

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a review of the literature that is relevant to the present study. It begins with an overview of previous research on standard and non-standard work arrangements and the development of the concept of work status congruence. The chapter then discusses the issue of work-life balance, its relationship with non-standard or flexible work arrangements, and the development of the concept of satisfaction with work-life balance. This chapter also explains work-related attitudes, namely job satisfaction and affective commitment, and how these attitudes relate with work status congruence and work-life balance. This chapter also identifies the research gaps.

2.2 Standard and Non-Standard Work Arrangements

Human resource practices have developed tremendously in past decades due to the process of globalisation, technological advancement, and social improvements. Currently, work arrangements can be categorised into two types, namely standard and non-standard work arrangements. Standard work arrangements are traditional staffing practices involving the employment of permanent and full-time workers who are working in normal work schedules, shifts and hours (Feldman, 2006). Non-standard work arrangements are also known as flexible staffing or scheduling practices. They

comprise the employment of non-standard workers (i.e. part-time, contractual, or temporary), or the utilisation of non-standard work schedules (i.e. flexible work schedule, shift or hours) (Leschke, 2009).

Polivka and Nardone (1989, p.11) defined non-standard employment as "...any job in which individual does not have an explicit or implicit contract for long-term employment or one in which the minimum hours worked can vary in a non-systematic way". Non-standard work arrangements have been called differently in prior studies although they basically have a similar meaning: contingent work (Polivka & Nardone, 1989; Feldman, 2004), or flexible work, or staffing/scheduling options, or arrangements (Kalleberg, Reynolds, & Marsden, 2003; Feldman, 2006; Fleetwood, 2007; Zeytinoglu et al., 2011), or alternative working arrangements (Walsh & Deery, 1999), or market-mediated working arrangements (Walker, 2011). In contrast, standard workers are permanent and full-time workers; also referred to in some studies as regular, traditional, classic or core employees with an ongoing and open-ended employment relationship (Conway & Briner, 2001).

Walker (2011), who conducted a review about non-standard employment in New Zealand, found that non-standard employment studies have been hampered by the absence of universally accepted vocabulary and definition, which was mostly decided in terms of non-standard employment's notion of absent continuity or permanency with limited duration or a fixed termination date. However, as described by Feldman (2006), non-standard employment entails non-permanent posts with any one employer or client and consists of a limited period of service either by contract or a specific task or project.

Hence, non-standard workers are other than permanent full-time workers such as part-timers, contract workers, or temporary workers; they are also referred to in some studies as contingent, casual, occasional, seasonal, periphery, atypical, irregular, unorthodox, special, externalised, non-traditional, leased or home-based workers (Cooke, Zeytinoglu, & Mann, 2009; Gallagher & Sverke, 2005; Gallagher & Parks, 2001). Non-standard employees do not necessarily work at the employers' workplace, and can be positioned at a range of sites, can be 'market mediated' through employment intermediaries (as temporary help) or employment agencies (Walker, 2011).

Demographically, standard employees and non-standard employees were found to be different; most obviously, in the terms of their employment contract. Standard employees are in a permanent, continuous, and open ended relationship while non-standard workers are in a flexible, temporary, or closed-ended contract (Barnett & Hall, 2001). In terms of work schedule, both standard and non-standard employees may work on a fixed or flexible schedule, shift and hours (Feldman, 2002). However, non-standard workers such as part-timers, temporary, and contract workers are mostly employed for flexible or alternative work schedules (flexitime, night or weekend shifts, or shorter hours) (Feldman, 2006). Consequently, in this study non-standard employment is defined as any flexible work arrangement that does not include permanent full-time status and/or support a normal working schedule.

Non-standard employment was once mainly utilised in services and manufacturing industries, and normally dominated by lower level employees, however nowadays they have been extensively employed in all kinds of industries (Feldman 2006). Due to current fluctuating economic conditions, the majority of non-standard employees were believed to consist of workers that would rather not work on non-standard employment

but having to accept such arrangements due to unavailable alternative options, in order to make ends meet or while waiting for job openings that are more compatible with their education and experience (Wittmer & Martin, 2011). Table 2.1 summarises the characteristics of standard and non-standard work arrangements.

Table 2.1

Characteristics of Standard and Non-Standard Work Arrangements

Standard Work Arrangements	Non-Standard Work Arrangements
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traditional staffing practices • employment of permanent and full-time workers who are working in normal work schedules, shifts and hours (Feldman, 2006) • also referred to in some studies as regular, traditional, classic or core employees with an continuous and open-ended employment relationship (Conway & Briner, 2001). • in terms of work schedule, both standard and non-standard employees may work on a fixed or flexible schedule, shift and hours (Feldman, 2002) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • flexible staffing or scheduling practices • employment of non-standard workers (i.e. part-time, contractual, or temporary), or the utilisation of non-standard work schedules (i.e. flexible work schedule, shift or hours) (Leschke, 2009). • absence of universally accepted vocabulary and definition, (which) was mostly decided in terms of non-standard employment's notion of absent continuity or permanency with limited duration or a fixed termination date (Walker, 2011) • entails non-permanent posts with any one employer or client and consists of a limited period of service either by contract or a specific task or project (Feldman, 2006) • any job in which the individual does not have an explicit or implicit contract for long-term employment or one in which the minimum hours worked can vary in a non-systematic way (Polivka & Nardone, 1989) • non-standard employment also referred to in some studies as contingent work (Polivka & Nardone, 1989; Feldman, 2004), or flexible work, or staffing/scheduling options, or arrangements (Kalleberg et al., 2003; Feldman, 2006; Fleetwood, 2007; Zeytinoglu et al., 2011), or alternative working arrangements (Walsh & Deery, 1999), or market-mediated working arrangements (Walker, 2011) • non-standard workers also referred to in some studies as contingent, casual, occasional, seasonal, periphery, atypical, irregular, unorthodox, special, externalised, non-traditional, leased or home-based workers (Cooke et al., 2009; Gallagher & Sverke, 2005; Gallagher & Parks, 2001) • can be 'market mediated' through employment intermediaries (as temporary help) or employment agencies (Walker, 2011) • mostly employed for flexible or alternative work schedules (flexitime, night or weekend shifts, or shorter hours) (Feldman, 2006)

In the early 1990s, non-standard employees normally worked for a single organisation or one employment agency. However, the situation is now different for many non-standard employees as they are independently working on their own (self employed) for multiple organisations or agencies (Kalleberg et al., 2003). In addition, many non-standard work arrangements are also gaining popularity among skilled workers such as professionals, technicians, managers, executives, and even consultants (Feldman, 2006).

Since the main focus of this study pertains to identifying the effects of work status congruence (which was a concept derived from non-standard employment) towards employees' work-life balance and work-related attitudes, it is necessary to review the literature of non-standard employment and the relevant studies that have been done in this field. The following sub-sections review the development of non-standard employment, its dimensions, typology, and theoretical background, as well as the development of the concept of work status congruence.

2.2.1 Development of Non-Standard Work Arrangements

There are numerous factors that contribute towards the development of non-standard work arrangements. These factors may be divided into organisational and social viewpoints. From the organisational angle, economic downturns and increased global competition have made businesses more sensitive or cautious in their staffing costs. One of the methods to reduce costs is to employ non-standard employees in order to maximise efficiency while enlisting lower payroll, compensation and benefits. This is because non-standard employees such as part-timers, temporary and contract workers normally enjoy lower wages and limited number of fringe benefits such as health insurance and pensions (Kalleberg et al., 2003). Hence, organisations prefer to employ

non-standard employees to lower their budget for staffing in terms of recruitment, hiring, selection, and administration e.g. utilising less paperwork for conforming to government regulations (McKeown & Hanley, 2009).

Further, variations or fluctuations of consumer demands throughout certain seasonal periods or certain spreads over non-standard hours of the day, as well as the introduction of innovative technology and revolutions in employment legislation have enabled companies to employ in a non-standard manner (Liu et al., 2011). In order to ensure businesses like sales and services remain intact at various times of the day and season (such as during low and peak), and in various locations, non-standard workers are preferred due to their schedule flexibility in order to adjust staffing and workload levels (Chang & Liao, 2009).

Walker (2011) found that companies took advantage of the nature of non-standard employment and offer such employment to conveniently hire and legally fire employees faster in an uncertain business environment in order to match the required number of employees at the required times, as well as to screen potential permanent employees (e.g. “temp-to-perm” arrangements) who had been observed as the best productive employees when performing their non-standard employment. Moreover, non-standard employment benefit organisations as it prevents permanent employees from total job loss, supplies the necessary support for out of the ordinary projects such as corporate restructuring or mergers, and stands-in for momentarily absent standard employees (Lepak, Takeuchi, & Snell, 2003; Houseman, 2001).

Marler, Barringer, and Milkovich (2002) explained that the increasing number of intermediary agencies, such as temporary help services, has made non-standard workers more attractive and promote outsourcing efficiencies and flexibility to both organisations and employees. In the case of shortages of skills in an organisation, the organisation can utilise non-standard work arrangements in terms of part-timers or temporary workers to solicit the required skills and competencies that were in short supply of certain occupations, hence externalising their employment relationship (Maynard et al., 2006).

From the social point of view, non-standard work arrangements are blooming due to increased participation of women in the workforce (Higgins et al., 2000). Non-standard employment is perceived as a solution to provide autonomy to women workers to balance attention to their families through shorter work hours or irregular work schedules and shifts (Feldman & Turnley, 2004). In addition, Barnett and Gareis (2002) stated that, “Evidence suggests that the flexibility associated with part-time work may reduce negative home-to-work spill-over, a mechanism by which problems at home affect employees' functioning on the job” (p. 138).

Therefore, flexibility is one of the vital factors in work arrangements which non-standard employees require, allowing them to balance between the needs of their work and non-work lives such as education, domestic errands, travel, and leisure (Felfe et al., 2008). In other words, non-standard employment helps employees with skills and experiences who were for certain reasons unwilling to work on full-time and permanent basis, and at the same time it provides employees with autonomy, flexibility, freedom, mobility, variation, and more control over balance between work and out-of-work responsibilities, demands, or interests, although there were certain trade-off in terms of

inferior remuneration and career prospects (Walker, 2011; Martin & Sinclair, 2007; Senter & Martin, 2007; Rosendaal, 2003; Ellingson, Gruys, & Sackett, 1998).

2.2.2 Advantages of Non-Standard Work Arrangements

Leschke (2009) researched on non-standard employees (i.e. temporaries, part-timers, and casual employees) of four countries; namely Denmark, Germany, the United Kingdom, and Spain, and found that many temporary workers (especially in Spain), were exiting employment. Nevertheless, many non-standard employees especially part-time workers as compared to full-time workers, were enjoying the benefit of having more opportunities to handle household care. This applied too in Spain and Denmark where part-time employees are not customarily used to balance work with family activities. Additionally, in Denmark and Germany, non-standard employees such as regular part-timers were protected by law similar to standard employees in terms of discharge or exit to unemployment.

Non-standard employment provides important career opportunities or a testing ground for certain groups of peoples to get the feeling of the real or current employment atmosphere, such as for the younger group of people who are new entrants to the employment world, or for the older generation who are retirees but would like to re-enter the job market (Leschke, 2009). These groups of workers take non-standard employment to develop new work skills and obtain income and variability as well as to stay active in employment (Feldman, 2006; Miller & Terborg, 1979). Thus, non-standard employment enlarges prospects to labour and provide avenues to people who would otherwise stay out of the workforce if not for such flexibility. Consequently, non-

standard employment can also increase the amount and selection of occupational options for workers at diverse phases of their professional or family cycles.

Additionally, some non-standard workers may see such arrangements as transitional solutions to help them in limited standard employments, as to provide supplementary income, or to support their dual-career desires (Torka & Schyns, 2007). Moreover, Marler et al. (2002) elaborated that non-standard employment could also enhance the employees' value in the labour market by allowing them to hold jobs with multiple companies, hence enabling them to accumulate diverse patterns of knowledge and skills, and enlarged scope of talents valued by many organisations.

Thus non-standard employment provides employees with career control and development, and a better balance between career and other non-work demands. Furthermore, Kirkpatrick and Hoque (2006), in their qualitative study among United Kingdom social workers, found that non-standard employees were attracted to such work arrangements because of the increased pay, and the ability to control work assignments and non-work commitments, as well as the 'transient phenomenon' before moving to standard employment.

2.2.3 Disadvantages of Non-Standard Work Arrangements

Nevertheless, non-standard work arrangements may also have negative effects on both organisations and employees. Polivka and Nardone (1989) suggested that, contingent workers may lack loyalty and motivation which can have an impact on the company's productivity and product quality, as well as affecting the commitment of standard employees (McKeown & Hanley, 2009). Non-standard workers may also be less

receptive to teamwork and lacking certain skills and abilities to be reassigned to other roles if needed (Walker, 2011). Thus, non-standard employees' weaker teamwork spirit and non-multi skills may hinder the business' hunt for learning and for developing the organisation (Connelly & Gallagher, 2004). Additionally, Senter and Martin (2007) believed that non-standard employees have lower commitment, higher turnover, and lower performance, compared to that of standard employees.

This was supported in the study by Stavrou et al. (2010) which reported that the 2003 to 2004 Cranet survey [the Cranet survey was the largest co-ordinated worldwide human resource management survey conducted by business school residents among highest-ranking corporate officers in charge of organisational human resource management in each Cranet-member countries (i.e. United Kingdom, France, Italy, Slovakia, the Netherlands, Greece, Cyprus, Estonia, Spain, Slovenia, Germany, Sweden, Finland, Austria, the Czech Republic, Belgium, Denmark, Australia, New Zealand, United States, and Canada)] found that responses from 2,337 private and public organisations suggested that non-standard work arrangements including weekend work, shift-work and part-time work should not be used frequently by organisations as they may be employee-hostile and possibly reduce employee commitment and loyalty.

In terms of the negative impact of non-standard employment towards individual employees, non-standard employees must sustain lower wages, fewer fringe benefits and entitlements, irregular work schedules, poorer job security and quality, lack of desirable task variety, nerve-racking overwork or underwork, inferior law protection, limited promotion and career advancements, exclusions from decision making, and are offered lesser training opportunities as compared to their standard counterparts (Giannikis & Mihail, 2011; Green & Heywood, 2011; McKeown & Hanley, 2009).

Hence, they may enjoy lower job satisfaction and well-being (Martin & Sinclair, 2007; Leschke, 2009). Alach and Inkson (2004) and Beard and Edwards (1995) also discovered that non-standard employees experienced problems of communication with the other standard employees as well as with the organisations they were working with. They were considered as outsiders and deprived of social experience in the workplace and faced stability issues in workplace relationships.

However, some of the non-standard employees were 'economic refugees' who were unable to find standard employment, hence, had no choice but to opt for this form of employment involuntarily as there were limited employment prospects provided by organisations because of dawdling fiscal scenario or due to high unemployment rate (Walker, 2011; Thorsteinson, 2003). Furthermore, Alach and Inkson (2004) also discovered that many non-standard employees that stayed too long in non-standard employment suffered adverse effects in terms of their marketability, professional development, and future employability.

Nevertheless, Feldman and Turnley (2004) found that advantages and disadvantages of non-standard employment were relative to individuals across the lifespan. For example, although the inability to get standard employment among young graduates might be seen as major detriment, but there were some who perceived it positively. Similarly, for late career individuals, non-standard employment might be seen as a switch mechanism for stirring progressively from full-time employment to full-time retirement. Hence, Feldman and Turnley (2004) suggested that strategies to manage non-standard employees could vary according to their career and life stages. Moore (2007) in her ethnographic study about the effects of flexible work arrangements among German automobile factory workers supported Feldman and Turnley's (2004) contention that

individuals were unique, hence perceived advantages or disadvantages of non-standard employment differently based on their own circumstances.

2.2.4 Typology and Dimensions of Non-Standard Work Arrangements

The studies of non-standard work arrangements have evolved since the 1970s in accordance with the evolution of women's participation in the labour market and the advancement of human resource practices. Furthermore, structural transformation on industrial and employment environments as well as a shift in economy and fluctuation in consumer demands have enabled varying and more flexible jobs to be offered to greater diverse groups of employees. Hence, studies have been conducted to better understand the effects of such developments towards organisations and employees.

Nonetheless, the early studies on non-standard work arrangements were mostly conducted bivariately to identify the effects of part-time and contract or temporary employments (also known as contingent or periphery) towards employees and organisations in comparison with standard employees. There were few studies on non-standard work arrangements that combine multiple non-standard workers i.e. part-time, temporary and contract workers in single studies (e.g. Lee & Johnson, 1991; Walsh & Deery, 1999; Kalleberg et al., 2003; Feldman, 2006; Cooke et al., 2009; Leschke, 2009). There were also few non-standard work studies that conducted surveys and compared part-time or temporary workers with other standard employees or among their subgroups (e.g. Martin & Sinclair, 2007; Zeytinoglu et al., 2011; Stavrou et al., 2010; Felfe et al, 2008; Gavino, Martinez, & Malos, 2010).

Before the 1990s, most non-standard work arrangement studies were mainly concentrated towards part-time employment only and mostly were operationalised as direct comparisons among two dichotomous groups of full-time and part-time labour. Among the earliest studies of comparing full-time and part-time employees were Hall and Gordon (1973) and Logan, O'Reilly, and Roberts (1973). Hall and Gordon (1973) studied the career choices of 229 married women, widowed, or divorced mothers in the United States, involved as housewives, full-time or part-time workers. The study discovered that full-time women workers were more satisfied with their careers as compared to part-timers and housewives, and sustained less home conflicts than part-timers.

Logan et al.'s (1973) study was the earliest to theoretically acknowledge that job satisfaction among standard or non-standard employees was based on their frames of references. They found that part-time workers were more satisfied with their jobs than full-timers due to different frame of reference by part-timers. The part-timers viewed their jobs in relation to what they anticipated to have in other part-time jobs instead of comparing to other full-time jobs which provided better benefits as their frame of reference that could cause dissatisfaction to them. Hence, the part-timers' lower expectations than their full-time counterparts have made them easily satisfied.

However, Miller and Terborg (1979) who compared job attitudes between full-timers and part-timers found that part-time employees were less satisfied with work, its benefits, and the job in general after taking into account differences in sex and tenure. They had utilised the theory of partial inclusion by Katz and Kahn (1978) to rationalise their findings since most part-timers might be less included in their organisations that made them less satisfied with their jobs as compared to full-time employees.

On the contrary, Eberhardt and Shani's (1984) study supported the frame of reference theory as applied before by Logan et al. (1973) and found that part-time employees had higher levels of overall job satisfaction and more favourable attitudes towards organisational structure, policies, reward systems, power distribution, and level of trust among organisational members as compared to full-time employees. In addition, they had also rationalised their findings based on the partial inclusion theory by Katz and Kahn (1978); they opine differently as compared to Miller and Terborg's (1979) study by suggesting that feeling less included in organisation has made part-timers less exposed from the negative influence of the organisations they were working with, hence contributing towards their better job satisfaction and attitudes.

Nevertheless, Still (1983) who conducted a longitudinal study of full-time and part-time retail sales person in United States discovered no differences in terms of organisational commitment among the two groups. However, Steffy and Jones (1990) comparing work dissatisfaction, job tension, role load pressures, and role ambiguity among 8,640 subjects found that part-time employees experienced more role strain and were more dissatisfied with their pay and co-workers as compared to their full-time counterparts, but no significant differences were found in work satisfaction. In Canada, Levanoni and Sales' (1990) found that part-timers reported higher levels of satisfaction about their job's social context and with their supervisors than did full-time employees even after controlling for sex profiles, but there were no significant differences between the two groups with regard to pay satisfaction and overall job satisfaction.

Rotchford and Roberts (1982) made a review about part-time employment and found that part-timers were mostly women, young, or old people. There were managers who would employ part-time workers because of the low absenteeism and higher productivity as compared to full-time employees, while some other managers detest part-time employment because of high absenteeism and low productivity. Based on the conflicting results of managers' perceptions towards part-time employment as well as incoherent results of prior studies comparing part-time and full-time employees, Rotchford and Roberts (1982) suggested that, in order to better understand the different responses about full-timers or part-timers, there was a need to include salient factors differentiating both employment arrangements, such as demographic distinctiveness, work hours, prospects of employment alternatives, and the managements' support.

2.2.4.1 Heterogeneity and Subgroup Typology of Part-Time Employees

Rotchford and Roberts' (1982) suggestion to differentiate the groups of part-time employees had shed light for better understanding of non-standard employees that perceived as not homogenous in later studies following their review. Hom (1979) differentiated part-time employees based on their working hours since some of them were working less than six hours a week while some others were working almost 40 hours a week. Such diversity could differently affect their job satisfaction. Hence, Hom segregated his respondents (from a large merchandising organisation) into sixteen groups according to their range of work hours per week. He found that the different groups of part-timers showed different levels of job satisfaction, and especially found that part-timers who were steadily employed were more satisfied than those who were working for short or seasonal periods. However, when the co-variations between demographic and attitudinal variables were statistically controlled, there was no

significant relationship found between participation in the part-time employment and job attitudes.

However, Jackofsky and Peters (1987) who compared 'regular' part-time workers who were working on standard work schedules (i.e. normal work hours), with 'irregular' part-timers who were working on non-standard work schedules (i.e. evening shift, weekends, holidays, and on-call), found that irregular part-time workers were more satisfied in terms of their overall job, work, pay, and co-workers as compared to regular part-timers and full-timers, as well as had less intention to quit than full-time employees, although they experienced more work/non-work schedule conflicts than the regular part-timers. They rationalised their findings according to partial inclusion theory (Katz & Kahn, 1978) thus corroborating Eberhardt and Shani's (1984) study by suggesting that feeling less included in an organisation has made irregular part-timers to be less exposed to negative influence from the organisation, hence making them more satisfied than regular part-time and less wanting to leave the organisation as compared to full-time employees.

The heterogeneity among non-standard employees especially in part-time employment was elaborated by Feldman (1990) who found that part-time workers were mostly females, younger, and older peoples employed in the services industry. Based on that, he suggested five-typology of part-time employees: i.e. permanent/temporary, organisation hired/agency hired, year-round/seasonal, main job/second job (moonlighting), and voluntary/involuntary subgroups that value flexibility and work hours differently among the different subgroups. In the same study, he proposed that part-time working arrangements will have a huge impact on the employees' quality of life, while at the same time pertinent to job satisfaction.

Applying the frame of reference theory by Logan et al. (1973) that could influence job attitudes differently, Feldman (1990) proposed that certain group of part-timers such as part-timers that were permanent, organisation hired, or moonlighting may use other full-time employees as their frame of reference but other groups of part-timers such as temporary and agency-hired may use other part-time employees as their frame of reference. Feldman also suggested that bivariate comparisons between full-time and part-time were not adequate hence required investigations of more complex sets of relationships that were theoretically and methodologically more sophisticated. Unfortunately, Feldman did not empirically test his proposition in his 1990s study.

Only in 1992, Feldman in his study with Doerpinghaus tested his 1990s assertions in terms of permanent/temporary typology of part-time employment by conducting a survey of part-time employees, and found that permanent part-timers which mostly comprised of married working women with children were more positive in their work attitudes as compared with temporary part-timers who mostly were working students. However, they also found adverse results in terms of frame of reference, where permanent part-timers in their study were referring to other part-time employees instead of other full-timers, as hypothesised.

Sinclair, Martin, and Michel (1999) grouped part-time employees into four general classes based on their motives or reasons for joining such work arrangements: i.e. primaries, supplementers, moonlighters, and students. They also attributed the group differences based on frame of reference theory (Logan et al., 1973) and varying levels of engagements in the employment relationship. A primary is the only breadwinner of his or her family whose income is solely derived from the non-standard employment. A

supplementer is a person who provides additional income for his or her family, such as the wife whose husband is the breadwinner of her family, or vice versa. A moonlighter is a person whom is working in non-standard employment while still holding another job elsewhere, maybe as a full-time worker in another company. A student is an individual who is working in non-standard employment to get additional income to support his or her study.

Sinclair et al. (1999) compared differences between full-time and all subgroup of part-time employees, in terms of organisational commitment, and the results showed that full-timers were significantly less committed than all groups of part-timers, excluding the students. Whereas among the subgroups, supplementers were the highest, followed by primaries, moonlighters, and lastly students. In terms of job satisfaction, full-timers were also less satisfied than supplementers and primaries, and among the part-timer subgroups, the supplementers were most satisfied, followed by primaries and students. When assessing the perceptions of quality of alternatives, moonlighters and students were found to perceive better employment alternatives than the full-timers, and the primaries and supplementers. Full-timers however, perceived a better labour-management relations climate, although they had more grievances than all four subgroups of part-timers.

However, the Sinclair et al.'s (1999) four classes of part-timers have been revised by Martin and Sinclair (2007), who further expanded the typology of part-time employees into eight different subgroups : primaries, older married supplementers, younger married supplementers, single supplementers, high school students, college or university students, part-time moonlighters, and full-time moonlighters. Drawing upon partial inclusion (Katz & Kahn, 1979) and frame of reference (Logan et al., 1973) theories,

Martin and Sinclair (2007) found that all eight subgroups of part-timers had higher job satisfactions, affective commitments, and turnover rates, as compared to full-timers except for college students, who were lower in job satisfaction than full-time employees. Their findings hence supported Eberhardt and Shani's (1984) proposition that part-time employees' limited exposure to the organisation influence better work attitudes.

Among the subgroups of part-time workers, Martin and Sinclair (2007) found that single supplementers enjoyed the most job satisfaction, followed by older married supplementers, primaries, full-time moonlighters, younger married supplementers, high school students, part-time moonlighters, and lastly college students. In terms of affective commitment, single supplementers were also the highest, followed by high school students, primaries, older married supplementers, full-time moonlighters, younger married supplementers, part-time moonlighters, and lastly also college students. The turnover rate among high school students were the highest, followed by college students, full-time moonlighters, single supplementers, part-time moonlighters, younger married supplementers, primaries, and lastly older married supplementers.

As similarly done by Martin and Sinclair (2007), Senter and Martin (2007) also conducted a study on the effects of job attitudes towards turnover intentions among eight subgroups of part-time employees. They found that segregation of part-time employees enhance the knowledge about antecedents of their turnover. In addition, Senter and Martin (2007) did not find any significant differences in predicting turnover caused by job satisfaction, affective commitment, or work alternatives among two combined subgroups of 'flexible' part-timers (i.e. primaries and supplementers) and 'fixed' part-timers (i.e. moonlighters and students).

Senter and Martin (2007) distinguished flexible and fixed part-timers based on the employees' non-work roles. Fixed part-timers were assumed to feel less included or psychologically less involved in the organisation they were working since they were more attached towards the other organisations they also attached, to such as their school, college or other employer (moonlighting). Therefore, Senter and Martin's (2007) study did not support the partial inclusion theory (Katz & Kahn, 1978) as applied in Sinclair et al.'s (1999) and Eberhardt and Shani's (1984) studies that presumed employees who were less included in the organisation were better in terms of their work attitudes and behaviours.

2.2.4.2 Heterogeneity and Subgroup Typology of Temporary Employees

This sub-section explains the previous studies of non-standard work arrangements that examine temporary workers (also referred to as contingent, periphery, or contract employees). These studies were conducted to find differences among the temporaries subgroups (i.e. not combined with part-time employees), or in comparison with other standard employees (also known as permanent, regular, traditional, typical, classic, or core). One of the earliest studies examining temporary workers was conducted by Pearce (1993). He found that there were no significant differences in terms of organisational commitment and co-cooperativeness between permanent and temporary employees. Pearce further discovered that temporary workers were engaged in more extra role behaviours, while, permanent employees reported lower trust in the organisation when they worked with temporary employees.

Feldman, who initially studied part-time employees in 1990 and 1992, had extended the similar typology of part-timers to temporary employees in his qualitative studies with Doeringhaus and Turnley in 1994. Feldman et al.'s (1994) study had deepened the understanding on diversity of temporary employees by grouping them into four subgroups based on their motives or reasons for joining such work arrangements: i.e. working mothers who need to balance financial and personal demands and to re-enter the labour market, college students who wanted to earn extra income while studying, peripheral workers who were older workers in early retirement wanting to socialise while earning money out of home, and the short-run unemployed who had been discharged from work or not able to find permanent employment. Feldman et al. (1994) also highlighted that all temporary workers were concerned about support from their managements, job security, fringe benefits, job assignments, and perceived under-employment.

On the other hand, Gallagher and Parks (2001) who reviewed temporary employment through their conceptual paper suggested three subgroups of temporary employees; i.e. temporary workers who were directly hired by the company (in-house), temporary workers who were hired through temporary help service companies or agencies, and temporary workers who were independent or self-employed contractors. They also proposed that the commitment for temporary employees were different from their permanent counterparts as well as different among their subgroups. In addition, the commitment among these groups of temporary workers might also be differentiated by various foci of commitment i.e. organisational, job, occupational, or employment.

Unfortunately, Gallagher and Parks (2001) as well as Gallagher and Sverke (2005), both did not empirically test their proposition in terms of commitment among the three subgroups of temporary employees. However, the Gallagher and Parks' (2001) and Gallagher and Sverke's (2005) proposition of the three foci of commitment i.e. organisational, occupational, and employment, was tested by Felfe et al. (2008). Felfe et al. found that permanent employees and self-employed contractors were more committed in terms of all foci and components of organisational, and occupational employment as compared to agency-hired temporaries, but permanent employees were less committed than self-employed contractors in terms of affective and normative organisational commitment, affective occupational commitment, and affective and normative employment commitment.

Felfe et al. (2008) also found that only affective occupational and affective employment commitment positively predicted organisational citizenship behaviour. In addition, Hall (2006) studied subgroups of Australian temporary employees i.e. between temporaries hired through employment intermediaries or temporary help agency, and temporaries directly hired by organisations. He found that agency-hired temporaries were less satisfied with their pay, level of flexibility, job security, skill utilisation and development, and autonomy and influence at work, as compared with temporaries hired directly by an organisation.

Nevertheless, there were some recent studies still conducted by way of bivariate comparison among temporary and permanent employees. For example, Han et al.'s (2009) study among nurses in Korea found that permanent nurses experienced higher levels of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and empowerment than did temporary nurses. On the other hand, Gavino et al. (2010) found that affective

organisational commitment was partially mediated between the relationships of favourable human resource practices (i.e. selection, training, compensation, and operations manager interactions) and commitment to customer.

2.2.4.3 Typology in Studies Combining Both Part-Time and Temporary Employees

The typology and dimensions of non-standard employees were also confirmed in studies combining both part-time and temporary or contract employees. Kalleberg et al. (2003) in their descriptive study about flexible staffing arrangements using a national survey of 1002 organisations in the United States found that non-standard employees can be grouped into three main categories (i.e. solely part-time, full-time or part-time temporary, and full-time or part-time contract employees), and each group can be hired directly by an organisation or through an employment intermediary or agency, on permanent, seasonal, or on-call basis, for work that was on-site or off-site from the organisation. They also found that each group of non-standard employees could provide special skills for organisations to meet various work demands and to simplify administrative tasks.

The non-homogenous characteristics of non-standard employees were also stressed by Feldman's (2006) review of a 15-year study on both part-time and temporary employees. Although no empirical evidence was provided in Feldman's (2006) study, he proposed that there are three dimensions of non-standard employments i.e. time, space, and number/kind of employers. In terms of time, non-standard employees differ based on number of hours worked per week, continuity of employment, synchronicity of hours worked, year-round or seasonal work, and aspirations of future employment. This indicated that non-standard employees vary in period of their services, hours worked,

their schedules, and their potential of conversion to standard employment. In terms of space, Feldman (2006) suggested that non-standard employees are differentiated at the place they are working; i.e. whether in a common workplace or at diverse worksite, whether working alongside standard employees or other non-standard employees, whether their company consists primarily of non-standard or standard employees, whether the means of communication in their organisation is virtual or face to face, and whether they were working for the same company or multiple companies. In terms of number/kind of employers, Feldman (2006) established that non-standard employees could be self-employed, directly hired by the company or through an agency (i.e. temporary help services), and whether they work for simultaneous or sequential employers.

Feldman (2006) anticipated that non-standard employment's instrumentality or motivation may vary across different groups of non-standard employees throughout their career span. For example, high school students would not value their non-standard employment since it can affect their academic achievement. While, college or university students value participation in non-standard employment as it assists them in realising their career interests and in enhancing their marketability upon graduation. For recent graduates, non-standard employment may be perceived as low market worth to impending employers, but for middle-aged women wanting to re-enter the employment market, such working arrangements may indicate an allegiance to resume their careers.

Feldman (2006) also proposed that middle-aged men may often perceive non-standard employment as a sign of rejection in the labour market, whereas for late-career individuals who try to bridge employment may often recognise non-standard working arrangements as a hint of soaring marketplace significance. Apart from broadening the

definition of non-standard employment by proposing much wider dimensions, Feldman's (2006) review confirmed that job satisfaction, job involvement, and organisational commitment were mostly studied as the outcome variables of the differences between standard and non-standard workers, and of the differences among the different subgroups of non-standard employees.

Additionally, Cooke et al. (2009) studied both part-time workers and temporary weekend workers in Canada, and found that the temporary weekend workers were those who wanted to balance between their work and family or leisure needs, and were normally younger or older employees who were unable to engage in a standard work arrangement. Their study also found that low-waged young workers were very satisfied with their weekend-based short workweek job. Further, the group of older and married women exhibited high job satisfaction notwithstanding having a weekend-based short workweek. Both groups' higher satisfaction indicated that they were enjoying balance between their work, economic, and family obligations, even though faced with a trade-off of something as unusual as a weekend-based short workweek.

2.2.5 Voluntariness of Preferences for Non-Standard Work Arrangements

Most of post 1990s non-standard employment studies (i.e. part-time, temporary or both) had acknowledged the non-homogeneous or heterogeneity among its various typology and dimensions. However, the studies were mostly conducted by directly segregating the non-standard employees into different dichotomous subgroups, according to their similar demographic or staffing and scheduling profiles, or according to their various reasons or motives in choosing such work arrangements (e.g. Cooke et al., 2009; Martin & Sinclair, 2007; Felfe et al., 2008).

Hence, to streamline understanding in terms of the effects of non-standard employment towards employees' work-related attitudes, some researchers have proposed the psychological notion of voluntariness of preferences for joining such work arrangements as the determining factor. This conception of voluntariness is proposed to align the complex variety of demographic profile and participation or the motives among non-standard employees. However, most of the studies of voluntariness of non-standard employees were initially conducted separately between part-time and full-time employees, or between temporary or contractual and permanent workers. Some exceptions were studies carried out by Lee and Johnson (1991), Walsh and Deery (1999), and Leschke (2009).

2.2.5.1 Voluntariness of Preferences for Part-Time Work Arrangements

Since the studies of non-standard work arrangements evolved originally from the study of part-time employment, the emphasis with voluntariness of preferences for such work arrangements were initially also focused among part-time employees before being extended to temporary or contractual labour. McGinnis and Morrow (1990) who found no differences in terms of job satisfaction and commitment suggested incorporating several factors such as the equalities of benefits and preferences of employees' work status to better understand the impact of part-time employment. They contended that "...operationalising full versus part-time employment solely in terms of the number of hours worked may be overly simplistic if we are to fully comprehend how and why part-timers differ from full-time employees" (p. 95).

Feldman (1990) in his conceptual studies of part-time employment in the United States suggested that part-time employees could be fully categorised into voluntary or involuntary part-timers based on their preferences for joining such work status. In Feldman's (1990) study, voluntary part-time employees were defined as workers who joined such work arrangements to pursue flexibility in order to find time to fulfil their household responsibilities such as taking care of children or elders, complementing income besides working other permanent full-time jobs (moonlighting), raising funds while studying, or continuing to be active after retirement. In other words, most of the voluntariness factors were directly related to the concern for career and work-life balance. Conversely, involuntary part-timers referred to the workers who had to join such work status due to the inability to find available desired standard employments that tally with their qualifications, or due to loss of jobs or work hours. Thus, the grounds for involuntary working on part-time basis converge around barriers to full-time service.

Steffy and Jones (1990) conducted a study among full-time and part-time employees and found that after controlling for sex, age, race and tenure, full-time workers were more satisfied in terms of pay and with their co-workers as compared with part-timers. However, there were no significant differences between them in terms of general job satisfaction and organisational commitment, despite conducting study within-organisation or across-organisation. Nevertheless, when voluntariness for part-time employment was considered, part-timers who work such arrangements voluntarily felt more satisfied than their involuntary counterparts.

Preferences and non-preferences for employment status symbolised as voluntary and involuntary by Feldman (1990) were further expanded by Tilly (1991) in his review of part-time employment in United States. Tilly (1991) classified part-time employees as

‘retention’ groups if they joined such work status voluntarily to gain a range of flexibilities such as control over their work conditions and lifestyles in order to take care of hobbies, leisure, families, children or elders while at the same time they get to enjoy similar work benefits, job security, high skilled jobs, and advancement opportunity as full-timers. Some may do so for other reasons such as skill development, supplementing another full-time job, earning money while attending school or as a transition to permanent work. Hence, part-time employees who are in the ‘retention’ groups may have job attitudes that are similar as their full-time counterparts.

Tilly (1991) referred to employees who involuntarily opted for part-time employment as ‘secondary’. They have no choice but to accept such work status due to the lack of availability of alternative prospects for standard employment or due to loss of work hours, health and mobility reasons. The ‘secondary’ part-timers had lower pay and benefits, inferior work schedules, low skilled and monotonous jobs, and high turnover as compared to full-time employees. Because of the inferior benefits and routine low skilled jobs, these part-timers may have more negative attitudes than full-time workers.

Nardone (1995) supplemented the study of voluntariness among part-time employees by examining the demographic comparisons between voluntary part-time workers and involuntary part-time workers using the Current Population Survey of 60,000 employees. He found that voluntary part-timers joined such work arrangements due to non-economic reasons, while involuntary part-timers were likely to be women and young workers who would rather work full-time, but still accepting such non-standard work status due to economic reasons. These involuntary part-timers mostly worked in the services industry, and were unable to get the work status they desired because of their lack of skills, and not because of unavailability of vacancy of the desired work.

However, Caputo and Cianni (2001) who examined the national survey among part-time women workers in the United States found that the majority of part-timers were characterised as involuntary as they were their family's sole income provider, and they were unemployed for a number of years prior to part-time work.

Maynard et al. (2006) had expanded the study of voluntariness among part-timers when they established four subgroups i.e. voluntary part-timers, involuntary part-timers, part-timers who were caretakers, and part-timers who were students. According to Maynard et al., the voluntariness or involuntariness of part-timers were because of availability or unavailability of full-time positions, Thus, caretakers and students were neither voluntary nor involuntary due to the fact that their reasons for choosing such work arrangements were not influenced by the availability of full-time works. By identifying sixteen reasons, and using cluster analysis and multiple analysis of variance, their study found that there were differences in terms of job satisfaction, organisational commitment and turnover intention between full-timers and part-timers as well as among the part-timers' subgroups.

Maynard et al. (2006) discovered students were similar to involuntary part-timers in terms of their attitudes. Both groups were having lesser job satisfaction, lesser affective commitment and more likely to leave the organisation as compared to caretakers and voluntary part-timers. Nevertheless, compared to involuntary part-timers, the part-timers who were students were more satisfied in terms of pay, supervisors and co-workers. Interestingly, voluntary part-timers were more satisfied in terms of work and people, more affectively committed, and had less turnover intention as compared to full-time workers. Caretakers were also more satisfied with their prospective promotions and supervisors, and more affectively and normatively committed than full-time employees.

The studies comparing the voluntariness of part-time employment were also replicated recently in many countries as well. For example, Boo et al. (2010) found that part-time work is much more common among women in Honduras, to allow them to combine paid work with other activities. However, their study also found that most women were working part-time involuntarily, not because of their choice, but rather due to lack of full-time employment. Hence, men and women working full-time were more satisfied at their work than women working part-time, and the association was stronger among men working full-time.

2.2.5.2 Voluntariness of Preferences for Temporary Work Arrangements

The study of voluntariness has also been conducted among other kinds of non-standard employees i.e. temporaries, and was conducted by Feldman et al. (1994) who extended Feldman's (1990) proposition of part-time employees' voluntariness affecting their work attitudes. Feldman et al. (1994) found that almost 77 per cent of their respondents reported involuntariness in joining such work arrangements. They also discovered that voluntary temporary employees were more satisfied with their jobs, salaries, lives, and agencies that they were working with, and more committed, as well as perceived more fairness of competition as compared with the involuntary temporary employees.

Later, in Feldman and Turnley's (1995) study among both low and high level temporary workers in seven temporary agencies in United States, they used six dichotomous items to differentiate temporary workers as either voluntary or involuntary. The results demonstrated that voluntary temporaries who were working their chosen work status, had jobs consistent with their qualifications, and were not trying to change their work

status from temporary to permanent. They were reported to have higher overall work, pay and life satisfaction as compared to involuntary temporaries. In the same year, Krausz, Brandwein, and Fox (1995) found that voluntary temporaries had higher overall satisfaction, intrinsic satisfaction (i.e. in terms of variety and challenge of work), and position and power satisfaction as compared to involuntary temporaries. Surprisingly, involuntary temporary employees were having higher extrinsic satisfaction (i.e. in terms of pay and benefits) than voluntary temporaries or even permanent employees.

Ellingson et al. (1998) had explored the effects of voluntariness of temporary employment towards their job satisfaction using a more complex measure distinguishing the voluntary and involuntary temporaries based on reasons for joining such work arrangements. The voluntary factor was represented by items such as sense of freedom, flexible hours, variety of work, and shorter work hours, while the involuntary factor consisted of loss of job, difficulty in finding permanent status, being laid off, and tight job market. Ellingson et al. (1998) found that although voluntary temporaries were more satisfied than involuntary temporaries, there was no significant relationship between voluntariness and satisfaction levels as well as performance.

Marler et al.'s (2002) findings indicated that although boundaryless temporaries perceived more job alternatives and expected higher wages as well as better satisfaction in terms of their jobs and pays as compared to traditional temporaries, there were no significant differences in terms of client commitment, co-operation, and citizenship behaviour. Interestingly, after controlling the level of work satisfaction, they found that traditional temporaries reported higher co-operation, and citizenship behaviour than boundaryless temporary labour. Their findings suggested that the traditional or

involuntary temporary may feel obliged to work better in the hope of getting a permanent job; while this was not the case for the boundaryless or voluntary type.

Marler et al.'s (2002) findings indicated that although boundaryless temporaries perceived more job alternatives and expected higher wages as well as better satisfaction in terms of their jobs and pays as compared to traditional temporaries, there were no significant differences in terms of client commitment, co-operation, and citizenship behaviour. Interestingly, after controlling level of work satisfaction, they found that traditional temporaries reported higher co-operation, and citizenship behaviour than boundaryless temporary labour. The findings suggested that the traditional or involuntary temporary may feel obliged to work better in the hope of getting a permanent job; while this was not the case for for the boundaryless or voluntary type.

De Jong and Schalk (2010) extended Marler et al.'s (2002) voluntariness study in the Netherlands. They separated the employees into three subgroups according to their motives or reasons for joining such work arrangements; i.e. 'autonomous' for temporaries who voluntarily opted for such work status to balance out-of-work commitment, 'stepping-stone' for temporaries who voluntarily chose such work status in order to obtain permanent jobs, and 'controlled' for temporaries who involuntarily decided on such work status due to unavailability of permanent jobs. Their study found that only 'stepping-stone' and 'controlled' temporaries were significantly different with their affective commitment, job satisfaction and intention to quit, while only controlled temporaries were significantly different in terms of trust and perceived performance.

2.2.5.3 Voluntariness of Preferences in Studies Combining Both Part-Time and Temporary Work Arrangements

On the other hand, there was a voluntariness study for non-standard employment combining both temporary and part-time employees in Japan by Bachmann (2009). The results indicated that non-standard employees, irrespective whether they were temporaries or part-timers, believed that the current economic conditions had forced organisations to offer more non-standard employment instead of the standard one. This increased the supply-driven instead of demand-driven scenario in labour market, which in turn created involuntary participation towards such work arrangements.

2.2.6 Congruent Preferences for Non-Standard Work Arrangements

As discussed in part 2.2.5, some studies of non-standard employment were conceptualised as voluntary or involuntary arrangement on the workers' preference or choice. However, the classifications are not absolute and they differ in the various studies. For example, the conventional voluntariness classification was indistinct in categorising an individual, since not all reasons for joining non-standard work arrangements could suit precisely into either the voluntary or involuntary category. For example, some researchers have argued that certain personal reasons such as taking care of one's family or other personal responsibilities like attending school, as involuntary (Nardone, 1995), while other researchers had classified them as voluntary (Feldman & Turnley, 1995; Tilly, 1991).

Further, according to Maynard et al. (2006), joining non-standard employment due to other non-work responsibilities may be perceived as voluntary or involuntary, depending on one's own unique career aims, life stage, and personal primacy and circumstances. Maynard et al. (2006) detached caretakers and students as neither voluntary nor involuntary. De Jong and Schalk (2010) had also separated their voluntary-involuntary groups into three parts of autonomous, stepping-stone, and controlled, in order to better analyse the effects of voluntariness apart from only two bivariate comparisons. Furthermore, there were inconsistent findings in voluntariness studies. Although many researchers found involuntary non-standard employees to have lower job satisfaction and affective commitment than their voluntary counterparts (e.g. Maynard et al., 2006), some researchers found no significant relationship between voluntariness and client commitment (Marler et al., 2002), as well as between voluntariness and satisfaction level (Ellingson et al., 1998).

Therefore, to overcome the difficulties in categorising multiple reasons and motivations for joining non-standard employment into voluntary or involuntary dimensions, recent researchers assessed the degree of congruency of employees' preferences for certain non-standard work arrangements. The initial study examining matched or congruent preferences for non-standard employment was conducted by Lee and Johnson (1991). Their study combining both standard (i.e. full-time and permanent) and non-standard (i.e. part-time and temporary) employees of United States National Park Service, found that no association was observed between congruent preferences for work status (i.e. permanent/ temporary) and work-related attitudes, i.e. job satisfaction and organisational commitment. However, when congruent preferences for work schedule (e.g. part-time, flexitime, irregular schedule, or rotating shift) were considered, there were positive associations between work status and organisational commitment (i.e.

full-time permanent employees were more committed than temporary employees when all were working their preferred schedule), although there was still no significant relationship between work status and job satisfaction.

Hence, Lee and Johnson's (1991) study have further extended the knowledge about employees' congruent preferences for standard or non-standard work status by also examining the effects of congruent preferences for work schedules (e.g. part-time, flexitime, irregular schedule, or rotating shift) towards employees' organisational commitment. They were also probably the only researchers who combined distinctions between permanent versus temporary employment status, and full-time versus part-time dimensions in a study of congruent preferences for work status and work schedules although the measurement used was purely dichotomous and non-continuous. Lee and Johnson's (1991) findings clearly demonstrated that the study of non-standard work arrangements which concentrated on preferences for work status alone (i.e. full-time, part-time, permanent, temporary, or contract) would not be adequate; instead preferences for work schedules were also vital.

Morrow, McElroy, and Elliott (1994) had conducted a similar study as Lee and Johnson (1991) that incorporated congruent preferences for both work status and work schedules, but operationalisation was done in full-time versus part-time employment. Their study was based on the theoretical underpinning of discrepancy model of job satisfaction (Lawler, 1973; Locke, 1969) that proposed when employees enjoyed "...the desired amounts of personally important job-related outcomes, they will exhibit high levels of job satisfaction" (p. 203). In other words, if the expected value of reward is matched or equal with the level of an employee's aspiration, he or she will be satisfied, and if there is a discrepancy, job dissatisfaction will result. Hence, Morrow et al. (1994)

anticipated that the more a worker accomplishes his or her needed job outcomes, the more he or she will embrace positive job attitudes and display optimistic job behaviours.

Morrow et al. (1994) also contended incoherent interpretation of theoretical framework of prior studies of non-standard work arrangements that utilised partial inclusion (Katz & Kahn, 1978) or frame of references (Logan et al., 1973), which usually were post-hoc to explain the higher or lesser favourable attitudes of non-standard employees as compared to their standard counterparts. Morrow et al.'s (1994) study found that after controlling for education and organisation tenure, part-time employment was significantly related to professional commitment and job involvement but not with job or scheduling satisfaction, whereas full-timers were more professionally committed and more involved with their jobs than part-time employees.

As with Lee and Johnson's (1991) study, when preferences for work schedules were considered, Morrow et al. (1994) found that employees who were working their preferred schedules and shifts demonstrated more favourable feelings in terms of their scheduling satisfaction, professional and organisational commitment, and intention to stay, but not with their job satisfaction. The insignificant relationship of job satisfaction in this study might be because of the simple operationalisation of preferences of work status and work schedule/shift as two dichotomous spectrums without considering the continuous psychological perception of such preferences, as well as the exclusion of permanent and temporary dimensions in Lee and Johnson's (1991) study.

A cross-cultural study about congruent preferences for work status and its effects towards employees' job attitudes were conducted by Armstrong-Stassen, Al-Ma'aitah, Cameron, and Horsburgh (1998) among Canadian and Jordanian nurses. However, their

study did not incorporate preferences for work schedule as per other congruency studies (e.g. Lee & Johnson, 1991; Morrow et al., 1994). They examined preferences for full-time or part-time employment by categorising the respondents into four groups according to their actual and preferred work status to determine the match or congruency of their work status: i.e. full-timers who preferred to work full-time, full-timers preferring to work part-time, part-timers preferring to work part-time, and part-timers preferring to work full-time.

Armstrong-Stassen et al. (1998) found that full-time and part-time employees of both countries did not differ in terms of their job satisfaction, and their turnover intention. However, when congruent preferences for work status were tested, Armstrong-Stassen et al.'s (1998) study found that Canadian full-time employees who preferred to work part-time were found to have lesser job satisfaction, higher emotional exhaustion, and more intention to leave the company as compared to part-time employees who preferred full-time status or other employees with congruent work status. Hence, Armstrong-Stassen et al.'s (1998) study indicated the importance of congruency between employees' actual and desired work status thus proving that studies comparing standard and non-standard employees should not focused on the actual work status alone.

Keil, Armstrong-Stasses, Cameron, and Horfsburgh (2000) replicated Armstrong-Stassen et al.'s (1998) study among Canadian nurses as well, but using two samples of part-time employees only (i.e., 204 and 251 respectively) without full-time sample. By categorising congruency of work status into two groups: i.e. part-timers who preferred part-time status and part-timers who preferred full-time status, their study found that there were no significant differences between part-time nurses with congruent and incongruent work status in terms of their overall job satisfaction, escape coping, and

turnover intention although part-timers with congruent work status were more satisfied with their financial rewards of their jobs, and part-timers with incongruent work status were more satisfied with their kind of work. However, Burke and Greenglass (2000) exhibited different results, where nurses with congruent work status had higher job satisfaction than their incongruent counterparts. They also found that among employees with incongruent work status, part-timers who preferred full-time status were more satisfied than full-timers who preferred part-time status.

Krausz, Sagie, and Bidermann (2000) proposed continuous scale to measure congruency for work status as compared to dichotomous measurement categorising congruent or incongruent as used in earlier studies (e.g. Lee & Johnson, 1991; Morrow et al., 1994; Armstrong-Stassen et al., 1998). They measured the congruency of work status as a percentage of full-time positions which the employees would prefer, and at the same time incorporated perceived scheduling control as another psychological variable aside from preferences for work status, in predicting employees' work-related attitudes and emotional withdrawal. Their study showed no significant differences between part-time and full-time employees in terms of their job satisfaction, organisational commitment, burnout or intention to leave. However, they found that employees who preferred to work more schedules were more committed and satisfied, with less burnout experienced, whereas employees who preferred to work less work schedule were more burnout and had lower job-related well-being, as compared to their congruent counterparts. They also found that congruent preferences for work status and perceived scheduling control were positively related with job satisfaction and organisational commitment, and negatively related with burnout.

Thorsteinson (2003) conducted meta-analytic review among studies with theoretical underpinning inclusive of partial inclusion, frame of reference, voluntariness and congruent preferences (or referred by Thorsteinson as person-job fit) for part-time employment up to year 2001. Hence, the review excluded some recent studies with better conceptualisation and operationalisation of non-standard work arrangements such as Holtom et al. (2002). Thorsteinson (2003) found that although full-timers were more involved with their jobs than part-timers, there were no significant differences among part-time and full-time employees in terms of overall and facets of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intention to leave. However, when he assessed a subset of studies that distinguished between voluntary and involuntary part-time employees, he discovered that the voluntary ones were more satisfied although the effect was small. Hence, part-timers may be less involved in their jobs, but not because they perceived such work arrangements as less satisfying for them to be less committed especially among part-timers who joined such work status voluntarily.

2.2.7 The Concept of Work Status Congruence

Although congruent preferences for work status had been proposed by many researchers based on the discrepancy theory (Lawler, 1973) to better understand the effects of non-standard work arrangements towards employees' work attitudes and behaviours, there were inconsistent findings that might be due to inconclusive measurements used. As argued by Krausz et al. (2000), most of the earlier studies measured the congruent preferences for work status through non-continuous scale of dichotomous segregation between congruent and incongruent work status (e.g. Lee & Johnson, 1991; Morrow et al., 1994; Armstrong et al., 1998; Keil et al., 2000; Burke & Greenglass, 2000). Moreover, not all prior researchers were alike in considering work schedules as well,

instead of preferences for work status only (e.g. Lee & Johnson, 1991; Morrow et al., 1994; Krausz et al., 2000). Furthermore, when congruent preferences for work status were considered, some studies have found that employees with congruent work status were more satisfied or committed (e.g. Burke & Greenglass, 2000). Nevertheless, there were some other studies which did not find any significant differences (e.g. Thorsteinson, 2003; Morrow et al., 1994; Keil et al., 2000).

Hence, to overcome the incoherent results regarding congruent preferences for work status and work schedule, Holtom et al. (2002) had proposed a more complex and unifying concept and measurement for work status congruence that assessed the degree of match preferences for work status, schedule, shift, and hours, as suggested by their other preceding researchers (e.g. Lee & Johnson, 1991; Morrow et al., 1994; Krausz et al., 2000; Keil et al., 2000). Drawing on the discrepancy theory (Lawler, 1973; Locke, 1969) as suggested by Morrow et al. (1994), Holtom et al.'s (2002) study found that there were significant positive effects of work status congruence towards employees' job satisfaction and affective commitment in both samples of hospital and retail. However, the significant positive effect of work status congruence towards employees' in-role and extra-role behaviour was found in the retail sample only, while significant negative effect of work status congruence towards employees' voluntary turnover was found in the hospital sample only. Altogether, their study concluded that employees working their congruent work status, schedule, shift, and hours irrespective standard or non-standard shall exhibit favourable job satisfaction and affective commitment.

Wittmer and Martin (2011) found that work status congruence, which they assessed using single item scale assessing preference of work status only (i.e. not similar as Holtom et al.'s 2002), and scheduling satisfaction were positively related with job

satisfaction, affective commitment, and employment mobility, while scheduling control was positively related with affective commitment and employment mobility only. They also discovered that flexible part-timers (i.e. primaries and supplementers) were higher in terms of their work status congruence, scheduling control, scheduling satisfaction, job satisfaction, affective commitment, and employment mobility as compared to fixed part-time workers (i.e. students and moonlighters).

Taken together, this study defines work status congruence in parallel with Holtom et al.'s (2002) study, i.e. the degree of match or congruent preferences for work status, schedule, shift, and hours enjoyed by an employee. In summary, the concept of work status congruence was proven to deal with all discrepancies in prior research of non-standard employment with its positive relationship with work-related attitudes. Moreover, work status congruence could be regarded as more conclusive with better conceptualisation and operationalisation of standard and non-standard employment by combining direct assessment of various characteristics of such work arrangements, and at the same time included psychological continuous measurements representing perceived control or organisational support and fulfilment of desired staffing and scheduling circumstances.

Besides, this new validated construct has also managed to address all the four reasons for the discrepant findings of prior studies highlighted by Barling and Gallagher (1996) which are; unfair comparisons because of fundamental differences in the content of the work performed by different types of employees, differences in the motivations and employment preferences for different types of workers, failure to control for demographic differences between different types of workers, and differences between studies in the psychometric properties of the dependent constructs under investigation.

However, in Holtom et al.'s (2002) study, work-status congruence using its new comprehensive measure was only operationalised as full-time and part-time only, without inclusion of temporary and permanent dimensions and its effect towards the work life balance study. The construct was also not being assessed in a hypothesised framework using structural equation modelling. Nevertheless, Carr et al. (2010) validated Holtom et al.'s (2002) measurement of work status congruence in their study, and found that there were significant relationships between work status congruence and organisational commitment as well as organisational citizenship behaviour. Therefore, this study is undertaken to validate and extend prior research of work-status congruence by integrating it with work-life balance in the work environment in Malaysia. The following sections review the development of studies of work-life balance and its relationship with non-standard work arrangements.

2.3 Work-Life Balance

The balance between work and non-work lives has been the subject of debate among academicians, practitioners, and policy makers over the past two decades. This is because significant changes in the demographics in modern societies have blurred the boundary and the interactions between work and other life's interests (Dash, Anand, & Gangadharan, 2012). Furthermore, there is an increasing number of working mothers, students, dual-career couples, single parents, and older workers in the employment pool. They demanded greater flexible working arrangements, thus making work-life balance a vital tool in today's employment relationships (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). In addition, more employees are bringing their work to home, hence blurring the borders between work and non-work life (Hill, Miller, Weiner, & Coleman, 1998). Technological

advancement had also assisted or deterred work-life balance by making work more available at all times, day and night, and in terms of facilitating a more flexible method as to when and where to work (Dash et al., 2012). In all, work-life balance has at all times been an apprehension of those concerned in the working life quality and its relation to a broader quality of life (Guest, 2004).

The phrase 'work-life balance' consists of two conjoining requisites: 'work-life' and 'balance'. The first term of 'work-life' encompasses a broad assortment of diverse constructs that include the nexus between paid work and other non-work activities which can be referred to as 'life' (Chang et al., 2010). This 'work-life' is a broader concept that extends the past studies of 'work-family' with the inclusion of all other life's interests or activities other than family such as leisure, study, recreation, travel, social, community and hobbies. Hence, it reflects the desires of employees with and without families, spouses, children, parents, or other home's needs (Chang et al., 2010). The second term of 'balance' is defined as harmony or equilibrium between two domains, e.g. work and non-work (Comer & Stites-Doe, 2006). This 'balance' was also commonly referred to as the opposite continuum of 'conflict', although there were scarce studies to prove this contention (Valcour, 2007).

Therefore, work-life balance is a state of equilibrium in which the demands of a person's job and personal life are equal. Frame and Hartog (2003) defined work-life balance as "...achieving satisfying experiences in all life domains," and as they pointed out, "to do so requires personal resources such as energy, time, and commitment be well distributed across domains" (p. 81). In other words, work-life balance involves having satisfactory feelings for all experiences: combining paid work with all other non-work

responsibilities or aspirations such as family, friends, hobbies, art, travelling, studies, community, personal, and leisure pursuits (Moore, 2007; Gurvis & Patterson, 2005).

The concept of work-life balance is also a lot broader in the sense that it is applicable to all employees, irrespective of marital or parental status so that they can experience an effective juggling act between their career and private lives (Dash et al., 2012). Virick, Lilly, and Casper (2007) suggested that work-life balance is achieved when employees exhibit a comparable deal of time and commitment to work and non-work domains and have the ability to fulfil both responsibilities. On the other hand, Moore (2007) in a two-year-long ethnographic study of an Anglo-German automobile factory explained that defining the "balance" in work-life is subjective and unique to each individual as individuals are themselves unique.

Attesting to the importance of work-life balance research is the increasing prevalence of the phenomenon. Employees are working a greater number of hours than ever before, and there are an increasing number of employees who are in some form of alternative work arrangements, such as flexitime, part-time, rotating shift, compressed work week, or telecommuting (Nelson & Tarpey, 2010). Hence, it is both practically and theoretically important to delineate factors that determine the influencing factors and the true effects of particular work-life balance initiatives. Roberts (2007) who conducted a study in the United Kingdom described that work-life balance is becoming important to both men and women irrespective of working standard or non-standard employment.

Eikhof, Warhurst, and Haunschild (2007) also conducted their review about the United Kingdom, and found that most of the work-life debate and its issues were still perceived as arising from women's responsibilities as caretakers, and most studies concentrated

toward the effects of family-friendly policies. They also suggested that re-conceptualisation is necessary in analysing the balance of the relationship between work and life. In addition, Dash et al. (2012) found no significance in the differences of work-life balance among demographic groups of gender, age, marital status, management level, and varying number of dependents. Hence, Dash et al. confirmed that work-life balance is a neutral construct, although many perceive that, women, adults, married and those having more family and job responsibilities as persons who require more work-life balance.

2.3.1 Development of Work-Life Balance Studies

The study of work-life balance has actually evolved recently post the year 2000s and was an extension from the study of work-family balance. Whereas the study of work-family balance was a study about positive interactions between work and family domains mostly conducted in year 1990s, and originated from the study of work-family conflict. The work-family conflict was earliest studied in 1980s, considering the negative interactions between work and family interface due to increasing participation of more women in labour market since the 1970s (Moore, 2007). The founding fathers of work-family conflict studies (i.e. Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985) have intensified the psychological study among working individuals and discovered significant relationships between work-family conflict and employees' work attitudes and well being.

In a snapshot, since most of early studies combining work and family domains were concentrated in terms of conflict or interference interactions, researchers in the late 1990s began to explore the positive interactions of both domains. This was also known as work-family balance. However, since the study of work-family balance was

considering work and family dimensions only, researchers from the middle of the 2000s began to extend work-family balance to the concept of work-life balance that encompassed other non-work or life's interests apart from family only, especially for employees who were single and have no dependants.

Chang et al. (2010) in their meta-analytic review of 245 empirical work-family/life balance studies (i.e. 77 per cent quantitative) published between 1987 and 2006, had suggested that the study of work-life balance was still under-developed. The majority of past studies conceptualised their research under the work-family term instead of the broader term of work-life though referring their research as work-life (i.e. only 9 per cent of quantitative studies and 26 per cent of qualitative studies examined work-life). Chang et al. (2010) also found that work-family on the contrary to work-life interactions remained robust despite the use of work-life in the publications' title or key words. They suggested that work-family and work-life were two different foci and should be regarded as separate research fields as they entailed dissimilar weight accentuations and appraisals.

Chang et al. (2010) also discovered that Hill, Ferris, and Martinson (2003) was the first quantitative study that explored work-life domains. However, Hill et al. (2003) who studied the effects of tele-work on personal/family life did not introduce solid measurement on work-life interactions in their study. Chang et al. (2010) affirmed that work-life balance studies shall be difficult in terms of operationalisation, since most of its original work-family balance studies were also inconsistently operationalised as low conflict or having positive interactions or spill-over between work and family such as work-family enrichment, facilitation, enhancement or fit.

Interestingly, from the total 245 empirical studies under review, Chang et al. (2010) established that only 31 quantitative studies which examined balance related constructs (i.e. positive interactions between work and family domains) instead of conflict related counterparts, perhaps due to the lack of conclusive theoretical frameworks and validated instruments. Hence, Chang et al.'s (2010) meta-analytic study has also stressed a need for a better conceptualisation of constructs and operationalisation of measures as well as a need for more positive interactions between work and non-work domains, inclusive of interest other than family only. Chang et al. (2010) also highlighted that past studies of work and non-work lives were scarce in understanding its relationship among lower levels and casual or non-standard employees that mostly enjoy less control over the balance of their work and life due to the lack in control over working hours and fewer employment rights, benefits and future prospects, hence often finding it harder to attain balance than those in more advantaged jobs.

Therefore, this study is aimed to examine the positive interactions between work and all of the employees' non-work domains other than family only, and to propose better conceptualisation and measurement of underdeveloped studies of work-life balance, as well as operationalising it in standard and non-standard work arrangements; hence providing empirical evidence of its effects towards employees' work attitudes.

2.3.2 Conceptualisation and Operationalisation of Work-Life Balance

The conceptualisation of work-life balance can be traced to work-family concept in terms of conflict or negative interactions, and then followed by balance of positive interactions of work and family domains. Subsequently, with the inclusion of other non-family interface, the concept of work-life emerged. The first study that explored work-

family conflict was published in 1985 by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) who studied only the theory of the interference between work and family interface. They defined work-family conflict as “...a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect” (p. 77).

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) conceptualised work-family conflict based on three major forms considering constraints of fulfilling both roles in the work and family domains: i.e. time-based conflict (that is someone’s physical or psychological impossibility to meet the demands of one’s role in one domain due to the demands of one’s role in the other domain), strain-based conflict (that is role-produced strain in the one domain affecting one’s performance in another domain), and behaviour-based conflict (that is the specific patterns of in-role behaviour being incompatible with expectations regarding another role).

Following Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), there were many studies conducted using this measurement. Consequently, the numbers of bi-directional studies of work-family and family-work such as conflict, interference, spill-over, or role overload were then increased tremendously after 2001, indicating a focus on negativity of the conflict (Chang et al., 2010). It is also observed that Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Collins (2001) were among the earliest researchers to introduce multi-dimensional measures that integrated negative and positive interactions between work and family domains that were symbolised as conflict and balance (e.g. work interference with family life, family life interference with work, and work/family enhancement).

The studies focusing only positive interactions between work and family domains were pioneered by Greenhaus, Collins, and Shaw (2003), who proposed that there are three dimensional measurements of work-family balance, which distinguished between time based, strain based, and behaviour based, as per Greenhaus and Beutell's (1985) conflict interactions. However, according to Chang et al.'s (2010) meta-analytic review of work-family studies, Greenhaus et al.'s (2003) proposition of three dimensional work-family balance measures had not been adopted in any subsequent research.

Instead of directly assessing feeling of balance (Butler, Grzywacz, Bass, & Linney, 2005; Hill et al., 2003; Frame & Hartog, 2003), fit (Hill, 2005; Grzywacz, & Bass, 2003; Voydanoff, 2005), or synergy (Beutell & Wittig-Berman, 2008) between work and family domains, many studies of positive participation in work and family dimensions were still mostly revolved around the bi-directionality of both interfaces, such as: enrichment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), facilitation (Aryee et al., 2005; Voydanoff, 2004; Grzywacz & Butler, 2005), enhancement (Hayman, 2009), or positive spill-over (Hammer et al., 2005).

Waumsley et al. (2010) were among the researchers who extended the study of work-family domains to work-life domains but they focussed on the negative or conflict interactions between both domains. They adapted Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian's (1996) existing measures on work-family and family-work conflict through slight adjustments of the items' wording from 'family' to 'life'. Netemeyer et al.'s (1996) original measurements included three psychological dimension of time, strain, and behaviour based, as suggested by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985). Therefore, Waumsley et al. (2010) introduced measures of a 7-point Likert scale of work-life conflict and life-work conflict, and proved that work-life conflict offered a better conceptualisation for

the conflicts between work and non-work interfaces experienced by people who did not live within a family structure or were involved with children.

Hence, the actual operationalisation of work-life balance was weak. Nelson and Tarpey (2010) in their study among full-time nurses in United States had established their own work-life balance measurement, using a two-item scale, i.e. the flexibility to take care of personal needs and the ability for off-days to fit personal needs. However the measurement was lacking in terms of three major forms of considerations; time, strain, and behaviour in fulfilling both roles in the work and life domains, as proposed by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985). Kanwar et al. (2009) had also developed their own measurement of work-life balance but was lacking the same three considerations; the dimensions of time, strain, and behaviour as well.

2.3.3 Flexible or Non-Standard Work Arrangements and Successful Work-Life Balance

Recent changes in the nature of careers elevate a stronger concern for balancing work and non-work life. Flexible work options (also known as non-standard work arrangements) were offered by organisations as work and home/life balance policies allowing employers to appear employee-friendly whilst meeting business needs (Clark, 2001). Additionally, as concern for balancing work and non-work roles grew, work schedule flexibility, or the ease in which employees can change their work hours, was construed as a work characteristic that became increasingly favoured by employees (Valcour, 2007). Therefore, the use of several family or life-friendly policies and practices (e.g. flexible work schedule or non-standard work arrangements) are likely to

reduce work and non-work conflicts as well as enhancing the work attitudes of employees (Krausz et al., 2000).

Hence, work-life balance had been studied as the outcome of work-life balance policies or initiatives taken by organisations to help employees fulfil their work and out-of-work demands, such as family, study, hobbies, social, and many more. McDonald, Brown, and Bradley (2005) highlighted that there were three major types of work-life policies or initiatives that have been created to assist employees in balancing their work and non-work lives; flexible work options (e.g. part-time work, flexible hours arrangements), specialised leave policies (e.g. parental leave, career break schemes), and dependent care benefits (e.g. subsidised childcare, child care referral).

Bond, Flaxman, and Bunce (2008) explained that many employers provided work-life balance policies or programs such as flexible work options or non-standard work arrangements that include part-time or temporary work, working from home or telecommuting, job-sharing, flexi-time and flexible working hours, compressed work weeks, rotating and night shift, and annualised hours. Additionally, O'Brien and Hayden (2008) suggested that flexible work arrangement or non-standard staffing and scheduling practices such as non-standard work status, schedule, shift, and hours were becoming more important, particularly in public and services sector organisations, which led the way for work-life balance.

Therefore, many previous studies have found that flexible work-life policies in terms of flexible work arrangements, including schedule flexibility, flexi-time, reduced work hours, and compressed work week were significantly and positively related to employees' work-life balance, and in turn improve functioning at work and out-of-work

responsibilities, as compared to standard fixed-hour or schedule (McNall et al. 2010; Hayman, 2009; Valcour, 2007). Breugh and Frye (2007) stressed that, previous researchers of work-life balance have generally measured the usage of overall work-life benefits through a composite scale reflecting the use of several benefits instead of looking at the effects of using a specific life-friendly policies or benefits (e.g. flexi-time, special leave, or on-site child care facility). The use of such a global benefit usage scale makes it impossible to determine which specific benefits may be particularly helpful for increasing work-life balance (Breugh & Frye, 2007).

Consequently, there were few studies that examined the effects of specific flexible or non-standard work arrangements in terms of part-time or temporary employment towards employees' out-of-work attachments (i.e. family or personal life). However, the studies were conducted separately according to full-time versus part-time employees or permanent versus temporaries, without considering both full-timers and temporaries as non-standard employees in a single study. No attempts were made to determine the effects of congruent preferences of such work arrangements. Higgins et al. (2000) for instance, highlighted that non-standard employment such as part-time offers the best of both worlds since it enables employees to pursue their career interests while still affording time to be with their families.

Hill, Martinson, Ferris, and Baker (2004) found that mothers working part-time had significantly better work-life balance and did not perceive lesser career opportunities as compared to mothers working full-time although they were working fewer hours and had lower income. Evidently, in a study of part-time professionals, Hill (2005) found that working part time was associated with greater work-family fit. Buehler and O'Brien (2011) found that mothers working part-time were experiencing less conflict between

work and family and were doing a higher proportion of child care and housework than those working full-time.

2.3.4 Flexible or Non-Standard Work Arrangements and Unsuccessful Work-Life Balance

Nonetheless, there were some studies that found negative or no association between flexible or non-standard work arrangements and employees' work-life balance. These were inferred by past researchers based on the insignificant or contradictory effects of family-friendly policies towards employees' work-family balance. For example, Barnett and Gareis (2002) depicted that fewer work hours in flexitime do not necessarily mean greater satisfaction in the family realm. In their study of part-time physicians, they found that "...physicians working longer hours reported higher marital-role quality than those working fewer hours to the extent that they performed fewer low-schedule-control household tasks than did their reduced-hours counterparts" (p. 364). Additionally, Batt and Valcour (2003) found no relationship between work-family benefits and work-family conflict.

It has also been argued that the low fringe benefits, routine tasks, and limited career advancement opportunities that characterise most part-time jobs, make it more difficult for individuals to balance family demands (Higgins et al., 2000). Therefore, the studies of the effects of work-life balance by using flexible work options or non-standard work arrangement have been inconclusive in their results and consequences towards employees' work-life balance. Hyman and Summers (2004), who conducted a survey among employees and managers in the United Kingdom, found that most of the

employees continued to experience difficulties in balancing their work and non-work lives although their employees had implemented work-family/life policies or programs.

Hyman and Summers (2004) also discovered that there were seven major problems related with the implementation of family/life-friendly policies that might influence the imbalance between employees' work-life, i.e. unequal practices among different industries and organisations, poor policy formalisation at organisation, decision on application lies at the discretion of untrained managers, restricted employee control or participation over the implementation of policies, policies were introduced to benefit employers only, and intrusion of work into domestic life. In addition, Budd and Mumford (2006) found that some organisations had family/life-friendly policies such as flexible or non-standard work arrangements implemented more for 'window dressing' purposes. The implementation was restricted and employees were not able to fully utilise it; hence, these policies did not promote their balance between work and non-work lives.

Furthermore, Wayne et al. (2006) also found that family/life-friendly benefits were not related with work-family enrichment. Additionally, Moore's (2007) two-year-long ethnographic and in-depth interview study at an Anglo-German automobile factory did not find that flexible work arrangements were necessarily good for work-life balance. Instead it contributed to poor balance. According to Moore, whether flexible working practices have a positive or negative influence on work-life balance depends on the circumstances of the individual. Whereas, Baral and Bhargava (2010) discovered that there were no associations between the 22 items of work-life benefits and policies and work-family enrichment.

2.3.5 Voluntariness of Flexible Work Arrangements and Work-Life Balance

Since there were some studies that did not find any significant association between work-family/life balance policies (such as flexible or non-standard work arrangements) and employees' work-life balance (inferred from work-family balance or as a contra of work-family conflict) e.g. Hyman and Summers (2004), Wayne et al. (2006), Moore (2007), and Baral and Bhargava (2010), researchers began to realise that implementation of work-life balance policies, programs, or initiatives should be more employee-driven. However, there were few studies exploring such propositions. For example, Tausig and Fenwick (2001) have investigated the effects of perceived schedule control in terms of non-standard work arrangements such as part-time and shift towards employees' work-family/personal balance measured using self developed two-item scales assessing employees' success and conflicts in balancing work and family or personal life.

Tausig and Fenwick's (2001) study found there was a positive relationship between perceived schedule control and work-family/personal balance, irrespective of work and family characteristics such as schedule type (i.e. part-time or full-time), work hours (i.e. shift or non-shift), and parenthood (i.e. parent or non-parent). Hence, their study suggested that alternative schedules per se did not "unbind" time. Implementation of non-standard work arrangements which were entirely decided by managers did not help employees maintain their work-family/personal balance. Instead, some sort of control or voluntariness of such arrangements was needed.

Van Rijswijk et al. (2004), who inferred work-life balance as low work-family conflict, explored the effects of work and family characteristics inclusive of full-time and part-time work arrangements towards employees' work-to-family interferences. They also studied the effects of voluntariness of choosing part-time employment towards work-life balance, such as for balancing work and family, or due to unavailability of full-time jobs, needing lesser workload, wanting more leisure time, furthering education, or others. Van Rijswijk et al.'s (2004) study among part-time and full-time working mothers (with a partner) at the Netherlands found that part-time work arrangements could reduce work-to-family interferences not only for those voluntarily choosing part-time work status for facilitating their work and family demands, but also for involuntary part-timers.

Fleetwood (2007) who conducted a conceptual review about the implementation of flexible or non-standard work arrangements in the United Kingdom had proposed dichotomous dimensions of flexible working practices i.e. either employee-friendly or employer-friendly. Employee-friendly flexible working practices such as voluntary part-time, voluntary term-time or temporary working, flexi-time, job sharing, shift swapping, self-rostering, time-off in lieu, sabbaticals and career breaks, and tele-home working were time-spatial and more demanded by employees. Whereas, employer-friendly flexible working practices such as involuntary part-time or temporary work, 24-7 rotating, night and weekend shift, stand-by and call-out arrangements, seasonal work, and unpredictable working hours were demanded by employers or customers. Fleetwood's (2007) study showed that there were increasing number of employees in the United Kingdom who engaged in employer-friendly flexible working practices, while the number occupied in employee-friendly working practices have dropped.

Hayman's (2009) study among Australian office-based employees had established that there were positive relationships between perceived usability of flexible work arrangements and three dimensions of work-life balance (work interference with personal life, personal life interference with work, and work-personal life enhancement). Hyman's study also showed that inconsistent administration of flexible or non-standard work arrangements did not enhance employees' work-life balance, or even resulted in more stress among those who really needed to balance their work and life demands. In addition, Nelson and Tarpey (2010) in their study among full-time nurses in the United States found that work-life balance was a significant outcome of satisfaction of work schedules and hours. Moreover, Jang, Park, and Zippay (2011) found a significant positive relationship between scheduling control and employees' job satisfaction and well being, that was stronger with the availability of work-life balance policies.

The studies of voluntary flexible work options or non-standard work arrangements have shed light to a more conclusive finding about its positive effects towards employees' work and non-work balance (Tausig & Fenwick, 2001; Van Rijswijk et al., 2004). These studies warranted more theoretical approach to prove that the employees' individual matched preferences for flexible work options such as non-standard work status, schedule, shift, and hours, established favourable balance of their work and life interface. Hence, this study is aimed to examine the work status congruence operationalised as matched preferences for work status, schedule, shift, and hours, as a predictor of employees' work-life balance.

The work status congruence conceptualised based on the discrepancy theory (Lawler, 1978; Locke, 1969) suggested that job characteristics that match one's desire would affect an employee's favourable feeling. This could be further extended to include the voluntariness of flexible work arrangements (e.g. Tausig & Fenwick, 2001; Van Rijswijk et al., 2004; Fleetwood, 2007) as well as perceived usability and control over such work arrangements (e.g. Hayman, 2009; Nelson & Tarpey, 2010). Therefore, it could be hypothesised that person-job fit (i.e. work status congruence as inferred by Thorsteinson, 2003) would have an impact towards job-life fit (i.e. work-life balance which extends job-family fit notion by Voydanoff, 2005), and in turn affect employee attitudes.

2.3.6 The Concept of Satisfaction With Work-Life Balance

Only after the mid 2000s, the study of work-life balance had evolved as an extension of work-family balance that converged from an overwhelmingly concentrated conflict perspective of work-family interactions towards the positive participation of work and home. However, operationalisation of a work-life balance concept, which includes all non-work activities other than family only, has yet to be completely established (Chang et al., 2010). In addition, most studies conceptualise positive reciprocal relationship into different terms and do not comprehensively operationalise the construct as a whole (Butler et al., 2005). Hence, this study is intended to address the scarcity of empirically verified conceptualisation and operationalisation of recently established study of work-life balance, by extending the studies of work-family balance studies with the incorporation of other non-work's interest apart from family only.

As not many available theoretically-developed measures were introduced by work-life balance scholars, this study is making reference to the study of Valcour (2007) who conceptualised work-family balance as satisfaction with work-family balance. Valcour's (2007) concept of satisfaction with work-family balance was an overall level of contentment resulting from an assessment of one's degree of success at meeting work and family role demands. In Valcour's (2007) study using hierarchical regression analysis, the unifying construct of satisfaction with work-family balance, was operationalised among full-timers. She found that satisfaction with work-family balance was negatively predicted by work hours and also positively related with perceived control of work hours.

In this study, the newly developed construct of satisfaction with work-family balance by Valcour (2007) is adapted through slight adjustments in the measurements by rewording the items from 'family' to 'life' to entail other non-work interests, not necessarily family only. A similar action was done by Waumsley et al. (2010) in their study assessing work-life and life-work conflict adapted from Netemeyer et al.'s (1996) existing measures of work-family and family-work conflict. Consequently, the adapted construct of satisfaction with work-family balance was renamed as satisfaction with work-life balance. Based on Valcour's (2007) study, the construct was measured by seven items including the assessment of three major forms of psychological considerations of work and non-work interactions: time, strain, and behaviour, as suggested by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985).

There were also various reasons indicating why this construct is considered as the most suitable construct in assessing an employee's work-life balance, overcoming inconsistent conceptualisation, weak measurement and operationalisation, and

discrepant findings of the past studies. This is because the construct is considered unique and holistic as it consisted both cognitive and an affective component, in terms of overall psychological contentment and perceived favourable feelings of all assessed dimensions (Hart, 1999). Other than that, this construct is deemed unitary in the nomological network since it was not centred upon conflict, or positive interactions between two interfaces, and not based on cross-domain transfer processes, such as spill-over, enrichment, enhancement or facilitation. Furthermore, it does not imply directionality from work to life or from life to work, as well as not only offering a global perception.

Yet, the original construct of satisfaction with work-family balance was once validated in Valcour's (2007) study towards the sample of full time service workers only and the construct was proven as an outcome of work hours (i.e. negative relationship) and perceived control over work time (i.e. positive relationship). Therefore, this study extends the study of work-family balance by validating measurement of satisfaction with work-life balance, and at the same time extends the body of knowledge of flexible or non-standard work arrangements by examining satisfaction with work-life balance as an outcome of work-status congruence.

Additionally, this study is designed to validate the adapted measurement of satisfaction with work-life balance as a mediator in relationship between work status congruence and work-related attitudes. Hence, this study is probably the first in extending the study of work-family balance (e.g. McNall et al., 2010; Baral & Bhargava, 2010) by understanding the mediating role of work-life balance concept. Since work-related attitudes are also the main focus in this study as they were closely related with both work-status congruence and satisfaction with work-life balance, it is important to review

relevant studies relating to them. The following section reviews the studies of non-standard work arrangements and work-life balance in relation with work-related attitudes.

2.4 Work-Related Attitudes

Most of the past studies of non-standard work arrangements and work-life balance have considered employees' work-related attitudes as the outcomes or dependent constructs of their studies. The initial study of non-standard work arrangements concentrated on finding differences in terms of work-related attitudes which concerned part-time versus full-time (e.g. Wittmer & Martin, 2011; Boo et al, 2010), or among temporary versus permanent employees (e.g. De Jong & Schalk, 2010; Connelly, Gallagher, & Gilley, 2007) et al., 2007). Although, Lee and Johnson (1991) and Walsh and Deery (1999) had established studies comparing work-related attitudes among both standard and both dimensions of non-standard employees i.e. part-time and temporary employees, there were sparse studies that operationalised the same, except for the recent turnover study by Zeytinoglu et al. (2011).

Additionally, the studies of non-standard employments effects towards work-related attitudes have also evolved from being a merely bivariate comparison among standard and non-standard employees (e.g. Thorsteinson, 2003; Han et al., 2009), to a more thorough assessment in terms of different typology and dimensions among non-standard employees themselves (e.g. Martin & Sinclair, 2007; Felfe et al., 2008). Furthermore, instead of measuring non-standard work arrangements objectively, theoretical studies incorporating psychological conceptualisation were conducted to better understand the significant relationships and differences among employees' work-related attitudes with

regard to standard and non-standard staffing and scheduling arrangements (e.g. Wittmer & Martin, 2011; Zeytinoglu et al., 2011; Senter & Martin, 2007; Holtom et al., 2002).

Job satisfaction and affective commitment were among major components of employees' work-related attitudes that were commonly studied by the majority of researchers of non-standard employment, i.e. among part-time employment (e.g. Wittmer & Martin, 2011; Martin & Sinclair, 2007; Maynard et al., 2006; Thorsteinson, 2003; Krausz et al., 2000), or among temporary or contractual work arrangements (e.g. De Jong & Schalk, 2010; Han et al., 2009). For example, Martin and Sinclair's (2007) study found that part-time employment was affecting job satisfaction and affective commitment. De Jong and Schalk's (2010) study on non-standard work arrangements among temporary employees revealed that certain temporary work arrangements were significantly predicting employees' job satisfaction and affective commitments.

In addition, Feldman (2006) who conducted a 15-year review of non-standard work arrangements inclusive of part-time, temporary, casual and contract workers (by proposing a multi-dimensional typology of non-standard employees) also confirmed that job satisfaction and organisational commitment were mostly studied as the outcome of variables. However, there were also some studies of non-standard employment that evaluate its effect towards employees' turnover intention (e.g. Senter & Martin, 2007; Maynard et al., 2006), but there were some studies that found no significant relationship between non-standard employment and turnover intention (e.g. Holtom et al., 2002; Conway & Briner, 2002).

On the contrary, the studies of work-life balance investigating employees' work-related attitudes were scarce and considered recent, since they were the extension of work-family balance concepts as substantiated in the meta-analysis study by Chang et al. (2010). Similar to work-family balance studies, job satisfaction and affective commitment were among the most studied employees' work-related attitudes in studies assessing the effects of work-life balance policies (e.g. Jang et al., 2011; Baral & Bhargava, 2010), or in studies identifying the relationship between the concept of work-life balance and employees' work-related attitudes (Kanwar et al., 2009; Sturges & Guest, 2004).

As established in literature, flexible work options (e.g. part-time, flexitime, non-normal schedule, shift, work hours, etc.) as part of work-life balance policies, benefits or practices were usually studied by work-life balance scholars (e.g. Jang et al., 2011; Baral & Bhargava, 2010), and correspondingly researchers in non-standard employment studies were equating the flexible work options as non-standard work arrangements (e.g. Zeytinoglu et al., 2011; Kalleberg et al., 2003) and there were studies assessing preferences for such flexible or non-standard staffing and scheduling practices inclusive of part-time status, work schedules, shifts, and hours (Holtom et al, 2002).

Therefore, as the majority of both non-standard employment and work-life balance studies were similarly investigating employees' work-related attitudes in terms of job satisfaction and affective commitment, both areas of studies shall be merged in this study, thus enabling extensions of theoretical exertion of non-standard employment studies towards work-life balance's body of knowledge. Consequently, this study theoretically holds up to both studies by substantiating empirical evidences for enhancement of known connotation as well as affirmation of tentative supposition. In

addition, assessing similar outcomes of work-related attitudes as of past studies (i.e. job satisfaction and affective commitment), shall enable this study to make steady comparisons and justifications, so that pertinent conclusions, contributions, and recommendations could be highlighted accordingly.

Since the main focus of this study is to identify effects of work status congruence and satisfaction with work-life balance towards work-related attitudes of job satisfaction and affective commitment, the following sub-sections separately depict the relevant studies of job satisfaction, affective commitment, and simultaneous satisfaction and affective commitment, as the outcomes of non-standard work arrangements or work-life balance.

2.4.1 Job Satisfaction

Many employment and human related studies include job satisfaction as predictor or outcome as well as moderator or mediator in their studies. Hence, job satisfaction is one of the most studied concepts in organisational behavioural studies. In general, job satisfaction is defined as “...the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating one’s job values” (Locke, 1969, p. 316). It has also been commonly defined as an attitudinal evaluative judgment of one’s job or job experiences (Ilies, Wilson, & Wagner, 2009). Conclusively, job satisfaction is a positive attitude deriving from favourable emotional or affective feeling to a job situation inclusive of its certain characteristics, and often inferred by how well outcomes meet expectations.

Most of the early studies on non-standard work arrangements have found conflicting results in terms of job satisfaction among standard and non-standard employees. For example, there were bivariate studies comparing part-timers and full-timers that found that job satisfaction were higher among part-time employees (e.g. Logan et al., 1973; Eberhardt & Shani, 1984), or lower among part-timers (e.g. Hall & Gordon, 1973; Miller & Terborg, 1979) as compared to their full-time counterparts. There were also few bivariate studies that found no significant difference in terms of job satisfaction between part-time and full-time employees (e.g. Levanoni & Sales, 1990; McGinnis & Morrow, 1990; Steffy & Jones, 1990). Incoherent results were also shown in earlier bivariate studies comparing job satisfaction between temporary or contractual and permanent employees (Krausz et al., 1995).

The discrepant findings of initial studies have made later researchers realise that non-standard employees were not homogenous, thus studies assessing their job satisfaction should consider the heterogeneity among them (Feldman, 1990). Many recent researchers had investigated job satisfaction among different subgroups of non-standard employees, categorised according to their typological dimensions of motives or reasons in choosing such work arrangements. For example, Martin and Sinclair (2007) who had expanded the Sinclair et al.'s (1999) four subgroups of part-time employees into eight subgroups, have found that although certain subgroups of part-timers such as supplementers and primaries were having higher job satisfaction than moonlighters and students, all the subgroups of the part-timers (except for college students) were having higher job satisfaction as compared to full-time employees.

To find a cohesive understanding about job satisfaction among non-standard employees, more researchers began to conceptualise non-standard employment with certain psychological factors such as voluntariness, congruent preferences, and organisational support or fulfilled/kept promises, instead of dichotomously operationalising them through objective measurement. Therefore, studies of voluntariness of non-standard employment found that voluntary part-timers were more satisfied than involuntary part-timers (e.g. Boo et al., 2010; Maynard et al., 2006), and even more than full-timers (e.g. Maynard et al., 2006), whereas voluntary temporaries were more satisfied than involuntary temporaries (e.g. Marler et al., 2002). However, there were researchers who found insignificant results in terms of such voluntariness among part-timers (e.g. Tansky, Gallagher, & Wetzel, 1997), and among certain temporary employees (e.g. De Jong & Schalk, 2010; Ellingson et al., 1998).

Early studies of congruent preferences of non-standard employment operationalised dichotomously among the part-time and the full-time employees have found insignificant differences in terms of job satisfaction (e.g. Keil et al., 2000; Morrow et al., 1994). However, later studies utilising continuous psychological measurement had established consistent results that job satisfaction was positively associated with work status congruence (Holtom et al., 2002; Wittmer & Martin, 2011). There were also recent studies which found significant relationship between psychological contract fulfilment and job satisfaction among part-time and full-time employees (e.g. Conway & Briner, 2002), as well as among temporary and permanent employees (e.g. De Jong & Schalk, 2010).

On the contrary, since studies of work-life balances were considered still under-developed as the extensions of work-family balance studies (based on Chang et al.'s (2010) meta-analytic review of 245 empirical work-family/life studies published between 1987 and 2006, not many researchers provided empirical evidences substantiating positive relationships between work-life balance and job satisfaction. However, a similar positive relationship with job satisfaction is expected, as proven by work-family balance studies (Baral & Bhargava, 2010; McNall et al., 2010). Nevertheless, a recent study by Kanwar et al. (2009) using self-developed scales of work-life balance constructs among information technology services companies of India, found that job satisfaction was a significant positive outcome of work-life balance.

Another study by Burke, Burgess, and Oberlaid (2004) found positive association between job satisfaction and balance value between work and personal life. In addition, Virick et al.'s (2007) found that based on structural equation modelling, work-life balance (i.e. adapted Hill, Hawkins, Ferris, & Weitzman's (2001) work-family balance scale) was positively related to job satisfaction. Jang et al.'s (2011) study added to the evidence regarding the positive relationship between the availability of scheduling control and work-life balance policies on the one hand, and job satisfaction and mental wellbeing, on the other.

2.4.2 Affective Commitment

There were also a vast number of studies on employment relationship and human relation that include affective commitment as a predictor or outcome as well as a moderator or mediator. Hence, affective commitment is also one of the three

psychological distinct components of organisational commitment, as per Allen and Meyer (1990), that is most commonly studied in organisational behaviour, the other two being normative commitment and continuance commitment. Allen and Meyer (1990) defined affective commitment as “...affective or emotional attachment to the organization such that the strongly committed individual identifies with, is involved in, and enjoys membership in the organization” (p. 2). Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) defined affective commitment as “...the relative strength of an individual’s identification with an involvement in a particular organization” (p. 27).

Therefore, affective commitment is an emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in an organisation; an employee feels connected to and ‘want to’ stay in the organisation. Allen and Meyer (1990) defined normative commitment as a sense of obligation or internalised value to remain in an organisation or the feeling of obligation of ‘ought to’ stay in an organisation, whereas continuance commitment is associated with perceived costs or lack of alternatives with leaving an organisation or the feeling of ‘have to’ stay in an organisation. Allen and Meyer (1990) originally developed 8-item measures of each component, but the measures were subsequently revised to 6-item scales by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993).

A study by Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, and Topolnytsky (2002) found that affective commitment was the most studied component and the strongest predictor of employee behaviour such as organisational citizenship behaviour and job performance, and continuance commitment has often been found to be indifferent to these behaviours. Meyer and Maltin (2010) also found similar pattern of findings in terms of strongest predictability power of affective commitment, followed by normative commitment, and lastly continuance commitment. There were some studies that found affective

commitment as negatively related with intention to quit the organisation (e.g., Vandenberghe & Tremblay, 2008), absenteeism (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005), turnover (Meyer et al., 2002), organisational citizenship behaviour (Felfe et al., 2008; Conway & Briner, 2002), and positively associated with an in-role and extra-role performance (Riketta, 2002).

The studies by Allen and Meyer (1996) and Meyer et al. (2002) have elaborated many antecedents of affective commitment such as locus of control, organisational support, role ambiguity, role conflict, and organisational justice. The study by Cichy, Cha, and Kim (2009) found that affective commitment had the strongest positive effects on interpersonal facilitation and job dedication. Since the main focus of this study is to identify effects of work status congruence and satisfaction with work-life balance towards work-related attitudes of job satisfaction and affective commitment, the following sub-sections discuss separately, the literature on affective commitment as an outcome of non-standard work arrangements, and as an outcome of work-life balance.

The other two components of Allen and Meyer's (1990) scale of organisational commitment, i.e. continuance commitment and normative commitment were not included in this study. Normative commitment was not assessed in this study because non-standard employees are less internalised in an organisation to develop a social norm due to their time and space constraints (Felfe et al., 2008). Furthermore, past organisational commitment studies highlighted that there were substantial correlations between affective commitment and normative commitment (e.g. $\rho = .77$ in Meyer et al., 1993) and they appeared to have an inherent psychological overlap, hence doubting the distinction between these constructs (e.g. Meyer et al., 1993; Allen & Meyer, 1996; Meyer et al., 2002).

As for continuance commitment, Holtom et al. (2002) had established that continuance commitment was not related to work status congruence. Meyer et al.'s (2002) meta-analysis and Powell and Meyer (2004) discovered that affective commitment have the strongest predictive power. Whereas, continuance commitment was not related to, and had little negative impact on work behaviours. In addition most of the past studies assessing organisational commitment of non-standard employees have a propensity to focus on the affective component of organisational commitment and excluded the other components i.e. continuance and normative (e.g. Holtom et al., 2002; Conway & Briner, 2002; Maynard et al., 2006; Felfe et al., 2008; Gavino et al., 2010). Aryee et al. (2005) explained that past research have focused on the affective rather than the continuance and normative forms of organisational commitments because of research evidence linking affective commitments to job performance (e.g. Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffine, & Jackson, 1989).

Similar to other frequently studied employees' work-related attitudes of job satisfaction, the majority of non-standard work arrangements studies that conducted bivariate comparison in terms of organisational commitment (i.e. not affective commitment only) among part and full-time, or temporary and permanent employees have identified irresolute effects of such work arrangements towards employees' overall organisational commitment. For example, Han et al.'s (2009) study among Korean temporary nurses found that they were less committed toward their organisations. However, there were earlier studies that found insignificant differences between temporary and permanent employees (e.g. Pearce, 1993), and insignificant differences between part-time and full-time employees (e.g. Still, 1983; McGinnis & Morrow, 1990; Steffy & Jones, 1990; Thorsteinson, 2003). Whereas, a study by Walsh and Deery (1999) combining both non-

standard employees of part-time and temporary workers, found that part-timers are more committed as compared to temporary employees.

When researchers found that the employees' voluntariness aspect of joining any work arrangements would effect their job attitudes, subsequent studies were conducted among part-time and full-time employees that investigated differences in terms of their organisational commitment. Although earlier studies by Tansky et al. (1997) and Thorsteinson (2003) found no significant differences, Maynard et al. (2006) who had separated caretakers and students from voluntary and involuntary subgroups had discovered that voluntary part-timers and caretakers had higher organisational commitment (i.e. not affective commitment) as compared to involuntary part-timers, students, and even full-timers. On the contrary, a study of boundary-less and traditional temporary employees in the United States by Marler et al. (2002) found no significant differences among both temporaries subgroups in terms of organisational commitment.

The non-standard employment studies that separately examined affective commitment instead of general organisational commitment, were initially studied in relation with voluntariness among temporary employees. For example, Van Dyne and Ang (1998) in their study assessing the relationship between affective commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour among permanent and temporary employees that were inferred as voluntary in Singapore, found that permanent employees had higher in terms of their affective commitment. In addition, De Jong and Schalk (2010) found that temporaries who joined such work arrangements to balance their work and non-work demands were insignificant in their affective commitment.

Recent studies comparing affective commitment among standard and certain subgroups of non-standard employees were also not in agreement. For example, Martin and Sinclair (2007) who had expanded the Sinclair et al.'s (1999) four subgroups of part-time employees into eight subgroups, have found that although certain subgroups of part-timers such as supplementers and students were different in terms of their affective commitment, all of them (irrespective of their subgroup) were having higher affective commitment than full-time employees.

However, a study about temporary employment by Felfe et al. (2008) found that all foci and components of commitment inclusive of affective organisational commitment were higher among permanent employees and self-employed contractors as compared to agency-hired temporaries. Studies of affective commitment among agency-hired temporaries were extended in Coyle-Shapiro and Morrow's (2006) study, who found significant positive relationships between client affective commitment, perceived client organisational support, and organisational attractiveness. However, Connelly et al. (2007) found no differences in both agency and client affective commitment when voluntariness and involuntariness of choosing such work arrangements were considered.

Studies to incorporate congruent preferences for non-standard work arrangements also progressed from examining employees' organisational commitment (e.g. Lee & Johnson, 1991; Morrow et al., 1994; Krausz et al., 2000) towards evaluation of employees' affective commitment instead (e.g. Holtom et al., 2002; Van Emmerick & Sanders, 2005; Wittmer & Martin, 2011). In terms of organisational commitment (i.e. not affective commitment), Lee and Johnson (1991) and Morrow et al. (1994) found that it was higher among congruent employees than the incongruent counterparts, and

Krausz et al. (2000) identified its positive relationship with preferred work status and perceived scheduling control.

Whereas, in terms of affective commitment, Van Emmrick and Sanders (2005) found that it was higher among employees who wanted to work more hours, and both Holtom et al. (2002) and Wittmer and Martin (2011) had established positive relationships between affective commitment and work status congruence, although the work status congruence scale by Holtom et al. (2002) was more complex with the inclusion of congruent preferences of work schedule, shift, and hours. Additionally, Wittmer and Martin (2011) also found similar positive relationships between affective commitment and both scheduling satisfaction and control, and flexible part-timers (i.e. primaries and supplementers) had higher affective commitment than fixed part-time workers (i.e. students and moonlighters).

As reported in the review of literature between work-related attitudes' component of job satisfaction and work-life balance, there were few studies that empirically tested the newly developed concept of work-life balance that was an extension of work-family balance studies (Chang et al., 2010). Further, the relationship between affective commitment and work-life balance was not empirically established yet. Nonetheless, positive relationship is expected between affective commitment and work-life balance, which is inferred based on the positive relationship between affective commitment and work-family enrichment/facilitation (Baral & Bhargava, 2010; Van Steenbergen, Ellemers, & Mooijaart, 2007; Gordon, Whelan-Berry, & Hamilton, 2007; Aryee et al., 2005).

2.4.3 Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment

There were several prior studies that have assessed the relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment (Riketta & Van Dick, 2005; Meyer et al., 2002; Allen & Meyer, 1996). Although most studies agreed on the positive correlation between job satisfaction and affective commitment, there were inconsistencies in determining the direction of the relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment (Cheng & Stockdale, 2003). For example, Kim and Brymer (2011) in their study among 324 hotel employees in the United States found that job satisfaction was a significant predictor for affective commitment. Yang (2010) in a study among 671 hotel employees in Taiwan, affirmed that job satisfaction significantly and positively contributed to the affective commitment, which in turn reduced employees' intentions to leave and subsequently resulted in decreased turnover. DeConinck (2009) who investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment in research models using structural equation modelling and path analysis confirmed that job satisfaction has a direct and positive influence on affective commitment.

Although there were also other studies that found job satisfaction as an antecedent of affective commitment (e.g. Shaw, Delery, & Abdulla, 2003; Güleriyüz et al., 2008), there were few studies that discovered job satisfaction as an outcome of affective commitment (e.g. Cheng & Stockdale, 2003; Wu & Norman, 2006; Felfe et al., 2008; Neining, Lehmann-Willenbrock, Kauffeld, & Henschel, 2010). Yet there were other studies which found no support of both directions such as a study by Wong, Hui, and Law (1995). On the other hand, past studies that discovered the positive effects of work status congruence and work-life balance towards both work-related attitudes of job satisfaction and affective commitment, have indicated the significant positive

correlation between job satisfaction and affective commitment, but the direction of whether job satisfaction predicted affective commitment or vice versa, was not established (Wittmer & Martin, 2011; Holtom et al., 2002; Baral & Bhargava, 2010).

2.5 Summary

This chapter reviewed past studies on the different research constructs such as non standard employment and flexible work arrangements, work-life balance, work status congruence, satisfaction towards work-life balance, and work related attitudes of job satisfaction and affective commitment. Overall, this chapter highlighted the research gaps in both staffing/scheduling arrangements and work-life balance. The next chapter discusses the rationale for the research framework and the hypothesised relationships among the variables in this study.