

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

SCHOOL OF LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS

THE EFFECTS OF PERCEIVED SUPPORT AND OPPORTUNITIES ON ORGANIZATIONAL
IDENTIFICATION: A STUDY OF COLLEGE INTERNS

CARLA MARANO
FALL 2015

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees
in Labor and Employment Relations and Spanish
with honors in Labor and Employment Relations

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

Xiangmin (Helen) Liu
Assistant Professor of Labor & Employment Relations
Thesis Advisor

Alan Derickson
Professor of Labor & Employment Relations
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

Exponentially growing in popularity throughout the United States, internships exist as a strategic element of proactive career development for university students and employers alike. Beyond the short-term value that interns generate for organizations during their internships, interns represent long-term potential for the organization's full-time workforce and future leadership. As a step toward understanding what factors facilitate enduring post-internship organizational identification, this thesis seeks to identify individual antecedents that predict this construct. Data was collected from 351 university students who participated in summer internship programs. Step-analysis revealed a significant, positive relationship between post-internship organizational identification and perceptions of supervisory support, coworker support and career opportunities. A discussion of the findings offers ways that organizations may augment and sustain organizational identification of interns after the conclusion of contractual relations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2 Theoretical Background.....	5
The Norm of Reciprocity	5
Signaling Theory	7
Social Exchange	8
Chapter 3 Hypothesis Development.....	9
Post-Internship Organizational Identification	9
Perceived Support.....	15
Coworker Support vs. Supervisory Support.....	17
Perceived Career & Learning Opportunities	18
Chapter 4 Methodology.....	24
Sample 1	25
Sample 2.....	28
Chapter 5 Results.....	30
Screening and Substitution.....	30
Control Variable Selection	31
Hypothesis Testing.....	34
Step Analysis.....	34
Chapter 6 Discussion.....	38
Limitations and Future Research Implications.....	38
Practical Implications	41
Appendix A IRB Exemption Determination Letter.....	45
Appendix B Citi Curriculum Completion Report.....	46
Appendix C Consent Form for Samples 1 and 2.....	47
Appendix D Table of Measurement Sources.....	48
Bibliography	51

List Of Tables

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF POST-INTERNSHIP LOYALTY RESEARCH.....	13
TABLE 2 SUMMARY OF RELEVANT STUDIES ON THE IMPACT OF SUPERVISORY SUPPORT, COWORKER SUPPORT, PERCEIVED CAREER OPPORTUNITIES AND LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES ON EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION.	21
TABLE 3 SUMMARY OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR DEPENDENT, INDEPENDENT AND CONTROL VARIABLES.....	33
TABLE 4 SUMMARY OF STEP-ANALYSIS OF INDEPENDENT AND CONTROL VARIABLES VS. ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION.	35

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Xiangmin (Helen) Liu for her tireless support throughout the formation of this thesis. In her continuous effort to maximize the potential of this study and bring this research to fruition, I am proud to attribute Dr. Liu to my success in this milestone of my academic career.

I would also like to express sincere gratitude to my honors advisor, Dr. Alan Derickson for his guidance in completing this thesis and all of his insightful encouragement. With his deep knowledge as a historian of labor relations, he acted as a subject matter expert in this domain, and provided me with inspiration on this topic.

Besides my advisors, I additionally would like to thank the entire School of Labor and Employment Relations at Penn State University. I cannot imagine a more supportive team to work with, and am deeply thankful for having had the chance to go through this endeavor with you. Beyond supplying me with the resources needed to complete this thesis, the School of LER consistently provided me with a positive environment and encouragement to move forward.

Finally, I would like to thank all of my friends and family who have supported me throughout the pursuit of my Master's degree. I am eternally grateful for all the faith you have held in me to accomplish this and the motivation you all provide me with each and every day.

Chapter 1

Introduction

My proposed research on the relationships between various aspects of an internship experience and the subsequent impact on post-internship organizational identification is innovative and unique. This is the first study to measure interns' reports using first-hand knowledge via self-reporting, to incorporate the predictors of perceived support and perceived opportunity in relation to post-internship organizational identification, and measure this dependent variable on a diverse array of interns.

Unlike other previous studies that analyze organizational identification of interns based on managerial accounts (Hui-juan, 2012), this thesis incorporates the perspective of the intern by directly measuring his or her viewpoint through a self-reported questionnaire. As such, this study measures first-hand, rather than second-hand, experiences of interns in their decision to be loyal toward an employer after exiting a contractual relationship. Additionally, this study incorporates four independent variables to be cross-analyzed, rather than measuring one or two independent variables. In contrast to intern studies that analyze the effects of a narrower span of variables, such as supervisor support on interns (Dixon et. al., 2005; Teo & Connell, 2014), the boundaries of this research are more expansive than those aforementioned and thus give rise to a wider breadth of understanding in this domain. Finally, this study differs from previous research in that it seeks to understand the relationship between these independent variables on post-internship organizational identification for interns in an assortment of industries, rather than a select set of full-time employees in the same industry (Alvesson, 2000; Santee-Eekhuis & Zhou, 2009).

Given the current knowledge previously mentioned in this report within the domain of interns and post-internship organizational identification, the objective of this study is to make a practical and theoretical contribution to existing information in this field. From a methodological perspective, my research methods are novel in this sub-field through incorporating both longitudinal and cross-sectional measurements. As this report thoroughly records how to conduct a study on summer interns using a combination of both design types, this opens the possibility for future developments in this sub-field in

two ways. First, scholars seeking to use this integrated methodological approach may use this study as framework future studies on this subject, facilitating replication of this study across different contexts. Second, the availability of the results using this methodological approach to greater academia will allow for conduction of a more diverse and comprehensive meta-analysis in this sub-field through comparing this study against similar research with different design types.

From a practical standpoint, it is essential to further explore post-internship organizational identification due to the increasing popularity and perceived importance of internships amongst college students and employers (Lee, Alonso, Esen & Scanlan, 2013). From an intern's perspective, an internship is typically a college student's first realistic exposure to the professional setting in which he or she seeks to pursue a career. Therefore, it serves as one of the primary ways in which an intern learns if he or she will fit not only into the organization, but into this selected career path as a whole (Greenhaus, Callanan, & Godshalk, 2000). Exposure to this given workplace and the consequent re-framing of an intern's professional perspective, in turn, leaves an intern with the decision of whether or not he or she wants to become a loyal member of the organization (Kanye & Crous, 2007). Thus, internships serve as a test-run of a student's anticipated career path, in which an intern re-evaluates his or her professional decisions, then subsequently adjusts his or her behavior along the spectrum of organizational identification based on these realizations. In the long-term, this decision of whether or not be loyal may cause a ripple effect, ultimately shaping the intern's professional and academic decisions (e.g. changing major, pursuing post-graduate degrees, etc.) As such, post-internship organizational identification is important to study because it impacts the very livelihood of the student either reinforcing the professional and academic decisions he or she has made thus far or giving way to a subtle, or even dramatic, shift in lifestyle.

While enduring relationships are of great value to the intern, the employer, similarly, finds high value in intern-organization relationships characterized by organizational identification. Described by Camille Luckenbaugh, Research Director of the National Association of Colleges and Employers, as an integral foundation toward building long-term organizational identification in the workplace (Loten, 2008), internships serve a critical role in constructing positive, sustainable relationships that translate

into corporate culture. Beyond this cultural aspect, post-internship organizational identification is largely impactful upon a firm's financial state. From Fitz-Enz's (2000) viewpoint on interns as a source of human capital in terms of return on investment, a loyal intern who transitions into full-time employment saves the organization costs from absence (e.g., lost revenue) and turnover (e.g., replacement recruiting), in addition to development investment costs (e.g., intern training). As such, it is crucial to examine how to promote and sustain post-internship organizational identification, in order for organizations to adequately create systematic approaches that encourage interns to remain loyal to the firm after their contractual relations have ended, for the good of the firm's financial state and corporate culture.

In the contemporary setting, employers, like students, act as proponents of student internship programs. From the managerial perspective, interns reciprocate to organizations as a pipeline of talent equipped with on-site training while concurrently serving as an augmentation of operational productivity (Lee, Alonso, Esen, & Scanlan, 2013). Using internships to synchronize the supply of skilled talent in higher education and the demands of the employment relationship, internships continue to grow at an exponential rate of 44% since the Recession (Lee et al., 2012). Reflecting this trend of growing influence, responses to a nationwide survey by the Society for Human Resource Management showed an amplification of reported internships at a rate of 34% between 2012 and 2013. Of the marginal 8% of organizations that reported a decline in extension of internship offers, this deficit is largely attributed to lack of work for the intern (46%) or lack of budget (35%). This indicates a lack of capital, rather than lack of support from management (10%), as the principal rationale behind discontinuing internship programs (Lee et al., 2012). Nearly 71% of organizations affirmed to have hired, or planned to hire, at least one intern in 2013 (Lee et al., 2012). Of the organizations with intern hires or plans for hire, 40% had a designated internship coordinator (Lee et al., 2012). The evidence present in this survey demonstrates the prominence of internship programs from an employer's perspective, as a valued and strategic method of talent management.

As the implementation of internship programs continues to proliferate and expand across organizations at an exponential rate, employer interest in post-internship organizational identification has grown substantially (Lee et al., 2012). Emerging nationwide research in this field demonstrates the

strength of this interest, with employers making full-time offers to over 64% of their interns and retaining nearly three-quarters of these full-time hires after one year (Koc et. al., 2014). Despite this growing interest, the amount of research on this topic is relatively limited. No researcher has yet seriously examined the effects of interns' perceived support and perceived opportunities whether cross-sectionally or longitudinally in relation to their post-internship organizational identification.

In an effort to augment understanding within this domain, this study identifies and analyzes the experiences of university students who participated in various internship programs, in order to investigate how certain aspects of internship experiences (intern's perceived support and perceived opportunities) impact post-internship organizational identification. To better understand how post-internship organizational identification develops, I focus on university students who have participated in at least one internship program over the course of the summer.

Rather than elaborating upon the legal definition of an intern under United States law, we will examine the profile of the modern intern through alternative characteristics such as education level, compensation, activities, duration, industry and academic credit availability. In 2013, most internships were given to undergraduate college students for 1-3 months during the summer, when they primarily worked via mentoring meetings, group projects with other interns and showcase presentations (Lee et al., 2012). For these undergraduate student interns, the overwhelming majority (70%) worked in a for-profit organization and were paid for their work, receiving an average of \$12.74 per hour (Lee et al., 2012). Thus, it is likely that the Fair Labor Standards Act legally classified many of these workers as employees. While very few interns were offered benefits such as paid holidays, housing assistance, a paid time off plan or health insurance, about half of interns received academic credit from an educational institution in exchange for their work, predominantly at the undergraduate level (Lee et al., 2012). Distribution by industry for interns in 2013 was widely scattered, with internship programs reported across nearly every industry - the top most popular being professional, technical and scientific services. Interns typically worked in medium-sized organizations of approximately 100-500 employees, with operations in more than one location across the United States (Lee et al., 2012).

Chapter 2

Theoretical Background

In order to fully comprehend the rationale behind each of the projected relationships and research conclusions of literature within this domain, it is essential to first analyze the relevant theoretical rationale behind this thinking. It is here important to note that, due to limitations of this study, the psychological constructs described in these theories were not directly measured in this study, but open a door for future study in this domain (see “Limitations” for further detail). While a myriad of theories exists within the field of Industrial/Organizational Psychology to interpret why these trends between variables exist, I will focus my logic analysis on the following three theories: 1) The Norm of Reciprocity 2) Signaling, and 3) Social Exchange.

The Norm of Reciprocity

Defined as one of the most “basic but unstated postulates of functional analysis,” the construct of reciprocity operates under two distinct, yet interrelated translations: 1) transactional social exchange(s); and 2) a “generalized moral norm” (Gouldner, 1960, p. 163). Through the widely popularized discourse of Gouldner (1960) regarding reciprocity as both a series of economically symbiotic exchanges and as a code of moral conduct, this construct emerges as a highly relevant factor in examining post-internship organizational identification.

As observed in a transactional setting, reciprocity may be manifested as an exchange between two parties, where Party A’s actions for Party B are contingent upon the expectancy of a beneficial exchange in the future from Party B. Here I draw upon the language of Gouldner (1960), who examines reciprocity as a form of persistence, in which Party A is obligated to pursue relations with Party B in order to receive a reward for this given action. In an organizational context, such as that depicted in this study, transactional reciprocity serves as a fundamental driver behind the construct of

post-internship organizational identification through explaining why an intern may feel continuous commitment to his or her organization even after the contractual relationship has ended.

Previous research exploring how transactional reciprocity may motivate post-internship organizational identification, emphasizes the critical role reciprocity plays in an employer-employee relationship (Dabos & Rousseau, 2004). In viewing an employee's reciprocity as the result of a varying perception of both "the nature of the resources involved" and the "organizational context" (Dabos & Rousseau, 2004, p. 68), the extent to which an intern reciprocates is a product of the intern's perception of what is expected from his/her employer as a result of the intern's actions. As such, the norm of reciprocity serves as justification for the relationship between post-internship organizational identification and the independent variables of this study, through positioning these predictors as either "the nature of the resources involved" (e.g. perceived learning opportunities and perceived career opportunities) or "the organizational context" (e.g. perceived supervisor support, perceived coworker support and organizational identification). In this sense, an intern may demonstrate organizational identification in the anticipation of receiving a reward from his/her employer beyond that of their agreed contractual relationship, thus pursuing the employer as a source of long-term reward (e.g. a future full-time position).

While transactional reciprocity functions in a quid-pro-quo relationship between employer and intern in determining organizational identification, exchanging intern performance for a future-oriented reward from the employer, it is crucial to also examine the latter form of reciprocity cited earlier in this section: a code of moral conduct. Functioning similarly to transactional reciprocity, moral-based reciprocity also offers a form of reward to an intern in deciding his/her post-internship organizational identification to a given employer. Unlike transactional-based reciprocity, however, moral-based reciprocity excludes future-oriented extrinsic rewards from an employer (e.g. compensation or full-time position), and operates solely on intrinsic rewards as a result of pursuing the relationship. In this moral-based sense, the rewards an intern may seek from pursuing an employer after leaving a company would include a subconscious obligation to sustain a stable social relationship founded upon a person's ethical beliefs. Referred to as "one of the universal principal

components of moral codes,” moral-based reciprocity stands as a latent, intrinsic drive that stems from a person’s desire toward sustaining social relationships (Gouldner, 1960, p. 161). In regards to post-internship organizational identification, morality-based reciprocity would encourage an intern to pursue relations with his/her employer with the intent of attaching him/herself socially to the firm as a whole, in exchange for the intern’s demonstrated organizational identification.

Signaling Theory

Similar to the construct of reciprocity, signaling also functions as a mechanism that may drive an intern’s motivation based upon anticipation of a reward in response to his/her post-internship organizational identification. Depicted by BliegeBird, et al. (2005, p. 221) as process of “individual strategic action and adaptation,” signaling stands as a response to “how a given pattern of action may signal particular hidden attributes.” Within the confines of this study, the concept of signaling largely applies to the unspoken communication between employer and intern, where an intern gauges whether or not he/she will be loyal to an organization based upon the intern’s perceptions of the employer’s actions.

As examined in Spence’s (1973) study of signaling theory and organizational attachment, the overt actions of an employer undergo a complex process of interpretation by the employee, who discerns these actions and consequently decides (consciously or subconsciously) if he or she wishes to remain loyal to the organization based upon this interpretation. In this sense, interpretations of internship characteristics act as signals that indicate to the intern the extent to which an organization supports him or her, and thus whether or not this organization deserves his or her continued support. Research demonstrates that perceived organizational support is not directly related to organizational commitment, but moderates the relationship between organizational commitment and other factors of job satisfaction (Casper & Harris, 2008). As such, this element of interpretation by the receiver within signaling theory ultimately conceives of post-internship organizational identification as a construct of the intern’s discretion, which is influenced by -rather than predicted by- an employer’s actions in an intern-organization relationship.

Social Exchange

Social Exchange theory incorporates elements of both Signaling Theory and the Norm of Reciprocity, yet brings a unique perspective through assimilation of these with economics. Similar to transactional reciprocity, each party takes an active role in signaling to the other either the respective benefits or punishments, which the other party interprets. These social signals then form the basis for a mutually beneficial trade between people(s). Referred to as “cognitive adaptations of social exchange” (Cosmides & Tooby, 1992, p. 163), social exchange may manifest itself in the way in which an intern may decide to remain with an employer. A theory largely situated upon rationalizing incongruences within economic theory, Social Exchange, similar to reciprocity and signaling, stands as reasoning behind the flow of contingent rewards. Described as a “frame of reference that takes the movement of valued things (resources) through social processes as its focus,” Emerson (1976, p. 359) defines the scope of social exchange as an exclusive arrangement between parties dependent upon “contingent return reinforcement.” Equivalent to conducting a cost-benefit analysis in economics, Social Exchange emphasizes the role of expected behavior as a result of an individual’s systematic decision that the benefits, or profits, of a making a given social exchange outweigh the consequences, or costs (Andersen & Taylor, 2009). Through this perspective, social interaction between an employer and an intern is a product of contemplated, decisive conclusions drawn by each party that can be justified as mutually beneficial through a formulaic equation.

Chapter 3

Hypothesis Development

A largely inclusive yet still discriminant construct, post-internship organizational identification describes the sentiments and behaviors of an employee upon leaving a given organization. As the aftermath of leaving an organization varies so greatly with each given individual, the subsequent cognitions, sentiments and actions encompassed by post-internship organizational identification profoundly indicate the course of action a former employee may pursue in regards to the next step on his or her career path (Alvesson, 2000). In order to fully understand the multi-faceted, complex characterizations of post-internship organizational identification, this chapter examines the various elements, as well as the limitations, of this definition in greater detail. In addition, this chapter identifies the independent variables of this study in congruence with their relation to post-internship organizational identification, and summarizes previous research in this space.

Post-Internship Organizational Identification

To begin dissecting the meaning of post-internship organizational identification, I will first explore the construction of employee organizational identification in the workplace in relation to post-exit loyalty. Described by Rutledge (2009) as a conscious decision independent of popularity, modern-day employee loyalty emerges as a result of a psychological contract between the worker and the employer that must be reciprocated repeatedly by both parties in a continuous process to satisfy the needs of both. In this relationship, the underlying mental fulfillment which a person achieves in response to working for a given employer is the driver behind true organizational identification, and is propelled by “engaging employment experiences” which keep an employee “attracted and committed to their work, and fascinated by their employer” (Rutledge, 2009, pp. 124). Rutledge’s interpretation of loyalty draws parallels to that of Haughey (1993, p. 1) who pursued this connection between loyalty and engagement as an “affection” which attaches the employee to behave in congruence with his or her

degree of loyalty to a given organization. Jointly, these behaviors become an employee's moral schema when acting as an agent of the organization, which translates into the "ethical character of the firm" built into the organization's corporate culture (Haughey, 1993, p. 1).

Haughey's (1993) explanation of loyalty continues to outline the contours between a corporate culture which discourages exit versus one which promotes loyalty. Both Haughey (1993) and Alvesson (2000) describe this difference as one which distinguishes discouragement of exit as an "unfreeing or narrowing" attempt at forced employee loyalty, including financial repercussions for leaving the organization (i.e., contract clauses preventing commerce between an ex-employee and the organization) or social punishment in the form of portrayals of the "immorality of the betrayers and the harm done to the organization" to the ex-employee's peers. In contrast, true post-internship loyalty focuses less upon the vilifying of individual whom is leaving (or left) the organization, and more upon organizational commitment, emphasizing a bond depicted by (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990, p. 7) as an enduring "linking of the individual to the organization," even though the person is no longer an employee of the company.

These concepts of exit discouragement versus post-exit loyalty promotion bear striking resemblance to the concepts of constraint-based loyalty and dedication-based loyalty. Here I draw upon the vocabulary of Noordhoff, Pauwels, & Odekerken-Schröder (2004, p. 351), who define the differences between these loyalty types in terms of customer loyalty, positioning constraint-based loyalty as one in which companies "erect switching barriers such that the costs of changing to a competing alternative act as obstacles for defection" and dedication-based loyalty as that which is based on "sincere interest to stay with the organization, diminishing their interest in competitive offerings." In observing these dichotomies of loyalty types, one may draw parallels between the previously discussed obstacles. On the one hand is that these barriers are intentionally created for exiting employees via discouragement of exit in congruence with Noordhoff, Pauwels & Odekerken-Schröder's (2004) constraint-based loyalty. On the other hand, dedication-based loyalty lies in close association with Mathieu & Zajac's (1990) organizational commitment involved in post-internship loyalty. This thesis attempts to predict the ways in which a company may foster post-internship loyalty, rather than discouragement of exit, as

observed throughout the systematic decision of a sample of ex-interns to be loyal, dis-loyal or non-loyal to their ex-employers.

To clarify these diverse aspects of loyalty concepts, previous research establishes a coherent, working definition for each aspect. To begin, I reference the works of Alvesson (2000) who defined the concept of a loyal employee (or ex-employee) as one who adheres to three main behaviors: 1) a high level of perceived fit between an employee's workplace needs with those of the organization; 2) a high prioritization of these overlapping individual and organizational needs; and 3) an altruistic attitude regarding one's employer. Alvesson's (2000) definition works in congruence with Bloemer & Odekerken-Schröder's (2006, p. 252) viewpoint on employee loyalty, depicting post-exit loyal employees as those who exhibit a persistent effort to "engage in a relationship with their employer" that is both constructive and stable even after the employee is no longer involved in a contractual relationship with his or her employer. Similar to that of a current employee with high organizational identification, loyal ex-employees will seek to find win-win strategies on how they may be able to "nurture a working relationship" with their ex-employer (Abbasi & Hollman, 2000, p. 333), critiquing efforts and posing solutions, rather than allowing the relationship to deteriorate due to a lack of formal obligation to engage with their ex-employer (Blodgett & Granbois, 1992). This type of dedication to an organization in the absence of a formalized contractual relationship can therefore be seen as what philosopher Josiah Royce (1908) illustrated as the sheer essence of loyalty, where a person is intrinsically bonded to a chosen cause regardless of contextual factors and guided by an inner willingness to devote oneself to a chosen cause.

In this context, a loyal employee resides on the opposite side of the post-internship loyalty spectrum from a disloyal employee. The counterpart of a loyal employee, a disloyal employee may be compared to what (Pittinsky & Shih, 2004, p. 791) refer to as a "knowledge nomad," who is seen as having less commitment to the organization, less ethical character as a worker, and more opportunistic tendencies motivated by egotistic intentions, rather than the altruistic attitude of a loyal employee. Exemplified by Alvesson (2000), a disloyal employee may exit an organization by following sabotage-like behavioral patterns such as encouragement of his or her peers to quit, gatekeeping of team contacts

to his or her personal benefit only, and even starting a competitor company using the knowledge and/or client base of his or her ex-employer.

Dispute exists within the scientific community as to whether disloyal employees may be interpreted as the antithesis of loyal employees, in viewing the disloyal employee as serving an egoistic bias, and whether loyal employees function under an altruistic bias. This debate stems from the notion that both egoism and altruism are self-deceptive psychological biases that “operate unconsciously to preserve and amplify a positive self-image” (Paulhus & John, 1998, p. 1040). Essentially, this idea resonates with the concept that while a disloyal employee may demonstrate the egoistic tendencies described by Alvesson (2000), this behavior is simply an alternative manifestation of the altruistically-motivated loyal employee, as both fundamentally seek to inflate their perceived self-worth through their subsequent actions (Paulhus & John, 1998). Therefore, the actions of an egoistic, disloyal employee are not entirely in contrast with the altruistic organizational dedication of a loyal employee, but rather exhibit the same drive to intensify a favorable impression of oneself through discrete means.

Acting as a type of middle ground between disloyal and loyal ex-employees, the role of a non-loyal employee exists as one who is more apathetic, who “experiences conflicts of interest and a limited inclination to make sacrifices for the sake of the employer” (Alvesson, 2000, p. 1105) and feels neither disdain nor responsibility toward the organization. As such, Alvesson’s (2000) interpretation of non-loyalty can be seen as a state of discontinuity where a person does not readily demonstrate the egoistic, sabotage-like behaviors of a disloyal employee or the altruistic actions of a loyal employee. Instead, a non-loyal employee can be best compared to a person who, after leaving an organization, does not intend to maintain a positive working relationship within his or her ex-employer and sustain post-internship relations nor intends to perform nefarious acts upon the organization, but is complacent in consciously pursuing alternate means of employment. Fuglsang & Sundbo’s (2006, p. 361) concept of “passive loyalty” is interchangeable with that of non-loyalty, in that both passive loyalty and non-loyalty prompt individuals to pursue a relationship on the basis of convenience rather than dedication. This element of convenience, rather than self-deceptive psychological biases drives a non-loyal ex-employee’s interaction with his or her ex-employer. As such, a non-loyal employee does not invest as much

emotional attachment into a contractual working relationship as a dis-loyal or loyal employee, but guides their decisions based on what is beneficial for the individual in the moment, devoid of sentimental dedication or defection.

Table 1: Summary of post-internship loyalty research.

Source	Theory
(Alvesson, 2000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loyalty vs. Dis-Loyalty vs. Non-Loyalty • Loyalty as a result of person-organization fit, organizational priority and workplace altruism
Rutledge (2009)	Organizational loyalty is a reciprocal result of employee engagement
(Haughey, 1993)	Discouraging exit vs. promoting loyalty
(Mathieu & Zajac, 1990)	Loyalty is enduring and continues after exit
(Noordhoff, Pauwels, & Odekerken-Schroder, 2004)	Constraint-based loyalty vs. dedication-based loyalty
(Bloemer & Odekerken-Schröder, 2006)	Loyalty as a persistent effort to maintain a stable, constructive relationship
(Abbasi & Hollman, 2000)	Loyalty as the nurturing of a mutually beneficial relationship
(Pittinsky & Shih, 2004)	Dis-loyal employees as opportunistic, unethical and egotistic
(Paulhus & John, 1998)	Both egoism and altruism are self-deceptive psychological biases
(Fuglsang & Sundbo, 2006)	Non-loyalty as passive and convenient
(Jauch, Glueck, & Osborn, 1978); Cooper C. L., 1999)	Work motivation and loyalty are distinct concepts

In regards to the limitations of what constitutes as post-internship loyalty, it important that various boundaries are established as to clarify what falls outside the realm of this construct. Primarily, it is essential to note that while there may be loose relations between the two constructs, there is a proven distinction between work motivation and post-internship loyalty, each insinuating different outcomes and antecedents (Jauch, Glueck, & Osborn, 1978; Cooper, 1999). In this sense, an employee who is still highly motivated to work for an organization after exit does not necessarily imply a loyal worker, but

rather one which may choose to pursue employment from the organization for an array of idiosyncratic reasons such as financial or moral obligation. In the same sense, a loyal worker does not necessarily imply one who contributes vast productivity to his or her ex-employer, but rather feels an intrinsic drive to maintain positive working relations with this given ex-organization.

Similar to personification, organizational identification involves a process in which an individual attempts to assimilate his/her values with those that he/she perceives to inhere in the organization he/she is attempting to emulate. The individual assigns a pseudo-persona or a myriad of attributes to the organization and then compares these values to that which the individual possesses personally (Mael & Ashforth, 1995). Over time, the individual will gradually morph his or her beliefs, attitudes, values and behaviors to match those perceived of the organization he or she wishes to identify with, and subsequently adapt aspects of his/her identity to meet those of the organization (Wells & Stryker, 1987). While organizational identification involves identity adaptation toward group values, it is important to note that organizational identification is not a concept that is assigned by group members, peers, or any other external party, but rather by the individual him/herself. In this process of self-assessment, organizational identification involves oneness with the organization as something entirely up to the discretion of the group member, and thus a concept which is not subject to interpretation by others, nor contingent upon active involvement in the given organization (Banks, et al., 1991).

Within the modern-day scientific community, it is understood that organizational identification is related to key work outcomes (Cooper & Thatcher, 2010) in a relationship in which organizational identification predicts an individual's effort toward attaining organizational goals (Ngo, Loi, Foley, Zheng, & Zhang, 2013). Through seeing oneself as part of a larger organization, individuals within a given workplace are more motivated to extenuate their efforts, seeing their work not only benefiting the company, but also advantaging themselves on a personal level. Through this logic, it is not surprising that organizational identification bears a strong, positive relation to organizational commitment and job satisfaction, while supporting a negative relationship with turnover (Ngo, Loi, Foley, Zheng, & Zhang, 2013).

Defined by Mael and Ashforth (1995) as “the perception of belonging to a group...where people perceive themselves as psychologically intertwined with a group's fate, sharing its common destiny, and experiencing its successes and failures,” organizational identification plays a substantial role in determining workplace behaviors and goals. As such, it is likely that organizational identification would be a significant factor in predicting post-internship loyalty within the confines of this study, as this construct measures items that reflect not only immediate job pursuit, but also likelihood to recommend others to the organization and likelihood of returning to the organization in the future. As such, for the purposes of this study, organizational identification is a sub-construct of post-internship loyalty, and will be used as the dependent variable of this study.

Perceived Support

Although supervisor and coworker support both stipulate different connotations, both constructs can nevertheless be viewed under parallel rationales and psychological motivation. Referred to as Perceived Organizational Support Theory, both perceived supervisor support and coworker support serve the joint function of “assurance that aid will be available from the organization when it is needed to carry out one’s job effectively and to deal with stressful situations” (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002, p. 678). More simplistically, perceived organizational support is the extent to which an employee feels the organization cares about the employee’s professional contributions, as well as personal well-being. Similar to the concept of organizational identification, perceived organizational support is based upon the personification of an organization, where a person assigns human-like characteristics to an organization and subsequently forms a schema of what to expect from an employer (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). This perception is based off of the legal, financial and moral responsibility that an organization holds over employees while they operate as agents of the company (Levinson, 1965). As supervisors and co-workers both assume roles as agents of organizations, an individual's perception of both supervisory support and coworker support not only pertain to how these persons view the individual, but moreover the extent to which the organization as a whole values the

individual's benefactions and personal welfare (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). In this type of relationship, where an individual's perception of supervisory support and coworker support leads to a higher perception of organizational support, the Norm of Reciprocity drives the individual to give back to the organization by exerting extra effort toward the organization through increased performance (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2006).

In regards to this study, the Perceived Organizational Support Theory casts large implications on predicting the relationship between interns' perceived supervisor and coworker support and post-internship loyalty. Overwhelmingly, evidence from empirical studies show that higher perceived organizational support is positively related to retention rates (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002), organizational commitment (Rhoades, Eisenberger & Armeli, 2001) and negatively related to intention to leave and turnover (Loi, Hang-Yue, & Foley, 2006). These findings are particularly pertinent toward employees who are new to an organization, as organizational support is largely beneficial in adapting to a new work environment and becoming aware of the social norms under which an organization operates (Ng & Sorensen, 2008). Due to the nature of internships to last for temporary periods of time, it is expected that most student interns (regardless of whether having interned at the organization previously) would be required to adjust to a new professional setting upon leaving their academic career to pursue temporary employment with an organization for the course of the summer. As such, perceived organizational support operates in congruence with Social Exchange Theory, in that the intern will assess the extent to which an organization will support him/her based upon subtle cues, and then accordingly reciprocates his/her extent of support to the organization (e.g., loyalty) based on these assessments. Through Signaling Theory, this reciprocated support, or loyalty, is largely motivated through anticipated rewards. For example, when an intern feels supported by her supervisor, she takes this as a cue that the greater organizational supports her, as well, and accordingly increases how loyal she feels to the organization in hopes that this will lead to continued support through extension of a full-time offer to her. Thus, in congruence with this research, I hypothesize that both coworker and supervisor support will be positively related with post-internship loyalty.

Coworker Support vs. Supervisory Support

It is important to note, however, that there are significant differences between coworker versus supervisory support. A simple way to differentiate these constructs is through authority over employment decisions. While a supervisor has sovereignty over critical decisions bearing on an employee's professional development, such as performance appraisals and elevation in career status, a coworker typically does not share this same degree of influence over the employee. Support from supervisors, unlike coworkers, carries a distinct connotation more closely focused upon augmenting value of an employee's contributions and personal well-being through guidance and leadership. In this sense, supervisory support is relevant for evaluating long-term development of the employee. Reasoning through Signaling, it is thus intuitive that a supervisor's expectation of long-term success for an employee will also work reciprocally, predicting an employee's commitment to adapting and fulfilling long-term goals for a supervisor, and ultimately, for the organization.

H1: Perceived supervisory support is positively related to perceptions of post-internship organizational identification.

Coworker relationships represent a less formal dynamic, with greater potential for peer-like relationships rather than structured conversations surrounding performance. Coworker support may foster a wide range of positive outcomes for employees, such as task-based instructions, advice in uncertain situations, help on assignments, mentorship and emotional support, and organizational identification on a personal level. As such, even though coworker support may not take place through formal, structured communications of expectations and goals, coworker support is conveyed through a sense of camaraderie and inclusion into a social network. In this sense, the coworker support influences post-internship loyalty through shaping an intern's identity with the people they regularly interact with.

H2: Perceived coworker support is positively related to perceptions of post-internship organizational identification.

Perceived Career & Learning Opportunities

Defined as “an organized, formalized, planned effort to achieve a balance between an individual’s career needs and the organization’s workforce requirements” (Foong-ming, 2008), opportunities for career development may arise resultant out of a formulated scheme by the organization itself (Gutteridge, Leibowitz, & Shore, 1993), or via self-exploration within a professional setting at the discretion of the employee (Arthur, 1999). Within this context, perceived career opportunities function as the potential to which an individual 1) has to propel his or her professional development through his or her own self-guided exploration at a company, and 2) adheres to organization-created institutions for employee advancement. As such, perceived career opportunities are a manifestation through the perspective entirely of the employee, as they are comprised of the bridge between an employee’s personal desire to grow and the employee-perceived potential that an organization has to fulfill these desires (Lips-Wiersma & Hall, 2007).

In viewing their employer as one which will reciprocate their efforts, an employee is overtly more likely to stay with a given organization if he or she sees potential for career development within the organization over the duration of a foreseeable time, and will be less likely to leave an organization in which he or she sees potential for personal career development (Foong-ming, 2008). As this relationship has held true across both executives (Gaertner & Nollen, 1992), as well as entry-level workers in knowledge-intensive professional settings (Igarria & Siegel, 1992) it is likely that this same trend would hold true to the participants of this study - namely student interns employed across a myriad of knowledge-intensive environments in professional positions. The relationship between other relevant sub-factors of post-internship loyalty, such as turnover and intent to remain with the organization, has also been demonstrated to be predicted by different aspects of career development, such as position mobility opportunity (Scholl, 1983). Through this logic, I hypothesize that there will be a positive relationship between both perceived career opportunities and post-internship loyalty and learning opportunities and post-internship loyalty.

H3: Perceived career opportunities are positively related to perceptions of post-internship organizational identification.

In a similar sense, learning opportunities present a prospect for self-enhancement of interns, but from another perspective more focused upon the acquisition or enhancement of skills, knowledge and abilities. Because the interns in this study are college students, it is intuitive to assume that participants likely already possess a desire in the academic setting to learn beyond the compulsory minimum, and expand their threshold of capability to an elevated status. As such, it is also logical to equate this assumption to the workplace. As demonstrated by Rosenholtz (1989), educational institutions such as schools and universities overlap with corporate settings in that learning opportunities both represent ways in which an individual can develop him or herself in order to aspire toward a particular goal. As such, interns, as students, come into an organization pre-accustomed to the idea of learning opportunities as a means of self-enrichment and development.

Beyond being accustomed to leveraging learning in an organizational setting, interns are likely to be loyal to an organization that fosters learning opportunities due to their newness in the business. Unlike full-time employees who are evaluated for their proficiencies within an organization, internships are designed with an exploratory mindset, focused on orienting the intern into the corporate culture, business processes and daily functions. A predominant goal of internships is therefore to provide a coordinated environment in which interns can gain knowledge about the organization before entering the workforce as a full-time employee of the company. In order to do this, interns must be provided with learning opportunities to help acclimate themselves and refine their previous experience into firm-specific knowledge. Learning opportunities, however, are not limited to classroom-style lectures, seminars and formal instructions at the workplace, but rather are expanded to other activities associated with on-the-job learnings, mentorship and feedback. Consistent with Rosenholtz (1989) and Kahne & Spote (2008), learning opportunities have been demonstrated to carry a significant, positive relationship with workplace commitment (Rosenholtz, 1989) for newcomers to an organization. Through being able to observe more experienced workers and engage in hands-on learning with experts, new hires at an organization not only are able to more quickly assimilate into culture, but also build an informal support

system and develop loyalty to an organization as a trusted foundation dedicated to continuous improvement.

H4: Perceived learning opportunities are positively related to perceptions of post-internship organizational identification.

Table 2 Summary of relevant studies on the impact of supervisory support, coworker support, perceived career opportunities and learning opportunities on employee organizational identification.

Study	Sample	DV(s)	IVs	Relevant Findings
Mael & Ashforth, 1995	2,535 U.S. Army recruits	Org. identification (OID)	Socialization Group attachment Intellectual orientation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. High socialization, group attachment and intellectual orientation are associated with significantly higher OID. 2. OID is a significant predictor of attrition.
Ngo, Loi, Foley, Zheng, & Zhang, 2013	591 employees in China	OID Job satisfaction Quit intention	Perceived org. support Procedural Justice Job insecurity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. POS has significant, positive relationship with OID, job satisfaction and a negatively effects quit intentions. 2. OID mediates the effects of POS on job satisfaction and quit intention.
Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002	Meta-analysis of 70+ studies	POS Org. commitment Job satisfaction Performance Withdrawal	Fairness (supervisory support, procedural justice, politics) Org. rewards (job conditions, security)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supervisory support sig. related to POS 2. Org. commitment, performance and withdrawal intention (negative) are all significant predictors of POS.
Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986	361 employees and 97 private high school teachers	Absenteeism Exchange ideology Org. commitment	POS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employee's org. commitment is significantly influenced by perceptions of org's employee commitment. 2. POS positively predicts org. commitment, and negatively predicts absenteeism.

Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2006	248 full-time retail employees	Supervisor POS Subordinate POS	Perceived supervisor support (PSS) Performance (in-role, extra-role)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PSS is positively related to supervisor POS, subordinate POS and performance, suggesting that POS is reciprocal between supervisor and subordinate.
Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002	314 employees of varied orgs. 793 retail sales employees	POS Org. support Turnover	PSS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PSS is associated with temporal change in POS, and is thereby a predictor of POS 2. Perceptions of supervisor status mediate the relationship between PSS and POS 3. POS mediates negative relationships between PSS and turnover.
Rhoades, Eisenberger & Armeli, 2001	357 employees of varied orgs.	POS Affective commitment Turnover	Work experiences (organizational rewards, procedural justice, supervisor support)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. POS mediates the positive relationships between work experiences and AC 2. POS is a significant predictor of AC 3. AC mediates the negative relationship between POS and turnover.
Loi, Hang-Yue, & Foley, 2006	517 practicing solicitors in Hong Kong	POS Perceived justice Quit intention	Organizational commitment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. POS mediates effects of perceived justice on organizational commitment and quit intention. 2. Organizational commitment is negatively related to quit intention.
Ng & Sorensen, 2008	Meta-analysis of 39 studies	Job Satisfaction Affective Commitment Quit intention	PSS Perceived coworker support (PCS)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Both coworker support and supervisory support are positively related org. commitment 2. Coworker support is a weaker predictor of org. commitment than supervisor support.

Gutteridge, Leibowitz, & Shore, 1993	1,596 global corporations	Perceived results (retention, skills, morale, empowerment)	Organizational development efforts	Organizational development efforts are positively related with perceived results in employee retention and morale.
Arthur, 1999	75 employees in varied orgs.	Improvisation Sense making Adaptation Learning	Career enactment (employee position, long-term development)	Persistent career-relevant learning is positively associated with career enrichment.
Lips-Wiersma & Hall, 2007	50 HR employees of varied orgs.	Employee responsibility (over own career development)	Developing capacity & employability (seeking career opportunities)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employee responsibility is positively related to developing capacity and employability 2. Organizational responsibility toward employee career opportunities mediates positive relationship with developing capacity and employability
Kahne & Sporte, 2008	4,057 students from 52 high schools	Commitment to Civic Participation	Civic Learning Opportunities	Learning opportunities are significantly related to long-term participation commitments
Rosenholtz, 2009	Meta-analysis	Workplace commitment (investment, satisfaction, desire to stay)	Rewards Autonomy Learning Opportunities Efficacy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Positive, significant relationship between learning opportunities and workplace commitment 2. Goal-setting activities mediate effects of learning opportunities with workplace commitment 3. Work efficacy and workplace commitment mediated by learning opportunities

Chapter 4

Methodology

To conduct research in this area, participants were surveyed using both between-case and within-case design for two separate sample groups (Sample 1 and Sample 2). While each of these design types was implemented at different times and utilized different questionnaires, both surveys measured the same independent and dependent variables in order to provide a consistent record of each variable across all participants. Given that data were collected from three separate surveys (Sample 1 Wave 1, Sample 1 Wave 2 and Sample 2), a unique strategy was formed to combine the results of all surveys into one, cohesive data set. This chapter examines measure assembly, data cleaning and data set combination process for each of these surveys.

Measures for variables used in both survey types are adapted measures from previous peer-reviewed studies on each respective construct. All questions adhered to Likert scales ranging from 1-5, with 1 as “Strongly Disagree” and 5 as “Strongly Agree.” Across all surveys, these existing measures were replicated and adapted to align with the corresponding time frame, promoting consistency across design types. Questions measuring organizational identification are taken from a combination of sources (see Appendix). Some measures were adapted by replacing the word “team” with the word “organization.” For example, “This team’s successes were my successes” was adapted to “This organization’s successes were my successes.” The items were measured to have an internal reliability of 0.70 ($\alpha = 0.70$). Measures from this questionnaire were intended to assess the long-term loyalty of individuals to an organization, in addition to continued identification with the employer, in order to embody a robust construct of post-internship organizational identification.

Questions measuring perceived coworker support in are taken from Bemiller & Williams’s Coworker Support Scale (2011). Using all five measures on the surveys, coworker support measures have an adequate internal reliability of 0.84 ($\alpha = 0.84$). Questions measuring perceived supervisory support in both Sample 1 and 2 (see Appendix) are taken from Graen, Linden and Williams (1982). Using all 5 measures on the surveys, coworker support measures have an adequate internal reliability of

0.83 ($\alpha = 0.83$). Questions measuring learning opportunities in both Sample 1 and 2 (see Appendix) are taken from Nikolova et. al.'s Workplace Learning Scale (2014). These items were measured to have an internal reliability of 0.80 ($\alpha = 0.80$). Questions measuring career opportunities in both samples are taken from a combination of sources (see Appendix). These items were measured to have an internal reliability of 0.89 ($\alpha = 0.89$). Questions measuring intrinsic motivation in both Sample 1 and 2 (see Appendix) are taken from Tremblay, Blanchard, Taylor, Pelletier & Villeneuve's Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (2009). Originally 18 items long and written in French, the measures of this scale were adapted based off back-to-back retranslation techniques, and then tested through exploratory factor analysis. Results of this analysis demonstrated a sufficient reliability, with an alpha value of 0.80 for all items measuring the construct of intrinsic motivation ($\alpha = 0.80$).

The rationale behind conducting both between-case and within-case designs is largely to augment the number of research participants, as participants were dispersed across various workplaces throughout the summer, yet concentrated within college campuses upon the coming of the academic year. As I will explain further, this time difference accounted for the disparities within my survey administration methodology to include both within and between case designs.

Sample 1

The first wave of the Sample 1 survey was conducted in early June 2015 in order to capture the attitudes of interns during the first segment of their internship experience, leaving the questionnaire open for approximately a week to give participants adequate time to answer. The second wave of surveys was distributed during the last week of August and left open until the first week of September. The rationale behind doing this was to capture the attitudes of interns both during the first segment of their workplace experience to gauge first impressions of the experience, and then measuring these attitudes again after the majority of internships had ended and students were transitioning back into college.

As most internships run between 10 and 12 weeks through the duration of university summer break, I estimated this time frame based on the academic calendar concluding spring semester in mid-

May and beginning fall semester in late August. As such, I reasoned that by early June, most students would have already started their internship programs, and that by early September, most interns would have concluded their internship and be transitioning back into college. Prolonging the implementation of the second wave of this data collection was intended to adequately capture post-internship loyalty of participants; as a large piece of post-internship loyalty involves actual job pursuit, I intended to measure if interns had received return offers upon concluding their internship experiences, and if so, whether they had accepted these offers, rejected them, or were postponing their decision. For those who had not yet received notification from their employers of their return offer status or who received an offer but did not yet give their employers a formal response, I included a section specifically designed for this audience to indicate their intended job pursuit as a substitute measure.

Participants in Sample 1 completed the survey online via Qualtrics.com. Because the survey asked questions on sensitive topics such as supervisor and coworker relationships, measures were taken to ensure the confidentiality of the respondent. All responses were stored on Qualtrics in a password-protected folder, viewable only by me and my thesis advisor (Dr. Xiangmin Liu). In addition, a schema was devised so that respondents would be able to be individually contacted for each subsequent survey wave while disclosing the least personal information as possible. Participants were asked to write in their email address (with full disclosure that they may be contacted again in the future), and automatically generated an ID code linked to their email address via Qualtrics (*see Appendix for Wave 1 & 2 questionnaires*). Respondents who reported to both 1) having an internship during the summer of 2014 and 2) not having been formally notified of their return offer status OR not having given their employer a formal response yet, were emailed an individualized link (formulated by Qualtrics) to participate in Wave 2 of the survey. This email was sent through the Share Survey function of Qualtrics, so that the entire process would be conducted through the secure data system, rather than using personal email to contact participants. These participants were emailed a link via Qualtrics. Once their responses were completed, their data was stored in Qualtrics alongside their individualized ID number. This allowed a safe, nameless, confidential system for respondents to participate in multiple survey waves without having their identities be compromised.

The purpose of creating an online survey designed as such was to enhance recruitment efforts. Because the majority of student interns were dispersed across various organizations throughout the United States, as well as several global internships, I elected to make the survey accessible online in order to best reach this geographically diverse audience. Accordingly, I used online forums to solicit participants and sought out online public spaces composed of individuals relevant to my study. In doing so, I posted the survey from my personal Facebook and LinkedIn accounts into professional groups made up of thousands of individuals with a high likelihood of partaking in a summer internship, such as 2014 Silicon Valley Summer Interns, LinkedIn Summer Interns, 2014 Bay Area Summer Interns, Jobs & Internships (open group for Penn State students), the Society of Human Resource Management Students and NYC Summer 2014 Interns. Beyond social media, I also sent out a link to my survey to various email listservs, such as that for the Penn State Chapter of Society of Human Resource Management, Penn State Society of Labor and Employment Relations, Air Products Interns and the Schreyer Honors College at Penn State.

For the first wave of Sample 1 surveying (referred to from here on as “Sample 1 Wave 1”), there was a total of 148 participants. Of these participants, about 59 were eliminated from the sample set due to incomplete survey responses during data cleaning, leaving a remainder of 89 complete data sets for Wave 1 Sample 1, or a 60% retention rate. Of this group of participants, approximately 51% responded to the Sample 1 Wave 2 survey (45 total participants). Unlike Sample 1 Wave 1, the overwhelming majority of these responses were considered complete and kept during data cleaning. Only one response was eliminated from Sample 1 Wave 2 (a 98% completion rate), resulting in a significantly higher completion rate than Sample 1 Wave 1. The rationale behind this is largely intuitive; participants who had already participated in the survey during Wave 1 self-selected themselves to participate in Wave 2, implying a heightened interest in participation. As such, it is not surprising that these self-selected individuals demonstrated greater effort to fully complete the second round of surveys. This phenomenon of self-selection, however, does denote potential for endogeneity, or wrongful causation due to a biased participant pool. In addition, panel attrition is a second risk involved in this Sample, due to the dramatic

drop in participants between Waves 1 and 2. These latent risks are elaborated on further in the Limitations section.

Sample 2

After completion of Sample 1, the within-case design segment of my research, I pursued my data collection based on the logic that by early September most internships would have concluded, and the majority of interns would be returning back to college. Following this rationale, I began on-site data collection at the Pennsylvania State University in University Park, Pennsylvania from October to December of 2014. Comprised of over 46,000 students from diverse backgrounds, (Penn State Admissions, 2014) the sheer magnitude and variety of the university's students deemed it adequate to collect data, as it would represent a myriad of employers and internship experiences.

As these surveys intended to measure the same constructs as the Sample 1, the questions of Sample 2 were nearly identical to that of Sample 1. However, unlike Sample 1, which would be administered more than once to the same individual, the Sample 2 would only be given to each participant once. Thus, Sample 2 needed to be adjusted so that the same measures could all be collected concurrently, rather than across time. To do this, all waves of surveys from Sample 1 were combined and then adjusted in three aspects: 1) elimination of repeated questions asked across multiple survey waves, 2) the substitution of questions designed to be asked across time with questions constructed to be asked within one measure 3) technical grammar adjustments due to change in time frame to that of the past-tense.

As some variables from Sample 1 were repeated across multiple waves of surveys, the repeated questions were eliminated and converted into one set of questions to measure the given variable. For example, supervisor support was measured twice in both Wave 1 and Wave 2 of the Sample 1, but was only measured once in Sample 2 (*see Appendix for Sample 2 questionnaire*). Although this eliminated a portion of the data, I reasoned that attempting to measure attitudes from two different specific time frames in the recent past (start of internship and end of internship) would confuse participants in addition

to almost doubling the estimated time it would take to complete the survey. I reasoned that this would promote frustration within participants, leading to a higher dropout rate and resulting in an incomplete data set. As such, I opted to replace the multiple-wave questions with one uniform measure of the variable across the entire duration of the internship experience, placing all verbs in the past-tense. Even though this restricted the data set to only include one measure of the variables rather than two, it was more rational to conduct the survey in this way due to the nature of Sample 2.

In order to solicit participation, both in-person and online surveys were given to students. I (Carla Marano) administered in-person surveys to classes across the Penn State, University Park campus. Classes were selected on a case-by-case basis to target student bodies that were likely to have participated in internships - in particular, students in their senior year of college in courses pertaining to career development across different subjects. With consent by the professor, surveys were administered in-person to a total of 19 classes. Physical copies of the surveys were distributed to students, then returned to the proctor upon completion, and coded into a password-protected electronic data set. In addition, the survey was distributed to students online via Qualtrics. Since Sample 2 would not require responses to be tracked across participants, Sample 2 of the online survey operated as an anonymous link with no identifiers. This online version was distributed to students through the Smeal College of Business listserv and to the followers of the Career Enrichment Network of the College of Liberal Arts via Twitter.

A total of 203 participants formed the extent of Sample 2, 103 participants taking the survey online via Qualtrics.com, and 100 taking the survey in-person by hand. After data cleaning, a total of 84 participants remained from the online portion, and 97 remained from the in-person version, resulting in a combined data set of 181 participants – an overall 89% retention rate from the original data set. Distinct from Sample 1, the data set for Sample 2 does not aggravate any bias due to panel attrition, since responses were only collected once from participants. Similar to Sample 1, however, the data set for Sample 2 also has to potential for endogeneity, since participants were able to freely elect and volunteer to participate in the survey. This issue is discussed further in the Limitations section.

Chapter 5

Results

This chapter explores the analysis of the combined data discussed in Chapter 4 through a variety of descriptive and inferential statistics. These figures examine both trends of variables on an individual level, as well as relationships between variables. The analysis focuses principally on quantitative relationships between the scores of the dependent variable, organizational identification, and scores of the independent variables of perceived supervisor support, coworker support, career opportunities and learning opportunities. These results incorporate both the responses of the longitudinal and cross-sectional renditions of this study to form one comprehensive set of findings, totaling 216 survey sets.

Screening and Substitution

The screening and substitution process of this study followed a systematic approach to ensure valid data usage and accurate conclusions. Responses were entirely deleted from the dataset for any one of the following reasons: 1) participant reported to be under 18 years old; 2) participant did not have an internship experience during the timeframe in question; 3) participant failed to complete most questions measuring the dependent variable; or 4) participant failed to complete most measures for more than one independent variable. Here it is important to note that completion of measures for control variables had no impact on whether or not a survey was considered complete, so long as the dependent and independent variables were considered complete. For example, if a participant opted not to fill out demographic information, but completed all measures for the independent and dependent variable, their dataset would still be included in analysis. However, if a participant filled out demographic information, but answered less than half of questions measuring the dependent variable, their case would be dropped from analysis.

In the event that some measures were not completed entirely, two distinct forms of mean substitution were implemented to artificially, yet fairly, complete missing items. The first case of mean

substitution was implemented for participants who answered more than half of the questions related to a specific variable, but did not answer all questions for said variable. In this case, all measures given by this respondent for said variable were averaged together, and then this average was substituted for the remainder of the non-responses for this participant's variable score. For example, if a participant were asked five questions to measure a given variable, but only answered four out of five of the questions, the average score for the four provided responses would be substituted for the fifth unanswered response. The four original responses plus the fifth mean-substituted response would be averaged, and this average would be used as the participant's mean score for this variable. As such, the mean score for this variable would be a fair representation of their anticipated response, and would not bias the dataset.

The second case of mean substitution was put in place for participants who answered the majority of questions for at least three of the independent variables, but answered less than half of the questions for one independent variable. In this case, the participant's average score for this variable would be substituted by the mean of all responses within the dataset. For example, if a participant completed all questions for three of the independent variables, but answered no questions for the fourth independent variable, the participant's average score for this fourth independent variable would be substituted with the mean of the entire dataset. This mean would be found by averaging the scores of every participant in the dataset for this given variable.

Control Variable Selection

After surveys were screened for completion, the mean score, standard deviation, and correlation with other variables was calculated for the remainder of survey sets (see Table 3). This examination revealed little variation and no significant difference amongst the control variables of extrinsic motivation, age and compensation. Therefore, these variables were removed from regression models. In addition, the variables of desired return position = part-time, desired return position = other, and academic year = sophomore were dropped for similar reasons, in addition to the fact that there was little representation of these variables in the dataset. This left the following variables remaining for data

analysis: intrinsic motivation, supervisory support, learning opportunities, coworker support, career opportunities, desired return position = internship, desired return position = full-time, gender, academic year = junior, academic year = senior, academic year = grad student and hours worked = over 40 per week.

Examination of control variables for this study revealed insights into the average participant's demographics. Overall, if given a return offer, most interns cited to most likely be offered either a full-time position with the organization, or another internship. As such, this indicates that part-time positions are a less likely next step after an internship experience, and that internships stand as a pipeline for a full-time workforce. Most participants of the study were females over the age of 21, predominately going into their senior year of college. Interns of this study, for the most part, worked full-time during their internships (over 40 hours a week). The majority of internships were paid without provision of academic credit. For those internships that were unpaid, most interns were given academic credit in exchange for their work. Very few interns received neither pay nor credit for their work. Similarly, a small margin of interns were given both academic credit and pay as compensation for their internships. This trend signals that the focus of internships is solely for monetary compensation, but for alternate benefits, as well, such as academic credit and formal recognition of workplace knowledge. As such, internships differ from traditional temporary, hourly positions in that wages are not always guaranteed nor the principal objective, but rather coupled with intangible outcomes related to professional development.

Table 3 Summary of descriptive statistics for dependent, independent and control variables.

Variable	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Org. Identification	3.82	0.05	1									
2 Supervisory Support	4.35	0.05	0.52*	1								
3 Coworker Support	4.42	0.04	0.37*	.66*	1							
4 Career Opportunities	3.91	0.06	0.66*	0.35*	0.21*	1						
5 Learning Opportunities	4.25	0.04	0.52*	0.48*	0.40*	0.47*	1					
6 Intrinsic Motivation	4.23	0.03	0.32*	0.29*	0.26*	0.24*	0.43*	1				
7 Desired employment: internship	0.64	0.04	0.05	0.04	-0.04	0.06	0.07	0.05	1			
8 Desired employment: full-time	0.58	0.03	-0.09	-0.11	-0.04	-0.12	-0.68	-0.01	-0.64*	1		
9 Academic Year: Senior	0.35	0.03	0.00	-0.05	-0.01	-0.06	-0.05	-0.05	-0.39*	0.29*	1	
10 Hours: Full-time	0.16	0.02	-0.19*	0.09	-0.14*	-0.14*	-0.16*	0.00	-0.18*	0.23*	0.13*	1

*Indicates a p-value less than 0.05

**Indicates a p-value less than 0.01

n=216

Hypothesis Testing

In regards to relationships between variables, I begin my analysis through investigating regressions between independent variables and the dependent variable (post-internship loyalty). To analyze relationships between variables in the original units of the variables, I examine regression as identified by the least squares criterion. This measure includes a calculation of the regression coefficient, or “the predicted change in Y for a unit change in X” and the regression intercept, or “the predicted value of Y when $X = 0$ ” (Schwab, 2004). In addition, I also calculate regression squared (R^2), or the “proportion of variance in Y that is accounted for (explained) by some X variable” (Schwab, 2004). Together, these figures fully illuminate the strength and direction of the relationship in a unit-less measurement. Through multiple regression analysis, I examine the relationships between “Y and two or more X variables in units of Y” (Schwab, 2004). In order to account for nominal values unable to be quantified, an analogous regression analysis using dummy variables was implemented.

Step Analysis

A step analysis was performed to show the individual effects that each independent variable had upon the dependent variable, holding all other factors constant. Table 4 (found in Appendix) depicts the coefficient, p-values, R^2 and adjusted R^2 values for all variables following this process for Models 1-6.

Table 4 Summary of step-analysis of independent and control variables vs. organizational identification.

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	Coef.	<i>p</i>	Coef.	<i>p</i>	Coef.	<i>p</i>	Coef.	<i>p</i>	Coef.	<i>p</i>	Coef.	<i>p</i>
Controls												
IM	0.60**	0.00	0.40**	0.00	0.46**	0.00	0.32**	0.00	0.28*	0.03	0.15	0.16
FT	0.11	0.47	0.30	0.68	0.06	0.66	0.44	0.71	0.65	0.52	0.00	0.60
Int.	-0.11	0.95	-0.62	0.82	-0.08	0.60	0.00	0.96	0.00	1.00	-0.07	0.94
Snr.	-0.12	0.46	-0.16	0.28	-0.11	0.48	-0.09	0.51	-0.11	0.49	-1.10	0.38
Grad	-0.13	0.52	-0.20	0.28	-0.09	0.62	-0.02	0.90	0.09	0.62	-0.05	0.74
Hours	0.25	0.11	0.22	0.11	0.13	0.40	0.13	0.28	0.18	0.20	0.07	0.51
Fem.	-0.36	0.75	-0.01	0.91	0.03	0.78	0.02*	0.81	-0.03	0.73	0.05	0.52
SS			0.43**	0.00							0.22**	0.00
CS					0.43**	0.00					0.20*	0.02
CO							0.50**	0.00			0.41**	0.00
LO									0.54**	0.00	0.10	0.28
R ²	0.14		0.32		0.24		0.46		0.28		0.56	
Adj. R ²	0.10		0.28		0.20		0.43		0.25		0.53	

Note: IM=Intrinsic Motivation; FT=Full-Time Desired Employment; Int. = Internship Desired Employment; Sen.=Senior-Year Student; Grad=Graduate Student; Hours=Full=Time; Fem.=Female; SS= Supervisory Support; CS = Coworker Support; CO = Career Opportunities; LO=Learning Opportunities

*Indicates a significant p-value less than 0.05

**Indicates a significant p-value less than 0.01

n=216

As shown in the R^2 value in Model 1 of Table 4, about 14% of the variation amongst the dependent variable is associated with difference in control variables alone (adjusted $R^2=0.10$). Consistent with my expectation, intrinsic motivation is positively associated with post-internship organizational identification ($b=0.60$, $p<0.05$). However, desired return positions (full-time and internships), gender, academic year and hours worked (full-time vs. part-time) are not significant predictors of the dependent variable. The effects of control variables remain consistent across Models 1-5, with intrinsic motivation maintaining significance, and the remainder of control variables remaining insignificant in their effects on the dependent variable. This pattern deviates in Model 6, however, where no control variables are significantly related to post-internship organizational identification. The subsequent tables within this model dive deeper into this concept, exploring how this variation increases with the individual addition of independent variables.

Hypothesis 1 expects that supervisory support is positively related to post-internship organizational identification. Accounting for control variables, perceived supervisory support is significantly related to in post-internship organizational identification ($R^2 = 0.32$, adjusted $R^2= 0.28$). Model 2 reports that one unit increase in supervisory support is associated with a 0.43 unit increase in post-internship organizational identification ($p<0.05$). The increase of R^2 from 0.14 to 0.32 indicates an 18% unique variance explained by supervisory support when accounting for control variables. In Model 6, which incorporates all independent variables alongside control variables and the dependent variables, this relation also holds true ($b=0.22$, $p<0.05$). These results strongly support Hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 2 expects that coworker support is positively related to post-internship organizational identification. Accounting for control variables, perceived coworker support is significantly related to in post-internship organizational identification ($R^2= 0. 0.241$, adjusted $R^2= 0.20$). Model 3 reports that one unit increase in coworker support is associated with a 0.43 unit increase in post-internship organizational identification ($p<0.05$). The increase of R^2 from 0.14 to 0.24 indicates a 10% unique variance explained by coworker support when accounting for control variables. In Model 6, which incorporates all

independent variables alongside control variables and the dependent variables, this relation also holds true ($b=0.20$, $p<0.05$). These results strongly support Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 3 expects that perceived career opportunities are positively related to post-internship organizational identification. Accounting for control variables, perceived career opportunities is significantly related to post-internship organizational identification ($R^2 = 0.46$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.43$). Model 5 reports that one unit increase in career opportunities is associated with a 0.50 unit increase in post-internship organizational identification ($p<0.05$). The increase in R^2 from 0.14 to 0.46 indicates a 32% unique variance explained by career opportunities when accounting for control variables. In Model 6, which incorporates all independent variables alongside control variables and the dependent variables, this relation also holds true ($b=0.41$, $p<0.05$). These results strongly support Hypothesis 4.

Hypothesis 4 expects that learning opportunities will be positively related to post-internship organizational identification. Accounting for control variables, perceived learning opportunities is significantly related to post-internship organizational identification ($R^2 = 0.28$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.25$). Model 4 reports that one unit increase in supervisory support is associated with a 0.54 unit increase in post-internship organizational identification ($p<0.05$). The increase in R^2 from 0.14 to 0.25 indicates an 11% unique variance explained by learning opportunities when accounting for control variables. In Model 6, which incorporates all independent variables alongside control variables and the dependent variables, however, this relation does not hold true. These results only partially support Hypothesis 4 and indicate a weak relationship.

Chapter 6

Discussion

Limitations and Future Research Implications

A notable limitation of this thesis comes from the potential for endogeneity bias. Due to the voluntary nature of participation of this survey, participants were not determined in a purely random fashion from the complete population pool of all interns in the United States in the time frame under investigation. Instead, participants elected to participate voluntarily, without any promise of reward or any threat against doing so, and participated due to alternative motivations such as social desirability. Those who I personally invited to participate may associate me with the study, and therefore answer differently as a result. Moreover, participants' answers may have also been influenced by another individual associated with the study (e.g., members of the thesis committee) or with an organization affiliated with this study (e.g., Penn State, the Schreyer Honors College). As such, there is a chance that the results of this study may be biased, with participants providing skewed results as to be viewed approvingly. Following this logic, this social desirability may materialize as a confounding variable that disproportionately skews results by influencing who participated. It is therefore possible that the regression models of this thesis may have incorporated this confounding variable when analyzing relationships between the dependent and independent variables.

To address this concern, more measures can be taken in future studies to develop a randomized study based off of a population more closely related to the true population (all interns in the United States at a given time). To do this, future researchers may extend the recruitment of this study to encourage more participants, and remove any personal connections to the study with a specific organization or individual. In doing so, future studies will more accurately depict the true population pool, and will experience fewer issues attributed to social desirability bias. In addition, measures may be taken to account for any potentially omitted, confounding variables.

A second limitation of this thesis is that the cross-sectional (rather than longitudinal) research design used in Sample 2 is survey-based, not experimental. As such, the results of this research do not control for reverse-causality, or that the dependent variable in fact explains the independent variables. Being that the dependent variable was measured concurrently with the independent variables and controls, it is possible that, upon answering questions about the dependent variable, participants changed their perspective about the remainder of variables in this study, and provided biased responses accordingly. However, this is not a large issue, as lag variables were used in Sample 1. As such, the independent variables reported at Time 1 cannot predict the dependent variable at Time 2, making reverse-causality impossible for Sample 1.

On the other hand, a third limitation of this thesis stems from panel attrition due to the longitudinal (rather than cross-sectional) element of this research used in Sample 1. Through post-hoc analysis to address this issue, responses from Sample 1 were tested to find whether those who dropped between Wave 1 and Wave 2 are statistically similar to those who also participated at Time 2. Results of this analysis proved little differentiation between scores for supervisory support ($\bar{x}_{\text{wave1}}=4.11$, $\bar{x}_{\text{wave2}}=4.12$), but significantly larger discrepancies for career opportunities ($\bar{x}_{\text{wave1}}=4.01$, $\bar{x}_{\text{wave2}}=4.24$), and learning opportunities ($\bar{x}_{\text{wave1}}=4.09$, $\bar{x}_{\text{wave2}}=3.89$). These results indicate that those who did not drop out, but rather continued with the study into Wave 2, had higher perceptions of supervisory support and career opportunities. As such, it is possible that Wave 1 results may be biased toward participants with more positive experiences at work, while participants with more negative perceptions of work self-selected out from the study.

In terms of enhancing future research, the objective of this study is to make a practical and theoretical contribution to existing information in this field, given the current knowledge previously mentioned in this report regarding interns and post-internship organizational identification. From a methodological standpoint, my research methods are novel in this sub-field through incorporating both longitudinal and cross-sectional measurements. As this report thoroughly records how to conduct a study on summer interns using a combination of both design types, this opens the possibility for future developments in the sub-field in two ways. First, scholars seeking to use this integrated methodological

approach may use this study as a framework for future studies on this subject, facilitating replication across different contexts. Second, the availability of the results using this methodological approach to greater academia will allow for other scholars to conduct more diverse and comprehensive meta-analysis in this sub-field through comparing this study against similar research with different design types.

As a fourth limitation of this study, it is essential to explicitly acknowledge that this study did not test the intervening variables discussed in Chapter 2 because of survey length limitations. The results of this research depict overall trends across organizational identification and the dependent variables, but do not overtly explain the underlying reasons behind why these trends occurred. As such, a major limitation of this study is that it is unclear as to *why* the relationships under investigation came to fruition. Future research is needed in this space to truly comprehend the relationships unearthed in this study, and shed light on the psychological processes involved.

Future studies could solve for this issue by measuring the constructs discussed within Chapter 2 (i.e. reciprocity, social exchange and signaling). The Norm of Reciprocity could be measured in future research by assessing the degree to which an intern felt the employment relationship was a mutual exchange. To measure social exchange, future studies could incorporate the two tests of negative social exchange, or TEST, as a means to measure the significance of negative relational transactions (Ruehlman & Paul, 2012), as well as the Social Exchange Scale (Lai, Rousseau & Chang, 2009) to measure the significance of positive relational transactions. To measure the potential explanation due to Signaling Theory, future studies may incorporate questions that attempt to measure the extent to which actions taken by members of the organization were perceived to convey positive, negative or neutral signals to the intern as per the intern's interpretation. Beyond these three theories cited within this thesis, future studies may also examine alternate psychological processes involved with the process of forming organizational identification based upon the dependent variables of this study.

Finally, it is important to note that the inclusion of "intrinsic motivation" as a control variable may have excluded too much variation between the independent and dependent variables in regression models. With roots in self-determination theory, Tremblay et. al's (2009) Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation Scale was used in this study as a means to control for effects of individual, psychological

differences of participants' intrinsic motivation on their post-internship identification. However, being that intrinsic motivation and self-determination largely operate as a result of the social environment in which they mature, the inclusion of this variable as a control may potentially have screened out certain aspects of the dependent variables (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Since all of the dependent variables of this study are, in fact, characteristics of an organization's social environment, it is intuitive that controlling for intrinsic motivation may potentially bias the results of regression, screening out aspects of social development related to perceived support and opportunities. Future studies could address this issue by directly assessing individual differences in personality as another independent variable of research, rather than treating intrinsic motivation as a control. In doing so, this would eliminate any crossover effects previously described that are involved with intrinsic motivation, and along with providing a more robust, enriched view of how internal, as well as external, factors can influence internship experiences.

Practical Implications

This study supports the position that an intern's post-internship organizational identification is directly related to the intern's perception of workplace support and opportunities. Supervisor support, coworker support and perceived career opportunities all significantly influence this relationship, and can largely predict how closely an intern will continue to align with the organization's goals and values after contractual relations end. To be exact, supervisor support, coworker support, career opportunities and learning opportunities explain approximately 56.16% of variation in post-internship organizational identification, accounting for control variables such as desired return to employment, gender, academic year, full-time status and intrinsic motivation. Hence, it is essential that organizations foster a supportive environment for interns and clearly communicate post-internship career opportunities available within the organization in order gain post-internship loyalty of their interns.

The contemporary workplace recognizes internships as a fundamental pipeline for organizational talent acquisition and development. Over 65% of United States students with paid internships in 2014 received full-time offers after graduation, compared to the 38.6% of students without internship

experience who received employment offers (Koc, E., et al., 2014). This trend demonstrates the value placed upon internships by organizations as critical work experience prior to entering postgraduate careers. However, on average, only one out of every two interns returned to the organization that he/she previously interned at to convert into a full-time or part-time employee within five years of completing the internship program (Koc, E., et al., 2014). As such, attrition issues related to post-internship organizational identification hinder businesses from retaining critical talent pipelines for their entry-level workforce and internal talent pool for long-term organizational leaders. To sustain post-internship organizational identification of interns and maintain a reliable pipeline, it is essential that organizations adapt their internship programs to foster this construct throughout the course of the internship experience. The following implications are offered as guidelines on how to achieve this.

Practical Implication 1: Perceptions of supervisor support shape interns' idea of how much the larger organization will support their career pursuits, and thus influences post-internship loyalty.

Despite the short-term nature of internships, students who participate in internship programs form attachments to their organization over the course of their experience. A critical element of this attachment stems from perceptions of supervisory support. In agreement with Perceived Organizational Support Theory (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), supervisory support acts as a cognitive representation of the degree to which the larger organization as a whole acts as a support system. In this sense, organizations that foster supervisory support can expect higher post-internship organizational identification from their interns. This may be done through assuring that interns are paired with a supervisor or manager who is willing and able to demonstrate commitment toward the assignment given to the intern, and who is capable of demonstrating care for the intern's professional development. In addition, attention should be drawn toward communication media of supervisors and interns to ensure that goals and objectives are clearly connected with progress, and that interns are aware of how to contact their managers in case confronted with a roadblock on the path toward advancement.

Practical Implication 2: Coworker support is a significant element of building long-term organizational identification of interns.

Similar to supervisory support, coworker support is critical for developing long-term post-internship organizational identification. In order to develop high perceptions of coworker support, organizations may conduct team-building sessions, which focus on developing bonds via informal social networks at an organization. Team-building activities such as these may span vertically through an intern's business function, or even focus upon internal development of the organization's internal intern network. In doing so, an organization signals to the intern that there exists a group of peers whom they can come to for work-related advice.

Practical Implication 3: Communication of attractive career opportunities is key to developing post-internship organizational identification of interns.

In congruence with academic studies by Collins & Porras (1996), long-term vision and clear communication of goals are amongst the most highly sought out leadership qualities within organizations, and are large determinants of a company's success. Following this logic, it is intuitive this also holds constant when examining post-internship organizational identity of interns. Through clear communication of career opportunities, interns are able to foresee their long-term goals in the organization. As these goals become more realistic and tangible, interns begin to psychologically align and prepare themselves for this role within the organization. This phenomenon is characterized by London's (1983) Career Motivation Theory, which states that career insight and career identity are main predictors of career decisions and behavior. In other words, understanding specifically what a future position will realistically entail as it relates to an individual's own career goals will influence an employee's decision to remain loyal to a company.

The findings of this study support the research of both Collins & Porras (1996) and London (1983), implying that interns experience significantly increased levels of loyalty to organizations when perceptions of career opportunities are strong. For organizations, it is therefore essential to clearly define what the next steps are for interns after the duration of their defined work period ends in terms of organizational progression, and to promote this next step as attractive to the intern. Human Resources, as well as management and intern peers, must make a conscientious effort to articulate future opportunities for the intern within the organization and communicate how this career opportunity can be attained. In

doing so, organizations can expect augmented post-internship loyalty from their interns in the form of heightened organizational identification.

Finally, it is important to note that intrinsic motivation plays a significant role in predicting post-internship organizational identification, both independently and as a moderator between three independent variables of this study (supervisory support, coworker support and career opportunities). Hence, it is beneficial for employers to select interns with levels of intrinsic motivation during the recruitment process, and continue to foster this motivation throughout the duration of the internship experience. Similar to person-organization fit, intrinsic motivation serves as a driver of organizational identification through self-motivation as a method of achieving goals, rather than external rewards such as compensation or promotion.

Appendix A

IRB Exemption Determination Letter

Date: June 06, 2014
From: The Office for Research Protections - FWA#: FWA00001534
 Jodi L. Mathieu, Research Compliance Analyst
To: Carla J. Marano
Re: Determination of Exemption
IRB Protocol ID: 45835
Follow-up Date: June 5, 2019
Title of Protocol: Motivation, commitment, job characteristics and workplace spirituality: A study of post-internship loyalty of summer interns

The Office for Research Protections (ORP) has received and reviewed the above referenced eSubmission application. It has been determined that your research is exempt from IRB initial and ongoing review, as currently described in the application. You may begin your research. The category within the federal regulations under which your research is exempt is:

45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Given that the IRB is not involved in the initial and ongoing review of this research, it is the investigator's responsibility to review IRB Policy III "Exempt Review Process and Determination" which outlines:

- What it means to be exempt and how determinations are made
- What changes to the research protocol are and are not required to be reported to the ORP
- Ongoing actions post-exemption determination including addressing problems and complaints, reporting closed research to the ORP and research audits
- What occurs at the time of follow-up

Please do not hesitate to contact the Office for Research Protections (ORP) if you have any questions or concerns. Thank you for your continued efforts in protecting human participants in research. This correspondence should be maintained with your research records.

Appendix B

Citi Curriculum Completion Report

COLLABORATIVE INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING INITIATIVE (CITI)

HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH CURRICULUM COMPLETION REPORT

Printed on 06/05/2014

LEARNER	Carla Marano (ID: 4018908) 180 Greenbrook Rd. Green Brook New Jersey 08812 United States
DEPARTMENT	Labor Employment Relations
PHONE	9082481588
EMAIL	cjm5755@psu.edu
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State University
EXPIRATION DATE	06/04/2017

SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH (IRB) COURSE

COURSE/STAGE:	Basic Course/1
PASSED ON:	06/05/2014
REFERENCE ID:	13173430

REQUIRED MODULES	DATE COMPLETED	SCORE
Pennsylvania State University	06/05/14	No Quiz
Research and HIPAA Privacy Protections	06/05/14	4/4 (100%)
Belmont Report and CITI Course Introduction	06/05/14	3/3 (100%)
History and Ethical Principles - SBE	06/05/14	5/5 (100%)
The Regulations - SBE	06/05/14	5/5 (100%)
Informed Consent - SBE	06/05/14	5/5 (100%)
Privacy and Confidentiality - SBE	06/05/14	5/5 (100%)
Research With Protected Populations - Vulnerable Subjects: An Overview	06/05/14	4/4 (100%)
Conflicts of Interest in Research Involving Human Subjects	06/05/14	5/5 (100%)
ELECTIVE MODULES	DATE COMPLETED	SCORE
Vulnerable Subjects - Research Involving Workers/Employees	06/05/14	4/4 (100%)

For this Completion Report to be valid, the learner listed above must be affiliated with a CITI Program participating institution or be a paid Independent Learner. Falsified information and unauthorized use of the CITI Program course site is unethical, and may be considered research misconduct by your institution.

Paul Braunschweiger Ph.D.
Professor, University of Miami
Director Office of Research Education
CITI Program Course Coordinator

Appendix C

Consent Form for Samples 1 and 2

Q1 Consent Form

What is this survey about? This survey seeks to understand how internship experiences may benefit a college student's career development.

Your participation is extremely important; it is the only way to ensure the data on this topic is consistent and accurate.

Who will see my answers?

The information you provide will be treated strictly as confidential. We guarantee that no one outside of our research team will have access to your responses at any point in time. We will analyze the findings in a way that no one individual or organization may be identified. We ask for your email address only so that we can feed the results back to you and link your responses to this questionnaire to any future survey.

How do I complete the questionnaire?

Please do not omit any question. Occasionally you will find items that do not quite fit your circumstances. In this case, give the answer closest to your views. Feel free to add any additional comments you think would be useful, either by the side of the question or at the end.

If you have any queries or concerns about the study please contact Carla Marano (cjm5755@psu.edu) or Helen Liu (xul16@psu.edu), both in the School of Labor and Employment Relations, Penn State University, University Park, PA 16802.

Q2 I have read and understood the above consent form and desire of my own free will to participate in this study.

- Yes (1)
 No (2)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Q3 Within the last 4 months, have you participated in a survey by Carla Marano regarding internship experience? Note: If you are a law student, wherever you see the word "internship" a clerkship is meant to be included in that term.

- Yes, I have. (1)
 No, I have not. (2)

If Yes, I have. Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Q4 Did you have an internship this summer? (If you had more than one internship, please answer all the questions below focusing on your primary internship)

- Yes (1)
 No (2)

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Appendix D

Table of Measurement Sources

Dependent Variable

Organizational Identification

Measures were developed using the following sources:

1. Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Organizational Identification Measure [Database record].

Retrieved from PsycTESTS.

2. Johnson, William L., Johnson, Annabel M., & Heimberg, Felix. (1999). A primary- and second order component analysis of the organizational identification questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 59(1), 159-170.

Format: Likert-type scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.”

Measures:

1. When I talk [talked] about my organization, I usually say ‘we’ rather than ‘they’ (Mael & Ashforth, 1992).
2. I view [viewed] the organization’s successes as my successes (Mael & Ashforth, 1992).
3. I felt a strong sense of belonging to this company (Johnson et al., 1999).
4. If a story in the media criticized this company, I would have felt embarrassed (Mael & Ashforth, 1992).
5. I was proud to tell others that I was a part of this company (Mael & Ashforth, 1992).
6. For me, this company was best of all possible organizations for which to work (Johnson et al., 1999).

Independent Variables

Supervisory Support

Source: Graen G.B., Liden R.C. & Hoel W. (1982a) Role of leadership in the employee withdrawal process. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 67, 868–872.

Format: Likert-type scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.”

Measures:

1. My supervisor understood my job problems and needs.
2. My supervisor recognized my potential
3. My I had an effective working relationship with my supervisor.
4. I know where I stood with my supervisor.

Coworker Support

Source: Bemiller, M., & Williams, L. S. (2011). Coworker Support Scale [Database record]. Retrieved from PsycTESTS. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/t24744-000>

Format: Likert-type scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.”

Measures:

1. I would say that my colleagues get [got] along with one another.
2. I feel that my colleagues are [were] supportive of me and my work.
3. If I wanted to talk to someone about a work-related problem, I could rely on one or more of my colleagues to listen.

Perceived Career Opportunities

Measures were developed using two sources: Kraimer et al., (2011). Organizational Support for Development and Perceived Career Opportunity Scale [Database record]. Retrieved from PsycTESTS; Adams, G. A. (1999). Career Growth Opportunity Measure [Database record]. Retrieved from PsycTESTS.

Format: Likert-type scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.”

Measures:

1. There are job opportunities available within [this company] that are of interest to me (Kraimer, 2011).
2. [This company] offers many job opportunities that match my career goals (Kraimer, 2011).
3. Working for this organization will help [helped] my career (Adams, 1999)
4. I can [could] achieve my career goals in this organization (Adams, 1999).

Perceived Learning Opportunities

Source: Nikolova, I., Van Ruysseveldt, J., De Witte, H., & Syroit, J. (2014). Workplace Learning Scale [Database record]. Retrieved from PsycTESTS. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/t28894-000>

Format: 5-point rating scale ranging from 1 (not applicable at all) to 5 (completely applicable).

Measures:

1. My supervisor helps [helped] me see my mistakes as a learning experience.
2. When confronted with difficulties in my tasks, I am [was] given the opportunity to consider what the best possible approach was.
3. My work offers [offered] opportunities for me to be creative and imaginative.

Control Variable

Intrinsic Motivation

Source: Tremblay, M. A., Blanchard, C. M., Taylor, S., Pelletier, L. G., & Villeneuve, M. (2009).

Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale [Database record]. Retrieved from PsycTESTS. doi:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/t01417-000>

Format: Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (does not correspond at all) to 5 (corresponds exactly).

Measures:

1. Because it allows [allowed] me to earn money.
2. Because it has [had] become a fundamental part of who I am.
3. Because I derive much pleasure from learning new things.
4. For the satisfaction I experience [experienced] in taking on interesting challenges.

Bibliography

1. Abbasi, S. M., & Hollman, K. W. (2000). Turnover: The Real Bottom Line. *Public Personnel Management* , 29 (3), 333-342.
2. Adams, G. A. (1999). Career-Related Variables and Planned Retirement Age: An Extension of Beehr's Model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* , 55 (2), 221-235.
3. Alvesson, M. (2000). Social Identity And The Problem Of Loyalty In Knowledge-Intensive Companies. *Journal of Management Studies* , 37 (8), 1101-1123.
4. Arthur, M. B. (1999). *The New Careers: Individual And Economic Change*. London: Sage Publications.
5. Banks, M., Bates, I., Breakwell, G., Bynner, J., Emler, N., Jamieson, L., Et Al. (1991). *Careers And Identities*. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.
6. Bemiller, M., & Williams, S. L. (2011). The Role Of Adaption In Advocate Burnout: A Case Of Good Soldiering. *Violence Against Women* , 17 (1), 89-110.
7. Bliegebird, R., Smith, E., Alvard, M., Chibnik, M., Cronk, L., Giordani, L., Et Al. (2005). Signaling Theory, Stategic Interaction, And Symbolic Capital. *Current Anthropology* , 46 (2), 221-248.
8. Blodgett, J. G., & Granbois, D. H. (1992). Toward an Integrated Conceptual Model of Consumer Complaining Behavior. *Journal Of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction And Complaining Behavior* , 5 (1), 93-103.
9. Bloemer, J., & Odekerken-Schroder, G. (2006). The Role Of Employee Relationship Proneness In Creating Employee Loyalty. *International Journal Of Bank Marketing* , 24 (4), 252-264.
10. Campion, M. A. (1991). Meaning And Measurement Of Turnover: Comparison Of Alternative Measures And Reccomendations For Research. *Journal Of Applied Psychology* , 76, 199-212.
11. Casper, W. J., & Harris, C. M. (2008). Work-Life Benefits And Organizational Attachment: Self Interest Utility And Signaling Theory Models. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior* , 72 (1), 95-109.

12. Collins, J. C., & Porras, J. I. (1996). Building Your Company's Vision. *Harvard Business Review* , 14 (7), 569-572.
13. Cooper, C. L. (1999). Can We Live With The Changing Nature Of Work? *Journal Of Managerial Psychology* , 14 (7), 569-572.
14. Cooper, D., & Thatcher, S. (2010). Identification In Organizations: The Role Of Self-Concept Orientations And Identification Motives. *Academy Of Management Review* , 35, 516-538.
15. Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (1992). Cognitive Adaptions For Social Exchange. *The Adapted Mind* , 163-228.
16. Dabos, G. E., & Rousseau, D. M. (2004). Mutuality And Reciprocity In The Physcological Contracts Of Employees And Employers. *Journal Of Applied Psychology* , 89 (1), 52.
17. Dixon, M. A., Cinningham, G. B., Sagas, M., Turner, B. A., & Kent, A. (2005). Challenge Is Key: An Investigation Of Affective Organizational Commitment In Undergraduate Interns. *Journal Of Education For Business* , 80 (3), 172-180.
18. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Percieved Organizational Support. *Journal Of Applied Psychology* , 71 (3), 500-507.
19. Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Percieved Supervisor Support: Contributions To Percieved Organizational Support And Employee Retention. *Jouranl Of Applied Psychology* , 87 (3), 565.
20. Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social Exchange Theory. *Annual Review Of Sociology* , 335-362.
21. Fitz-Enz, J. (2000). *The Roi Of Human Capital*. New York, Ny, Usa: Amacom.
22. Foong-Ming, T. (2008). Linking Career Developmnet Practices To Turnover Intention: The Mediator Of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal Of Business And Public Affairs* , 2 (1), 1-16.
23. Fuglsang, L., & Sundbo, J. (2006). Flow And Consumers In E-Based Self-Services: New Provider-Consumer Relations. *The Service Industries Journal* , 26 (4), 361-379.
24. Gaertner, K. N., & Nollen, S. D. (1992). Turnover Intentions And Desire Among Executives. *Human Relations* , 45 (5), 447-465.

25. Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The Norm Of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. *American Sociological Review*, 161-178.
26. Greenhaus, J. H., Callanan, G. A., & Godshalk, V. M. (2000). *Career Management* (3 Ed.). Orlando, FL, Usa: Dryden Press.
27. Gutteridge, T., Leibowitz, Z., & Shore, J. (1993). *Organizational Career Development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
28. Haughey, J. C. (1993). Does Loyalty In The Workplace Have A Future? *Business Ethics Quarterly* , 1-16.
29. Hui-Juan, W. (2012). Analysis On Improving Work Loyalty Of Interns. *Journal Of Nantong Textile Vocational Technology College* , 1, 21.
30. Igbaria, M., & Siegel, S. R. (1992). The Reasons For Turnover Of Information Systems Personnel. *Information & Management* , 23 (6), 321-330.
31. Jauch, L. R., Glueck, W. F., & Osborn, R. N. (1978). Organizational Loyalty, Professional Commitment And Academic Research Productivity. *Academy Of Management Journal* , 21 (1), 84-92.
32. Kahne, J. E., & Sporte, S. E. (2008). Developing Citizens: The Impact Of Civic Learning Opportunities On Students' Commitment To Civic Participation. *American Educational Research Journal* , 45 (3), 738-766.
33. Kanye, B., & Crous, F. (2007). Graduate Interns' Experiences: A Career Success Orientations Approach. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology* , 33 (3), 84-93.
34. Koc, E., Koncz, A., Tsang, K., & Longenberger, A. (2014). *Internship & co-op survey report*. Retrieved October 5, 2014, from Nacweb.org:

<http://www.nacweb.org/uploadedFiles/Content/static-assets/downloads/executive-summary/2014-internship-co-op-survey-executive-summary-pdf>
35. Koc, E., Koncz, A., Tsang, K., & Longenberger, A. (January, 24 2014). 2014 Internship & Co-op Survey. Bethlehem, PA, USA: National Association of Colleges and Employers.

36. Kottke, J. L., & Sharafinski, C. E. (1988). Measuring Perceived Supervisory and Organizational Support. *Education and Psychological Measurement* , 48, 1075-1079.
37. Lai, L., Rousseau, D., & Chang, K. (2009). Idiosyncratic deals: Coworkers as Interested Third Parties. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 547-556.
38. Lee, C., Alonso, A., Esen, E., & Scanlan, K. (2013). SHRM Survey Findings: Internships. *Society For Human Resource Management*. Retrieved October 20, 2014, from SHRM Survey Findings.
39. Levinson, H. (1965). Reciprocation: The Relationship Between Man and Organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly* , 9, 370-390.
40. Lips-Wiersma, M., & Hall, D. T. (2007). Organizational Career Development Is Not Dead: A Case Study On Managing the New Career During Organizational Change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 771-792.
41. Loi, R., Hang-Yue, N., & Foley, S. (2006). Linking Employees' Justice Perceptions to Organizational Commitment and Intention to Leave: The Mediating Role of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* , 79 (1), 101-120.
42. Loten, A. (2008, March 12). *Why Interns Are Good for Business*. Retrieved September 25, 2015, from Inc.com:

http://www.greatergrads.com/clientuploads/archived_articles_pdf/3_12_08_WhyInternsAreGoodForBusiness.pdf
43. Mael, F. A., & Ashforth, B. E. (1995). Loyal From Day One: Biodata, Organizational Identification and Turnover Among Newcomers. *Personnel Psychology* , 48, 309-333.
44. Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A Review and Meta-Analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates and Consequences of Organizational Commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108 (2), 171.

45. Ng, T. W., & Sorensen, K. L. (2008). Toward a Further Understanding of the Relationship Between Perceptions of Support and Work Attitudes: A Meta-Analysis. *Group & Organizational Management* .
46. Ngo, H. Y., Loi, R., Foley, S., Zheng, X., & Zhang, L. (2013). Perceptions of Organizational Context and Job Attitudes: The Mediating Effect of Organizational Identification. *Asa Pacific Journal of Management* , 30 (1), 149-168.
47. Noordhoff, C., Pauwels, P., & Odekerken-Schroder, G. (2004). The Effect of Customer Card Programs: A Comparative Study in Singapore and The Netherlands. *International Journal of Service Industry Management* , 15 (4), 351-364.
48. Paulhus, D. L., & John, O. P. (1998). Egoistic and Moralistic Biases in Self-Perception: The Interplay of Self-Deceptive Styles with Basic Traits and Motives. *Journal of Personality* , 66 (6), 1025-1060.
49. Penn State Admissions. (2014). *Campus Facts: Penn State University Park*. Retrieved November 22, 2014, from Penn State Admission Web site:
<http://admissions.psu.edu/pennstate/campuses/?campusCode=UP>
50. Pittinsky, T. L., & Shih, M. J. (2004). Knowledge Nomads, Organizational Commitment and Worker Mobility in Positive Perspective. *American Behavioral Scientist* , 47 (6), 791-807.
51. Raghuram, S., Gajendran, R. S., & Liu, X. (2014). Effect of leader member exchange relationships on organizational alumni: A longitudinal study. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1,12546.
52. Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Percieved Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature. 87 (4), 698.
53. Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2006). When Supervisors Feel Supported: Relationships With Subordinates' Percieved Supervisor Support, Perceived Organizational Support and Performance. *Robert Jouranl of Applied Psyscology* , 91 (3), 689-695.

54. Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective Commitment to the Organization: The Contribution of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology* , 86 (5), 825.
55. Rose, P. S., Teo, S. T., & Connell, J. (1984, 2 153-163). Converting Interns Into Regular Employees: The Role of Intern-Supervisor Exchange. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* .
56. Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). Workplace Conditions that Affect Teacher Quality and Commitment: Implications for Teach Induction Programs. *Elementary School Journal* , 89 (4), 421-439.
57. Ruehlman, L. S., & Karoly, P. 1991. With a little flak from my friends: Development and preliminary validation of the Test of Negative Social Exchange (TENSE). *Psychological Assessment*, 3: 97–104.
58. Rutledge, T. (2009). *Getting Engaged: The New Workplace Loyalty*. Toronto, ON, Canada: Mattanie Press.
59. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-Determination Theory And The Facilitation Of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, And Well-Being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68.
60. Santee-Eekhuis, J., & Zhou, Q. (2009). *Post-internship Loyalty: Is It a Fantasy?* Retrieved September 25, 2015, from Universiteit Twente web page: <http://doc.utwente.nl/89637/1/Post-internship-loyalty-Is-it-a-fantasy.pdf>
61. Schwab, D. (2004). *Research Methods for Organization Studies* (2 ed.). Mahwah, NJ, USA: Psychology Press.
62. Seibert, S. E., Crant, J. M., & Kraimer, M. L. (1999). Proactive Personality and Career Success. *Journal of Applied Psychology* , 84 (3), 416.
63. Spence, A. (1973). Job Market Signaling. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87, 355-379.
64. Tang, T. L., Kim, J. K., & Tang, D. S. (2000). Does Attitude Toward Money Moderate the Relationship Between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Voluntary Turnover? *Human Relations* , 53 (2), 213-245.
65. Thomas, K. W. (2000). *Intrinsic Motivation at Work: Building Energy & Commitment*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

66. Tremblay, M. A., Blanchard, C. M., Taylor, S. P., Luc, G., & Vileneuve, M. (2009). Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale: Its Value for Organizational Psychology Research. *Journal of Behavioural Science* , 41 (4), 213-226.
67. van Dick, R., van Knippenberg, D., Kerschreiter, R., Hertel, G., & Wieseke, J. (2008). Interactive Effects of Work Group and Organizational Identification on Job Satisfaction and Extra-Role Behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* , 72 (3), 388-399.
68. Wells, L. E., & Stryker, S. (1987). Stability and Change In Self Over the Life Course. *Life Span Development and Behavior* , 10, 191-229.

ACADEMIC VITA

Carla Marano

carlamarano180@gmail.com

Education

M.S. Human Resources and Employment Relations, 2015, Penn State University, University Park, PA

B.S. Labor and Employment Relations, 2015, Penn State University, University Park, PA

B.A. Spanish, 2015, Penn State University, University Park, PA

Thesis Title: The Effects of Perceived Support and Opportunities on Organizational Identification: A Study of College Interns

Thesis Supervisor: Dr. Xianming (Helen) Liu

Association Memberships/Activities

- Society of Human Resource Management
- Nittany Greyhounds Student Organization
- Society for Labor and Employment Relations
- Phi Eta Sigma National Honors Society
- The National Society of Collegiate Scholars
- Latin American Societies & Cultures Program: Buenos Aires 4-Month Immersion

Professional Experience

Penn State University | Graduate Teaching Assistant | University Park, PA_ Aug. – Dec. 2015

- Provide feedback on 60+ students' analysis of case law in regards to legal principles which affect the creation, development, and implementation of employment law

General Electric Corp. | Graduate Intern – HR Leadership Program | Erie, PA May – Aug. 2015

- Designed career matrix to baseline site complexity and overall structure of 10 global production sites through 50+ think tank sessions with senior leaders
- Developed full scale, actionable needs-analysis of entire division (hourly and exempt) to serve as structure for strategic workforce planning and integrated talent management

LinkedIn Corp. | Intern - HR Business Partner | Mountain View, CA May – Aug. 2014

- Constructed live onboarding module for over 70 managers of the Global Sales Organization
- Researched internal managerial onboarding trends through independent conduction of 1:1 interviews/focus groups with over 50 sales managers and account executives

New Wave Web & Marketing, LLC. | Intern | Buenos Aires, Argentina Aug.– Nov. 2013

- Improved worldwide brand recognition for clients via strategic enhancement of ranking in major search engines amongst other industry leaders and target online audience
- Launched social media marketing and pay-per-click (PPC) campaigns via search-engine-optimized content, resulting in increased website traffic for 20+ clients and lead-generation

Research Interests

I have broad interests in the field of Human Resources, particularly in understanding industrial and organizational psychology. Specifically, I am interested in organizational loyalty and commitment as it pertains to temporary and hourly populations.