

THE ROLE OF POLYCHRONICITY IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TIME NORMS AND JOB SATISFACTION

Dona Beshka

*Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences,
University of Groningen¹*

Abstract

The main aim of this research was to investigate the relationship between restrictive organisational time norms and job satisfaction and whether it is moderated by time preference style, polychronicity. It was hypothesised that the relationship between restrictive organisational time norms and job satisfaction would be negative and that it would be strengthened at high levels of polychronicity. Literature has found that polychronicity is negatively related to adherence to deadlines, punctuality, and inflexibility, thus the person-environment (PE) fit theory was used to justify the assumption that such individuals would not thrive in highly time-restrictive organisational contexts. Although these relations have been previously investigated in some regard to time management behaviour, research linking polychronicity directly to time norms and job satisfaction as a relevant moderating variable to this relationship is lacking. Participants (N = 119) working full-time in organisations answered a questionnaire regarding their perceptions of time norms in their organisations, their time preference style, and their level of job satisfaction. It was found that the strict time norm of 'schedules and deadlines' had a positive effect on job satisfaction, unlike predicted. Polychronicity had a positive effect on job satisfaction. Interaction effects between polychronicity and the time norms were insignificant. These findings have relevant implications for the understanding of the conceptual clarity of time norms and related concepts, the application of PE fit in job contexts, and the relevance of individual differences in time management.

Keywords: *time management, time norms, polychronicity, job satisfaction, person-environment fit*

¹ The study was conducted under the supervision of Dr. Anita Keller

Nowadays, workers take very few breaks and organisations impose highly demanding schedules (Aeon et al., 2021). Ineffective organisational time management leads to a multitude of detrimental consequences, such as stress and burnout (Holmefur et al., 2019). In an attempt to control their employees, organisations promote time norms, defined as written and unwritten rules that guide individual time management (Ancona et al., 2001; Bergmann, 1992), which could negatively affect perceived autonomy of time use and in turn lead to negative job outcomes such as lower job satisfaction (Claessens et al., 2004). Organisational time norms that restrict individual time management are consistent with the notion of linearity of time, or sequential progress in which one task occurs after the other and each one must be completed according to a specified schedule (Macan, 1994). According to Schriber and Gutek (1987), two such organisational time norms that most accurately fit this description are strict schedules and deadlines and orderly sequencing of tasks (Schriber & Gutek, 1987).

By prescribing strict time norms, organisations fail to consider individual differences in time management behaviour (Aeon et al., 2021). One such individual difference that is neglected in organisational settings with these strict time norms, is time preference style, polychronicity. Polychronicity refers to a preference for flexibility in time management, multitasking, and an inability to follow linear temporal patterns most often enforced in organisations (Blue-dorne et al., 1999). The time norms of scheduling and deadlines and sequencing of tasks propose a strict, orderly, and linear use of time thus neglecting the preference for flexibility of those high in polychronicity. Such individuals may perceive lower time autonomy and in turn, exhibit lower job satisfaction. Investigating these relationships is imminent in understanding a neglected topic in research (Mohammed & Harrison, 2013), how to improve work conditions to fit employees with varying needs.

The study proposes that a mismatch between an organisation's time norms and employees' time preference style will be negatively related to job satisfaction as a result of a person-environment (PE) misfit. An individual's job satisfaction is highly dependent on one's characteristics, those of the environment, and the perceived 'fit' between them (Wöhrmann et al., 2020). For example, some individuals prefer to follow a strict schedule or sequence tasks while others prefer flexible work and multitasking. However, if these time preferences are not encouraged by the organisational time norms, job satisfaction may suffer. This research aims to contribute to the mistreated area of organisational literature and provide a new perspective on the relationship between time

norms and job satisfaction by discovering whether this relationship depends on one's time preference style, polychronicity.

Time norms and job satisfaction

According to Aeon and Aguinis (2017), time norms are abstract patterns of expected temporal activity that are shared among all members of an organisation and are very important aspects in ensuring organisational functioning. Time norms may take the form of specific schedules and deadlines, coordination tactics, or task sequencing. Employees in organisations must be aware of these time norms and adjust their time management according to the expectations (Glass, 2006).

Time norms regulate workflow in organisations by facilitating conformity (Doob, 1971); similarly, to other group norms, they indicate group identity. According to Schriber and Gutek (1987), employees are required to conform to time norms, as a form of behavioural control, to ensure coordinated performance that is necessary to achieve complex goals. Thus, time norms can be seen as imposed social rules that aim to homogenize individual behaviour in an organisation to reach desired work outcomes (Schriber & Gutek, 1987).

Time norms belong to a broader concept, known as organisational culture. According to Schriber and Gutek (1987), organisations see time as a scarce resource that must be managed efficiently. However, time management practices and time norms differ across organisations and each creates its conception of how time should be managed, this is the organisation's time culture. Upon entering an organisation, individuals are required to adjust their time management to fit the organisations' time culture.

The time culture of an organisation has clear impacts on job outcomes. Burt et al. (2010) found that organisations that promote less time-management friendly behaviour, experience greater stress and turnover in employees. Furthermore, Macan (1994) indicates that strict time-norms which advocate for highly structured schedules are related to a lower likelihood of time management behaviour and lower perceived control over time. Additionally, perceived control of time is affected by job autonomy and is related to job outcomes, such as job satisfaction (Claessens et al., 2004). Organisations produce lower job autonomy by disallowing independence and creating strict time norms which lead to lower job satisfaction through the mediating role of increased stress. Research on stress in the workplace concludes that job characteristics and job autonomy affect job satisfaction through job strain (Claessens et al., 2004). Individuals must perceive that time norms facilitate rather than restrict their

autonomy of time use to incur positive work outcomes. For example, failing to follow a particular schedule leads to lower job autonomy, more strain, and thus lower job satisfaction, while high job autonomy entails less strain and as a result greater job satisfaction (Macan, 1994). This leads to the following expectations:

- (a) Perceived strict time norm of schedules and deadlines is negatively related to job satisfaction; and
- (b) Perceived strict time norm of sequencing of tasks is negatively related to job satisfaction.

Time norms, polychronicity, and job satisfaction

Strict time norms can lead to lower job satisfaction, particularly in individuals that have a time preference style that does not match the one imposed by the organisational time norms. Polychronicity is a time preference style characterised by a tendency to multitask activities and engage in task-switching (Hall, 1959). Polychronicity represents a continuum ranging from monochronic to polychronic: individuals high on polychronicity are more likely to be involved in several work tasks at the same time, as opposed to their monochronic counterparts, who score low on polychronicity (Poposki & Oswald, 2010). Polychronic individuals tend to experience losing track of time due to their wish to multitask (Conte et al., 2019). Furthermore, polychronicity is negatively related to punctuality and adhering to schedules and deadlines (Bluedorne et al., 1999). Moreover, these findings suggest that the extent to which jobs suit individuals may depend on their time preference style. Research-based on job-analysis of train operator position indicates that this job requires a monochronic time preference style due to the great emphasis on arriving on time and staying on schedule (Tett, 1991). In addition, a restaurant server job is more adequate to polychronic individuals due to their multitasking ability and preference for schedule flexibility (Asghar et al., 2020).

These findings are explained by the notion that individuals high in polychronicity value synchronization of activities to a greater extent, thus the normative 'productivity' that is often required by monochronic organisations which entails strict time management, leads to negative outcomes in those high in polychronicity (Schein, 1985). It is not that polychronic individuals are inefficient because studies have demonstrated the extent to which polychronicity is indeed positively related to performance and speed, however, they function under different time management conditions. Thus, it can be assumed

that individuals high in polychronicity are less likely to thrive in organisational contexts that promote inflexible schedules, deadlines, and sequencing of tasks.

This prediction calls upon the theory of person-environment fit (PE) to elaborate on why a mismatch between time preference style and imposed time norms is expected to lead to lower job satisfaction. The person-environment fit theory addresses the match between an individual's own needs and values and opportunities offered in their immediate environment (Pervin, 1987). According to the PE fit theory, the misfit between the person and the environment leads to stress (Sonnetag & Frese, 2013). Pervin (1987) shows that a match between students' need for structure and existing structure in the environment predicted satisfaction. Similarly, Edwards (1991) demonstrates that the misfit between an individual's needs and the supplies in the environment is one of the most influential predictors of strain.

This study aims to analyse whether a misfit between one's needs related to one's level of polychronicity and organisational time norms predict job satisfaction. Research finds that congruence between individually preferred and experienced polychronicity at work has several positive work outcomes such as greater organisational commitment and perceived fairness (Slocombe & Bluedorn, 1999). Similarly, research by Irak (2018) indicates that an individual's perception of PE fit mediates the positive relationship between scheduling flexibility and job satisfaction; individuals that believed they could control their own time and schedule tasks independently to fit their needs and work habits, experienced greater job satisfaction. According to Schein (1985), monochronic individuals are more suitable for large organisations due to their adherence to strict management style while polychronic individuals are more suitable for smaller organisations that have more flexible management styles. Finally, Mohammed and Harrison (2013) argue that mismatches between individual differences in temporal behaviour, such as polychronicity, and task demands could be detrimental to performance. Assuming these arguments, individuals high in polychronicity, implicating a preference for multitasking and schedule flexibility, are likely to experience dissatisfaction in jobs with perceived time norms imposing strict schedules/deadlines and orderly sequencing of tasks that inhibit multitasking. The study forms the following hypotheses:

- (a) The negative relationship between the perceived strict time norm of schedules and deadlines and job satisfaction is moderated by polychronicity, such that at high levels of polychronicity the relationship is stronger; and
- (b) The negative relationship between perceived strict time norm of sequencing of tasks and job satisfaction is moderated by polychronicity, such that at high levels of polychronicity the relationship is stronger.

Method

Participants and procedure

Participation was sought from employees currently working either in-office or remotely, at organisations in Germany 51% ($n = 61$), Netherlands 18% ($n = 21$), Bulgaria 13% ($n = 15$), and other countries 19% ($n = 22$). Participants were recruited via email, text message, and real-life promotion, and asked to fill out a questionnaire regarding time management in their organisation. Participants were informed about the importance of their contribution and the benefits that follow from participation, such as receiving personalised psychological feedback and a chance of winning a lottery prize. Those who agreed to participation received a twenty-minute questionnaire that they had one week to complete, distributed over email via a platform called Qualtrics. Initially, 197 responses were received, however, data was edited to remove irrelevant responses, such as blank or nonsensical answers, leaving a remainder of 119 interpretable answers. The questionnaire was available in English and German language; participants could choose which language to answer in. To ensure accuracy, translations were done by two independent translators that translated from English to German and vice versa.

The aimed sample size was 120 participants. Data was gathered from 119 participants, all employees working a minimum of 20 hours per week in an organisation ($M_{age} = 32.14$, $SD_{age} = 12.79$; 59% female, $n = 70$). Twenty-one percent of participants ($n = 25$) worked in the health and social welfare business sector, 9% ($n = 11$) worked in the financial industry, 8% ($n = 9$) in education, 8% ($n = 9$) worked in production, and so on. On average, participants had been employed for 9.86 years ($SD = 12.03$); they had worked in their current organisation 6.00 years ($SD = 8.27$) on average, had their current function for an average of 5.06 years ($SD = 7.42$), and worked 37.94 ($SD = 10.14$) hours per week on average.

Measures

Predictor variables in this study are the perceived organisational time norms of *schedules and deadlines* and the *sequencing of tasks*. Primarily, the time norms of *schedules and deadlines* and *sequencing of tasks* were measured using selected items from facets of the Time Dimensions Scale by Schriber and Gutek (1987). Participants rated their extent of agreement, ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*, with each five-point Likert type item based on their perception of how much each statement pertained to the organisation they currently worked at. All items were given codes, 1 for *strongly disagree* and 5 for *strongly agree*,

only reverse items were coded in an opposite manner 5 for *strongly disagree* and 1 for *strongly agree*. For *schedules and deadlines*, participants were presented with nine items describing schedules and deadlines in their organisation. For example, some statements include: “Staying on schedule is important here” and “It is important to meet our deadlines”. Additionally, two items were used to measure the time norm of *sequencing of tasks*. For instance, one of them states: “To get the job done it is important to do tasks in a specific order”. When applied to the sample, the first scale measuring schedules and deadlines had solid internal consistency with a Cronbach’s alpha of $\alpha = 0.87$. Similarly, the other scale measuring sequencing of tasks had an internal consistency equivalent to $r = 0.71$.

The outcome variable, job satisfaction, was measured using the Rafferty and Griffin (2006) three-item measure. Participants were asked to rate their agreement with presented statements on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from *completely disagree* (1) to *completely agree* (7). For example, one such item is “Overall, I am satisfied with my job.” When applied to the sample, the internal consistency of the scale was satisfactory with a Cronbach’s alpha $\alpha = 0.87$.

The moderating variable polychronicity was measured using a shortened five-item version of the MPI scale by Poposki and Oswald (2010). Participants were asked to indicate agreement with statements regarding their time use preferences coded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). Reverse items were coded *strongly disagree* (5) to *strongly agree* (1). For example, some statements include: “I like to finish one task completely before focusing on anything else” and “I am much more engaged in what I am doing if I am able to switch between several different tasks”. The internal consistency of the scale, when applied to the sample, was good with a Cronbach’s alpha $\alpha = 0.84$.

Since this study took place during the coronavirus pandemic, working from home could be an important variable to control for because perhaps the perceptions of organisational time norms may differ from a home-office setting. Participants were asked to indicate how often they worked from home during the past month one example, item measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from *not at all* (1) to *every day* (5). To summarise, 43% ($n = 51$) reported ‘not at all’ or ‘less than 1 day a week’, 46% ($n = 55$) participants reported working from home either ‘every day’ or ‘most days’ of the week, 11% ($n = 13$) reported working from home ‘1 or 2 days a week’.

Results

This research analysed the relationship between the perceived organisational time norms of schedules and deadlines and sequencing of tasks on job sat-

isfaction and whether it is moderated by time preference style, polychronicity. Furthermore, the study controlled for whether or not individuals worked from home during the last month of the coronavirus pandemic.

A correlation analysis of the study variables is presented in Table 1. Polychronicity is negatively related to sequencing of tasks ($r = -.22, p = .018$) and job satisfaction ($r = -.21, p = .022$), this is in line with the theory. Schedules and deadlines are positively related to job satisfaction ($r = .29, p = .002$). Working from home is negatively related to sequencing of tasks ($r = -.23, p = .012$).

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

	<i>Variable</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5
1	Work from Home	119	2.01	1.66	-				
2	Polychronicity	116	2.74	0.83	-.11	-			
3	Schedules and Deadlines	114	3.81	0.66	.05	-.14	-		
4	Sequencing of Tasks	116	2.87	0.93	-.23*	-.22*	.13	-	
5	Job Satisfaction	116	5.51	1.25	.06	-.21*	.29**	.04	-

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

Prior to testing the hypotheses, an assumption test was done for linearity, homoscedasticity, normality, multicollinearity, and outliers. A histogram indicates no violation of the normality assumption. None of the Tolerance values were below 0.1 and none of the VIF were above 10, the assumption of no multicollinearity has been met. Durbin-Watson statistics fell within an acceptable range, thus the assumption of no autocorrelation of residuals has been met as well. QQ-plots and residual plots were generated and no evidence of a homoscedasticity and linearity violation over a reasonable degree could be found.²

To test the hypotheses, a regression analysis was run using centred predictors to ease interpretation. The first regression model tested the main effects of each time norm variable on job satisfaction while also controlling for the variable working from home. The second model also includes two interaction terms one testing the effect of schedules and deadlines and polychronicity and the other testing the effect of sequencing of tasks and polychronicity. As a whole, the first model explained 12% of the variance in job satisfaction ($R^2 = .12$). Upon the addition of the interaction terms, the second model significantly predicted job

² these analyses are available upon request (MAIL)

satisfaction ($p < .05$); 14% of the variance in job satisfaction can be explained by the second model ($R^2 = .14$). However, the second model does not significantly improve the prediction of job satisfaction from the first model ($R^2_{change} = .02, p > .05$).

Hypotheses 1 and 2 refer to the negative main effects of perceived organisational time norms on job satisfaction, after controlling for the variable work from home ($\beta = -0.003, p > .05$). The variable schedules and deadlines are a significant predictor of job satisfaction, but in the opposite direction than hypothesised ($\beta = 0.27, p < .01$). However, the variable sequencing of tasks is not a significant predictor of job satisfaction ($\beta = -0.04, p > .05$). Thus, there is no support for either of these hypotheses. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Results of the regression analyses for the effects of work from home, schedules and deadlines, sequencing tasks, and polychronicity on job satisfaction

	Effect	B	SE	β	95% CI		p
					LL	UL	
1	Work from Home	-0.01	0.07	-0.01	-0.15	0.13	.913
	Schedules and Deadlines	0.50	0.17	0.27	0.16	0.84	.004
	Sequencing Tasks	-0.05	0.13	-0.04	-0.31	0.19	.666
	Polychronicity	-0.28	0.14	-0.19	-0.56	-0.01	.041
2	Work from Home	-0.01	0.07	-0.003	-0.14	0.14	.974
	Schedules and Deadlines	0.48	0.17	0.26	0.14	0.82	.006
	Sequencing Tasks	-0.07	0.13	-0.05	-0.32	0.18	.574
	Polychronicity	-0.32	0.14	-0.22	-0.61	-0.04	.024
	Int:Schedules and Polych	0.17	0.16	0.10	-0.15	0.49	.287
	Int:Seq and Polych	-0.17	0.12	-0.13	-0.42	0.08	.180

Note. CI = Confidence Interval; LL = Lower Limit; UL = Upper Limit.

Additionally, polychronicity was added to the model to explore its main effect on job satisfaction. After controlling for the variable work from home, polychronicity is a significant predictor of job satisfaction ($\beta = -0.19, p < .05$). Can be seen in Table 2.

Hypotheses 3 and 4 refer to the interaction between the perceived organisational time norms and the moderator polychronicity and its effect on job sat-

isfaction, after controlling for work from home. The interaction coefficient of schedules and deadlines and polychronicity is a non-significant predictor of job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.10, p > .05$). Similarly, the interaction coefficient of sequencing of tasks and polychronicity is an insignificant predictor of job satisfaction ($\beta = -0.13, p > .05$). As such, there is no support for either of these hypotheses. Results can be seen in Table 2.

Discussion

This research explored the relationship between restrictive organisational time norms and job satisfaction and whether this relationship depends on individual differences in time preference style, known as polychronicity. According to the PE fit theory, a mismatch between the needs of polychronic individuals and the environment imposing highly restrictive time norms would further strengthen the negative effects of time restriction on job satisfaction. This study aimed to add to organisational literature and provide knowledge to support the improvement of time management practices in organisations.

The first finding is that the time norm focusing on strict schedules and deadlines is positively related to job satisfaction. One explanation for this finding is that it is probable that the perception of schedules and deadlines in one's organisation led to greater accountability and clarity of job roles at a time when they were ambiguous and in turn, participants experienced greater job satisfaction. Role ambiguity refers to uncertainty regarding work tasks, obligations, demands, and purpose (Urien, et al., 2017). Research finds a negative effect of role ambiguity on job satisfaction, the more uncertainty employees experience regarding what they are meant to do, the less satisfied they are at work, and the more they experience negative emotions (Askenazy, 2001; Bauer, 2004). Particularly, during the pandemic, ambiguity in organisations was at its peak, thus, the existence of schedules and deadlines might have allowed for lower role ambiguity and greater clarity which could explain the positive effect of this time norm on job satisfaction. A negative correlation between working from home and the time norm sequencing of tasks was found, indicating that employees likely found it difficult to organise their work during this time.

Furthermore, another possible explanation for this finding is that although the focus was on time norms, maybe dimensions of the concept of time structure were activated from the given time norm descriptions and are more fitting in explaining these findings. According to Feather and Bond (1983), time structure is the extent to which individuals perceive that their use of time is organised and

purposeful. Time structure facilitates time management and leads to positive job outcomes (Bond & Feather, 1988).

Since time norms and time structure are highly related concepts, confusion regarding the difference between these two concepts has been found in the literature (Aeon & Aguinis, 2017) and can contribute to making sense of the findings. Primarily, due to the lack of context, the statements depicting the time norm of schedules and deadlines might have been perceived in a manner likened to some dimensions of time structure: effective time organisation, structured routine, persistence, sense of purpose, etc. Therefore, perceiving a high time structure explains the positive effect on job satisfaction (Chang & Nguyen, 2011). Additionally, this assumption is based on the possibility that as an attempt to respond in a socially desirable way, participants focused less on the time norm of schedules and deadlines as a prescribed organisational rule that must not be breached (Aeon & Aguinis, 2017), but rather with a positive connotation as the extent to which their organisation facilitates time structure or effective usage of time. Thus, the descriptions of the time norm of schedules and deadlines possibly led to the individual appraisal that time was productively and meaningfully spent at work and therefore activated positive perceptions of job satisfaction (Chang & Nguyen, 2011). This proposed explanation is also in line with research that demonstrates that time structure is a mediating variable in the positive relationship between time management behaviour and job satisfaction (Whetton, 1989). In the future, interpretations of the questionnaire should be assessed by asking participants to elaborate on their understanding of the given statements.

Another finding was that polychronicity is not a significant moderator in the relationship between time norms and job satisfaction. This finding can be explained by the notion that in the study, the emphasis was perhaps not on time norms which could create a mismatch between individuals high in polychronicity and their restrictive environment, but rather on dimensions of time structure which are relevant for individuals both high and low in polychronicity (Kaufman-Scarborough & Lindquist, 1999); even if one is high in polychronicity, reduction of uncertainty through proper structure leads to organisational wellbeing (Kaufman-Scarborough & Lindquist, 1999); recent findings show only partial differences between individuals high and low in polychronicity on dimensions of time structure, indicating that aspects of time structure are relevant for all individuals. The only real difference amongst individuals high and low in polychronicity, regarding to the time structure is in the ability to adjust to change and work under pressure. Therefore, since the presented statements in the 'schedules and deadlines' scale do not relate to these aspects of time structure but rather to keeping track of time, prioritisation, and scheduling, it can be assumed that in

this regard aspects of time structure that were emphasised do not differ amongst individuals high and low in polychronicity, so the lack of interaction makes sense given these findings.

Instead of polychronicity, another moderator that could have accounted for the relationship between time norms and job satisfaction is the type of organisational culture. This could also explain the negative relationship between polychronicity and job satisfaction. According to Cameron and Quinn (2011), there are four types of organisational culture, two of which are predominated by high structure, known as the market and hierarchy cultures. The existence of a market or hierarchy culture in an organisation could explain why the relationship between time norms and job satisfaction is positive. Since market and hierarchy organisational culture instill values of structure and control (Cameron & Quinn, 2011), given that these values are accepted by employees this could explain why they are satisfied at work regardless of the strict time norms and their own time preference styles.

Although the interaction effect between polychronicity and these specific time norms was insignificant, polychronicity has a negative main effect on job satisfaction. These findings are in line with the literature on polychronicity and job outcomes. This can be explained by the notion that although preference for time structure has a positive effect even in polychronic individuals, there is a multitude of other normative time management behaviours that are endorsed in organisations that are counterproductive to individuals high in polychronicity and could thus lead to lower job satisfaction. It cannot be said for certain which time norms apply to participants' workplace, however, it can be assumed that they are not limited to the time norms selected in this study. One such time norm that was not investigated but could interact with polychronicity to affect job satisfaction, is autonomy of time use as described by Schriber and Gutek (1987). This refers to the extent to which organisations allow freedom to employees in managing their own time at work. Low autonomy of time in an organisation could explain the negative relationship between polychronicity and job satisfaction (Claessens et al., 2004). Those high in polychronicity working at an organisation with low autonomy of time may be less satisfied with their jobs. Research has found that this time norm is specifically related to various negative job outcomes, such as low performance, therefore it requires attention because it could be the culprit of the findings. Furthermore, another possible restrictive time norm that could account for this negative relationship is allocation of time. It can be safely assumed that those high in polychronicity will be less satisfied at work if they do not have control over how to allocate time on tasks. This is

supported by the finding of a negative relationship between polychronicity and sequencing of tasks.

This study has several important limitations that must be addressed. Primarily, the reliance on self-report measures leads to responses that are subject to responding bias. Participants often want to provide socially desirable responses that may exaggerate their level of job satisfaction, the perceived extent to which their organisation enforces certain norms and standards of behaviour, etc. Additionally, they may be unaware of their own preferences in time management behaviour; they may have reported that they do not prefer multitasking while engaging in certain behaviours that indicate otherwise. Finally, questions are open to interpretation. In this case, the time norms may have been interpreted differently by different participants. Another limitation is the focus on perceived time norms rather than actual time norms; the use of a more objective measure of time norms would have avoided doubts regarding the results obtained. Finally, due to the low sample size and convenience sampling method, predictive power is limited.

However, this study also has relevant strengths that are worth mentioning. Particularly, it is an attempt to research a field in organisational psychology and time management literature that has not been investigated before. There is effective reliance on the theory behind traditional time management topics, such as organisational time norms, and provides an innovative outlook by focusing on the moderating role of individual differences. This is a far more personalised approach in studying the effect of time norms on individuals, instead of solely focusing on their role at a macro level, particularly in regard to their relationship with broader concepts such as organisational culture.

As such, this research has several important theoretical implications. Primarily, the findings potentially contribute to the PE theory by demonstrating that not only is a match between the person and environment essential to incur positive job outcomes but there are also some conditions of the work environment, for instance, time structure, that apply to all individuals regardless of their personal preferences or characteristics. Furthermore, the findings broaden the knowledge of the concept of time structure by giving light to its relation to individual differences. Unlike earlier research that links time structure only to monochronicity, these findings suggest that aspects of time structure are important even to individuals high in polychronicity (Kaufman-Scarborough & Lindquist, 1999).

Additionally, the findings emphasise the need for conceptual clarity in defining time norms and time structure as they are often used interchangeably (Aeon & Aguinis, 2017). Further, the study leads to theoretical implications regarding

the role of types of organisational cultures by proposing that they may not only be influential moderators in the relationship between time norms and job satisfaction, they may also be used to explain the relationship between polychronicity and job satisfaction. Finally, the study highlights the effect of role ambiguity during uncertain times and how it is related to job satisfaction schedules, and deadlines.

The practical implications of this study address the importance of finding ways to provide proper time structure in organisations that will be perceived by employees as meaningful and facilitative of time management behaviour without coming off as restrictive. Additionally, findings have implications for how to improve working environments by developing an organisational culture that is adequate for those with differing individual time management preferences.

Future research should discover, why the time structure is such a relevant factor in predicting job satisfaction, irrespective of differences in individual preference in time management behaviour. Possible mediators to the relationship between time structure and job satisfaction should be identified, such as an aspect of time structure, sense of purpose. A sense of purpose may facilitate effective time management in individuals irrespective of differing levels of polychronicity (Kaufman-Scarborough & Lindquist, 1999). Another topic for future research may be that in organisational cultures focusing on flexibility, time norms may facilitate job satisfaction and polychronicity may be positively related to job satisfaction. Additionally, time management may also differ across different cultures and this may affect job outcomes (Aeon & Aguinis, 2017). Finally, future research can also investigate which additional time norms interact with polychronicity to influence job satisfaction. Finally, improvement of the methodological aspects of the study by finding a more objective measure of time norms and polychronicity is essential.

References

- Aeon, B., & Aguinis, H. (2017). It's About Time: New Perspectives and Insights on Time Management. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 31(4), 309–330. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2016.0166>
- Aeon, B., Faber, A., & Panaccio, A. (2021). Does time management work? A meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE*, 16(1). <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1371/journal.pone.0245066>
- Ancona, D. G., Goodman, P. S., Lawrence, B. S., & Tushman, M. L. (2001). Time: A New Research Lens. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(4), 645–663. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.5393903>
- Asghar, M., Gull, N., Tayyab, M., Zhijie, S., & Tao, X. (2020). Polychronicity at work: Work engagement as a mediator of the relationships between job outcomes. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 45, 470–478. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.10.002>
- Askenazy, P. (2001). Innovative workplace practices and occupational injuries and illnesses in the United States. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 22(4), 485–516. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0143831X01224003>
- Bergmann, W. (1992). The Problem of Time in Sociology. *Time & Society*, 1(1), 81–134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463x92001001007>
- Bluedorn, A. C., Kalliath, T. J., Strube, M. J., & Martin, G. D. (1999). Polychronicity and the Inventory of Polychronic Values (IPV): The development of an instrument to measure a fundamental dimension of organizational culture. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 14(3–4), 205–230. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1108/02683949910263747>
- Bond, M. J., & Feather, N. T. (1988). Some correlates of structure and purpose in the use of time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 321–329.
- Burt, C. D. B., Weststrate, A., Brown, C., & Champion, F. (2010). Development of the time management environment (TiME) scale. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(6), 649–668. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1108/02683941011056978>
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture*. Wiley.
- Chang, A., & Nguyen, L. T. (2011). The mediating effects of time structure on the relationships between time management behaviour, job satisfaction, and psychological well-being. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 63(4), 187–197. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1111/j.1742-9536.2011.00008.x>

- Claessens, B. J. C., Van Eerde, W., Rutte, C. G., & Roe, R. A. (2004). Planning behaviour and perceived control of time at work. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 25(8), 937–950. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.292>
- Conte, J. M., Aasen, B., Jacobson, C., O’Loughlin, C., & Toroslu, L. (2019). Investigating relationships among polychronicity, work-family conflict, job satisfaction, and work engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 34(7), 459–473. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1108/JMP-01-2018-0046>
- Doob, L. W. (1971). *Patterning of time* (First Edition). Yale University Press.
- Edwards, J. R. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology, 1991, Vol. 6.* (pp. 283–357). John Wiley & Sons.
- Feather, N. T., & Bond, M. J. (1983). Time structure and purposeful activity among employed and unemployed university graduates. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 56, 241–254.
- Glass, J. (2006). The Time Divide: Work, Family and Gender Inequality. Jerry A. Jacobs and Kathleen Gerson. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(3), 509–511. <https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.51.3.509>
- Hall, E. T. (1959). *The silent language*. New York, NY: Anchor Books
- Holmefur, M., Lidström-Holmqvist, K., Roshanay, A. H., Arvidsson, P., White, S., & Janeslätt, G. (2019). Pilot study of Let’s Get Organized: A group intervention for improving time management. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 73(5), 1–10. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.5014/ajot.2019.032631>
- Irak, D. U., & Mantler, J. (2018). The role of temporal flexibility on person–environment fit and job satisfaction. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 24(6), 829–845. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1017/jmo.2017.50>
- Kaufman-Scarborough, C., & Lindquist, J. D. (1999). Time management and polychronicity: Comparisons, contrasts, and insights for the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 14(3–4), 288–312. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1108/02683949910263819>
- Macan, T. H. (1994). Time management: Test of a process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(3), 381–391. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1037/0021-9010.79.3.381>
- Mohammed, S., & Harrison, D. A. (2013). The clocks that time us are not the same: A theory of temporal diversity, task characteristics, and performance in teams. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Pro-*

- cesses, 122(2), 244–256. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1016/j.obhdp.2013.08.004>
- Pervin, L. A. (1987). Person-environment congruence in the light of the person-situation controversy. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 31(3), 222–230. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(87\)90040-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(87)90040-6)
- Poposki, E. M., & Oswald, F. L. (2010). The Multitasking Preference Inventory: Toward an improved measure of individual differences in polychronicity. *Human Performance*, 23(3), 247–264. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1080/08959285.2010.487843>
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view*. Jossey-Bass.
- Schriber, J. B., & Gutek, B. A. (1987). Sometime dimensions of work: Measurement of an underlying aspect of organization culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72(4), 642–650. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1037/0021-9010.72.4.642>
- Slocombe, T. E., & Bluedorn, A. C. (1999). Organizational behaviour implications of the congruence between preferred polychronicity and experienced work-unit polychronicity. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 20(1), 75–99. [https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(199901\)20:1<75::AID-JOB872>3.0.CO;2-F](https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199901)20:1<75::AID-JOB872>3.0.CO;2-F)
- Sonnentag, S., & Frese, M. (2013). Stress in organizations. In N. W. Schmitt, S. Highhouse, & I. B. Weiner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*, Vol. 12, 2nd ed. (pp. 560–592). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(4), 703–742. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00696.x>
- Urien, B., Osca, A., & García-Salmones, L. (2017). Role ambiguity, group cohesion and job satisfaction: A Demands-Resources Model (JD-R) Study from Mexico and Spain. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 49(2), 137–145. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1016/j.rlp.2015.09.014>
- Whetton, D. A. (1989). What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 34–51.
- Wöhrmann, A. M., Brauner, C., & Michel, A. (2020). Working time preferences and early and late retirement intentions. *Chronobiology International*, 37(9–10), 1283–1286. <https://doi-org.proxy-ub.rug.nl/10.1080/07420528.2020.1806291>

УЛОГАТА НА ПОЛИХРОНИЦИТЕТОТ ВО ПОВРЗАНОСТА ПОМЕЃУ ВРЕМЕНСКИТЕ НОРМИ И ЗАДОВОЛСТВОТО ОД РАБОТАТА

Дона Бешка

*Факултет за бихевиорални и општински науки,
при Универзитетот во Гронинген*

Кратка содржина

Целта на ова истражување беше да се испита поврзаноста помеѓу рестриктивните организациски временски норми и задоволството од работата и дали поврзаноста е модерирана од стилот на временско преферирање, полихроничитет. Беше претпоставена негативна поврзаност помеѓу рестриктивните организациски временски норми и задоволството од работата со очекување таа да биде посиљна кај повисоките нивоа на полихроничитет. Теоретските сознанија упатуваат дека полихроничитетот е негативно поврзан со почитување на роковите, точноста и нефлексибилноста. Оттука, теоријата за усогласеност помеѓу луѓето и организациите беше користена за да се оправда претпоставката дека поединци со висок полихроничитет нема да напредуваат во организациски контексти кои строго го ограничуваат времето. Иако оваа врска била испитувана, сепак недостасуваат истражувања за улогата на полихроничитетот како модератор варијабла на врската помеѓу временските норми и задоволството од работата. Учесниците во ова истражување се 119 вработени со полно работно време, кои одговараа на прашалник во врска со нивните перцепции за временските норми во организации каде што се вработени, нивниот префериран временски стил и нивното ниво на задоволство од работата. Наодите упатуваат дека строгата временска норма на „распореди и рокови“ има позитивно влијание врз задоволството од работата и дека полихроничитетот позитивно влијае врз задоволството од работата. Не е добиен значаен интеракциски ефект помеѓу полихроничитетот и временските норми. Наодите имаат импликации за примената на теоријата за усогласеност помеѓу луѓето и организациите во работен контекст и овозможуваат подобро разбирањето на концептот на временските норми и сродните концепти, како и подобро разбирање на индивидуалните разлики во управување со времето.

Клучни зборови: *управување со време, временски норми, полихроничитет, задоволство од работата, усогласеност помеѓу луѓето и организациите*