

Unfinished Sympathy:  
Inducements and Expectations of client organizations regarding agency work

University of Twente

# Unfinished Sympathy:

## INDUCEMENTS AND EXPECTATIONS OF CLIENT ORGANIZATIONS REGARDING AGENCY WORK

Sarah Lehmann

29.01.2010

Enschede

## Table of content

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Samenvatting</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1: Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1: Problem specification	6
1.2 Scientific Relevance	7
1.3 Social Relevance	7
1.4 Composition	8
<b>2: Theoretical Background</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Psychological contract theory and social exchange theory	9
2.3 Employee-organization relationship strategy (Tsui et al., 1997)	10
2.4 Employee-organization relationship strategy and agency work	11
2.5 Expectations and Inducements of client organizations	12
<b>3: Method</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1 Introduction	14
3.2 Qualitative Method: The Interview	14
3.3 Quantitative Method: The Questionnaire	15
3.4 Participants	16
3.5 Procedure of Data Collection	16
3.6 Data Analysis	17
<b>4: Results</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1 Introduction	18
4.2 Organization A	18
4.3 Investments of Organization A	18
4.4 Expectations of Organization A	20
4.5 Conclusion for Organization A	21
4.6 Organization B	21
4.7 Investments of Organization B	22
4.8 Expectations of Organization B	25

<b>4.9 Conclusion for Organization B</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>4.10 Organization C</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>4.11 Investments of Organization C</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>4.12 Expectations of Organization C</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>4.13 Conclusion for Organization C</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>5: Discussion, Limitations and Suggestions</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>6: References</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>7: Appendixes</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>7.1 Interview protocol and questionnaire in Dutch</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>7.2 Interview protocol and questionnaire in German</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>7.3 Tables</b>	<b>52</b>

## **Abstract**

This thesis aims to investigate the client organizations perspective regarding agency work in terms of offered inducements and expected agency worker contributions. By using the employee-organization relationship framework as proposed by Tsui, Pearce, Porter and Tripoli (1997), the assumption by Tsui and Wu (2005), that agency workers are either approached under the quasi-spot contract or the underinvestment approach and not under the mutual investment and overinvestment approach, is empirically investigated.

By conducting semi-structured interviews and a questionnaire information is obtained by a sample of 8 direct supervisors and managers in three client organizations. The results of the performed analysis leads to a twofold conclusion: client organizations in this sample indeed handle the quasi-spot contract or the underinvestment approach for their agency workers. But the interviews also show that client organizations do not simply replace the traditional, commitment and loyalty based employment relationship with a purely economic exchange relationship. Instead, tenure and vocational qualification clearly affects the offered investments in and the expectations about agency workers. Agency workers are therefore not perceived and treated as a homogenous group.

## **Samenvatting**

Deze these heeft het doel de perspectieven van inleners ten aanzien van uitzendwerk in termen van investeringen en verwachtingen te bestuderen. Daarbij wordt gebruik gemaakt van het “employee-organization relationship” raamwerk van Tsui, Pearce, Porter en Tripoli (1997). Met dit raamwerk worden de verwachtingen en de investeringen van inleners gecategoriseerd. Daarbij wordt de assumptie van Tsui en Wu (2005), dat inleners uitzendkrachten alleen onder de quasi-spot contract of de underinvestment benadering behandelen en niet onder de mutual investment of overinvestment benadering, empirisch onderzocht.

Door gebruik te maken van semi-gestructureerde interviews en een vragenlijst, is informatie van een steekproef van 8 directe leidinggevende en managers in drie inlenersbedrijven verkregen. De resultaten van de analyses leiden tot een tweevoudige conclusie: inleners in dit steekproef gebruiken inderdaad de quasi-spot contract of de underinvestment benadering voor hun uitzendkrachten. Maar de interviews maken ook duidelijk, dat inleners de traditionele, op betrokkenheid en loyaliteit gebaseerde relatie niet door een puur economische ruil relatie vervangen. In plaats daarvan, beïnvloed het verblijf van uitzendkrachten in de bedrijven en hun beroepsmatige qualificatie het aanbieden van investeringen en de verwachtingen in uitzendkrachten. Uitzendkrachten worden daarom niet als een homogene groep waargenomen en behandeld.

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1 Problem specification**

Generally, the world of work becomes more complex. Faced with increased global competitive pressure, organizations try to seek adequate ways in maintaining flexibility to remain successful. Achieving flexibility can have many facets (see for example Reilly, 1998), but all forms are established with the general goal to enable efficient and effective responding in times of changing circumstances. A frequently initiated response in those times is the implementation of numerical flexibility, in which the numbers of employees remain elastic. Elasticity can thereby realized with differentiated employment contracts, such as agency work (Reilly, 1998). Agency work is in this respect a unique work arrangement, because the organization at hand is not the employer of the agency worker. Instead, the agency worker is employed by the agency, which deploys the agency workers to the client organizations. In the client organizations the agency workers work under the premises and direction of the client (Coyle-Shapiro et al., 2006b). This so-called triangular employment allows the client organization to externalize some administrative control and responsibility to the agency, while maximizing the flexible usage of agency workers (Reilly, 1998).

The uniqueness of triangular employment stimulated a huge amount of scientific interest (see for examples: Connelly et. al 2006; Coyle-Shapiro et. al, 2006a; Gallagher & McLean Parks, 2001; Koene et al., 2005; Torika, 2003). The main body of research takes the perspective of the agency worker, in order to describe their perception about agency work as well as the reasons to engage in this form of employment. The results indicate, that preference of agency work is explained with a better life-work balance (Casey & Alach, 2004; Reilly, 1998), acquisition of additional skills, and maximizing of earnings (Reilly, 1998). In contrast, other research findings show (see for examples Mangum et al., 1985 and Segal et al., 1997) that agency work leads to labour market segmentation into low wage and less stable agency jobs with little opportunities for career advancement.

Although these research findings are useful in understanding the employment relationship from the agency workers perspective, another important perspective seems to be largely ignored: the perspective of the client organization. What are the expectations of client organizations regarding agency work? Are the expectations based upon concepts like commitment and loyalty? Or are the expectations limited in a way of getting the job done and not more? And in order to fulfill those expectations, what kinds of investments do client organizations offer for agency workers?

This investigation focuses therefore on the client organization perspective regarding agency work and uses the employee-organization relationship framework as proposed by Tsui, Pearce, Porter and Tripoli (1997) and Tsui & Wu (2005). In her initial work about employment approaches, Tsui et al. (1997) distinguishes four different employee-organization relationship approaches: mutual investment, quasi-spot contract, underinvestment and overinvestment. As has been stated by Tsui and Wu (2005), client organization handles either a quasi-spot contract or an underinvestment approach for agency workers. Both approaches may be characterized as involving short-term interests, restricted investments and expectations by the client organizations (Tsui et al., 1997). This investigation tries to test the assumption of Tsui and Wu (2005) by investigating the employee-organization relationship approaches of client organizations regarding agency work. Therefore, human resource managers and direct supervisors as representatives of the client organization are participating in this investigation and their expectations about agency work and their investments in agency work are assessed via semi-structured interviews and a short questionnaire aiming to map their expectations.

## **1.2 Scientific relevance**

As has been proposed in the introduction, the perspective of client organizations regarding agency work is not heavily assessed in past research activities. Investigating on this topic might therefore extend scientifically the knowledge about agency work, and enables a more general understanding of the concept agency work and its implementation in different organizational contexts. In addition, the statement of Tsui and Wu (2005) is tested, which allows to proof if the traditional, loyalty and commitment-based employment relationship is indeed replaced by a purely economic and short-term employment relationship for agency workers. Investigating on this topic might result in a description of what people within agency work indeed receive by their client organizations and what they are expected to contribute in return.

In order to complete the picture about the triangular employment relationship, the perspective of the agencies should be taken into account in future research activities.

## **1.3 Social Relevance**

The federal government of Germany introduced the legislative amendment respectively agency work (Hartz-proposals) in order to make better usage of the German employment potential and to increase the chances of unemployed people to find a new job. As a

consequence, at the end of 2008, 637 000 people were employed as agency workers in Germany (Statistics of the employment office, 2009), which is an increase of 405 000 agency workers compared to 1998. In opposition to the federal government of Germany, trade unions are sceptical about agency work and report the fear that previously negotiated work is replaced by cheap and less secure workplaces (Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund, 2003). This different interpretation of the concept agency work indicates that its image depends clearly on the kind of perspective someone has. In analysing the perspective of client organizations in terms of expectations and investments regarding agency work, this investigation may create a more general understanding about the concept agency work and may allow a correction of the held fears by trade unions. Additionally, the position of the single agency worker may be strengthened more generally.

#### **1.4 Composition**

In the second chapter the theoretical background of the investigation is specified. After shortly introducing the concept of psychological contract and the mechanism of social exchange theory, the employee-organization relationship approaches as proposed by Tsui et al. (1997) are described in detail. In the following, the relationship between employee-organization relationship framework and agency work is specified as indicated by Tsui and Wu (2005). Finally, the employee-organization relationship approaches are defined in terms of offered human resource (HR) practices and kind of expectations.

In the third chapter, the used methods, semi-structured interviews and the questionnaire are described. Additionally, the recruitment of participants, the procedure of data collection and the data analysis are specified.

In the fourth chapter, the analysis of the interviews and the questionnaire are presented for Organization A, B and C, which results in the categorization of each organization within the employee-organization relationship framework.

In the fifth chapter, the discussion of the obtained results, the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research activities are presented.



## **2 Theoretical Background**

### **2.1 Introduction**

In order to categorize the client organization perspective regarding agency work within the employee-organization relationship framework (Tsui et al., 1997) necessary theoretical concepts are introduced in this chapter. First of all, the concept of psychological contract and the mechanism of social exchange theory are shortly described. This enables an overview of the nature of exchange relationships and the involved expectations within the employment relationship and builds the connection with the employee-organization relationship framework as proposed by Tsui et al. (1997) and Tsui and Wu (2005). By describing the conceptualization of the framework and the four employee-organization relationship approaches in detail, this chapter finally establishes a classification scheme for investigating the client organization perspective regarding agency work within the employee-organization relationship framework.

### **2.2 Psychological contract theory and social exchange theory**

Following Rousseau (1990a, page 390), psychological contracts are “an individual's beliefs regarding reciprocal obligations. Beliefs become contractual when the individual believes that he or she owes the employer certain contributions (e.g. hard work, loyalty, sacrifices) in return for certain inducements (e.g. high pay, job security).”

Thereby, a distinction between relational and transactional obligations is established (Rousseau, 1990b): Transactional obligations are best described as economic in which short term inducements are exchanged for well specified contributions by the employee. Relational obligations are more social, in which long term inducements are exchanged for broad and open-ended contributions on sides of both employee and employer. Thereby, time frame and tangibility of the obligations (Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1993) are the defining characteristics of the established psychological contract.

Although psychological contract theory enables to understand employment relationships by examining the types of obligations that organizations and employees promised each other (Janssens, 2003), psychological contract theory is clearly restricted upon the perception of the obligations in taking the perspective of the individual employee. On the contrary, this investigation takes the perspective of client organizations in investigating the investments in and the expectations about agency workers. In order to analyze the perspective of client organizations, the mechanism of social exchange theory are taken into account. By

identically distinguishing between economic (transactional) and social (relational) resources as kind of exchanges within the employment relationship (Blau, 1964), the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) explains the development of the exchange relationship for both employee and employer. The norm of reciprocity is defined by Robinson et al. (1994, page 139) as “one party’s receipt of a benefit obligates another party to pay a cost.” Thereby, the involved parties try to reach a balance between inducements offered and inducement received (Blau, 1964). As a consequence, the exchange relationship between organization and employee becomes more extensive over time, in which the number of obligations, as well as the diversity of the obligations exchanged increases (Robinson et al., 1994, as referring to Blau, 1964; Homans, 1961; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). This clearly indicates the effect of tenure on the employment relationship. Both types of exchange relationships are further clarified in the following paragraphs.

### **2.3 Employee-organization relationship strategy (Tsui et al., 1997)**

The term employee-organization-relationship strategy is used by Tsui et al. (1997) to “capture the employer’s perspective on the employment relationship” and “includes the employer’s expectations about specific contributions that it desires from employees and the inducements that it uses to effect the desired contributions” (Tsui et. al 1997, page 1091). As indicated by Tsui et al. (1997) an underlying mechanism of the employment relationship is the previously introduced social exchange framework (Blau, 1964) and the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). In connecting the kind of exchanges (inducements and expected employee contributions as being either economic or social), the established employee-organization relationship strategy of the employer can be categorized within four approaches: the mutual investment, the quasi-spot contract, the underinvestment and the overinvestment approach (Tsui et al., 1997). The defining characteristic of each single approach is thereby the relative balance or imbalance between expected employee contribution and offered inducements of the employer.

The mutual investment approach and the quasi-spot contract approach are balanced approaches. The quasi-spot contract is a highly circumscribed employee-organization relationship approach relying on economic exchange: the employer offers short-term, purely economic inducements in exchange for well-specified contributions by the employee (Tsui et al. 1997). On the contrary, the mutual investment approach relies on social exchange, in which the employer offers unspecified, broad and open-ended inducements, including considerations of the employees’ well being and training and expects reciprocity on the side

of the employee in terms of loyalty and commitment (Tsui et al. 1997). Balance within both approaches is reached through the matching of employee expected contributions and offered inducements by the employer.

In contrast to the quasi-spot contract and the mutual investment approaches, the underinvestment and the overinvestment approaches are unbalanced approaches. The underinvestment approach is best described as demanding broad and open-ended obligations from the employee, while the employer offers only restricted inducements (Tsui et al. 1997). Within the overinvestment approach, the employer offers unspecified, broad and open ended inducements, without expecting broad and open-ended obligations on the side of the employee (Tsui et al., 1997).

By testing the effect of the distinct employee-organization relationship approaches upon employee attitudes and performance, Tsui et al. (1997) indicates that the mutual investment approach achieves the best outcomes in terms of core task performance, affective commitment and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). The level of affective commitment and OCB is similar in employees who are approached under the overinvestment approach, but their performance on core tasks is lower when compared to the performance levels within the mutual investment approach (Tsui et al., 1997). In contrast, the quasi-spot contract approach is associated with lower performance levels, lower OCB and lower affective commitment (Tsui et al. 1997) and the underinvestment approaches is associated with even poorer outcomes on both performance and attitude measures. The research results by Tsui et al. (1997) indicate therefore clear evidence in establishing the effect of the employee-organization relationship approaches upon performance and attitudes in employees.

In order to establish a relationship between the employee-organization relationship approaches of client organizations and agency work, the article of Tsui and Wu (2005) is introduced in the following paragraph.

#### **2.4 Employee-organization relationship strategy and agency work**

Tsui and Wu (2005) investigate the effect of the distinct employee-organization relationship approaches on the efficacy and effectiveness of organizations. Within their article, Tsui and Wu (2005) report that the goal of organizations to remain flexible leads them to develop a new employment relationship, in which loyalty and commitment based employment is replaced by an economic relationship involving relatively well defined duties. The investments an employer offers within this new employment relationship are indicated in terms of challenging jobs and fixed compensation packages (Tsui and Wu, 2005, page 115)

while expecting high levels of job performance on the side of employees. This new employment relationship is categorized by Tsui and Wu (2005) as belonging to the quasi-spot contract and the underinvestment approach and more importantly for this investigation, Tsui and Wu (2005) state that the new employment relationship is used for agency workers. Stated within the context of this investigation, Tsui and Wu (2005) indicate that client organizations handle either the quasi-spot contract or the underinvestment approach for their agency workers.

The statement by Tsui and Wu (2005) about the employee-organization relationship approaches of client organizations regarding agency work can be challenged because of two reasons. First of all, the investigation of Tsui and Wu (2005) is based upon a Chinese sample and their findings might therefore not be transferable to another context due to cultural differences. Secondly, the assumption that agency workers are either approached under the quasi-spot contract or the underinvestment approach remains untested by Tsui and Wu (2005). Instead, Tsui and Wu (2005) merely deduct that agency workers are subjected under the quasi-spot contract or the underinvestment approach based on the fact that employers want to maintain a high amount of flexibility. In contrast to their assumption, Torka and Schyns (2009) report that agency workers tenure within a client organization affects the offering of HR-practices and consequently, the level of agency workers commitment. This finding is clearly in contradiction with the unified quasi-spot contract and underinvestment approaches for agency workers as indicated by Tsui and Wu (2005), because commitment as an attitude outcome is only to be expected within the mutual investment and the overinvestment approaches (Tsui et al. 1997). In analyzing the investments of client organizations regarding their agency workers it is therefore additionally important to include tenure of agency workers within the client organization, because tenure might affect the offered inducements of client organizations toward agency workers. To investigate the effect of tenure a distinction is made between short term, medium term and long term usage of agency workers within a client organization.

## **2.5 Expectations and inducements of Client organizations**

In order to categorize the perspective of client organization regarding agency work within the employee-organization relationship framework (Tsui et al., 1997) the inducements a client organization offers toward agency workers and the expectations a client organization has about its agency workers need to be specified.

Unfinished Sympathy:  
Inducements and Expectations of client organizations regarding agency work

The expectations of client organizations can be divided into transactional and relational expectations (Janssen, 1997; Oudehoven, 2003). Transactional expectations are economic and focused on the fulfillment of narrowly described tasks, while relational expectations include the exchange of social-emotional factors, such as loyalty, commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB).

The inducements a client organization is willing to utilize toward agency workers are reflected by offered human resource (HR) practices. HR-practices are defined by Rousseau (1995, page 36) as “structural signals regarding the organizations intentions towards their employees” and can be considered as sending messages regarding the skills and competencies that the organization is expecting from its employees. These HR-practices include aspects such as salary, financial benefits, performance review, training (Rousseau, 1995), development and promotion (Benson, 2006) as well as the permission in participating in decision-making (Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1985).

Therefore, if client organizations offer more than financial compensation and well-defined tasks but offer inducements that point to long-term investments such as development and promotion opportunities and expected agency worker contributions are focused upon relational expectations such as commitment and loyalty, the mutual investment approach is assumed. If client organizations offer investments which in contrast are focused upon well-defined tasks, fixed compensation packages and the expected agency worker contributions are focused upon transactional expectations, the quasi-spot contract is assumed. If client organizations offer the same investments as within the mutual investment approach, while expected agency worker contributions are focused upon transactional expectations the overinvestment approach is assumed. If client organizations offer the same investments as within the quasi-spot contract, while expected agency workers contribution are focused upon relational expectations, the underinvestment approach is assumed.

<b>Inducements</b>	<b>Expectations</b>		
		<b>Transactional</b>	<b>Relational</b>
	<b>High</b>	Overinvestment approach	Mutual investment approach
<b>Low</b>	Quasi-spot contract approach	Underinvestment approach	

Table 1: Categorization of the employee-organization relationship approaches according to Tsui et al. (1997)

### **3 Method**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

In order to analyze the perspective of client organizations, information is obtained via interviews and a short questionnaire. The combination of qualitative and quantitative methods is known as methodical triangulation and enables to balance out the weaknesses of a single method by drawing on the strength of both (Bryman, 2006). Using the interview as qualitative component to gain in-depth information of a phenomenon (Schwab, 2005), the questionnaire as quantitative component is used to verify the obtained information by assessing more specified indicators of the phenomenon (Blumer, 1954). In addition, methodological triangulation enables the comparison of different perceptions of the same subject (Mayring, 2001). Both methods and their development are described in detail in the following paragraphs.

#### **3.2 Qualitative method: The Interview**

Generally, a distinction can be made between unstructured, semi-structured and structured interviews. Unstructured interviews are associated with a high amount of flexibility (Schwab, 2005). Flexibility is important in the assessment of complex phenomena but increases the risk to obtain a huge amount of information which is not directly related to the topic of interest. In contrast, structured interviews restrict the range of responses by maintaining the kind and sequence of questions. This avoids the problem of receiving non-related information, but increases the risk to miss important aspects. To avoid these threats and to combine the strengths of both, this investigation performs semi-structured interviews. An interview protocol is used, in which the general structure of the interview is outlined to ensure that all questions of interest are asked. The structure remains flexible, so that the interviewer can switch ordering of question if a topic of interest arises spontaneously from the answer received from participants (Shaw et al., 2005). Further ensures the interview protocol that all participants are exposed to the same kind of questions, which is essential for the comparison among interviews.

The interview protocol was developed in cooperation with the tutor of this investigation and a group of students who also investigate on the topic “Unfinished Sympathy” as part of their Bachelor thesis. After reading related literature, a group discussion leads to the formulation of the content of the interview protocol. In a role-play the applicability and the implementation of the interview was tested. Within a group discussion,

certain alliteration of the interview protocol were made, which leads to the final version of the interview.

Basically, the interview consists of four parts: demographic characteristics of the participant (e.g. function, age, and tenure), contextual organizational factors, investments and expectations of client organizations. Within the contextual organizational factors, participants are asked to indicate the predominant duration of the agency work relationships, in which a distinction is made between short (some hours, days, weeks), medium (weeks, or months) and long (six months and longer, or repeated usage of the same agency worker). Agency workers are grouped within these different time frame categories (if applying to the organization) and participants are asked to indicate their investments and expectations regarding category of agency worker. The investments of client organizations in agency workers are investigated among seven HR-practices: 1) Selection, 2) Salary, 3) Financial benefits, 4) Work content, 5) Work environment, 6) Development and promotion, and 7) Industrial relations. Investments in regular employees are likewise investigated and are used as control group. In the fourth and last part of the interview, participants are asked to indicate their expectations about regular employees and category of agency workers without specifying any response category.

### **3.3 Quantitative method: the Questionnaire**

The questionnaire consists of statements regarding the expectations a client organization has about regular employees and its agency workers. In order to categorize the expectations of client organizations within the employee-organization relationship framework (Tsui et al., 1997) three different expectation-scales are assessed: transactional expectations, relational, task-related expectations and relational, non-task related expectations. The items for measuring transactional expectations are retrieved from the “Conscientiousness Scale“ (Zorgvuldigheidsschaal) from Van Oudehoven (2003), while the items relating to relational, task-related expectation are retrieved from Jannsen (1997). The items measuring relational, non-task related expectations were developed by our Tutor. Participants are asked to indicate per category of agency worker (short, medium, long) their degree of agreement with the statements. The response scale ranges from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree.

Both the interview and the questionnaire were originally formulated in Dutch. In order to analyse the investments and expectations of client organizations in Germany, both were translated into German. To maintain reliability and validity of both versions, a back translation was performed (Greco et al., 1987). To further increase the accuracy of the results, a member check was performed. Respondents were asked to check their answers by reading

the interview protocol, in order to avoid misinterpretations and to enable adaptations of the answers.

Both interview protocol and questionnaire can be found in the appendix of this investigation.

### **3.4 Participants**

Participating client organizations were obtained via a series of steps. First of all, the target group of the investigation was focused to the Metal Sector. The Federation of Metalworking industry in Dortmund and Münsterland was contacted in order to obtain names of client organizations. Due to the economic crisis, both federations were not able to provide information. Therefore, internet-databases were used, with the result that 70 client organizations received a letter, in which the study at hand was introduced and the offer to participate was made. A week later the organizations were called and their interest in participating was evaluated. Most organizations indicated that due to lack of time and the economic crisis they are not able to take part in the study, but two organizations agreed to take part and appointments were scheduled. The rejection rate of 98% made it necessary to extent the target group of client organizations. Therefore, the requirements to take part in this study were minimized upon “having experience with agency workers” and “belonging to the region Münsterland”. Based on personal contacts, it was possible to find a third client organization.

In total, 8 interviews in three client organizations were conducted. In all three organizations the perspectives of at least one direct supervisor and one manager are assessed. Organization C additionally provided the perspective of a second manager and the perspective of the head of the production department.

### **3.5 Procedure of Data collection**

In order to obtain the information from direct supervisors and managers, appointments were scheduled to perform face-to-face interviews. The interviews were conducted during the regular working time of the participants and took place in the offices of the participants or in conference rooms. An exception was made for the direct supervisor belonging to Organization C, who was interviewed at home. This participant was retrieved via private contacts. All interviews were audio-taped and transcribed literally. At the beginning of each interview, anonymity and confidentiality of the obtained information was assured, so that neither the participant, nor the client organization becomes identifiable based upon the



retrieved information. After conducting the interview and the questionnaires it was possible to make guiding tours in two of the three client organizations, in which different working floors and the general organization of work became visible. The expressions of these tours are incorporated in the description of the organizations in Chapter 4. Only in Organization A the guiding tour was due to lack of time impossible.

### **3.6 Data Analysis**

In order to assess the investments and expectations of client organizations regarding agency work the analysis of responses includes a series of steps, which finally leads to a categorization within the employee-organization relationship approaches as proposed by Tsui et al. (1997).

First of all, the investments of client organizations are assessed. Among the seven HR-practices, differences between agency workers and regular employees are described.

As a second step, the expectations of participants in regular employees and agency workers are compared as indicated during the interview. The assessment of expectations is completed by analysing the scores on the questionnaire with the help of tables (table 2 and table 3 in the appendix). In this analysis a comparison between type of expectation and type of employee (regular employees and category of agency workers) was performed. This leads to a within and between participant analysis of expectations in agency workers and enables a comparison among client organization. Further is it analyzed if the expectations as indicated during the interview are related to the responses given in the questionnaire.

## **4 Results**

### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents the results. After briefly introducing each participating organization, the investments and expectations of client organizations in agency workers are described in detail. Based on the results of the qualitative and quantitative analysis, each organization is categorized within the employee-organization relationship framework as proposed by Tsui et al. (1997).

### **4.2 Organization A:**

Organization A is active in the sector of structural steel engineering and was established in 1973. Organization A can be categorized as a small, family-owned company. In 2008, the firm employed 30 employees, from which 6 up to 7 were agency workers. In 2009, due to the economic crisis, no agency workers were employed. Generally, agency workers are used as fitters and welders for handling peaks in production loads. The interviewees indicate that agency workers are used only short-term (a day, up to 3 weeks).

Interviews were conducted with the company manager of the organization and a direct supervisor of agency workers. The company manager is 46 years old and has 5 years tenure, the direct supervisor is 60 years old with 25 years tenure. Both interviewees gathered experience with agency workers (company manager and supervisor: both 12 years). Both interviewees indicated that they personally had never worked as agency workers.

### **4.3 Investments of Organization A**

The interviewees indicate that the organization selected in the past 4 agency workers to become regular members of the staff. The criteria for *selection* are described in terms of personal qualifications, know-how and impression gathered during the agency work relationship. The company manager explains without specifying a firm related example, that agency work is a stepping-stone only for high qualified agency workers, while agency work in low qualified positions can be regarded as “leave in the curriculum vitae”. The following statement reflects this:

*“Some of them are doing temporary agency work since 5 years. Then you ask yourself: Why? Yes, because they do not find any employment nowhere.”*

Unfinished Sympathy:  
Inducements and Expectations of client organizations regarding agency work

In terms of *salary*, the company manager explains that agency workers earn significantly less than regular employees. Although the company manager states that agency work can be seen as a form of modern slavery associated with price dumping and decreased quality standard, the organization never contacted agencies to adjust salary levels of agency workers. Instead, both participants state that financial obligations toward agency workers are per definition obligations of the agencies, thereby refusing responsibility. Within the same line of reasoning, agency workers receive no *financial benefits* from the organizations. While regular employees receive financial benefits, such as Christmas bonus, holiday pay and subsidies for buying working clothes, agency workers are not subjected by these policies. As the company manager explains it:

*“The only things we are offering are the material and the equipment.”*

In order to ensure security at the workplace, the company manager indicates that, if necessary, required work clothes are provided by the organization, although this is an obligation of the agency.

Both interviewees state, that the *work content* of agency workers and regular employees is identical, that is, both are used as fitters and welders. The only difference exists in terms of personal responsibility. While regular employees are capable to fulfil a function on their own, agency workers work always in a team with regular employees. Agency workers have therefore a supportive function in the process of fitting and welding.

Thereby, no differences exist between regular employees and agency workers in terms of *physical and social working conditions*. The direct supervisor states additionally that the integration in the team depends individually upon the agency worker. But generally, no distinction is made based on contract.

In terms of *developmental opportunities*, both interviewees report that agency workers are expected to own relevant vocational qualifications to fulfil obligated tasks, which makes training unnecessary. Training on-the-job is only offered, if new processes or projects are introduced. In contrast, regular employees receive developmental practices to extend their vocational qualifications, such as payments to make a lift truck license. Promotion within the hierarchy of the organization is indicated by both interviewees as restricted, because of the flat hierarchy of the organization more general. But committed and motivated regular employees are supported to extend their responsibilities and are entrusted with new projects. In contrast, agency workers can not promote within the hierarchy of the organization. Instead,

the company manager highlights that he is contractually obligated to ensure that agency workers are merely used as fitter and welder. As a result, agency workers remain in the same position, independent of personal possibilities and ambition.

In terms of *industrial relations* the manager states that group discussions are scheduled once a week but its realization depends on the need for action. In these group discussions the procedures of future projects are developed and regular employees in executive position are participating and express their ideas and opinions. Agency workers do not participate in these discussions, but are briefed about the developed procedure to maintain work-flow. Further, the direct supervisor explains, that agency workers engage in less idea generation than regular employees during regular working time and are less concerned with the general production-process:

*“Agency workers are concentrated on the things they have to do, and it is important that they make those things right.”*

Organization A has no works council due to the relative small size of the organization and the company manager additionally indicates, that a works council is unnecessary because consensus is reached between management and employees.

#### **4.4. Expectations of Organization A**

In the following paragraph, the expectations of the interviewees about agency workers and regular employees are presented as indicated during the interview and on the questionnaire. The scores of the questionnaire can be found in the appendix of this investigation (table 2 and table 3).

Both Interviewees report that they expect a full task fulfilment in technical and social manners from regular employees. This includes willingness to work hard, high self-motivation and adaptation with organizational manners. As the direct supervisor highlights, regular employees are expected to work overtime if necessary.

The company manager indicates during the interview that he has identical expectations about regular employees and agency workers. In contrast to his statement, scores on the questionnaire indicate, that he has lower relational expectations (task and non-task related) and even higher transactional expectations about agency workers than about regular employees (see table 2 in the appendix).

In contrast to the company manager, the direct supervisor differentiates between expectations: he expects from regular employees an increased engagement and commitment, while expecting from agency workers the fulfilment of their tasks. This statement is confirmed by the responses on the questionnaire: Concerning all three scales, he expects less from agency workers than regular employees and expectations are foremost transactional, while relational expectations (task and non-task related) are less important.

#### **4.5 Conclusion for Organization A**

Based on the analysis of the investments and the expectations in agency workers, Organization A is categorized within the employee-organization relationship framework (Tsui et al. 1997).

Agency workers in Organization A receive less salary, no financial benefits, are used only in supportive functions, receive no developmental and promotional opportunities and are not participating in group discussions. Expectations about agency workers are thereby predominately transactional. Therefore, it is concluded that Organization A approaches agency workers under the underinvestment approach tending toward a quasi-spot contract approach. Investments in agency workers are clearly restricted and especially in terms of salary, the organization takes no initiative to pay adequate salaries toward its agency workers.

#### **4.6 Organization B**

Organization B was established in 2000 and is an international operating manufacturer of high-tech investments goods and special machinery in the field of building materials, forging industry, process automation and special machinery. The manufacturing of the special machinery involves the development of innovative products, which are designed in the construction department and then manufactured as proto-types. During the guiding-tour, it was possible to take a look into the working halls of the organization. An internal communication system is installed to ensure efficient and effective cooperation between work groups. The development of innovative products results also in an increased cooperation between white-collar and blue-collar workers. The designers of new products follow the manufacturing process, in order to detect problems or construction faults and to re-ask the experience made with the new machinery.

Organization B employs 170 regular employees at the beginning of 2009. Due to the economic crisis and the decrease in order positions the firm introduced short-time work for its employees and fixed-term contracts were not renewed. As a consequence, 20 regular

employees with a fixed-term contract and all agency workers had to leave the firm. In 2008, up to 12 agency workers worked in the organization for medium or long term duration and were used as support for regular employees in times of increased production loads and for the completion of projects.

One direct supervisor and one manager were interviewed. The direct supervisor is the head of the construction department and has regular contact with agency workers who belong to the vocational group of engineers. These agency workers are obtained via agencies, which are specialized in engineers. The direct supervisor is 42 years old and has 3 years tenure and two years experience with agency workers. He used to be an agency worker for two month, in the field of machinery operator.

The second interview was conducted with the organizational coordinator. This manager is responsible for the successful and effective coordination of all departments. Based on his personal history as blue-collar worker, he still feels connected to the blue-collar employees, and his experience with agency workers are based on this time. The manager has 9 years tenure and has experience with agency workers since 5 years. He indicated that he never had worked as agency worker.

Different to Organization A, Organization B uses agency workers for medium and long durations and the agency workers differ in vocational qualification (engineers and blue-collar workers). This allows the evaluation of the possible effect of tenure and vocational qualification on the investments and expectations in agency workers. Therefore the answers from both interviewees are compared.

#### **4.7 Investments of Organization B**

Both Interviewees indicated that three to four agency workers were selected to become regular employees of the organization. The criteria for *selection* are stated in terms of personal engagement and qualification as well as the experience gathered during the agency work period.

In terms of *salary*, the direct supervisor states that the hourly rates of agency workers are on a similar level to those of regular employees, although differences exists in the quality of the offered agency workers:

*“Sometimes it looks like as someone (temporary agency managing clerk) stands directly behind the university and picks out all the people to place them somewhere. Other agencies have their staff since 10 or 15 years and those are really able to do their jobs. The expenses*

Unfinished Sympathy:  
Inducements and Expectations of client organizations regarding agency work

*are about the same, may be 2 Euros more per hour. But the quality of the employee is quite different.”*

The manager reports that the salaries between own employees and agency workers differ, but that this difference declines with increasing vocational qualification. The paid hourly rate is thereby not affected by the duration of the agency work relationship.

Both Interviewees indicate that re-negotiations about the salaries of agency workers never occurred, because salary is an internal part of the contract between agency and its workers:

*“In principle, we are just the client organization. So stupid this sounds, in principle we rent human labour, for which we have to pay salary toward the agency.”* (Manager)

Likewise, agency workers receive no *financial benefits* from the organization. Only regular employees receive holiday pay, Christmas bonuses, cash bonuses for the successful completion of projects and subsidies for buying working clothes. But, long term agency workers in blue-collar functions are invited to organizational events, such as Christmas celebrations or barbecue evenings and white collar agency workers are allowed to make use of company cars. Medium term agency workers in blue-collar jobs are not invited to organizational celebrations because of their limited stay within the firm.

Concerning *work content*, both interviewees report that agency workers in white-collar jobs are predominantly used as support for regular employees and hold no supervising positions:

*“The organization has its own specialists and those specialists would work in charge, while agency workers would work more supportive.”* (Supervisor)

The manager additionally indicates that the assignment of agency workers in supportive functions is based upon the uncertainty about the duration of the agency work. For blue-collar jobs, no distinction is made between regular employees and agency workers in terms of work content, nor does medium or long term duration affect the work content.

The *work environment* is indicated as identical for both regular employees and agency workers in terms of physical and social working conditions:

Unfinished Sympathy:  
Inducements and Expectations of client organizations regarding agency work

*“Not in my department. That are all office workplaces, and everybody has a chair and a table.”* (Direct supervisor)

*“No. We do not get agency workers in for the bad jobs. They have the same rights and they have to do the same work as our regular employees.”* (Manager)

Both interviewees report that agency workers receive no *developmental opportunities*, based on the fact that they are merely used as support for regular employees and the limited duration of the work relationship. Instead, agency workers are expected to hold required vocational qualification to fulfil tasks. In contrast, regular employees receive training-on-the-job and internal and external courses to extend their qualifications (such as English-courses, supervising seminars).

Both Interviewees report that it is generally possible for agency workers to be promoted within the hierarchy of the organization, based upon personal qualifications. But this promotion depends on the selection of agency workers to become regular employees:

*“If we have an agency worker, who is exceptional good, then we make him the head of the team. ... And this kind of workers are then selected and employed directly by the organization.”* (Manager)

Referring to *industrial relations*, the supervisor states that both regular employees and agency workers are participating in group discussions and can report their ideas and opinions. Thereby, the kind of contributions seem not to differ, although the supervisor explains that agency workers, based on their constantly changing work contexts, might be able to review processes differently than regular employees.

In contrast to the supervisor, the manager aims that agency workers are not participating in group meetings, but can report their ideas and opinions during regular work time. Thereby, the amount of contributions between regular employees and agency workers differ, although this difference becomes smaller if the tenure of the latter increases. Generally, the manager regards regular employees as being more pro-active in taking initiatives than agency workers:

*“Agency workers frequently resign themselves into their fate. They do not want to be unemployed and choose therefore for agency work. Then they are passed around like Gypsies*



*and as a consequence they aren't highly motivated. This is included in the whole story (of agency work)."*

*"Those people (agency workers) who are here for a longer time period contribute correspondingly more, because they do not feel like agency worker, but almost like regular employees."*

#### **4.8 Expectations of Organization B**

The direct supervisor indicates that he expects less from medium and long term agency workers than from regular employees because former are used only for supportive functions. Regular employees are expected to be committed, to extend vocational qualifications, to guide agency workers, and to think in a business-like manner. In contrast, he expects from agency workers an adequate tasks performance and integration in the team. Thereby, the direct supervisor expects more from long term agency workers than from medium term agency workers, because long term agency workers are more familiar with the processes. In accordance with this statement, the scores for long term agency workers on the questionnaire are higher on all three expectation scales than for medium-term agency workers (see table 2 in the appendix). But when compared to regular employees, expectations in long-term agency workers score even higher for relational non-task related expectations and score equal for transactional and relational task-related expectations. The expectation about medium-term agency workers are equally focused upon transactional and relational non-task related expectations, while relational task-related expectations are less important.

The manager states during the interview that he expects the same from long term agency workers and regular employees. He expects from both that they do a good job. Further, the manager explains that he expects less from medium term agency workers:

*"I grant every agency worker a certain introductory phase, in which I do not directly expect a 100% performance level. Instead I am satisfied with 80% performance, because they have to become familiar with everything new."*

In line with this statement, the manager expects more from long term agency workers among all three expectation scales than from medium term temporary agency workers (see table 2 in the appendix). In contradiction with his statement, the expectations about long term agency workers and regular employees are only equal for transactional and relational non-task related

expectations, while relational task-related expectations are lower for long term agency workers. The expectations about medium term agency workers are focused on transactional expectations, while relational expectations (task and non-task related) are less important.

The vocational qualification affects the expectations in agency workers only for relational expectations (task and non-task related). In accordance, both interviewees expect more from long term agency workers than from medium term agency workers. Expectations about medium term agency workers in blue-collar functions are focused on transactional expectations, while expectations in medium term agency workers in white-collar functions are equally focused on transactional and relational non-task related expectations. Expectations about long term agency workers in blue-collar functions are focused on transactional and relational non-task related expectations, while expectations in long term agency workers in white-collar functions are equally focused on all three expectation scales.

#### **4.9 Conclusion Organization B**

Given the fact that medium term agency workers in blue-collar functions receive less salary, no financial benefits, no developmental practices, no promotion possibilities and are not participating in group discussions, it is concluded in relationship with the predominately transactional expectations that medium term agency workers are approached under the quasi-spot contract.

Long term agency workers in blue-collar functions receive the same investments than medium-term agency workers. In the relationship with the predominant relational non-task related and transactional expectations, it is concluded that long term agency workers in blue-collar functions are subjected under the underinvestment approach.

The investments in medium term and long term agency workers in white-collar functions are identical to those of agency workers in blue-collar functions, except that agency workers in white-collar functions receive similar salaries, are participating in group discussion and employ only supportive functions. In relationship with the predominant transactional and relational expectations (task and non-task related), it is concluded that medium term and long term agency workers in white-collar functions are subjected under the underinvestment approach.

#### **4.10. Organization C**

Organization C was established in 1974 and bought by a Finish holding in 1998. Since then the firm is a legal unit within this group and has specialized in systems for high surface

regulation, radiator connections, drinking water installation and plastic pipes. Organization C employs 440 regular employees and uses agency workers solely in the production department, in which 150 regular employees are employed. In the production department, assembly lines are installed to finish the end-products. Working teams are assigned per assembly line, in which the machine operator is in charge and is supported by a team of employees. In times of increased production loads and in holiday seasons the number of regular employees is extended by 40 agency workers. Agency workers remain in the organization for short or medium term duration. At the time of conducting the interviews, no agency workers were employed, which was attributed by all interviewees as a consequence of the general economic crisis and the decrease in production orders.

In Organization C four interviews are conducted. The first interviewee is the plant manager. In this function he is responsible for the whole production area including personnel development. He is 42 years old and has 4 years tenure in which he gathered experiences with agency workers. He previously worked in the Netherlands and gathered experience with agency workers in this context too, which he indicates with the duration of 4 up to 5 years.

The second interviewee is the project manager, who is responsible for technical development and implementation. He is 53 years old and works since 25 years for Organization C and has experience with agency workers since 15 years. He is also a works council member.

The third interviewee is the head of the production department. He is 44 years old and works since 22 years for Organization C and has since 8 years experience with agency workers.

The fourth interviewee is the process technician of the production department and can be regarded as direct supervisor of agency workers. He is 32 years old and works since 10 years for Organization C and has 3 years experience with agency workers.

All interviewees indicated that they personally had never worked as agency workers.

#### **4.11. Investments of Organization C**

All four interviewees state that agency workers have been selected in the past to become regular employees. The criteria for *selection* are personal impression, high motivation, good perception of work, high qualifications, potential for development and a generally good performance level. The direct supervisor additionally explains that the stable economic situation enabled the selection of agency workers. Further, the project manager states that an agreement between works council and management is established, in which the agency work

employment is not allowed to exceed the duration of three months. Therefore, if production loads are increasing or stable for a time period longer than three month, the jobs of agency workers have to become regular contracted.

All four interviewees told that agency workers receive less *salary* than regular employees. This difference is estimated by the plant manager with 30 up to 40 % and is explained with the agreements between agencies and their agency workers. Organization C, under pressure from the works council, takes initiative and signs only contracts with agencies, which pay a minimum hourly rate of 9 Euro toward its workers. The reasons behind this firm policy are indicated by the direct supervisor in terms of preventing salary dumping and the exploitation of agency workers, while the project manager states that qualified agency workers are only attracted by agencies that pay adequate hourly rates. Therefore, ensuring that agency workers receive this minimum hourly rate is perceived as an organizational benefit in the long-run.

Although adequate salary levels are indicated as important, agency workers receive no *financial benefits*. While regular employees receive holiday pay, a Christmas bonus and annual royalties, agency workers are not subjected by these internal bonus policies. As the head of the production department explains it:

*“This means, the one for whom the organization pays the social security payments gets it (financial bonuses). For the agency workers, the social security payments are paid by their agencies.”*

The only exception is made if agency workers suggest ideas that get implemented. In those instances, agency workers receive a financial bonus. In addition, agency workers receive no financial benefits for working clothes, because the supply of equipment is a responsibility of their agencies. While regular employees receive payments to buy working shoes and are equipped with clothes containing the organizational logo, the interviewees explain additionally that the limited duration, the frequent change of agency workers and associated costs are reasons in not paying financial subsidies or offering working clothes. Organization C only offers required working tools, ear protectors and gloves which are necessary for task fulfilment.

*Work content and work environment* do not differ for agency workers and regular employees, because both are used for supportive functions. Likewise, all interviewees state that social and physical working conditions are identical.

Unfinished Sympathy:  
Inducements and Expectations of client organizations regarding agency work

In terms of *developmental opportunities*, all interviewees indicate that agency workers receive no formal training: they are expected to fulfil the obtained tasks after a one day training-on-the-job. In contrast, the abilities of regular employees are extended via internal and external courses (such as English-courses, supervising seminars, truck license) and organized within a quality matrix to ensure that regular employees possess the abilities to perform all tasks within the production department. Further, agency workers can not promote within the hierarchy of the organization. As the head of the production department explains it:

*“But if you know that they remain here only for three months, then you prefer to leave them in the positions they are already familiar with. Of course they would be potential machinery operators and they would own those positions, if we would use them longer.”*

In contrast, the mobility of regular employees is organized via internally published job advertisements and regular employees are preferred over external applicants. Agency workers are allowed to apply for the published jobs too, but they are only considered as external applicants who hold relevant job experience.

In terms of *industrial relations*, all interviewees' state that group discussions are regular scheduled in order to evaluate problems and to formulate solutions and performance goals. Regular employees are actively participating and this is additionally encouraged to reach improvements. Agency workers are not participating within the group discussions, but can report their ideas and opinions during regular working time. Thereby, the plant manager states that they contribute less and are more reserved than regular employees, but this behaviour changes when tenure of the agency workers increases:

*“Agency workers, who are here longer, feel more committed with the organization, than those who remain only for two weeks.”*

The direct supervisor explains that the contributions of agency workers and regular employees differ in quality. Agency workers do not have a global overview of the production process and are more concerned with the tasks at hand. Being more extreme, the project manager reports that agency workers contribute nothing in terms of improvements:

*“They contribute aspects in terms of restructuring. But not for improvements, that's more quite the reserve. The competitive think based on the possible loss of the own workplace that I*

*experience by the people (regular employees) is immense and gets bigger by the economical pressure. And that's not an advantage for the organization."*

As has been already indicated under the headings of salary and selection, Organization C has a powerful works council, which represents the interests of regular employees. Agency workers are not members of the works council due to the fact that they remain only for short of medium term duration in the organization. But agency work is a subject within the meetings of the works council, in which the hourly rates of agency workers and the maximum duration of their stay within the organization are discussed. The reasons to engage in those topics are explained in terms of preventing salary dumping and to ensure that agency workers are only used to handle peaks in production and not for replacement of regular contracted jobs.

#### **4.12. Expectations of Organization C**

As a general remark, only the project manager and the head of the production department completed the questionnaire separately for short and medium term agency workers. Although all interviewees indicated that agency workers are also used short term, the plant manager and the direct supervisor stated that the predominant usage of agency workers is for a medium duration. Therefore both completed the questionnaire only for medium term agency workers.

During the interview the plant manager reports that he expects less from medium term agency workers than from regular employees, because agency workers receive less salary and are not used for a replacement of regular employees. Therefore expectations about medium term agency workers are that they are qualified to fulfil their tasks, familiar with the required working tools and perform in correspondence with the guidelines. Regular employees are expected to own sufficient qualifications to produce and evaluate products, delivering on time and with high quality, to show initiative, and to be changeable and adaptable. The differentiation between expectations is confirmed by the responses on the questionnaire: expectations about medium term agency workers are lower on all expectation scales when compared to regular employees. Thereby, the expectations about medium term agency workers are not purely transactional. Instead, they involve equally high relational non-task related expectations, while relational task-related expectations are less important.

The project manager states that he expects less from short term than from medium term agency workers and regular employees, because short term agency workers are not familiar with the processes. Expectations in medium term agency workers and regular

employees are indicated in terms of engagement, loyalty, imaginativeness and assertiveness. This statement is not confirmed by the responses on the questionnaire: expectations about short and medium term agency workers are similar among all expectation scales. In addition, medium term agency workers score lower on the relational-task related expectation scale when compared to regular employees, while expectations are only equal for transactional and relational non-task related expectations. Expectations in short term agency workers are focused on transactional expectations, while relational expectations (task and non-task related) are less important.

The head of the production department explains, that he expects the same from agency workers (short and medium term) and regular employees. These expectations include the identification with the workplace, flexibility, innovativeness, imaginativeness, goal-oriented behaviour, leadership taking, social cooperation, the ability to criticize, and consciousness. In contrast to this statement, short term agency workers score lower for relational task-related and relational non-task related expectations when compared to regular employees. In addition, medium term agency workers score even lower than short term agency workers on relational task-related expectations. Only transactional expectations are identical for short, medium term agency workers and regular employees, while medium term agency worker score also equal for relational non-task related expectations when compared to regular employees. In sum, expectations in short term agency workers are focused on transactional expectations, while expectations in medium term agency workers are focused on transactional and relational non-task related expectations.

The direct supervisor expects less from medium term agency workers than from regular employees, because regular employees have a global overview of work and a self-interest in the fulfilment of high expectations. Agency workers are expected to fulfil their task, while regular employees are expected to be flexible, willing and following. In line with this statement, expectations about regular employees are higher among all three expectation scales when compared to medium term agency workers. But, expectations about medium term agency workers are not focused on transactional expectations. Instead, relational non-task related expectation score highest, while both transactional and relational task-related expectations are less important.

#### **4.13. Conclusion Organization C**

Given that short term agency workers in Organization C receive less salary, restricted financial benefits, no developmental practices, are not allowed to promote within the

Unfinished Sympathy:  
Inducements and Expectations of client organizations regarding agency work

hierarchy and are not participating in group discussions it is concluded with the predominantly transactional expectations that short term agency workers are approached under the quasi-spot contract tending toward the underinvestment approach.

Medium term agency workers receive the same investments than short term agency workers but expectations are involving similar high transactional and relational non-task related expectations. Therefore it is concluded, that medium term agency workers are clearly subjected under the underinvestment approach.





## **5 Discussion, Limitations and Suggestions**

The aim of this investigation was to find evidence for the statement of Tsui and Wu (2005) that agency workers are approached with a quasi-spot contract or an underinvestment approach.

In terms of investments, the interviews show that work content and work environment is identical for agency workers and regular employees. Additionally, it is shown that agency workers are selected to become regular employees of the organizations. Thereby criteria for selection are indicated in terms of personal qualification, engagement and good performance levels. These investments are found in any client organization, which was interviewed. In contrast, among all three client organization the interviews show that investments in agency workers are restricted in terms of financial benefits, development and promotion: agency workers receive no financial benefits, are not trained, and can not promote within the hierarchy of the organization. Differences between client organizations exist in terms of salary levels and industrial relations. While Organization A and Organization C report that agency workers receive less salary and are not participating in group discussions, Organization B differentiates between agency workers based on vocational qualification. White-collar agency workers receive similar salaries than regular employees and are participating in group discussions. In contrast, blue-collar agency workers receive less salary and are not participating in group discussions.

In terms of expectations, transactional expectations are indicated as most important for both regular and agency workers among all three organizations. Further, relational non-task related expectations are indicated among all three organizations as more important than relational task-related expectations. Additionally, the expectations about regular employees are higher among all three expectation scales when compared to agency workers. Expectations in regular employees and agency workers are highest in Organization B, than in Organization C and Organization A respectively. Interestingly, the effect of tenure on the expectations among organizations is only established for relational non-task related expectations: within Organization B long term agency workers score higher than medium term agency workers and within Organization C medium term agency workers score higher than short term agency workers. Indeed, if the duration of the employment relationship between agency worker and client organization increases so become relational non-task related expectations more important. Likewise, vocational qualification affects relational expectations (task and non-task related). Within Organization B it was possible to show, that

expectations about white-collar agency workers are more relational (task and non-task related) when compared to blue-collar agency workers.

Taking all these variations into account, the conclusion of this investigation is twofold. Indeed, the categorization of client organizations within the employee-organization relationship framework (Tsui et al., 1997) results in the formulation of evidence of the statement of Tsui and Wu (2005): agency workers in this sample are approached under the quasi-spot contract or the underinvestment approach among all three client organizations. But the interviews also show that client organizations do not simply replace the traditional commitment and loyalty based employment relationship with the so-called new employment relationship (Tsui and Wu, 2005). Instead, interviews in Organization B and Organization C clearly show that client organizations take care of their agency workers. Organization C influences the hourly rates of agency workers and highlights thereby the importance of paying a fair salary toward agency workers. Likewise, interviewees in Organization B explain that the offered quality of the agency worker is more important than the paid hourly rate. An agency worker with relevant job experience and a higher salary level is preferred over agency workers without experience who cost less. In addition, tenure of agency workers clearly influences the perspective of client organization. Organization B reports that agency workers become more committed and perceive themselves more as regular employees, if their tenure in the organization increases. In exchange, they are more valued and integrated within the organization. Likewise, tenure influences the degree of relational expectations (task and non-task related): the longer the agency worker remains in the organization, the more important relational expectations become. That is, client organizations expect more than high performance levels from their agency workers, who remain longer in the organization.

In sum, it seems not reasonable to conclude that client organizations develop a pure economic exchange relationship with their agency workers: tenure and vocational qualification influences the perspective of client organizations regarding their agency workers. During the course of the employment relationship, obligations of both parties become more extensive and diverse. Although it was not possible to show within this investigation that agency workers are also approached under mutual investment and overinvestment approaches, it is clearly shown that client organizations perceive agency workers not as a homogenous group, which is in accordance with Torka (2003).

In addition it was possible to show, that agency work is a stepping-stone toward regular employment: all client organizations in this sample report that qualified and motivated agency workers are selected to become regular employees of the organization. Importantly,

interviewees in Organization A and Organization C indicate that agency work is not a voluntary chosen work arrangement for most agency workers. Instead, it is perceived as a way to prevent unemployment and not as a way to gather experiences in diverse work contexts. Only Organization B reports that agency work might increase the quality and the experience horizon of the single agency worker and might therefore be a voluntary chosen work arrangement. Again, vocational qualification of the agency workers influences the perspective of client organizations. So may be its time that client organizations change their perspective of agency work more generally and perceive it as a work arrangement from which both client organization and agency worker might profit. Putting both in a win-win situation might increase the efficacy and effectiveness of client organizations more persistently than the implementation of a pure numerical flexibility could ever achieve.

*Limitations of the study and suggestion for future research:*

First of all, the small size of the sample in this investigation minimizes the generalization of the obtained results. In addition, the participating client organizations clearly differ in terms of structure and sector which make a true comparison difficult. Likewise, the obtained results are based on the specific German context regarding agency work. It is therefore not reasonable to assume that the obtained results might identically apply to other contexts or other European countries. For future research activities it seems reasonable to include organizational factors, such as size, sector and firm policies, which are similar among client organizations. In addition, it seems reasonable to include other European countries which might differ in terms of laws and organization of agency work, in order to estimate its effect on the perspective of client organizations.

Likewise, the recruitment of participating organization was difficult. Although most client organizations indicated the economic crisis as reason for not participating in the study, responses during the recruitment phase clearly show that client organizations are sceptical in reporting and explaining their investments in and expectations about agency work. As a consequence, the participating client organizations might differ in terms of openness and organizational policies. This could have in turn influenced the obtained results.

In addition, the employee-organization relationship framework as proposed by Tsui et al. (1997) takes the perspective of the employer. Within agency work, the triangular employment includes the agency workers, the agency and the client organizations. The perspective of the employer needs therefore to be divided on client organizations and agencies. As has been shown, all client organizations highlight that certain HR-practices, such

Unfinished Sympathy:  
Inducements and Expectations of client organizations regarding agency work

as salary, financial benefits, and training are per definition obligations of the agency. In including the perspective of the agency a true categorization of agency workers within the employee-organization relationship framework as proposed by Tsui et al. (1997) becomes possible. Likewise, agency workers need to be included in order to assess their performance levels and their attitudinal outcomes as proposed by the four employee-organization relationship approaches.

This investigation therefore suggests the inclusion of all parties within the triangular employment relationship in future research activities. Additionally, it has been shown, that tenure and vocational qualification of agency workers influences the client organization perspective. Therefore, investigating different vocational groups of agency workers and their duration of stay within a client organization might be fruitful to assess differences and similarities between the treatment of regular employees and agency workers.

In addition, this investigation assessed the investments in agency workers among 7 HR-practices. Although these practices were useful to describe differences between agency workers and regular employees, future research might investigate other HR-practices. Likewise, it seems reasonable to include regular employees in future research activities in order to evaluate their perception about the offered HR-practices. It seems reasonable to assume that client organizations try to present themselves in a favourable light (also known as impression management), so that the perception of management and regular employees about offered investments might differ.

## 5 References

- Benson, G., (2006), Employee development, commitment and intention to turnover a test of “Employability” policies in action. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 173-192.
- Blau, P.M., (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: Wiley.
- Blumer, H., (1954). What is wrong with social research. *American Sociological Review*, 14, 3-10.
- Bryman, A., (2006). Integrating qualitative and quantitative research: how is it done?. *Qualitative research* 6,1, 97-113.
- Casey, C., Alach, (2004). ‘Just a temp?’ Women, temporary employment and lifestyle. *Work, Employment & Society* , 459-480.
- Chambel, M.J., Castanheira, F., (2007). They don’t want to be temporaries: similarities between temps and core workers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 28, page 943-959.
- Connelly, C.E., Gallagher, D.E. & Gilley, M.G., (2006). Organizational and client commitment among contracted employees: A replication and extension with temporary workers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, (70), pp. 326-335.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A.-M., & Morrow, P. C., (2006). Organizational and client commitment among contracted employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 416–431.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J.A.M., Morrow, P.C., & Kessler I., (2006). Serving two organizations: Exploring the employment relationship of contracted employees. *Human Resource Management*, Winter 2006, Vol. 45, No. 4, pp. 561–583.
- Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund (DGB), (2003). Ratgeber Zeitarbeit, Handlungshilfe für Betriebs und Personalräte, retrieved on 03, September via [www.dgb.de](http://www.dgb.de)
- Gallagher, D. G., & McLean Parks, J.,(2001). I pledge thee my troth ... contingently:

- Commitment and the contingent work relationship. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 181–208.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- Greco, D.L., Walop, W., & Eastridge, L., (1987). Questionnaire Development: 3. Translation. *Clinical Epidemiology Vol. 136*, April 15.
- Janssens, M., Sels, L., Van den Brande, I., (2003). Multiple types of psychological contracts: A six-cluster solution. *Human Relations*, Vol. 56, No.11.
- Janssen, O., Van Looy, B., & Vanschoonbeek, G., (1997). Cognities van empowerment als schakel tussen delegerend leiderschap en innovatief gedrag van werkenemers. *Gedrag en Organisatie*, 4, 175-195.
- Koene, B., Riemsdijk van, M.J. (2005). Managing temporary workers: work identity, diversity and operational HR choices. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 15 (1), pp. 76-92.
- Lincoln, J.R., Kalleberg, A.L., (1985). Work organization and workforce commitment: a study of plants and employees in the U.S. and Japan. *American Sociological Review*, 50, 738-760.
- Mangum, G., Mayall, D., and Nelson, K., (1985). The Temporary Help Industry: A Reponse to the Dual Internal Labor Market. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 38(4), 599 - 611.
- Mayring, P. (2001). Combination and Integration of Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/ Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 2(1). Retrieved November 12, 2009, from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/viewArticle/967/2110>
- McDonald D.J., Makin, P.J., (2000). The psychological contract, organisational commitment

Unfinished Sympathy:  
Inducements and Expectations of client organizations regarding agency work  
and job satisfaction of temporary staff. *Leadership & Organization Development  
Journal* 21/2, 84-91.

Oudehoven (2003). *Gedrag en Organisatie*.

Pearce, J.L., (1993). Toward an Organizational Behavior of contract Laborers: Their psychological contract involvement and effects on employee Co-workers. *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 5, pp. 1082-1096.

Reilly, P.A., (1998). Balancing Flexibility - Meeting the interests of employer and employee. *European Journal of work and organizational Psychology*, 7 (1), 7-22.

Robinson, S.L., Kraatz, M.S., Rousseau, D.M., (1994). Changing Obligations and the psychological contract: a longitudinal study. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37, No.1, 137 – 152

Rousseau, D. M. (1990a). New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: a study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* , 11 (5), pp. 389-400.

Rousseau, D. M., (1990b). Assessing organizational culture: The case for multiple methods. *Organizational climate and culture* (pp.153 - 192). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rousseau, D.M., (1995): *Psychological contracts in Organizations. Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rousseau, D.M., McLean Parks, J., (1993). The Contracts of Individuals in Organizations. In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 15, 1-43. Greenwich: JAI Press.

Schwab, D.P., (2005). *Research Methods for organizational studies*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers Mahwah, New Jersey.



- Segal, L. M., and Sullivan, D. G. (1997), The Growth of Temporary Services Work. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11(2), 117 - 136.
- Shaw, W.S., Huang, Y., (2005). Concerns and expectations about returning to work with low back pain: Identifying themes from focus groups and semi-structured interviews. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 27(21), pp. 1269 – 1281.
- Statistics of the Employment office, (2009). *Arbeitsmarkt in Zahlen, Arbeitnehmerüberlassung*, Retrieved August 12, 2009 from <http://statistik.arbeitsagentur.de> .
- Steinke, I., (2000). *Gütekriterien qualitativer Forschung*. Qualitative Forschung. Ein Handbuch, S. 319-331. Reinbek b. Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch.
- Torka, N. (2003). Flexible but committed. The relationship between contract and commitment. *PhD thesis. Twente University Press. Enschede*.
- Torka, N., Schyns, B. (2009). On the job and co-worker commitment of agency workers and permanent employees. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*.
- Tsui, A.S., Pearce, J.L., Porter, L.W., & Tripoli, A.M., (1997). Alternative approaches to the employee-organization relationship: Does investment in employees pay off?. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 40, No.5, 1089-1121.
- Tsui A.S., Wu, J.B., (2005). The new employment relationship versus the mutual investment approach: implications for human resource management. *Human Resource Management*, Summer 2005, Vol. 44, No. 2, Pp. 115–121.

## 7 Appendix

### 7.1 Interview Schedule and Questionnaire in Dutch

#### *Introductie*

Kennismaking

Doelstelling interview (inclusief relevantie onderzoek)

Anonimiteit

Mogelijkheid aanvullende opmerkingen toe te voegen einde interview

Mijn eerste set van vragen gaat over een aantal persoonlijke kenmerken. Ik stel u deze vragen omdat onderzoek laat zien dat bijvoorbeeld de duur van de ervaring met uitzendkrachten een invloed kan hebben op de manier van omgang met deze. Persoonlijke vragen dienen om achteraf – over de bedrijven heen – te kijken of bijvoorbeeld de aard van de functie een invloed heeft op de houding t.a.v. uitzendkrachten.

#### *Persoonlijke kenmerken van de geïnterviewde*

1. Wat is uw functie?
2. Wat is uw leeftijd?
3. Sinds wanneer bent u werkzaam voor ... (naam bedrijf)?
4. Hoe lang hebt u ervaring met uitzendkrachten al dan niet binnen ... (naam bedrijf)?
5. Hebt u zelf ooit als uitzendkracht gewerkt?

#### *Uitzendkrachten bij ... (naam bedrijf)*

De volgende vragen dienen om in kaart te brengen hoe en hoeveel uitzendkrachten ... (naam bedrijf) inzet.

1. Maakt ... (naam bedrijf) gebruik van
  - kortdurig uitzendwerk (enkele uren, dagen of weken)
  - uitzendwerk voor een middelmatige duur (enkele weken tot maanden)
  - langdurig uitzendwerk (6 maanden of langer of herhaaldelijke inzet van een en dezelfde uitzendkrachten)
2. Zijn er op dit moment uitzendkrachten bij ... (naam bedrijf) werkzaam?
  - a) Zo ja, hoeveel en wat is de procedurele verhouding tot vaste medewerkers?
  - b) Voor welke functies worden uitzendkrachten ingezet?
- b) Zo nee, waarom zijn er op dit moment geen uitzendkrachten bij ... (naam bedrijf) werkzaam?

#### *Wat biedt ... (naam bedrijf) aan uitzendkrachten?*

De volgende vragen gaan over het personeelsmanagement van ... (naam bedrijf) voor uitzendkrachten. Voor de verschillende aspecten wil ik u vragen wat ... (naam bedrijf) aan

deze biedt.

#### 1) Selectie

- Zijn er uitzendkrachten die u op termijn een aanstelling bij het bedrijf biedt?
- Indien ja, welke uitzendkrachten krijgen een vaste aanstelling bij ... (naam bedrijf). Anders gezegd: aan wat moeten ze voldoen?

#### 2) Financiële beloning

- Wat is uw indruk: zijn er verschillen in salaris tussen vaste medewerkers en uitzendkrachten?

Indien er verschillen zijn: welke en waarom bestaan volgens u deze verschillen?

- Zijn er bepaalde monetaire beloningen die uitsluitend eigen medewerkers krijgen (e.g., kerstgeld, eindejaarsbonus)
- Kunnen uitzendkrachten in aanmerking komen voor financiële beloningen van ... (naam bedrijf)? (e.g., 'envelop' voor verjaardag, bonus voor goede prestaties)?
- Wat is uw indruk: zijn er verschillen in beloning tussen uitzendkrachten? Zo ja, wat zijn volgens u de oorzaken van deze verschillen?
- Zijn er verschillen in beloning tussen (kijken wat van toepassing is) kortdurige, middelmatige duur en langdurige uitzendkrachten?
- Maakt ... (naam bedrijf) gebruik van meerdere uitzendbureaus? Zo ja, hebt u de indruk dat er salarisverschillen tussen uitzendbureaus zijn?
- Is het weleens voorgekomen dat ... (naam bedrijf) zich met de hoogte van salarissen van uitzendkrachten heeft bemoeid? Zo ja, kunt u vertellen wat de aanleiding daarvan was?

#### 3) Monetaire compensaties

Monetaire compensaties gaan over financiële tegemoetkomingen in bijvoorbeeld werkkleding en reiskosten.

- Zijn er volgens u verschillen in monetaire compensaties tussen vaste medewerkers en uitzendkrachten? Indien er verschillen zijn: welke en waarom bestaan deze verschillen?
- Zijn er volgens u verschillen in monetaire compensaties tussen (wat van toepassing is) kortdurige, middelmatige duur en langdurige uitzendkrachten?
- Is het weleens voorgekomen dat ... (naam bedrijf) zich met monetaire compensaties van uitzendkrachten heeft bemoeid? Zo ja, kunt u vertellen wat de aanleiding daarvan was?

#### 4) Arbeidsinhoud

- Zijn er functies of taken die uitsluitend door vaste medewerkers en uitsluitend door uitzendkrachten worden vervuld? Zo ja, welke en waarom?

- Zijn er verschillen in arbeidsinhoud tussen (wat van toepassing is) kortdurige, middelmatige duur en langdurige uitzendkrachten?

#### 5) Arbeidsomstandigheden

- Zijn er verschillen in fysieke arbeidsomstandigheden (bijvoorbeeld zwaarder werk, belastender werk, vermoeiender werk, gevaarlijker werk) tussen vaste medewerkers en uitzendkrachten?

- Zijn er verschillen in fysieke arbeidsomstandigheden tussen (wat van toepassing is) langdurige, middelmatige duur en langdurige uitzendkrachten?

- Zijn er verschillen in sociale arbeidsomstandigheden (bijv. omgang met vaste medewerkers, leidinggevend, integratie in afdelingen of teams) tussen vaste medewerkers en uitzendkrachten?

- Zijn er verschillen in sociale arbeidsomstandigheden tussen (wat van toepassing is) langdurige, middelmatige duur en langdurige uitzendkrachten?

#### 6) Ontwikkeling en promotie

- Biedt ... (naam bedrijf) vaste medewerkers mogelijkheden voor training-on-the-job en, zo ja, welke?

- Biedt ... (naam bedrijf) uitzendkrachten mogelijkheden voor training-on-the-job en, zo ja, welke?

- Zijn er verschillen in mogelijkheden voor training-on-the-job tussen kortdurige, middelmatige duur en langdurige uitzendkrachten?

- Biedt ... (naam bedrijf) vaste medewerkers mogelijkheden voor opleiding en cursussen en, zo ja, welke?

- Biedt ... (naam bedrijf) uitzendkrachten mogelijkheden voor opleiding en cursussen en, zo ja, welke?

- Zijn er verschillen in mogelijkheden voor opleiding en cursussen tussen kortdurige, middelmatige duur en langdurige uitzendkrachten?

- Heeft ... (naam bedrijf) al ooit opleidingen en cursussen voor uitzendkrachten gedeeltelijk of geheel vergoed? Indien ja: Waarom heeft men dit gedaan?

- Biedt ... (naam bedrijf) vaste medewerkers de mogelijkheid op een betere of hogere functie? Anders gezegd: kunnen eigen medewerkers doorgroeien?

- Biedt ... (naam bedrijf) uitzendkrachten de mogelijkheid op een betere of hogere functie? Anders gezegd: kunnen uitzendkrachten doorgroeien?

- Zijn er verschillen in mogelijkheden betere of hogere functies tussen kortdurige, middelmatige duur en langdurige uitzendkrachten?

## 7) Arbeidsverhoudingen

- Organiseert c.q. organiseren de verschillende afdelingen van ... (naam bedrijf) werkoverleg op teamniveau? Zo ja, krijgen vaste medewerkers aldaar de gelegenheid om hun mening en ideeën te uiten?
- Nemen ook uitzendkrachten aan dit overleg deel? Zo ja, geldt dit voor alle uitzendkrachten of alleen voor bepaalde groepen (kortdurige, middelmatige duur, langdurig)?
- Wat is uw mening over de inbreng van uitzendkrachten in het werkoverleg? Hebben ze meer of minder inbreng dan vaste medewerkers of misschien een andere inbreng (bijvoorbeeld andere ideeën of meningen)?
- Zijn er ook andere vormen van groepsoverleg bij ... (naam bedrijf), zoals kwaliteitskringen of projectteams? Nemen ook uitzendkrachten aan deze vormen van groepsoverleg deel? Zo ja, geldt dit voor alle uitzendkrachten of alleen voor bepaalde groepen (kortdurige, middelmatige duur, langdurig)?
- Zijn ooit (verbeterings)ideeën van uitzendkrachten geïmplementeerd en, zo ja, welke?
- Wat is uw mening: dragen uitzendkrachten meer of minder bij aan organisatievernieuwing dan vaste medewerkers?
- *Vraag aan directe leidinggevendenden:* Naast groepsoverleg kunnen medewerkers ook meningen en ideeën direct en individueel aan de directe leidinggevende vertellen. Doen uitzendkrachten dit en, zo ja, wat is de aard van hun inbreng, kunt u voorbeelden noemen? Komt deze 'spontane' inbreng van alle uitzendkrachten of doen dit alleen bepaalde groepen (wederom de antwoorden laten zien)?
- *Vraag voor directeuren, HR managers of ondernemingsraadleden:*
- Zijn onder de ondernemingsraadleden ook uitzendkrachten? Zo ja, wat is hun inbreng? Zo nee, heeft ... (naam bedrijf) al ooit geprobeerd om uitzendkrachten voor de OR te werven?
- Zijn uitzendkrachten een thema binnen de OR en zo ja, welke thema's betreffende uitzendkrachten worden er besproken?

Deze laatste set van vragen gaat over verwachtingen die u van vaste medewerkers en uitzendkrachten hebt.

- 1) Wat verwacht u van uw vaste medewerkers?
- 2) Hebt u andere verwachtingen t.a.v. uw vaste medewerkers dan t.a.v. uw uitzendkrachten? Zo ja, waarom, zo nee, waarom niet (en wat zijn de verschillen in verwachtingen)?
- 3) Verwacht u van alle uitzendkrachten hetzelfde of zijn er verschillen in verwachtingen? Waarom hebt u deze verschillende verwachtingen, wat zijn de 'oorzaken'?

*Invullen van de beknopte vragenlijsten*

a) Verwachtingen vaste medewerkers

b) Verwachtingen uitzendkrachten (*Attentie: indien er qua verblijfsduur verschillende groepen uitzendkrachten worden ingezet, betekent dit dat de respondent voor iedere groep – kortdurig, middelmatige duur, langdurig – één lijst (dus maximaal 4: 1 voor eigen medewerkers, 1 voor kortdurige uitzendkrachten, 1 voor middelmatige duur uitzendkrachten, 1 voor langdurige uitzendkrachten) moet invullen*) Volgende identieke vragen in identieke volgorde aan geïnterviewde voorleggen. 5-punkt antwoordschaal: 1 = helemaal niet mee eens; 5 = helemaal mee eens

Ik verwacht van ... (eigen medewerkers, kortdurige uitzendkrachten, middelmatige duur uitzendkrachten, langdurige uitzendkrachten) dat ze

- Knelpunten opsporen (probleemherkenning)
- Problemen in kaart brengen (probleemherkenning)
- Informatie inwinnen om afwijkingen te kunnen constateren (probleemherkenning)
- Nieuwe werkwijze, technieken of instrumenten uitzoeken (idee generatie)
- Originale ideeën genereren (idee generatie)
- Nieuwe oplossingen bedenken voor oude problemen (idee generatie)
- Nieuwe benaderingen bedenken voor de uitvoering van taken
- Efficiënt zijn
- Zorgvuldig te werk gaan
- Naar perfectie streven
- Gericht zijn op planning
- Zich aan de regels houden
- De kwaliteit bewaken
- Ervoor zorgen dat het werk op tijd af is
- Collega's helpen
- Aanwezig zijn op bijeenkomsten ook zijn deze niet verplicht
- Meedenken met de afdeling en ... (naam bedrijf)
- Bijdragen aan een goeie sfeer

## **7.2 Interview Schedule and Questionnaire in German:**

*Einleitung*

Vorstellung

Ziel des Interviews (einschließlich Relevanz der Untersuchung)

## Anonymität

Möglichkeit für weitere Bemerkungen besteht am Ende des Interviews

Der erste Teil der Fragen bezieht sich auf einige persönliche Merkmale. Ich stelle ihnen diese Fragen, da aufgrund von Untersuchungen z.B. die Dauer der Erfahrungen mit Zeitarbeitern, Einfluss haben kann auf die Art und Weise wie man mit Zeitarbeitern umgeht. Persönliche Fragen dienen um hinterher Vergleiche zwischen den Betrieben zu ermöglichen (z.B. ob die Tätigkeit Einfluss hat auf die Haltung/Einstellung in Bezug auf Zeitarbeiter).

### *Persönliche Merkmale des Interviewten*

1. Welche Funktion besetzen Sie?
2. Wie alt sind Sie?
3. Seit wann sind Sie angestellt bei... (Name des Betriebes)?
4. Seit wann haben Sie Erfahrung mit Zeitarbeitern bei ... (Name des Betriebes) und seit wann davor??
5. Waren Sie selbst einmal als Zeitarbeiter tätig??

### *Zeitarbeiter bei ... (Name des Betriebes)*

Die nun folgenden Fragen dienen einen Übersicht zu schaffen wie viele Zeitarbeiter ...(Name des Betriebes) einsetzt und wie.

1. Nutzt... (Name des Betriebes)
  - kurzfristig eingesetzte Zeitarbeiter (einige Stunden, Tage oder Wochen)
  - mittelfristig eingesetzte Zeitarbeiter (einige Wochen oder Monate)
  - langfristig eingesetzte Zeitarbeiter (6 Monate und länger oder wiederholter Einsatz)
2. Sind zurzeit Zeitarbeiter bei ... (Name des Betriebes) angestellt?
  - a) Falls ja, wie viele und wie ist das prozentuelle Verhältnis zu festen Mitarbeitern?
  - b) Für welche Funktionen werden Zeitarbeiter eingesetzt?
  - b) Falls nicht, warum sind bei ... (Name des Betriebes) zurzeit keine Zeitarbeiter angestellt?

### *Was bietet ... (Name des Betriebes) seinen Zeitarbeitern?*

Die folgenden Fragen beziehen sich auf das Personalmanagement bezüglich Zeitarbeitern von ... (Name des Betriebes). Bezogen auf verschiedene Aspekte möchte ich Sie fragen was ... (Name des Betriebes) seinen Zeitarbeitern bietet.

#### *1) Selektion*

- Gibt es Zeitarbeiter denen ein befristeter oder unbefristeter Arbeitsvertrag in Ihrem Betrieb angeboten wurde?
- Falls ja, warum wurde diesen Zeitarbeitern ein solcher Vertrag angeboten (was sind die Kriterien)?

## *2) Finanzielle Vergütung*

- Was ist Ihr Eindruck: Unterscheiden sich die Gehälter von festen Mitarbeitern und Zeitarbeitern?
- Falls ja, was für Unterschiede und warum bestehen diese Ihrer Meinung nach? Gibt es bestimmte geldliche Boni die ausschließlich festen Mitarbeitern zukommen (z.B. Weihnachtsgeld, 13. Monatsgehalt)
- Erhalten Zeitarbeiter von ... (Name des Betriebes) finanzielle Boni? (z.B. Geburtstagsgeld, Zuschlag aufgrund von guter Leistung)
- Was ist Ihr Eindruck: Erhalten unterschiedliche Zeitarbeiter unterschiedliche Gehälter Boni? Falls ja, was sind Ihrer Meinung nach die Gründe für diese Unterschiede?
- Erhalten kurzfristige, mittelfristige und langfristige (betriebsspezifische Einteilung) Zeitarbeiter unterschiedlich Gehälter?
- Arbeitet ... (Name des Betriebes) mit mehreren Zeitarbeitsfirmen zusammen? Falls ja, haben Sie den Eindruck, dass Gehaltsunterschiede vorhanden sind?
- Ist es bereits vorgekommen, dass ... (Name des Betriebes) die Höhe der Gehälter von Zeitarbeitern beeinflusst hat? Falls ja, können Sie mir Gründe dafür nennen?

## *3) Geldwerte Vorteile / Finanzielle Ausgleichszahlungen/ Finanzielle Zuschüsse*

Unter geldwerten Vorteilen sind finanzielle Zuschüsse/Beihilfen zu verstehen, wie z.B. Vergütungen für Arbeitskleidung oder Anfahrtskosten.

- Bestehen Ihrer Meinung nach Unterschiede zwischen Festangestellten und Zeitarbeitern im Bezug auf finanzielle Zuschüsse?
- So ja, welche und warum?
- Bestehen Ihrer Meinung nach Unterschiede zwischen kurzfristig/mittelfristig und langfristig beschäftigten Zeitarbeitern?
- Ist es in Ihrem Betrieb bereits vorgekommen, dass Sie sich mit den finanziellen Zuschüssen von Zeitarbeitern beschäftigt haben?
- So ja, könnten Sie die Gründe dafür nennen?

## *4) Arbeitsinhalt*

- Gibt es Aufgaben und Funktionen in Ihrem Betrieb, die ausschließlich von Festangestellten oder ausschließlich von Zeitarbeitern übernommen werden?
- So ja, welche und warum?
- Bestehen bei ... (Name des Betriebes) Unterschiede bezüglich des Arbeitsinhaltes für kurzfristig/mittelfristig und langfristig beschäftigte Zeitarbeiter?

## *5) Arbeitsbedingungen*



-Gibt es Unterschiede bezüglich der körperlichen Arbeitsbedingungen (z.B. schwerer, belastender, ermüdender oder gefährlichere Arbeit) , zwischen Festangestellten und Zeitarbeitern?

-Gibt es Unterschiede bezüglich der körperlichen Arbeitsbedingungen zwischen kurzfristig/mittelfristig und langfristig beschäftigten Zeitarbeitern?

-Gibt es Unterschiede bezüglich der sozialen Arbeitsbedingungen (z.B. der Umgang mit Festangestellten, Vorgesetzten, Integration in den Abteilungen oder in den Teams) zwischen Festangestellten und Zeitarbeitern?

-Gibt es Unterschiede bezüglich der sozialen Arbeitsbedingungen zwischen kurzfristig/mittelfristig und langfristig beschäftigten Zeitarbeitern?

#### *6)Entwicklung und Beförderung*

-Bietet ... (Name der Firma) für seine Festangestellten Möglichkeiten eines Training-on-the-job (Lernen am Arbeitsplatz) und, wenn ja, welche?

-Bietet ... (Name der Firma) für seine Zeitarbeiter Möglichkeiten eines Training-on-the-job/(Lernen am Arbeitsplatz) und, wenn ja, welche?

-Gibt es zwischen den kurzfristig/mittelfristig und langfristig beschäftigten Zeitarbeitern Unterschiede in den Möglichkeiten für Training-on-the-job/(Lernen am Arbeitsplatz)?

-Bietet ... (Name der Firma) seinen Festangestellten die Möglichkeiten an Weiterbildungen und Lehrgängen teilzunehmen, wenn ja, welche?

-Bietet ... (Name der Firma) seinen Zeitarbeitern die Möglichkeiten an Weiterbildungen und Lehrgängen teilzunehmen, wenn ja, welche?

-Gibt es Unterschiede bezüglich der Teilnahmemöglichkeit an Weiterbildungen und Lehrgängen zwischen kurzfristig/mittelfristig und langfristig beschäftigten Zeitarbeitern?

-Hat... (Name der Firma) jemals Weiterbildungen und Lehrgänge für Zeitarbeiter teilweise oder vollständig vergütet?

-Wenn ja: Warum hat man dies getan?

-Bietet... (Name der Firma) seinen Festangestellten die Möglichkeit einer anderen Funktion und/oder die Möglichkeit innerhalb der Firmenhierarchie aufzusteigen?

-Bietet... (Name der Firma) seinen Zeitarbeitern die Möglichkeit einer anderen Funktion und/oder die Möglichkeit innerhalb der Firmenhierarchie aufzusteigen?

-Gibt es Unterschiede bezüglich der Möglichkeit ein andere Funktion und/ oder die Möglichkeit innerhalb der Firmenhierarchie aufzusteigen zwischen kurzfristig/mittelfristig und langfristig beschäftigten Zeitarbeitern?

#### *7)Arbeidsverhouding = Industrielle Betieuhungen*

Unfinished Sympathy:  
Inducements and Expectations of client organizations regarding agency work

- Organisiert bzw. organisieren die unterschiedlichen Abteilungen von ... (Name der Firma) Arbeitsbesprechungen auf Abteilungs- oder Teamniveau?
- Wenn ja, erhalten Festangestellte dort die Gelegenheit ihre Meinung und Ideen zu äußern?
- Nehmen auch Zeitarbeiter an diesen Besprechungen Teil?
- Wenn ja, erhalten Zeitarbeiter dort die Gelegenheit ihre Meinung und Ideen zu äußern?
- Wenn ja, gilt dass für alle Zeitarbeiter oder nur für bestimmte Gruppen (kurzfristig/mittelfristig/langfristig beschäftigte Zeitarbeiter)?
- Was ist Ihre Meinung zu den Beiträgen der Zeitarbeiter bei den Beratungen? Tragen sie mehr oder weniger zur Diskussion bei oder haben die Zeitarbeiter gänzlich neue/andere Beiträge im Vergleich zu den Festangestellten (z.B. andere Ideen oder Meinungen)?
- Gibt es auch andere Arten von Partizipation bei ... (Name der Firma) wie zum Beispiel Qualitätszirkel oder Projektteams?
- Nehmen auch Zeitarbeiter an diesen Arten der Partizipation Teil?
- Wenn ja, gilt das für alle Zeitarbeiter oder nur für bestimmte Gruppen (kurzfristig/mittelfristig/langfristig beschäftigte Zeitarbeiter)?
- Wurden jemals Verbesserungsvorschläge von Zeitarbeitern eingeführt oder übernommen?
- Wenn ja, welche ?
- Tragen, Ihrer Meinung nach, die Zeitarbeiter mehr oder weniger zur Verbesserung/Reform/Umstrukturierung des Betriebes bei als Festangestellte?

*Frage an direkte Vorgesetzte*

- Außerhalb von Arbeitsbesprechungen können Mitarbeiter Meinungen und Ideen auch direkt und individuell an den Vorgesetzten heran tragen. Zeigen Zeitarbeitnehmer das gleiche Verhalten?
- Wenn ja, von welcher Art sind ihre Beiträge?
- Können sie ein Beispiel nennen/beschreiben?
- Kommen diese spontanen Beiträge von allen Zeitarbeitern oder zeigen sich Unterschiede zwischen kurzfristig/mittelfristig und langfristig beschäftigten Zeitarbeitern?

*Frage an Direktoren, HR Managers oder Betriebsratsmitglieder:*

- Sind unter den Betriebsratsmitgliedern auch Zeitarbeiter? Wenn ja, was ist deren Beitrag? Wenn nicht, hat ... (Name des Betriebes) jemals probiert Zeitarbeiter für den Betriebsrat zu werben?
- Sind Zeitarbeiter ein Thema innerhalb des Betriebsrates? Und wenn ja, welche Themen werden bezüglich der Zeitarbeiter besprochen?

*Diese letzten Fragen haben einen Bezug auf die Erwartungen die Sie an Festangestellte und*

*Zeitarbeiter haben.*

-Was erwarten Sie von ihren Festangestellten?

-Haben Sie andere Erwartungen an ihre Festangestellten im Vergleich zu Ihren Zeitarbeitern?  
Wenn ja, warum, und wenn nein, warum nicht? (und was sind die Unterschiede in den Erwartungen?)

-Erwarten Sie von allen Zeitarbeitern das gleiche, oder bestehen Unterschiede bezüglich der Erwartungen an kurzfristig, mittelfristig und langfristig beschäftigte Zeitarbeiter? Warum haben Sie diese unterschiedlichen Erwartungen und welche Ursachen sehen Sie dafür?

*Einfüllen des Fragebogens.*

-Erwartungen an Festangestellte

-Erwartungen an Zeitarbeiter

Folgende identische Fragen, in identischer Reihenfolge an den Interviewpartner stellen. Die Antwortskala läuft von 1-5, wobei 1 = stimme ganz und gar nicht zu und 5 = stimme ganz entschieden zu.

Ich erwarte von ... (eigenen Mitarbeitern, kurzfristig eingesetzten Zeitarbeitern, mittelfristig eingesetzten Zeitarbeitern, langfristig eingesetzten Zeitarbeitern), dass sie:

- Engpässe erkennen
- Eine Problemübersicht entwickeln
- Informationen einholen, um Abweichungen feststellen zu können
- Neue Arbeitsweisen, neue Techniken oder Instrumente herausfinden.
- Originelle Ideen entwickeln.
- Neue Lösungen für alte Probleme bedenken.
- Neue Vorgehensweisen entwickeln für die Ausführung von Aufgaben.
- Effizient sind.
- Sorgfältig ihre Arbeit verrichten.
- Nach Perfektion streben.
- Ziel orientiert handeln.
- Sich an Regeln halten.
- Die Qualität bewahren.
- Dafür Sorge tragen, dass die Arbeit pünktlich fertig gestellt wird.
- Kollegen helfen.
- Anwesend sind bei Absprachen/Treffen, auch wenn an diesen nicht verpflichtet teilgenommen werden muss.

Unfinished Sympathy:  
Inducements and Expectations of client organizations regarding agency work

- Mitdenken im Zusammenhang mit der Abteilung und im Zusammenhang mit ... (Name Betrieb)
- Beitragen an einer guten Atmosphäre

### 7.3 Tables

**Table 2: Expectations among client organizations regarding category of agency worker**

1= Regular employees

2= Short term agency workers

3= Medium term agency workers

4= Long term agency workers

Organization Type employee	Relational Task-related Expectations	Transactional Expectations	Relational non-task related Expectations	Mean Total
<b>Organization A</b>				
1	3.9	4.3	4.1	4.1
2	2.5	3.8	2.9	3.1
Mean total	3.2	4.1	3.5	3.59
<b>Organization B</b>				
1	4.6	4.7	4.2	4.5
3	2.1	4.1	3.6	3.3
4	4.1	4.7	4.4	4.4
Mean total	3.6	4.5	4.1	4.1
<b>Organization C</b>				
1	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.4
2	3.2	4.2	3.5	3.6
3	3.1	4.2	3.9	3.6
total	3.5	4.2	3.9	3.9

Unfinished Sympathy:  
Inducements and Expectations of client organizations regarding agency work

**Table 3: Expectations among participants regarding agency work**

1= Regular employees

2= Short term agency workers

3= Medium term agency workers

4= Long term agency workers

	Relational Task-related Expectations	Transactional Expectations	Relational Non-task related Expectations	Mean Total
<b>Organization A</b>				
Company Manager				
1	3.6	4.3	4.2	4
2	2.8	4.6	3.2	3.5
Direct supervisor				
1	4.3	4.3	4	4.2
2	2.2	3.1	2.5	2.6
<b>Organization B</b>				
Direct supervisor				
1	4.3	4.5	3.5	4.1
3	2.3	3.7	3.7	3.2
4	4.3	4.5	4	4.3
Manager				
1	5	5	5	5
3	2	4.6	3.5	3.3
4	3.8	5	4.8	4.5
<b>Organization C</b>				
Plant Manager				
1	5	4.9	4.5	4.8
3	2.8	3.7	3.7	3.4
Project Manager				
1	4.4	4.1	3.7	4.1
2	2.7	4.1	3.2	3.4
3	2.8	4.3	3.7	3.6
Head of production department				
1	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3
2	3.7	4.3	3.7	3.9
3	3.4	4.3	4.2	4
Direct supervisor				
1	3.4	4.6	4.7	4.2
3	3.1	3	4	3.4