intention of leaving after graduation. Given this result, it would have been advantageous to ask participants whether better career opportunities were
available with their current organization. If there were, their turnover intentions may not have been as high, despite their current school enrollment. In their discussion on voluntary turnover, Hom, Mitchell, Lee, and Griffeth (2012) point out that some individuals may voluntarily leave an organization to comply with parental demands to complete college. This serves as a possible explanation as to why participants who were enrolled in school had higher turnover intentions than participants who were not currently enrolled in school. Participants who are enrolled in school and work only part time may still live at home with parents and feel coerced into the possibility of leaving their jobs to complete college (Hom, Mitchell, Lee, & Griffeth, 2012).

After a full interpretation of the results, it is necessary to question whether the groups of “students who work” and “workers who study” are, in fact, different and distinct groups. Results obtained in the present study do not suggest that there are large differences between the two groups, as all reported effect sizes are small, whether the results were statistically significant or not. Students who work and workers who study may not be distinct groups, in that they may have more similarities to each other than differences. Practical results may not have been obtained because these groups may be similar in many ways, including their organizational commitment, professional commitment, university commitment, and academic commitment. Significant results that were obtained in this study may be due to other factors that are not inherent to just the “students who work” or “workers who study” group. These
results may have been obtained due to factors that the present study did not assess (e.g., motivation, personality traits, work ethic).

Limitations of the Study

This study was subject to several limitations. First, it is possible that the study may be methodologically flawed, as the results reflect groups that were not easily distinguishable from one another. Results that were significant had small effect sizes and thus, are not practically significant. One such methodological limitation of the study is in the categorization process. Participants were asked to assess their own categories, which may not have provided meaningful or accurate groupings.

As the majority of participants in the sample were from CSUSB, a large portion of the sample was categorized in the “students who work” group. It was difficult to find participants representative of the “workers who studied” and “workers who do not go to school” group. It would have been advantageous to have a sample that had a larger amount of respondents in these two groups. Additionally, a percentage of participants could not be categorized as either students who worked, workers who studied, or workers who did not go to school. As a result, these participants were not able to be included in the analyses. Research also shows that using college students as a sample can also yield different means and standard deviations for certain items (Leong & Austin, 2006). As a large portion of the sample in this study was comprised of
students, the results obtained may be affected by their status as a student and represents a limitation to the study.

A large number of the participants both worked and took classes at CSUSB, which may have confounded their university commitment scores, as their employer and university were the same entity. A participant in the current study who both worked and took classes at CSUSB may experience heightened levels of commitment to both their organization and their university. These participants are likely spending greater amounts of time on a weekly basis engaging with the university, and as such, this may have an effect on their experienced levels of commitment toward it.

Additionally, the staff at CSUSB is able to take classes free of charge. This may have affected their scores on several scales, such as their university, academic, or organizational commitment scores. Another limitation is the lack of research on student workers, workers who study, and withdrawal behaviors, so sound hypotheses were not able to be formulated or tested in the present study.

The sample was 56.8% Hispanic and 26.1% Caucasian. Thus, 82.9% of the sample was comprised of only two ethnicities, which could allow for several of the results received to be affected by culture or fluency in the English language (Leong & Austin, 2006). The same results may not have resulted if tested using a different sample with different demographics. Additionally, the sample was 80.4% female. This represents a limitation in that
women may exhibit different patterns in regard to commitment, absenteeism, and turnover intentions than men (Ng et al., 2005). Different results may have been obtained had the sample been more evenly distributed in terms of gender.

Lastly, the present study used an internet-based survey to collect data. Research indicates that internet users and those with access to the internet and a computer are disproportionately young, educated, urban, and of middle and upper socioeconomic classes (Leong & Austin, 2006). This represents a sample that is unrepresentative of the general population and may have impacted the results obtained. Additionally, the use of the internet allowed participants to begin the survey and not finish it completely. The use of a proctored, in-person test would have likely resulted in a less missing data.

Implications and Directions for Future Research

There are several implications that can be drawn from these results. In terms of theoretical implications, this study has contributed information on employees of organizations and how their enrollment in school can contribute to their commitment, absenteeism, and turnover intentions. Research has examined absenteeism, turnover, and commitment in employees (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1990; Cohen, 1993; Meyer et al., 2002; Somers, 2010). It has been suggested that employment affects an individual’s school work and other educational-related outcomes (Gleason 1993; Lang 2012), however, there is little literature on how employee enrollment in school affects the organization
and contributes to commitment levels, absenteeism rates, and turnover intentions. This study has allowed for further comparisons and research questions on commitment, absenteeism, and turnover to be formulated and tested in regard to the employees who also attend school.

Future research can use the results of this study to examine the various effects of full-time or part-time status in school, major, or current year in school. Literature to date has suggested that employment while in school can impact timely graduation, GPA, and can affect individuals of various majors differently (Lang, 2012). The results obtained in this study suggest that concurrent school enrollment and employment can impact the organization also, not just the individual’s academics. It was found that the participants who were not currently enrolled in school missed work significantly more often than participants who were currently enrolled in school. Future research can examine this result further and attempt to investigate the reasons why participants who are not enrolled in school are missing work more frequently. Specifically, a study which assesses motivation in both participants who are enrolled in school and participants who are not could examine whether absenteeism and school enrollment is related to motivational factors.

Literature in the future can use this research to further examine the “students who work” and “workers who study groups.” As mentioned previously, the results obtained in this study suggest that there are not large differences between these two groups. Future research should attempt to
determine if these are really two distinct and separate groups. If these are determined to be two separate groups, results of the present study suggest that they may have more similarities than differences. To further examine these groups, future research should examine more areas that could potentially separate these groups. Scales could be developed in an effort to efficiently categorize participants, rather than relying on their own judgments of whether they are a student who works or a worker who studies. Had such a scale been available at the time of this study, different results may have been obtained.

This study also found that participants who were not currently enrolled in school had higher affective commitment and lower normative commitment than participants who were currently enrolled in school. Affective commitment has been shown to have a strong favorable correlation with attendance, performance, and organizational citizenship behavior (Meyer et al., 2002). Affective attachment has also been shown to be negatively correlated to withdrawal behaviors, such as turnover (Meyer et al., 2002). The present study can inform future theory and research in the area of organizational commitment. These results can serve as a starting point and future research can aim to determine why participants who are not enrolled in school have higher affective commitment. This will allow theory and literature on organizational commitment to grow, and understand how it can be applied to different populations of workers.
In addition to the theoretical implications, there are also several practical implications for organizations. Organizations can use these results for the purpose of managing its current employees. Information on the level of commitment exhibited by the different groups within the organization can help them understand their employee’s behavior and develop interventions or programs to develop higher levels of commitment in their student workers. Commitment is an important concept for organizations to understand, as it is also commonly linked to the presence of withdrawal behaviors including absenteeism and turnover. Understanding the risk for a greater possibility of elevated absenteeism and turnover exhibited by students could aid them in making promotion decisions and also save them a great deal of money. Absenteeism and turnover are expensive for organizations to manage, with absenteeism amounting to $3.6 million per year and turnover costing organizations $25 billion per year (Cialdini, 2004; Karsan, 2014).

In addition, organizations can develop career counseling programs for their current employees (especially those who are students), in order to aid in managing both their role as employee and student, as well as educate them on the options to promote within the organization. Research has shown that role congruence is important for students and is an important factor in allowing them to be able to manage stress and exhibit positive affect (Swanson, Broadbridge, & Karatzias, 2006). These results can help employers to promote such role congruence for their employees. This would ultimately help the
organization by reducing turnover and increasing commitment. Student workers would be assisted by the implementation of career counseling programs, as they would be able to effectively manage their dual roles and be knowledgeable on their career options within their current organization.
APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT
Informed Consent

My name is Brittany Roy, and I am currently working on my Master’s Degree in Industrial/Organizational Psychology at California State University, San Bernardino. I am writing to invite you to participate in an online survey designed to understand the concepts of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover intentions. Specifically, I am examining how individuals’ enrollment status in school contributes to their commitment, absenteeism, and turnover intentions with their current employer.

This study is being conducted by me, Brittany Roy, under the supervision of Dr. Kenneth Shultz, Professor of Psychology, California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been approved by the Department of Psychology Institutional Review Board Sub-Committee of the California State University, San Bernardino. A copy of the official Psychology IRB stamp of approval should appear on this consent form. The University requires that you give your consent BEFORE participating in this study.

This study is for participants who are 18 years of age or older, who are currently employed at least part-time (i.e., 10+ hours/week), and have been employed with their current organization for at least 12 months prior to participation in this study. If you consent to participate, you will be administered a survey that will ask questions about yourself and your employment with your current organization. You will also be asked to provide some demographic information (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, etc.). If you are a CSUSB student, you may receive 1 points of extra credit in a selected Psychology class at your instructor’s discretion.

The survey will take approximately 25-30 minutes to complete. This study involves no risks beyond those routinely encountered in daily life, nor any direct benefits to you as a participant. Responses will be kept strictly confidential and used only for the purposes of research for this project. Your responses will NOT be shared with your organization of employment. Should you indicate that you are a student at CSUSB, please be aware that your academic information (GPA, current unit enrollment, etc.) will be obtained for purposes of the study. However, this information is provided to the researchers without specific identifying information, therefore participant identities will remain anonymous. All responses will be protected by the researcher on password protected computers. The results from this study will be reported in a master’s thesis, but any results shared will be described at the group level only.
Please be aware that there are no right or wrong answers. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw your participation in the study at any time, or refuse to answer any specific question without penalty.

If you desire to receive a summary of the results, I can be reached at royb@coyote.csusb.edu. You may also contact Dr. Kenneth Shultz at kshultz@csusb.edu. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please feel free to contact the Department of Psychology IRB sub-committee (at PSYC.IRB@csusb.edu). You may also contact the Human Subjects office at California State University, San Bernardino at (909) 537-7588.

I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and understand the true nature and purpose of this study, and I freely consent to participate. I acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age. Please indicate your desire to participate by placing an “X” on the line below.

Participant’s X: 

Date: (MM/DD/YYYY)
APPENDIX B

SCALES
Demographic Information

The following demographic items are being asked in order to analyze the data at a group level. The answers to the following questions will NOT be used to identify any individual participant.

Are you currently enrolled in any college-level classes?
- Yes
- No

Are you currently a student at CSUSB?
- Yes
- No

What is your CSUSB student ID number? _____________

This information is needed to obtain your official academic records. All identifying information will be removed in the final version of the data set. You will not be able to be identified once your academic information is recorded and your student ID is removed.

What school do you attend (If not CSUSB student) _____________

What is your overall GPA? (If not CSUSB student) _______

What is your gender?
- Male
- Female

What is your age in years? ______

What is your ethnicity?
- Native American (including Alaskan Native)
- Asian (including Oriental, Pacific Islander and Filipino)
- African American
- Hispanic
- Caucasian
- Other race: ________________
- Mixed race
What is your current marital status?
- Married
- Living together
- Separated
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Single, never married
- Other: ________________

How many people live in your household? _____

What is your current, primary job or occupation title? _______________

How many hours per week do you work on average? _____

How long have you been in your current position at your organization? (In years) ____

How many years have you worked with your current organization? _____

How many years have you worked within your current occupation? _____

How do the categories below describe you? (Total across all four categories must add up to 100)

- A student who does not work
- A student who works
- A worker who does not go to school
- A worker who does attend school
Are you currently in a work-study program?
   - Yes
   - No

Do you currently receive financial aid?
   - Yes
   - No

Are you employed:
   - On-campus
   - Off-campus

Is your current job related to the profession you intend to pursue after graduation?
   - Yes
   - No

What type of job do you currently hold?
   Professionally-related internship
   Service/Sales (Fast food, retail, etc.)
   Clerical/Secretarial work
   Trade/labor/craft
   Managerial
   Professional (Science, Health, Teaching, Business, IT professional, etc.)
   Armed Forces
   Other

Do you currently receive reimbursement from your employer to attend school?
   - Yes
   - No

If the answer to the above question was “yes:”
   How many units do you have to enroll in per quarter to receive reimbursement? Units:_______
   Not specified
   How much reimbursement do you receive per quarter? $_____._____

What is your major? ___________
What degree are you currently pursuing?
- Not currently pursuing a degree
- Undergraduate degree
- Graduate degree
- Other: ___________

How many units are you currently enrolled in? ________

Are these quarter or semester units?
- Quarter
- Semester
- Other: ___________
Organizational Commitment

The following statements refer to one’s feelings regarding their status as a member of a particular organization. Please read each statement and indicate your level of agreement using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allen and Meyer (1990) Affective Organizational Commitment Scale

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

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I do not feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this organization.

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

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

Allen and Meyer (1990) Continuance Organizational Commitment Scale

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 It wouldn’t be too costly for me to leave my organization now.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
I feel I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.

One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable sacrifice—another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.

Allen and Meyer (1990) Normative Organizational Commitment Scale

1. I think that people these days move from company to company too often.
2. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.
3. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me.
4. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore I feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.
5. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.
6. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.
7. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their career.
8. I do not think that wanting to be a ‘company man’ or ‘company woman’ is sensible anymore.

**University Commitment Questionnaire (UCQ)**

The following statements refer to one’s feelings regarding their status as a student at a particular university. Please read each statement and indicate your level of agreement using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither A or D</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this university be successful.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I talk up this university to my friends as a great university to attend.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I feel very little loyalty to this university.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I would accept almost any type of course-work in order to remain enrolled in this university.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I find that my values and the university’s values are very similar.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am proud to tell others that I am part of this university.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I could just as well be studying at a different university as long as the area of study was similar.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 This university really inspires the very best in me in the way of academic performance.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this university.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am extremely glad that I chose this university to attend over others I was considering at the time I applied.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 There’s not too much to be gained by sticking with this university for my entire academic career.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Often, I find it difficult to agree with this university’s policies on important matters relating to its students.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I really care about the fate of this university.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 For me this is the best of all possible universities to attend.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Deciding to attend this university was a definite mistake on my part.
Professional Commitment Questionnaire (PCQ)

The following statements refer to one’s feelings regarding their status as a member of a particular profession (e.g., doctor, nurse, firefighter). Please read each statement and indicate your level of agreement using the following scale.

<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>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither A or D</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this profession be successful.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I talk up this profession to my friends as a great profession to work in.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I feel very little loyalty to this profession.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working in this profession.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I find that my values and the profession’s values are very similar.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am proud to tell others that I am part of this profession.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I could just as well be working in a different profession as long as the type of work was similar.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 This profession really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this profession.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am extremely glad that I chose this profession to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 There’s not too much to be gained by sticking with this profession indefinitely.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Often, I find it difficult to agree with this professions policies on important matters relating to its employees.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I really care about the fate of this profession.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 For me this is the best of all possible professions in which to work.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Deciding to work for this profession was a definite mistake on my part.
Academic Commitment Questionnaire (ACQ)

The following statements refer to one’s feelings regarding their status as a student, specifically, their membership in a major or program. Please read each statement and indicate your level of agreement using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither A or D</td>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this major be successful.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I talk up this major to my friends as a great major to have.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I feel very little loyalty to this major.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I would accept almost any type of course-work in order to remain in this major.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I find that my values and the values associated with this major are very similar.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am proud to tell others my major.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I could just as well have another major as long as the type of classes were similar.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 This major really inspires the very best in me in the way of academic performance.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to change majors.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am extremely glad that I chose this major over others I was considering at the time.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 There’s not too much to be gained by sticking with this major indefinitely.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Often, I find it difficult to agree with this major’s policies on important matters relating to its students.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I really care about the fate of this major.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 For me this is the best of all possible majors to pursue.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Deciding to pursue this major was a definite mistake on my part.

Turnover Intentions
(Jaros, 1997)

Considering your current organization, please use the scales below to rate your opinion about each statement. For each statement, indicate your answer by clicking on the appropriate circle.

1. How often do you think about leaving your organization?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always

2. How likely are you to search for a position with another employer in the next year?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Definitely Probably Not Probably Definitely
   Will Not Will Not Sure Will Will

3. How likely are you to leave the organization in the next year?
   1 2 3 4 5
   Definitely Probably Not Probably Definitely
   Will Not Will Not Sure Will Will

**Absenteeism**

How many days have you been absent from work in the last 12 months? __________

What would you cite as the most common reasons for which you generally must miss work? Please check all that apply.

- Sickness/Medical reasons
- Family-related reasons
- School-related reasons (Class attendance, homework assignments, etc.)
- Work-related reasons (Conflict with coworkers, unhappy with job, etc.)
- Transportation
- Not applicable, I haven’t missed work in the last 12 months
- Other
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