# The effect of organizational commitment on employee creativity: what is the role of a temporary work contract?



# Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen

University:	Radboud University Nijmegen
Faculty:	Faculty School of Management
Master:	Business Administration
Specialization:	Strategic Human Resource Leadership
Author:	J.M. de Vries
Student number:	4838416
Supervisor:	Dr. Y.G.T. van Rossenberg
Second examiner:	Dr. R.L.J. Schouteten
Date:	21 <sup>st</sup> November 2018
Defence date:	30 <sup>th</sup> November 2018

# Acknowledgements

The present thesis, *The effect of organizational commitment on employee creativity: what is the role of a temporary work contract?*, is a study which is conducted as a part of my Master thesis for the Master Business Administration, specialization Strategic Human Resource Leadership at the Radboud University Nijmegen. This Master thesis has been written between February and November 2018. There are several people who deserve a special thanks because of their support and help during this extensive period.

First, I would like to thank my supervisor Yvonne van Rossenberg for sharing her knowledge with me and helping me throughout the whole process of finding a topic, gathering the data and analyzing the data. She also helped me by providing constructive criticism and answering all of my questions.

Secondly, I would like to thanks my friends, family and partner for their support during this period. They have provided me with wise counseling and where always patient when I felt the need to talk about my thesis. Also, they encouraged me when I had difficulties analyzing my results or writing the final chapters.

Finally, I would like to thank my fellow students for their help and support. It was pleasant to discuss my research with people who were facing the same issues.

Judith de Vries

Nijmegen, 21<sup>st</sup> November 2018

# Abstract

The objective of this research was to analyse the relationship between organizational commitment and creativity for employees with a temporary contract, through the lens of the social exchange theory (SET) and within the Dutch context. The study tested whether the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity was moderated by the contract type of the employee. The data of the study was collected together with six other Master students and eight Bachelor students. The research was conducted by means of a survey among the Dutch workforce. 861 Dutch employees who work directly for an organization, via an agency, as employer for their own company or as freelancer filled in the questionnaire.

Multiple analyses were used to analyse the data of this research. The study found a positive relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity. Furthermore, the results showed a negative significant relationship between temporary employment and organizational commitment. The study found no evidence for the relationship between temporary employment and employee creativity. Finally, temporary employment positively moderated the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity. However, drawing on SET it was expected that temporary employment negatively moderated the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE.

The findings of this study constitute a significant contribution to the scientific and practical knowledge on the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity and the effect of a temporary work contract. The study showed the importance of focussing on temporary employees in order to create a committed workforce. Also, to create a creative environment, organizations are advised to make sure that employees are committed towards the organization.

Keywords: Organizational commitment – Employee creativity – Creative Process Engagement – Temporary employment – Social Exchange Theory

# Table of contents

1. Introduction	5
1.1. Introduction of the topic	5
1.2. Research objective, framework and contributions	9
1.3. Structure of the Thesis	10
2. Theoretical background	11
2.1. Organizational commitment	11
2.1.1. Klein et al., Unidimensional, Target-free measurement (KUT)	12
2.1.2. Social exchange theory and organizational commitment	13
2.2. Employee creativity	15
2.2.1. Creativity theories	16
2.2.2. Creative process engagement	
2.3. Organizational commitment and employee creativity	19
2.4. Temporary work	21
2.4.1. Temporary work and organizational commitment	22
2.5. Theoretical model	24
3. Methodology	25
3.1 Research design and sample	25
3.2.1. Response rate	26
3.3. Research ethics	27
3.4. Measurement instrument	27
3.4.1. Organizational commitment	28
3.4.2. Employee creativity	28
3.4.3. Temporary employment	29
4. Results	30
4.1. Preliminary Analyses	30
4.1.1. Descriptive statistics	30
4.1.2. Outliers	31
4.1.3. Normality	32
4.1.4. Psychometric analyses of the variables	33
4.1.5. Means, standard deviations and correlations	35
4.2. Hypotheses testing	35
4.2.1. Hypothesis 1	35
4.2.2. Hypothesis 2	36

4.2.3. Hypothesis 3
4.2.4. Additional analysis for Hypothesis 3 40
5. Conclusion and Discussion4
5.1. Conclusion
5.2. Discussion
5.3. Contribution
5.3.1. Theoretical Contribution
5.3.2. Practical Contribution
5.4. Limitations and directions for future research49
Literature
Appendices
Appendix 15
Appendix 2
Appendix 3
Appendix 46
Appendix 5
Appendix 6
Appendix 7
Appendix 8
Appendix 9
Appendix 10
Appendix 11
Appendix 12
Appendix 13
Appendix 1494

# 1. Introduction

This chapter introduces the topic of this thesis, including the practical and scientific relevance. First, the different concepts of this study are introduced. Secondly, the research objective, framework and contributions will be discussed. Finally, the outline of the thesis will be described.

# 1.1. Introduction of the topic

The objective of this study is to analyse the relationship between organizational commitment and creativity for employees with a temporary contract, through the lens of the social exchange theory (SET) and within the Dutch context. Temporary employment is still under researched these days, even though a large part (34,8%) of the Dutch workforce has a temporary contract, fixed term contract, or a contract via a temporary work agency (CBS, 2018). Since the use of flexible workers decreases the risks and costs of the employer, a rise in the demand for flexible worker can be noticed. However, there is little literature available on the consequences of temporary employment. Furthermore, there is little literature available on the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity. This study aims to contribute to the literature by examining the relationship between organizational commitment and creativity for employees in temporary employment.

One of the key concepts within this research is temporary employment. Temporary employment can be defined as: "dependent employment of limited duration" (De Cuyper, De Witte and Van Emmerik, 2011, p. 104). Moreover, Felfe, Schmook, Schyns and Six (2008), illustrate temporary employment as "a form of work which is characterized by limited time horizon for employment with an organization and therefore provides flexibility and independence for both the employer and the employee" (p.82). Temporary work can be viewed in different ways. Firstly, temporary work can be viewed as work via a temporary work agency, this is called temporary agency employment. The main idea of temporary agency employment is that temporary work agencies assign employees to short-term jobs at various companies (Jahn & Weber, 2016). In that way, companies can benefit from the flexibility that the temporary work agencies offer. Secondly, temporary workers can also work directly for a company. However, they are employed for a fixed-time period which means that there is a lack of security for those employees. Within this research we will focus on this type of temporary employees. Since the introduction of the law 'Wet Werk en Zekerheid (WWZ) at the beginning of 2015, temporary work has become an even more important topic in The Netherlands. This law has made an end to the so called 'Flexwet' (Bagga, 2014). This law

introduced two new regulations; the first one stated that the period an employee has to leave the organization before he or she can re-enter the organization increased from three to six months (Bagga, 2014). The second regulation was the maximum term for having three temporary contracts decreased from three to two years (Bagga, 2014). This law was introduced in order to increase the chances for temporary employees to receive a permanent contract. However, the number of employees with a temporary contract increased over the past few years. Therefore, the aim of the new law has not been reached.

One attitude that is studied for reflecting how employees experience the attachment with the organization is commitment. Since it is the human capital itself that makes the organization competitive, it is very important to make sure that all employees are committed to the company they work for (Gagné and Howard, 2016), including the temporary workers. In the past few years there has been a significant increase in organizations' need to adapt to technological innovations and remaining competitive. This will result in cost-cutting practices including job redesign, restructuring, merging and downsizing (Frese, 2000). Mowday (1998) argues that cost cutting and corporate downsizing negatively impacts employees and are short-sighted strategies that hurt companies where it matters most, namely the bottom-line. In addition, Ugboro (2006) has found that high potential employees are more likely to leave the uncertainties of a downsizing environment or job redesign for better job opportunities elsewhere. This will result in a less committed workforce that will leave the company if they get better job opportunities or job offers elsewhere. Therefore, it can be stated that these pressures mentioned above will make it more difficult for organizations to have and retain a committed workforce.

Furthermore, over the years commitment has increasingly become an important topic to investigate for researchers. This is mainly due to the fact that commitment has a relationship with important behavioural outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intention (Cooper, Stanley, Klein & Tenhiälä, 2016). A theoretical explanation for this can be found in SET (Blau, 1964). Based on this theory, employees who feel supported and valued by their employer are likely to give trust and engagement in return (Ng & Feldman, 2011). In other words, when employees feel supported and rewarded by their employer, according to SET, they will be more committed towards the organization. This will, in turn, lead to lower turnover intention and higher job satisfaction. When taking a closer look into the literature on commitment, we can see a lot of different definitions. Commitment can, for example, be defined as "a volitional psychological bond reflecting dedication to and responsibility for a particular target" (Klein, Cooper, Molloy & Swanson, 2014, p. 222). Another definition of commitment is given by Meyer, Becker,

and Van Dick (2006). They define commitment as; "a force that binds an individual to a target and to a course of action of relevance to that target" (Meyer et al., 2006, p. 666). In order to create some sort of integration within all the different definitions and conceptualizations of commitment, Allen and Meyer (1990), developed the 'three-component model' (TCM). Drawing from all the different studies on commitment and with a focus on the organization, they identified three distinct components. These three components are; affective, continuance and normative commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Whereas affective commitment is about an employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Continuance commitment can be linked to the employee's awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization and finally, normative commitment refers to an employee's feeling of obligation to continue their employment and believe staying with the organization is the right thing to do (Allen & Meyer, 1996). The definitions mentioned above both have differences and similarities. The first difference is that the definitions of Klein et al. (2014) and Meyer et al. (2006) refer to commitment towards a target. On the other hand, Allen & Meyer (1996) talk about commitment towards the organization. Another difference that can be noticed is that Klein et al. (2014) aims to see commitment as something voluntary whereas Meyer et al. (2006) look at commitment as something that is forced. However, similarities can also be noticed between the different definitions. All definitions refer to commitment as an action of dedication, relevance, responsibility, emotional attachment or involvement. This indicates that commitment refers to a positive action of an individual or employee.

Innovation and creativity in the workplace have become more and more important (Anderson, Potočnik & Zhou, 2014). Both concepts are important determinants of organizational performance, success and longer-term survival and thus can be seen as a source of competitive advantage (Anderson et al., 2014). Evidence consists that employee creativity can contribute to organizational innovation, effectiveness and survival (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Creativity is not something that can be implemented easily by the employer. It is a complicated, multilevel and emergent phenomenon, that has to develop over time. Furthermore, it requires the right leadership style in order to maximize the benefits of employee creativity (Anderson et al., 2014). Anderson et al. provide a definition of creativity, in which innovation is also included: "Creativity and innovation at work are the process, outcomes, and products of attempts to develop and introduce new and improved ways of doing this. The creativity stage of this process refers to idea generation, and innovation can occur at the level of the individual, work team, organization, or at more than one of these levels combined but will invariably result in identifiable benefits at one or more of these levels of analysis" (Anderson et al., 2014, p.1298). Zhang and Bartol provide a definition of creativity

which is close to the definition given by Anderson et al. (2014). They define creativity as: "the production of novel and useful ideas by an individual or by a group of individuals working together" (Zhang & Bartol, 2010, p. 107). The difference between these definitions is that Anderson et al. (2014) see creativity at three different levels, namely; individual, work team and organizational level. Whereas, Zhang and Bartol (2010) only see creativity in two different levels; individual and group level. Anderson et al. (2014) argue that no consensus has been reached on the constitution of creativity. Several researchers define creativity as process-oriented definition, although most research describe creativity as an outcome-oriented definition (Dewett, 2004). The process-oriented definition of creativity focuses on different stages of individual creative production (Dewett, 2004). However, the definitions mentioned earlier can be referred to as outcome-oriented definitions because they describe creativity as the production of novel and useful ideas. For this study, creativity will also be used as an outcome variable. Derived from the studies of Zhang and Bartol (2010) and Anderson et al. (2014) we can state that creativity is an important concept for organizations. The main reason for this is that creative employees will produce novel and useful ideas which will in turn lead to higher organizational performance and success.

Taking a closer look at the relationship between commitment and temporary workers, we can state that most commitment researchers did not make a distinction between permanent and temporary employment. However, it is important to look at both groups differently since temporary employment can be seen as a short-term social exchange relationship and therefore, employees can be limited in developing commitment (Van Rossenberg, Klein, Asplund, Bentein, Breitsohl, Cohen, Cross, De Aguiar Rodrigues, Duflot, Kilroy, Ali, Rapit, Ruhle, Solinger, Sward, Yalabik, 2018). The absence of an organization offering a sustainable work relationship, including job security, positive attitudes and career development will result in a more transactional relationship instead of a relationship based on mutual trust (Rousseau, 1995). Due to the growing number of temporary workers in The Netherlands it is important to expand the knowledge about these type of workers in relationship to commitment and creativity.

To recapitulate, several studies have proven that commitment is related with important behavioural outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intention (Cooper et al., 2016). This can be theoretically explained by SET. However, not much has been written about the relationship between organizational commitment and creativity, despite the fact that creativity can contribute to organizational innovation, effectiveness and survival (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Above that, only a few studies have proven that temporary employment has a negative impact on developing commitment (Van Rossenberg et al., 2018). Based on the importance of the relationship between commitment and creativity for temporary employees, it is theoretically and practically relevant to further investigate this relationship.

## 1.2. Research objective, framework and contributions

The majority of research on commitment has focused on standard employment arrangements (Cooper et al., 2016), but not much research has been done on the relationship between commitment and creativity, within a temporary work context. Therefore, the research objective of this study is:

'Gain insight into the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity for employees with a temporary contract, through the lens of the social exchange, within the Dutch context.'

This research objectives leads to the following research question:

'To what extent does organizational commitment lead to employee creativity for employees with temporary contracts, through the lens of the social exchange theory, within the Dutch context?'

This study aims to contribute to gaps in the literature on both organizational commitment, employee creativity, temporary work and the relationship between these concepts. Firstly, this study is defined within the Dutch context. A few studies have been done on both organizational commitment and employee creativity, but no literature can be found within the Dutch context. Since the introduction of the new WWZ law in 2015, temporary employment among Dutch employees increased. Since almost 35% (CBS, 2018) of the Dutch workforce has a temporary employment contract, it is important to gain insight into the consequences of such a contract on organizational commitment and employee creativity. Due to the large number of temporary workers the Dutch context serves as a good context to carry out this study.

Secondly, not much research has been done on the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity. Academia have shown that organizational commitment leads to several behavioural outcomes (Cooper et al., 2016), however not much research has proven that organizational commitment leads to employee creativity. Since employee creativity is an important determinant of organizational performance, success and longer-term survival (Anderson et al., 2014) it is important to investigate whether organizational commitment will increase employee creativity. By examining the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity through the lens of SET, this study aims to contribute to fill this gap in the literature.

Thirdly, since no literature exists on the effect of temporary work on the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity, there is a call for research on this topic. Several

studies found that organizational commitment leads to behavioural outcomes such as innovative behaviour (Cooper et al., 2016). Also, studies have been done on the relationship between multiple foci's of commitment and forms of employment such as traditional, temporary and self-employed workers (Felfe et al., 2008). However, these studies have not taken employee creativity into account. Since the number of temporary employees increased over the years it is important to know whether this type of contract moderates the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity through the lens of SET.

Finally, this study contributes to the existing literature because it investigates the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity for both temporary and permanent employees through the eyes of SET. Commitment literature is often grounded in SET (Van Rossenberg, 2013). However, SET is new in relationship with employee creativity. Therefore, this study contributes to the existing literature on employee creativity.

## 1.3. Structure of the Thesis

This thesis consists of five chapters. The second chapter will elaborate more on the existing theory on organizational commitment, creativity and temporary work. In chapter three, the research design and method will be discussed. Chapter four will discuss the findings of the analysis of this study. Finally, chapter five will outline the conclusion and discussion, including practical – and theoretical implications and directions for future research.

# 2. Theoretical background

This chapter outlines a review of the existing literature of the key concepts of this study, the relationships between these concepts and, at last, the development of the conceptual model. Based on the theoretical findings the hypotheses will be formulated and drawn into a conceptual model.

## 2.1. Organizational commitment

The first important key concept of the research question is organizational commitment. As mentioned earlier in chapter 1, the commitment field is in a state of conceptual development. Therefore, different definitions exist which can all be applied for different types of commitment studies. Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) argue that, although increasing attention exists for the study of workplace commitment, there still remains confusion and disagreement about what commitment is, where it is directed and how it develops and affects behaviour. Also, commitment can occur at different levels, including commitment to organizations, unions, occupations and professions, teams and leaders, personal careers and goals, which makes it even more challenging to define commitment (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).

The most widely known and frequently used conceptualization of commitment is the TCM (Van Rossenberg, Cross, Swart & Kinnie, 2018). The goal of the authors was to create some sort of integration of all the different definitions. Allen and Meyer (1996) described three types of commitment within their TCM, including affective, continuance and normative commitment. Several studies found that all three components correlate negatively with turnover intention, absenteeism, and positively with job performance and organizational citizenship behaviour (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).

Commitment has a rich and long history and has been examined from different perspectives (Klein & Park, 2016). Two main streams can be noticed within the commitment literature, one which defines commitment as a unidimensional construct (e.g. Klein, Molloy, & Brinsfield, 2012) and one which defines commitment as a multidimensional construct (e.g. Allen & Meyer, 1990). The TCM can be seen as a multidimensional model because commitment is viewed from three different perspectives; affective, continuance and normative (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Multidimensional models of commitment try to characterize the nature of the 'ties that bind' individuals to the focus of their commitment (Allen, 2016). However, some academia believe that commitment is viewed as a unidimensional construct. One of these academia is Howard J. Klein. Klein et al. (2012) reconceptualised commitment to show its uniqueness and improve the applicability of commitment across all workplace targets. This is done in order to bring "clarity, consistency and synergy" to research and management of workplace commitment (Klein et al., 2012, p.130). Klein et al. (2014) define commitment as "a volitional psychological bond reflecting dedication to

and responsibility for a particular target" (p. 222). Klein et al. (2014) argue that the TCM of Meyer et al (1991) is not always evident. This is partly due to the fact that the normative and affective mind-sets experience overlap (Klein et al., 2014).

Commitment can be directed towards different targets or foci. For example, commitment towards the union, organization or job. In order to reduce the complexity of this study, the focus is on organizational commitment. The main reason for this is because this study focuses on employees who work within a temporary timeframe for an organization. Also, the majority of research focused on the organization as a target of commitment (Becker, 2016). Meyer and Allen (1991) define organizational commitment as "a psychological state that characterises the employee's relationship with the organization and has implications for their decision to continue or discontinue membership" (p. 67). This definition differs from the definition of Klein et al. (2014) in such a way that the definition of Meyer and Allen (1991) focuses on the organization as a target and Klein et al. (2014) do not define this target within their definition of commitment.

# 2.1.1. Klein et al., Unidimensional, Target-free measurement (KUT)

Klein, Molloy and Brinsfield (2012) have formed a model which is a reconceptualization of commitment. This model is shown in figure 1.



Figure 1. Klein et al. (2012) process model of commitment to any workplace target.

This figure shows a system of individual, target and environmental factors, which all influence the perceptions of an individual (Klein et al., 2012). These perceptions of target and environment lead to a

perceived relationship with a target and also determines the experienced type of connection; salience, affect, trust or control. These connections determine the degree of target commitment and finally, result in commitment outcomes and actions. Linking the model to this study we can state that the moderating effect of temporary employment can be linked to environmental factors. The temporary contract will influence the perceptions of the employee and, following SET, will result in a lower amount of organizational commitment and therefore a lower amount of employee creativity.

Klein et al. (2014) argue that previous measurements of commitment are problematic. They argue that the TCM of Meyer et al. (1991) is not always evident since the normative and affective mind-sets experience overlap (Klein et al., 2014). Therefore, Klein et al. tried to resolve these issues and developed the 'Klein et al., Unidimensional, Target-free' (KUT) method. The advantages of using the KUT method are that it provides a better definition with clear boundaries that makes it possible to better differentiate commitment as a unique construct. Furthermore, it is better applicable across all targets of the workplace and it provides greater coherence, convergence and synergy across the different workplace commitment studies. Finally, the KUT methods cuts out measurement confounds which results in a more valid, psychometrically solid instrument that can be easily adapted to assess commitment at any target (Klein et al., 2014).

#### 2.1.2. Social exchange theory and organizational commitment

SET will be used as a theoretical framework within this study, since commitment attitudes and their effect on behaviour are often grounded in SET (Van Rossenberg, 2013). Furthermore, social exchange has been frequently used as a framework for exploring relationships between employees and organizations (McMillian & Albrecht, 2010). Blau (1964) states that SET explains that a party that supplies benefits to the other party, obliges this other party. To fulfil this obligation, the other party gives something in return. According to the Blau (1964), trust and other 'macro motives' such as loyalty and commitment provide the basis for social exchange. In comparison with other sorts of exchange, social exchange mostly explains symbolic or behavioural obligations such as commitment or innovative behaviour. Social exchange relationships are based on trust that the other parties to the exchange will fairly fulfil their obligations in the future (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). According to Konovsky and Pugh (1994) this trust is necessary for maintaining social exchange. When there is no trust between the employee and employer they will not benefit from the social exchange since they do not expect to get something positive out of it.

Several academia have written about SET in relationship with organizational behaviour. According to Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005), SET is one of the most influential theories for understanding workplace

behaviour such as organizational citizenship behaviour and organizational commitment. The article of Konovsky and Pugh (1994) is related to SET and examines the social exchange model of organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). OCB is employee behaviour that is above and beyond the call of duty and is therefore voluntary and not rewarded according to the context of an organization's formal reward structure (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). The authors found that their results are consistent with their social exchange model of OCB. This indicates that social exchange can be seen as an important theoretical framework for explaining and predicting the variance of OCB. Furthermore, Settoon, Bennett and Liden (1996) found that organizational commitment can be seen as a social exchange with perceived organizational support. Perceived organizational support can be seen as a trust of an employee that the organization will fulfil its exchange obligations (Settoon et al., 1996). Other behavioural outcomes that have been tested based on SET are in-role behaviour and citizenship behaviour (Settoon et al., 1996). Their study shows that leader member exchange, which indicates the quality of the exchange between employee and employer (Settoon et al, 1996), has a strong positive association based on social exchange with in-role behaviour and citizenship behaviour. Based on the studies mentioned above we can state that SET is often associated with organizational behaviour such as commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour and in-role behaviour (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Settoon et al., 1996).

SET implies that employees feel a moral obligation to reciprocate when they receive benefits or support from their employer. In other words, when employees receive support or benefits from their employer they will feel the obligation to give something back. This can be in terms of organizational behaviour such as commitment or job performance. Liu, Loi and Ngo (2018) argue that when the social exchange relationship becomes more frequent and intense, the employees are likely to display positive work-related attitudes and behaviour that benefits their organization. Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005) also linked SET to commitment. They argue that employees are willing to exchange their commitment towards the organization in exchange for an employer's support. Collier and Esteban (2007) argue that organizational commitment will be dependent on the employee's perception of the value and benefit that they receive from their organizational membership. This relationship can be seen as a social exchange since the organization gives something to the employee and the employee will be committed to the organization in return. Furthermore, evidence exists that high commitment human resource practices in combination with trust in management have a large impact on building employee commitment (Collier & Esteban, 2007). Therefore, organizations have to make sure that they provide employees with the right attributes and opportunities in order to create a committed workforce, which will lead to high levels of employee creativity through a social exchange mechanism.

#### 2.2. Employee creativity

The second important key concept of the research question is employee creativity. Anderson (2014) argues that "creativity and innovation in any organization are vital to its successful performance" (p.1267). This illustrates that it is important for organizations to focus on the creativity of employees. Hou, Goa, Wang, Li and Yu (2011) also acknowledge the importance of creativity. They state that employee creativity can improve the performance and competitiveness of the organization (Hou, Gao, Wang, Li & Yu, 2011).

Some of the definitions of employee creativity have already been mentioned in chapter 1. Additionally, Van Rossenberg (2013) states that although the 60 years of scholarly interest on the topic of creativity, academic have not yet reached an agreement on the assessment of employee creativity. Furthermore, employee creativity has been studied within a wide variety of scholarly disciplines, including psychology, management, art and science (Runco, 2003). This makes it even more difficult to come to a unified definition of employee creativity (Van Rossenberg, 2013).

Also, a distinction can be made between different types of creativity. As Anderson mentioned; "Creativity and innovation can occur at the level of the individual, work team, organization, or at more than one of these levels combined but will invariably result in identifiable benefits at one or more of these levels of analysis" (Anderson et al., 2014, p.1298). In the section below the different types of creativity will be described in order to clarify these different types of creativity.

#### Individual creativity

Creativity at the individual level is about the personal and socio-psychological characteristics of the individual that are positively related to employee creativity (Szobiová, 2015). Some of these characteristics are sensitivity to problems, autonomy, self-confidence and willingness to take risks (Szobiová, 2015). Furthermore, age can also affect the creativity of individuals. Thus, individual creativity is different for every employee since it is dependent on factors as age, autonomy and willingness to take risks. In addition, individual creativity regularly refers to the originality of ideas in product, service, practice and process (Peng, Zhang, Fu & Tan, 2013). Also, individual creativity can be seen as a social process embedded in the individual's working environment which can be influenced by the support from co-workers and social interactions with colleagues.

#### Group creativity

Creativity at group level is dependent of several factors, such as membership changes within the group (Klijn & Tomic, 2010). Other factors that affect creativity at group level are the formal and informal contacts and the group climate (Klijn & Tomic, 2010). For example, studies have shown that strong group cohesiveness decreases the level of group creativity, whereas weak ties facilitate it (Perry-Smith, (2006).

#### Organizational creativity

Factors that influence organizational creativity are; cultural influences, availability of resources, reward policies, the mission and strategy of the organization and the structure and technology (Klijn & Tomic, 2010). All factors mentioned above are positively related to creativity (Paulus, 2000). A case study performed by Perry (1995) showed that avoiding hierarchy, creating flexible workplaces and emphasizing on cross-fertilization promote creativity and innovation. Managers also have a large role when promoting organizational creativity. Their role is to consider both personal and contextual factors, such as goals and deadlines in order to increase creativity (Oldham & Cummings, 1996). Oldham and Cummings (1996) also argue that highly creative employees function best in complex and challenging jobs that are managed by their supervisor in a supportive and non-controlling way. However, less creative employees will get stressed and irritated under such circumstances, which will lead to lower organizational creativity. The goal of the organization is to create a context and strategy that will maximize creative output at work, while taking individual differences into account (Klijn & Tomic, 2010).

For this research the focus is on individual creativity. This is because the focus of the study is on temporary contracts, which is a characteristic that is different for every employee and therefore can only be considered at the individual level.

#### 2.2.1. Creativity theories

As mentioned before, academia have not reached consensus on the definition and measurement of employee creativity. Therefore, a lot of creativity theories can be found within the literature. In order to give an idea of the existing theories that focus on creativity, two important theories on individual creativity are described below.

#### The componential theory of individual creativity

This theory assumes that "all humans with normal capacities are able to produce at least moderately creative work in some domain, some of the time and that the social environment (the work environment)

can influence both the level and the frequency of creative behaviour" (Amabile, 1997, p.42). The theory exists of three components of individual creativity: expertise, creative-thinking skills, and intrinsic motivation (Amabile, 1997). The higher the level of the three components, the higher individual creativity will be. The three components will be elaborated on below.

Expertise can be viewed as "the set of cognitive pathways that may be followed for solving a given problem or doing a given task" (Amabile, 1997, p.42). This component includes memory for actual knowledge, technical proficiency, and special capabilities in the target work domain (Amabile, 1997). These skills are thus dependent on the company you work for and what they demand from their employees.

Creative thinking adds that "something extra" of creative performance. This depends on personality characteristics such as independence, self-discipline, the view on taking risks, and tolerance for ambiguity (Amabile, 1997).

The intrinsic task motivation component determines what the employee will actually do. Both intrinsic and extrinsic motivators exist. However, several studies have shown that intrinsic motivation will be more useful for creativity than extrinsic motivation (Amabile, 1997). An employee who is highly intrinsically motivated is likely to apply great effort to the acquirement of the necessary skills. Therefore, the intrinsic task motivation component can be seen as an important factor within the component theory of individual creativity.

#### Theory of individual creative action

Ford (1996) argues that creativity actions can result from the joint influence of sense making, motivation and knowledge and ability. All three processes are linearly dependent on each other, so in the case of one of these processes lacking, an individual is not engaging in creative action making (Ford, 1996). The sense making process are guided by schema, which are developed based on the common features of relevant items (Ford, 1996). Goals, receptivity beliefs, capability beliefs and emotions are all part of the motivation process. Ford (1996) argues that an employees' motivation is dependent on the interaction of the factors mentioned above. Finally, knowledge and ability are dependent on three influences; domain-related knowledge, behavioural abilities, and creative-thinking abilities. Domain-related knowledge refers to the prior knowledge of an employee which will be an important determinant for an employees' ability to be creative. Behavioural abilities refer to for example, a person's ability to communicate within and across domains. This is important because social networking can be a source for the development of novel ideas (Ford, 1996). To conclude, creative-thinking abilities refers to the person's ability to be creative, because without the ability the process will fail.

Both individual theories mentioned above indicate the importance of the employees' knowledge, ability and motivation to express their creative behaviour. Therefore, based on the two theories mentioned above, we can conclude that employers have to intrinsically motivate employees (Amabile, 1997) and provide them with the right knowledge and skills in order to create an environment in which employees can express their creative behaviour.

#### 2.2.2. Creative process engagement

In this thesis, employee creativity is viewed as a type of work behaviour and as an outcome of organizational commitment. One of the few existing measurements of employee creativity which allows this behavioural view towards creativity is Creative Process Engagement (CPE) (Van Rossenberg, 2013). CPE can be defined as "the employee involvement in creativity-relevant methods or processes, including (1) problem identification, (2) information searching and encoding, and (3) idea and alternative generation (Zhang & Bartol, 2010, p.108). Zhang and Bartol (2010) use CPE to refer to the process by which creativity appears. CPE indicates the importance of an employees' engagement in the creative process. Ideas that may not be novel and useful arise when employees minimally engage in the creative process (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Therefore, CPE is important for the creativity within an organization. Three phases can be distinguished within the creative process; problem identification, information searching and idea generation (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). This study will focus on the measurement of the creative process, by measuring employee creativity as the individual behaviour which is central in the creative process (Van Rossenberg, 2013). Drawing on SET, we can state that employees will involve more in creativity-relevant methods or processes when they receive support and engagement from their employer. This study focuses on the relationship between commitment and creativity for employees in temporary employment relationships. Based on SET, we can argue that temporary employees do not receive support and rewards from their employer and therefore engage less in the creative process. Conversely, employees in permanent employment are likely to be more creative since they receive support and rewards from their employer by having a permanent contract.

Several concepts can be linked to CPE (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). According to Zhang and Bartol (2010) two of these concepts are psychological empowerment and intrinsic motivation. Psychological empowerment can be defined as "an experienced state or set of cognitions" (Zhang & Bartol, 2010, p. 110). Psychological empowerment and CPE can be related to each other in a sense that when an employee

perceives that his or her job tasks are important and meaningful, the employee will spend more time and effort on understanding the problem. Furthermore, the employee will search for a solution by the use of a wide range of information gathered from multiple sources and databases and generating a high number of alternatives by connecting diverse sources of information (Gilson & Shalley, 2004). Psychological empowerment can be a part of a social exchange since the employee perceives support from his or her employer and therefore, will spend more time and effort on understanding the problem. Also, intrinsic motivation can be linked to CPE (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). According to Amabile (1993) intrinsic motivation derives from the employees' intrinsic value of the work such as satisfaction or joy. On the other hand, extrinsic values are rewards such as bonuses and money. When employees are intrinsically motivated, they are more likely to assign all of their knowledge to the problem they face (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). This will then lead to the engagement in the creative process (Kanfer, 1990). The study of Zhang and Bartol (2010) supported the hypothesis that intrinsic motivation is positively related to CPE. Intrinsic - and extrinsic motivation are both part of a social exchange. Intrinsic motivation derives from the joy and pleasure an employee perceives from his job and therefore he or she is motivated and willing to perform well. Extrinsic motivators are money or other rewards. With receiving these rewards, employees will be motivated to perform their job well. As a consequence, we can state that a social exchange based on intrinsic motivation is more valuable for the organization since this relationship is based on joy and pleasure and not on money or other rewards.

To conclude, CPE will result in the generation of new and useful ideas for a company. However, in order to create a creative work environment, the employer has to make sure that a social exchange exists between the employee and employer. This social exchange indicates that the employee perceives support and rewards from the employer and the employee will give back to the employer in terms of CPE.

#### 2.3. Organizational commitment and employee creativity

Few studies have been done on the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity. However, a wide range of studies on organizational commitment and employee creativity solely have been published. The few studies that have been found regarding the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity include other concepts such as thinking styles or high-commitment work systems instead of organizational commitment. This again confirms the call for more literature on the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity.

Hou et al. (2011) have studied the influence of thinking styles within the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity. Thinking style refers to "the preferred ways of

processing information when people think" (Hou et al., 2011, p.413). The thinking styles included in the research are change and connection. The researchers found that the hypothesis that change can affect employee creativity through organizational commitment was significant. Furthermore, higher change will result in lower organizational commitment and lower employee creativity (Hou et al., 2001). Thus, the researchers found a significant relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity when taking change as a thinking style into account.

Additionally, Chang, Jia, Takeuchi and Cai (2014) have examined the relationship between highcommitment work systems and employee creativity. High-commitment work systems refer to a "system of human resource management practices such as employee participation, internal promotion, team rewards, profit sharing, extensive training and benefits and job security that signal commitment to employees (Chang et al., 2014). Their study confirmed the positive relationship between high-committed work systems and employee creativity.

Moreover, Van Rossenberg (2013) examined the effect of affective commitment to the organization on incremental creative work behaviour. Incremental creative work behaviour has been defined as creative behaviour that is directed at improving, developing and generating ideas in regard to improving the work in innovation projects (Van Rossenberg, 2013). For this study, CPE has also been used as a measurement for incremental creative work behaviour. The hypothesis in this study is that affective commitment to the organization will positively affect incremental creative work behaviour. This hypothesis is partly supported, with organizational commitment to have a significant effect on incremental creative work behaviour in phase one and three (problem finding and idea generation) of the study (Van Rossenberg, 2013). Thus, it is not proven that organizational commitment has an effect on incremental creative work behaviour in phase 2 (information searching and encoding).

Based on the studies described above, we can state that a positive relationship exists between organizational commitment and employee creativity when taking change as a thinking style and high-committed work systems such as employee participation and extensive training into account. However, these studies do not provide a theoretical explanation for this relationship. Empirical research on commitment attitudes and their effect on behaviour that do give a theoretical explanation mostly focus on SET (Van Rossenberg, 2013).

Academia agree that social exchange "involves a series of interactions that generate obligations" (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 874). Within SET, these interactions are commonly seen as interdependent and contingent on the actions of another person. SET (Blau, 1964) can be adopted to the

relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity. Organizational commitment is associated with behavioural outcomes such as innovative behaviour and OCB (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). In addition, organizational commitment tends to correlate positively with these behavioural outcomes. The social exchange between employer and employee exists when employees perceive high support or rewards from their employer and, in turn, they tend to show commitment, innovative behaviour or OCB. However, not much evidence exists on the social exchange between organizational commitment and employee creativity since this relationship is still under researched. Nowadays, employers ask for their employees to be creative in order to increase organizational profit. Drawing on SET employees are committed to the organization because they feel that they are supported by their employer and, in exchange for this, the employees will show higher levels of creativity. This study examines this relationship between organizational commitment and creativity using the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 1: a higher level of organizational commitment will lead to a higher level of employee creativity.* 

## 2.4. Temporary work

The third and last key concept of the research question is temporary work. Cooper et al. (2016) have focused on a specific type of work arrangement within their study, namely fixed-term contracts. According to the authors, these arrangements include full- and part-time jobs and finite work relationships between employer and employee (Cooper et al., 2016). In addition, Felfe et al. (2007) differentiate between temporary work and self-employment as new forms of employment. Temporary work can be characterized by a limited time horizon for employment with an organization, and therefore provides flexibility for both the employer and employee (Felfe et al., 2007). Felfe et al. (2007) argue that temporary workers can regard two organizations as their employer, namely the organization they work for and the temporary work agency. This study will focus on employees who work directly for an organization and therefore, see their organization as their employer. The emergence of new forms of employment can also be seen as something positive. Employees have the opportunity to find the type of employment which fits best to their need, aims and personal situation (Felfe et al., 2007). However, trade unions have emphasized the insecure condition of temporary employment while on the other hand, employers argue that it is a good way of entering the labour market (Berglund, Håkansson, Isidorsson, & Alfonsson, 2017). Moreover, employees argue that temporary employment can be used in order to receive a permanent contract

(Berglund et al., 2017). However, research within the Swedish context has shown that only 40% of the temporary workers receives a permanent contract after two years (Berglund et al., 2017).

Rousseau (1989) distinguished between two types of unwritten contracts for fixed-term and permanent employees; psychological and implied contracts. Psychological contract refers to "an individual's beliefs regarding the terms and conditions of a reciprocal exchange agreement between that focal person and another party" (Rousseau, 1989, p.123). On the other hand, implied contracts refer to "a mutual obligation existing at the level of the relationship" (Rousseau, 1989, p.124). Thus, implied contract are agreements which arise from interaction between individuals or organizations, that become part of the social structure of the relationship (Rousseau, 1989). Moreover, when linking these different types of unwritten contracts back to the distinction between fixed-term contracts and permanent contract, we can assume that these unwritten contracts are perceived differently. This has to do with two types of agreements; transactional and relational (Rousseau, 1989). Employees with fixed-term contracts are more likely to have a transactional agreement with their employer which means that this agreement is shortterm and of finite duration. Employees with permanent contracts, on the other hand, are more likely to have a relational agreement with their employer which means that this relationship is open-ended and involves factors such as loyalty (Rousseau, 1989). SET can be adopted to both types of unwritten contracts and types of agreements. Linking this to the social exchange between temporary employment and organizational commitment, we can state that the transactional agreement is most applicable. Employees perceive low support and rewards from their employer because of their fixed-term employee arrangement and will not feel the obligation to be committed towards the company in return.

#### 2.4.1. Temporary work and organizational commitment

Few empirical evidence can be found in the literature that proves that employees with temporary contracts perceive lower commitment towards the organization compared to permanent employees (Cooper et al., 2016). Cooper et al. (2016) focused on the relationship between different foci's of commitment on standard and fixed-term employment for employees in Finland. The authors argue that organizational commitment may be less relevant for temporary employees. Furthermore, they state that for employees with fixed-term contracts it might be less important to be committed to their organization or supervisor, and more beneficial to be committed to their profession and job since this is beneficial for both the employee and the organization (Cooper et al., 2016). However, when employees do not feel committed to one's supervisor and organization this will increase turnover rates and decrease citizenship behaviours (Cooper et al., 2016). The researchers found full support for the hypothesis that employees

with temporary contracts have low commitment to the organization and supervisor and high commitment to the profession and job goals (Cooper et al., 2016). However, their assumption that permanent employees would be highly committed to the organization, profession, supervisor and job goals was partly supported. The researchers found that commitment to the supervisor was high, but significantly lower than commitment to the organization, profession and job goals.

In addition, Felfe et al. (2007) hypothesized that affective organizational commitment should be lower for temporary employees than for permanent employees. The results confirmed this hypothesis and showed that permanent employees showed higher levels of affective organizational commitment than temporary employees.

To conclude, both studies have shown that temporary employees perceive lower organizational commitment compared to employees in permanent employment. This can be linked to SET since temporary employees are less likely to perceive support compared to permanent employees. As a consequence, temporary employees tend to show lower organizational commitment compared to permanent employees. This leads to the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 2a: Temporary employees will perceive lower organizational commitment in comparison with permanent employees.* 

In addition to hypothesis 2a it is likely to state, based on social exchange, that when temporary employees perceive lower organizational commitment they will also show lower levels of CPE. However, no empirical or theoretical evidence has been found confirming this negative relationship. This will be tested using the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 2b: Temporary employees are less likely to show elements of creative process engagement in comparison with permanent employees.* 

Drawing on hypothesis 1 and 2, the moderating effect of temporary employment on the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity will be studied. A moderation occurs when the relationship between two variables (organizational commitment and employee creativity) changes as a function of a third variable (temporary employment) (Field, 2013). The moderation effect indicates that the effect of organizational commitment on employee creativity is lower for temporary employees and stronger for permanent employees. Also, a social exchange exists between temporary employment and organizational commitment because temporary employees, as discussed earlier, tend to perceive organizational commitment since they will feel less supported and rewarded by their employer. Furthermore, organizational commitment tends to have a positive relationship with employee creativity. Literature has shown that temporary work leads to lower organizational commitment and therefore we can assume it will also lead to lower employee creativity. This leads to the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 3a: Temporary employment will negatively moderate the relationship between organizational commitment and creativity in comparison with permanent employment.* 

*Hypothesis 3b: Temporary employment will positively moderate the relationship between organizational commitment and creativity in comparison with permanent employment.* 

# 2.5. Theoretical model

The theoretical model which is presented in figure 2 is derived from the hypotheses mentioned above. The concept 'temporary work' functions as a moderator within the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity. Derived from the literature, we assume that a positive relationship exists between organizational commitment and employee creativity. Furthermore, we assume that a negative relationship exists between temporary workers and organizational commitment. Also, it is assumed that a negative relationship exists between temporary work and employee creativity. To conclude, following the empirical and theoretical evidence, temporary work will have a negative effect on the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity.



Figure 2. Conceptual model

# 3. Methodology

Chapter two outlined the theoretical framework that has been used to formulate hypotheses. This can be seen as deductive research. Deductive research refers to the process of deducing theory from the gathered data in order to test the different hypotheses (Rowley, 2012). This chapter describes the methodology section of this thesis. In the first part of this chapter the research design, sample and response rate will be outlined. Secondly, the research ethics will be discussed. Finally, the research measurement and an operationalization of the key concepts will be provided.

## 3.1 Research design and sample

The aim of this thesis is to obtain insight into the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity with temporary employment as a moderating variable. In order to obtain these insights choices have to be made regarding the research design and sample. The research design can be seen as the first step in organizing the research process after defining the research idea and hypotheses (Toledo-Pereyra, 2012). A good research plan can help to get the most accurate results as possible. For this thesis, data was collected through an online survey design through which it is possible to reach a large group within a relatively low amount of time. This study is looking to generalize statements about the population. The population includes Dutch employees that work directly for an organization, via an agency, as employer for their own company or as freelancer. These groups aim to represent employees working in The Netherlands. Since it is not possible to reach the whole Dutch workforce, a sample has been taken from this population. In order to create a good sample that represents the population, 15 students have gathered data by sending out the questionnaire to employees with different work settings such as freelancers, employees who work via an agency and employees with permanent and temporary contracts. A total of 861 respondents have been gathered from which we were able to do the analysis.

As mentioned earlier, an online survey has been conducted among a sample of the Dutch workforce. The advantages of a survey are firstly that it is highly flexible since it is possible to study a lot of research questions by conducting an online survey (Muijs, 2010). Secondly, survey studies are efficient in terms of gathering large numbers of data at reasonably low cost and effort. Thirdly, a survey is relatively low time consuming and it is easy to reach a larger population. This will, in turn, increase the validity because it increases the chance that the population is represented well. Fourthly, the use of standardised questions makes it possible to compare between respondents and types of respondents (Muijs, 2010). Finally, an online survey provides access to groups and individuals who would be difficult to reach through

other channels (Wright, 2005). A disadvantage of using a survey as a measurement instrument can be that only limited amount of data and insight can be collected.

Furthermore, a cross-sectional study has been used as a research strategy. A research strategy refers to the general approach that you will take in your research (Anderson, 2013). Anderson (2013) argues that a cross-sectional study can be seen as an appropriate strategy for HR related studies together with comparative research, case study research and action research. Cross-sectional studies are carried out at one point in time over a short period (Levin, 2006). Usually, cross-sectional studies are conducted to estimate the prevalence of the outcome of interest for a given sample. A cross-sectional study has been chosen as a research strategy since it is appropriate for relative short-term projects, it is relatively cheap to organize and it will produce a lot of information (Anderson, 2013). A limitation of cross-sectional studies is that they are carried out at one point in time and give no indication of the events occurred before or after the time of measurement (Levin, 2006). Also, a poor level of responses may lead to unrepresentative data and respondents can interpret the research questions differently which will decrease the reliability and validity of the research (Anderson, 2013). However, the researchers will react adequately to low response by asking more employees to fill in the questionnaire. Moreover, the research questions have been checked in advance by the supervisor and the students to prevent different interpretations of questions.

Since the data consists of quantitative survey output, this research focused on the quantitative research approach. Quantitative data can be referred to as data that can be counted in order to make statements about organizational and employment situations (Anderson, 2013). Quantitative research is suitable to apply on this study since it eliminates the subjectivity of judgement and it achieves high levels of reliability of the data due to the large amount of surveys (Matveev, 2002).

#### 3.2.1. Response rate

The data of the study was collected together with six other Master students and eight Bachelor students. The researchers each collected 50 respondents, existing of employees who work directly for an organization, via an agency, as employer for their own company or as freelancer. Since all groups have to be represented in the survey, it was important to find a wide variety of respondents regarding their work setting.

The dataset for this study contains of the responses of 861 employees. However, not all 861 respondents completed the questionnaire. 762 respondents filled in their gender (88,5%) and 748 (86,9%) respondents answered the question in which year they are born. Furthermore, the sample consists of 465

females (61%), 285 males (37,4%), 6 transgenders (0,8%) and 6 respondents did not want to answer the question (0,8%). 408 (54,2%) of the respondents has a permanent contract and 354 (45,8%) of the respondents has a temporary contract.

### 3.3. Research ethics

The term ethics refers to general assumptions as to what people are 'ought' or 'ought not' to do (Anderson, 2013). In research it is about loyalty to a code of behaviour in relation to the rights of the people that become subject of your research or are affected by it (Anderson, 2013). Therefore, it is important to address some ethical issues that concern the researcher as well as the people that participate in the research.

The first ethical issue is about the confidentiality of the study. Confidentiality refers to the guarantee that data will not be shared with people that are not authorized to see or read it (Anderson, 2013). Here it is important that the research purpose is transparent to the respondents. Before starting the questionnaire, the respondents see an introduction page in which they are told that the data will be used for international scientific research and for Bachelor and Master theses only. Furthermore, the respondents are told that the researchers and students will use the data confidentially and that the results are processed anonymously.

A second ethical issue regards the dignity and well-being of the participants (Anderson, 2013). The research should not cause distress, harm or embarrassment to anyone who is involved in it. This issue has been handled since the questionnaire is fully anonymous, the respondents are able fill it in online instead of being interviewed by someone and the respondents have the freedom to withdraw from the research at any time.

Finally, with respect to research integrity it was important that the researcher used the facts of this research instead of interpreting the results based on their own experience. Since this study consists of quantitative data it was easier to make statements based on the data. Furthermore, the results have been checked by the supervisor which increases the reliability of the study.

#### 3.4. Measurement instrument

A survey has been made which includes items regarding the topic of commitment such as job satisfaction, innovative work behaviour and turnover intentions. For this research the items; organizational

commitment, CPE and type of work contract will be used. Also, the items tenure in years and contract hours will be used as control variables.

#### 3.4.1. Organizational commitment

The data of this study will be collected using the Klein et al., Unidimensional, Target-free (KUT) measurement of commitment which has been highlighted in chapter two. This measurement aims to measure commitment instead of other workplace bonds, such as transactional bonds (Van Rossenberg, Cross, Swart & Kinnie, 2018). Furthermore, the KUT measurement is a unidimensional measurement which indicates that it looks at commitment as a unidimensional construct. The TCM, for example, is a multidimensional measurement and divides commitment in to affective, normative and continuance commitment. Since it is not likely that employee creativity will act differently on different types of commitment the unidimensional measurement of Klein et al. (2012) is suitable for this study. For this study, commitment is defined as "a volitional psychological bond reflecting dedication to and responsibility for a particular target" (Klein, Cooper, Molloy & Swanson, 2014, p. 222). However, this study focuses on organizational commitment and therefore the target Klein et al. (2014) refer to can be seen as the organization. Organizational commitment will be measured on a five-point Likert scale varying from "not at all" to "extremely". Four questions will be related to organizational commitment namely, "how committed are you to your organization?", "to what extent do you care about your organization?", "how dedicated are you to your organization?" and "to what extent do you have chosen to be committed to you organization?".

#### 3.4.2. Employee creativity

A measurement is developed in order to measure the key concept employee creativity. This measurement is called Creative Process Engagement (CPE) and can be found in Appendix 1. This measurement has been used since, for this study, employee creativity is viewed as a type of work behaviour and one of the few existing measurements of employee creativity which allows this behavioural view towards creativity is CPE (Van Rossenberg, 2013). The measurement is used to examine employee creativity within the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity for employees with temporary contracts. CPE will also be measured on a five-point Likert scale varying from "never" to "very frequently". Three different phases of CPE are addressed, including problem identification, information searching and encoding and idea generation. The first phase consists of three questions, the second phase consist of four questions and the last phase consists of five questions.

#### 3.4.3. Temporary employment

In the final section of the survey, the respondents will be asked about the type of work contract. The respondents can choose between a temporary - or fixed term contract. Both contract types are needed for this study in order to make a distinction between the type of contract and the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity. Temporary work within this research is defined according to the definition of De Cuyper, De Witte and Van Emmerik (2011) "dependent employment of limited duration (p. 104)". Within this research the operationalization of limited duration is less than two years, because this is in line with the WWZ law (2015). Furthermore, when respondents have a temporary contract, the question will be asked whether they think that they will eventually receive a permanent contract. This information is needed in order to describe the difference between employees with a temporary contract who think it is likely that they will receive a permanent contract or employees who think that they will not receive a permanent contract, and their relationship between commitment and employee creativity.

# 4. Results

In the previous chapters, a theoretical explanation is provided in order to form the hypotheses and the method was outlined. This chapter will discuss the results of the analyses. The first part of the analyses consists of preliminary analysis and the second part of the analysis will test the different hypotheses.

# 4.1. Preliminary Analyses

This paragraph outlines the descriptive statistics of the study. Furthermore, the sample has been checked on outliers and normality. Also, the results of the reliability test and factor analysis are discussed in paragraph 4.1.4. and finally, the means, standard deviations and correlations are outlined.

## 4.1.1. Descriptive statistics

In order to create an overview of the characteristics of the sample that has been studied, an overview has been made of the number of respondents (N), mean (M), minimum, maximum and standard deviation (SD) (see appendix 2). This overview can be found in Table 1.

Table 1								
Descriptive statistics								
	N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Standard Deviation			
Age	748	19,69	1	62	14,69			
Tenure (years)	771	7,20	0	50	9,22			
Contract hours	799	24,36	0	60	14,86			

Table 2 provides an overview of the variables that are measured on nominal and ordinal levels of measurement. The frequency and percentage for each group of respondents have been gathered from the SPSS output (appendix 3). The survey has been distributed among people who work and live in the Netherlands. Within this study we want to measure employees with temporary and permanent contracts. 54,2% (N = 408) of the sample has a permanent contract and 45,8% (N = 345) has a temporary contract. This can be seen as representative for the population of the study since both groups are large enough to be compared with each other.

Table 2								
Descriptive statistics								
	Frequency							
Gender (N=762)	Female	465 (61%)						
	Male	285 (37,4%)						
	Transgender	6 (0,8%)						
	Other/ do not want to provide information	6 (0,8%)						
Type of organization (N=861)	Direct for an organization	668 (77,6%)						
	Via an agency	40 (4,6%)						
	Via a secondary agency	36 (4,2%)						
	As employer for my own company	36 (4,2%)						
	As freelancer	70 (8,1%)						
	does not want to provide information	11 (1,3%)						
Contract (N=753)	Permanent contract	408 (54,2%)						
	Temporary contract	354 (45,8%)						

From the respondents (N=762), 61% is female, 37,4% is male, 0,8% is transgender and the remaining 0,8% reported to be different than female, male or transgender or did not want to provide the information. The larger percentage of female respondents can be due to the fact that most of the students who have distributed the survey are female.

# 4.1.2. Outliers

According to Field (2013), an outlier is a score that is different from the rest of the data. This assumption has been tested for the variables 'age', 'tenure' and 'contract hours' using the chart builder function in SPSS. For these variables, no outliers have been found and thus, no data has been deleted from the dataset.

4.1.3. Normality

The goal of a normality test is to see whether the error terms of the variables are normally distributed. Normal distribution of the error terms have been checked for the variables which are outlined in paragraph 4.1.1.

The first variable that has been checked on normality is age. 748 respondents answered the question in which year they are born. As mentioned before in paragraph 4.1.1., the mean of the age of the respondents is 19,69 years. From the histogram (appendix 4) we can see that we can distinguish between two generations within the sample. The first-generation ranges from the age of 20 to 35 (57,7%) and the second-generation ranges from the age of 48 to 61 (27%). This may be due to the fact that the questionnaire is spread among friends and family of Bachelor and Master students, which are all between the age of 20 and 30. Therefore, it is likely that friends who have answered the questionnaire will be between the age of 20 and 35, and their parents and other relatives are likely to be between 48 and 61 years old.

The second variable that has been checked on normality is tenure. Since all groups have answered the question for how long they have been employed for the organization they are currently working for, the different groups have to be computed. This is done with the Compute Variable function in SPSS. The histogram and frequency table show that most employees have been working for their current company for 0 to 15 years (83,9%).

Contract hours has been checked on normality as third variable. This variable had also been computed since all groups answered the question how many hours they work based on their contract hours. From the histogram we can state that most respondents have a 0-hours contract (14%) or a 40-hours contract (19,8%). Also, 8,7% of the respondents has a contract for 32 hours a week and 8% has a 36-hours contract.

The last variable that has been checked on normality is type of organization. In this question the respondents were asked whether they work directly for an organization, via an agency, via a secondary agency, as employer for their own company or as freelancer. A large majority of the respondents is working directly for an organization (77,6%), followed by people who are working as freelancer (8,1%). Since almost 80% is working directly for an organization we can state that this variable is not normally distributed.

32

#### 4.1.4. Psychometric analyses of the variables

#### 4.1.4.1. Reliability scale

CPE and organizational commitment are both measured by the use of multiple questions within the questionnaire. CPE can be divided into three phases which, together, measure the concept of CPE. These three phases are 'problem identification', 'information searching and encoding' and 'idea generation'. The first two phases are measured with three items and the third phase 'idea generation' is measured with five items. The reliability of each phase has to be checked in order to make sure that these phases reflect the construct that it is measuring, in this case CPE. The Cronbach's alpha provides an impression of how well the items represent the underlying latent construct. Field (2013) states that a Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha$ ) value of .7 to .8 or higher is acceptable. The Cronbach's alpha of the first phase is  $\alpha = .818$  (appendix 5) which can be seen as a more than acceptable value. The Item-Total statistics shows us the Cronbach's alpha when one of the items is deleted. When this value is higher than the current Cronbach's alpha, the researcher should consider to remove this item. None of the Cronbach's alpha values increases when items are deleted, so we can state that all items reflect the first phase of CPE. The Cronbach's alpha does not increase when one or more items are removed. Finally, the Cronbach's alpha of the third phase is  $\alpha = .877$ . For these items also counts that none of the items increases the Cronbach's alpha when they are deleted.

Organizational commitment is measured with four items. After running the reliability analysis, we can state that these items together reflect the construct of Organizational commitment well ( $\alpha$  = .917). No items have to be removed since this does not increase the Cronbach's alpha.

#### 4.1.4.2. Exploratory Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is a technique for identifying clusters of variables. This technique has three main uses. First, it helps to understand the structure of a set of variables. Secondly, it helps to construct a questionnaire to measure an underlying variable. Finally, factor analysis can help to reduce a data set to a more manageable size (Field, 2013). Using existing scales of which psychometric qualities have been confirmed by previous studies, an exploratory factor analysis for this study is not a necessary step. However, to confirm the reliability of the three-factor structure of CPE, a factor analysis is conducted to provide more insight into how the relationship between these phases is best represented.

CPE is measured using 11 items which have been divided into three phases. These phases can also be seen as factors which together represent one construct. All factor loadings of the indicator are statistically significant, p < .001, ranging from 0.663 to 0 (see appendix 6). However, the factor analysis

only shows one factor on which all items load. This is contradictory to the measurement of CPE, which implies that there are three phases who, together, form one construct. The eigenvalues of the second factor are .931, which is below the recommended value of 1. This means that all items are together best represented as one overarching factor. However, some evidence is found for the three-factor structure, which the second (.931) and the third factor (.752) explaining still a proportion of the eigenvalue. Furthermore, the correlation matrix which can be found in table 3 shows that the first three items correlate high with each other (0.537, 0.638, 0.628). This indicates that these three items can represent one factor and thus represent the phase 'problem identification'. The items of the phase 'information seeking and encoding' also correlate high with each other (0.712, 0.557, 0.613) which also indicates that these items are good representatives of the second phase. The same counts for the third phase 'idea generation' which has correlations of 0.648, 0.594, 0.507, 0.685, 0.617, 0.530, 0.562, 0.552, 0.601, 0.555.

From this analysis it is confirmed that all items of CPE load on one factor. However, for this thesis we will assume that the three phases exist. The high correlation among the factors also strengthen the idea of the three phases which together represent CPE.

Table 3													
Means, Standard Deviations and correlations of CPE													
	Mean	Standard	1.A	1.B	1.C	2.A	2.B	2.C	3.A	3.B	3.C	3.D	3.E
		deviation											
CPE phase 1.A	4,36	1,388	-	.638**	.537**	.509**	.468**	.432**	.446**	.480**	.448**	.370**	.429*
CPE phase 1.B	4,74	1,302	.638**	-	.628**	.568**	.504**	.462**	.532**	.515**	.451**	.419**	.423**
CPE phase 1.C	4,03	1,449	.537**	.628**	-	.635**	.525**	.491**	.514**	.558**	.520**	.445**	.484**
CPE phase 2.A	4,46	1,387	.509**	.568**	.635**	-	.712**	.557**	.651**	.585**	.553**	.426**	.556**
CPE phase 2.B	4,66	1,415	.468**	.504**	.525**	.712**	-	.613**	.698**	.565**	.516**	.385**	.548**
CPE phase 2.C	4,05	1,540	.432**	.462**	.491**	.557**	.613**	-	.706**	.576**	.521**	.437**	.612**
CPE phase 3.A	4,31	1,468	.446**	.532**	.513**	.651**	.698**	,706**	-	.648**	.594**	.507**	.685**
CPE phase 3.B	4,06	1,444	.480**	.515**	.558**	.585**	.565**	.576**	.648**	-	.617**	.530**	.562**
CPE phase 3.C	3,83	1,368	.448**	.451**	.520**	.553**	.516**	.521**	.594**	.617**	-	.552**	.601**
CPE phase 3.D	3,72	1,340	.370**	.419**	.445**	.426**	.385**	.437**	.507**	.530**	.552**	-	.555**
CPE phase 3.E	3,83	1,470	.429**	.423**	.484**	.556**	.548**	.612**	.685**	.562**	.601**	.555**	-

Notes. \*\* correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)

# 4.1.5. Means, standard deviations and correlations

Table 4 provides an overview of the means, standard deviations and correlations of the variables CPE, organizational commitment and the control variables contract hours and tenure in years (see appendix 7). This table shows that the three phases of CPE correlate high with each other (.689, .673 and .790) which was already expected from the factor analysis.

Table 4									
Means, Standard Deviations and correlations									
	Mean Standard CPE CPE CPE Organizational							Tenure in	
		deviation	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	commitment	hours	years	
CPE Phase 1	4,38	1,18	-	.689**	.673**	.226**	.177**	026	
CPE Phase 2	4,39	1,26	.689**	-	.790**	.244**	.177**	031	
CPE Phase 3	3,95	1,16	.673**	.790**	-	.195**	.152**	089*	
Organizational	4,96	0,95	.226**	.244**	.195**	-	.203**	.173**	
commitment									
Contract hours	24,46	14,86	.177**	.177**	.152**	.203**	-	.208**	
Tenure in years	7,2	9,22	026	031	089*	.173**	.208**	-	

Notes. \*\* correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed), \* correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

## 4.2. Hypotheses testing

### 4.2.1. Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 proposes a positive relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. A linear regression analysis is used in order to test the first hypothesis. Regression analysis is used to fit a linear model to the data and to predict values of an outcome variable (dependent variable) from one or more predictor variables (independent variable) (Field, 2013). For this case, the outcome variable is CPE and the predictor variable is organizational commitment. Model 1 includes the effect of the control variables tenure in years and contract hours on the dependent variable CPE. The Model Summary (see appendix 8) shows the R squares ( $R^2$ ) which tells us how much variance the model predicts (Field, 2013). The Adjusted R square of the first model is .032. The second model includes the effect of commitment to the organization, this effect is significant (b = .240, p < .001) and is the cause for an increase in the explained variance ( $R^2 = .085$ ). This tells us that 8,5% of the variance of CPE is explained by both the control variables and organizational commitment. Tenure and contract hours explain 3,2% and organizational commitment explains 5,3% of the variance of CPE. This indicates that there are other factors (91,5%) that influence CPE, which are not included in this model. Furthermore, the Model Summary shows that the explained variance
of model 1 and 2 are highly significant (p < .001). Also, the Model Summary shows that the change in explained variance from model 1 to model 2 is significant ( $R^2$  Change = .053, p < .001). This indicates that organizational commitment is explaining significantly more of the variance of CPE compared to the control variables.

The Coefficients table shows the B-values which provide information about the relationship between the outcome and the predictor variable. Moreover, the B-value also represents a change in the outcome which will result in a unit change in the predictor. The independent variables have not been standardized before, therefore the standardized effects from the SPSS output have been used.

Table 5 gives an overview of the results of the regression analysis with CPE as dependent variable. Both control variables are significantly related to CPE (p < .01, p < .001). Tenure in years has a negative significant impact on CPE (b = .128, se = .004, p < .01). Contract hours has a positive significant impact on CPE (b = .138, se = .003, p < .001). The main effect organizational commitment is also positively and significantly related to CPE (b = .240, se = .011, p < .001).

Table 5									
Results of Regression Analysis for CPE									
	Model 1 Model 2								
Model	Variable	В	SE	R <sup>2</sup> Change	В	SE	R <sup>2</sup> Change	VIF	
1. Control	Tenure in	096*	.004	0.035***	128**	.004		1.044	
variables	years								
	Contract hours	.182***	.003		.138***	.003		1.044	
2. Main	Organizational				.240***	.011	0.054***	1.066	
effects	commitment								
R <sup>2</sup>		.032 .085							
$\Delta R^2$						.0	53***		

Notes. \* p < 0.05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < 0.001. B: standardized coefficients, SE: standard error.

Based on the information given above, we can state that hypothesis 1 is supported. This means that organizational commitment has a positive influence on the level of engagement in the creative process of employees.

### 4.2.2. Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 consists of two parts. Hypothesis 2a proposes that employees in temporary employment are less likely to show commitment to the organization. On the other hand, employees in permanent

employment are more likely to show higher levels of commitment to the organization. An ANOVA is used to test this second hypothesis. ANOVA is used to compare means between groups (Field, 2013). This test includes the mean (M) of each group, the test statistic (F) and the level of significance (p). The ANOVA table in SPSS (see appendix 9) shows that the means between employees in temporary and permanent employment are significantly different F (1, 675) = 47,604, p < .001). Table 6 shows that temporary employees (N = 279) have a lower level of organizational commitment compared to permanent employees (N = 398) (M<sub>temp</sub> = 4,67 M<sub>perm</sub> = 5,12). Therefore, we can state that hypothesis 2a is supported. This means that temporary employees will perceive lower organizational commitment in comparison with permanent employees.

Table 6							
Results of ANOVA for organizational commitment							
N Mean Standard deviation Standard erro							
Permanent contract	398	5,12	0,772	0,039			
Temporary contract	279	4,61	0,899	0,054			
Total	677	4,93	0,855	0,033			

Hypothesis 2b proposes that employees in temporary employment are less likely to show elements of CPE. On the other hand, employees in permanent employment are more likely to show elements of CPE. This hypothesis is also tested using an ANOVA. Table 7 shows that temporary employees (N = 241) show a slightly higher level of CPE compared to permanent employees (N= 367) ( $M_{temp}$  = 4,251,  $M_{perm}$  = 4,213) (see appendix 9). However, this difference cannot be seen as significant (F (1, 606) = 0,183, p > .05). Therefore, we can state that hypothesis 2b is not supported.

Table 7							
Results of ANOVA for CPE							
N Mean Standard deviation Standard error							
Permanent contract	367	4,21	1,045	0,055			
Temporary contract	241	4,25	1,119	0,072			
Total	608	4,23	1,074	0,044			

#### 4.2.3. Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 consists of two parts. Hypothesis 3a proposes a negative moderation effect of temporary employment on the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. Hypothesis 3b proposes a positive moderation effect of temporary employment on the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. A linear regression analysis is used in order to test these hypotheses. For both hypotheses, the outcome variable is CPE and the predictor variable is organizational commitment. Also, type of contract has been added to the model as a moderating variable. Model 1 includes the effect of the control variables tenure and contract hours on the dependent variable CPE, with the moderating variable type of contract. The adjusted R square of the first model with the moderating variable permanent contract is .101 (see appendix 10). This tells us that the control variables tenure in years and contract hours explain 10,1% of the variance of CPE for permanent employees.

The second model includes the effect of organizational commitment. This effect is significant for both types of contract ( $b_{perm} = .304$ , p < .001;  $b_{temp} = .206$ , p < .01) and is the cause for an increase in the explained variance ( $R^2 = .188$ ,  $R^2 = .058$ ). The adjusted R square of model 2 for permanent employees is .188. This tells us that 8,7% of the variance of CPE is explained by organizational commitment for permanent employees. This indicates that there are other factors (81,2%) that influence CPE for permanent employees, which are not included in this model.

Furthermore, the adjusted R square of model 1 for temporary employees is .021 and the adjusted R square of model 2 for employees in temporary employment is .058. So, tenure and contract hours for temporary employees explain 2,1% of the variance of CPE. 4,7% of the variance of CPE is explained by organizational commitment for temporary employees. This indicates that there are other factors (94,2%) that influence CPE for temporary employees, which are not included in this model.

Table 8 gives an overview of the results of the regression analysis with CPE as dependent variable and contract type as moderating variable (see appendix 10). Table 8 shows that the control variable tenure in years is not significantly related to CPE with contract type as moderating variable (p > .05). However, the control variable contract hours is significantly related to CPE for both contract types (p < .001, p < .05). The control variable contract hours has a positive significant impact on CPE for permanent employees (b = .322, se = .005, p < .001). Furthermore, the control variable contract hours also has a positive significant impact on temporary employees (b = .178, se = .005, p < .05). However, the control variable contract hours has more impact on CPE for employees in permanent employment compared to employees in temporary employees in permanent is also positively and significantly related to CPE for employees in permanent employment (b = .304, se = .016, p < .001). Furthermore, organizational

commitment is also positively and significantly related to CPE for employees in temporary employment, however, this effect is lower than for permanent employees (b = .206, se = .022, p < .01).

	Table 8								
	Results of R	egression Anal	ysis for	CPE with c	ontract typ	e as mod	erating var	iable	
			Model 1			Model 2			
Model	Variable	Moderating	В	SE	R <sup>2</sup>	В	SE	R <sup>2</sup>	VIF
		variable			Change			Change	
1. Control	Tenure in	Permanent	072	.005	0.106***	088	.005		1.003
variables	years	contract							
	Tenure in	Temporary	.026	.033	0.031	.026	.003		1.010
	years	contract							
	Contract	Permanent	.322	.005***		.265	.005		1.003
	hours	contract							
	Contract	Temporary	.178	.005*		.178	.005		1.010
	hours	contract							
2. Main	Organizational	Permanent				.304	.016***	.089***	1.040
effects	commitment	contract							
	Organizational	Temporary				.206	.022**	.042**	1.002
	commitment	contract							
R <sup>2</sup>		Permanent		.101			•	188	-
		contract							
		Temporary		.021				058	
		contract							
$\Delta R^2$		Permanent		.106			017 (.09	8106)***	c
		contract							
		Temporary		.031			0.011 (.0	42031)**	
		contract							

Notes. \* p < 0.05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < 0.001. B: standardized coefficients, SE: standard error.

Based on the information given above and the results from the linear regression analysis, we can state that hypothesis 3a is not supported and hypothesis 3b is supported. This means that a positive moderation effect of temporary employment exists on the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. However, the results also show that this effect is stronger for employees in permanent employment (b = .304, p < .001) compared to employees in temporary employment (b = .206, p < .01). In addition, the results show that only 8,7% of the explained variance of CPE for permanent employees is explained by organizational commitment. The explained variance of CPE by organizational commitment for temporary employees is even lower (4,7%). This indicates that organizational commitment explains a small proportion of the variance of CPE for both contract types and therefore, other factors which are not in this study exists that explain the remaining variance of CPE.

#### 4.2.4. Additional analysis for Hypothesis 3

24,7% of the respondents indicated that it is likely, almost sure or sure that their next contract will be a permanent contract (appendix 11). This may result in other creative behavior from this group compared to employees who do not think that their next contract will be a permanent contract. One reason for this is that these employees see themselves already as permanent employees, since they expect to keep working for the company after their current contract expires. The additional analysis aims to find if employees who answered the question whether they expect that their next contract will be a permanent contract positively, will engage more in the creative process compared to employees who answered the question negatively. A linear regression analysis is used in order to test this hypothesis. The outcome variable of the regression analysis is CPE and the predictor variable is organizational commitment. A dummy variable has been created in order to act as a moderating variable. The dummy variable divides the respondent into two groups, the first group (negative) with respondents who do not expect to get a permanent contract (75,3%) and the second group (positive) with respondents who expect to receive a permanent contract after their current contract (24,7%). Model 1 includes the effect of the control variables tenure and contract hours on the dependent variable CPE, with the dummy variable as moderator. The second model includes the effect of organizational commitment. This effect is significant for both groups ( $b_{\text{negative}}$  = .159, p < .05,  $b_{\text{positive}}$  = .248, p < .05) (see appendix 11). The adjusted R square of model 1 for employees who do not expect to receive a permanent contract is .035. The adjusted R square of model 2 for the same group is .056. The adjusted R square of model 1 for the group of respondents who expect to receive a permanent contract is .009. Model 2 has an adjusted R square of .059 for the same group. So, an increase in the explained variances can be noted when comparing the adjusted R squares of both groups. The largest increase can be noticed from model 1 to model 2 for the positive group, 5% of the variance of CPE is explained by organizational commitment for employees who expect to receive a permanent contract. This indicates that there are relatively many additional factors (94,1%) that influence CPE for employees who expect to receive a permanent contract, which are not included in this model.

Table 9 provides an overview of the results of the regression analysis. This table shows that, just as in table 7, the control variable tenure in years is not significantly related to CPE with the dummy variable as moderator (p > .05). The main effect organizational commitment is positively and significantly related to CPE with the dummy variable as moderator for both employee groups ( $b_{negative} = .159$ , se = 020, p < .05,  $b_{positive} = .248$ , se = .034, p < .05). However, the effect of organizational commitment on CPE for employees who expect to receive a permanent contract is larger (b = .248).

Based on the information given above, we can state that employees who expect to receive a permanent contract after their current contract perceive a higher amount of CPE, caused by organizational commitment, compared to employees who do not expect to perceive a permanent contract.

	Table 9								
Results of	Regression	Analysis for cr	eative p	process er	ngagement	with Du	ımmy Var	iable as mo	oderator
			Model 1			Model	2		
Model	Variable	Moderating	В	SE	R <sup>2</sup>	В	SE	R <sup>2</sup>	VIF
		variable			Change			Change	
1.	Tenure in	Negative	141	.017	.046*	150	.017*		1.007
Control	years								
variables									
	Tenure in	Positive	.083	.030	.033	.058	.029		1.045
	years								
	Contract	Negative	.174	.005*		.174	.005*		1.007
	hours								
	Contract	Positive	146	.005*		189	.008		1.045
	hours								
2. Main	Organizat	Negative				.159	.020*	.025*	1.003
effects	ional								
	commitm								
	ent								
	Organizat	Positive				.248	.034*	.060*	1.035
	ional								
	commitm								
	ent								

R <sup>2</sup>	Negative	.046	.071
	Positive	.033	.093
$\Delta R^2$	Negative	.035*	.021 (.056035)*
	Positive	.009	0.05 (.059009)*

Notes. \* p < 0.05, \*\* p < .01, \*\*\* p < 0.001. B: standardized coefficients, SE: standard error.

## 5. Conclusion and Discussion

This chapter will first discuss the most important finding of the analysis. Secondly, the limitations of this study will be discussed. Finally, recommendations will be given for practical implications and future research.

### 5.1. Conclusion

The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity for employees in temporary employment, through the lens of SET and within the Dutch context. This thesis contributes to the existing literature by examining the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity, which was measured by CPE. Also, this study showed that a social exchange exists between this relationship. Secondly, since most commitment literature do not make a distinction between permanent and temporary employment, there is a call for research that focuses on temporary employment solely. Therefore, this research examined the relationship between temporary employment and organizational commitment. The results of this study show that a negative significant relationship exists between temporary employment and organizational commitment. Moreover, this study focused on the Dutch workforce since a large group of employees (34,8%) within The Netherlands has a temporary contract, fixed term contract, or a contract via a temporary work agency (CBS, 2018). Therefore, the Dutch workforce can be seen as a representative group for this study. In addition, few studies have shown that commitment will lead to behavioural outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intention (Cooper et al., 2016), this indicates that it is important that all employees feel committed towards the organization, including temporary workers. However, previous studies did not provide convincing empirical support on the relationship between commitment and the behavioural outcome creativity. Also, this relationship has not been empirically or theoretically investigated by making a distinction between temporary and permanent employees. In order to fill these gaps in the literature, this thesis focused on the following research question:

To what extent does organizational commitment lead to employee creativity for employees with a temporary contract, through the lens of the social exchange theory and within the Dutch context?

In order to answer this research question, hypotheses have been formulated based on theoretical evidence. These hypotheses have been tested using regression analysis and ANOVA. The hypotheses can be found in figure 3.



Figure 3. Conceptual model

This study finds organizational commitment to have a positive effect on the level of engagement in the creative process of employees. The proposed negative relationship between temporary employment and organizational commitment, grounded in SET, was also confirmed. This indicates that temporary employees will perceive lower organizational commitment in comparison with permanent employees, which can be explained by the reciprocal exchange that is perceived by the employee and employer when employees receive a permanent contract. Hypothesis 2b proposed that employees in temporary employment are less likely to show elements of CPE. Yet, the results of the analysis showed that the effect of temporary employment on CPE was not found to be significant. Therefore, we can state that, for this study, temporary employment is not significantly related to CPE. This is an indication that CPE is not well understood through the social exchange mechanism for employees in temporary employment. Further, the results did not find support for the hypothesized negative moderation effect of temporary employment on the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. This indicates that temporary employment cannot be seen as a significant negative moderation effect on the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. This indicates that CPE is not well understood through the social exchange mechanism for temporary workers and in relationship with organizational commitment. On the other hand, findings did show a significant positive moderation effect of temporary employment on the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. This indicates that a positive moderation effect of temporary employment exists on the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. However, drawing on SET it is expected that temporary employment negatively moderates the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. An explanation for this can be because temporary employees receive a less stable and long-term outlook in employment, which will result in lower levels of organizational commitment and lower levels of engagement in the creative process. To conclude, this study did find a positive significant relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. Also, the negative significant relationship between temporary employment and organizational commitment is confirmed. However, the social exchange mechanism cannot be applied on the relationship between temporary employment and CPE and organizational commitment and CPE for temporary employees and therefore, other mechanisms have to be examined which explain this relationship.

### 5.2. Discussion

This part discusses the findings of this study and relates it to the literature presented in the theoretical background section. First, this research investigated the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. The findings of this study indicate a positive significant impact of organizational commitment on CPE. Previous studies did not provide convincing empirical support on the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity. However, the studies that have been found which included organizational commitment and employee creativity all proposed a positive relationship between organizational commitment and creativity (Hou et al., 2011; Chang et al., 2014; Van Rossenberg, 2013). The findings of this study correspond with the findings from previous research. This also confirms that this relationship works through the mechanism of SET. When employees are committed towards the organization, because of the reciprocal exchange that is perceived by the employer and employee, they will engage more in the creative process.

Secondly, the findings of this study indicate that there is a negative significant impact of temporary employment on organizational commitment. This indicates that temporary employees perceive lower organizational commitment in comparison with permanent employees. This finding corresponds with the literature that was found on the relationship between temporary employment and organizational commitment (Cooper et al., 2016). Furthermore, Felfe et al. (2007) also found that affective organizational commitment was lower for temporary employees compared to permanent employees. Based on these empirical findings we can assume that social exchange does exists for temporary employment in relationship with organizational commitment. However, this social exchange mechanism works in such a way that the employees perceive a less stable and short-term relationship with their employer because of their temporary contract and therefore, will not give back in terms of being committed towards the organization. On the other hand, employees with permanent contracts seem to have a higher level of reciprocity with their employer in giving back in terms of commitment towards the organization.

Thirdly, hypothesis 2b tested the relationship between temporary employment and CPE. The findings of this study show that there is no significant relationship between temporary employment and CPE. Based on SET we would expect temporary employees to show lower levels of CPE, with temporary employees receiving a less stable and short-term relationship with their employer, which is expected to lead to lower levels of engagement in the creative processes in return. Possibly, there are other mechanisms through which temporary employees may be motivated to engage in the creative process other than through social exchange. Two creativity theories have been discussed in chapter two, possibly these theories are able to explain the relationship between temporary employment and CPE.

Drawing on SET (Blau, 1965), temporary employment was used as a moderating variable to test the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity. Based on this theory, it is expected that temporary employment causes employees to be committed towards the organization and therefore makes them engage less in the creative process. However, the results of this study showed the effect to be reversed. The results show a positive moderation effect of temporary employment on the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. This result is also contradictory to the literature that has been presented in chapter two. On the basis of previous research, we may expect a positive relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity (Hou et al., 2011; Chang et al., 2014; Van Rossenberg, 2013) however, evidence exists that temporary employment has a negative effect on organizational commitment (Cooper et al., 2016). Furthermore, drawing on SET it is expected that temporary employment is negatively related to employee creativity, since employees with temporary contracts do not feel the urge to give back in terms of creativity. The reversed effects could have been caused by the fact that a large part of the group of temporary employees (24,7%) indicated that it is likely, almost sure or sure that their next contract will be a permanent contract. The additional analysis of hypothesis 3 showed that employees who expect to receive a permanent contract after their current contract perceive a higher amount of CPE, caused by organizational commitment, compared to employees who do not expect to perceive a permanent contract. Therefore, this group of employees can be seen as permanent employees since these employees are (almost) sure that they will keep working for the company after their current contract expires.

#### 5.3. Contribution

This part will elaborate more on the theoretical and practical contributions of this study.

#### 5.3.1. Theoretical Contribution

Creative behavior is considered to be essential for organizations to increase organizational performance (Anderson et al., 2014). In addition, in order to create a creative environment, employers have to make sure that employees are committed to the organization. This is because organizational commitment is positively related with behavioral outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intention (Cooper, Stanley, Klein & Tenhiälä, 2016). However, due to the rise of temporary workers, employers have to consider that they have to deal with two different types of employees; permanent and temporary employees. Thus, in order for organizations to enhance organizational performance, it is important that employers are provided with theoretical support and knowledge on the relationship between organizational commitment and creativity for temporary employees. SET was used to explain this relationship, since commitment attitudes and their effect on behaviour are often grounded in this theory (Van Rossenberg, 2013). Drawing on this theory, if an employee feels committed towards the organization, this can be seen as the basis for social exchange (Blau, 1965). For example, the results of this study showed that the social exchange mechanism works for the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. However, for employees who work temporary for an organization it is likely that this social exchange mechanism works differently compared to permanent employees. Based on SET, temporary employees will feel less committed towards the organization compared with permanent employees and, as a consequence, engage less in the creative process. However, the results of this study showed that SET might not be applicable for the relationship of organizational commitment and CPE for temporary employees. The results indicated a positive moderation effect of temporary employment on the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE, which is a reversed effect compared to the ideas of SET and the theoretical and empirical evidence that is discussed in chapter 2. This indicates that CPE cannot be seen as a behavioural outcome which is caused by organizational commitment for temporary employees. Possibly, organizational commitment leads to other behavioural outcomes for temporary employees, such as lower turnover intentions or organizational citizenship behaviour.

The results of this study did reveal a positive relationship between organizational commitment and CPE based on SET. This study contributes to the existing literature by examining the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE within the Dutch context. Another contribution of this study is that the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE is based on the social exchange mechanism. Commitment has been studied several times based on social exchange but this mechanism is new for creativity studies. Based on the findings of this study we can state that a social exchange exists between organizational commitment and CPE.

Besides testing SET on the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE for temporary workers, this study also contributes to the existing literature by attempting to develop a theoretical explanation for the relationship between temporary employment and organizational commitment. The results of this study showed that the social exchange mechanism also holds for the relationship between temporary employment and organizational commitment. However, this social exchange relationship is lower for temporary employees, compared to permanent employees. The theoretical explanation for this could be that employees who are employed via a temporary contract, and thus have a short-term relationship with their organization, will not feel the urge to give something back in return in terms of organizational commitment.

The results of this study revealed that the social exchange mechanism does not hold for the relationship between temporary employment and CPE. Therefore, this study does not contribute in providing a theoretical explanation for the relationship between temporary employment and CPE.

This study also contributes to the commitment literature since it focuses on temporary employment across different types of organizations and industries in a national setting (The Netherlands) in which temporary employment is very high. However, this does not mean that the results can only be applied within this national setting. It can also be generalized in countries where temporary employment is a common work arrangement. Previous studies showed that organizational commitment may be less relevant for temporary employees (Cooper et al., 2016). Also, Felfe et al. (2007) showed that permanent employees showed higher levels of affective organizational commitment compared to temporary employees. However, these studies did not provide theoretical support for their findings. This study contributes to the theoretical literature on temporary employment and organizational commitment since it shows that the social exchange mechanism holds for this relationship. Furthermore, the effect of temporary employment on the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE has been studied. The results of this study show that temporary employment has a positive effect on the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. However, this finding cannot be explained by SET.

To conclude, this study shows that limits might exists in the use of SET on the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE for temporary employees. Therefore, other mechanisms have to be studies in explaining the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE for temporary employees. However, the social exchange mechanism does hold for the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE. Furthermore, SET can also be applied on the relationship between temporary employment and organizational commitment.

#### 5.3.2. Practical Contribution

This research is relevant for organizations since it contributes to the practical understanding of the relationship between organizational commitment and employee creativity for temporary workers. First, this study shows that temporary employees are less committed towards the organizational compared to permanent employees. Commitment can be related to behavioral outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intentions (Cooper et al., 2016). Yet, this indicates that it is important for organizations to have and to retain a committed workforce. Since this study revealed that temporary employees are less committed towards the organizations to have and to retain a committed workforce. Since this study revealed that temporary employees are less committed towards the organization, employers have to focus on increasing commitment among temporary employees.

Secondly, this study confirmed that organizational commitment is positively related to employee creativity. Therefore, we can state that in order to create a creative environment in which employees engage in the creative process, employers have to make sure that their employees are committed towards the organization. However, although temporary employment negatively effects organizational commitment, this study showed that temporary employment is not significantly related to CPE. This indicates that the type of work contract does not play a role in determining whether an employee does or does not engages in the creative process. However, since temporary contract does not play a role in the CPE of employees, there are other mechanisms that determine CPE. For organizations that are dependent on the CPE of their employees, such as technology or innovative companies, it is important to define these mechanisms since this will increase the CPE of employees.

### 5.4. Limitations and directions for future research

Although this research contributes to the theoretical and empirical research on commitment, CPE and temporary employment this research also has its limitations. In the next part these limitations will be discussed and recommendations will be provided to overcome these issues. One of these limitations is the cross-sectional design. This type of research design has several disadvantages. One of these disadvantages is the social desirability that comes with survey research. Social desirability refers to a respondent wish to make a favorable impression (Wåhlberg, 2010). Although this survey was anonymous and the respondents could withdraw from the survey at any time, still some bias can exist due to social desirability.

Another limitation of this study is that organizational commitment within this study is measured from multiple groups all working in different organizations, including employees who work directly for an

organization, via an agency, as employer for their own company or as freelancer. These different groups of employees all work across different industries and have a different work environment and therefore, differ in terms of commitment towards the organization. For example, employees who work directly for an organization will feel a different sense of commitment towards the organization compared to a freelancer who only works for a few months for his or her client. On the other hand, including all these groups in the sample increases the validity of this study since this study wants to measure the Dutch workforce. A recommendation for future research is to look at the different groups both separately from each other and together in order to investigate whether a difference in terms of organizational commitment exists between these groups. To conclude, additional regression analysis showed that this limitation did not have an influence on the results of this study (appendix 12).

Since the type of contract is measured for employees who work directly for an organization, via a work agency or detached for another organization all taken together, this can also be seen as a limitation for this study. It is likely that temporary employment will be perceived differently for these different groups. For example, employees who work directly for an organization feel a higher need to receive a permanent contract compared to employees that work via an agency, since these employees choose to work for shorter periods of time and within different companies. The sample included 280 temporary employees who work directly for an organization (appendix 13). Future research should look at these groups separately to avoid making statements about different groups with different needs.

Finally, another limitation of the study was that it took a relatively large amount of time to fill in the questionnaire since all Bachelor and Master students included their questions in the questionnaire. This will cause respondents to leave the questionnaire or answer the questions without carefully reading the questions. Within this study, 861 employees started the questionnaire. Of these 861 employees, 686 (79,7%) finished the questionnaire (appendix 14). One of the reasons that 20,3% did not finish the questionnaire can be because of the relatively large amount of time to fill in the questionnaire. This limitation can affect the reliability and validity of this research when respondents answer the questions without care due to a shortage of time. Another recommendation for future research is to leave out personal questions which make it possible to track down the respondents and limit the time needed to fill in the questionnaire to a maximum 15 minutes. Furthermore, a recommendation for future research is to use a longitudinal study. This research design conducts multiple observations over a specific period of

time. For this research it can be useful to measure the relationship between organizational commitment and CPE before and after having a temporary employment relationship.

To conclude, since this study showed that CPE cannot be explained by the use of SET, future research should focus on other mechanisms that explain CPE. In other words, there is a call for theoretical explanation of the mechanisms that explain CPE since this can improve the competitiveness of the organization (Hou et al., 2011). Furthermore, this study focused on commitment towards the organization in relationship with CPE. Since this research did not found a significant relationship between organizational commitment and CPE, future research should focus on the social exchange mechanism of CPE for temporary employees in relationship to other targets of commitment such as the profession, career or team.

## Literature

Albrecht, S.L., Dineen, O.J. (2016). Organizational commitment and employee engagement: ten key questions. In Meyer, J. P. (Ed.), *Handbook of Employee Commitment*. Cheltenham, Glos: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Allen, N.J. (2016). Commitment as a multidimensional construct. In Meyer, J. P. (Ed.), *Handbook of Employee Commitment*. Cheltenham, Glos: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of occupational psychology*, *63*(1), 1-18.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of vocational behavior*, *49*(3), 252-276.

Amabile, T. (1997). Motivating creativity in organizations: On doing what you love and loving what you do. *California Management Review, 40*(1), 39-58.

Anderson, V. (2013). Research methods in human resource management. London, England: CIPD.

Anderson, N., Potočnik, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-thescience review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*, *40*(5), 1297-1333.

Bagga, S. (2014). Wet werk en zekerheid wat houdt de wet werk en zekerheid in? wie heeft er mee te maken? *Maatwerk, 15*(4), 32-33.

Becker, T. E. (2016). Multiple foci of workplace commitments. In J. P. Meyer (Ed.), *Handbook of employee commitment* (pp. 43-58). Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.

Berglund, T., Håkansson, K., Isidorsson, T., & Alfonsson, J. (2017). Temporary employment and the future labor market status. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, *7*(2), 27.

Blau, P. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Bryman, A. (2017). Quantitative and qualitative research: further reflections on their integration. In *Mixing methods: Qualitative and quantitative research* (pp. 57-78). Routledge.

CBS. (2018, February 19). *Weer meer vast werk maar flexwerk groeit harder*. Retrieved from https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2018/08/weer-meer-vast-werk-maar-flexwerk-groeit-harder

Collier, J., & Esteban, R. (2007). Corporate social responsibility and employee commitment. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 16*(1), 19-33.

Cooper, J.T., Stanley, L.J., Klein, H.J., & Tenhiälä, A. (2016). Profiles of commitment in standard and fixedterm employment arrangements: Implications for work outcomes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *25*(1), 149-165.

Chang, S., Jia, L., Takeuchi, R., & Cai, Y. (2014). Do high-commitment work systems affect creativity? A multilevel combinational approach to employee creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *99*(4), 665.

Cuyper, N., Witte, H., & Emmerik, H. (2011). Temporary employment: Costs and benefits for (the careers of) employees and organizations. *Career Development International, 16*(2), 104-113.

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of management*, *31*(6), 874-900.

Dewett, T. (2004). Employee creativity and the role of risk. *European Journal of Innovation Management,* 7(4), 257-266.

Felfe, J., Schmook, R., Schyns, B., & Six, B. (2008). Does the form of employment make a difference?— Commitment of traditional, temporary, and self-employed workers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72(1), 81-94.

Field, A. (2013). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (4th edition. ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

Frese, M. (2000). The changing nature of work. In N. Chmiel (Ed.), Introduction to work and organizational psychology: A European perspective (pp. 424-439). Malden, : Blackwell Publishing.

Gagné, M., Howard, J. (2016). A motivational model of employee attachment to an organization. In Meyer, J. P. (Ed.), *Handbook of Employee Commitment*. Cheltenham, Glos: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Gilson, L., & Shalley, C. (2004). A little creativity goes a long way: An examination of teams' engagement in creative processes. *Journal of Management -Lubbock Then College Station Texas Then Stamford Connecticut-,30*(4), 453-470.

Holden, M. T., & Lynch, P. (2004). Choosing the appropriate methodology: Understanding research philosophy. *The marketing review*, *4*(4), 397-409.

Hou, Y., Gao, G., Wang, F., Li, T., & Yu, Z. (2011). Organizational Commitment and Creativity: the Influence of Thinking Styles. *Annals of Economics & Finance*, *12*(2).

53

Jahn, E., & Weber, E. (2016). The effect of temporary help jobs on employment volatility. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique*, *49*(1), 412-427.

Kanfer, R. (1990). Motivation theory and industrial and organizational psychology. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, *1*(2), 75-130.

Klein, H., Cooper, J., Molloy, J., & Swanson, J., & (2014). The assessment of commitment: Advantages of a unidimensional, target-free approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *99*(2), 222-238.

Klein, H., Molloy, J., & Brinsfield, C. (2012). Reconceptualizing workplace commitment to redress a stretched construct: Revisiting assumptions and removing confounds. *Academy of Management Review, 37*(1), 130-152.

Klein, J., Park. (2016). Commitment as a unidimensional construct. In Meyer, J. P. (Ed.), *Handbook of Employee Commitment*. Cheltenham, Glos: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Klijn, M., & Tomic, W. (2010). A review of creativity within organizations from a psychological perspective. *Journal of Management Development, 29*(4), 322-344.

Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of management journal*, *37*(3), 656-669.

Levin, K. A. (2006). Study design III: Cross-sectional studies. *Evidence-based dentistry*, 7(1), 24. McMillan, K., & Albrecht, S. (2010). Measuring social exchange constructs in organizations. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 4(3), 201-220.

McCusker, K., & Gunaydin, S. (2015). Research using qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods and choice based on the research. *Perfusion*, *30*(*7*), 537-542.

Matveev, A. V. (2002). The advantages of employing quantitative and qualitative methods in intercultural research: Practical implications from the study of the perceptions of intercultural communication competence by American and Russian managers. *Theory of communication and applied communication*, *1*(1), 59-67.

Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Van Dick, R. (2006). Social identities and commitments at work: Toward an integrative model. *Journal of organizational behavior*, *27*(5), 665-683.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, *1*(1), 61-89.

Meyer, J. P, & Allen, N. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace, Theory, Research, and Application*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Pubication, Inc.

Meyer, J.P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review, 11*(3), 299- 326.

Morin, A. J., Madore, I., Morizot, J., Boudrias, J. S., & Tremblay, M. (2009). Multiple targets of workplace affective commitment: Factor structure and measurement invariance of the Workplace Affective Commitment Multidimensional Questionnaire. *Advances in psychology research*, *59*(1), 45-75. Mowday, R. (1998). Reflections on the study and relevance of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, *8*(4), 387-402.

Muijs, D. (2010). Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS. Sage.

Oldham, G., & Cummings, A. (1996). Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(3), 607-634.

Paulus, P. (2000). Groups, teams, and creativity: The creative potential of idea-generating groups. *Applied Psychology*, *49*(2), 237-262.

Peng, J., Zhang, G., Fu, Z., & Tan, Y. (2014). An empirical investigation on organizational innovation and individual creativity. *Information Systems and E-Business Management, 12*(3)

Perry, T. (1995). Designing a culture for creativity. Research-Technology Management, 38(2), 14-17.

Perry-Smith, J. (2006). Social yet creative: The role of social relationships in facilitating individual creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*(1), 85-102.

Rousseau, D. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements.* Sage Publications.

Runco, M. A. (Ed.). (2003). *Perspectives on creativity research. Critical creative processes*. Cresskill, NJ, US: Hampton Press.

Rowley, J. (2012). Conducting research interviews. *Management Research Review*, 35(3-4), 260-271.

Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader–member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of applied psychology*, *81*(3), 219.

Solinger, O. N., Van Olffen, W., & Roe, R. A. (2008). Beyond the three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of applied psychology*, *93*(1), 70.

Toledo-Pereyra, L. (2012). Research design. Journal of Investigative Surgery, 25(5), 279-280.

Ugboro, I. O. (2006). Organizational commitment, job redesign, employee empowerment and intent to quit among survivors of restructuring and downsizing. *Journal of Behavioral & Applied Management*, 7(3).

Van Rossenberg, Y., Cross, D., Swart, J. & Kinnie, N. (2018). HRMJ review paper. *Under review at Human Resource Management Journal.* 

Van Rossenberg, Y. (2013). *Multiple foci of commitment and creative work behaviour in interorganisational innovation projects* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Bath).

Wåhlberg, A. (2010). Social desirability effects in driver behavior inventories. *Journal of Safety Research*, *41*(2), 99-107.

Wright, K. B. (2005). Researching Internet-based populations: Advantages and disadvantages of online survey research, online questionnaire authoring software packages, and web survey services. *Journal of computer-mediated communication*, *10*(3)

Zhang, X., & Bartol, K. (2010). Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*(1), 107-107.

# Appendices

## Appendix 1

Creative Process Engagement (developed for the study drawing on Amabile [1983], Perry-Smith [2006], and Reiter-Palmon and Illies [2004])

Respondents answered the following question: "In your job, to what extent do you engage in the follow actions when seeking to accomplish an assignment or solve a problem?" (1 "never," 2 "rarely," 3 "occasionally," 4 "frequently," 5 "very frequently").

### Problem identification:

- 1. I spend considerable time trying to understand the nature of the problem.
- 2. I think about the problem from multiple perspectives.
- 3. I decompose a difficult problem/assignment into parts to obtain greater understanding.

### Information searching and encoding:

- 4. I consult a wide variety of information.
- 5. I search for information from multiple sources (e.g., personal memories, others' experience, documentation, Internet, etc.).
- 6. I retain large amounts of detailed information in my area of expertise for future use.

### Idea generation:

- 7. I consider diverse sources of information in generating new ideas.
- 8. I look for connections with solutions used in seeming diverse areas.
- 9. I generate a significant number of alternatives to the same problem before I choose the final solution.
- 10. I try to devise potential solutions that move away from established ways of doing things.
- 11. I spend considerable time shifting through information that helps to generate new ideas.

Descriptive Statistics							
N Minimum Maximum Mean Std. Deviation							
Het jaar waarin in geboren ben is	748	1	62	19,69	14,669		
Valid N (listwise)	748						

Descriptive Statistics							
	Ν	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation		
SUM(TenOrgY,Agency_Ten	771	,00	50,00	7,2010	9,21657		
OrgY,Detach_TenOrgY,Bus							
sOwner_TenOrgY,ZZP_Ten							
Y)							
Valid N (listwise)	771						

Descriptive Statistics									
	Ν	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation				
HoursContractAll	799	,00	60,00	24,4606	14,85791				
Valid N (listwise)	Valid N (listwise) 799								

	Ik ben een								
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative				
					Percent				
Valid	Vrouw	465	54,0	61,0	61,0				
	Man	285	33,1	37,4	98,4				
	Transgender	6	,7	,8	99,2				
	Anders	2	,2	,3	99,5				
	Deze informatie verstrek ik	4	,5	,5	100,0				
	liever niet								
	Total	762	88,5	100,0					
Missing	-999	99	11,5						
Total		861	100,0						

	lk werk								
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative				
					Percent				
Valid	direct voor een	668	77,6	77,6	77,6				
	organisatie.								
	via een uitzendburo.	40	4,6	4,6	82,2				
	via een detacheringsburo.	36	4,2	4,2	86,4				
	als werkgever in mijn	36	4,2	4,2	90,6				
	eigen bedrijf.								
	als ZZP-er / freelance.	70	8,1	8,1	98,7				
	Ik verstrek deze informatie	11	1,3	1,3	100,0				
	liever niet								
	Total	861	100,0	100,0					

SUM(Contract,Agency_Contract,Detach_Contract)							
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent		
Valid	een vast contract / vast dienstverband	408	47,4	54,2	54,2		
	een tijdelijk contract / tijdelijk dienstverband	345	40,1	45,8	100,0		
	Total	753	87,5	100,0			

Missing	System	108	12,5	
Total		861	100,0	



Simple Bar of SUM(TenOrgY,Agency\_TenOrgY,Detach\_TenOrgY,BussOwner\_TenOrgY,ZZP\_TenY)



Simple Bar of SUM(TenOrgY,Agency\_TenOrgY,Detach\_TenOrgY,BussOwner\_TenOrgY,ZZP\_TenY)



Reliability Statistics				
Cronbach's	Cronbach's N of Items			
Alpha	Alpha Based on			
	Standardized			
	Items			
,815	,818,	3		

Item-Total Statistics					
	Scale Mean if	Scale Variance if	Corrected Item-	Squared Multiple	Cronbach's
	Item Deleted	Item Deleted	Total Correlation	Correlation	Alpha if Item
					Deleted
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op	8,77	6,126	,649	,439	,765
uw werk					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u					
zich bezig met de volgende					
activiteiten? - 1. Ik besteed					
veel tijd aan het beter					
begrijpen van de aard van					
problemen.					
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op	8,39	6,168	,720	,519	,697
uw werk					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u					
zich bezig met de volgende					
activiteiten? - 2. lk bekijk					
problemen vanuit					
verschillende perspectieven.					
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op	9,11	5,921	,639	,420	,779
uw werk					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u					
zich bezig met de volgende					
activiteiten? - 3. Om					
problemen beter te begrijpen					
breek ik problemen op in					
verschillende delen.					

Reliability Statistics					
Cronbach's	Cronbach's	N of Items			
Alpha	Alpha Based on				
	Standardized				
	Items				
,831	,834	3			

	Item-Total Statistics					
					Cronbach's	
	Scale Mean if	Scale Variance if	Corrected Item-	Squared Multiple	Alpha if Item	
	Item Deleted	Item Deleted	Total Correlation	Correlation	Deleted	
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op uw werk	8,71	7,013	,702	,530	,756	
In uw werk, noe vaak houdt u zich bezig met de volgende activiteiten? - 4. Ik raadpleeg						
een verscheidenheid aan informatie.						
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op uw werk	8,50	6,630	,746	,573	,712	
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u zich bezig met de volgende						
activiteiten? - 5. Als ik naar						
informatie zoek raadpleeg ik						
verschillende bronnen (zoals,						
persoonlijke ervaring,						
documenten, internet,						
ervaring van anderen enz.).						
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op	9,11	6,678	,631	,402	,831	
uw werk						
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u						
zich bezig met de volgende						
activiteiten? - 6. Ik verzamel						
een grote hoeveelheid aan						
informatie over mijn						
vakgebied om later te						
gebruiken.						

Reliability Statistics					
Cronbach's	Cronbach's	N of Items			
Alpha	Alpha Based on				
	Standardized				
	Items				
,877	,877	5			

Item-Total Statistics					
	Scale Mean if	Scale Variance if	Corrected Item-	Squared Multiple	Cronbach's
	Item Deleted	Item Deleted	Total Correlation	Correlation	Alpha if Item
					Deleted
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op	15,41	21,350	,744	,584	,842
uw werk					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u					
zich bezig met de volgende					
activiteiten? - 7. In het					
genereren van nieuwe					
ideeen, raadpleeg					
verschillende bronnen.					
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op	15,66	21,925	,713	,526	,850
uw werk					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u					
zich bezig met de volgende					
activiteiten? - 8. In het					
zoeken van oplossingen kijk					
ik naar connecties tussen					
geheel verschillende					
gebieden.					
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op	15,89	22,464	,715	,515	,849
uw werk					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u					
zich bezig met de volgende					
activiteiten? - 9. Ik verzamel					
een groot aantal alternatieve					
oplossingen voor een					
probleem voordat ik een					
uiteindelijke oplossing kies.					

C. Activiteiten en prestatie op	16,01	23,573	,637	,415	,867
uw werk					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u					
zich bezig met de volgende					
activiteiten? - 10. Ik probeer					
oplossingen aan te dragen					
die afwijken van de normale					
gang van zaken.					
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op	15,89	21,531	,731	,559	,845
uw werk					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u					
zich bezig met de volgende					
activiteiten? - 11. In het					
genereren van nieuwe					
ideeen besteed ik veel tijd					
aan het doorspitten van					
informatie.					

Reliability Statistics					
Cronbach's	Cronbach's	N of Items			
Alpha	Alpha Based on				
	Standardized				
	Items				
,914	,917	4			

Item-Total Statistics						
	Scale Mean if	Scale Variance if	Corrected Item-	Squared Multiple	Cronbach's	
	Item Deleted	Item Deleted	Total Correlation	Correlation	Alpha if Item	
					Deleted	
SUM(ComOrg1,Agency_Co	15,07	8,034	,763	,583	,907	
mOrg1,Detach_ComOrg1,Bu						
ssOwner_ComOrg1,ZZP_Co						
mOrg1)						
SUM(ComOrg2,Agency_Co	14,84	8,721	,828	,691	,881	
mOrg2,Detach_ComOrg2,Bu						
ssOwner_ComOrg2,ZZP_Co						
mOrg2)						

SUM(ComOrg3,Agency_Co	14,73	8,893	,824	,690	,883
mOrg3,Detach_ComOrg3,Bu					
ssOwner_ComOrg3,ZZP_Co					
mOrg3)					
SUM(ComOrg4,Agency_Co	14,88	8,310	,818	,680	,883
mOrg4,Detach_ComOrg4,Bu					
ssOwner_ComOrg4,ZZP_Co					
mOrg4)					

KMO and Bartlett's Test				
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of	,935			
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	5041,601		
	df	55		
	Sig.	,000		

Total Variance Explained										
Component		Initial Eigenvalu	es	Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings						
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %				
1	6,389	58,082	58,082	6,389	58,082	58,082				
2	,931	8,465	66,546							
3	,752	6,837	73,383							
4	,510	4,635	78,018							
5	,445	4,047	82,066							
6	,421	3,825	85,891							
7	,402	3,657	89,548							
8	,339	3,082	92,631							
9	,331	3,007	95,638							
10	,257	2,333	97,971							
11	,223	2,029	100,000							
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.										

Component Matrix <sup>a</sup>	
	Component
	1
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op uw werk	,679
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u zich bezig met de volgende activiteiten? - 1. Ik besteed veel tijd aan het	
beter begrijpen van de aard van problemen.	
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op uw werk	,728
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u zich bezig met de volgende activiteiten? - 2. Ik bekijk problemen vanuit	
verschillende perspectieven.	
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op uw werk	,755
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u zich bezig met de volgende activiteiten? - 3. Om problemen beter te	
begrijpen breek ik problemen op in verschillende delen.	

C. Activiteiten en prestatie op uw werk	,812					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u zich bezig met de volgende activiteiten? - 4. Ik raadpleeg een						
verscheidenheid aan informatie.						
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op uw werk	,787					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u zich bezig met de volgende activiteiten? - 5. Als ik naar informatie zoek						
raadpleeg ik verschillende bronnen (zoals, persoonlijke ervaring, documenten, internet, ervaring van						
anderen enz.).						
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op uw werk	,769					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u zich bezig met de volgende activiteiten? - 6. Ik verzamel een grote						
hoeveelheid aan informatie over mijn vakgebied om later te gebruiken.						
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op uw werk	,841					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u zich bezig met de volgende activiteiten? - 7. In het genereren van						
nieuwe ideeen, raadpleeg verschillende bronnen.						
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op uw werk	,795					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u zich bezig met de volgende activiteiten? - 8. In het zoeken van						
oplossingen kijk ik naar connecties tussen geheel verschillende gebieden.						
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op uw werk	,761					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u zich bezig met de volgende activiteiten? - 9. Ik verzamel een groot						
aantal alternatieve oplossingen voor een probleem voordat ik een uiteindelijke oplossing kies.						
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op uw werk	,663					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u zich bezig met de volgende activiteiten? - 10. Ik probeer oplossingen						
aan te dragen die afwijken van de normale gang van zaken.						
C. Activiteiten en prestatie op uw werk	,773					
In uw werk, hoe vaak houdt u zich bezig met de volgende activiteiten? - 11. In het genereren van						
nieuwe ideeen besteed ik veel tijd aan het doorspitten van informatie.						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						
a. 1 components extracted.						

Correlation Matrix											
	C.	C.	C.	C.	C. Activiteiten	C.	C.	C.	C.	C.	C. Activiteiten
	Activiteite	Activiteite	Activiteiten	Activiteiten	en prestatie	Activiteiten	Activiteite	Activiteiten	Activiteiten	Activiteiten	en prestatie op
	n en	n en	en prestatie	en prestatie	ор	en prestatie	n en	en prestatie	en prestatie	en	uw werk
	prestatie	prestatie	ор	ор	uw werk	ор	prestatie	ор	ор	prestatie	In uw werk, hoe
	ор	ор	uw werk	uw werk	In uw werk,	uw werk	ор	uw werk	uw werk	ор	vaak houdt u
	uw werk	uw werk	In uw werk,	In uw werk,	hoe vaak	In uw werk,	uw werk	In uw werk,	In uw werk,	uw werk	zich bezig met
		In uw	hoe vaak	hoe vaak	houdt u zich	hoe vaak	In uw	hoe vaak	hoe vaak	In uw	de volgende
	In uw	werk, hoe	houdt u zich	houdt u zich	bezig met de	houdt u zich	werk, hoe	houdt u zich	houdt u zich	werk, hoe	activiteiten? -
	werk, hoe	vaak	bezig met	bezig met	volgende	bezig met	vaak	bezig met	bezig met	vaak houdt	11. In het
	vaak	houdt u	de volgende	de volgende	activiteiten? -	de volgende	houdt u	de volgende	de volgende	u zich	genereren van
	houdt u	zich bezig	activiteiten?	activiteiten?	5. Als ik naar	activiteiten?	zich bezig	activiteiten?	activiteiten?	bezig met	nieuwe ideeen
	zich bezig	met de	- 3. Om	- 4. lk	informatie	- 6. lk	met de	- 8. In het	- 9. lk	de	besteed ik veel
	met de	volgende	problemen	raadpleeg	zoek	verzamel	volgende	zoeken van	verzamel	volgende	tijd aan het
	volgende	activiteiten	beter te	een	raadpleeg ik	een grote	activiteiten	oplossingen	een groot	activiteiten	doorspitten van
	activiteiten	? - 2. lk	begrijpen	verscheiden	verschillende	hoeveelheid	? - 7. In	kijk ik naar	aantal	? - 10. lk	informatie.
	? - 1. lk	bekijk	breek ik	heid aan	bronnen	aan	het	connecties	alternatieve	probeer	
	besteed	problemen	problemen	informatie.	(zoals,	informatie	genereren	tussen	oplossingen	oplossinge	
	veel tijd	vanuit	op in		persoonlijke	over mijn	van	geheel	voor een	n aan te	
	aan het	verschillen	verschillend		ervaring,	vakgebied	nieuwe	verschillend	probleem	dragen die	
	beter	de	e delen.		documenten,	om later te	ideeen,	e gebieden.	voordat ik	afwijken	
	begrijpen	perspectie			internet,	gebruiken.	raadpleeg		een	van de	
	van de	ven.			ervaring van		verschillen		uiteindelijke	normale	
	aard van				anderen		de		oplossing	gang van	
	problemen				enz.).		bronnen.		kies.	zaken.	

Correlation	C. Activiteiten	1,000	,638	,537	,509	,468	,432	,446	,480	,448	,370	,429
	en prestatie op											
	uw werk											
	In uw werk,											
	hoe vaak houdt											
	u zich bezig											
	met de											
	volgende											
	activiteiten? -											
	1. Ik besteed											
	veel tijd aan											
	het beter											
	begrijpen van											
	de aard van											
	problemen.											
	C. Activiteiten	,638	1,000	,628	,568	,504	,462	,532	,515	,451	,419	,423
	en prestatie op											
	uw werk											
	In uw werk,											
	hoe vaak houdt											
	u zich bezig											
	met de											
	volgende											
	activiteiten? -											
	2. lk bekijk											
	problemen											
	vanuit											
	verschillende											
	perspectieven.											
C. Activiteiten	,537	,628	1,000	,635	,525	,491	,514	,558	,520	,445	,484	
-----------------	------	------	-------	-------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	
en prestatie op												
uw werk												
In uw werk,												
hoe vaak houdt												
u zich bezig												
met de												
volgende												
activiteiten? -												
3. Om												
problemen												
beter te												
begrijpen breek												
ik problemen												
op in												
verschillende												
delen.												
C. Activiteiten	,509	,568	,635	1,000	,712	,557	,651	,585	,553	,426	,556	
en prestatie op												
uw werk												
In uw werk,												
hoe vaak houdt												
u zich bezig												
met de												
volgende												
activiteiten? -												
4. Ik raadpleeg												
een												
verscheidenhei												

d aan											
informatie.											
C. Activiteiten	,468	,504	,525	,712	1,000	,613	,698	,565	,516	,385	,548
en prestatie op											
uw werk											
In uw werk,											
hoe vaak houdt											
u zich bezig											
met de											
volgende											
activiteiten? -											
5. Als ik naar											
informatie zoek											
raadpleeg ik											
verschillende											
bronnen (zoals,											
persoonlijke											
ervaring,											
documenten,											
internet,											
ervaring van											
anderen enz.).											
C. Activiteiten	,432	,462	,491	,557	,613	1,000	,706	,576	,521	,437	,612
en prestatie op											
uw werk											
In uw werk,											
hoe vaak houdt											
u zich bezig											
met de											

							-	-			
volgende											
activiteiten? -											
6. Ik verzamel											
een grote											
hoeveelheid											
aan informatie											
over mijn											
vakgebied om											
later te											
gebruiken.											
C. Activiteiten	,446	,532	,514	,651	,698	,706	1,000	,648	,594	,507	,685
en prestatie op											
uw werk											
In uw werk,											
hoe vaak houdt											
u zich bezig											
met de											
volgende											
activiteiten? -											
7. In het											
genereren van											
nieuwe ideeen,											
raadpleeg											
verschillende											
bronnen.											
C. Activiteiten	,480	,515	,558	,585	,565	,576	,648	1,000	,617	,530	,562
en prestatie op											
uw werk											

In uw werk,											
hoe vaak houdt											
u zich bezig											
met de											
volgende											
activiteiten? -											
8. In het											
zoeken van											
oplossingen											
kijk ik naar											
connecties											
tussen geheel											
verschillende											
gebieden.											
C. Activiteiten	,448	,451	,520	,553	,516	,521	,594	,617	1,000	,552	,601
en prestatie op											
uw werk											
In uw werk,											
hoe vaak houdt											
u zich bezig											
met de											
volgende											
activiteiten? -											
9. Ik verzamel											
een groot											
aantal											
alternatieve											
oplossingen											
voor een											

probleem											
voordat ik een											
uiteindelijke											
oplossing kies.											
C. Activiteiten	,370	,419	,445	,426	,385	,437	,507	,530	,552	1,000	,555
en prestatie op											
uw werk											
In uw werk,											
hoe vaak houdt											
u zich bezig											
met de											
volgende											
activiteiten? -											
10. Ik probeer											
oplossingen											
aan te dragen											
die afwijken											
van de normale											
gang van											
zaken.											
C. Activiteiten	,429	,423	,484	,556	,548	,612	,685	,562	,601	,555	1,000
en prestatie op											
uw werk											
In uw werk,											
hoe vaak houdt											l I
u zich bezig											
met de											
volgende											
activiteiten? -		1								ļ	

11. In het						
genereren van						
nieuwe ideeen						
besteed ik veel						
tijd aan het						
doorspitten van						
informatie.						

Desc	criptive Stati	stics	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Ν
MEAN(CPE_Phase1_1,CPE	4,3814	1,18254	760
_Phase1_2,CPE_Phase1_3)			
MEAN(CPE_Phase2_1,CPE	4,3936	1,25591	758
_Phase2_2,CPE_Phase2_3)			
MEAN(CPE_Phase3_1,CPE	3,9500	1,16013	758
_Phase3_2,CPE_Phase3_3,			
CPE_Phase3_4,CPE_Phase			
3_5			
MEANOrgcom	4,9587	,95340	847
HoursContractAll	24,4606	14,85791	799
SUM(TenOrgY,Agency_Ten	7,2010	9,21657	771
OrgY,Detach_TenOrgY,Bus			
sOwner_TenOrgY,ZZP_Ten			
Y)			

		C	orrelations				
		MEAN(CPE	MEAN(CPE	MEAN(CPE	MEANOrgc	HoursContr	SUM(TenOr
		_Phase1_1,	_Phase2_1,	_Phase3_1,	om	actAll	gY,Agency_
		CPE_Phase	CPE_Phase	CPE_Phase			TenOrgY,Det
		1_2,CPE_P	2_2,CPE_P	3_2,CPE_P			ach_TenOrg
		hase1_3)	hase2_3)	hase3_3,CP			Y,BussOwne
				E_Phase3_			r_TenOrgY,Z
				4,CPE_Pha			ZP_TenY)
				se3_5			
MEAN(CPE_Phase1	Pearson Correlation	1	,689**	,673**	,226**	,177**	-,026
_1,CPE_Phase1_2,C	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000	,000	,494
PE_Phase1_3)	Sum of Squares and	1061,386	774,629	698,412	189,475	2187,784	-202,752
	Cross-products						
	Covariance	1,398	1,023	,923	,250	3,073	-,293
	Ν	760	758	758	759	713	694
MEAN(CPE_Phase2	Pearson Correlation	,689**	1	,790**	,244**	,177**	-,031
_1,CPE_Phase2_2,C	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000	,000	,414
PE_Phase2_3)	Sum of Squares and	774,629	1194,027	871,023	217,229	2310,028	-254,721
	Cross-products						

	Covariance	1,023	1,577	1,151	,287	3,254	-,369
	Ν	758	758	758	757	711	692
MEAN(CPE_Phase3	Pearson Correlation	,673**	,790**	1	,195**	,152**	-,089*
_1,CPE_Phase3_2,C	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000	,000	,019
PE_Phase3_3,CPE_	Sum of Squares and	698,412	871,023	1018,847	159,731	1831,105	-671,963
Phase3_4,CPE_Pha	Cross-products						
se3_5	Covariance	,923	1,151	1,346	,211	2,579	-,972
	Ν	758	758	758	757	711	692
MEANOrgcom	Pearson Correlation	,226**	,244**	,195**	1	,203**	,173**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000
	Sum of Squares and	189,475	217,229	159,731	768,984	2282,854	1169,333
	Cross-products						
	Covariance	,250	,287	,211	,909	2,861	1,523
	Ν	759	757	757	847	799	769
HoursContractAll	Pearson Correlation	,177**	,177**	,152**	,203**	1	,208**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000
	Sum of Squares and	2187,784	2310,028	1831,105	2282,854	176164,508	20878,651
	Cross-products						
	Covariance	3,073	3,254	2,579	2,861	220,758	28,758
	Ν	713	711	711	799	799	727
SUM(TenOrgY,Agen	Pearson Correlation	-,026	-,031	-,089*	,173 <sup>**</sup>	,208**	1
cy_TenOrgY,Detach_	Sig. (2-tailed)	,494	,414	,019	,000	,000	
TenOrgY,BussOwner	Sum of Squares and	-202,752	-254,721	-671,963	1169,333	20878,651	65407,839
_TenOrgY,ZZP_Ten	Cross-products						
Y)	Covariance	-,293	-,369	-,972	1,523	28,758	84,945
	Ν	694	692	692	769	727	771
**. Correlation is signif	icant at the 0.01 level (2	-tailed).					
*. Correlation is signific	cant at the 0.05 level (2-	tailed).					

				Model \$	Summary								
Mode	R	R	Adjusted R	Std. Error		Cha	nge Statis	stics					
I		Square	Square	of the	R Square	F	df1	df2	Sig. F				
	Estimate Change Change Change												
1	1 ,188 <sup>a</sup> ,035 ,032 1,05508 ,035 11,870 2 650 ,000												
2	,299 <sup>b</sup>	,089	,085	1,02579	,054	38,645	1	649	,000				
a. Prec SUM(T	lictors: (C	onstant), H Agency Te	loursContract	All, h TenOrgY,B	ussOwner Te	enOrgY,ZZI	P TenY)						
b. Prec	b. Predictors: (Constant), HoursContractAll,												

SUM(TenOrgY,Agency\_TenOrgY,Detach\_TenOrgY,BussOwner\_TenOrgY,ZZP\_TenY),

SUM(OrgCom1All,OrgCom2All,OrgCom3All,OrgCom4All)

				Coeffi	cients <sup>a</sup>						
Mode	el	Unstar Coef	ndardized ficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Co	orrelation	S	Collinearity S	statistics
		В	Std. Error	Beta			Zero- order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	4,014	,083		48,643	,000					
	SUM(TenOrgY,Age ncy_TenOrgY,Deta ch_TenOrgY,BussO wner_TenOrgY,ZZP TenY)	-,011	,004	-,096	-2,438	,015	-,058	-,095	-,094	,957	1,044
	HoursContractAll	.013	.003	.182	4.631	.000	.163	.179	.178	.957	1.044
2	(Constant)	2,781	,214	,	13,004	,000	,	,	,	,	.,
	SUM(TenOrgY,Age ncy_TenOrgY,Deta ch_TenOrgY,BussO wner_TenOrgY,ZZP _TenY)	-,014	,004	-,128	-3,306	,001	-,058	-,129	-,124	,941	1,063
	HoursContractAll	,010	,003	,138	3,539	,000	,163	,138	,133	,925	1,081
	SUM(OrgCom1All, OrgCom2All,OrgCo m3All,OrgCom4All)	,067	,011	,240	6,217	,000	,248	,237	,233	,938	1,066
a. De	ependent Variable: ME		ICPE1,MEA	NCPE2,MEANC	CPE3)			1	1	1	

				Descri	ptives					
MEAN(OrgCom1A	NI,OrgCom2All,Org	Com3All,	OrgCom	4All)				-		
		Ν	Mean	Std.	Std.	95% Co	nfidence	Minimu	Maximu	Between-
				Deviation	Error	Interval	for Mean	m	m	Compone
						Lower	Upper			nt
						Bound	Bound			Variance
een vast contract	/ vast	398	5,1160	,77245	,03872	5,0399	5,1921	1,75	7,00	
dienstverband										
een tijdelijk contra	act / tijdelijk	279	4,6705	,89884	,05381	4,5646	4,7765	1,00	7,00	
dienstverband										
Total	677	4,9324	,85487	,03286	4,8679	4,9969	1,00	7,00		
Model Fixed Effects				,82685	,03178	4,8700	4,9948			
	Random Effects				,22600	2,0609	7,8040			,09713

	ANOVA										
MEAN(OrgCom1All,OrgCom2All,OrgCom3All,OrgCom4All)											
Sum of Squares df Mean Square F Sig.											
Between Groups	32,545	1	32,545	47,604	,000						
Within Groups	461,481	675	,684								
Total	494,026	676									



Mijn contract bij deze organisatie is

Test of Homogeneity of Variances										
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.					
MEAN(MEANCPE1,MEANC	Based on Mean	1,581	1	606	,209					
PE2,MEANCPE3)	Based on Median	1,578	1	606	,209					
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1,578	1	604,314	,209					
	Based on trimmed mean	1,593	1	606	,207					

	ANOVA										
MEAN(MEANCPE1,MEANCPE2,MEANCPE3)											
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.						
Between Groups	,211	1	,211	,183	,669						
Within Groups	699,811	606	1,155								
Total	700,022	607									

	Model Summary											
Mijn contract bij deze	Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R	Std. Error of the							
organisatie is				Square	Estimate							
-999	1	,086ª	,007	-,010	1,15491							
	2	,230 <sup>b</sup>	,053	,028	1,13307							
een vast contract / vast	1	,326ª	,106	,101	,97255							
dienstverband	2	,442 <sup>b</sup>	,195	,188	,92432							
een tijdelijk contract / tijdelijk	1	,177ª	,031	,021	1,09826							
dienstverband	2	,271 <sup>b</sup>	,074	,058	1,07702							
a. Predictors: (Constant), Hours	ContractAll	,										
SUM(TenOrgY,Agency_TenOrg	gY,Detach_	TenOrgY,Bus	sOwner_TenO	rgY,ZZP_TenY)								
b. Predictors: (Constant), Hours	b. Predictors: (Constant), HoursContractAll,											
SUM(TenOrgY,Agency_TenOrgY,Detach_TenOrgY,BussOwner_TenOrgY,ZZP_TenY),												
SUM(OrgCom1All,OrgCom2All	,OrgCom3A	ll,OrgCom4Al	I)									

			<b>ANOVA</b> <sup>a</sup>				
Mijn contract bij deze organisatie is	Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
-999	1	Regression	1,172	2	,586	,440	,645 <sup>b</sup>
		Residual	156,057	117	1,334		
		Total	157,229	119			
	2	Regression	8,304	3	2,768	2,156	,097 <sup>c</sup>
		Residual	148,925	116	1,284		
		Total	157,229	119			
een vast contract / vast	1	Regression	38,754	2	19,377	20,486	,000 <sup>b</sup>
dienstverband		Residual	326,320	345	,946		
		Total	365,074	347			
	2	Regression	71,173	3	23,724	27,768	,000 <sup>c</sup>
		Residual	293,901	344	,854		
		Total	365,074	347			
een tijdelijk contract / tijdelijk	1	Regression	7,121	2	3,561	2,952	,055 <sup>b</sup>
dienstverband		Residual	219,524	182	1,206		
		Total	226,646	184			
	2	Regression	16,691	3	5,564	4,796	,003 <sup>c</sup>
		Residual	209,954	181	1,160		
		Total	226,646	184			

a. Dependent Variable: MEAN(MEANCPE1,MEANCPE2,MEANCPE3)

b. Predictors: (Constant), HoursContractAll,

SUM(TenOrgY,Agency\_TenOrgY,Detach\_TenOrgY,BussOwner\_TenOrgY,ZZP\_TenY)

c. Predictors: (Constant), HoursContractAll,

 ${\tt SUM}({\tt TenOrgY}, {\tt Agency\_TenOrgY}, {\tt Detach\_TenOrgY}, {\tt BussOwner\_TenOrgY}, {\tt ZZP\_TenY}),$ 

SUM(OrgCom1All,OrgCom2All,OrgCom3All,OrgCom4All)

		Co	efficients <sup>a</sup>				
Mijn contract bij deze organisatie is	Model		Unstandardize	ed Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			В	Std. Error	Beta		
-999	1	(Constant)	4,373	,162		26,982	,000
		SUM(TenOrgY,Agency_ TenOrgY,Detach_TenOr gY,BussOwner_TenOrg Y,ZZP_TenY)	-,013	,014	-,088	-,935	,352
		HoursContractAll	,001	,006	,014	,146	,884
	2	(Constant)	3,478	,412		8,440	,000
		SUM(TenOrgY,Agency_ TenOrgY,Detach_TenOr gY,BussOwner_TenOrg Y,ZZP_TenY)	-,020	,014	-,136	-1,431	,155
		HoursContractAll	-,003	,006	-,047	-,487	,627
		SUM(OrgCom1All,OrgCo m2All,OrgCom3All,OrgC om4All)	,051	,021	,229	2,357	,020
een vast contract / vast	1	(Constant)	3,435	,155		22,117	,000
dienstverband		SUM(TenOrgY,Agency_ TenOrgY,Detach_TenOr gY,BussOwner_TenOrg Y,ZZP_TenY)	-,007	,005	-,072	-1,404	,161
		HoursContractAll	,030	,005	,322	6,309	,000
	2	(Constant)	1,630	,328		4,970	,000
		SUM(TenOrgY,Agency_ TenOrgY,Detach_TenOr gY,BussOwner_TenOrg Y,ZZP_TenY)	-,009	,005	-,088	-1,806	,072
		HoursContractAll	,024	,005	,265	5,381	,000

		SUM(OrgCom1All,OrgCo	,096	,016	,304	6,160	,000					
		m2All,OrgCom3All,OrgC om4All)										
een tijdelijk contract /	1	(Constant)	4,021	,143		28,185	,000					
tijdelijk dienstverband		SUM(TenOrgY,Agency_	,012	,033	,026	,358	,721					
		TenOrgY,Detach_TenOr										
		gY,BussOwner_TenOrg										
		Y,ZZP_TenY)										
		HoursContractAll	,013	,005	,178	2,427	,016					
	2	(Constant)	2,816	,442		6,370	,000					
		SUM(TenOrgY,Agency_	,017	,033	,036	,504	,615					
		TenOrgY,Detach_TenOr										
		gY,BussOwner_TenOrg										
		Y,ZZP_TenY)										
		HoursContractAll	,013	,005	,178	2,476	,014					
		SUM(OrgCom1All,OrgCo	,064	,022	,206	2,872	,005					
		m2All,OrgCom3All,OrgC										
		om4All)										
a. Dependent Variable: MI	. Dependent Variable: MEAN(MEANCPE1,MEANCPE2,MEANCPE3)											

				N	lodel Summai	у						
Permanent	Model	R	R	Adjusted R	Std. Error of		Cha	nge Statis	tics			
			Square	Square	the	R Square	F	df1	df2	Sig. F		
					Estimate	Change	Change			Change		
	1	,284ª	,081	,076	,98373	,081	16,724	2	380	,000		
	2	,409 <sup>b</sup>	,167	,160	,93776	,086	39,171	1	379	,000		
Niet	1	,214ª	,046	,035	1,12822	,046	4,395	2	183	,014		
permanent	2	,267⁵	,071	,056	1,11620	,025	4,965	1	182	,027		
Wel	1	,182ª	,033	,009	1,06528	,033	1,387	2	81	,256		
permanent	2	,304 <sup>b</sup>	,093	,059	1,03836	,060	5,255	1	80	,025		
a. Predictors:	(Constan	t), HoursC	ContractAll,									
SUM(TenOrg)	Y,Agency	_TenOrg	/,Detach_1	enOrgY,Buss	Owner_TenOr	gY,ZZP_TenY	()					
b. Predictors:	b. Predictors: (Constant), HoursContractAll,											
SUM(TenOrgY,Agency_TenOrgY,Detach_TenOrgY,BussOwner_TenOrgY,ZZP_TenY),												
SUM(OrgCom	1All,Org	Com2All,C	rgCom3Al	I,OrgCom4All)	)							

			ANOVA	1			
Permanent	Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	1	Regression	32,368	2	16,184	16,724	,000 <sup>b</sup>
		Residual	367,734	380	,968		
		Total	400,101	382			
	2	Regression	66,814	3	22,271	25,326	,000 <sup>c</sup>
		Residual	333,287	379	,879		
		Total	400,101	382			
Niet permanent	1	Regression	11,189	2	5,594	4,395	,014 <sup>b</sup>
		Residual	232,939	183	1,273		
		Total	244,128	185			
	2	Regression	17,374	3	5,791	4,648	,004 <sup>c</sup>
		Residual	226,754	182	1,246		
		Total	244,128	185			
Wel permanent	1	Regression	3,148	2	1,574	1,387	,256 <sup>b</sup>
		Residual	91,921	81	1,135		
		Total	95,069	83			
	2	Regression	8,814	3	2,938	2,725	,050 <sup>c</sup>
		Residual	86,255	80	1,078		
		Total	95,069	83			

a. Dependent Variable: MEAN(MEANCPE1,MEANCPE2,MEANCPE3)

b. Predictors: (Constant), HoursContractAll,

SUM(TenOrgY,Agency\_TenOrgY,Detach\_TenOrgY,BussOwner\_TenOrgY,ZZP\_TenY)

c. Predictors: (Constant), HoursContractAll,

 ${\tt SUM}({\tt TenOrgY}, {\tt Agency\_TenOrgY}, {\tt Detach\_TenOrgY}, {\tt BussOwner\_TenOrgY}, {\tt ZZP\_TenY}),$ 

SUM(OrgCom1All,OrgCom2All,OrgCom3All,OrgCom4All)

	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>													
Permanent	Mod	el	Unstand Coeffi	dardized cients	Standardi zed Coefficie nts	t	Sig.	Co	rrelation	S	Colline Statis	earity stics		
			В	Std. Error	Beta			Zero- order	Partia I	Part	Tolera nce	VIF		
	1	(Constant)	3,594	,138		25,97 5	,000							
		SUM(TenOrgY,A gency_TenOrgY, Detach_TenOrg Y,BussOwner_T enOrgY,ZZP_Te nY)	-,006	,005	-,061	- 1,245	,214	-,043	-,064	-,061	,996	1,004		
		HoursContractAll	,024	,004	,282	5,717	,000	,278	,281	,281	,996	1,004		
	2	(Constant) SUM(TenOrgY,A gency_TenOrgY, Detach_TenOrg Y,BussOwner_T enOrgY,ZZP_Te nY)	1,959 -,008	,293 ,005	-,078	6,698 - 1,667	,000 ,096	-,043	-,085	-,078	,992	1,008		
		HoursContractAll	,019	,004	,225	4,713	,000	,278	,235	,221	,961	1,041		
		SUM(OrgCom1A II,OrgCom2AlI,Or gCom3AlI,OrgCo m4AlI)	,086	,014	,299	6,259	,000	,337	,306	,293	,960	1,042		
Niet permanent	1	(Constant)	4,074	,121		33,72 1	,000							

		SUM(TenOrgY,A	-,034	,017	-,141	-	,053	-,126	-,142	-,140	,993	1,007
		gency_TenOrgY,				1,946						
		Detach_TenOrg										
		Y,BussOwner_T										
		enOrgY,ZZP_Te										
		nY)										
		HoursContractAll	,013	,005	,174	2,397	,018	,162	,174	,173	,993	1,007
	2	(Constant)	3,257	,386		8,445	,000					
		SUM(TenOrgY,A	-,036	,017	-,150	-	,039	-,126	-,153	-,149	,990	1,010
		gency_TenOrgY,				2,084						
		Detach_TenOrg										
		Y,BussOwner_T										
		enOrgY,ZZP_Te										
		nY)										
		HoursContractAll	,013	,005	,175	2,446	,015	,162	,178	,175	,992	1,008
		SUM(OrgCom1A	,045	,020	,159	2,228	,027	,150	,163	,159	,997	1,003
		II,OrgCom2All,Or										
		gCom3All,OrgCo										
		m4All)										
Wel	1	(Constant)	4,790	,266		18,03	,000					
permanent						5						
		SUM(TenOrgY,A	,022	,030	,083	,743	,460	,113	,082	,081	,957	1,045
		gency_TenOrgY,										
		Detach_TenOrg										
		Y,BussOwner T										
		enOrgY,ZZP_Te										
		nY)										
		HoursContractAll	-,011	,009	-,146	-	,196	-,163	-,143	-,143	,957	1,045
						1,304						
	2	(Constant)	3,333	,686		4,855	,000					
		SUM(TenOrgY,A	,016	,029	,058	,533	,595	,113	,060	,057	,948	1,055
		gency_TenOrgY,										
		Detach_TenOrg										
		Y,BussOwner_T										
		enOrgY,ZZP_Te										
		nY)										
		HoursContractAll	-,015	,008	-,189	-	,090	-,163	-,188	-,182	,929	1,077
						1 714						

		SUM(OrgCom1A	,079	,034	,248	2,292	,025	,223	,248	,244	,966	1,035
		II,OrgCom2All,Or										
		gCom3All,OrgCo										
		m4All)										
a Dependent Variable: MEAN(MEANCPE1 MEANCPE2 MEANCPE3)												

Model Summary <sup>a</sup>												
Mijn contract bij	Mod	R	R	Adjusted R	Std. Error	Change Statistics						
deze organisatie is	el		Square	Square	of the	R Square	F	df1	df2	Sig. F		
					Estimate	Change	Change			Change		
een vast contract /	1	,326 <sup>b</sup>	,106	,101	,97255	,106	20,486	2	345	,000		
vast dienstverband	2	,442 <sup>c</sup>	,195	,188	,92432	,089	37,945	1	344	,000		
een tijdelijk contract	1	,177⁵	,031	,021	1,09826	,031	2,952	2	182	,055		
/ tijdelijk	2	,271°	,074	,058	1,07702	,042	8,250	1	181	,005		
dienstverband												
a. There are no valid cases in one or more split files. Statistics cannot be computed.												
b. Predictors: (Const	b. Predictors: (Constant), Hoelang bent u voor deze organisatie werkzaam? - Jaren, Hoeveel uren per week werkt u? - Aantal											
uren per week op ba	sis van	uw contra	act									

c. Predictors: (Constant), Hoelang bent u voor deze organisatie werkzaam? - Jaren, Hoeveel uren per week werkt u? - Aantal uren per week op basis van uw contract, SUM(ComOrg1,ComOrg2,ComOrg3,ComOrg4)

				Coet	ficients <sup>a,b</sup>							
Mijn contract bij	Model		Unstandardized		Standard	t	Sig.	Correlations		าร	Collinearity	
deze organisatie			Coeffi	cients	ized					Statistics		stics
is					Coefficie							
					nts							
			В	Std.	Beta			Zero-	Partia	Part	Tolera	VIF
				Error				order	I		nce	
een vast	1	(Constant)	3,435	,155		22,11	,000					
contract / vast						7						
dienstverband		Hoeveel uren	,030	,005	,322	6,309	,000	,318	,322	,321	,997	1,003
		per week werkt										
		u? - Aantal uren										
		per week op										
		basis van uw										
		contract										
		Hoelang bent u	-,007	,005	-,072	-	,161	-,055	-,075	-,071	,997	1,003
		voor deze				1,404						
		organisatie										
		werkzaam? -										
		Jaren										
	2	(Constant)	1,630	,328		4,970	,000					

		Hoeveel uren per week werkt u? - Aantal uren	,024	,005	,265	5,381	,000	,318	,279	,260	,963	1,038
		basis van uw contract										
		Hoelang bent u voor deze organisatie werkzaam? -	-,009	,005	-,088	- 1,806	,072	-,055	-,097	-,087	,994	1,006
		Jaren SUM(ComOrg1, ComOrg2,Com Org3,ComOrg4)	,096	,016	,304	6,160	,000	,348	,315	,298	,962	1,040
een tijdelijk contract / tijdelijk	1	(Constant)	4,021	,143		28,18 5	,000					
dienstverband		Hoeveel uren per week werkt u? - Aantal uren per week op basis van uw contract	,013	,005	,178	2,427	,016	,175	,177	,177	,991	1,010
		Hoelang bent u voor deze organisatie werkzaam? - Jaren	,012	,033	,026	,358	,721	,009	,026	,026	,991	1,010
	2	(Constant)	2,816	,442		6,370	,000					
		Hoeveel uren per week werkt u? - Aantal uren per week op basis van uw contract	,013	,005	,178	2,476	,014	,175	,181	,177	,991	1,010
		Hoelang bent u voor deze organisatie werkzaam? - Jaren	,017	,033	,036	,504	,615	,009	,037	,036	,988	1,012

		SUM(ComOrg1, ComOrg2,Com	,064	,022	,206	2,872	,005	,205	,209	,205	,998	1,002
		Org3,ComOrg4)										
a. There are no va	a. There are no valid cases in one or more split files. Statistics cannot be computed.											
b. Dependent Variable: MEAN(MEANCPE1,MEANCPE2,MEANCPE3)												

	Mijn contract bij deze organisatie is											
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative							
					Percent							
Valid	een vast contract / vast dienstverband	399	46,3	58,8	58,8							
	een tijdelijk contract / tijdelijk dienstverband	280	32,5	41,2	100,0							
	Total	679	78,9	100,0								
Missing	-999	182	21,1									
Total		861	100,0									

	Mijn contract via dit uitzendburo is											
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative							
					Percent							
Valid	een vast contract / vast	6	,7	15,0	15,0							
	een tijdelijk contract / tijdelijk dienstverband	34	3,9	85,0	100,0							
	Total	40	4,6	100,0								
Missing	-999	821	95,4									
Total		861	100,0									

	Mijn contract via dit detacheringsburo is											
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative							
					Percent							
Valid	een vast contract / vast dienstverband	3	,3	8,8	8,8							
	een tijdelijk contract / tijdelijk dienstverband	31	3,6	91,2	100,0							
	Total	34	3,9	100,0								
Missing	-999	827	96,1									
Total		861	100,0									

	Finished												
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative								
					Percent								
Valid	False	175	20,3	20,3	20,3								
	True	686	79,7	79,7	100,0								
	Total	861	100,0	100,0									