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ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Predicting Job Performance and Job Satisfaction: An Examination of the Five-Factor Model of Personality, Polychronicity and Role Overload

by

Fiona L. S. Cochrum-Nguyen

Master of Science in Psychology with a Concentration in Applied Psychology
San Diego State University, 2013

A great deal of research has been conducted on the individual differences that predict job performance. However, less research has focused on the individual differences that may better equip employees to deal with stress-inducing situations. The current study explored the effects of polychronicity on job performance and job satisfaction. Polychronicity refers to an individual’s preference for engaging in multiple tasks simultaneously, as well as the belief that this preference is the best way to get things accomplished. The current study also examined the effects of an individual’s polychronicity on their interpretation of the stressor role overload, and how this impacts job performance. When individuals become overwhelmed by their work demands and feel as if they do not have the resources to deal with them, they experience role overload. The challenge-hindrance stressors framework suggests that an individual’s interpretation of a stressor as either a challenge or a hindrance influences whether that stressor will have a negative or positive effect on their work. Individuals with more polychronic orientations may be more predisposed to interpret a stressor such as role overload in a more positive way, as a challenge. Researchers have suggested that individuals with more polychronic tendencies may be less likely to feel the stress of role overload. Such individuals may consequently also experience more job satisfaction as a result.

The current study investigated the effects an individual’s polychronic orientation has towards alleviating workplace stress and increasing job satisfaction and job performance. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to extend the research on employee characteristics such as polychronicity and the Big Five personality dimensions within a stressful environment. The current study utilized an online questionnaire through the Amazon Mechanical Turk service (MTurk). The sample for the present study was drawn from a diverse worker pool consisting of 100,000 users from over 100 different countries. The final sample size was 194 participants who completed the posted survey and received monetary compensation of $0.50. Correlations were used to explore relationships between the Big Five traits and job performance as well as the relationships between demographic variables and the variables of interest. Hierarchical regression analyses were used to test for the moderating effects of role overload on the polychronicity-job performance relationship and the polychronicity-job satisfaction relationship. The results indicated that polychronicity was significantly and positively related to job performance, job satisfaction, and role overload. Polychronicity was also found to be significantly positively related to Neuroticism. Exploratory analyses
revealed that role overload moderated the relationship between polychronicity and subjective stress, and that polychronicity significantly accounted for variance in job satisfaction and job performance over and above the Big Five personality dimensions of Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Neuroticism. The findings in this study have practical implications for management’s motivational tactics and selection procedures. Future research could include an assessment of whether individuals are interpreting their stress as either a challenge or a hindrance, and it could include an assessment of other stressors that role overload is commonly paired with such as role ambiguity and role conflict.
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INTRODUCTION

The economic downturn has put a great deal of pressure on American workers. According to Metlife’s ninth annual Survey of Employee Benefits Trends (Jacoby, 2011), 40% of employees feel as if their workload increased in the past 12 months. This sentiment is shared by their employers, 39% of which reported an increase in productivity and a focus on getting more out of their employees. Some employees struggle to keep up with the workload, and a recent Gallup poll (Jones & Saad, 2010) found that 80% of workers reported feeling stress on the job. Research has indicated that personality can play an important role in predicting how hard individuals will work and their likelihood of success on the job (De Fruyt & Salgado, 2003; Krishnan, Netemeyer, & Boles, 2002; Liao & Chuang, 2004; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991). In the context of an organization, it may be that certain employees are more predisposed to take on multiple demands, cope with the stress of their job, provide better customer service, or manage multiple employees in a more successful way than others.

A survey conducted by TNS, an independent research company, polled 2,500 Americans on their views and behaviors as related to technology in the workplace and current economic trends (TNS Global, 2011). Results of the survey found that 48% of employees reported that they were constantly required to do more work with fewer resources and that 39% reported that they were doing the job of two people because of the impact of the economy recession on their companies. The demanding nature of today’s job positions suggests a strong likelihood of employees experiencing high levels of stress in their jobs. A great deal of research has been conducted on stress in the workplace, with findings running the gamut of negative work outcomes (Allan et al., 2009; Kerr, McHugh, & McCrory, 2009; O’Neill, & Davis, 2011; Yeh, Lin, Lin, & Wan, 2010). However, little of this research has focused on the individual differences that may better equip employees to deal with such stress-inducing situations. Building off of the notion that employees’ personalities somehow influence their job performance, organizations would greatly benefit from taking the time to identify and strategically hire those employees that possess the qualities that predispose them for success. It is also imperative for further research to be conducted on the complex
relationships involving individual personality characteristics and work-related outcomes, as well as any moderators that may affect those relationships. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to extend the research on employee characteristics such as polychronicity and the Big Five personality dimensions within a stressful environment.
HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

MAIN EFFECTS

The following is a development of the logical reasoning behind the four proposed main effects.

The Five Factor Model and Job Performance

Numerous studies have linked employee characteristics to different job outcomes (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993, 1995; Krishnan et al., 2002; Liao & Chuang, 2004; Sager, 1991; Srivastava & Sager, 1999). Over the past decade, increasing importance has been placed on investigating the link between an employee’s personality and their job performance (De Fruyt & Salgado, 2003; Hough & Oswald, 2000; Tett et al., 1991). One of the most commonly used taxonomies describing personality is the Five-Factor Model of Personality, or the “Big Five.” The Big Five outlines five separate dimensions of an individual’s personality: Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism. Nested under these dimensions are additional personality constructs; however, the Big Five are widely considered to be the most representative and all-encompassing traits of personality (Christiansen & Robie, 2011; Conte & Gintoft, 2005). Barrick, Mount, and Judge (2001) define Openness to Experience as one’s creativity, unconventionality and ability to reason. Conscientiousness refers to one’s dependability, organization, strong work ethic, responsibility and tendency towards planning. Extraversion refers to one’s sociability, thrill-seeking, and ambition. Agreeableness is defined as one’s compliance and affability. Finally, Neuroticism, which is also referred to as emotional stability, is defined as one’s anxiety, hostility, depression and personal insecurity.

The personality trait that has been found to be the most consistently predictive of an employee’s job performance is Conscientiousness (Gottfredson, 1997; Salgado, 1997; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). Conscientious individuals tend to be punctual, well-organized, dependable and achievement-oriented, which are all performance-related criteria that are, on average, predictive of success in most workplaces (Frei & McDaniel, 1998; Gellatly, 1996; Hurtz & Donovan, 2000). Consistent with this inference, Barrick and Mount’s (1991, 1993)
meta-analyses found Conscientiousness to positively relate to job performance across all occupational groups tested, as well as across different criterion types. In light of this, it is hypothesized that

**Hypothesis 1:** Conscientiousness will be significantly positively related to ratings of job performance.

The personality trait of Extraversion has also been shown to significantly correlate with job performance, but only in certain occupations (Barrick & Mount, 1993; Conte & Jacobs, 2003; De Fruyt & Salgado, 2003; Kinney, 2007). Conte and Jacobs (2003) found that Extraversion correlated with the job performance of train operators. The more extroverted the train operator, the more likely they were to have multiple absences on the job. Extraversion was also found to be more predictive of performance in jobs that were high in autonomy (Vinchur, Schippmann, Switzer, & Roth, 1998). Most notably, a consistent positive relationship has been found between Extraversion and performance in jobs with a predominant social aspect to them (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Mount, Barrick, & Stewart, 1998). For instance, Conte and Gintoft’s (2005) study of sales positions, which are widely regarded as highly social occupations, found a positive correlation between Extraversion and job performance. These results were consistent with previous studies of sales performance where Extraversion was found to reliably predict sales performance criteria (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Vinchur et al., 1998). O*NET (n.d.), an online resource of job descriptions, lists Speaking, Active Listening, and Social Perceptiveness as the top three most important skills for a sales position. O*NET lists similar required skills for management positions, and categorizes both management and sales as “social occupations [that] frequently involve working with, communicating with, and teaching people. These occupations often involve helping or providing service to others.” Many of the skills and tasks associated with managing and sales positions involve an individual’s ability to socialize with others and to be engaging and energetic. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the more extroverted an individual is, the more successful they will be in their jobs if they hold sales or management positions.

**Hypothesis 2:** Extraversion will be significantly positively related to ratings of job performance, specifically in sales and management positions.

Although research on the personality trait of Neuroticism has shown mixed results concerning its relationship with job performance, Neuroticism has been strongly linked to
many negative work outcomes such as burnout and emotional exhaustion (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998; Wright & Staw, 1999). Some research has implied that little to no relationship exists between Neuroticism and job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Barrick, Stewart, & Piotrowski, 2002; Salgado, 2003; Vinchur et al., 1998). However, positive relationships between an individual’s emotional stability and their job performance have been demonstrated in Salgado’s (1997) study of financial service managers, as well as in Tett et al.’s (1991) meta-analytic review. Furthermore, Mount et al. (1998) suggest that an individual’s emotional stability has higher predictive validity in jobs that require more interpersonal interactions compared to positions that lack that social aspect. Although the relationship between Neuroticism and job performance may be more conspicuous in fields that typically involve a great deal of social interaction, most jobs do involve at least some degree of social contact. Therefore, it can be inferred that the more neurotic the employee, the more likely it is that their work performance will suffer.

**Hypothesis 3:** Neuroticism will be significantly negatively related to job performance.

Employees’ varying personality traits can help to explain how they will likely react to events in the workplace (Froggatt & Cotton, 1987; Karasek, 1979; Lang & Markowitz, 1986; Parker & Sprigg, 1999; Parkes, 1991; Rahim & Psenicka, 1996; Schaubroeck, Jones, & Xie, 2001; Schaubroeck & Merritt, 1997). However, the nature of job performance is multidimensional. Although past research has documented just how extensively the Big Five influence employees’ actions in the workplace, further research is needed on additional individual differences that may also impact employee performance. Due to severe downsizing and the weak state of the current economy, managers in organizations today expect extreme efficiency and productivity from their employees. This trend has created a demand for positions that require a great deal of multitasking. Not every individual has the ability to multitask, which is why it is so important for organizations to be able to correctly assess and predict which individuals will be able to survive in a multitasking environment. This need has led to a dramatic increase in research on polychronicity as a predictor of employee performance (Arndt, Arnold, & Landry, 2006; Conte & Gintoft, 2005; Conte & Jacobs, 2003; Kinney, 2007; Leonard, 2008; Lindquist & Kaufman-Scarborough, 2007; Madjar & Shalley, 2008; Zhang, 2006).
Polychronicity is a term coined by Edward T. Hall (1959) that refers to an individual’s preference for engaging in multiple tasks simultaneously, as well as the belief that this preference is the best way to get things accomplished. For example, those with stronger polychronic tendencies feel more efficient and productive when engaging in multiple activities at once. Conversely, monochronicity refers to an individual’s preference for engaging in only one activity at a time. Such individuals usually choose to complete a task before focusing on the next one, and tend to view any additional activities as stress-inducing interruptions.

According to Hall (1959), an individual’s preference for either monochronicity or polychronicity is due to a cultural, or societal, distinction. Hall proposed that “high context” societies found in Middle Eastern or Central and South American cultures tend to be more flexible with their time and more willing to shift comfortably from one activity to another, whereas “low context” societies found in Western culture tend to focus on one activity at a time before moving on to the next. Hall (1959) further postulated that individualistic cultures more commonly exhibit monochronicity, and that collectivist cultures tend to exhibit polychronicity. These findings were supported in some later studies (Levine & Bartlett, 1984; Levine, West, & Reis, 1980), but were not supported in others (Conte, Rizzuto, & Steiner, 1999). Although certain cultures may show a tendency towards one extreme or another, research by Conte and Gintoft (2005) also suggests that individuals in each culture fall somewhere along a continuum, with extreme polychronicity at one end and extreme monochronicity at the other. Although polychronicity has been defined as both a cultural construct and a personality construct, in the current study, it will be examined at the individual level as a personality construct.

Some initial research has investigated whether gender and age are statistically significant predictors of multitasking performance. Hall (1959) suggested that males tended to be more monochronic than females. On the other hand, Francis-Smythe and Robertson (1999) found no statistically significant difference between men and women’s polychronicity scores. Studies by Kaufman, Lane, and Lindquist (1991) and Bluedorn (2000, 2002) also found no correlation between polychronicity and gender or age. A post hoc analysis in Kinney’s (2007) study revealed that although gender does not appear to be an important determinant of performance, age does appear to be. Results of the study showed that as age
increases, mean performance scores decrease. These results may be partially explained by Francis-Smythe and Robertson’s (1999) findings that younger individuals scored higher on polychronicity than their older counterparts. However, these findings were contradicted in a study by Zhang (2006) who found that in general most middle-aged managers with higher levels of education exhibited more polychronic tendencies. An additional study by Carrier, Cheever, Rosen, Benitez, and Chang (2009) across three generations of Americans found that the most recent generation, called the Net Generation, do multitask more and find multitasking easier than their predecessors. Through an anonymous online survey, participants reported their perceived level of difficulty for combining certain tasks as well as which tasks they would normally choose to combine. Results of the study showed that younger generations consistently reported a greater amount of multitasking in their lives, but also that all three generations agreed upon which tasks would be most efficient to combine. It is possible that younger generations have the advantage in that they’ve generally been raised in technology-saturated environments, and therefore are more comfortable combining their activities. Yet, because all generations agreed as to which tasks should be combined, it may be that older employees are choosing to embrace more multitasking behaviors. The current study will explore any connections that may emerge involving participant demographics.

Polychronicity and Job Performance

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor reported employers taking 1,599 mass layoff actions in May 2011 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011). Organizations are understaffed, which creates an increased need for maximum efficiency. An employee’s ability to multitask and get the job done has never been more valuable. Consequently, an organization’s need to identify and hire such individuals has increased considerably. Polychronicity should have a greater impact in demanding job roles where multitasking is required. For example, managerial roles often consist of frequent and unpredictable interruptions throughout the day. Managers are expected to interrupt their current task and attend to another more important task that has suddenly arisen. The success of individuals in managerial roles may be determined by their ability to deal with engaging in multiple tasks at the same time and frequently switching from one task to another. This assumption is supported by multiple studies in which positive correlations were demonstrated.
between polychronicity and work-related performance measures (Arndt et al., 2006; Conte & Gintoft, 2005). It is important to note that the jobs in the cited studies all required some level of multitasking. This further supports Bluedorn’s (2002) notion that managerial positions require a more polychronic orientation. Conversely, Conte and Jacobs (2003) found a significant positive correlation between an individual’s polychronicity and their absence and lateness in their study of train operators, a monotonous job that emphasizes routine and schedules. Here, an individual’s polychronic tendencies were shown to be a detriment to their job performance, suggesting that an individual’s polychronic orientation is tied to the nature of their work environment. Depending on which aspects of the job are emphasized in different occupations, an individual’s polychronicity may serve to help or hinder their work performance.

An occupational field that has received considerable attention in this area is the retail industry. This industry has been shown to strongly reflect the link between polychronicity and job performance. There is a high demand for multitasking and effective time management in retail, highlighting the advantages of employees who possess a strong polychronic attitude.

Furthermore, the cost of turnover is high for retail organizations. Employees who are distracted and stressed out by frequent interruptions may suffer in terms of customer service and ultimately, sales. It is a worthwhile investment for an organization to seek out employees whose polychronic orientation complements their job environment. Further investigation into the possible influences of the construct of polychronicity is warranted. Thus, it is hypothesized that

**Hypothesis 4:** Polychronicity will be significantly positively related to ratings of job performance, specifically in the retail and managerial industries.

**Polychronicity and Job Satisfaction**

Not only is it important for organizations to successfully hire a productive workforce, but it is just as important for a company to maintain a productive environment for that workforce. Today’s employees are a diverse group of people who come from a variety of different cultural groups. Studies pinpointing exactly where each individual falls on the polychronicity continuum, whether due to individual preferences or cultural influences, can
help to reduce psychological strain and role overload in the workplace, as well as increase job satisfaction among employees.

Research has shown that individuals express job satisfaction when their interests and needs are matched with their work (Daft & Noe, 2001). In turn, high job satisfaction leads to better performance (Butts, Vandenburg, DeJoy, Schaffer, & Wilson, 2009; Greguras & Diefendorff, 2009; Singh, 2000). Individuals who are poorly matched to their work environment may feel overwhelmed by their workload and experience increased stress. Benabou (1999) found that polychronicity was significantly negatively correlated with an individual’s preference to work for an organization that emphasized punctuality, schedules and deadlines, and routines. Polychronic employees may become restless or frustrated if they are placed in a repetitive, monochronic environment such as accounting, assembly lines, or train operation. Monochronic individuals placed in jobs that require high levels of multitasking like the retail industry may experience higher levels of stress and time pressure as a result. Such individuals may also be more likely to quit their jobs.

The effects of psychological strain and role overload on an organization’s employees can be very damaging to the company. A study by Cartwright and Cooper (1997) revealed that psychological strain led to lower rates of productivity and higher rates of absenteeism and turnover. Leonard’s (2008) study of the cultural effects on individual’s temporal orientation examined the correlation between polychronicity and stress reaction from role overload. Polychronicity levels were measured using a scale developed specifically for the study. Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement on a 7-point strongly-agree to strongly-disagree scale. Leonard (2008) concluded that, as an individual’s level of polychronicity increases, their level of job satisfaction also increases. Further, it was discovered that in the United States and Venezuela, as polychronicity increases, psychological strain and role overload were shown to decrease. Workplace stressors, such as role overload, have repeatedly been associated with decreased job satisfaction (Mansell, Brough, & Cole, 2006; O'Neill & Davis, 2011). In the right job setting, an individual’s polychronic orientation can go a long way towards alleviating workplace stress and increasing job satisfaction.

This concept of employee/work fit was studied more thoroughly by Arndt et al. (2006). The authors explored the effects of employees’ polychronic orientation on retail
employee satisfaction. Arndt et al.'s (2006) study found that polychronicity had a significant effect on retail employees' job satisfaction, their perceived distributive fairness, and company turnover. Employees with a polychronic orientation exhibited higher job satisfaction and perceived the distributive practices of the company as more fair. Also, job satisfaction was found to negatively correlate with turnover. Therefore, it is hypothesized that

**Hypothesis 5:** Polychronicity will be significantly positively related to job satisfaction.

**MODERATING EFFECTS**

The following is a development of the logical reasoning behind the two proposed moderating effects.

**Role Overload and Job Performance**

It has been well-documented that stress leads to numerous negative work outcomes such as exhaustion (Jackson, Turner, & Brief, 1987), lower organizational commitment (Agarwal, 1993), higher turnover (Motowidlo, Packard, & Manning, 1986), and increased health problems (Cummings, 2001). Role overload is a leading stressor in today’s fast-paced and downsized organizations. When individuals become overwhelmed by their work demands and feel as if they do not have the resources to deal with them, they experience role overload (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964). Role overload is also defined as having too many expectations from multiple role senders, with limited time and resources. The tasks expected of the employee are manageable by themselves; however, when multiple task requirements overlap, they can exceed the employee’s capabilities to accomplish them in a timely manner (Kahn et al., 1964). This occurrence can have severe consequences for an organization by reducing the effectiveness and productivity of even high-performing employees. High levels of stressors have also been found to be associated with physiological problems and lower job performance (Motowidlo et al., 1986). A meta-analysis by Gilboa, Shirom, Fried, and Cooper (2008) proposed a negative linear model between hindrance-based stressors (job demands that hinder one’s attainment of personal goals and development) and performance. Their model hypothesized what has been consistently found across numerous studies -- that stressors are detrimental to job performance. Gilboa et al. (2008) found a negative correlation between role overload and job performance, and this relationship was found to be higher among managers than among non-managers. This
negative linear relationship between role overload and job performance is consistent with previous literature (Behrman & Perrault, 1984; Cohen, 1980; Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Jamal, 1984; Orpen & Bernath, 1987). However, the possible predictors of job performance are involved in a complicated network of relationships. Some authors have suggested that role overload may be composed of multiple dimensions. It was proposed that there was both a quantitative and a qualitative aspect of role overload, and that each of these dimensions could relate to performance differently (Caplan, Cobb, & French, 1975; Sutherland & Cooper, 1995). Role overload has also been shown to explain variance over and above that of role ambiguity and role conflict as illustrated in Gilboa et al.’s (2008) study. The interaction effects of role stressors have been studied only marginally. In contrast to Gilboa et al.’s (2008) negative linear model, a growing number of role-stress researchers have begun to explore the possible positive effects of stressors (Babakus, Cravens, Johnston, & Moncrief, 1999; Edwards & Cooper, 1988; Singh, 1998; Singh, Goolsby, & Rhoads, 1994). The theoretical basis for this alternative approach is that it is the perception of the individual that determines the effect, whether negative or positive, of a role-stressor. This challenge-stressors framework was first outlined by Lazarus and Folkman (1984) who introduced a complex model of the relationships between individuals’ personal control, stress, and coping ability. It was posited that some types of stressors can actually make you more productive. One person may evaluate a role-stressor as a hindrance and become distressed, thereby negatively affecting the quality of their work. Another person may interpret that same role-stressor as a challenge and, inspired to rise to that challenge, may start to work more effectively as a result (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005; McGrath, 1976). It all comes down to whether the individual interprets the stressor as an overwhelming obstacle or an opportunity for growth. Wincent and Örtqvist (2011) conducted a 3-year longitudinal study of managers in new businesses in which they posited that certain combinations of role stressors would have a direct effect on positive affect. They found support for this relationship, as well as a significant positive correlation between positive affect and job performance. Their results support an indirect influence of role stressors on job performance.

The opportunity to turn stressors into productive motivators has far-reaching potential for organizations, especially those who regularly experience high levels of role-stress. It is
important to note that different stressors have different relationships to job performance, and it is important to explore these relationships further. In particular, mixed results have been found in studies analyzing the link between role overload and job performance. It has been suggested that no correlation exists between the two constructs, as the correlations discovered have frequently been non-significant (Eatough, Chang, Miloslavic, & Johnson, 2011). However, Tourigny, Baba, and Wang (2010) found a significant positive correlation between role overload and job stress in their study of airline employees in mainland China. Among the role stressors studied, role overload was found to be the most effective in increasing job stress among airline employees. Jones, Chonko, Rangarajan, and Roberts (2007) suggest that the inconsistencies found between role overload and different dimensions of job performance are due to an individual employee’s level of work experience. The authors suggest that more experienced employees are able to cope more effectively with high levels of role overload. Gilboa et al. (2008) have even suggested that an inverted U relationship exists, such that individuals with a preference to multitask perform well when presented with a high number of tasks to complete until the number of tasks or the level of task difficulty exceeds that individual’s capabilities or available resources. The mixed results concerning role overload’s effect on job performance suggest that other variables may play a role in this relationship.

Limited research has taken place linking polychronicity and role overload. The research that has been done indicates a negative correlation between the two constructs (Conte & Gintoft, 2005; Kaufman et al., 1991; Leonard, 2008). Frei, Raciot, and Travagline’s (1999) study mirrored these results, and the researchers suggested that individuals with more polychronic tendencies may be less likely to feel the stress of role overload, compared to those with more monochronic tendencies. The researchers even went so far as to suggest that polychronic individuals may even enjoy the interruption, as they are accustomed to frequent task-switching and prefer to be engaged in multiple tasks at once. It is possible that individuals with more polychronic tendencies are less susceptible to the demands of their job. A polychronic orientation may predispose one to be better equipped to handle such challenges. In this way it is likely that such individuals will perform their jobs more effectively. In an attempt to further explore the relationship between role overload and polychronicity, it is hypothesized that:
Hypothesis 6: There will be a significant negative relationship between polychronicity and role overload.

**Polychronicity, Job Performance and Role Overload**

The relationship between role overload and job performance is clouded, as past studies have reported positive, negative, and inverted U associations between the two variables (Behrman & Perrault, 1984; Jackson & Schuler, 1985; LePine et al., 2005; McGrath, 1976; Spector & Jex, 1998). The varying outcomes of studies that have explored this relationship suggest that other variables may play a role in the relationship between role overload and job performance. The construct of role overload has been found to act as a moderator to other job outcome relationships, as demonstrated in a study by Brown, Jones, and Leigh (2005) where role overload was found to moderate the direct effects of both self efficacy and goal level on performance. The relationships between self efficacy and goal level on performance were positive when role overload was low but then became non-significant when role overload was high. Extrapolating from these findings, it is possible that the level of role overload could result in different outcomes depending on an individual’s preference (e.g., polychronicity), or depending on the situation in the workplace (e.g., if individuals are a part of a polychronic or monochronic organization). More specifically, it is possible that role overload will moderate the effects of polychronicity on performance. Employees with more polychronic tendencies may be more effective in situations where the influx of information and demands of a job are high (Schein, 1992). When the pressure is high for employees to perform multiple role demands, those with more polychronic tendencies may be shown to be more effective in their jobs. Additionally, the positive effects of an individual’s polychronicity on job performance may only be apparent when given a multitude of concurrent tasks to complete. A lack of role overload on the job may deprive polychronic individuals of a platform through which to exhibit their superior performance. It is entirely possible that the positive effects of polychronicity on performance are only visible when an individual is experiencing high role overload, a situation in which a polychronic individual would thrive. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 7:** The relationship between polychronicity and job performance will be moderated by role overload such that this relationship will be significant and positive when role overload is high and non-significant when role overload is low.
Polychronicity, Job Satisfaction and Role Overload

One construct that has been clearly related to job performance is employee satisfaction (Brown & Peterson, 1993; Harrison, Newman, & Roth, 2006; Kraus, 1995; LePine et al., 2005). In addition, numerous studies have found that monotonous work combined with low role overload has been associated with low job satisfaction (Abdel-Halim, 1981; Campion & McClelland, 1991; Fried & Ferris, 1987; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Melamed, Ben-Avi, Luz, & Green, 1995; O’Reilly, 1980; Sales, 1970). In Chou’s (2007) dissertation on the effects of job satisfaction on different sources of job support, 984 direct care workers in assisted living facilities were surveyed in Wisconsin. Chou found that job satisfaction was negatively correlated with role overload. These results mirrored those of a study by Pearson (2008) in which the psychological health, leisure satisfaction, job satisfaction and role overload of 155 employed women was assessed. Again, role overload was found to negatively correlate with job satisfaction.

Returning to Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) challenge-hindrance stressors framework, individuals who interpreted stressors as challenging were also shown to report higher levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and motivation compared to those who interpreted stressors as hindrances (Dienstbier, 1989; LePine et al., 2005; Wincent & Örtqvist, 2011). Individuals with more polychronic orientations may be more predisposed to interpret a stressor such as role overload in a more positive way than their more monochronic counterparts. More polychronic individuals may consequently experience more job satisfaction as a result. Alternatively, at low levels of role overload, a polychronic person who finds more reward in a dynamic, fast-paced environment with multiple tasks to accomplish would likely not exhibit that same increase in job satisfaction due to the lack of stimulation in the workplace. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 8:** The relationship between polychronicity and job satisfaction will be moderated by role overload such that this relationship will be significant and positive when role overload is high and non-significant when role overload is low.

**Subjective Stress**

Hypotheses 7 and 8 center on the idea that more polychronic individuals may not feel the stress of role overload, but instead may enjoy the extra work and thereby perform their jobs more effectively as a result. However, how do we know that these individuals are
actually experiencing the stress of role overload? In order to assess participant’s experience of stress, subjective stress will be examined as an exploratory outcome variable of polychronicity with role overload as a moderator.
METHOD

SAMPLE AND DATA COLLECTION

Participants were asked to complete an online questionnaire through the Amazon Mechanical Turk service (MTurk). MTurk is an online database hosted by Amazon.com with over 100,000 users from over 100 different countries (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). The sample for the present study was drawn from this diverse worker pool. Individuals registered with MTurk can choose to complete tasks or surveys that have been posted on the site and in return receive monetary compensation. Amazon charges a 10% commission for this service. A study by Buhrmester at al. (2011) demonstrated that the quality of the data collected through MTurk met the psychometric standards associated with traditional methods, with absolute levels of the mean alphas on par with traditional-sample alphas and high test-retest reliabilities (r = .80-.94; mean r = .88). Participants that chose to complete the current study’s survey received payment of $0.50 each. A sample size of 200 participants was attained within 12 hours of the survey’s posting. Participation was limited to individuals who were 18 years of age and older. All participants remain anonymous. No identifying information was requested at any point in the data collection process. The online questionnaire included items regarding participants’ age, gender, employment status (unemployed, part-time, or full-time), ethnicity, time in current job, level of education, organization level, and job classification according to the most recent version of the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-88; see Appendix A). This statistical classification system is utilized by the International Labour Organization, a specialized agency of the United Nations. The ISCO-88 is a hierarchical coding system that organizes all jobs into clearly defined occupational groups according to skill level and the tasks and duties performed in the job. There are 390 unit groups, 116 minor groups, 28 sub-major groups, and 10 major groups. The 10 major groups in this system were used to categorize the data. A full list of the 10 major groups is included in the Appendices. Multiple studies have utilized the ISCO-88 system to explore the effects of individuals’ occupations (Kristensen, Bjorner, Christensen, & Borg, 2004; Sutedja et al., 2007; Wieclaw, Agerbo, Mortensen, & Bonde, 2005).
MEASURES

The following measures all utilize a 7-point Likert scale, with the exception of Role Overload, Job Performance and Subjective Stress, which were measured using a 10-item scale and two 5-item scales, respectively. Additionally, Polychronicity was measured through multiple scales.

Big Five Personality Measure

Individual’s personality traits were assessed through the separate dimensions of the Big Five Personality measure. Openness to Experience is one’s creativity, unconventionality and ability to reason. Conscientiousness is one’s dependability, organization, strong work ethic, responsibility and tendency towards planning. Extraversion is one’s sociability, thrill-seeking, and ambition. Agreeableness is one’s compliance and affability. Neuroticism is one’s anxiety, hostility, depression and personal insecurity. Each Big Five personality dimension was measured using the “Big Five Mini Markers” developed by Saucier (1994; see Appendix B). This scale was developed from Goldberg’s (1992) list of 100 adjectives describing aspects of each of the Big Five dimensions. Saucier’s Mini Markers are 40 adjectives, with 8 adjectives for each Big Five dimension. Respondents are asked to consider each adjective and then rate themselves on a 7-point scale with 1=extremely inaccurate to 7=extremely accurate. Conte and Gintoft (2005) found internal consistencies of .80 for Extraversion, .83 for Conscientiousness, .85 for Agreeableness, .83 for Openness, and .75 for Neuroticism. For the current study internal consistencies of .84 for Extraversion, .81 for Conscientiousness, and .69 for Neuroticism were found.

Polychronicity

Polychronicity is operationalized as an individual’s preference for engaging in multiple tasks simultaneously, as well as the belief that this preference is the best way to get things accomplished. This construct was measured using Bluedorn, Kalliath, Strube, and Martin’s (1999) 10-item scale, the Inventory of Polychronic Values (IPV; see Appendix C). The IPV was found to have a Cronbach’s alpha of .84-.88 (Schell & Conte, 2008). The reliability of the IPV for the present study was .70. Respondents used a 7-point Likert scale with 1= Strongly Disagree to 7= Strongly Agree. The higher a participant scores on this scale the more polychronic their orientation. Half of the items are reverse-scored. In addition to
Bluedorn et al.’s (1999) 10-item measure, the Multitasking Preference Inventory (MPI) recently developed by Poposki and Oswald (2010) was used (see Appendix D). The MPI is a 17-item measure of polychronicity. Poposki and Oswald (2010) redefined polychronicity as “an individual’s preference for shifting attention among ongoing tasks, rather than focusing on one task until completion and then switching to another task.” An internal consistency reliability of .88 was found for this scale. The reliability of the MPI for the present study was .72.

**Role Overload Measure**

Role overload is a type of stressor that can be operationalized as one having too many job demands. This construct was measured using Reilly’s (1982) 10-item scale of role overload (see Appendix E). An internal reliability of .88 was found for this scale. One item was adjusted by changing the word “parents” to “employees” in order to better reflect the organizational focus of the current study. Respondents used a 7-point Likert scale with 1= Strongly Disagree to 7= Strongly Agree. The reliability of role overload for the present study was .93.

**Job Performance**

Following Viswesvaran, Ones, and Schmidt’s (1996) definition, job performance was defined qualitatively, in terms of how well a job was done, and quantitatively, in terms of how much was produced. Participant’s job performance was measured through the 6-item scale used in Rhoads, Singh, & Goodell’s (1994) study of sales people (see Appendix F). Respondents were asked to rate their job performance in comparison to their coworkers on six dimensions of performance; quantity, ability, potential, customer relations, time management, and planning and knowledge. Participants were asked to rate themselves on a 5-point Likert scale with 1= “bottom 10%” to 5= “top 10%”. An internal consistency of .74 was found for this scale. The analysis is limited by the lack of objective performance data, however support for the use of subjective measures of job performance has been found in some studies (Churchhill, Ford, Hartley, & Walker, 1985; Schneider, Ashforth, Higgs, & Carr, 1996). Busch and Bush (1978) found that subjective measures had less leniency errors, restriction of range, and halo error than supervisors’ ratings. The authors also found that
subjective measures highly correlated with objective measures of performance. The reliability of the subjective job performance measure for the present study was .92.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction concerns the way employees feel about their jobs. This construct is operationalized as the extent to which an employee is content with the work they perform. Job satisfaction was measured using the five general job satisfaction items from the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1975; see Appendix G). An internal reliability consistency of .76 was found for this scale. Respondents rated each item on a 7-point Likert scale with 1= Strongly Disagree to 7= Strongly Agree. The reliability of the job satisfaction scale for the present study was .79.

**Subjective Stress**

Subjective stress was measured using the four items developed by Motowidlo et al. (1986) in their study of occupational stress (see Appendix H). An internal reliability consistency of .83 was found for this scale. Respondents rated each item on a 5-point Likert scale with 1= Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree. The reliability of the subjective stress scale for the present study was .73.

**STATISTICAL ANALYSES**

Prior to the main analyses the data was analyzed for missing values. Surveys identified with missing values were list-wise deleted to preserve the accuracy of the data set. The reliability and validity of each of the measures was examined, as were the means, standard deviations, and internal consistency reliabilities of each of the variables. Correlations were used to explore any relationships between demographic variables and the variables of interest. Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 will be tested using correlations. Hierarchical regression analyses were used to test for any moderating effects, as proposed in Hypotheses 7 and 8. The variables polychronicity and role overload were entered into the equation separately. Next an interaction term was created as the product of polychronicity and role overload. This interaction term was then entered into the equation. This equation was tested with job performance as the criterion variable, and then again with job satisfaction as the criterion variable. A significant interaction would indicate a moderating effect of role
overload on the polychronicity job performance relationship or the polychronicity job satisfaction relationship. A moderating effect would be indicated by a significant coefficient for the interaction term and a significant increase in R-squared. In order to determine the appropriate number of participants needed to achieve statistically significant relationships (a < .05) between the constructs of interest, a statistical power analysis (Cohen, 1992) was performed. A power analysis was conducted at the .80 power level and determined that a total of 125 participants were needed for the current study.

A total of 194 respondents participated in the current study. In terms of the sample, .02% of participants reported an ethnicity of Hispanic or Latino, and .02% of participants reported an ethnicity of American Indian or Alaska Native. Of the sample, 73% of respondents reported being of Asian ethnicity, and .02% of participants were reportedly African American. Additionally, 18.56% of participants reported a White ethnicity, and .02% of participants indicated Other as their ethnicity. In terms of gender, 61.86% of participants were male (N= 120), 37.11% were female (N=72), and 1% of participants did not report their gender (N= 2). The mean age of the sample was 29.97 years old, with a standard deviation of 8.82 years. The mean amount of organizational tenure of participants was 4.2 years, with a standard deviation of 4.69 years. Additionally, 82.4% of participants reported college level education (N= 159), and 67% of participants held management positions (N= 130).
RESULTS

Means, standard deviations, correlations, and coefficient alphas for all study variables are shown in Table 1 (see Appendix I). Gender was found to significantly negatively correlate with polychronicity (IPV: \( r = -.18, p < .05 \)) (MPI: \( r = -.16, p < .05 \)). Age was found to significantly negatively correlate with polychronicity (MPI) (\( r = .14, p < .05 \)). Organizational level was found to significantly positively correlate with Extraversion (\( r = .35, p < .01 \)), polychronicity (IPV: \( r = .19, p < .01 \)) (MPI: \( r = .15, p < .05 \)), role overload (\( r = .22, p < .01 \)), job performance (\( r = .27, p < .01 \)), and job satisfaction (\( r = .19, p < .01 \)). Education was found to significantly positively correlate with polychronicity (IPV: \( r = .15, p < .05 \)) (MPI: \( r = .18, p < .05 \)). Conscientiousness was found to have a significant positive relationship with both job satisfaction (\( r = .54, p < .01 \)) and job performance (\( r = .46, p < .01 \)). Extraversion was also found to have a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction (\( r = .51, p < .01 \)) and job performance (\( r = .49, p < .01 \)). Polychronicity, as measured by IPV, was found to significantly positively correlate with job satisfaction (\( r = .16, p < .05 \)) and job performance (\( r = .21, p < .01 \)). A t-test was performed to determine whether there were any significant differences between ethnicities. A Scheffe post hoc analysis revealed that there were significant differences between individuals who indicated Asian ethnicity and individuals who indicated White ethnicity (\( p = .031 \)). Specifically, the two groups scored significantly differently on polychronicity as measured by the IPV, with a mean score of 4.76 for Asian participants and a mean score of 4.23 for White participants. Table 2 (see Appendix J) illustrates the mean scores on variables across ethnic groups.

REGRESSION RESULTS

Correlations were conducted for hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Hypothesis 1 proposed that Conscientiousness would be significantly positively related to ratings of job performance. In the regression analyses testing this hypothesis the relationship between conscientiousness and job performance was significant (\( r = .46, p < .001 \)). As predicted, individuals higher on conscientiousness reported higher ratings of job performance. Hypothesis 2 proposed that Extraversion would be significantly positively related to ratings
of job performance, specifically in sales and management positions. The data were filtered to only include job categories 1: Legislators, senior officials and managers, 4: Clerks, and 5: Service workers and shop and market sales workers. The N for this subset of the data was 69. Regression analyses indicated a significant relationship between extraversion and job performance in this data subset \((r = .53, p < .001)\). Employees in legislation, management, clerical work, service work, or market sales who scored higher on extraversion reported higher ratings of job performance. Support was also found for hypothesis 3, where Neuroticism was predicted to be significantly negatively related to job performance \((r = -.26, p < .001)\). Individuals scoring higher in neuroticism reported lower ratings of job performance. Hypothesis 4 investigated the relationship between polychronicity and ratings of job performance, specifically in the retail and managerial industries. The data were again filtered to only include job categories 1: Legislators, senior officials and managers, 4: Clerks, and 5: Service workers and shop and market sales workers. Support for this hypothesis was not found. Hypothesis 5 proposed that polychronicity would be significantly positively related to job satisfaction. Utilizing the Inventory of Polychronic Values (IPV) to measure polychronicity regression analyses indicated support for this relationship \((r = .16, p < .05)\). Individuals scoring higher on polychronicity reported higher levels of job satisfaction.

Conversely, when polychronicity was regressed on job satisfaction using the Multitasking Preference Inventory (MPI), the proposed relationship was not supported \((r = .08, p = .28)\). Finally, hypothesis 6 proposed that there would be a significant negative relationship between polychronicity and role overload. The analyses including the IPV indicated a significant relationship between polychronicity and role overload, however it was in the opposite direction of the one initially hypothesized \((r = .29, p < .001)\). Analyses including the MPI supported these findings \((r = .36, p < .001)\). Contrary to what was initially predicted, individuals higher on polychronicity also reported higher levels of role overload.

Polychronicity was also found to be significantly positively related to Neuroticism (IPV: \(r = .19, p < .001\)) (MPI: \(r = .32, p < .001\)).

**M**ODERATED **R**EGRESSION **R**ESULTS

The variables of interest were first centered. Additionally, two different measures of polychronicity were used, the Multitasking Preference Inventory (MPI) and the Inventory of
Polychronic Values (IPV). Separate analyses were conducted using first IPV as the moderating variable, and then using MPI as the moderating variable. To test hypothesis 7, which proposed that the relationship between polychronicity and job performance is moderated by perceived role overload, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted (See Table 3 in Appendix K and Table 4 in Appendix L). Polychronicity (as measured by IPV) and role overload (RO) were entered in the first step, and the interaction term (IPV X RO) was entered in the second step. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were then conducted with polychronicity (as measured by MPI) and role overload (RO) entered in the first step, and the interaction term (MPI X RO) entered in the second step. If the interaction term was significant, this would indicate a moderation effect. As evidenced in Tables 3 and 4, neither interaction term was significant, so neither interaction term significantly predicted job performance ($p < .05$). In order to test hypothesis 8, which proposed that the relationship between polychronicity and job satisfaction is moderated by perceived role overload, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted with control variables polychronicity (as measured by IPV), role overload (RO), and the interaction term (IPV X RO). Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were then conducted with control variables polychronicity (as measured by MPI), role overload (RO), and the interaction term (MPI X RO). As evidenced in Tables 5 and 6 (see Appendices M and N), the results of these analyses demonstrated that neither interaction term significantly predicted job satisfaction.

**EXPLORATORY ANALYSES**

In order to conduct a more thorough analysis of the moderating effects of polychronicity, the hierarchical multiple regression analysis was repeated, this time with an exploratory model examining the moderating role of polychronicity on the role overload-subjective stress relationship. As can be seen in Tables 7 and 8 (see Appendices O and P), the interaction term (MPI X RO) significantly predicted subjective stress ($\beta = -.17$, $p < .05$), and the interaction term (IPV X RO) also significantly predicted subjective stress ($\beta = -.16$, $p < .05$). Figures 1 and 2 in Appendices Q and R illustrate these relationships.

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to determine whether polychronicity, as measured by IPV or MPI, provided incremental validity over and above
the Big Five personality dimensions of Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism. Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism were entered in step 1 of the regression analysis, and polychronicity was entered in step 2. The significance of the change in variance was examined to determine the incremental validity of polychronicity.

Table 9 (see Appendix S) presents the results of the regression analyses for job performance and job satisfaction. For job performance, both overall regression equations were significant (p < .01). The first regression equation ($r^2 = .30, p < .01$) indicated that Extraversion ($\beta = .35, p < .01$), and Conscientiousness ($\beta = .29, p < .01$) were significantly related to job performance. In the second step of the regression equation ($r^2 = .32, p < .01$), Extraversion ($\beta = .33, p < .01$), Conscientiousness ($\beta = .26, p < .01$), and polychronicity (IPV) ($\beta = .17, p < .01$) were significantly related to job performance. The addition of polychronicity, as measured by the IPV, accounted for a significant increase in variance in job performance ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .01$).

The first regression equation ($r^2 = .30, p < .01$) indicated that Extraversion ($\beta = .35, p < .01$), and Conscientiousness ($\beta = .29, p < .01$) were significantly related to job performance. In the second step of the regression equation ($r^2 = .31, p < .05$), Extraversion ($\beta = .34, p < .01$), and Conscientiousness ($\beta = .28, p < .01$), and polychronicity (MPI) ($\beta = .13, p < .05$) were significantly related to job performance. The addition of polychronicity, as measured by the MPI, accounted for a significant increase in variance in job performance ($\Delta R^2 = .02, p < .01$).

For job satisfaction, both overall regression equations were significant (p < .01). The first regression equation ($r^2 = .40, p < .01$) indicated that Extraversion ($\beta = .27, p < .01$), Conscientiousness ($\beta = .30, p < .01$), and Neuroticism ($\beta = -.20, p < .01$) were significantly related to job satisfaction. In the second step of the regression equation ($r^2 = .42, p < .01$), Extraversion ($\beta = .25, p < .01$), Conscientiousness ($\beta = .28, p < .01$), Neuroticism ($\beta = -.25, p < .01$), and polychronicity (IPV) ($\beta = .18, p < .01$) were significantly related to job satisfaction. The addition of polychronicity, as measured by the IPV, accounted for a significant increase in variance in job satisfaction ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .01$).

The first regression equation ($r^2 = .40, p < .01$) indicated that Extraversion ($\beta = .28, p < .01$), Conscientiousness ($\beta = .31, p < .01$), and Neuroticism ($\beta = -.20, p < .01$) were significantly related to job satisfaction. In the second step of the regression equation ($r^2 = .43,$
p < .01), Extraversion (β = .26, p < .01), Conscientiousness (β = .29, p < .01), Neuroticism (β = -.27, p < .01), and polychronicity (MPI) (β = .19, p < .01) were significantly related to job satisfaction. The addition of polychronicity, as measured by the MPI, accounted for a significant increase in variance in job satisfaction (ΔR² = .03, p < .01). In summary, polychronicity, as measured by both the IPV and MPI, was found to account for variance in job performance and job satisfaction beyond that accounted for by Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Neuroticism.
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among Big Five personality dimensions, polychronicity, and role overload on job performance and job satisfaction. An additional purpose of this study was to compare two competing measures of polychronicity, the Multitasking Preference Inventory (MPI) and the Index of Polychronic Values (IPV). Further, this study examines whether polychronicity provides incremental validity over and above the variance explained by the Big Five personality dimensions of Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Neuroticism.

Exploring the relationship between polychronicity and job performance with a role stressor variable as a moderator of this relationship is something that previous research has yet to address. The current study explores the degree to which the effects of polychronicity exist or are enhanced at different levels of role overload. This investigation extends research on polychronicity and may also lead to more attention being given to personality research in predicting how different individuals handle common work stressors. Furthermore, this research can be useful for practitioners in developing employee selection procedures so that organizations can select for employees that have the highest likelihood for success. This may be especially relevant for those job positions that have a strong likelihood of experiencing a great deal of role overload.

HYPOTHESES

As predicted in Hypothesis 1, which stated that Conscientiousness will be significantly positively related to ratings of job performance, individuals higher on conscientiousness reported higher ratings of job performance. Support was also found for Hypothesis 2, which stated that Extraversion will be significantly positively related to ratings of job performance, specifically in sales and management positions. Employees in legislation, management, clerical work, service work, or market sales who scored higher on Extraversion reported higher ratings of job performance. Support was also found for Hypothesis 3, which stated that Neuroticism will be significantly negatively related to job performance. Individuals who scored higher in Neuroticism reported lower ratings of job
performance. Hypothesis 4 investigated the relationship between polychronicity and ratings of job performance, stating that polychronicity will be significantly positively related to ratings of job performance, specifically in the retail and managerial industries. Hypothesis 4 was not supported. Support was found for Hypothesis 5, which stated that polychronicity will be significantly positively related to job satisfaction. Individuals scoring higher on polychronicity reported higher levels of job satisfaction; however, this relationship was only significant when polychronicity was measured through the Inventory of Polychronic Values (IPV). Conversely, when polychronicity was regressed on job satisfaction using the Multitasking Preference Inventory (MPI), Hypothesis 5 was not supported. Furthermore, contrary to what was initially predicted in Hypothesis 6, which stated that there will be a significant negative relationship between polychronicity and role overload, individuals higher on polychronicity also reported higher levels of role overload. This relationship may be better defined through an assessment of how individuals are interpreting their role overload and whether or not they are actually experiencing stress from the role overload. Polychronic individuals could be reporting higher role overload but may not be experiencing the stress associated with this role stressor. This idea is supported by the fact that a non-significant relationship was found between polychronicity and stress. This may indicate that individuals could be experiencing role overload because their polychronicity causes them to be more inclined to take on more tasks, but they may not be interpreting this role stressor as an actual stressor.

Polychronicity was also found to be significantly positively related to Neuroticism for both measures of polychronicity, which is inconsistent with previous literature. Conte and Jacobs (2003) found significant a significant positive relationship between polychronicity and Extraversion, and a significant negative relationship between polychronicity and Conscientiousness; however, they found no relationship between polychronicity and Neuroticism. The current study failed to find a significant relationship between polychronicity and either Extraversion or Conscientiousness. This positive relationship between polychronicity and Neuroticism has not been demonstrated before in the literature. One explanation for this finding may be that polychronicity and Neuroticism are related through an additional construct. Polychronicity has been shown to be a subcomponent of Type A Behavior Pattern (TABP). Other subcomponents of this construct include time
urgency, achievement strivings, and impatience or irritability. Neuroticism is also commonly referred to as emotional instability, which could be conceptually related to impatience or irritability. This positive relationship between Neuroticism and polychronicity may be an indicator of an overall high level of TABP.

Conscientiousness was found to have a significant positive relationship with both job satisfaction and job performance. The personality literature has found strong support for the relationship between Conscientiousness and job performance across most occupations (Anderson & Viswesvaran, 1998; Barrick & Mount, 1991; Salgado, 1997; Tett et al., 1991). Extraversion was also found to have a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction and job performance. Support has been found for Extraversion as a strong predictor of job performance; however, this has been restricted for the most part to occupations where social interactions are a significant aspect of the job (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Mount et al., 1998). Although the relationships found were unusually high, it should be noted that Neuroticism was still found to have a negative relationship with both job satisfaction and job performance. This relationship is supported in the research and is an indicator that participants were responding accurately in the survey.

Polychronicity, as measured by IPV, was found to be positively related to job performance, and positively related to job satisfaction. These findings are consistent with the literature on polychronicity. Polychronicity has been found to be positively related to job performance and job satisfaction in occupations that have been shown to typically require multitasking, such as sales (Conte & Gintoft, 2005).

**IPV vs MPI**

One purpose of the present study was to test how the newly developed measure of polychronicity, the Multitasking Preference Inventory (MPI), compared to the Inventory of Polychronic Values (IPV) in terms of convergent and discriminant validity. This is the first study to include both the MPI and IPV as measures of polychronicity. The IPV developed by Bluedorn et al. (1999) was initially meant to measure polychronicity at the cultural-level rather than the individual-level. Additionally, the IPV contains items that not only refer to preference, but also refer to individuals’ behaviors and beliefs. In developing the MPI, Poposki and Oswald (2010) sought to further refine measurement of polychronicity at the
individual-level. So the MPI items focus solely on the preference for multitasking, rather than including the behavioral and belief components that exist in the IPV. Poposki and Oswald (2010) argue that the construct of polychronicity has been defined in a multitude of complex and dissimilar ways, leading to a lack of conceptual clarity and problems in its measurement. It is argued that the definition of polychronicity should be narrowed and kept operationally distinct from the act of multitasking. Poposki and Oswald (2010) offer the following definition: “Individual polychronicity is a non-cognitive variable reflecting an individual’s preference for shifting attention among ongoing tasks, rather than focusing on one task until completion and then switching to another task.” Their study findings demonstrated that scores on the MPI were significantly related to scores on Extraversion and scores on the IPV and the Polychronic Attitude Index (PAI), previous measures of polychronicity. However, the MPI was shown to be empirically distinct as demonstrated through factor analysis, and correlated significantly differently with the criterion measures. The current study found that the MPI had a strong significant positive correlation with the IPV ($r = .72$, $p < .01$). Additionally, the two measures had similar reliability coefficients, with IPV at .70 and MPI at .72. While the relationships weren’t significant, the IPV and MPI demonstrated slight correlations with Extraversion and Conscientiousness in opposite directions. The MPI reflected negative relationships with Extraversion and Conscientiousness, while the IPV demonstrated positive relationships with the same variables. These differences may be negligible because no significance was found. Additional differences in predictive power were observed in polychronicity’s relationships with job performance and job satisfaction. Polychronicity as measured by the IPV was found to have a significant positive relationship with job performance and a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction. However, when polychronicity was measured by the MPI neither the relationship with job performance nor the relationship with job satisfaction was found to be significant. These findings may be the result of the MPI’s narrowed focus on individuals’ preference to multitask. Individuals who are multitasking in their jobs may therefore potentially be performing more effectively as a result. Because items addressing the behavior of multitasking, as are present in the IPV, were excluded from the MPI, this relationship between multitasking behavior and job performance may have gone unobserved. Moreover, the IPV also contains items that address the belief that being involved in multiple
tasks at the same time is the best way to go about doing things. The MPI does not contain such items. Therefore it is possible that individuals who are multitasking and believe that this is the best way to accomplish things experience more job satisfaction as a result, and the MPI may fail to capture this relationship. Furthermore, polychronicity, as measured by the MPI, was found to have a significant negative relationship with age. However this relationship was not found to be significant when polychronicity was measured by the IPV. A t-test was performed to determine whether any racial differences in polychronicity were observed, and it was found that Asians and Whites were significantly different on polychronicity as measured by the IPV. This finding is consistent with the literature on cultural variation in temporal orientation. Hall’s (1959) definition of polychronicity suggests that it may explain the temporal orientation of individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Hall proposed that “high context” societies found in Middle Eastern or Central and South American cultures tend to be more flexible with their time and more willing to shift comfortably from one activity to another, while “low context” societies found in Western culture tend to focus on one activity at a time before moving on to the next. Hall (1959) further suggested that individualistic cultures more commonly exhibit monochronicity, and collectivist cultures have been found to exhibit polychronicity. These findings were supported by later studies (Levine & Bartlett, 1984; Levine at al., 1980). However, the current study’s findings of racial differences in polychronicity may be due to the low numbers of other reported ethnicities in the sample. Moving forward, further studies utilizing both the IPV and the MPI are recommended in order to get a clearer picture of the relationships surrounding the construct of polychronicity.

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

Relationships among demographic variables were also explored. Gender was found to significantly negatively correlate with polychronicity. Specifically, males were found to be more polychronic than females. There have been conflicting findings in the relationship between gender and polychronicity, with some studies finding no relationship (Adams & van Eerde, 2010; Francis-Smythe & Robertson, 1999), and other studies findings males to be more polychronic than females (Hall, 1989). The current study’s findings support the notion that males tend to be more polychronic than females, but more research is needed examining gender differences in polychronicity. Education was found to significantly positively
correlate with polychronicity. The higher education individuals reported achieving, the more polychronic they tended to be. This relationship has been previously found in the literature (Zhang, 2006).

**Moderated Relationships**

Hypothesis 7, which stated that the relationship between polychronicity and job performance will be moderated by role overload such that this relationship will be significant and positive when role overload is high and non-significant when role overload is low, was not supported. Additionally, Hypothesis 8, which stated that the relationship between polychronicity and job satisfaction will be moderated by role overload such that this relationship will be significant and positive when role overload is high and non-significant when role overload is low, was not supported. While these relationships may truly exist, the data did not support these hypotheses. One possible factor explaining the lack of significant moderating relationships is that role overload may be composed of different dimensions, both quantitative and qualitative. These dimensions could be differentially related to performance (Caplan et al., 1975; Sutherland & Cooper, 1995). Additionally, role stressors other than role overload may have influenced the observed effects of the proposed moderated relationships. Role ambiguity is distinguished in the stress literature for its strong negative relationship with job performance (Fried, Ben-David, Tiegs, Avital, & Yeverechyahu, 1998; Karatepe & Uludag, 2008; Orpen & Bernath, 1987; Owens, 2002; Tubre & Collins, 2000). Gilboa et al., (2008) specifically found that role ambiguity had a stronger negative correlation with job performance than role conflict and role overload. It may be that at high levels of role ambiguity, all positive effects of polychronicity on performance are negated, regardless of role overload levels. Furthermore, there is the possibility of a curvilinear relationship such that polychronic individuals who are motivated to be involved in multiple tasks at once do perform better than their monochromic counterparts until the number of tasks or the task difficulty exceeds that individual’s capabilities or resources. Then this positive relationship may start to turn negative, and the upperhand that polychronic employees previously held may dissolve into being a detriment to their performance. Perhaps at a certain level of task number and difficulty a polychronic individual may begin to perform less effectively than a monochronic individual. The presence of a curvilinear relationship may have confounded the
analyses and led to the current study’s non-significant findings.

**EXPLORATORY ANALYSES**

The exploratory model examining the moderating role of role overload on the polychronicity subjective stress relationship was significant for both measures of polychronicity (IPV and MPI). Role overload was found to moderate the relationship between polychronicity and subjective stress such that the relationship was significantly negative at high levels of role overload, and insignificant at low levels of role overload. As individuals’ polychronicity increased, their subjective stress was found to decrease at medium and high levels of role overload. Conversely, at low levels of role overload, individuals’ subjective stress was found to slightly increase as their polychronicity increased. It may be that more polychronic individuals are properly challenged by increased role overload, and therefore experience less subjective stress. Additionally, at low levels of role overload, more polychronic individuals may become bored or restless, and therefore may experience more subjective stress. One explanation for this finding is that subjective stress is a psychological variable that conceptually overlaps with role overload and polychronicity. This relationship may be especially strong due to the variables’ being conceptually similar and to the data being entirely self-report. An individual who reports experiencing the stressor of role overload is much more likely to also report experiencing stress.

Further exploratory analyses provided evidence that polychronicity, as measured by both the IPV and MPI, significantly accounted for variance in job satisfaction and job performance, over and above that explained by the Big Five personality dimensions of Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism. This supports the literature suggesting polychronicity is distinct from the Big Five personality dimensions.

**RESEARCH LIMITATIONS**

One limitation of the current study is the small sample size of managers and sales positions. Because Hypotheses 2 and 4 were restricted to the retail and managerial industries, the limited number of participants may have been the reason why more significant results were not found. Perhaps extending this research to focus on just sales and management positions, or those positions that can be argued to have polychronic merit, would uncover more about this proposed relationship. Gilboa et al., (2008) found that the negative
correlation between role overload and performance was stronger for managers than non-managers. Further studies looking at these populations may further define the relationship between role overload, polychronicity, job performance, and job satisfaction.

Another limitation to the current study is that it consists entirely of self-report data, and could therefore potentially suffer from common method bias. It is widely believed that common method bias inflates the relationships between variables, especially when data is collected through self-report (Campbell, 1982; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff & Todor, 1985). However, common method bias has been shown to be less of a problem than commonly believed (Spector, 2006). Spector (2006) refuted the belief that the relationships between self-reported variables were always upwardly biased. His study demonstrated that the biasing factors of negative affect and acquiescence did not have strong and consistent effects on the construct validity of self-report data. Additionally, it was demonstrated that different-method correlations were at times higher than common-method correlations. These findings were supported in a recent study by Lance, Dawson, Birklebach, and Hoffman (in press), where 18 published multitrait-multimethod matrices were re-analyzed, and it was found that the common-method observed score correlations were equal to, if not lower than, the multi-method score correlations. Self-report was the most theoretically relevant method of measurement for the variables of role overload, subjective stress, and job satisfaction. Given that these variables assess job characteristics that are perceived by the individual, it is most relevant for individuals to rate themselves on that construct. A supervisory measure of job performance, in addition to the self-reported data collected, would have been preferable in order to gain a more complete view of participants’ true level of job performance. However, due to budgetary and time constraints, self-report data were ultimately a necessity for the current study.

Performance is a construct that is highly complex and multidimensional. In this study, individual job performance was only measured through self-rated performance measures, so this might not have provided the most comprehensive picture of the relationships among role overload, polychronicity and job performance. Thus, caution should be used in interpreting the results of this study since self-reported job performance is likely to suffer from impression management. However, the job performance responses do show substantial variance, which suggests that participants were likely to be providing accurate information.
Future studies may benefit from using multiple sources and methods of performance measurement.

**Practical Implications**

The findings in this study have practical implications for management and hiring practices in organizations. Employees may benefit from being made aware of their polychronic orientation. This may help them to be more aware of how they react to different stressors and workloads, and this may allow them to work more effectively and avoid burnout. Companies could leverage this knowledge through assessment of their employees’ polychronic orientations and work stress experiences. Additionally, companies can also assess their organization’s level of polychronicity. Are employees working in a monochronic environment or a polychronic environment? By focusing on what is valued within a particular organization, the motivational tactics and selection procedures utilized by management can be adjusted accordingly. Not only is it important for organizations to have the tools necessary to successfully hire a productive workforce, but it is just as important for a company to maintain a productive environment for that workforce. Today’s employees are a diverse group of people who come from a variety of different cultural groups. Studies pinpointing exactly where each individual falls on the polychronicity continuum, whether due to individual preferences or cultural influences, can help to reduce psychological strain and role overload in the workplace, as well as increase job satisfaction among employees.

**Future Research**

Future research could include an assessment of whether individuals are interpreting their stress- as either a challenge or a hindrance. This may be helpful in pinpointing whether high levels of polychronicity are more likely to make someone interpret stress as a challenge. Furthermore, this may help to address whether those individuals are more likely to perform better as a result of this challenge interpretation. Additionally, future research could examine other stressors that role overload is commonly paired with such as role ambiguity and role conflict to investigate their relationships with polychronicity, job performance, and job satisfaction. Karatepe and Uluday (2008) found that role conflict enhanced job performance, and Owens (2002) found a significant relationship between role ambiguity and salesperson behaviors. Additionally, Onyemah (2008) suggested that there may be an inverted U
relationship between role stressors and performance. Further investigations into the dynamics of these relationships could shed substantial light on the interactions of role stressors and important job outcomes.
CONCLUSION

This study investigated the relationships among Big Five personality dimensions, polychronicity, and role overload on job performance and job satisfaction. The findings indicated that Conscientiousness and Extraversion were significantly and positively related to ratings of job performance and job satisfaction. Neuroticism was significantly and negatively related to job performance and job satisfaction. The results also indicated that polychronicity was significantly and positively related to job performance, job satisfaction, and role overload. In addition, polychronicity was found to be significantly positively related to Neuroticism, a relationship that has not previously been demonstrated in the literature. Further, this study contributed to the literature by comparing two competing measures of polychronicity, the Multitasking Preference Inventory (MPI) and the Index of Polychronic Values (IPV). Some differences between measures were found; however, further research utilizing both measures is needed. Exploratory analyses revealed that role overload moderated the relationship between polychronicity and subjective stress, and that polychronicity significantly accounted for variance in job satisfaction and job performance over and above the Big Five personality dimensions of Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Neuroticism. This study provides insights into the roles of stress and different personality characteristics on important work outcomes. Investigating such relationships can lead to better understanding of both organizations and their employees. This in turn can foster the development of better selection procedures and may lead to the improvement of motivational tactics in organizations.
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APPENDIX A

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD CLASSIFICATION
OF OCCUPATIONS (ISCO-88)
The following briefly outlines ISCO-88 major groups, and is meant to facilitate the interpretation of the classification.

1. Legislators, senior officials and managers
   This major group includes occupations whose main tasks consist of determining and formulating government policies, as well as laws and public regulations, overseeing their implementation, representing governments and acting on their behalf, or planning, directing and coordinating the policies and activities of enterprises and organizations, or departments. Reference to skill level has not been made in defining the scope of this major group, which has been divided into three sub-major groups, eight minor groups and 33 unit groups, reflecting differences in tasks associated with different areas of authority and different types of enterprises and organizations.

2. Professionals
   This major group includes occupations whose main tasks require a high level of professional knowledge and experience in the fields of physical and life sciences, or social sciences and humanities. The main tasks consist of increasing the existing stock of knowledge, applying scientific and artistic concepts and theories to the solution of problems, and teaching about the foregoing in a systematic manner. Most occupations in this major group require skills at the fourth ISCO skill level. This major group has been divided into four sub-major groups, 18 minor groups and 55 unit groups, reflecting differences in tasks associated with different fields of knowledge and specialization.

3. Technicians and associate professionals
   This major group includes occupations whose main tasks require technical knowledge and experience in one or more fields of physical and life sciences, or social sciences and humanities. The main tasks consist of carrying out technical work connected with the application of concepts and operational methods in the above-mentioned fields, and in teaching at certain educational levels. Most occupations in this major group require skills at the third ISCO skill level. This major group has been divided into four sub-major groups, 21 minor groups and 73 unit groups, reflecting differences in tasks associated with different fields of knowledge and specialization.
4. Clerks

This major group includes occupations whose main tasks require the knowledge and experience necessary to organize, store, compute and retrieve information. The main tasks consist of performing secretarial duties, operating word processors and other office machines, recording and computing numerical data, and performing a number of customer-oriented clerical duties, mostly in connection with mail services, money-handling operations and appointments. Most occupations in this major group require skills at the second ISCO skill level. This major group has been divided into two sub-major groups, seven minor groups and 23 unit groups, reflecting differences in tasks associated with different areas of specialization.

5. Service workers and shop and market sales workers

This major group includes occupations whose main tasks require the knowledge and experience necessary to provide personal and protective services, and to sell goods in shops or at markets. The main tasks consist of providing services related to travel, housekeeping, catering, personal care, protection of individuals and property, and to maintaining law and order, or selling goods in shops or at markets. Most occupations in this major group require skills at the second ISCO skill level. This major group has been divided into two sub-major groups, nine minor groups and 23 unit groups, reflecting differences in tasks associated with different areas of specialization.

6. Skilled agricultural and fishery workers

This major group includes occupations whose tasks require the knowledge and experience to produce farm, forestry and fishery products. The main tasks consist of growing crops, breeding or hunting animals, catching or cultivating fish, conserving and exploiting forests and, especially in the case of market-oriented agricultural and fishery workers, selling products to purchasers, marketing organizations or at markets. Most occupations in this major group require skills at the second ISCO skill level. This major group has been divided into two sub-major groups, six minor groups and 17 unit groups, reflecting differences in tasks associated with differences between market-oriented and subsistence agricultural and fishery workers.
7. Craft and related trades workers

This major group includes occupations whose tasks require the knowledge and experience of skilled trades or handicrafts, which, among other things, involves an understanding of materials and tools to be used, as well as of all stages of the production process, including the characteristics and the intended use of the final product. The main tasks consist of extracting raw materials, constructing buildings and other structures and making various products as well as handicraft goods. Most occupations in this major group require skills at the second ISCO skill level. This major group has been divided into four sub-major groups, 16 minor groups and 70 unit groups, reflecting differences in tasks associated with different areas of specialization.

8. Plant and machine operators and assemblers

This major group includes occupations whose main tasks require the knowledge and experience necessary to operate and monitor large scale, and often highly automated, industrial machinery and equipment. The main tasks consist of operating and monitoring mining, processing and production machinery and equipment, as well as driving vehicles and driving and operating mobile plant, or assembling products from component parts. Most occupations in this major group require skills at the second ISCO skill level. This major group has been divided into three sub-major groups, 20 minor groups and 70 unit groups, reflecting differences in tasks associated with different areas of specialization.

9. Elementary occupations

This major group covers occupations which require the knowledge and experience necessary to perform mostly simple and routine tasks, involving the use of hand-held tools and in some cases considerable physical effort, and, with few exceptions, only limited personal initiative or judgment. The main tasks consist of selling goods in streets, door-keeping and property watching, as well as cleaning, washing, pressing, and working as laborers in the fields of mining, agriculture and fishing, construction and manufacturing. Most occupations in this major group require skills at the first ISCO skill level. This major group has been divided into three sub-major groups, ten minor groups and 25 unit groups, reflecting differences in tasks associated with different areas of work.
10. Armed forces

Members of the armed forces are those personnel who are currently serving in the armed forces, including auxiliary services, whether on a voluntary or compulsory basis, and who are not free to accept civilian employment. Included are regular members of the army, navy, air force and other military services, as well as conscripts enrolled for military training or other service for a specified period, depending on national requirements. Excluded are persons in civilian employment of government establishments concerned with defense issues: police (other than military police); customs inspectors and members of border or other armed civilian services; persons who have been temporarily withdrawn from civilian life for a short period of military training or retraining, according to national requirements, and members of military reserves not currently on active service. Reference to a skill level has not been used in defining the scope of this major group.
APPENDIX B

BIG FIVE MINI MARKERS
Big Five Mini Markers (Saucier, 1994)

HOW ACCURATELY CAN YOU DESCRIBE YOURSELF?

Please use this list of common human traits to describe yourself as accurately as possible. Describe yourself as you see yourself at the present time, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you are generally or typically, as compared with other persons you know of the same sex and of roughly your same age. Please use the scan sheet and the rating scale to indicate how accurately each trait describes you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Inaccurate</td>
<td>Quite Inaccurate</td>
<td>Slightly Inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Slightly Accurate</td>
<td>Quite Accurate</td>
<td>Extremely Accurate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___ 1. Bashful

___ 2. Bold

___ 3. Careless

___ 4. Cold

___ 5. Complex

___ 6. Cooperative

___ 7. Creative

___ 8. Deep

___ 9. Disorganized
10. Efficient
11. Energetic
12. Envious
13. Extraverted
14. Fretful
15. Harsh
16. Imaginative
17. Inefficient
18. Intellectual
19. Jealous
20. Kind
21. Moody
22. Organized
23. Philosophical
24. Practical
25. Quiet
26. Relaxed
27. Rude
28. Shy
29. Sloppy
30. Sympathetic
31. Systematic
32. Talkative
33. Temperamental
34. Touchy
35. Uncreative
36. Unenvious
37. Unintellectual
38. Unsympathetic
39. Warm
40. Withdrawn
APPENDIX C

INVENTORY OF POLYCHRONIC VALUES (IPV)
Inventory of Polychronic Values (IPV) (Bluedorn, Kalliath, Strube, & Martin, 1999)

1. I like to juggle several activities at the same time.

2. I would rather complete an entire project every day than complete parts of several projects. (R)

3. People should not try to do many activities at once. (R)

4. I believe it is best for people to be given several tasks and assignments to perform.

5. I prefer to do one thing at a time. (R)

6. I believe people should try to do many things at once.

7. When I work by myself, I usually work on one task at a time. (R)

8. I believe it is best to complete one task before beginning another. (R)

9. I believe people do their best work when they have many tasks to do.

10. I seldom like to work on more than a single task or assignment at the same time. (R)
APPENDIX D

MULTITASKING PREFERENCE INVENTORY
(MPI)
Multitasking Preference Inventory (MPI) (Poposki & Oswald, 2010)

1. I prefer to work on several projects in a day, rather than completing one project and then switching to another.
2. I would like to work in a job where I was constantly shifting from one task to another, like a receptionist or an air traffic controller.
3. I lose interest in what I am doing if I have to focus on the same task for long periods of time, without thinking about or doing something else.
4. When doing a number of assignments, I like to switch back and forth between them rather than do one at a time.
5. I like to finish one task completely before focusing on anything else.
6. I like to do other things during TV commercials, like read or clean.
7. I prefer to combine cooking with other tasks such as cleaning the house.
8. When I am using a computer, I like to have multiple windows open so I can switch between multiple tasks.
9. It makes me uncomfortable when I am not able to finish one task completely before focusing on another task.
10. I am much more engaged in what I am doing if I am able to switch between several different tasks.
11. I do not like having to shift my attention between multiple tasks.
12. I would rather switch back and forth between several projects than concentrate my efforts on just one.
13. I would prefer to work in an environment where I can finish one task before starting the next.

14. I don't like when I have to stop in the middle of a task to work on something else.

15. When I have a task to complete, I like to break it up by switching to other tasks intermittently.

16. I have a "one-track" mind.

17. I prefer not to be interrupted when working on a task.
APPENDIX E

ROLE OVERLOAD SCALE
Role Overload Scale (Reilly, 1982)

1. I have to do things that I do not really have the time and energy for.

2. There are too many demands on my time.

3. I need more hours in the day to do all the things that are expected of me.

4. I cannot ever seem to catch up.

5. I do not ever seem to have any time for myself.

6. There are times when I cannot meet everyone’s expectations.

7. Many times I have to cancel commitments.

8. I seem to have more commitments to overcome than other employees I know.

9. I have to prepare priority lists to get all the things done. Otherwise I forget because I have so much to do.

10. I feel I have to do things hastily and may be less careful to get everything done.
APPENDIX F

JOB PERFORMANCE SCALE
Job Performance Scale (Rhoads at al., 1994)

Now we are interested in your effectiveness as an employee on each of the following items. The categories are:

**Bottom 40%,  Average,  Upper 40%,  Top 20%,  Top 10%,  Top 5%**

1. The quantity of work you achieve
2. Your ability to reach your professional goals set by your company
3. Your performance potential among coworkers in your company
4. The quality of your performance
5. The quality of your performance in regard to time management
6. The quality of your performance in regard to job knowledge
APPENDIX G

JOB DIAGNOSTIC SURVEY
Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1975).

1. My opinion of myself goes up when I do this job well.

2. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job.

3. I feel a very high degree of personal responsibility for the work I do in this job.

4. I frequently think of quitting. (R)

5. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job.
APPENDIX H

THE SUBJECTIVE STRESS SCALE
(SSS; 4 ITEMS)
The Subjective Stress Scale (SSS; 4 items)
(Motowidlo et al., 1986)
Note: (R) = reverse-coded

The following statements are about how you feel about your job and your organization with which you may agree or disagree. Using the response scale below, indicate your agreement or disagreement with each item by circling the appropriate number (from 1 to 5) that best describes the extent to which you agree.

1. I feel a great deal of stress because of my job.
2. Very few stressful things happen to me at work. (R)
3. My job is extremely stressful.
4. I almost never feel stressed at work. (R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

CORRELATIONS AMONG PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS, POLYCHRONICITY, ROLE OVERLOAD, SUBJECTIVE STRESS, JOB PERFORMANCE, JOB SATISFACTION, AND DEMOGRAPHICS
Table 1. Correlations Among Personality Characteristics, Polychronicity, Role Overload, Subjective Stress, Job Performance, Job Satisfaction, and Demographics

|                          | Mean | SD  | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   |
|--------------------------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| (1) Conscientiousness    | 5.32 | .96 | (81) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| (2) Extraversion         | 4.79 | 1.10|      | .52**| (.84)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| (3) Neuroticism          | 3.69 | .96 |      | -.51**| -.42**| (.69)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| (4) Polychronicity (IPV) | 4.67 | .79 |      | .05 | .07 | .19**| (.70)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| (5) Polychronicity (MPI) | 4.52 | .67 |      | -.06| -.03| .32**| .72**| (.72)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| (6) Role Overload        | 4.23 | 1.17|      | -.17*| .04 | .33**| .29**| .36**| (.93)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| (7) Subjective Stress    | 2.94 | .81 |      | .00 | .07 | .14 | .01 | -.05| .54**| (.73)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| (8) Job Performance      | 4.31 | 1.08|      | .46**| .49**| -2.6**| .21**| .10 | .01 | .10 | (.92)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| (9) Job Satisfaction     | 5.45 | 1.01|      | .54**| .51**| -4.6**| .16* | .08 | -.16*| -.23**| .43**| (.79)|      |      |      |      |      |      |
| (10) Gender a            | 1.38 | .50 |      | .04 | .05 | -.10| -.18*| -.16*| -.02| -.01| -.05| .06 |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| (11) Age b               | 29.97| 8.82|      | .15*| .17*| -.11| -.10| -.14*| .01 | .16*| .12 | .11 | .17* |      |      |      |      |      |
| (12) Self-Employment     | 1.53 | .50 |      | .32**| .23*| -.23*| -.12| -.08| -.11| .05 | .26**| .16*| -.04| -.03 |      |      |      |      |
| (13) Org Level c         | .67 | .47 |      | .12 | .35**| -.01| .19**| .15*| .22**| .05 | .27**| .19**| -.11| .10 | -.09 |      |      |      |
| (14) Org Tenure b        | 4.20 | 4.69|      | .08 | .06 | .06 | .02 | -.03 | .12 | .18*| .04 | .01 | .07 | .61**| -.05| .17* |      |      |
| (15) Education d         | .82 | .38 |      | .14 | .13 | -.02| .15*| .18*| .14 | -.05| .11 | .04 | -.12| -.16*| .02 | .16*| -.14 |      |

Note: N=194.

a Coded 1 = male, 2 = female, 3 = decline to state
b Measured in years
c Coded 1 = management, 0 = non-management
d Coded 1 = college, 0 = no college
* Correlation is significant at the .05 level
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level
APPENDIX J

COMPARING ETHNICITY MEANS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>American Indian/Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Openness to Experience</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extraversion</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Neuroticism</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Role Overload</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Polychronicity (IPV)</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.76*</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>4.23*</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Polychronicity (MPI)</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Subjective Stress</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Job Performance</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 194

* = Significantly different (p < .05)
APPENDIX K

SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS 7 (IPV) (N = 194)
Table 3. Summary of Hypothesis 7 (IPV) (N = 194)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of Polychronic Values</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of Polychronic Values X Role Overload</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01
APPENDIX L

SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS 7 (MPI) (N = 194)
Table 4. Summary of Hypothesis 7 (MPI) (N = 194)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multitasking Preference</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multitasking Preference Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multitasking Preference Inventory X Role</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05,  **p < .01
APPENDIX M

SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS 8 (IPV) (N = 194)
Table 5. Summary of Hypothesis 8 (IPV) (N = 194)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of Polychronic Values</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>-.198**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of Polychronic Values X Role Overload</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01
APPENDIX N

SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESIS 8 (MPI) (N = 194)
### Table 6. Summary of Hypothesis 8 (MPI) (N = 194)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multitasking Preference</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multitasking Preference</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05,  **p < .01
APPENDIX O

SUMMARY OF EXPLORATORY MODEL
(MPI) (N = 194)
Table 7. Summary of Exploratory Model (MPI) (N = 194)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multitasking Preference Inventory</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multitasking Preference Inventory X Role Overload</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05,  **p < .01
APPENDIX P

SUMMARY OF EXPLORATORY MODEL
(IPV) (N = 194)
### Table 8. Summary of Exploratory Model (IPV) (N = 194)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of Polychronic Values</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of Polychronic Values X Role Overload</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01
APPENDIX Q

MULTITASKING PREFERENCE INVENTORY
Figure 1. Multitasking preference inventory.
APPENDIX R

INVENTORY OF POLYCHRONIC VALUES.
Figure 2. Inventory of polychronic values.
APPENDIX S

SUMMARY OF HIERARCHICAL REGRESSION ANALYSES (N = 194)
Table 9. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses (N = 194)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th></th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>Total R²</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.295**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.323**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>.395**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (IPV)</td>
<td>.028**</td>
<td>.015**</td>
<td>.312*</td>
<td>.029**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.333**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychronicity</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.297**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.401**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.297**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (MPI)</td>
<td>.015**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.312*</td>
<td>.033**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychronicity</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05,  **p < .01