

Raelin, Joseph A.

Article — Accepted Manuscript (Postprint)

Youth Permanent Part-Time Employment as a Labour Market Alternative to Full Time Work: A Longitudinal Analysis

Journal of Occupational Behaviour

Suggested Citation: Raelin, Joseph A. (1983) : Youth Permanent Part-Time Employment as a Labour Market Alternative to Full Time Work: A Longitudinal Analysis, Journal of Occupational Behaviour, ISSN 0142-2774, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, Vol. 4, Iss. 3, pp. 179-191, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3000266>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/269220>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

YOUTH PERMANENT PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT AS A LABOR MARKET ALTERNATIVE
TO FULL TIME WORK: A LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS

A Paper

By

Joseph A. Raelin

Director
Institute for Public Service

Associate Professor
School of Management

Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167

July 1, 1982

SUMMARY

This study examines two hypotheses developed from the literature on part-time employment that youth whose first job becomes permanent and who are employed part-time will experience neither lower status nor wages in their later work experience compared to their full-time counterparts. These same youth, however, will not fare as well in their later employment compared to in-school youth who are also working part-time. The data, which are taken from independent samples of the National Longitudinal Surveys (NLS), are subjected to analyses of variance and covariance. The latter technique adjusts the main effects of working time for a number of work experience and demographic variables which were identified as potential contaminants. The results support both hypotheses. Permanent part-time work for youth who choose not to remain in school is a viable labor market alternative. The policy implications of this general finding are discussed.

YOUTH PERMANENT PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT AS A LABOR MARKET ALTERNATIVE
TO FULL-TIME WORK: A LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS

As the nation moves to consider the adjustment of hours to increase work (Clark, 1977; Golembiewski and Proehl, 1978) it is important that our human resources policymakers and managers be informed as to the impact of part-time work, relative to full-time work, on ultimate employment success. This information would be particularly instructive as regards the nation's most vital resource, its youth, who, if employed initially part-time, might or might not find long-term pay-offs to such work (Becker, 1964; Mincer and Polacheck, 1973). Some research has indicated that the part-time effect on later work experience is positive; other research that it is negative. This paper hypothesizes that to the extent part-time work is permanent, its long-term effect will not be significantly worse than full-time employment. The effect, however, may not be as much as that conceivably produced by working part-time but also remaining in school.

BACKGROUND

From the point of view of labor demand, the part-time job market now employs over 16 million Americans and is growing. Indeed, the proportion of workers voluntarily employed part-time compared to full-time workers has increased from one out of twelve workers in 1957 to nearly one out of six today. The reason for this growth on the demand side is that industries and occupations which typically employ a high proportion of part-time workers have boosted their employment (Deutermann and Brown, 1978). Specifically, part-time work is most common in the trade and service industries and among sales, clerical, and laborer jobs. With regard to wages, part-timers as a group earn less than full-timers. The wage gap has been estimated to be from 8 to 20 per cent. The reason for the gap appears to be that the occupations in which people work part-time, although growing, usually pay poorly (Owen, 1978). It should be noted, however, that this wage gap has been estimated at one point in time and that it does not suggest a fixed differential over time.

Researchers of part-time employment have also begun to consider the distinction between permanent and non-permanent or peripheral part-time work as well as that between voluntary and involuntary or casual part-time work. These classifications are not mutually exclusive; for example, permanent work under conditions of under-employment may be considered involuntary (Terry, 1981). The latter distinction was initially noted by Hallaire (1968), who reported that as much as one-third of part-time employment (depending upon the method of estimation) was involuntary. The greatest advantage of part-time work, however, from the point of view of the employee in terms of his or her economic and psychological well-being, emerges from voluntary experiences. Yet, many employers tend to perceive benefits from involuntary or casual part-time work (Bednarzik, 1975).

With respect to the permanent-peripheral distinction, permanent part-time work appears to be more attractive, and by assumption more beneficial, to employees in terms of such important work-related traits as initiative and perceived occupational level as compared to temporary part-time work (Gannon and Nothern, 1971). However, when data are controlled for demographic characteristics, non-permanent or peripheral part-timers do not express any greater degree of dissatisfaction with their work than permanent part-timers (Hom, 1979).

Turning to the supply side of part-time employment, compared to the full-time labor force, part-time workers are disproportionately young people under age 25 and women (Owen, 1978). In October 1981, 44 per cent of all women between the ages of 16 and 21 who worked were part-time employed, with the corresponding figure for men being 37 per cent (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1981). Part-time employment rates for men after age 25 dip to 4.1 per cent or lower until age 60, whereas they hover slightly above 20 per cent for women. Education, in addition to age, has also been found to be unrelated to the tendency for women to work part-time (Jones and Long, 1978; Leon and Bednarzik, 1978; Owen, 1978). The proclivity of women to work part-time is matched by their generally positive attitudes toward part-time employment. It is seen, for example, as a way to help carry out both household and work responsibilities at the same time and to provide income and a continuous record of labor market experience (Nollen et al., 1976). Nevertheless, since women are disproportionately represented in those industries and occupations which were earlier cited as low paying, their part-time wage rates at any one point in time are generally lower than those of their full-time counterparts (Jones and Long, 1978; Leon and Bednarzik, 1978). Tsuchigane and Dodge (1974) consider this discrepancy to constitute a persistent component of economic sex discrimination.

With respect to race, black youth incur about the same amount of part-time

work as white youth. However, there is concern, especially among the dual labor market theorists (Doeringer and Piore, 1971; Harrison, 1971) that such work for disadvantaged individuals may fit the description of being involuntary or peripheral.

Finally, part-time work among youth can be differentiated depending on whether the youth is in-school or out-of-school. According to Cole (1980), part-time work while in school can have numerous work attitudinal and financial benefits, but such advantages can be reversed if time at work exceeds 20 hours per week.

Aside from the attributes of part-time employment, whether beneficial or detrimental, public policymakers and human resource managers in the United States have historically resisted its expansion. Western European labor unions are also concerned about its growth. The argument presented by these actors is that part-time workers negatively affect the employment and earnings of full-time workers. U.S. laws and regulations affecting relations between employers and their workers seem to reflect this indifference towards part-time work, an apt example being social security legislation (Clark, 1977; Janjic, 1972). On the other hand, a number of policy analysts, to wit, Dillin (1977) Hallaire (1968), and Levitan and Belous (1978), have argued forcefully for adopting positive part-time employment policies in order to answer such societal concerns as unemployment or the increasing taste for leisure.

About 35 states in the U.S. and the Federal Government itself through The Federal Employees Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act have undertaken some limited programs in part-time employment, but before emphasizing it in our human resources policy, it would seem most appropriate first to consider its long-term labor market effects relative to full-time work. Further, this consideration should carefully note the distinctions in the nature of part-time work; i.e., whether it be permanent or peripheral, and should detail which segments of the population to whom it will be applied.

HYPOTHESES

Based upon the various distinctions in part-time employment, this study will consider hypotheses underlying two of the categories previously cited. Primarily, it will focus only on permanent part-time first jobholders as opposed to peripheral first jobholders. Secondly, it will consider the later work experience of youth who are in-school and working. It will not explicitly treat the voluntary-involuntary classification.

H01: Youth whose first job is permanent and part-time will fare no worse in terms of the status and wages of their later work experience compared to permanent full-time first jobholders.

H02: In-school youth who work part-time will ultimately fare better in their later experience compared to out-of-school permanent part-time first jobholders.

On the basis of the foregoing literature search, the expectation is that both hypotheses will be accepted. By considering only permanent part-time work, some of the disadvantages of temporary work experience - such as a casual attachment to the labor market (Mincer and Polachek, 1973) - will be minimized, but the advantages - opportunity for career advancement and/or for human capital accumulation - will be maximized. Further, it is expected that permanent part-timers even if under-employed will not necessarily be placed in deadend jobs. The fact that these jobs are permanent suggests that their employers have accepted this employment alternative. The barriers to this latter contention are worthy of explication, however. The demand-side literature indicates that employers devote more on-the-job investment in full-timers than part-timers; consequently, part-time workers may only be partially included in the organizational social system (Miller and Terborg, 1979; Peters, Jackofsky, and Salter, 1981). Moreover, there may be an association between managerial practices and attitudes and the promot-

ability of part-time workers based upon perceived on-the-job learning deficiencies, lack of visibility, limited availability, or supposed career disinterest (Nollen et al., 1976; Goodman, 1980; Lublin, 1982).

The second hypothesis is based upon the rather direct human capital argument (Becker, 1964) that part-time jobholders who continue with their schooling are not only obtaining useful job experience but are at the same time investing in their own future. Their continued education will pay off in terms of better jobs, if not in the present, than at least when their formal studies have been terminated.

METHOD

The data base for this study was the youth cohorts (ages 14-24) of the National Longitudinal Surveys (NLS). In order to establish the permanent job criterion of labor market status, male youth whose job was held for less than one year were excluded. In the case of the young women, since the tenure variables was coded in months rather than in years, as it was for the young men, and since the universe of working women was less than working men, the cut-off point was established at six months. In addition, in order to establish compatible preconditions for initial work experience and to allow for more reliable assessment of subsequent work-related effects, only individuals whose first job was obtained prior to or during the first year of the NLS survey were selected. Finally, only out-of-school youth were considered, and tenure on the first job was held to seven years. The former condition was inserted given that although some after-school jobs are permanent, many tend to be temporary, ad hoc forms of employment.

The total number of cases in the resulting permanent first jobholder sample amounted to 384 young men and 388 young women. A slight amount of attrition occurred over time. For example, some individuals left the labor force, although in relatively random fashion. The young men surveys began in 1966; the young women in 1968. Since data were available for both cohorts to 1975, the total

span for the young women was two years shorter than the young men.¹

The principal variables of the study were working time (on the first job) as the independent variable and later rate of pay and occupational status as the dependent variables. Working time was measured by determining the respondent's usual hours worked at the job in 1966 (1968 for the women). Hours between 1 and 35 were coded as part-time; hours between 36 and 49 were coded as full-time. Overtime beyond 49 hours was excluded. Later rate of pay was constructed by first dividing 1975 income from wages and salary by weeks worked in 1975. This quotient was then divided by hours worked per week in 1975, which produced an hourly rate of pay. This procedure was used so as not to bias the ultimate earnings (typically measured as an annual income) by hours worked. In addition, compared to the standard hourly rate provided in the data set, it considers salaries so as not to weight the measure in favor of nonexempt classifications. Later occupational status for 1975 was measured by the familiar Duncan index of socioeconomic status. This index is ordinal, runs from 1 to 96, and is based on the educational requirements and economic rewards of an occupation.

Besides working time, other work experience and demographic variables were considered in the early period of 1966. These included rate of pay and occupational status, measured as described above for the 1975 variables, tenure on the first job, running from 1 to 7 years; career aspirations, computed from a variable measuring the difference between the occupation desired at age 30 (age 35 for the women) and the occupation of the current job; sex; age; race, coded as a dummy variable from white and black categories; and education, measured by highest grade attained in 1966.

All of the above measures, except for the principal variables and tenure, were constructed as covariates in the study because: 1) they were thought to be able to sharpen the discrimination between part-time and full-time effects by re-

ducing contamination, and/or 2) they were found by the author's previous work with the sample (Raelin, 1980) to be the most important predictors of later employment.

Besides the dependent variables, career aspirations and education were reviewed again in the late period as was a measure assessing occupational mobility between 1966 and 1975, coded as (1) same occupation, and (2) different occupation. During the period of the study, occupational mobility was prevalent and considered a possible means to advance vocationally or financially (Sommers and Eck, 1977).

The intent of the analysis was to test the first hypothesis of the study by comparing permanent part-time and full-time workers during the early period of the study and then likewise seven to nine years later. The comparison performed to test the second hypothesis was against a mutually exclusive sample of youth who were in-school but working during the first year of the survey.

The principal techniques used were analysis of variance and covariance. The analysis is obviously conditioned by the time period selected. Different results might be found, for example, if the early period were to be the present and the later period some ten years hence.

RESULTS

The status of permanent part-time and full-time first jobholders in terms of the selected descriptive variables and for both early and late periods is reported in Table 1.² Contrary to prior cross-sectional analyses of part-time employment, this working time alternative, at least for young first jobholders whose jobs have been relatively permanent, does not hold any severe disadvantages as compared to full-time work. Among males, the part-timers start out with relatively inferior status and pay, but this appears to be largely accounted for by their age and tenure. In fact, this discrepancy with respect to status and pay is

completely erased nine years later, with the part-timers even slightly overtaking their full-time counterparts in terms of pay.

Turning to the young women, the consistency between part-time and full-time workers in the early period is even more dramatic. There are simply no significant differences among the descriptive variables. By the late period, however, part-timers have made slightly more occupational changes and are behind in their educational attainment. Apparently, these young female part-time workers do not use their additional time to increase their education relative to full-timers. Their occupational shifts also do not result in relative economic gain as they begin to lag behind their full-time counterparts. The career aspirations of both groups of women are noteworthy in the later period since they turn negative. This is perhaps accounted for by career discrimination, one sign of which is their lower rates of pay compared to males in spite of equivalent educational attainment and higher occupational status (see also Raelin, 1982).

The multivariate analysis serves to confirm the insignificance of the longitudinal differences between permanent part-time and full-time young workers. Before reviewing the findings directly, additional information is provided on the covariance analysis procedure utilized. According to this procedure, the categorical independent variable, working time, is inserted into an ANOVA design as are the metric covariates in order to remove extraneous variation from the dependent variable. The SPSS program used for the analysis (Nie et al., 1975) allows the re-

searcher a variety of options in making model specifications. In this study, the covariates and the main effect for working time were processed separately, the covariates first. The covariates as a group, however, were processed simultaneously. The net impact of this ANOVA option was to determine whether working time had any unique additional effect on the dependent variables of later rate of pay and occupational status after controlling for some well-established predictors.

Tests were also run to determine the presence of significant interaction effects. However, only one set of near significant ($P < .1$) interactions were found - that of working time with early occupational status and age on women's later occupational status. The interaction effect indicates a tendency for part-time younger women and those with initial low level jobs to exceed the later occupational achievements of their full-time counterparts in the same two categories. However, the interaction did not measurably affect model specification.

The net results of the analysis of covariance, therefore, serve to support the first hypothesis. Working time virtually plays no role in later work experience. As a demonstration of these results, Table 2 displays the multiple classification analysis (MCA) produced from the analysis of covariance of the occupational status dependent variable. To conserve space, the rate of pay table has been deleted. The MCA provides a good illustration of the pattern of the independent factor's relationship to the dependent variable by examining factor categories in terms of their deviation from the grand mean. The table also notes the significant covariates from the early period. Examining the table closely, we see that the unadjusted deviations are almost identical between the working time categories for the young men, producing an ETA of zero. The adjustment provided by the covariates (described earlier) depicts an advantage for the part-timers but the BETA produced, which can be read as a partial correlation

ratio, is nonsignificant at .09. Likewise for the young women, the adjusted deviation favors the part-timers and even reverses the lower mean results obtained under the unadjusted condition. The significant covariates indicate that the way to get ahead is not through a choice on working time, but by getting a good first job in terms of status and, in the case of the men in terms of pay as well, and by staying in school. The pattern of results for the non-displayed rate of pay dependent variable is quite similar to the above.

The second hypothesis of this study is examined by direct examination of the mean values of some extrinsic as well as early period and late period job characteristics of the in-school sample. These values are then compared to the mean values obtained for the permanent part-time sample of first jobholders. T-tests are performed to test for statistical significance. As Table 3 reveals, the in-school youngsters start out with considerable job disadvantages in the early period, regardless whether male or female populations are considered. This finding also holds whether occupational status or rate of pay is chosen as the selected early period indicator. However, it is clear that these differences are largely accounted for by the very nature of the samples - the in-school youth are significantly younger, and at the time of the initial survey have held their jobs for less time and are less educated than the permanent first jobholders. The job differences, then, in the early period are not remarkable, they are expected. What is most intriguing, however, is that the in-school youth, again regardless of sex, surpass their counterparts in status and significantly so in education in less than a decade of time. Moreover, the in-school female youth surpass in terms of pay; the young males, however, given the apparent influence of seniority and/or experience in their case, do not catch up to their permanently employed counterparts. However, given the later status difference, it might be a matter of time before the in-school male youth also catch up in terms of pay.

Obviously, one reason accounting for the status re-direction in the late period is the education variable itself. The in-school youth benefit from their extra years of education. Beyond education, background factors and test scores were emphasized as significant precursors of status by Jencks and his associates (1979). Consequently, scores for socioeconomic status and IQ are depicted in Table 3. Socioeconomic status was based on the Duncan index of parent's occupation which was the father's in all cases except where missing, in which case, the mother's occupation was used. The IQ score is a well-known aptitude measure familiar to most people. The results do not support the SES proposition, but back up the contention (although only significant at the .1 level for the young women) that intelligence differentiates the samples. School may well be more palatable to the in-school part-timers given their superior aptitude. The career aspirations of these youth also start out higher than their counterparts, although they appear to become disabused with their career chances later on, a finding discussed extensively by Schein (1978: chap. 8). The latter interpretation, however, must be subject to caution given the perilously low number of cases in the permanent part-time cells as well as the previously cited problem of attrition. Nevertheless, some support is given for the lowered aspirations among the in-school part-timers by their slightly greater occupational mobility during the time period under study.

The racial composition of the separate samples can be examined in the table. The race score is simply a proportionate value of white to black respondents; 1 being white, 2 black. In the analysis presented here, however, no significant racial effects are discernible.

DISCUSSION

The findings support both hypotheses promulgated indicating that youth who for whatever reason leave school but obtain permanent part-time work do not suffer any subsequent economic or occupational disadvantages in their later youth career compared to their full-time counterparts. However, working part-time (even if the job is not permanent) and staying in school is still a superior alternative. Nevertheless, some youth, given financial necessity or perhaps even disinterest in school, must work. In this case, permanent part-time work is a viable alternative, especially if full-time work is unavailable or perhaps due to family circumstances, unacceptable. By stipulating "permanent part-time," there is an indication that the youth's employer has accepted this working time alternative and that the job is not necessarily deadended. In other words, there are advancement opportunities within the organizational system.

Beyond making sure that one's first job is a good job in terms of status and pay, there is no substitute for education if one wants to advance in his or her ultimate career. There is evidence that staying in school, certainly at least to obtain the high school diploma, and working part-time, will allow one to catch up and surpass within nine years permanent full-time workers in terms of occupational status.

With respect to public policy implications, this study lends support to human resource policymakers and managers who advocate adoption of a flexible approach to working time, at least during the earlier stages of a career. The part-time alternative, which, for example, can be an ideal means of introducing youngsters to the labor market, can be particularly attractive if combined with efforts to increase educational and quality of work opportunities. Full-time

employment holds no inherent advantage over part-time except that it tends to supply the better jobs. If part-time work can be made as attractive, i.e., in its permanence, content, and advancement opportunity, as full-time work, its expansion as a human resource policy tool deserves greater scrutiny. Employers are therefore encouraged to review their entry-level jobs to see whether such devices as work sharing might open up greater opportunities for part-time work.

The finding that staying in school and working is even a superior alternative to working part-time alone suggests that employers accommodate a school-oriented schedule for their young workers. Government support of these employer efforts through tax incentives, credits, and the like might ensure careful consideration of the part-time policy tool. However, youth part-time jobholders also need government support of their efforts, such as through the establishment of equivalent fringe benefits which do not penalize part-time work. Finally, although the use of government as an employer of last resort is not currently on the public policy agenda as a human resource alternative, slight alterations in such programs might prove worthwhile for our disadvantaged youth population. For example, there have been some promising results from a former U.S. Department of Labor sponsored guaranteed part-time job/in-school pilot program called the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects (YIEPP). Preliminary findings from the YIEPP suggest that disadvantaged youth who are both in the labor market and in school are likely to have greater employment and earnings potential after leaving school than those who do not participate in both of these activities. The evidence from this study suggests that a program such as YIEPP which would provide permanent part-time jobs, such as might be supplied through the private sector, in addition to incentives for remaining in school, would be a productive way of introducing our most disadvantaged youth to positive early work experiences.

FOOTNOTE

1. The selection procedure produced some unavoidable biases, although none are considered serious. The youthful nature of the sample of first jobholders likely results in an overrepresentation of lower educated youth since those who stayed in school to attain higher levels of education are not included. Selecting on the basis of first job might also underrepresent those who initially experience greater job mobility. Finally, the longer duration for the men, over which data were available, does allow greater potential for variation in the findings for men than women.

2. It should be noted that the analysis in Table 1 (and in Table 3 as well) concentrates on differences between part- and full-time workers but not on differences between the two time periods. Both conceptual and methodological explanations may be offered for this practice. Conceptually, the measures between the two time periods appear to follow an expected progression with the exception of educational level for the young women. This exception is accounted for by the methodological explanation. There is first of all attrition in the sample. Further, idiosyncracies in the NLS question patterns may have caused some of the numbers to drop considerably, i.e., the career aspirations variable in the late period for the males, or even to increase slightly as in the male rate of pay variables. Nevertheless, the late period cases among the part-time and full-time samples are generally held to their original respective panels and, consistent with prior NLS research (see, for example, Kohen et al., 1977), attrition is found to be relatively random.

REFERENCES

- Becker, G. S. (1964). Human capital. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Bednarzik, R. W. (1975). 'Involuntary part-time work: A cyclical analysis', Monthly Labor Review, 98, 12-18.
- Clark, R. (1977). Adjusting hours to increase work. Washington, D.C.: National Commission for Manpower Policy, Special Report No. 15.
- Cole, S. (1980). 'Child Labor: Looking Backward', Psychology Today, 14, 49-68.
- Deutermann, W. V. & Brown, S. C. (1978). 'Voluntary part-time workers: A growing part of the labor force', Monthly Labor Review, 101, 3-10.
- Dillin, D. (1977). 'New look at part-time employment', Civil Service Journal, 18, 34-37.
- Doeringer, P. B. & Piore, M. (1971). Internal labor markets and manpower analysis. D. C. Heath, Lexington.
- Gannon, M. J. & Nothern, J. C. (1971). 'A comparison of short-term and long-term part-time employees', Personnel Psychology, 24, 687-696.
- Golembiewski, R. T. & Proehl, Jr., C. W. (1978). 'A survey of the empirical literature on flexible workhours: Character and consequences of a major innovation', Academy of Management Review, 3, 837-853.
- Goodman, E. (1980). 'Time is on their side', Boston Phoenix, January 29.
- Hallaire, J. (1968). Part-time employment: Its extent and its problems. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris.
- Harrison, B. (1971). 'Human capital, black poverty, and 'radical' economics', Industrial Relations, 10, 277-286.
- Hom, P. W. (1979). 'Effects of job peripherality and personal characteristics on the job satisfaction of part-time workers', Academy of Management Journal, 22, 551-565.
- Janjic, M. (1972). 'Part-time work in the public service', International Labor Review, 105, 335-349.

Jencks, G., Bartlett, S., Corcoran, M., Crouse, J., Eaglesfield, D., Jackson, G., McClelland, K., Meuser, P., Olneck, M., Schwartz, J., Ward, S., & Williams, J. (1979). Who gets ahead? The determinants of economic success in America. Basic Books, New York.

Jones, E. B. & Long, J. E. (1979). 'Part-week work and human capital investment by married women', Journal of Human Resources, 14, 563-578.

Jones, E. B. & Long, J. E. (1978). Women and part-week work, National Technical Information Service, Springfield.

Kohen, A. I., Grasso, J. T., Myers, S. C., & Shields, P. M. (1977). Career Thresholds: A longitudinal study of the educational and labor market experience of young men, Vol. 6. The Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research, Columbus, and the U.S. Department of Labor, Washington.

Leon, C. & Bednarzik, R. W. (1978). 'A profile of women and part-time schedules', Monthly Labor Review, 101, 3-12.

Levitan, S. & Belous, R. S. (1978). 'Reduced worktime: Tool to fight unemployment', Worklife, 3, 22-26.

Lublin, J. S. (1982). 'More managers are working part-time; some like it, but others have no choice', The Wall Street Journal, June 2.

Miller, H. E. & Terborg, J. T. (1979). 'Job attitudes of part-time and full-time employees', Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 237-240.

Mincer, J. & Polachek, S. (1973). 'Family investments in human capital: Earnings of women', in T. W. Schultz (ed.), Economics of the Family. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. (1975). Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill, New York.

Nollen, S. D., Eddy, B. B., Martin, V. H. & Monroe, D. (1976). Permanent part time employment: An interpretive review. National Technical Information Service, Springfield.

Owen, J. D. (1978). 'Why part-time workers tend to be in low-wage jobs', Monthly Labor Review, 101, 11-14.

Peters, L. H., Jackofsky, E. F., and Salter, J. R. (1981). 'Predicting turnover: A comparison of part-time and full-time employees', Journal of Occupational Psychology, 2, 87-98.

Raelin, J. A. (1982). 'A comparative analysis of female-male early youth careers', Industrial Relations, 21, 231-247.

Raelin, J. A. (1980). Building a career: The effect of initial job experiences and related work attitudes on later employment. The W. E. Upjohn

Schein, E. H. (1978). Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs. Addison-Wesley, Reading.

Sommers, D. & Eck, A. (1977). 'Occupational mobility in the American labor force', Monthly Labor Review, 100, 3-19.

Terry, S. Lazos (1981). 'Involuntary part-time work: New information from the CPS', Monthly Labor Review, 104, 70-74.

Tsuchigane, R. & Dodge, N. (1974). Economic discrimination against women in the United States. D. C. Heath and Company, Lexington.

U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, (1981). 'Employment and earnings', 28, 19.

U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, (1975). Handbook of labor statistics 1975. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington.

TABLE 1

Selected Characteristics of Permanent Part-Time and Full-Time First Jobholders in the Early and Late Periods^a

	Males				Females					
	Part-Time		Full-Time		Part-Time		Full-Time			
<u>Early Period</u>	\bar{x}	N	\bar{x}	N	F^b	\bar{x}	N	F^b		
Occupational Status	25.4	41	32.3	222	3.9*	39.5	43	41.9	319	.6
Rate of Pay	1.7	38	2.1	227	3.7*	1.6	40	1.9	316	2.0
Tenure	1.9	43	2.5	227	5.1*	1.7	43	1.5	324	.1
Career Aspirations	18.8	35	14.6	190	1.1	8.8	10	9.8	82	.3
Age	19.7	43	21.0	227	11.7**	21.2	43	21.4	324	.4
Education	11.5	43	11.7	227	.1	12.0	43	12.2	313	.6
<u>Late Period</u>										
Occupational Status	38.9	40	38.7	184	.0	40.6	34	41.6	260	.1
Rate of Pay	3.9	42	3.7	222	.1	2.1	35	2.6	262	1.9
Occupational Mobility	1.6	37	1.6	167	.0	1.6	24	1.4	168	4.1*
Career Aspirations	1.9	9	22.3	21	1.6	-9.9	11	-4.7	58	.2
Education	11.8	36	12.2	178	.8	11.7	33	12.4	244	5.6*

a See text for description of variables.

b Significance established using an F ratio comparing mean differences through a oneway analysis of variance

* F significant at .05 level

** F significant at .01 level

TABLE 2

Multiple Classification Analysis of Occupational Status 1975 by Working Time
for Young Male and Young Female First Jobholders with Adjustment for Covariates

	Grand Mean	N	Unadjusted Deviation	ETA	Adjusted for Covariates	Significant 1966 Covariates (P<.01) ^a	BETA	R ²	R
<u>Young Men</u>									
Part-Time		32	.03		4.79	Rate of pay			
	38.91			.00		Education	.09	.45	.67
						Occupational status			
Full-Time		175	-.01		-.88				
<u>Young Women</u>									
Part-Time		23	-3.05		1.62	Education			
	41.96			.05		Occupational status	.03	.38	.62
Full-Time		184	.38		-.20				

^a Significance established through the F ratio

TABLE 3

Selected Job and Extrinsic Characteristics of In-School Part-Time Young Workers
with Corresponding Values of Permanent Part-Timers Repeated^a

		Males				Females			
<u>Extrinsic</u>	\bar{x}	N	t ^b	\bar{x}	N	t			
Education	10.4 (11.4)	1572 (43)	2.10*	11.6 (12.0)	935 (43)	1.64			
SES	37.4 (33.0)	1328 (36)	1.15	36.9 (34.8)	849 (35)	.46			
Age	16.3 (19.7)	1572 (43)	10.26*	17.0 (21.2)	935 (43)	14.90*			
IQ	104.7 (100.3)	1086 (27)	2.03*	105.5 (101.6)	690 (27)	1.84			
Race	1.3 (1.2)	1558 (43)	.99	1.2 (1.3)	920 (43)	1.06			
<u>Early Period</u>									
Occupational Status	20.5 (25.4)	1565 (41)	2.02*	26.1 (39.5)	930 (43)	4.04*			
Rate of Pay	1.2 (1.7)	1549 (38)	2.07*	1.1 (1.6)	756 (40)	2.41*			
Tenure	.9 (1.9)	849 (43)	4.96*	1.1 (1.7)	864 (43)	3.34*			
Career Aspirations	37.6 (18.8)	1268 (35)	4.27*	30.9 (8.8)	287 (10)	3.61*			
<u>Late Period</u>									
Occupational Status	42.5 (38.9)	1199 (40)	1.00	44.4 (40.6)	780 (34)	1.10			
Rate of Pay	3.0 (3.9)	1507 (42)	1.79	2.5 (2.1)	786 (35)	1.28			
Occupational Mobility	1.8 (1.6)	671 (37)	2.48*	1.8 (1.6)	324 (24)	1.90			
Career Aspirations	-11.4 (1.9)	438 (9)	.94	-11.0 (-9.9)	245 (11)	.01			
Education	13.7 (11.8)	1021 (36)	3.73*	13.5 (11.7)	670 (33)	7.87*			

^a Values for both means and number of cases of permanent part-timers are indicated in parentheses.

^b Two-tailed t-test performed for uncorrelated means with significance established at .05 level.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Joseph A. Raelin is associate professor of administrative sciences at the School of Management, Boston College. He received his Ph.D. in Policy Studies from SUNY at Buffalo. His research interests are in employment policy and public policy analysis. His latest work is a research volume published by The W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research entitled; Building A Career. Dr. Raelin is also the Director of the Institute for Public Service at Boston College.