



How do you work? A qualitative research into the differences between protean and traditional career orientation.



Lidewij Peters

FACULTY OF BEHAVIOURAL, MANAGEMENT AND SOCIAL SCIENCES  
COMMUNICATION STUDIES

EXAMINATION COMMITTEE

Dr. H.A. Van Vuuren

Dr. S. Jansen



How do you work? A qualitative research into the differences between protean and traditional career orientation.

Lidewij Peters

S1368656

L.peters@student.utwente.nl

University of Twente

Faculty of Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences

Department of Communication Studies

Supervisors

Dr. H.A. Van Vuuren

Dr. S. Jansen

13-07-2018



## Abstract

In the last decade, a lot has changed in the working environment. The demand for flexibility from employees has increased. Therefore, there has been a shift from permanent to more flexible working arrangements with regards to time, place and contracts. The shift in contracts can be translated into two different types of employees: protean and traditional employees. This research will give an insight in the attitude towards job satisfaction and the evaluation of work autonomy, work flexibility, job security and organizational identification of both protean and traditional career oriented individuals. Data was collected through dyadic interviews, with one protean and one traditional employee included in the dyad. 12 dyads were interviewed from the educational, technical and economic sector. Results indicate that there are differences in evaluations of work autonomy and work flexibility. Similarities occur between both groups of employees when it comes to organizational commitment and job security. Overall attitude towards job satisfaction are the same on both groups, however the reason why both groups of employees are equally satisfied are different.

*Keywords: protean career, traditional career, employment, job satisfaction, dyadic interviews*



# Table of Content

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 Protean versus Traditional Employees	8
1.2 Job satisfaction	9
1.3 Working conditions	10
1.3.1 Work Autonomy	10
1.3.2 Work flexibility	10
1.3.3 Job security	10
1.4 Social Identity Theory and Social Categorization Theory	11
1.4.1 Social Identity Theory	11
1.4.2 Social Categorization Theory	12
<b>2 Method</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Research design	13
2.2 Participants	13
2.3 Dyadic Interview	14
2.4 Data Analysis	14
<b>3 Results</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1 Job Satisfaction	16
3.2 Working Conditions	17
3.2.1 Work Autonomy	17
3.2.2 Work Flexibility	18
3.2.3 Job Security	19
3.2.4 Effort	20
3.2.5 Training and schooling	20
3.3 Organizational Identification	21
3.3.1 Social interactions	21
3.4 Indirect evaluation of the other group	22
3.5 Protean versus Traditional employees	23
<b>4 Discussion</b>	<b>25</b>
4.1 Discussion and conclusion	26
4.2 Implications	27
4.3 Limitations and directions for future research	29
<b>References</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Appendixes</b>	<b>i</b>
A: Overview of all the participants	i
B: Topic list and interview outline	i
C: Codebook	iv
D: Translation of all Quotes	viii

# 1 Introduction

Over the last few years, the employment branch has been changing rapidly. Flexibility in all shapes and sizes has made an entry in the last few years. This increased flexibility with regards to employment includes flexible working contracts, flexible scheduling, working from home and working from different locations (Mas & Pallais, 2017). The CBS reports that flexible contracts, especially in the commercial employment branch increased with 6,1% in the third quarter of 2017 compared to the previous year (CBS, 2017). This increase is a result of organizations' demand for employees with flexible contracts. Organizations are deflecting from a full-time contract to a flexible contract, which can entail part-time work, flexible working hours, flexible working days and being on standby (DutchIct, 2016). This deflection would mean that employers are striving to have different types of contracts with the same organizations: a flexible contract and a permanent contract. This deflection in the change of contracts from the organization side, means that employees have to change their ways of working: they have to be equally adaptive (Hall & Moss, 1998).

This adaptation in contracts can be roughly translated into differences in types of career: a protean and a traditional career. The main difference between these two types of careers is that a protean career is managed by the individual itself, whereas a traditional career is managed by the organization (Gubler, Arnold & Coombs, 2014). And these two types of careers can exist within the same organization. Questions that come with the deflection in contracts, and the change in careers, is first of all, if only the working contract or career changes, or do the working activities, and conditions of these activities also change within the same organization? The second question that is raised is, are the attitudes towards overall job satisfaction of these two types of employees, influenced by the separation of protean and traditional employees? A third question that rises is how working conditions between the two groups of employees differ if both are present at the same organization? All these questions bundle up in one main research question: **What are the differences in attitude towards job satisfaction and the evaluation of working conditions between traditional and protean employees?** This research will help to better understand the differences between protean and traditional employees at the same organization.

## 1.1 Protean versus Traditional Employees

Firstly, it has to be noted that both protean and traditional careers are not the same as flexible and permanent contracts. Where protean employees are most of the time flexible, flexible employees are not always protean employees. The same goes for traditional versus permanent. Most traditional employees have permanent contracts, while those with a permanent contract are not always traditional. Employees with a permanent contract, can have protean careers and those with a flexible contract, can have traditional careers. The rest of this chapter is organized as follows: first, the concepts of protean and traditional career will be explained and the main differences will be elaborated. Next, personal characteristics will be integrated with these two types of career.

The shift in the employment branch has been one from a traditional and linear career to a flexible, fluid and protean career (Lo Presti, & Pluviano, Briscoe 2018), which results in the decrease of traditional careers (Briscoe, Hall & DeMuth, 2006) and the increase of protean careers (Guest, 2004). A traditional career is characterised by vertical success, progress on the corporate ladder, low mobility and strings being pulled by the organization rather than the individual (Hall, 1996; 2004). McDonald, Brown and Bradley (2005) add that increased payment and position within related jobs are also characteristic/typical of a traditional career. Individuals with a traditional career *'tend to take a more*



*passive role in managing their career and are more likely to seek direction from the organization'* (De Vos & Soens, 2008,p.450), and are not so proactive and self-directed as their colleagues with a protean career.

A protean career can be defined as *'a career that is self-determined, driven by personal values rather than organizational rewards'* (Hall, 2004,p2). A protean career is driven by the individual rather than the organization, mobility is high and psychological success is much more important than financial rewards (Hall, 2004). Focussing on personal values rather than organizational values is a characteristic of protean career (Hall & Moss, 1998) and in line with this, changing organizations or even professions is more common with protean careers than with traditional careers.

As mentioned earlier, personal characteristics also differ between individuals with a protean and traditional career. McArdle et al. (2007) indicate that individuals who engage in a protean career are more self-directed than those who have a traditional career. Protean employees are more actively looking to advance in their career since they are more proactive, flexible, self-managed (McArdle et al. 2007), more competent to cope with uncertainty of work (Seibert, Kraimer, & Crand, 2001) and have a more increased level of self-directedness (Baruch, Herrmann, & Hirschi, 2015), compared to their traditional colleagues. Higher levels of self-actualizations (striving for health, the search for identity and autonomy, and the yearning for excellence (Maslow, 1971), self-reliance (the perception that an individual is able to solve (personal) problems on their own (Labouliere, Kleinman & Gould, 2015), and freedom are also characterizing for protean individuals (Shevchuk & Strebkov, 2012). They are not willing to wait for events to happen and are proactively engaging in making them happen (Briscoe, DeMuth, & Hall, 2006).

## 1.2 Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is the overall attitude, either positive or negative, that an employee has over the job he or she holds and everything that comes with the job. According to Locke (1969) *"job satisfaction is the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating one's job values"* (p.317). According to Weiss (2002) job satisfaction is an attitude towards specific aspects of our concrete job and tasks characteristics (Van Dick et al. 2004), with an affective response towards the evaluation of that job and tasks. There are a lot of different concepts associated with job satisfaction, including job security, relationships with managers and colleagues (Ghazzawi, 2008), but flexibility and work autonomy also have a positive influence on job satisfaction (Quora, 2018) and motivation (Forbes, 2017). Next to these concepts, job satisfaction is influenced by organizational commitment and identification (Ghazzawi, 2008; Jeanson & Michinov, 2018). Relevant for this research is the question if there is a difference in the degree of job satisfaction between employees with a protean career and the ones with a traditional career. However, not only working conditions as flexibility, security and autonomy, are antecedents of job satisfaction, the degree of organizational identification is also a factor to consider. These concepts will be discussed further on.

With regards to the overall degree of job satisfaction, both Stroh, Brett and Reilly (1996), Shevchuk and Strebkov (2012) and Gulyani and Bhatnagar (2017) conclude in their research that employees with a protean career report a significant higher average degree of satisfaction than the ones with a traditional career. Ryan (2004) reports a non-significant outcome when it comes to the relationship between protean careers and degree of job satisfaction. Creed and Supeli (2016) however, draw the conclusion from their research outcomes that employees with a protean career have a lower degree of job satisfaction over time than those with a traditional career orientation. A lot of research has been done over the years, but the outcomes are inconclusive.

This research will give a bit more insight in the differences between protean and traditional employees who work at the same organization.

### 1.3 Working conditions

As mentioned earlier, working conditions as work autonomy, work flexibility and job security have an effect on the degree of job satisfaction. First, these three concepts will be elaborated on and after that, the differences between individuals with protean and traditional careers on those concepts will be explained.

#### 1.3.1 Work Autonomy

Work autonomy is defined as the latitude to which an employee is allowed to craft his or her job (Aubé, Morin, & Rousseau, 2007), and has the substantial freedom, independence and discretion in scheduling work tasks and the way these tasks are carried out (Hackman and Oldham, 1980). It also includes the freedom to select work projects, the ways these projects will be accomplished, setting of work schedules (Cummings & Molloy, 1977, as cited in Breugh, 1999), work independence and freedom (Hackman, Lawrence, & Oldham, 1975, as cited in Breugh, 1999). The level of autonomy also has an impact on concept such as job satisfaction, turnover intentions, quality of work and productivity (Van Mierlo et al. 2006). The level of work autonomy is higher with individuals with a protean career than with individuals with a traditional career (Hall & Moss, 1998; Shevchuk & Strebkov, 2012). Protean employees find it more difficult to accept rules that are imposed on them by authorities or corporate cultures, and they choose to develop their own criteria of career success and work-life-balance, autonomy to make own decisions (Shevchuk & Strebkov, 2012). This freedom to develop own criteria, is cherished by protean career individuals while traditional career employees experience this autonomy as a lack of external support (Hall & Moss, 1998)

#### 1.3.2 Work flexibility

Work flexibility can mean flexibility in different ways. Wallace (2003) considered flexibility in three different terms: time (working hours), place (place of work), and conditions (contractual arrangements). Protean career types are described as more flexible (Baruch et al. 2015) and adaptable (Gulyani & Bhatnagar yani, 2017), than those individuals with a traditional career orientation. Gulyani and Bhatnagar (2017) document in their study that individuals with a protean career orientation, prefer to work within an organization that gives them a certain degree of flexibility in work design, e.g. time and place, in addition to interesting tasks and opportunities. Next to the internal flexibility that employees with a protean career have, their flexibility also has an advantage for the organization. Since protean employees are recruited more swiftly, and without the formal and long recruitment process (Platman, 2004), they can be let go just as easily as they were recruited.

#### 1.3.3 Job security

Protean career types focus on work security rather than job security. Since the economic recession, job security is not a given anymore (Briscoe, Henagan, Burton & Murphey, 2012), and long-term security from the same organization has been dead even longer (Hall & Moss, 1998). Job security with individuals with a traditional career is defined as stable and secure employment (Jarosch, 2015) with the same organization while individuals with a protean career are more motivated by personal growth and learning than by the amount of job security they have (Briscoe et al. 2012). Individuals with a protean career *“focus on security in ongoing employability rather than security in ongoing*

*employment*” (Bridgstock, 2005, p.3). This ongoing employability is realized by their enhancement in human capital (Bridgstock, 2005) by e.g. training, education, and development of skills. The focus on ongoing employability rather than ongoing employment, Bridgstock (2005) indicates that relationships with employers are based more on a transaction than on a relation. Because of the transactional basis of a relationship, employers are more inclined to hire protean career oriented employees for particular projects or tasks (Auer, 2007) and hire traditional career oriented employees for a longer lasting professional relationship.

## 1.4 Social Identity Theory and Social Categorization Theory

Aforementioned, organizational identification and commitment are also influencers on the degree of job satisfaction of individuals with protean and traditional careers. In line with organizational identification and commitment, Social Identity Theory, Social Categorization Theory and the link with protean and traditional careers will be discussed.

### 1.4.1 Social Identity Theory

Protean careerists are leaning more towards professional identification and commitment rather than organizational identification and commitment. Whereas traditional employees are leaning towards organizational identification and commitment (Lo Presti et al. 2017), and therefore not sharing the same degree of organizational identification (Waters et al. 2014). This comes forth from Social Identity Theory (SIT), which helps understand and explain group processes and intergroup relations. SIT helps predict why and what individuals may think, feel or act as part of certain group processes (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995; Ellemers, 2012). Individuals tend to categorize and define themselves into different social categories, e.g. gender, age, interests, or in terms of another social referent, this being either another individual or a group (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). These social categories are also present in the organizational context, e.g. a department, union, lunch group, and an employee can derive parts of his or her identity from these groups (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). In addition to identification with a group, belongingness to or inclusion with a group is also important (Maslow, 1943; Ellemers, 2012), as this belongingness or inclusion can result in the level of identification one has with the relative group.

A low degree of organizational identification and commitment from protean career types can have multiple explanations. Firstly, individuals with a protean career tend to categorize themselves in terms of their profession rather than in terms of their organization (Ashford & Mael, 1989), and therefore, are showing a lower degree of organizational identification and commitment (Gulyani & Bhatnagar, 2017). This can result in protean careerists possibly not feeling the need to stay within the same organization, and they can start looking for alternative employment elsewhere more easily (Gulyani & Bhatnagar, 2017) since they are not highly committed to the organization.

Secondly, protean career types can see the organization as a convenient vehicle to realize personal career goals (Ashforth & Mael, 1989) and to develop their knowledge, skills and abilities (Schnatter, Dahling & Chau, 2017). Organizations are only there to help protean career types develop themselves and therefore they are not actively linking their identity to the organization (Schnatter et al. 2017), since one organization will be exchanged for another one if an individual is not developing their skills, knowledge and abilities anymore.

Lastly, protean employees might have a lower level of organizational identification and commitment because some of them are seconded at the organization. Secondment staff is defined by Lewis (2002) as *“The deployment of an individual of one related employer to another on a temporary basis, with eventual return to the first employer anticipated”*. This makes a clearly defined employer-

employee relationship rather difficult. When employees work in project teams or at a different site, with employees from other organizations, identification and commitment with the employer becomes more and more difficult to uphold (Rubery et al. 2002).

#### 1.4.2 Social Categorization Theory

Where SIT focusses on the fact that individuals are defining themselves in terms of social categories, Social Categorization Theory (SCT), describes how individuals do that. The social identity of SCT focusses on the membership of social (in)groups (Hornsey, 2008), and the identification with those. Hornsey (2008) points out that in-groups and the perception thereof, increases a degree of identification with an organization. Lee, Park and Koo (2015) also indicate that because of the belongingness to an in-group, organizational identification is increased. Through the employees process of categorizing themselves within an in-group, “*I become we*” (Brewer, 1991,p.47), which indicates the level of organizational identification. However, it is not mentioned to what extent protean employees are able to access an in-group at an organization that they are seconded at. Since individuals are approaching those individuals who belong to the same in-group, and keeping those who belong to the out-group at a distance (Schnatter et al. 2017), it is interesting to examine how this in-group versus outgroup belongingness translates to protean versus traditional career oriented individuals in an organization.

Table 1 summarizes the multiple differences between protean and traditional careers, and the individuals behind them. Degrees of both job autonomy, job flexibility and professional identification are higher with individuals who have a protean career orientation while degrees of job security, and organizational identification and commitment are higher with traditional career types. The degree of job satisfaction is inconclusive with regards to both groups of employees, and therefore they can have different or the same degree of job satisfaction.

To answer the research question that was formulated earlier as thoroughly as possible, two representatives of both protean and traditional employees participated at the same time in the study. The differences between both groups are a good starting point in the discussion in how groups experience the concepts of e.g. job satisfaction, work autonomy, work flexibility, job security. This discussion is most valuable when both groups are part of the discussion at the same time, since it can bring up viewpoints that are otherwise forgotten.

Table 1: Summary of differences between protean versus traditional career oriented individuals.

	Protean Career Oriented Individuals	Traditional Career Oriented Individuals
Career orientation	Pro-active and self-directed approach in achieving a career that is driven by personal values.	More passive role in obtaining a career that is driven and directed by the organization.
Work Autonomy	Autonomy and degree of freedom is appreciated.	Autonomy and degree of freedom is experienced as lack of support.
Work Flexibility	More flexible with regards to their contractual working arrangements.	More flexible with regards to working hours (one week 35 hours, another week 45 hours).
Job Security	Oriented towards ongoing employability.	Oriented towards ongoing employment.
Organizational Identification	Identification with profession.	Identification with organization.

## 2 Method

In this method section, the research design will be discussed, an overview of the participants will be provided, an outline of the interview will be given and the data analysis will be explained.

### 2.1 Research design

The method used in this research were semi-structured, qualitative dyadic interviews. The dyadic interviews that were carried out, included two participants at the same time (Sohier, 1995) from the same organization. To get a good understanding of what the participants think and feel about the topics talked about in the introduction, participants participated in the dyadic interview. Typically for dyadic interviews is that they bring together two participants (Morgan et al. 2013) of different viewpoints, which in this research are the protean and traditional career point of view. The participants, who are working at the same organization and know one another and are therefore able to talk to each other in a way that they are accustomed to. The interaction between both participants combines the intimacy of an individual interview with the public performance of a focus group (Morris, 2001).

Both participants interacted in response to open-ended research questions (Morgan et al. 2013), and the data was collected through the conversation and interaction between the two participants (Morgan et al. 2016). With the conversation that was going on between the two types of participants, both participants were sharing their own viewpoints and comparing them to the viewpoints of their dyadic partner. This sharing and comparing is an important component of dyadic interview (Morgan et al. 2013) since it creates a joint picture and a shared narrative (Arskey, 1996, as stated in Eisikovitz and Koren, 2010). With the dyadic interview, the differences between both groups of employees were more easily explored than during a one-on-one interview since the dyad stimulate each other to bring up ideas which might have not been come up otherwise (Morgan et al. 2013). And from these ideas, the other participant can draw forth from statements and responses from his or her dyadic partner (Morgen et al. 2013), and the discussion continued.

### 2.2 Participants

This research included two different types of participants, protean and traditional career oriented participants. Criteria for protean employees in this research were mainly high mobility (Hall, 2004) and high flexibility (Gulyani & Bhatnagar, 2017). These criteria for protean career types were translated into employees that have secondment contracts. Secondment employees are on 'loan' at organization A from organization B, and while working at another organization, the employee does not change payrolls but rather the receiving employer pays a reimbursement for the employees costs (Lewis, 2002). Secondment employment gives employees the freedom to select and switch projects to continue developing their skills, knowledge and abilities (Schnatter et al. 2017), and therefore their ongoing employability (Bridgstock, 2005). The main criteria for the traditional oriented employees were low mobility and the organization is in charge of the employee's career (Hall, 2004). These criteria for traditional employees translated in the recruitment of employees who have a direct contract at the organization, either permanent or temporary. A contract directly at the organization, gives the organization the power to decide what happens with an employee, especially if an employee has a temporary contract.

Convenience sampling of the participants was used in this study, mainly through personal contacts. These personal contacts provided the researcher with contact details for participants who were willing to cooperate. These potential participants were then approached via email. One personal contact contacted the potential participants himself and made the dyads for the interview based on the

amount of personal contact that the potential participants had between them. This resulted in six dyadic interviews on the same day, at a technical organization. The other potential participants were contacted via email and those participants recruited the other part of the dyad themselves. This resulted in six other dyadic interviews, in three different sectors: the technical, the educational and the financial sector. All data was gathered between January and March 2018.

The participants of the research were equally divided into protean and traditional. Of the 12 dyadic interviews, there were 12 protean, secondment, employees (50%) and 12 traditional employees (50%), which makes a total of 24 participants. Of these 24 participants, 6 were female (25%) and 18 were male (75%). The participants came from three different sectors of work: the educational sector (16,7%), the technical sector (58,3%) and the financial sector (25%). An short overview can be found in Table 2. For a full overview of all the participants, including organization, age, and gender, see appendix A.

### 2.3 Dyadic Interview

The dyadic interview started off with a reassurance that everything that was said remained confidential and anonymous and would not be able to be traced back to them. It was also mentioned that there were no right or wrong answers since the research was about their personal experience about the differences between regular staff and secondment staff within an organization. Permission was asked to record the interview, with a recording device, for further analysis. The interview began with an introductory question: *“For which organization do you work for?”*. As the interview progressed, multiple questions were asked. Most central questions to these interviews were: *“Are you satisfied with your employer?”* and *“What are, according to you, the most important differences between the two groups of employees?”*. Other topics that were discussed in the interview included, but were not limited to, flexibility in work, autonomy in work, job security, and treatment from colleagues and management. Questions, corresponding with these topics were: *“Do you notice that colleagues from your team treat both parties differently?”* (treatment from colleagues), *“How do you think the other looks at job security?”* (job security) and *“How do you think the other copes with the flexibility of work? And does this correspond to your own viewpoint?”* (work flexibility). A full overview of these questions can be found in appendix B.

Halfway through gathering the data, it was noticed that both protean and traditional employees evaluated one another in a certain way. And to get a better insight in these evaluations, the question *“Would you switch position with your dyadic partner?”* was added. This question was asked from interview 8 onwards. Every interview but one was held with all three people (the interviewer and two interviewees) face to face. That one interview was partially held through Skype, since one interviewee was not present at the same location. The length of the interviews varied from 36 minutes to 56 minutes.

### 2.4 Data Analysis

Following the actual interviews, all interviews were transcribed and a codebook was created to get a proper insight in what was actually said during the interviews. Most of the codes in the codebook were created based on the literature review that was done previous from the data gathering, e.g. work autonomy, work flexibility, job security, and job satisfaction. The rest of the codes were created based on the output of the data. The codebook consisted of 12 different constructs, and each construct consists of 3 different sub codes: a general code and two codes with specifications ‘different’ or ‘not different’ attached to it. The construct of flexibility consists of three codes: ‘flexibility’, which covers all

general flexibility comments, ‘flexibility different’ covers all comments on flexibility where the difference between protean and traditional employees comes forth, and ‘flexibility not-different’, which covers all comments on that describe the similarities on flexibility between the two types of employees. In total there are 41 codes. All codes were carefully defined. The code ‘flexibility different’, was defined as: *“Everything that participants said with regards to differences in flexibility between the two types of employees (in working hours, place of work [home, the office], and choosing a new project)”*. The full codebook can be found in appendix C.

Afterwards, the codebook was carefully discussed with a second coder so that a mutual understanding of the definition was ensured. Ten percent of the total transcribed pages of data was coded by two codes to achieve a satisfactory intercoder reliability. A Cohen’s Kappa of .76 was achieved which is, according to Dooley (2001), regarded as reliable. Subsequently, all interview transcripts were individually uploaded into Atlas.Ti to code the rest of the generated data. Coding was done per quotation that regarded the same topic.

Table 2: An overview of the participants

	Secondment staff male	Secondment staff female	Regular staff male	Regular staff female
Technical sector	7	0	7	0
Financial sector	1	2	3	0
Educational sector	0	2	0	2
Total	8	4	10	2

### 3 Results

In this result section, the concepts of job satisfaction, working conditions and organizational identification will be discussed. Table 3 gives an complete overview of the results that are found in this study. To make the data more understandable, it has to be noted that the different organizations have different utterances for both protean and traditional employees. Protean staff is not referred to as protean staff, but they are referred to as ‘signed on’, ‘external’, or ‘hired’. When participants talk about traditional staff, that works directly for the organization, terms as ‘regular’, ‘internal’ or ‘normal’ are used.

Table 3: A summary of the differences found between protean versus traditional career oriented individuals.

	Protean Career Oriented Individuals	Traditional Career Oriented Individuals
Career orientation	Most of the participants are oriented towards ongoing employability but they also prefer the organization they are currently in.	Most of the participants oriented towards ongoing employment but they are still developing themselves to.
Work Autonomy	A lot of the participants indicate that they are allowed less involvement in particular projects since managers worry about loss of knowledge when protean employees leave. They indicate the same degree of freedom in their day to day activities as traditional employees.	A lot of the participants indicate that they have autonomy in work to a certain degree. They are allowed to organize their day to their own liking, but the planning of a project is leading.
Work Flexibility	Participants indicate that they are not as flexible with regards to working hours, as employers for protean staff are strict with 40-hour work weeks. They are, however, not strict in what time they start and finish work.	Participants indicate that they are flexible with their work. If they work 45 hours one week, they are able to work 35 hours the next, for compensation.
Job Security	Most participants have high degrees of job security since they have a contract with their secondment employer and will get a new assignment through that employer if the current assignment expires.	All participants have high degrees of job security with their organization.
Organizational Identification	Most participants identify themselves with their organization while a few identify themselves with their profession.	All participants identify themselves with the organization they work for.

#### 3.1 Job Satisfaction

As mentioned in the method section, participants were asked about their degree of job satisfaction. The overall degree of job satisfaction were the same for both protean and traditional participants. Everyone was happy with their jobs and the way they were treated by the organization. Not one participant had a low degree of job satisfaction. All participants answered the question with a short “Yes”, or “Yes, I am satisfied”.



What stands out is that both protean and traditional participants are satisfied with their role and place within the organization. Protean participants explain that they appreciate the freedom and flexibility of a flexible contract, and therefore take all the little extra administrative tasks that come with it, for granted. *“Yes it is purely the systems behind it, the administrative hassle that comes with it”.*

Protean participants mostly indicate that they are satisfied because they have the flexibility of looking for alternative employment if this is no longer work that they enjoy doing. *“Yes I agree, then I can decide for myself if I want to stay at a place I do not like. And that is a benefit in my eyes.”* In contrast to this, a traditional participant indicated that he enjoyed the stability that comes with his position within the organization. He indicated the following: *“Well I prefer the certainty that comes with the job. I always had something like, I prefer the certainty of a permanent contract over switching jobs the entire time. I’m happy with my permanent job.”* Another traditional participant also stated that he likes the stability of a traditional career: *“I chose for my current employer for a reason and that was mainly the certainty that came with it. At a certain point you feel comfortable at an organization and you stay”.*

Both protean and traditional career oriented individuals both have high degrees of job satisfaction. The reasons why behind their high satisfaction are different. As can be seen in Table 3, evaluation of work autonomy, work flexibility, job security, and the degree of organizational identification are different with protean employees than they are with traditional employees. These differences will be explained in this chapter.

## 3.2 Working Conditions

The conditions of work of both groups do not differ a lot. Both groups of employees are doing the same work and getting, roughly, the same as reward. However, there are some differences in approach with regards to the work that both groups are delivering.

### 3.2.1 Work Autonomy

As Table 3 indicates, the evaluation of work autonomy between protean and traditional employees differ. When both groups of employees were asked about their evaluation of work autonomy, both parties indicated that they just do what their manager or supervisor tells the team what to do. Usually this is the result of the scheduling of a certain project: *“With myself, I get orders and I don’t really get to choose what I like. Sometimes it happens that you get to choose a task that you like most, but mostly we just have to follow the schedule. **Yes exactly, and there are tasks on the schedule and sometimes you can steer in your own activities but the schedule of je projects has priority”***

However, when it comes to *who* does what within a team, several factors play a role in who does what. One respondent indicates that when there is work to be done, a traditional employee will take the lead then a protean employee gets bits and pieces. One explanation that a traditional employee gives is that managers would like to keep the knowledge with the traditional employees. This is to prevent that thoughts and reasoning behind decisions gets lost when the protean employee leaves the organization. But when bits and pieces are given, a protean employee indicates the following: *“Yes but in which order I do the tasks is up to us. And we try to divide the tasks, we discuss that sort of thing”.*

#### *Knowledge transfer*

When talking about autonomy, both groups indicate that a protean employee has just a little autonomy as the traditional employee. And when the question ‘if, and to what extent does your manager treat both groups differently?’, was asked, both groups most of the time answered most of the time that he or she did not treat both groups differently. But when the conversation continued, it

brought to light that managers are, in most cases, somewhat reluctant to include protean staff in knowledge projects: *"Yes that is a projects that is managed by a project manager outside our department, and he clearly states that he does not want hired staff included"*. And another participant says: *"They try to keep as much of the knowledge with the regular staff, he profits from that. And with us, well in reality you see that a lot of the hired staff also carry projects, so if you keep all the knowledge within the organization is something to wonder"*. But keeping knowledge projects with traditional staff and giving all the other projects to the protean staff is not always be accomplished: *"Well you have internal projects to keep knowledge inside, you see. However, you [his protean colleague] were asked to participate in that as well"*. This reluctance to include protean employees in knowledge projects, indicates that managers view protean and traditional employees differently. The assumption that protean employees are more inclined to leave the organization than traditional employees, results in higher levels of trust towards traditional employees in comparison to protean employees and the inclusion of both groups in knowledge projects.

### 3.2.2 Work Flexibility

As indicated in Table 3, the main difference between protean and traditional employees with regards to work flexibility is the flexibility with regards to working hours. In general, protean staff is much more focussed on working the hours that their employer and the organization that they are at, have agreed on. However, both parties equally allow themselves the flexibility of working the hours that they are comfortable with, as long as they work their contracted hours. A traditional staffer at a technical firm says the following regarding this: *"I think that everyone is inclined to make those 8 hours per day and 40 hours per week. But that also applies to the regular staff, everyone tries to achieve that."* And another traditional employee adds to this: *"And those flexible working hours are nice, so the first time I start at 8:30 and you leave a bit earlier. You clock your hours and at the end of the week you should have worked 40 hours and otherwise you have to take it out of your days off. So if you want to sleep in because you had a rough weekend, you can just start at 10:00 o'clock"*. But this is not always the case, one protean employee said: *"so in general hired staff is, in my opinion, more inclined to put a bit more effort in work, to work a few hours extra. And then I'll have to look at other companies, I know that there, an organization in the eastern part of the country, the hired staff was working overtime while the regular staff were already on their way home."* But a lot of participants also attribute flexibility to character traits: *"So, yeah, I'm just flexible but that has more to do with personality than the employer I recon."* But flexibility in working hours is not the only kind of flexibility that was mentioned in the introduction: the flexibility to switch jobs and organizations was also explained. A lot of protean employees indicate that they prefer the flexibility they have to change jobs or projects with this kind of career. *"I love the flexibility of a secondment employer"*. Another protean employee says the following: *"Well, you have to be flexible, otherwise you are not able to do this kind of job. Then you'll have to get a permanent job at an organization. I like this, you gain a lot of experience and the advantage that, if it doesn't suit you, you're able to switch and you'll try something different. And I see that as a great advantage"*. However, it must be noted that the employees who said this, are both in markets that are booming and vacancies are not easily filled with qualified staff. One protean employee indicates that she's flexible with her projects because she knows will have another project soon after she leaves her current one: *"With myself, as long as the IT-business is booming, I've got work. And I don't just do one thing, I'm more an all-rounder"*.

Both groups of employees indicate that their degree of flexibility is satisfactory because both groups enjoy the flexibility than comes with their career orientation. Protean career oriented individuals

have more flexibility when it comes to switching organizations and assignments and less flexibility when it comes to their working hours, while traditional careerists have more flexibility in work hours and less in changing organizations and assignments. Protean careerists do have more administrative work when it comes with their flexibility in working hours, but do that gladly since they have a lot of flexibility in changing organizations and assignments if they want to.

### 3.2.3 Job Security

As Table 3 illustrates, job security for a protean employee does not mean the same as it does for a traditional employee. A protean employee do have high degrees of security since they have a working contract at their secondment firm, however they do not know when their current assignment expires. Traditional employees have high degrees of job security at their current employer. This can be translated into the continued employability by protean career types and the ongoing employment by traditional career types. From the interviews comes forward that protean employees are less concerned with their enduring employability and more with their enduring employment. One protean employee said the following with regards to job security: *"I think I'm more flexible with this than my colleagues are. Because when you are hired staff, you see so many organizations and you gain so much experience. My [traditional] colleague just works in his zone, and everything he does, he does here."* And another protean employee adds: *"And next to that, I have a permanent contract at my employer, so if I don't have an assignment, I get paid anyway, which is a nice safety net"*. This quote illustrates that protean employees are more flexible, since they have a safety net with their employer and know that they will get a new assignment through that employer.

#### *The Golden Cage Effect*

What some participants bring up is the 'golden cage' effect. Where some protean employees are more cautious about their contract and put their best foot forward, some traditional employees are in a so called golden cage, where it does not matter so much how you function, but since those traditional employees have a permanent contract, it's too big of a step to leave the organization: *"Maybe it is just because they are internal, that they are in a golden cage and actually want something different but also know that if they went somewhere else, they would get paid less, and therefore stayed but were not motivated at all."* *"If you're an internal staff member and you don't like it anymore, and you're are too scared to take such a big step, then you'll notice that in their motivation. And you see that more often with internal staff than with external staff since it's easier for external staff to leave"*. This is not the same for protean employees who don't have a permanent contract at the organization: *"You can almost say that an external staff member has to succeed, and an internal staff member also of course but before there are sanctions towards an internal staff member, he had about 86 possibilities to perform better. While with an external staff member patience runs out faster."* But it's not just a big step for traditional employees to leave the organization, it is also a lot of effort for the organization to get rid of traditional employees who are not functioning properly. It is much easier for an organization to get rid of a protean employee than of a traditional employee. And this difference is causing frustration with, especially protean, employees. *"The way I look at it, is that it is just not fair if an individual does not perform he or she cannot be removed from the organization because he/she is an internal staff member. Which is not only not good for him/her, but also not for the team and the organization."*

### 3.2.4 Effort

In line with the golden cage effect, participants indicate that mostly protean employees do put more effort in their work than traditional employees do. *“Yes I do notice that, in general, hired staff will put more effort in their work. They have to be friendly of course, and have a bit of a commercial mentality. And because you are kind of the representation of your employer, you have to be a bit more cooperative to the organization that provides your assignment.”* The reason that protean career oriented employees are putting more effort in their work is that they are more easily dismissed than their traditional counterpart. One dyad of participants said the following: *“So in general hired staff is, in my opinion, more inclined to put a bit more effort in work, to work a few hours extra. And then I’ll have to look at other companies, I know that there, an organization in the eastern part of the country, the hired staff was working overtime while the regular staff were already on their way home with their bikes.”* This was affirmed by another participant who indicated the same. *“I had the same when I was still at my former employer. I always had it in the back of my head that my organization that provided my assignment had to be very satisfied, so I worked hard, not sure if I worked harder then, than I do now. But it was always a kind of stress in the back of my mind that said that I could be kicked out at any time. And now I don’t have to worry anymore since I have a permanent contract”.* But it is not always the case that protean careerists are putting more effort in work. Some participants also indicate that new colleagues, regardless of their contracts, are more inclined to put more effort in their work since they still have to prove themselves worthy of the job. *“We have a new colleague, a regular one, and you notice that he tries to make a few extra hours at one point, and at another point he tries to put in just a bit more effort”.* Traditional employees tend to put more effort in relationships in the workplace than protean employees. The reason for this is that traditional employees have more job security and are less flexible to change organizations or assignments and. Protean employees put generally more effort in their work than traditional employees do. This can be clarified because of the lower job security that protean employees have, if they put a lot of effort in their work, they are less likely to be dismissed.

### 3.2.5 Training and schooling

As mentioned earlier, protean employees are more inclined than traditional employees to work towards their ongoing employability than towards their ongoing employment. This ongoing employability can come from training, education or development of skills. However, results show that both protean and traditional participants work on their ongoing employability. A protean participant indicates that she’s studying next to her job: *“I noticed that I was stuck, and that’s why I started studying again and I do this part time, next to my job”.* And one traditional participant indicated the following: *“I’m 55 now and if I’m forced to look for another job, I at least can say that I recently took two American exams. That shows that I’m still learning and I think that, if I can keep this up, I’ll be guaranteed of a job at my current employer”.* And not just this participant indicates that he keep developing himself with regards to this employability. Another traditional employee states that she can easily access training and education, if she wants to. *“I can easily go to my director and say: well, I’ve seen this course that I would really like to take”.* Organizations do not tend to make a distinction in traditional and protean employees when it comes to offering training and schooling. A protean employee indicates: *“Even as a hired staff member, you get the same possibilities as a regular staff member. You have access to the same courses and are allowed access to everything. And that won’t change”.* And another protean employee says: *“There are courses organized which you can attend and will be compensated”.* However, there are differences between types of organizations. Within the technical and financial sector, protean employees get more training and schooling presented to them than in the educational sector. One

traditional employee from the technical sector said: *"I witnessed that here, that an hired staff member was sent to a seminar of a week to get his knowledge brushed up. An arrangement will be made if it is deemed necessary to take a course or seminar. Then we'll engage in these procedures"*. Protean employees in the educational sector have to get their training and schooling from the secondment employer rather than the employer they work for on a daily basis. A protean employee indicates the following: *"I know that from my [secondment] employer different courses are offered that you can take for your work such as Time Management or effectivity or something. But they are separate from the organization I'm currently assigned to"*. This difference between branches can be attributed to the fact that within the technical sector, qualified staff is really hard to find. Organizations are therefore doing everything to keep staff committed to their organization, both traditional and protean. This includes the policy to make all employees equal in treatment, both protean and traditional: *"You get all same the possibilities as a hired staff member, with regards to courses and education"*

### 3.3 Organizational Identification

As illustrated by Table 3, the focus of identification differs between protean and traditional employees. Protean employees tend to identify themselves more with the organization they work at than their profession while traditional employees only identify themselves with their organization.

Protean employees have two different organization that they could identify with: their employer and the organization that they are working at. Interestingly, the level of identification from protean staff members towards the organization that they work for on a daily basis is higher than the identification level towards the organization that they actually work for. Protean staff members identify themselves more with their colleagues that they work with on a daily basis than their colleagues from the same employer. As a protean employee said: *"It feels that the organization that I'm working for on a daily basis, is my employer"*, while her actual employer is the secondment organisation. In addition, another protean employee indicates that she forgets who her real employer is: *"Well I feel so involved that forget that I'm just on assignment here and that [my secondment organization] is my employer since I'm here on a daily basis"*. And these participants are not the only ones, multiple protean employees stated that they had little commitment or identification with the organization that they actually get paid by. *"I don't notice a lot from my [secondment] employer, it just feels that my assignment provider is my employer. That's how I see it, it's just the paperwork that is different."* *"Yes I'm happy with the organization that gives me my assignment actually, I feel at home at the organization I work at on a daily basis"*. This lack of identification towards their employer can be attributed to the fact that organizational members compare their identity perceptions and expectation, which affect levels of identity congruence, which leads to organizational identification (Foreman & Whetten, 2002). This is however, not the case for everyone. One protean participant indicated that she works at her payroll organization and is employed at another organization. *"My employer is [my secondment organization], and I'm hired by another organization"*, and therefore indicates that she does not feel very identified with the organization she currently is working.

#### 3.3.1 Social interactions

Social interaction during work hours is not different when it comes to the two groups of employees. Both groups treat each other like colleagues, no matter who their employer is. *"Yes I see my colleague, who actually works for a secondment employer, not as a hired colleague, but as an organizational colleague"*. Participants also indicate that a lot of their colleagues do not even know that

they are secondment staff rather than regular staff, which makes it easy not to distinguish between the two groups of employees. *“When we walk through the factory, all kinds of employees [both protean and traditional] work there. They don’t care who is external and who is internal. That doesn’t matter.”* And a lot of participants point out that it is not relevant who your employer is: *“yes well I think that for most of the colleagues it doesn’t matter, because you have a lot of colleagues, both internal and external”*.

However, expectations with regards to social interactions do differ between protean and traditional employees. Where both protean and traditional respondents claim that all kind of colleagues are welcome to join all kinds of things, their expectations of social interaction towards colleagues from the other group are not the same. One traditional employee indicates: *“If an external staff member states that he is just here to do his assignment than I’m more inclined to make my peace with it than when an internal staff member says that. Then I’ll think: come on, you’re part of the club, come socialize”*. Expectations that an employee has with regards to the other group of employees, cannot always be right since multiple participants indicate that it can be quite hard to tell if an employee is traditional or protean. This hard-to-tell-difference, can be attributed to the personality that the relevant employee has.

Another aspect of social interactions, are company outings. While at some organizations, both groups of employees are treated the same: *“I was assigned here in the beginning and within 3 weeks they hosted a party and I got an invite as well”*. While other organizations do distinguish between protean and traditional staff.

### 3.4 Indirect evaluation of the other group

When conducting the interview, a lot of information came to light. And with everything that was said, an indirect evaluation of both groups came to light. How do participants actually feel and what do they actually think about the other group? One thing that came forward is that not a lot of participants wanted to switch sides and that they were happy with what they had. One traditional employee stated multiple times that secondment firms were *‘just human traffickers’*, and those organizations were just about *‘moving around boxes’*, instead of helping employees with a suitable project. Another one indicated that secondment firms were *‘just making money because of the middleman’s hard work’*. He also said the following: *“I prefer to go directly to an organization where I want to work and take care of my own negotiations instead of going through another organization where someone can make money because of me”*. One dyad contained two former colleagues from the same secondment firm, where one transferred to a permanent contract at the organization they were detached. When asked what their overall opinion of the other group was, the one still at the secondment firm was: *“defector”*.

To indicate the subtle in-group versus out-group mentality: a protean employee called himself *‘different from others’* with regards to being ambitious and wanting work that had more variation to the job. He also indicated that the general technical employee is a bit *‘autistic, rigid and introvert’*, but since this participant is *‘different from others’*, this would not apply to him. Another protean employee said that: *“I just want to keep the flexibility, that if I don’t enjoy it anymore or the work gets boring, you can go somewhere else. That will keep you sharp”*. Both statements would indicate that traditional employees (the out-group) are not as ambitious and are satisfied with the same daily tasks over and over again and would therefore not be sharp in comparison to other protean colleagues (the in-group). In addition to this, another protean participant indicates that *“it is expected of me that, where ever I go, I learn the ropes. That keeps you sharp, keeps you off the street. And I like that, I prefer the hectic”*. This quote indicates that only protean employees would love the hectic environment and keeping busy with work, since they are expected to know an organization when they start their assignment there, while

traditional employees are not keen on the hectic environment and craziness that can come from a job. This in-group versus out-group also comes to light when talking of lunch-breaks: *“it is of course nice that you can talk about your assignment and the organization, we do that as well, let’s be honest. You’ll want to talk about that with a colleague that is with the same employer, not one that is at the organization you have your assignment. So that can be a small wall? Because of how things go? Yes well, because of those things, a wall arises.”*

Jealousy of the other party also came to light in one of the dyadic interviews. One protean employee said multiple times that she only had a contract until the end of the summer, and that she would like to continue working at the organization on a more permanent contract like her dyadic partner. *“Well you keep hearing me say, until the end of August. So I know that I’ve got a job for another 6 months and after that it is a question. I can imagine that you [her dyadic partner] are a bit more relaxed in this, I’m just safe for half a year but we’ll see.”*

### 3.5 Protean versus Traditional employees

As mentioned in the introduction section, there are three main differences between protean and traditional oriented employees. Firstly, protean oriented employees are in charge of their own careers while with traditional oriented employees the organization is in charge. This does seem to be the case. Where protean career oriented employees are trying to develop themselves, by undergoing training and education and switching projects if they want something else. Also, protean career types are more inclined to switch projects or task if they feel that they have learned enough or feel like a change of scenery. Traditional employees are, in general, guided more by the organization, but this is not the case for everyone. Traditional employees however, do not stand still in their personal development, organizations are offering training and schooling for their employees. And some traditional employees also undertake training and schooling outside of the organization they work for since they want to uphold their employability. Also, traditional employees are more inclined to stay with the same organization, since they have the security of work and income.

Secondly, mobility was higher with protean employees than it was with traditional employees. As was shown in the flexibility section in the result chapter, protean employees are generally more flexible than their traditional counterparts. This includes both flexibility in working hours and flexibility in working conditions. Where there were no real differences found between protean and traditional career types on behalf of the flexibility in working hours, there was a difference in flexibility in work and switching work. Protean employees are more flexible in changing work settings than traditional employees. But this can be attributed to the fact that both groups are actively choosing to be in their particular group. More than one traditional employee indicated that they chose to be a traditional employee, and several protean employees indicated the same, that they chose to be a protean employee.

And thirdly, psychological success was a motive for protean employees while financial rewards were a motive for traditional employees. This however does not seem to be the case since multiple protean employees indicated that they did not want to transfer employer as they would go backwards financially. *“We have a set sum of money per month to cover our travel expenses and then when hired staff talk about wanting to get a direct contract at the organization, that this is an issue. If they switch employers, it will cost them money”.*

### *Personal Characteristics*

As pointed out in the introduction, protean career types appear to be more pro-active than those with a traditional career orientation. According to one protean employee, this is definitely so: *“I think I’m a little different from the average [technical employer], since I’m inclined to seek more challenge, and I don’t get that at this department. I have a quite versatile character, I’m ambitious etc”*.

However, other participants argue that pro-active personalities are not just reserved for individuals with a protean career and that it solely depends that person’s character, rather than the differences on character traits between protean and traditional employees: *“Well I think that differs per person. That does not have anything to do with hired or regular staff. No I don’t think so”*. Another traditional employee adds: *“No that’s a character thing”*. And another indicates that: *“Well his predecessor [of a protean employee], was a bit less anticipating and didn’t do much. He didn’t take any decisions and left everything to us. You can say something about it like: well you can make your own decisions. He didn’t fly very high. But that was purely his character, that doesn’t have anything to do with being normal or hired staff”*.

In summary, there are differences between protean and traditional career oriented staff. See Table 3 for the short overview. On the subject of job flexibility, both groups of participants are equally flexible in the organization of their workdays, but traditional participants are more flexible when it comes to working overtime. On the subject of job autonomy, protean staff indicates that they are being kept away from knowledge projects since they are able to leave the organization at any time while traditional staff are not that inclined to leave. This is in line with job security, where protean participants indicate that they have safety net if they want to switch projects, traditional participants do not have a safety net if they want to switch projects or employers. With regards to career orientation, protean career oriented participants indicated that they are oriented towards ongoing employability, but most of them do prefer to stay with the organization they are currently working for. Traditional career oriented participants are oriented towards ongoing employment, but that does not mean that they do not keep developing themselves. And the last difference between protean and traditional career oriented staff is in which terms they identify themselves. Where traditional participants all identify themselves with the organization, some protean participants identify themselves with the organization and some with their profession.



## 4 Discussion

This research was conducted to better understand the differences within an organization between protean and traditional career oriented individuals. The aim of this research was to better understand the structure that originates when there are two different groups of employees (protean and traditional) working at the same organization, and how this structure originates. The differences between the groups were examined through twelve dyadic interviews, where each dyad existed of a traditional and a protean career oriented employee. The results of the research indicate what the main differences between the two groups of employees are. Table 4 gives an overview of the results found with regards to the differences between the two groups of employees and how these results relate to viewpoints found in literature. In this chapter, the results will be discussed and the research question will be answered. In addition, practical and theoretical implications, limitations and directions for future research will be given.

Table 4: An overview of the differences between previous research and current results.

	Protean Career Orientation		Traditional Career Orientation	
	Viewpoint from literature	Viewpoint from data	Viewpoint from literature	Viewpoint from data
Career orientation	Pro-active and self-directed approach in achieving a career that is driven by personal values.	Most of the participants pro-actively engaged in their ongoing employability and their career.	More passive role in obtaining a career that is driven and directed by the organization.	Semi-pro-active attitude towards ongoing employability but keen on staying with the same employer.
Work Autonomy	Autonomy to make own decisions and criteria appreciated.	Autonomy in the way a working day is organized, no autonomy/freedom in selecting work projects.	Autonomy to make own decisions and develop own criteria is experienced as lack of support.	Autonomy in the way a day is organized and some autonomy in selecting working projects.
Work Flexibility	More flexible in work (e.g. time and place) compared to traditional staff.	Less flexible in workhours but more flexible in switching employment compared to traditional staff.	Less flexible in work (e.g. time and place) compared to protean staff.	More flexible in workhours but less flexible in switching employers compared to protean staff.
Job Security	Oriented towards ongoing employability.	Oriented towards ongoing employability together with the security of a contract with their employer.	Oriented towards ongoing employment.	High levels of job security with the organization.
Organizational Identification	Identification with profession.	Mostly identification with organization than profession.	Identification with organization.	All participants identify themselves with the organization they work for.

## 4.1 Discussion and conclusion

The results of this research illustrate that both protean and traditional staff are satisfied with their jobs and the roles that they fulfil. The degree of job satisfaction is influenced by the level of organizational identification and the discussed working conditions: work autonomy, work flexibility and job security. Both groups have a different view on both organizational identification and their working conditions but these different views are the reason that they are satisfied with their jobs.

As can be seen in Table 4, results of organizational identification and working conditions are, however, not in line with results from previous research. Current results indicate that both protean and traditional staff are continuously working on increasing their employment potential, and taking charge of their own career. With protean staff, this is mostly within multiple organizations and with traditional staff within one organization. Both protean and traditional staff undertake training and education to keep themselves attractive on the labour market. However, this is not in line with previous research done by Hall (1996; 2004), McDonald et al. (2005) and Hall and Moss (1998). These researches indicate that only protean staff are taking charge of their own career and are actively involved in the continuance while traditional staff is more passive in this.

As Table 4 points out, previous research shows that protean staff appreciates work autonomy with regards to making own decisions and formulating own criteria, where traditional staff experiences this as lack of support (Shevchuck & Strebkov, 2012; Hall & Moss, 1998). Current results, however, indicate that the appreciated autonomy is not always given by managers to protean staff members. Traditional staff gets more autonomy in making own decisions than protean staff, which can partly be attributed to the fact that managers are hesitant to include protean staff in knowledge projects because if protean staff leaves, their particular knowledge is also gone.

With regard to work flexibility, Table 4 also indicates that current research outcomes do not reach full consensus with research conducted by Baruch et al. (2015) and Gulyani and Bhatnagar (2017). These researchers indicated that protean staff is more flexible in comparison to traditional staff while the outcomes of this research indicate that protean staff is less flexible than traditional staff. This lack of flexibility from protean staff can be attributed to the rigid administration that their own employer handles. However, in line with previous research, protean staff is more flexible when it comes to changing organizations that they work for. Protean career oriented individuals can more easily switch organizations than their traditional counterpart. This is because protean career types do have the security of a continuous employment at their, mostly secondment, employer. The same job security that protean staff has, also applies to traditional staff members. While previous research indicated that protean staff is more oriented towards ongoing employability while traditional staff is oriented towards ongoing employment. Results of this research do not back up findings from Briscoe et al. (2012) and Bridgstock (2005) since the majority of the protean staff also do have the security of a permanent contract, just not at the organization that they work at on a daily basis, while the rest of the protean staff do not have the safety net of a permanent job. In line with earlier research, traditional staff has high levels of job security. However, these high levels can be attributed to the stable economic environment. Some participants indicated that the level of job security was not always as high, especially not in the economic recession.

On the subject of organizational identification, Table 4 indicates that there is partial consensus between current and previous research outcomes. Where Lo Presti et al. (2017) and Waters et al. (2014) indicate that traditional career types are leaning towards organizational identification, protean career types are leaning towards professional identification. While results support the claims that traditional career oriented employees are leaning more towards organizational identification, the claim that their

protean counterpart is leaning more towards professional identification cannot be supported. Since the results show that the majority of the protean staff is also leaning more towards organizational identification rather than professional identification. A minority of this group, however, does identify themselves with their profession rather than the organization. The division within this group can be attributed to the fact that there were roughly two types of protean staff, one type was already at the organization for quite some time and the other type was actively circulating within different jobs and assignments. Therefore, these types of protean staff members are less inclined to identify themselves with the organization since they will only be there for a short period of time.

The research question that was formulated in the introduction section was: What are the differences in attitude towards job satisfaction and the evaluation of working conditions between traditional and protean employees? And to answer that research question: there are no differences in the evaluation of job satisfaction between protean and traditional employees. However, there are differences in assessment of working conditions among protean and traditional career oriented staff members. The concepts of work autonomy, work flexibility, job security and organizational identification have a certain influence on the degree of job satisfaction held by protean and traditional staff members. When taking all these differences into account, it can be concluded that both protean and traditional career oriented staff members are equally satisfied with their job due to the fact that they are in the role they want to be in, either protean or traditional. The role that individuals have, gives them certain, in their point of view, advantages which influences the overall degree of job satisfaction. Furthermore, because the majority of both groups is satisfied with the position that they are in, they are not willing to switch places. However, a minority of the protean staff evaluates the traditional staff with a certain level of contempt. This can partly be attributed to the fact that protean staff may classify themselves as more pro-active and more self-directed in their career than their traditional counterpart. Another explanation is that protean staff might look at traditional staff with resentment, since they aspire the same position as traditional employees. The majority of traditional staff is, just as protean staff, satisfied that they are not in the position of their counterpart. This can be attributed to the continuously changing of organizations, projects or assignments and the way the employer of the protean staff member reacts to this.

## 4.2 Implications

### *Theoretical implications*

There has been done a lot of research into protean and traditional career oriented individuals, their attitude towards job satisfaction and their evaluations of working conditions. Previous research shows inconclusive results with regards to job satisfaction between protean and traditional employees. Stroh et al. (1996), Shevchuk and Strebkov (2012) and Gulyani and Bhatnagar (2017) indicated higher attitudes with regards to job satisfaction from protean employees than from traditional employees, Creed and Supeli (2016) indicated the opposite. Current research outcomes are most in line with results from Ryan (2004), who indicated that there is a non-significant outcome with regards to attitude of job satisfaction between protean and traditional employees.

Interesting to see is that current research outcomes with regards to work autonomy are not in line with outcomes of previous research. Hall and Moss (1998) indicated that traditional employees would perceive autonomy as a lack of support from their supervisors, which cannot be concluded from current data. The same applies to outcomes from research by both Hall and Moss (1998) and Shevchuck

and Strebkov (2012), who concluded that protean employees have more autonomy than their traditional counterpart. However, current research outcomes show that this is the other way around, traditional employees have slightly more autonomy than protean employees, mostly due to the knowledge transfer.

With regards to work flexibility, Baruch et al. (2015) and Gulyani and Bhatnagar (2017) indicated that protean employees are in general more flexible and adaptable while current research outcomes only indicate that protean employees are more flexible when it comes to looking for alternate assignments and traditional employees are more flexible when it comes to working hours and place where they work.

Research done by Bridgstock (2005) indicated that protean employees are more oriented towards ongoing employability and traditional employees more towards ongoing employment. However, current research outcomes indicates that both protean and traditional are oriented towards ongoing employability. Both types of employees take courses and keep up their knowledge. Job security is not just a given for the traditional employees, as claimed by Jarosch (2015), in this research both protean and traditional have the security of a contract at an organization.

On the topic of organizational identification, current and previous research do not align. Where Schnatter et al. (2017) claim that protean employees do not identify themselves with the organization they work for but rather their profession, current research outcomes disagree. A small amount of protean participants identifies themselves with their profession while the majority identifies themselves in terms of the organization they currently work at.

### *Practical implications*

This study has implications for two different kinds of organizations, the secondment organization and the organization that hires protean personnel for particular projects. In the first organization, the employer must realize that most of their employees do not identify themselves with the organization and will their commitment towards the organization be low. When this is a problem for the employer, action must be undertaken to increase identification and commitment towards the employer. Results indicate that a lot of managers from secondment organizations have no clue what their employees are doing on their projects. A minority of participants indicated that they missed interest from their secondment management and therefore felt that they belonged more to the organization they do a project at, than to the organization they work for.

For the organization that hired protean career oriented individuals for particular projects, it is important to realize that protean staff evaluates working conditions differently than their own, traditional, employees. With the results of this study, organizations should prepare themselves for the differences between the two types of staff on the work floor. This includes registering the needs and wants of both traditional and protean staff and make sure these needs and wants are met to ensure a positive outcome. Another aspect that organizations should take into consideration is that a minority of both protean and traditional staff views the other group with either contempt or resentment. Organizations should understand that different kind of employees should be treated differently. Where traditional staff is engaged in all kinds of projects, protean staff might feel that they get to do all the smaller tasks which do not include any knowledge tasks. And to make sure the collaboration between these two groups is successful, an organization should actively engage into closing the gap between the two groups of staff.

### 4.3 Limitations and directions for future research

There are a few limitations of this study. The first is that there are only 24 participants, which is too little to make the data generalizable. This does not give a good representation of all the individuals with a traditional and protean career. In addition, half of the participants came from the same technical organization, which does not give a good representation of the full/complete technical sector. The same applies to the economic sector, the dyads that were included here, came from the same organization. With the small amount and organizational background of participants in mind, the data can therefore not be generalized to other organizations and other sectors. Further research should focus on one particular industry to get generalizable data. And to get this generalizable data, research should get a representative range of different organizations within a particular industry. The second limitation of the study is the representation of sectors included in the study and the amount of female and male participants. When looking at all the participants, there is an over-representation of technical males, which could have coloured the data in some way. A third limitation of the study is that only a small representation of protean career oriented individuals was used, namely the employees who are on secondment at another organization. This is only a small representation of the entire group of protean career oriented individuals. In future research, the entire population of protean career oriented individuals should be represented in a study. And the same goes for traditional career oriented staff. In this research, traditional staff is represented by employees who have a direct contract at the organization, but again this is only a small representation of the entire population of traditional staff. In future research, the entire population of traditional staff should also be represented in a study. Lastly, it needs to be kept in mind that in this research all participants were gathered through personal contacts. Which means that a lot of people participated as a favour for the researcher. This could have coloured the data. Future research should get a more random group of both protean and traditional employees to participate in the study. This is to prevent that all participants are gathered through personal contact, which can result in the fact that the one sector was represented by one organization alone, which occurred in this study.

More directions for future research is to improve the method that was used in this research to get more insight in the group dynamic. In this research, the indirect evaluations of the other group were an unforeseen result, while this method would have been a good tool to examine how one group evaluates the other group. Another direction for future research is to do more in-depth research into the Golden Cage Effect. This phenomenon probably occurs at every organization, and it would be interesting to examine the lengths of this phenomenon.

Future research can go in many different directions, but it should focus on the relative differences between both groups because, as it turns out, both protean and traditional employees are happy with their place within an organization.

## References

- Aubé, C., Rousseau, V. , & Morin, E. M. (2007). Perceived organizational support and organizational commitment: The moderating effect of locus of control and work autonomy. *Journal of managerial Psychology, 22*(5), 479-49. DOI 10.1108/02683940710757209
- Auer, P. (2007). *Security in labour markets: Combining flexibility with security for decent work*. Internat. Labour Office.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of management review, 14*(1), 20-39. doi:10.5465/AMR.1989.4278999
- Breaugh, J.A. (1999), "Further investigation of the work autonomy scales: two studies". *Journal of Business and Psychology, 13*(3), 357-7. Doi:10.1023/A:1022926416628
- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17*, 475–482.
- Bridgstock, R. (2005). Australian artists, starving and well-nourished: What can we learn from the prototypical protean career?. *Australian journal of career development, 14*(3), 40-47. Retrieved from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/1767/2/1767.pdf>
- Briscoe, J. P., DeMuth, R. L. F., & Hall, D. T. (2006). Protean and boundaryless careers: An empirical exploration. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*(1), 30-47. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.09.003
- Briscoe, J. P., Henagan, S. C., Burton, J. P., & Murphy, W. M. (2012). Coping with an insecure employment environment: The differing roles of protean and boundaryless career orientations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*(2), 308-316. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2011.12.008
- Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (CBS), 2017. Omzet zakelijke dienstverlening blijft groeien. Retrieved from: <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2017/48/omzet-zakelijke-dienstverleners-blijft-groeien>. Last accessed on 12-04-2018.
- Cummings, T. G., & Molloy, E. S. (1977). *Improving productivity and the quality of work life*. Oxford, England: Praeger.
- De Vos, A., & Soens, N. (2008). Protean attitude and career success: The mediating role of self-management. *Journal of Vocational behavior, 73*(3), 449-456. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2008.08.007
- Dooley, K. (2001). Social research methods. In *4 th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ*.
- DutchIct (2016), Detachering: trends en ontwikkelingen. Retrieved from: <https://www.dutchict.nl/trending/de-trends-en-ontwikkelingen-in-de-detachering/#.Ws4zsahuY2w>Last accessed on 12-04-2017.
- Eisikovits, Z., & Koren, C. (2010). Approaches to and outcomes of dyadic interview analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 20*(12), 1642-1655. doi:10.1177/1049732310376520
- Ellemers, N. (2012). The group self. *Science, 336*(6083), 848-852. doi:10.1126/science.1220987

- Forbes (2016). Why a flexible worker is a happy and productive worker. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/adigaskell/2016/01/15/why-a-flexible-worker-is-a-happy-and-productive-worker/#f5cc00c14c44>. Last accessed on 12-04-2018.
- Forbes (2017) What really motivates you at work. Retrieved from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/pauladavislaack/2017/06/28/what-really-motivates-you-at-work/#19112f628839>. Last accessed on: 12-04-2018.
- Foreman, P., & Whetten, D. A. (2002). Members' identification with multiple-identity organizations. *Organization Science*, 13(6), 618-635.
- Ghazzawi, I. (2008). Job satisfaction antecedents and consequences: A new conceptual framework and research agenda. *The Business Review*, 11(2), 1- 10.
- Gubler, M., Arnold, J., & Coombs, C. (2014). Reassessing the protean career concept: Empirical findings, conceptual components, and measurement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1). Doi:10.1002/job.1908
- Guest, D. (2004). Flexible employment contracts, the psychological contract and employee outcomes: an analysis and review of the evidence. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 5(1), 1-19. Retrieved from: [https://www.uv.es/~psycon/documentacion/publicaciones/IJMR\\_002.pdf](https://www.uv.es/~psycon/documentacion/publicaciones/IJMR_002.pdf)
- Gulyani, G., & Bhatnagar, J. (2017). Mediator analysis of passion for work in Indian millennials: Relationship between protean career attitude and proactive work behavior. *Career Development International*, 22(1), 50-69. Doi: 10.1108/CDI-04-2016-0057
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley
- Hall, D. T. (1996). Protean careers of the 21st century, *Academy of Management Executive*, 10(4), 8-16. doi:10.5465/ame.1996.3145315
- Hall, D. T. (2004). The protean career: A quarter-century journey. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 65(1), 1-13. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2003.10.006
- Hall, D. T., & Moss, J. E. (1998). The new protean career contract: Helping organizations and employees adapt. *Organizational dynamics*, 26(3), 22-37. Retrieved from: <http://www.unizar.es/proactividad/articulos/articulo7.pdf>
- Baruch, Y., Herrmann, A., & Hirschi, A. (2015). The protean career orientation as predictor of career outcomes: Evaluation of incremental validity and mediation effects. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 88, 205-214.
- Hogg, M. A., Terry, D. J., & White, K. M. (1995). A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social psychology quarterly*, 255-269. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2787127>
- Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(1), 204-222. Doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00066.x
- Jarosch, G. (2015). Searching for job security and the consequences of job loss. *Manuscript, Princeton University, New Jersey*.

- Jeanson, S., & Michinov, E. (2018). What is the key to researchers' job satisfaction? One response is professional identification mediated by work engagement. *Current Psychology*, 1-10. Doi: 10.1007/s12144-017-9778-2
- Labouliere, C. D., Kleinman, M., & Gould, M. S. (2015). When self-reliance is not safe: associations between reduced help-seeking and subsequent mental health symptoms in suicidal adolescents. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 12(4), 3741-3755. doi:10.3390/ijerph120403741
- Lee, E. S., Park, T. Y., & Koo, B. (2015). Identifying organizational identification as a basis for attitudes and behaviors: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological bulletin*, 141(5), 1049. Doi:10.1003/bul0000012
- Lewis, P. G. (2002). Second First-Transfer Pricing Issues in Secondment of Personnel. *Tax executive*, 54, 320.
- Lo Presti, A., Pluviano, S., & Briscoe, J. P (2018). Are freelancers a breed apart? The role of protean and boundaryless career attitudes in employability and career success. *Human Resource Management Journal*. Doi 10.1111/1748-8583.12188
- Mas, A., & Pallais, A. (2017). Valuing alternative work arrangements. *American Economic Review*, 107(12), 3722-59.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological review*, 50(4), 370.
- Maslow, A. H. (1971) *The farther reaches of human nature*. Viking, New York
- McArdle, S., Waters, L., Briscoe, J. P., & Hall, D. T. T. (2007). Employability during unemployment: Adaptability, career identity and human and social capital. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 71(2), 247-264. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2007.06.003
- McDonald, P., Brown, K., & Bradley, L. (2005). Have traditional career paths given way to protean ones? Evidence from senior managers in the Australian public sector. *Career Development International*, 10(2), 109-129. Retrieved from: <https://eprints.qut.edu.au/10687/1/10687.pdf>
- Morgan, D. L., Ataie, J., Carder, P., & Hoffman, K. (2013). Introducing dyadic interviews as a method for collecting qualitative data. *Qualitative health research*, 23(9), 1276-1284. doi:10.1177/1049732313501889
- Morgan, D. L., Eliot, S., Lowe, R. A., & Gorman, P. (2016). Dyadic interviews as a tool for qualitative evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 37(1), 109-117. Doi:10.1177/1098214015611244
- Morris, S. M. (2001). Joint and individual interviewing in the context of cancer. *Qualitative Health Research*, 11(4), 553-567. doi:10.1177/104973201129119208
- Platman, K. (2004). 'Portfolio careers' and the search for flexibility in later life. *Work, employment and society*, 18(3), 573-599. DOI: 10.1177/0950017004045551
- Quora (2018). Is autonomy in the workplace always good for innovation. Retrieved from: <https://www.quora.com/Is-autonomy-in-the-workplace-always-good-for-innovation>. Last accessed on 12-04-2018.



- Rubery, J., Earnshaw, J., Marchington, M., Cooke, F. L., & Vincent, S. (2002). Changing organizational forms and the employment relationship. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(5), 645-672. Doi: 10.1111/1467-6486.00306
- Ryan, K. M. (2009). The performative journalist: Job satisfaction, temporary workers and American television news. *Journalism*, 10(5), 647-664. Doi: 10.1177/1464884909106537
- Schnatter, K. M., Dahling, J. J., & Chau, S. L. (2017). Examining Career Pathing Through the Lens of Identity Theories. *Identity as a Foundation for Human Resource Development*.
- Shevchuk, A., & Strebkov, D. (2012). Freelancers in Russia: Remote work patterns and e-markets. *Economic sociology\_the european electronic newsletter*, 13(2), 37-45. Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/155989>
- Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Crant, J. M. (2001). What do proactive people do? A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career success. *Personnel psychology*, 54(4), 845-874.
- Sohier, R. (1995). The dyadic interview as a tool for nursing research. *Applied Nursing Research*, 8(2), 96-101. Doi:10.1016/S0897-1897(95)80562-1
- Stroh, L K., Brett, J. M. & Reilly, A. H. (1996) Family structure, glass ceiling and traditional explanations for the differential rate of turnover of female and male managers, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49(1), 99-118. Doi: 10.1006/jvbe.1996.0036
- Supeli, A., & Creed, P. A. (2016). The longitudinal relationship between protean career orientation and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention-to-quit. *Journal of Career Development*, 43(1), 66-80. Doi: 10.1177/0894845315581686
- Van Dick, R., Christ, O., Stellmacher, J., Wagner, U., Ahlswede, O., Grubba, C., Hauptmeijer, M., Höhfeld, C., Moltzen, K. & Tissington, P. A. (2004). Should I stay or should I go? Explaining turnover intentions with organizational identification and job satisfaction. *British Journal of Management*, 15(4), 351-360.
- Van Mierlo, H., Rutte, C. V., Vermunt, J. K., Kompier, M. A. J., & Doorewaard, J. A. M. C. (2006). Individual autonomy in work teams: The role of team autonomy, self-efficacy, and social support. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 15(3), 281-299. DOI: 10.1080/13594320500412249
- Wallace, C. (2003). Work Flexibility in Eight European countries: A cross-national comparison. *Sociologickýčasopis/Czech Sociological Review*, 773-794.
- Waters, L., Briscoe, J. P., Hall, D. T., & Wang, L. (2014). Protean career attitudes during unemployment and reemployment: A longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 84(3), 405-419. Doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2014.03.003
- Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. *Human resource management review*, 12(2), 173-194.



## Appendixes

### A: Overview of all the participants

Dyad	Gender	Age	Organization	Duration of employment	Duration of secondment
1	Male	50	Nationale Nederlanden	27 years	N/A
	Female	27	Calco	N/A	22 months
2	Male	58	VMI Group	unk.	N/A
	Male	63	Firma Voort	N/A	13 months
3	Male	unk.	VMI Group	unk.	N/A
	Male	unk.	Akos	N/A	+/- 3 years
4	Male	unk.	VMI Group	unk.	N/A
	Male	unk.	W-Pro	N/A	+/- 2 years
5	Male	unk.	VMI Group	1 year	N/A
	Male	unk.	ICT Automatiseringen	N/A	6 years
6	Male	unk.	VMI Group	unk.	N/A
	Male	unk.	TCPM	N/A	2-3 years
7	Male	unk.	VMI Group	unk.	N/A
	Male	unk.	Clafis	N/A	3 years
8	Female	28	Saxion Hogescholen	4 years	N/A
	Female	25	Randstad	N/A	5 months
9	Male	unk.	Nationale Nederlanden	27 years	N/A
	Female	unk.	Brunel	N/A	2,5 months
10	Male	55	Nationale Nederlanden	31 years	N/A
	Male	unk.	Brunel	N/A	3 years
11	Female	unk.	Universiteit Twente	unk.	N/A
	Female	unk.	Randstad	N/A	unk.
12	Male	27	TNO	9 months directly at TNO, before via TMC	N/A
	Male	35	TMC	N/A	2 years

### B: Topic list and interview outline

#### Topic list

- Level of autonomy (Cummings & Molloy, 1977, as cited in Breough, 1999)
  - Freedom to select projects
  - The way of working (planning, execution)
- Rules within an organization (Shevchuck and Strebkov, 2012) -

- Rules by authorities (managers)
- Rules that are embedded in the organizational culture
- How do both parties look at these rules?
- Work flexibility (Wallace, 2003):
  - Time (working hours/work schedules)
  - Place (office/home)
  - Conditions (contractual arrangements, hours, pay etc) → Social security
- Social interaction
  - On a day-to-day basis (is everyone treated equally, are there differences how people treat staff or secondment)
  - Company or team outings
- Treatment of management
  - Differences in payment (dividends)
  - Is there a group that is favoured by management?
- How do both parties look at each other?
  - Is there a big segregation between the two parties?

## Interview outline

Voorafgaand aan het dyadische interview, wordt het doel van het interview uitgelegd. Er wordt aan de participanten uitgelegd wat ik graag wil weten. Door uit te leggen welke voorbeelden ik al heb gehoord van verschillende organisaties, ben ik vooral benieuwd naar de ervaringen die zij hebben. Daarnaast wordt uitgelegd dat er geen goede of foute antwoorden zijn maar dat het juist om de persoonlijke ervaringen gaat. Er wordt ook benadrukt dat alles wat wordt gezegd, anoniem en vertrouwelijk wordt behandeld.

- Voor welke organisatie werken jullie?
  - En kunnen jullie daar iets meer over vertellen?
- Wat is jullie rol binnen de organisatie? (de huidige organisatie, waar participant 1 werkt en participant 2 gedetacheerd zit)
  - En kunnen jullie daar iets meer over vertellen?
  - Kan (degene die gedetacheerd zit) ook iets vertellen over hoe het detacheringstraject er uit ziet vanuit zijn werkgever?
- Zijn jullie tevreden met jullie werkgever?
  - Zo ja/nee, waarom?
- Wat zijn, volgens jullie, de belangrijkste verschillen tussen de twee groepen?
  - Kunnen jullie hier wat verschillende voorbeelden bij geven?
- Hoe denken jullie dat de relatie van de ander met jullie manager is?
  - Denken jullie dat er een verschil in beide relaties zit?
  - Zo ja/nee, waarom?
  - En hebben jullie een voorbeeld van een verschil? (Deze vraag wordt alleen gesteld als de participanten aangeven dat er een verschil is)
- Merken jullie dat collega's uit jullie team beide partijen anders behandelen?
  - Zo ja, heb je hier een voorbeeld van?
    - Heeft het verschil in behandeling van één persoon invloed op het de rest van het team?

- Zo ja, op welke manier? En heb je hier een voorbeeld van?
- Hoe denken jullie dat de ander met flexibiliteit in werkuren omgaat? Strikt 9 tot 5 of is dit flexibeler?
  - Komt dit overeen met jullie eigen standpunt?
- In hoeverre hebben jullie zelf in de hand welke projecten jullie oppakken binnen jullie team?
  - En in hoeverre hebben jullie de vrijheid om die projecten tot een succes te maken?
- In hoeverre denken jullie dat er verschil zit in de mate van integratie met collega's tussen beide groepen? (bijvoorbeeld dat een groep een betere band heeft met naaste collega's dan een andere groep)
- Merken jullie verschillen tussen de twee groepen mbt sociale interactie op de werkvloer?
  - En zitten er verschillen in participatie mbt activiteiten die na het werk plaatsvinden? (Denk bijvoorbeeld aan teamuitjes, sportactiviteiten etc).
  - In hoeverre denken jullie dat de ander zal investeren in een nieuwe collega die er maar een tijdje is? (geldt voor beide partijen, de gedetacheerde zit er maar een bepaalde tijd en heeft ook collega's vanuit zijn detacheringsbedrijf en voor de werknemer die een collega krijgt die er maar een tijdje zit)
- Zijn er verschillen in de manier waarop beide groepen werknemers (extra) worden beloond? (denk aan winstuitkering, kerstpakket etc).
  - Zo ja, wat vinden jullie van deze verschillen?
- Hoe denken jullie dat de ander aankijkt tegen de zekerheid van werk?
  - Verschilt dit met de mate waarop je er zelf naar kijkt?
- Met al deze verschillen en overeenkomsten in het achterhoofd, hoe kijken jullie tegen de andere partij aan?
  - En in hoeverre geloven jullie dat er een scheiding is tussen deze twee groepen?
- Na dit gesprek te hebben gevoerd, zouden jullie iets willen veranderen waar we het net over hebben gehad?
- Zouden jullie, na dit gesprek, van positie willen wisselen met elkaar?

## C: Codebook

Construct		Codes	Uitleg
	1	Voorstellen	Alles wat de participanten zeggen terwijl ze zich voorstellen.
	2	Uitleg werkzaamheden	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de inhoud hun werkzaamheden
	3	Uitleg werkgever	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over bij welke werkgever.
	4	Commitment werkgever	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de commitment richting hun werkgever.
Verantwoordelijkheid	5	Verantwoordelijkheid	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de verantwoordelijkheid die beide groepen nemen m.b.t. hun werkzaamheden
	6	Verantwoordelijkheid_Vershil	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de verschillen tussen beide groepen m.b.t. verantwoordelijkheid over werkzaamheden.
	7	Verantwoordelijkheid_geen_verschil	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de gelijkheid tussen beide groepen m.b.t. verantwoordelijkheid over werkzaamheden.
Arbeidsvoorwaarden	8	Arbeidsvoorwaarden	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de arbeidsvoorwaarden van beide groepen. Hier vallen ook de functioneringsgesprekken onder
	9	Arbeidsvoorwaarden_Vershil	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de verschillen in secundaire arbeidsvoorwaarden. Hier vallen ook de functioneringsgesprekken onder
	10	Arbeidsvoorwaarden_geen_Vershil	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de overeenkomsten in secundaire arbeidsvoorwaarden. Hier vallen ook de functioneringsgesprekken onder.
Extra Beloning	11	Extra_Beloning	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de extra beloning die zij krijgen buiten hun arbeidsvoorwaarden om (personeelsuitjes, kerstpakketten etc)

	12	Extra_Beloning_Vershil	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de verschillen in extra beloningen die zij krijgen buiten hun arbeidsvoorwaarden om (personeelsuitjes, kerstpakketten etc) voor beide groepen.
	13	Extra_Beloning_geen_Vershil	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de overeenkomsten in extra beloningen die zij krijgen buiten hun arbeidsvoorwaarden om (personeelsuitjes, kerstpakketten etc) voor beide groepen.
Tevredenheid	14	Tevredenheid	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de mate van tevredenheid over hun werkgever. Hiermee wordt de gemeenschappelijke werkgever/opdrachtgever bedoeld.
	15	Tevredenheid_verschil	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de verschillen in mate van tevredenheid over hun werkgever. Hiermee wordt de gemeenschappelijke werkgever/opdrachtgever bedoeld.
	16	Tevredenheid_geen_Vershil	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de overeenkomsten in mate van tevredenheid over hun werkgever. Hiermee wordt de gemeenschappelijke werkgever/opdrachtgever bedoeld.
Uitvoering werkzaamheden	17	Uitvoering werkzaamheden	Alles wat participanten zeggen over de manier waarop ze hun werkzaamheden kunnen uitvoeren
	18	Uitvoering werkzaamheden verschil	Alles wat participanten zeggen over de verschillen waarop zij hun werkzaamheden kunnen uitvoeren
	19	Uitvoering werkzaamheden geen verschil	Alles wat participanten zeggen over de overeenkomsten waarop zij hun werkzaamheden kunnen uitvoeren.
Interactie manager	20	Interactie_manager	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over de interactie met de manager

	21	Interactie_manager_verschil	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over de verschillen in behandeling tussen beide groepen door hun manager
	22	Interactie_manager_geen_verschil	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over de overeenkomsten in behandeling tussen beide groepen door hun manager
Interactie collega	23	Interactie_collega	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over interactie met hun collega's
	24	Interactie_collega_verschil	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over de verschillen in behandeling tussen beide groepen door collega's
	25	Interactie_collega_geen_verschil	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over de overeenkomsten in behandeling tussen beide groepen door collega's
Interactie collega verwachting	26	interactie_collega_verwachting	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over de mate van verwachtingen die ze hebben voor nieuwe collega's.
	27	Interactie_collega_verwachting_verschil	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over verschillen in de mate van verwachting die ze van een nieuwe collega hebben.
	28	interactie_collega_verwachting_geen_verschil	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over overeenkomst in de mate van verwachting die ze van een nieuwe collega hebben.
Flexibiliteit	29	Flexibiliteit	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over de flexibiliteit (in werkuren, plaats van werken [thuiswerken], kiezen nieuw project)
	30	Flexibiliteit_verschil	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over de verschillen in flexibiliteit (in werkuren, plaats van werken [thuiswerken], kiezen nieuw project)
	31	Flexibiliteit_geen_verschil	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over de overeenkomst



			in flexibiliteit (in werkuren, plaats van werken [thuiswerken], kiezen nieuw project)
Zekerheid van werk	32	Zekerheid_van_werk	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over zekerheid van werk
	33	Zekerheid_van_werk_verschil	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over de verschillen in de mate van zekerheid van werk
	34	Zekerheid_van_werk_geen_verschil	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over de overeenkomsten in de mate van zekerheid van werk
Inzet	35	Inzet	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de mate waarop zij zich inzetten voor hun werk
	36	Inzet verschil	Alles wat de participanten zeggen over de verschillen in mate van inzet voor hun werk
	37	Inzet geen verschil	Alles wat participanten zeggen over de overeenkomsten in mate van inzet voor hun werk.
Autonomie	38	Autonomie	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over autonomie tijdens het werk
	39	Autonomie_verschil	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over de verschillen in autonomie tijdens het werk
	40	Autonomie_geen_verschil	Alles wat er door de participanten wordt gezegd over de overeenkomsten in autonomie tijdens het werk
	41	Niet relevant	Alles wat wordt gezegd wat niet relevant is.

## D: Translation of all Quotes

Paragraph	Dutch quote	English translation
3.1	Ja gewoon puur de systemen die er achter hangen. [...] Dus echt meer de administratieve gebeuren er achter.”	“Yes it is purely the systems behind it, the administrative hassle that comes with it”.
3.1	“Want ik vind ja, ook voor mezelf, ik kan ook bepalen wanneer ik, wanneer ik iets niet leuk vind. Dan hoef ik [...] in ieder geval niet te blijven [...]. En dat vind ik persoonlijk wel een voordeel”.	“Yes I agree, then I can decide for myself if I want to stay at a place I do not like. And that is an beneficial in my eyes.”
3.1	“Ja mij bevalt het juist dat ik vast zit. Want ik had altijd al zoiets van, ik heb liever gewoon straks een beetje een vaste baan en niet elke keer wat anders. [...] Ik ben wel blij dat dit nu gewoon vast is”.	“Well I prefer the certainty that comes with the job. I always had something like, I prefer the certainty of a permanent contract over switching jobs the entire time. I’m happy with my permanent job.”
3.1	“ik heb niet voor niks voor [mijn huidige werkgever] gekozen voor vast en dat is vooral vastigheid. Ja op een gegeven moment vind je een bedrijf, daar voel je je prettig bij”.	“I chose for my current employer for a reason and that was mainly the certainty that came with it. At a certain point you feel comfortable at an organization and you stay”.
3.2.1	“Bij mij wordt het toegeschoven zeg maar ik heb niet dat ik, ja soms is het van dit en dit hebben we, wat vind je leuker? Dat komt af en toe voor maar in principe doe je wat er op de planning staat en. <b>Ja dat, daarom, er staan dingen in de planning en je kunt soms wat sturen en vragen in je eigen werkzaamheden maar ja het blijft toch een beetje het project dat heeft prioriteit.”</b>	“With myself, I get orders and I don’t really get to choose what I like. Sometimes it happens that you get to choose a task that you like most, but mostly we just have to follow the schedule. <b>Yes exactly, and there are tasks on the schedule and sometimes you can steer in your own activities but the schedule of je projects has priority”</b>
3.2.1	“Maar ja in welke volgorde of wat ik eerst doe of wat daarna, dat mogen we zelf, ja probeer ik een beetje te verdelen af en toe. Maar alles in overleg”.	Yes but in which order I do the tasks is up to us. And we try to divide the tasks, we discuss that sort of thing”.
3.2.1	“Ja dat is een project die door een projectleider wordt gedaan buiten onze afdeling. En die zegt wel heel duidelijk, ik wil geen inhuur eigenlijk”.	Yes that is a projects that is managed by a projectmanager outside our department, and he clearly states that he does not want hired staff included”.

3.2.1	“[ze] proberen de meeste kennis zo veel mogelijk bij de vaste mensen te houden. Daar heeft die natuurlijk zelf belang bij. Bij ons, ja je ziet toch in de praktijk dat heel veel inleners ook de kar trekken en zo dus of je die kennis allemaal binnenhoudt”.	“They try to keep as much of the knowledge with the regular staff, he profits from that. And with us, well in reality you see that a lot of the hired staff also carry projects, so if you keep all the knowledge within the organization is something to wonder”.
	“Kijk als je, je hebt hier ook interne projecten voor kennisopbouw. Nee daar ben jij trouwen ook voor gevraagd.”	“Well you have internal projects to keep knowledge inside, you see. However, you [his protean colleague] were asked to participate in that as well”.
3.2.2	“Volgens mij probeert iedereen redelijk die 8 uur per dag te maken, 40 uur in de week. Maar dat geldt voor de [vaste werknemers] eigenlijk net zo goed, tenminste over het algemeen probeert iedereen dat gewoon een beetje vol te houden”.	“I think that everyone is inclined to make those 8 hours per day and 40 hours per week. But that also applies to the regular staff, everyone tries to achieve that.
3.2.2	“En die flexibele werktijden zijn mooi dus de ene keer begin ik om half 9 en je gaat wat eerder weg. Je klokt gewoon in en je moet eind van de week gewoon 40 uur hebben en anders worden het gewoon snipper uren, dat is allemaal geen probleem. Als ik een keer uit wil slapen, zwaar weekend heb gehad dan begin je gewoon om 10 uur”.	And those flexible working hours are nice, so the first time I start at 8:30 and you leave a bit earlier. You clock your hours and at the end of the week you should have worked 40 hours and otherwise you have to take it out of your days off. So if you want to sleep in because you had a rough weekend, you can just start at 10:00 o'clock”.
3.2.2	“Dus inleners over het algemeen, is mijn ervaring, die kunnen nog wel een stapje doorgaan, overwerken. Dan moet ik even kijken naar andere bedrijven, ik weet wel, als er overgewerkt werd bij een bedrijf, in het oosten van het land, waar ik gezeten heb. Waren het de inleners die vaak overuren maakten en de vaste medewerkers die waren al op de fiets naar huis.	“so in general hired staff is, in my opinion, more inclined to put a bit more effort in work, to work a few hours extra. And then I’ll have to look at other companies, I know that there, an organization in the eastern part of the country, the hired staff was working overtime while the regular staff were already on their way home with their bikes.
3.2.2	“Dus dat, ja ik ben ook gewoon flexibel maar dat heeft meer denk ik met de persoon te maken dan zozeer waar de werkgever”.	“So, yeah, I’m just flexible but that has more to do with personality than the employer I recon.”
3.2.2	“Ik vind [de flexibiliteit van een detacheerder] heerlijk.”	“I love the flexibility of a secondment employer
3.2.2	“Je moet ook flexibel kunnen zijn en anders kun je dit werk helemaal niet doen. Dan moet je echt op een vaste plek gaan zitten en. Ik vind dit juist leuk, ook vooral je ziet heel veel, je krijgt heel veel ervaring én het	“Well, you have to be flexible, otherwise you are not able to do this kind of job. Then you’ll have to get a permanent job at an organization. I like this, you gain a lot of experience and the

	voordeel van bevalt het niet, ja sorry jongens, dit is niet wat ik zoek. En dan probeer je toch wat anders te vinden. Dat vind ik een voordeel.”	advantage that, if it doesn't suit you, you're able to switch and you'll try something different. And I see that as a great advantage”.
3.2.2	“Maar bij mij is het wat, zolang de IT booming is, heb ik werk. Want ik doe natuurlijk niet één ding. [...] Ik ben natuurlijk meer allround inzetbaar ook”.	“With myself, as long as the IT-business is booming, I've got work. And I don't just do one thing, I'm more an allrounder”.
3.2.3	“Ik denk dat dat ik daar flexibeler mee omga dan [mijn collega] denk ik. Want het is natuurlijk wel zo dat je ergens als inlener, je komt bij verschillende bedrijven dus je hebt ontzettend veel ervaring op een gegeven moment. Kijk [mijn collega] zit alleen hier [...] en die werken gewoon in dat vierkantje, alles wat ze hier doen, dat doen ze hier”.	“I think I'm more flexible with this than my colleagues are. Because when you are hired staff, you see so many organizations and you gain so much experience. My [traditional] colleague just works in his zone, and everything he does, he does here.”
3.2.3	“Daarnaast heb ik ook wel een vaste dienststelling bij [mijn werkgever] he, dus ik krijg gewoon doorbetaald als er geen opdrachtgever meer is. Dus dat is voor mij ook wel een vangnet wat dat betreft”.	“And next to that, I have a permanent contract at my employer, so if I don't have an assignment, I get payed anyway, which is a nice safety net”.
3.2.3	“Misschien juist omdat die intern is, in een gouden kooi zat en dan eigenlijk iets anders wilde maar dacht 'nou op zich als ik ergens anders ga, dan krijg ik minder betaald', dat die daarom bleef. Maar niet zo gemotiveerd was.”	“Maybe it is just because they are internal, that they are in a golden cage and actually want something different but also know that if they went somewhere else, they would get payed less, and therefore stayed but was not motivated at all.”
3.2.3	Als je intern bent en je vindt het eigenlijk niet zo leuk meer maar je vindt het een hele grote stap om iets anders te gaan doen, ja dan merk je dat. Dan ben je minder gemotiveerd en ik denk dat dat vaker gebeurt, ziet bij internen dan bij externen want externen kunnen misschien zeggen 'ik ga weg', of het bedrijf zegt 'ga maar weg'.”.	“If you're an internal staff member and you don't like it anymore, and you're are too scared to take such a big step, then you'll notice that in their motivation. And you see that more often with internal staff than with external staff since it's easier for external staff to leave”.
3.2.3	“Nou je zou bijna kunnen zeggen een externe móet presteren, en een interne uiteraard ook maar voordat je als interne daar, zeg maar arbeidsrechtelijke maatregelen tegen genomen worden, heb je al 86 mogelijkheden gehad. Om je te verbeteren, om je te ontwikkelen. Het bedrijf is verplicht om jou stapsgewijs jouw kansen helpen te vergroten, je te ontwikkelen, cursussen te volgen. Nou noem alles maar op. Ik denk dat een externe daar dan uiteindelijk iets minder geduld mee is	“You can almost say that an external staff member has to succeed, and an internal staff member also of course but before there are sanctions being performed towards an internal staff member, he had about 86 possibilities to perform better. While with an external staff member patience runs out faster.”

3.2.3	“Hoe ik er zelf naar kijk is gewoon dat ik het soms niet eerlijk vind als iemand niet presteert en gewoon niet weg kan worden gehaald, omdat die intern is. En dat is denk ik ook gewoon sowieso niet goed voor de hele organisatie. Voor het team niet, voor de personen zelf niet”.	“The way I look at it, is that it is just not fair if an individual does not perform he or she cannot be removed from the organization because he/she is an internal staff member. Which is not only not good for him/her, but also not for the team and the organization.”
3.2.4	“Ja wat ik vaak wel aan inleners merk, is dat ze over het algemeen nog wel eens een stapje verder willen gaan zeg maar. Ja ze moeten zich natuurlijk ook heel klantvriendelijk opstellen, dat ze, een beetje commercieel moet je ook zijn. He toch? Zo zie ik het ook wel, dus je stelt je over het algemeen toch wat coöperatiever op naar het bedrijf. Want je bent ook het visitekaartje van in jouw geval [jouw werkgever]”.	“Yes I do notice that, in general, hired staff will put more effort in their work. They have to be friendly of course, and a bit of a commercial mentality. And because you are kind of the representation of your employer, you have to be a bit more cooperative to the organization that provides your assignment.”
3.2.4	“Dus inleners over het algemeen, is mijn ervaring, die kunnen nog wel een stapje doorgaan, overwerken. Dan moet ik even kijken naar andere bedrijven, ik weet wel, als er overgewerkt werd bij een bedrijf, in het oosten van het land, waar ik gezeten heb. Waren het de inleners die vaak overuren maakten en de vaste medewerkers die waren al op de fiets naar huis.	“so in general hired staff is, in my opinion, more inclined to put a bit more effort in work, to work a few hours extra. And then I’ll have to look at other companies, I know that there, an organization in the eastern part of the country, the hired staff was working overtime while the regular staff were already on their way home with their bikes.
3.2.4	“Ik had toen ik nog bij [mijn vorige werkgever, detachteringsbedrijf] zat, had ik wel, werkte ik veel over omdat ik in m’n achterhoofd altijd had van ‘ja, [mijn opdrachtgever] moet wel heel blij zijn over mij’, dus ik werkte al, ik weet niet of ik toen harder werkte dan nu. Maar ik had wel een soort van stress in m’n achterhoofd van o jee, ik kan zo maar er hier uit worden getrapt. Naja, aan het einde van m’n contract. Terwijl nu, ik heb gewoon een onbepaalde tijd contract dus dat is, ja.	“I had the same when I was still at my former employer. I always had it in the back of my head that my organization that provided my assignment had to be very satisfied, so I worked hard, not sure if I worked harder then, than I do now. But it was always a kind of stress in the back of my mind that said that I could be kicked out at any time. And now I don’t have to worry anymore since I have a permanent contract”.
3.2.4.	“Maar we hebben [een nieuwe college], geen inlener dan. Maar dat is een nieuwe maar die probeert hier en daar wel een extra uurtje, een beetje een stapje harder”.	“We have a new colleague, a regular one, and you notice that he tries to make a few extra hours at one point, and at another point he tries to put in just a bit more effort”.
3.2.5	“Ik merkte gewoon dat ik vast liep [...] en daarom studeer ik nu ook, doe ik er een deeltijd opleiding naast.”	“I noticed that I was got stuck, and that’s why I started studying again and I do this part time, next to my job”.

3.2.5	“Ik ben nu 55, als ik nu gedwongen wordt op zoek te gaan naar een andere baan dan kan ik in ieder geval zeggen ‘joh ik ben misschien bijna 55 of ik ben 55 maar ik heb recent nog wel 2 van die Amerikaanse examens afgedaan’. Dat laat wel zien dat ik nog steeds bezig ben met leren en ik denk dat ik dat nog een poosje moet volhouden want de baangarantie binnen [mijn huidige werkgever] die zie ik niet”	“I’m 55 now and if I’m forced to look for another job, I at least can say that I recently took two American exams. That shows that I’m still learning and I think that, if I can keep this up, I’ll be guaranteed of a job at my current employer”.
3.2.5	“Ik kan wel makkelijker naar mijn directeur stappen en zeggen ‘nou ik heb een opleiding gezien en die wil ik echt ontzettend graag doen”.	“I can easily go to my director and say ‘well, I’ve seen this course that I would really like to take”.
3.2.5	“Je krijgt ook als inlener, krijg je alle mogelijkheden. Ja eigenlijk dezelfde rechten en dezelfde opleidingen, je mag overal aan meedoen. En dat verandert niet”.	“Even as a hired staff member, you get the same possibilities as a regular staff member. You have access to the same courses and are allowed access to everything. And that won’t change”.
3.2.5	“En worden er cursussen georganiseerd waar je aan mee kan doen en dat wordt allemaal vergoed.”	“There are courses organized which you can attend and will be compensated”
3.2.5	“Dat heb ik ook nog wel meegemaakt hier, ook een inlener dat die dat een week op cursus gestuurd wordt om bij te scholen. Dus daar wordt wel een regeling voor getroffen. Als we het nodig vinden binnen een afdeling dat er kennis uitgediept moet worden, ja dan gaan we dit soort trajecten in”.	“I witnessed that here, that an hired staff member was send to a seminar of a week to get his knowledge brushed up. An arrangement will be made if it is deemed necessary to take a course or seminar. Then we’ll engage in these procedures”.
3.2.5	“Ik weet wel dat vanuit [detacheringsorganisatie] verschillende cursussen en dingen aangeboden worden, die je kunt gebruiken voor je opleiding, op je werk. [...] <b>Maar dat wordt wel gefaciliteerd vanuit [detacheringsorganisatie]?</b> Ja, [de detacheringsorganisatie] heeft bijvoorbeeld Time Management, of effectiviteit of weet ik, dat soort cursussen bieden ze aan. <b>Maar dat staat eigenlijk los van [opdrachtgever]?</b> Ja ja, dat is als gedetacheerde waar je dan, waar jullie dan niet aan kunnen komen maar waar ik wel aan kan komen”.	“I know that from my [secondment] employer different courses are offered that you can take for your work such as Time Management or effectivity or something. But they are separate from the organization I’m currently assigned to”.
3.2.5	“Je krijgt ook als inlener, krijg je alle mogelijkheden. Ja eigenlijk dezelfde rechten en dezelfde opleidingen, je mag overal aan meedoen. En dat verandert niet.”	“You get all same the possibilities as a hired staff member, with regards to courses and education”

3.3	“Ik werk voor m'n gevoel voor [de organisatie waar ik dagelijks werk]”,	“It feels that the organization that I'm working for on a daily basis, is my employer”.
3.3	“Ja ik voel me wel zo betrokken dat ik dat dan wel [...] vergeet [...] dat Calco mijn werkgever is omdat ik gewoon hier werk”.	“Well I feel so involved that forget that I'm just on assignment here and that [my secondment organization] is my employer since I'm here on a daily basis”.
3.3	“Ik merk van [mijn gedetacheerde werkgever] niet veel, voor mij voelt het alsof de UT gewoon mijn werkgever is. Zo zie ik het eigenlijk ook. Het is eigenlijk meer dat het op papier anders is zeg maar”.	“I don't notice a lot from my [secondment] employer, it just feels that my assignment provider is my employer. That's how I see it, it's just the paperwork that is different.”
3.3	“ja ik ben wel blij met [mijn werkgever] eigenlijk als, ik werk ook wel eens bij, ik voel me behoorlijk [thuis in de organisatie waar ik dagelijks werk] dus dat is ook wel zo”.	“Yes I'm happy with the organization that gives me my assignment actually, I feel at home at the organization I work at on a daily basis”.
3.3	“Ik werk voor [mijn werkgever (een detachingsbedrijf)], en ik ben ingehuurd door [de opdrachtgever]”,	“My employer is [my secondment organization], and I'm hired by another organization”.
3.3.1	“Ja, ja en ik zie mijn collega, die eigenlijk voor [een detachingsbureau] werkt, niet als een [gedetacheerde] collega maar als een [organisatie] collega”.	“Yes I see my colleague, who actually works for a secondment employer, not as a hired colleague, but as an organizational colleague”.
3.3.1	“Nee als wij bijvoorbeeld ook in de werkplaats komen, daar loopt ook van alles [zowel protean als traditioneel] rond. Die weten ook niet wie ingeleend is of niet. Dat maakt niet uit.”	“When we walk through the factory, all kinds of employees [both protean and traditional] work there. They don't care who is external and who is internal. That doesn't matter.”
3.3.1	“Ja ik denk dat dat op zich is dat de meeste [collega's], dat het de interne medewerkers niet heel veel uitmaakt want je hebt genoeg collega's om je heen, of die nou intern of extern zijn”.	“yes well I think that for most of the colleagues it doesn't matter, because you have a lot of colleagues, both internal and external”.
3.3.1	“Als een inlener hier zit en zegt, ik werk bij mijn ingeleende bedrijf en ik zit hier vooral mijn project te doen in een hoekje, dan heb je daar eerder vrede mee, dan als een vaste inlener, of een vaste medewerker ergens zit en ik denk dan 'kom op zeg, je hoort een beetje bij de club, doe eens gezellig”’.	“If an external staff member states that he is just here to do his assignment than I'm more inclined to make my peace with it then when an internal staff member says that. Then I'll think: come on, you're part of the club, come socialize”
3.3.1	“Ja toen ik hier ook in het begin gedetacheerd zat, binnen drie weken hadden ze een feestje, en toen ben ik ook gewoon uitgenodigd”.	“I was assigned here in the beginning and within 3 weeks they hosted a party and I got an invite as well”.

3.4	“ik ga liever direct bij een bedrijf in dienst waar ik mijn eigen onderhandelingen kan doen, in plaats van dat er iemand anders die onderhandelingen doet en daarover dan weer een vrij vette marge kan verdienen”.	“I prefer to go directly to an organization where I want to work and take care of my own negotiations instead of going through another organization where someone can make money because of me”.
3.4	wil gewoon de flexibiliteit hebben als ik het niet meer leuk vind of het werk wordt saai, dat ik dan ergens anders heen ga want het houdt je namelijk scherp”.	“I just want to keep the flexibility, that if I don’t enjoy it anymore or the work gets boring, you can go somewhere else. That will keep you sharp”.
3.4	“Ik word toch geacht, als ik ergens weer inspring, inderdaad de keuken te kennen. En dat houdt je gewoon scherp. En het houdt je bezig, en ja ik vind dat lekker, ik vind die hectiek, houd ik wel van”.	“it is expected of me that, where ever I go, I learn the ropes. That keeps you sharp, keeps you off the street. And I like that, I prefer the hectic”.
3.4	“Wat wel natuurlijk heel fijn is dat als je dingen wilt bespreken over [de opdrachtgever], want dat doen wij natuurlijk ook, eerlijk is eerlijk. Dan wil je dat wel gewoon met een collega bespreken die ook bij [de werkgever] zit. Dat ga je niet met een [collega van de opdrachtgever] bespreken. Dan heb je kans dat het ineens bij [de leidinggevende] ligt. <b>Dus dat kan best een klein muurtje zijn? Door die dingen, dat gaat niet?</b> Ja door die dingen heb je altijd een muur.”	“it is of course nice that you can talk about your assignment and the organization, we do that as well, lets be honest. You’ll want to talk about that with a colleague that is with the same employer, not one that is at the organization you have your assignment. <b>So that can be a small wall? Because of how things go?</b> Yes well, because of those things, a wall arises.”
3.4	“Nou je hoort mij nu de hele tijd zeggen, tot ten minste eind augustus. Dus ik weet dat ik nu een half jaar werk heb en daarna is het afwachten. Dus ik denk dat jij [her dyadic partner] daar toch wel wat relaxter in staat in die zin, maar ik zit nu dit half jaar veilig, maar het is toch afwachten hoe het gaat lopen.”	“Well you keep hearing me say, until the end of August. So I know that I’ve got a job for another 6 months and after that it is a question. I can imagine that you [her dyadic partner] are a bit more relaxed in this, I’m just safe for half a year but we’ll see.”
3.5	“Wij hebben echt een vast bedrag per maand voor de reiskosten en hoor je wel eens mensen die nu ingeleend zijn die graag in dienst willen, die lopen daar tegenaan. Dan zeggen ze, nee, ik kan toch beter ingeleend blijven en dan wat langer blijven dan vast in dienst, wat dat kost gewoon geld”.	“We have a set sum of money per month to cover our travel expenses and then when hired staff talk about wanting to get a direct contract at the organization, that this is an issue. If they switch employers, it will cost them money”.
	“Ik denk dat ik een beetje anders ben dan de gemiddelde want ik neig wel meer uitdagingen, en dat kan ik eigenlijk niet vinden op onze afdeling dus	“I think I’m a little different from the average [technical employer], since I’m inclined to seek more challenge, and I don’t



	ja. [...] Ik heb wel een veelzijdig karakter wat dat betreft, ambitieus enzo dus.”	get that at this department. I have a quite versatile character, I’m ambitious etc”.
	“Ja dat denk ik wel, dat dat per persoon verschilt. Dat dat niet met inleen [versus vaste kracht] te maken heeft. Dat denk ik niet”.	“Well I think that differs per person. That does not have anything to do with hired or regular staff. No I don’t think so”.
	“Nee ik denk dat dat ook echt weer een karakter ding is”.	“No that’s a character thing”.
	“Want eigenlijk zijn voorganger (van een protean employee) [...] was gewoon wat meer afwachtend en die deed ook niet zo veel. Die nam ook geen enkele beslissing, die liet alles aan ons over. Ja daar kan je iets van zeggen maar ja, je mag ook zelf wel eens af en toe. Die ging niet heel hard zeg maar. Maar dat is echt puur op persoon, dat heeft niks met vast, ik zie ook wel eens iemand vast zit, die begint met zo hard als iemand die ingeleend is.”	“Well his predecessor [of a protean employee], was a bit less anticipating and didn’t do much. He didn’t take any decision and leave everything to us. You can say something of it like: well you can make your own decisions. He didn’t fly very high. But that was purely his character, that doesn’t have anything to do with being normal or hired staff”.

