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Abstract

This study explored if employees with different labor contracts had different psychological contracts and, if they had a different evaluation of their psychological contract. It was also investigated if the evaluation of the psychological contract moderates the relationship between the contract types and affective commitment. A cross-sectional study was conducted at an individual level in one payroll organization. The permanent and temporary employees sample was composed from other research. The total sample consisted of 929 respondents. The results of this study show that payroll employees have a different psychological contract in contrast to permanent and temporary employees. Payroll employees have lower expectations regarding the obligations of their psychological contract except for their Work-Life Balance and Rewards. Temporary and permanent employees have the same psychological contract. Also, payroll employees felt that employer obligations were the most fulfilled compared with permanent and temporary employees. Finally, this study explored if the relationship between labor contract and Affective Commitment was moderated by the evaluation of the psychological contract. The different labor contract types did not differ on Affective Commitment. When Fulfillment was taken into account permanent employees had more Affective Commitment in comparison to payroll employees. Temporary employees had the same Affective Commitment as permanent employees.

van Affectieve Betrokkenheid. Wanneer de evaluatie van het psychologisch contract werd meegenomen in het onderzoek bleken vaste werknemers meer Affectieve Betrokkenheid te tonen dan payroll werknemers. Tijdelijke werknemers verschilden niet in hun Affectieve Betrokkenheid van vaste werknemers.
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Introduction

Long-term, open-ended exchanges between the employer and the employee was the standard labor relationship for a long time (Lepak & Snell, 2002). This standard labor relationship is what is known as the permanent labor contract. Due to increasing global competition and fluctuations in demands (De Witte & Näswall, 2003) organizations need to be more flexible. An answer to this was the temporary labor contract. This explains the growing of temporary labor contracts in the last decades (De Cuyper et al., 2008). The Netherlands are among the countries with the most temporary labor contracts (De Jong, Schalk & Goessling, 2007). Temporary work is defined as “dependent labor of limited duration” (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2002, p. 170).

There are a number of different forms of temporary labor (De Cuyper, Notelears & De Witte, 2009), for instance temporary agency work and fixed term work. Fixed-term contract work means that employees are hired by the organization (De Cuyper, Notelaears & De Witte, 2009) and temporary agency work means that employees have a tripartite labor relationship (Gallagher & McLean Parks, 2001). An employee is thus hired by the agency to perform work at another organization.

An advantage of a temporary labor contract is that employees are easily hired and fired. Furthermore, organizations invest little in temporary employees because they stay too short in the organization for the organization to get their investment back (De Cuyper & De Witte, 2006). Temporary employees thus, make an organization more flexible on the one hand. On the other hand they are less committed and loyal to the organization in contrast to permanent employees (Van Dyne & Ang, 1998). Organizations need to be flexible, but they also need to have a group of core employees who can for instance train the new employees.

Another answer from organizations on the issue of flexibility of employees is a new form of labor contract called payrolling. Payrolling means that the payroll organization will handle the administrative tasks and is the legal employer (Vereniging Payroll Ondernemingen [VPO], n.d.; mkbservicedesk, n.d.) while the payroll employees will work for the client organization. Payroll labor has similarities and differences with permanent labor as well as temporary labor. Payroll employees and temporary employees can both be seen as the peripheral employees of an organization according to the Flexible Firm Model by Atkinson and Meager (1986). This theory states that a flexible, modern organization has a division of employees, one group are the stable core employees and the other group are the peripheral employees which are flexible in numbers. Temporary employees and payroll employees are both hired and fired easily in contrast to the permanent employees. They are thus flexible in
numbers and can be seen as peripheral employees. Payroll employees can also be classified as core employees because organizations invest in them long-term in contrast to temporary employees (De Cuyper & De Witte, 2006). Payroll employees can be seen as core as well as peripheral employees. This shows that payroll employees can be classified as permanent employees on the one hand and as temporary employees on the other hand (see table 1). This study will investigate this new and upcoming type of contract and will compare this with other well known types of contracts.

Table 1. Core and Peripheral Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Permanent employees</th>
<th>Temporary employees</th>
<th>Payroll employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long period in the organization</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(core employees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible in numbers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(peripheral employees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The different contract types can lead to different expectations from the employees of the employer. In other words, employees with a different contract type can have a different psychological contract. A psychological contract is an implicit contract between the employer and an employee about the expectations they have (Conway & Briner, 2005). Employers expect that employees will work hard, put in extra time, work carefully, help co-workers and be loyal. On the other hand employees expect to be paid at a good rate, be treated fair, have good working conditions and be treated with respect (Conway & Briner, 2005). Temporary employees may have other expectations then permanent employees because of the limited time they spent in the organization (OECD, 2002). They may for instance be less committed than permanent employees (Van Dyne & Ang, 1998). This study will focus on three types of contracts (temporary labor contracts, permanent labor contracts and payroll labor contracts) and to what extent they have a different psychological contract. Due to globalisation it is important for organizations to find a balance between flexibility and the future existence of the organization. One way to do that is to examine the psychological contracts and get more insight in the different contract types.

This study wants to find out in what way employees with a different labor contract (permanent, payroll and temporary) differ in their psychological contract and to what extent they find that their psychological contract is fulfilled. This leads to the following research question:

To what extent is the psychological contract different for different contract types?
Theoretical Framework

Types of contract

Although the majority of employees still have permanent labor contracts, temporary work has become an important alternative labor option (OECD, 2002; Sparrow & Cooper, 2003). Temporary labor is different from traditional ongoing permanent labor concerning the future existence of the job and the distribution of the working hours (Reilly, 1998). This research focuses on permanent labor contracts, temporary labor contracts and payroll contracts as mentioned in the introduction. Permanent work and temporary work are well known labor contracts in contrast to payroll contracts. Payroll contracts will, for that reason, be discussed in detail below.

Payrolling means that an organization boards its employees to another organization. This payroll organization takes on all the responsibilities regarding employees and has to deal with such matters as sick employees, employees who become incapable of work and matters as pensions, contracts and the firing of employees. Advantages of payrolling for client organizations are that it saves time because there is no administrative work. Furthermore, it is cost saving because a client organization only has one invoice every month and that are the wages of the employees (mkbservicedesk, n.d.). Finally, it gives a client organization flexibility because it can easily adapt the workforce for busy or slow periods (HR praktijk, 2008). An organization that has payroll employees can focus completely on its core business. A payroll organization becomes the employer in the legal sense (mkbservicedesk, n.d.; VPO, n.d.), which is different for temporary employees and permanent employees. For these employees the organization they actually work for is their legal employer. Another distinction that can be made is that temporary employees can see this work as a stepping stone to permanent work (Giesecke & Gross, 2003). This might not be for payroll employees because they already work permanent for an organization, the payroll organization. The differences between payroll employees and temporary employees are the similarities between payroll employees and permanent employees and vice versa. For instance that payroll employees and temporary employees may be seen as peripheral employees who are easy to hire and fire (Atkinson & Meager, 1986). On the other hand, payroll employees can be seen as core employees because they are the same as permanent employees except that the organization has less responsibilities and administrative work regarding the payroll employees. See table 1 for similarities and differences between the contract types.
The differences and similarities of these types of contracts can result in a different psychological contract for payroll employees in comparison to temporary employees and/or permanent employees. This research will focus on the psychological contract that the different contract types have with the organization where they perform their work.

Psychological contract

A psychological contract is an implicit exchange relationship between an employee and the employer (Conway & Briner, 2005). The psychological contract is based on assumptions and perceptions. Employees will expect that the employer will provide them with a good salary, good working conditions and fair treatment. An employer on the other hand will expect that employees will work extra time, help co-workers and be loyal. So, an employee expects certain things from the employer and the employer will expect certain things from the employees (Conway & Briner, 2005). The definition of psychological contract that is used in this research is:

“The psychological contract is individual beliefs, shaped by the organization, regarding terms of an exchange agreement between individuals and their organization” (Rousseau, 1995, p.9).

The expectations employees have about their psychological contract is to a great extent formed through pre-labor experiences, the recruiting practice and the early on-the-job socialization (Rousseau, 2001). The employee has for instance certain expectations about the social atmosphere and organizational policies through the recruitment. Also, psychological contracts are relatively stable and durable over time (Rousseau, 2001).

There are three approaches to the psychological contract, the content approach, the evaluation approach and the feature approach (Freese, 2007). The content approach focuses on the content of the psychological contract and differences between groups of employees about the content of their psychological contract. The evaluation approach is about the evaluation of the psychological contract. Thus, if employees experience fulfillment of their psychological contract or the other way around if they experience psychological contract breach. Finally, the feature approach is about describing the features of the psychological contract (Freese, 2007). This research will focus on the content and evaluation approach.

The content approach is about the content of the psychological contract. The psychological contract can be divided into employer obligations and employee obligations.
The employer obligations are the expectations employees have about the things the employer is obliged to offer them (Freese, 2007). The employer obligations consist of the following aspects: job content, career development, social atmosphere, organizational policies, work-life balance, and rewards. Job content is not about the job itself but about how it is organised, such as whether employees experience variation in their work or if their work is challenging. Career development is about the opportunities to advance in the organization. Social atmosphere is about the relationship with colleagues and how friendly the work environment is. Organizational policies are about such issues as participation in important decisions, clear rules and fair regulations and keeping employees informed. Work-life balance is about the opportunity for employees to arrange a balance between their work and personal life. Finally, rewards are about salary and other compensations.

Employee obligations, are those things that employees feel obliged to offer the organization (Freese, 2007). Employee obligations consist of in-role and extra-role employee obligations (Freese, 2007). In-role employee obligations are the things that employees feel obliged to do according to their contract, such as helping colleagues, good cooperation and complying with the rules and regulations. Extra-role employee obligations are the obligations employees feel obliged to do besides their contract, such as volunteering to do extra work, working weekends, making suggestions for improvement. See figure 1 for a model of the psychological contract.

The evaluation approach is about fulfillment of the psychological contract. In other words, whether the expectations employees have about their psychological contract are met by the employer. The psychological contract has two components, employer obligations and employee obligations. However, in this study only the employer obligations are investigated. Thus, if employees with different contract types feel that their expectations regarding job content, career development, social atmosphere, organizational policies, work-life balance and their rewards are fulfilled.
Employer/organizational obligations

- Job content
- Organizational policies
- Career development

Employee obligations

- Work-life balance
- Rewards
- Social atmosphere

In-role employee obligations

Extra-role employee obligations

Figure 1. Psychological Contract (Freese, 2007)

**Psychological contract and labor contracts**

De Cuyper, Notelears and De Witte (2009) found that employees with different contracts might have different interpretations about what a weakened labor relationship is. This means that employees with a different contract type may have a different psychological contract. Lepak and Snell (1999) have developed a framework where they described different ways of categorising labor contracts. This is called the HR Architecture Framework and has four quadrants. Lepak and Snell have categorised the labor contracts on the uniqueness of the skills the employees need in the eyes of the organization and the value of these skills for the organization (1999).

Quadrant one is called developing human capital. This is about unique and valuable skills that employees have. The labor relationship is characterised with the notion of long-term involvement and investment. Permanent employees can be placed in this quadrant.

Quadrant two is called acquiring human capital. The skills employees have are valuable but not unique and are easy transferable to other organizations. Organizations want to internalize these skills because they are valuable (Hamel & Prahalad, 1994). The labor relationship is a symbiotic one, the employer and employee will have a labor relationship as long as they both benefit from the relationship. The third quadrant is called contracting human capital. The skills are generic and of limited strategic value. This means that an organization will hire the employees externally. The focus of the labor relationship lies in the economic...
benefits in contrast to quadrant one where the relational aspects such as commitment and loyalty are important. Temporary labor falls in this category.

Finally, quadrant four is called creating human capital alliances. The skills that belong in this quadrant are unique in some way but they are not directly valuable for creating competitive advantage. The labor relationship is called partnership, which means that they focus on mutual investments and building trust and in the meantime protecting their investments and gain access to each other’s knowledge.

This research focuses on quadrant one and three. Permanent employees can be placed in quadrant one and temporary employees can be placed in quadrant three. Payroll employees will fall between quadrant one and three because on the one hand they have similarities with permanent employees and on the other hand with temporary employees. The Social Identity Theory (SIT) and Self-Categorization Theory (Haslam, 2004) can explain this. These theories state that people categorize themselves in certain groups. Every group has a prototypical characteristic and people categorize themselves to that group if they have that characteristic (Tsui, Egan & O’Reilly, 1992). Payroll employees can thus categorize themselves to temporary agency employees on the basis of the peripheral status they both have. Moreover payroll employees can categorize themselves to permanent employees on the basis that both are core employees. This can lead to differences in the psychological contract for the different contract types (see also table 2).

Table 2. Similarities and Differences of the Contract Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Permanent labor contract</th>
<th>Temporary labor contract</th>
<th>Payroll labor contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizations invest in these employees</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to hire and fire</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique and valuable skills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic skills and of limited strategic value</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in figure 1, the psychological contract is divided in the employer obligations and the employee obligations. The employer obligations will be discussed first.

To start with the content of the job. Permanent employees and payroll employees have higher expectations about their job content then temporary employees. This because temporary employees work for a shorter period of time in the organization in contrast to the other two contract types. According to De Witte and Näswall (2003), permanent employees
have better quality work in comparison to temporary employees. Permanent employees and payroll employees would therefore have better quality jobs in contrast to temporary employees. Saloniemi, Virtanen and Vahtera (2004) found that temporary employees are more likely to work in physically uncomfortable jobs compared to permanent employees. Also, temporary employees have jobs that are seen as least satisfying in terms of job content or work schedules by other employees (OECD, 2002). Furthermore, temporary jobs are often monotonous and not very challenging (Hall, 2006) Concluding, permanent employees and payroll employees have the best and most challenging jobs in comparison to temporary employees. Job content can be different according to the type of contract the employees have.

Hypothesis 1a: Permanent employees and payroll employees have higher expectations regarding job content in contrast to temporary employees.

Hypothesis 1b: Permanent employees and payroll employees perceive better fulfillment of job content in contrast to temporary employees.

The next item of the employer obligations is career development. The Human Capital Theory (Sullivan, 1999) states that employers invest very little to nothing in temporary employees. The reason behind this is that temporary employees stay a too short period in the organization for the employer to earn the costs of the investment back (De Cuyper & De Witte, 2006). According to Aronsson, Gustafsson and Dallner (2002) temporary employees have less training opportunities than permanent employees. Forrier and Sels (2003) also conclude that temporary employees get less training and development opportunities than permanent employees. This means that temporary employees get less career development opportunities than permanent employees and payroll employees.

Hypothesis 2a: Temporary employees have lower expectations regarding career development opportunities in contrast to permanent employees and payroll employees.

Hypotheses 2b: Temporary employees perceive less fulfillment of career development opportunities in contrast to permanent employees and payroll employees.

The following scales are social atmosphere and organizational policies. The Social Identity Theory and Self-Categorization Theory (Haslam, 2004) can explain the expectations
of the social atmosphere and organizational policies that employees with a certain contract have. Through these theories employees create groups and assign themselves to certain groups. This could lead to in-group and out-group bias. People view their own group more positively than any other group (Forsyth, 2006). Employees with the same contracts form a group and see themselves as the in-group while employees with a different contract are seen as the out group. This can create that temporary employees and payroll employees feel left out and not part of the organization because they feel they belong to the periphery. This means that temporary and payroll employees will participate less and are less interested in social atmosphere and organizational policies. Also, cohesion can have an influence on this. Cohesion is “a group characteristic that reflects a high degree of psychological alignment among its members and enables them to act as a group” (Haslam, 2004, p.282). Permanent employees feel more part of the organization and thus are a cohesive group in contrast to temporary and payroll employees. This can lead to less organizational commitment, lower job satisfaction (De Witte & Näswall, 2003), less willingness to participate in organizational policies and less willingness to create a bond with colleagues. The hypotheses are as follows:

**Hypothesis 3a:** Permanent employees have higher expectations regarding the social atmosphere in contrast to temporary employees and payroll employees.

**Hypothesis 3b:** Permanent employees perceive better fulfillment of the social atmosphere in contrast to temporary employees and payroll employees.

**Hypothesis 4a:** Permanent employees have higher expectations regarding the organizational policies in contrast to temporary employees and payroll employees.

**Hypothesis 4b:** Permanent employees perceive better fulfillment of the organizational policies in contrast to temporary employees and payroll employees.

Work-life balance is another aspect of the employer obligations of the psychological contract. Permanent and payroll employees will have the best working times and conditions (De Witte & Näswall, 2003). This in contrast to temporary employees because they have supporting jobs and can perform the job for the period the organization needs them (Lepak & Snell, 1999). Employers would not invest in them (De Cuyper & De Witte, 2006) so they cannot properly arrange their work-life balance. Permanent employees and payroll employees
can arrange their work-life balance better than temporary employees. This leads to the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 5a:** Permanent employees and payroll employees have higher expectations regarding their work-life balance in contrast to temporary employees.

**Hypothesis 5b:** Permanent employees and payroll employees perceive better fulfillment of their work-life balance in contrast to temporary employees.

Finally, rewards are the sixth aspect of the employer obligations. Permanent employees will have better wages than temporary employees and payroll employees. Bhandari and Hesmati (2006), OECD (2002) and Wooden (2004) state that employers invest less in temporary employees in terms of their wages. Also, according to Cranford, Vosko and Zukewich (2003) temporary employees have lower earnings and poorer working conditions in contrast to permanent employees. Besides that, permanent employees have a direct labor relationship with the employer instead of a tripartite labor relationship as the payroll employees. This could have an influence on the rewards because the third party also has to be paid. Temporary and payroll employees expect less from their employer regarding the rewards in contrast to permanent employees. The hypothesis that follows from this is:

**Hypothesis 6a:** Temporary employees and payroll employees have lower expectations regarding the rewards that they receive in contrast to permanent employees.

**Hypothesis 6b:** Temporary employees and payroll employees perceive less fulfillment of the rewards that they receive in contrast to permanent employees.

The employee obligations consist of two components, in-role and extra-role employee obligations. In-role employee obligations are the obligations employees have in regard to their employer, the tasks that employees perceive they have to do according to their contract (Freese, 2007). In-role employee obligations are more important and elaborate for permanent employees and payroll employees in contrast to in-role employee obligations of temporary employees. This because temporary employees spent a shorter time in the organization and thus would have less in-role employee obligations and attach less value to them. Permanent
employees and payroll employees will have more in-role employee obligations than temporary employees.

**Hypothesis 7:** Permanent employees and payroll employees have more expectations regarding their in-role employee obligations in contrast to temporary employees.

Extra-role employee obligations are matters such as helping colleagues and working overtime (Freese, 2007). The expectation is that permanent employees and payroll employees will do these a lot more than temporary workers. The Social Exchange Theory can play a role in this because it states that employees behave in such a way that they think they will get certain benefits in return for certain costs (Haslam, 2004). Temporary employees stay a shorter period of time in the organization and thus are usually more interested in short-term benefits in contrast to long-term benefits (De Cuyper & De Witte, 2006). This is in line with the Expectancy Theory, employees choose the option that leads them to the rewards they desire most (Beardwell, Holden & Claydon, 2004). This means that temporary employees will experience less extra-role employee obligations than permanent employees and payroll employees. Permanent employees are also more committed to the organization and have more loyalty toward the organization (Conway & Briner, 2005) in contrast to temporary employees. This leads to the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 8:** Temporary employees have lower expectations regarding their extra-role employee obligations in contrast to permanent employees and payroll employees.

**Affective commitment and the labor contract types**

Affective commitment is a type of organizational commitment and is based on the desire of an individual to stay with the organization (Nelson & Quick, 2005). Affective commitment is an employee’s attachment toward the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1984), this attachment develops through frequent exchanges between the employer and the employee (Van Dyne & Ang, 1998). Settoon, Bennett and Liden (1996) state that affective commitment is based on the support employees receive from their employer. When affective commitment of the employees is low they are less satisfied with the organization and have more turnover intentions (De Gilder, 2003). Research has shown that permanent employees have a higher affective commitment then temporary employees (Van Dyne & Ang, 1998; De Gilder, 2003; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2002; Forde & Slater, 2006). Employers invest less in temporary
employees because of their transferrable skills and short stay in the organization. Temporary employees are less committed toward the organization in contrast to permanent employees.

Payroll employees are a different story, they have a tripartite labor relationship. This means that they can feel committed toward the payroll organization or toward the organization where they perform their work (the client organization). If payroll employees feels more committed toward the payroll organization then this can affect the work they perform at the client organization.

An interesting question is whether employees feel more committed when they feel that their psychological contract is fulfilled. Permanent employees have a higher affective commitment in contrast to temporary employees as stated above. The question is whether affective commitment of permanent employees is still higher if the fulfillment of the psychological contract is taken into account. The affective commitment of the employees could be higher if they feel that their psychological contract is fulfilled. It also could be lower if they feel that their psychological contract is not fulfilled. This could also be different for the different contract types. This leads to the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 9**: The relation between a labor contract and affective commitment is moderated by the evaluation of the psychological contract.
Figure 2. Conceptual model hypotheses 1 to 8

- Labor contract type
- Perceived obligations of the psychological contract
- Evaluation of the psychological contract

Figure 3. Conceptual model hypothesis 9

- Labor contract type
- Evaluation of the psychological contract
- Affective commitment
Method

Design

The sample of payroll employees was gathered from one payroll organisation who is connected to the VPO (Vereniging Payroll Ondernemingen). The sample of permanent and temporary employees came from an already existing datasets from other researchers. The datasets from other researchers used the same questionnaire as the one that has been used for the payroll sample.

Sample

The dataset from the payroll organization consisted of 122 respondents. Of these respondents 32% is male and 68% is female. From the respondents 44.3% went to secondary school, 27% completed vocational education (MBO) and 28.7% went to an university of applied sciences (HBO) or an university (WO). Their age ranged from 15 to 74 with an average of 45.90. These respondents worked in market research (59%), in the hotel and catering industry (19.7%), with the government (6.6%), in call centres (4.1%), in retail (1.6%), in the health care (1.6%), in education (0.8%), in construction and industry (0.8%) and 5.7% worked in a sector that was not specified in the questionnaire. All these 122 respondents had a payroll contract.

The datasets of the other researchers existed of 807 respondents from which 23.3% is male and 76.7% is female. From these respondents 10.9% went to secondary school, 23.3% completed vocational education (MBO) and 65.8% went to an university of applied sciences (HBO) or an university (WO). The age ranged from 18 to 65 with an average of 40.96. Of these respondents 88.7% worked in the healthcare sector, 2.7% worked in construction and industry and 8.6% worked in education. Of the respondents 17% had a temporary labor contract and 83% had a permanent labor contract. The differences between the samples are shown in Table 3. As can be seen, the samples are very different from each other, especially the sector in which the employees work. Payroll employees work mainly in the market research sector and permanent and temporary employees mainly in the healthcare sector. Also, the majority of payroll employees is older than 51, while the majority of permanent and temporary employees is between 31 and 50 years old. Further, the majority of payroll employees has completed secondary education, while the majority of permanent and temporary employees completed university of applied sciences or university.

These datasets have been merged and the final dataset that has been used for analyses consisted of 929 respondents. Of these respondents 24.4% is male and 75.5% is female. From
the respondents 15.3% went to secondary school, 23.8% completed vocational education (MBO) and 60.9% went to an university of applied sciences (HBO) or an university (WO). The age ranged from 15 to 74 with an average of 41.61. The respondents worked in the health care sector (77.3%), market research (7.8%), education (7.5%), the hotel and catering industry (2.6%), construction and industry (2.5%). Further, 0.9 respondents worked in government, 0.5% in call centres, 0.2% in retail and 0.8% who had a different jobs which was not specified in the questionnaire. Of the respondents 14.7% had a temporary labor contract, 72.1% had a permanent labor contract and 13.1% had a payroll contract. The complete results for the final dataset are shown in table 3.

Table 3. Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payroll organization</th>
<th>Other research</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Other research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organization</td>
<td>Permanent employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;51</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applied science/</td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and industry</td>
<td>industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel and</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>catering</td>
<td>industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Call centres</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market Research</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of contract</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyses

This study is an explanatory research. After merging of the datasets the descriptive statistics from the variables were calculated and a missing values check was performed. The option exclude cases pair wise was ticked as to not unnecessarily limit the sample size (Pallant, 2005). After that, the data were checked for outliers. The next step was to get the data ready for testing the hypotheses. First, the questionnaire was checked for negatively formulated questions. These were reversed to positively formulated questions. Then the total scores for each scale were calculated. For instance, the six items of job content were calculated to one scale that measured the total job content. After having done this for all the scales the reliability of the scales was checked. Finally, the hypotheses were tested. Hypotheses one through eight were tested with a one-way analysis of variance with post-hoc tests. According to Pallant (2005) a one-way analyses of variance is used for comparing two or more groups on the mean of a continuous variable. Post-hoc tests are used to determine the differences between the groups (Pallant, 2005). Hypothesis nine is tested with a hierarchical regression analysis.

Instruments

The survey questionnaire that was used is called the new psychological contract questionnaire from Tilburg, the NTPCV (nieuwe Tilburgse psychologisch contract vragenlijst) (Freese, Schalk & Croon, 2008). The translation of the example questions can be found in appendix A.

The psychological contract

The psychological contract consists of six scales of employer obligations and two scales of employee obligations. The employer obligations all start with the following introduction to their questions “In the employment relationship employees have expectations about what the organization will offer.”. The reliability of the scales is checked with Cronbach’s alpha. The Cronbah’s alpha is mentioned per scale, the first that is mentioned is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>contract</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>137</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>137</th>
<th>14.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary employment contract</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll employment contract</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the one that was found in this study, the Cronbach’s alpha between the square brackets has been found in previous studies (Freese, Schalk & Croon, 2008). The six scales are Job Content, Career Development, Social Atmosphere, Organizational Politics, Work-Life Balance and Rewards. Job Content consist of 6 items (α = .82, [α = .78]). An example item is “To what extent is your organization obliged to offer you variation in your work?”. Career Development consists of 6 items (α = .87, [α = .80]). An example item is “To what extent is your organization obliged to offer you career opportunities?”. Social Atmosphere (5 items, α = .86, [α = .84]). An example item is “To what extent is your organization obliged to offer you a good working atmosphere?”. Organizational Policies (8 items, α = .85, [α = .84]) with as example item “To what extent is your organization obliged to offer you participation in important decisions?”. Then, Work-Life Balance (4 items, α = .65, [α = .57]). An example item is “To what extent is your organization obliged to have considerations for your personal circumstances?”. Finally, Rewards (6 items, α = .80, [α = .76]) with as example item “To what extent is your organization obliged to offer you an appropriate salary?”.

Employer obligations consists of In-Role and Extra-Role Employee Obligations. The introduction to the question start with “In the employment relationship you have opinions on what you should offer the organization.”. In-Role Employee Obligations is measured by 11 items (α = .86, [α = .86]). An example item is “To what extent do you feel obliged to cooperate in a good way with your colleagues?”. Extra-Role Employee Obligations is measured by 11 items (α = .82, [α = .82]). An example item is “To what extent do you feel obliged to keep your knowledge and skills up to date to be able to deal with changing requirements in the organization?”.

The answering scales all ranged from 1 “not at all” to 5 “to a great extent”.

Evaluation of the psychological contract

The evaluation of the psychological contract was measured with a Fulfillment scale (Freese, Schalk & Croon, 2008), which consisted of six items and a Cronbach’s alpha of .80, which is equal to what is found in previous studies of Freese, Schalk and Croon (2008). An example item is: “To what extent did your employer fulfil the obligations with regard to the rewards?” The answering scale ranged from 1 “not at all” to 5 “to a great extent”.

Evaluation of the psychological contract

The evaluation of the psychological contract was measured with a Fulfillment scale (Freese, Schalk & Croon, 2008), which consisted of six items and a Cronbach’s alpha of .80, which is equal to what is found in previous studies of Freese, Schalk and Croon (2008). An example item is: “To what extent did your employer fulfil the obligations with regard to the rewards?” The answering scale ranged from 1 “not at all” to 5 “to a great extent”.
Affective commitment

Affective commitment is measured with seven items (Freese, Schalk & Croon, 2008). This scale has been used twice in the questionnaire, once for the client organization and once for the payroll organization. Reliability of this scale shows a Cronbach’s alpha of .82 for the client organization, a Cronbach’s alpha of .87 for the payroll organization and .83 in former studies (Freese, Schalk & Croon, 2008). An example item is “I am very glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined”. The answering scale ranged from 1 “totally disagree” to 5 “completely agree”.

Types of contract

The types of contract are measured with one question: “Which type of contract do you currently have?”. The respondents could choose from the following: “temporary labor contract, permanent labor contract or payroll labor contract”.

Control variables

The control variables are measured with one question each. Gender was measured with the question: “What is your gender?” Age was measured with the question: “What is your age?” After analyses age is collapsed in three categories, respondents till 30, respondents from 31 to 50 and respondents who were 51 or higher. Finally, education is measured with the following question: “What is your highest completed education?” After analyses the answer categories were collapsed into three categories, respondents who went to secondary school, respondents who completed vocational education (MBO) and respondents who went to an university of applied sciences (HBO) or an university (WO).
## Results

**Table 4. Correlation Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Type of contract</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JC</td>
<td>-.221**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>-.315**</td>
<td>.587**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>-.137**</td>
<td>.432**</td>
<td>.476**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>-.198**</td>
<td>.405**</td>
<td>.552**</td>
<td>.530**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>WLB</td>
<td>.118**</td>
<td>.187**</td>
<td>.160**</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>.370**</td>
<td>.121**</td>
<td>.201**</td>
<td>.201**</td>
<td>.227**</td>
<td>.450**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IREO</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.232**</td>
<td>.275**</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>.081*</td>
<td>.157**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EREO</td>
<td>-.093**</td>
<td>.169**</td>
<td>.247**</td>
<td>.151**</td>
<td>.213**</td>
<td>.353**</td>
<td>.220**</td>
<td>.379**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FJC</td>
<td>.095**</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.082**</td>
<td>.067*</td>
<td>.077*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FCD</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.107**</td>
<td>.074*</td>
<td>.079*</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.086**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>FSA</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.057*</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.081*</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.511**</td>
<td>.421**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>FOP</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.087**</td>
<td>.068*</td>
<td>.070*</td>
<td>.536**</td>
<td>.433**</td>
<td>.553**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>FWLB</td>
<td>.140**</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.066*</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.158**</td>
<td>.108**</td>
<td>.121**</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.268**</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>.300**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>FRW</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.099**</td>
<td>-.090**</td>
<td>.358**</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>.311**</td>
<td>.381**</td>
<td>.375**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>AC CO</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.067*</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>.140**</td>
<td>.434**</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>.414**</td>
<td>.277**</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>AC PO</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.099**</td>
<td>-.090**</td>
<td>.358**</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>.311**</td>
<td>.381**</td>
<td>.375**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.213**</td>
<td>-.111**</td>
<td>-.205**</td>
<td>-.062**</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.116**</td>
<td>-.067*</td>
<td>.073*</td>
<td>.092**</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.121**</td>
<td>.139**</td>
<td>.124**</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.120**</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.075*</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.164**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.214**</td>
<td>.179**</td>
<td>.152**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.151**</td>
<td>-.064*</td>
<td>-.190**</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.070*</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.**
- *= Significant at .05 level
- ***= Significant at .01 level
- ***= Significant at .001 level

JC = Job Content, CD = Career Development, SA = Social Atmosphere, OP = Organizational Policies, WLB = Work-Life Balance, RW = Rewards, IREO = In-Role Employee Obligations, EREO = Extra-Role Employee Obligations.


AC CO = Affective Commitment Client Organization, AC PO = Affective Commitment Payroll Organization.
Psychological contract

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to explore if the three contract types had different expectations regarding their psychological contract. The results are shown in table 5. As can be seen in table 5, the different labor contract types have different expectations about their psychological contract.

When looking at the expectations of Job Content, Career Development, Social Atmosphere and Organizational Policies it shows that permanent and temporary employees have more expectations regarding these items of the psychological contract in contrast to payroll employees.

Employees with different labor contract types perceive different levels of obligations with regard to the content of their jobs (F=53.74, p<.001). The Tukey HSD test indicates that permanent and temporary employees perceived statistically higher obligations with regard to Job Content as compared to payroll employees (Mean differences are 3.319 and 3.030 p< .001, Means are 22.02, 22.31 and 18.99 respectively). Permanent and temporary employees did not differ significantly from each other. Hypothesis 1a, permanent and payroll employees have higher expectations with regard to Job Content in contrast to temporary employees, is thus rejected.

Employees with different labor contract types perceive different levels of obligations regarding their Career Development (F=120.89 p<.001). The Tukey HSD test indicates that permanent and temporary employees perceived statistically higher obligations with regard to Career Development as compared to payroll employees (Mean differences are 5.139 and 4.743 p<.001, Means are 23.69, 23.29 and 18.55 respectively). Permanent and temporary employees did not differ significantly from each other. Hypothesis 2a, temporary employees had lower expectations regarding Career Development in contrast to permanent and payroll employees, is therefore rejected.

Employees with different labor contract types perceive different levels of obligations with regard to Social Atmosphere (F=18.93 p<.001). The Tukey HSD test indicates that permanent and temporary employees perceived statistically higher obligations with regard to Social atmosphere as compared to payroll employees (Mean differences are 1.780 and 1.634 p<.001, Means are 19.92, 19.77 and 18.14 respectively). Permanent and temporary employees did not differ significantly from each other. Hypothesis 3a, permanent employees have higher expectations regarding Social Atmosphere in contrast to temporary and payroll employees, is thus partially rejected.
Employees with different labor contract types perceive different levels of obligations with regard to Organizational Policies (F=52.67 p<.001). The Tukey HSD test indicates that permanent and temporary employees perceived statistically higher obligations with regard to Social Atmosphere in contrast to payroll employees (Mean differences are 3.707 and 3.089 p<.001, Means are 33.36, 32.74 and 29.66 respectively). Permanent and temporary employees did not differ significantly from each other. Hypothesis 4a, permanent employees have higher expectations regarding Organizational Policies in contrast to temporary employees and payroll employees, is partially rejected.

The scales Work-Life Balance and Rewards show that payroll employees have more expectations regarding these aspects of the psychological contract in contrast to permanent and temporary employees.

Employees with different labor contract types perceive different levels of obligations with regard to their Work-Life Balance (F=19.51 p<.001). The Tukey HSD test indicates that permanent and temporary employees perceived statistically lower obligations with regard to their Work-Life Balance as compared to payroll employees (Mean differences are -1.492 and -1.181 p<.001, Means are 12.63, 12.94 and 14.12 respectively). Permanent and temporary employees did not differ significantly from each other. Hypothesis 5a, permanent and payroll employees have higher expectations regarding their Work-Life Balance in contrast to temporary employees, is partially rejected.

Employees with different labor contract types perceived different levels of obligations with regard to their Rewards (F=115.58 p<.001). The Tukey HSD test indicates that permanent and temporary employees perceived statistically lower obligations with regard to their rewards in contrast to payroll employees (Mean differences are -5.633 and -6.350 p<.001, Means are 22.50, 21.48 and 28.13 respectively). Permanent and temporary employees did not differ significantly from each other. Hypotheses 6a, temporary and payroll employees have lower expectations regarding Rewards in contrast to permanent employees, is thus rejected.

In-role and Extra-role Employee Obligations are also shown in table 5. Employees with different labor contract types perceive different levels of obligations with regard to their In-Role Employee Obligations (F=5.73 p <.01). The Tukey HSD test indicates that permanent employees perceived statistically higher obligations regarding In-Role Employee Obligations as compared to payroll employees (Mean difference is 1.422 p<.01, Means are 46.41 and
44.99 respectively). Temporary employees did not differ significantly from each of the other two labor contract types. Hypothesis 7, permanent employees and payroll employees have more expectations regarding their In-Role Employee Obligations in contrast to temporary employees, is therefore rejected.

Employees with different labor contract types perceive different levels of obligations with regard to their Extra-Role Employee Obligations (F=4.46 p<.05). The Tukey HSD test indicates that permanent and temporary employees perceived statistically higher obligations regarding Extra-Role Employee Obligations as compared to payroll employees (Mean differences are 1.536 and 2.249 p<.05, Means are 35.40, 36.11 and 33.86 respectively). Permanent and temporary employees did not differ significantly from each other. Hypothesis 8, temporary employees have lower expectations regarding their Extra-Role Employee Obligations in contrast to permanent and payroll employees, is thus rejected.

Table 5. ANOVA and Post-hoc Comparison Test of the Employer and Employee Obligations of the Psychological Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Contract types</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
<th>Post-hoc comparison (Tukey HSD)</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employer obligations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job content</td>
<td>53.74***</td>
<td>Permanent contract</td>
<td>22.02</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>P - T</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary contract</td>
<td>22.31</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>P-Pay</td>
<td>3.319***</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll contract</td>
<td>18.99</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>T-Pay</td>
<td>3.030***</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>120.891***</td>
<td>Permanent contract</td>
<td>23.69</td>
<td>2.931</td>
<td>P-T</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary contract</td>
<td>23.29</td>
<td>2.874</td>
<td>P-Pay</td>
<td>5.139***</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll contract</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>5.498</td>
<td>T-Pay</td>
<td>4.743***</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>18.929***</td>
<td>Permanent contract</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td>2.792</td>
<td>P-T</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary contract</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>2.549</td>
<td>P-Pay</td>
<td>1.780***</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll contract</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>4.245</td>
<td>T-Pay</td>
<td>1.634***</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational policies</td>
<td>52.673***</td>
<td>Permanent contract</td>
<td>33.36</td>
<td>3.454</td>
<td>P-T</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary contract</td>
<td>32.74</td>
<td>3.506</td>
<td>P-Pay</td>
<td>3.707***</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>29.66</td>
<td>4.822</td>
<td>T-Pay</td>
<td>3.089***</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>rewards</td>
<td>Employee obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Type</strong></td>
<td>Work-life contract</td>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>Employee obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent contract</td>
<td>19.512***</td>
<td>115.578***</td>
<td>5.732**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary contract</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>46.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll contract</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>21.78</td>
<td>44.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance Levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*= Significant at .05 level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**= Significant at .01 level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***= Significant at .001 level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay = Payroll labor contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T= Temporary labor contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*= Significant at .05 level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**= Significant at .01 level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***= Significant at .001 level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay = Payroll labor contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T= Temporary labor contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The effect sizes of the analyses are measured using eta squared. Eta squared is calculated by dividing the sum of squares between groups by the total sum of squares. The effect size indicates “the relative magnitude of the differences between means” (Pallant, 2005, p.201). According to Cohen (1988) .2 refers to a small effect size, .5 to a medium size and .8 to a large effect size. Following these guidelines of Cohen, results show that the effect sizes are all small effects. This is shown in table 6.

Table 6. Effect Sizes of the Psychological Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer obligations</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job content</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational policies</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-role employee obligations</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-role employee obligations</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes.
Cohen’s effect sizes: small = .2, medium = .5, large = .8

According to the correlation matrix (table 4) three control variables have an influence on the psychological contract. These are age, sex and education. To check their influence on aspects of the psychological contract hierarchical regression analysis was conducted. The results are shown in table 7. As can be seen in this table age has an influence on the following aspects of the psychological contract: Job Content (β = -.077 p<.05), Career Development (β = -.148 p<.001)) and Social Atmosphere (β = -.126 p<.001). When the age of an employee increases, the expectations they have regarding those aspects of the psychological contract decreases. Also, women have higher expectations regarding Career Development (β = .066 p<.05), Social Atmosphere (β = .116 p<.001), Organizational Policies (β = .106 p<.01) and In-Role Employee Obligations (β = .132 p<.001) in contrast to men. In fact, In-Role Employee Obligations mainly differ due to the sex of the employees. An explanation for this is that the majority of the respondents is female (76%) in this study. Employees who have a higher education have more expectations regarding their Job Content (β = .085 p<.01) and
employees who have a higher education have less expectation regarding Social Atmosphere ($\beta = -.072 \ p<.001$). The expectations of Extra-Role Employee Obligations are not influenced by the control variables. The $R^2$ change is overall small ($R^2<.072$) which indicates that the control variables are not of great influence.
Table 7. Hierarchical Regression Analysis with Control Variables

Notes.
*= Significant at an .05 level
**= Significant at an .01 level
***= Significant at an .001 level

Dummy: temporary employees = 1, permanent employees = 0, payroll employees = 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Job Content</th>
<th>Career development</th>
<th>Social atmosphere</th>
<th>Organization policies</th>
<th>Work-life balance</th>
<th>Rewards</th>
<th>In-role employee obligations</th>
<th>Extra-role employee obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.105**</td>
<td>-.077*</td>
<td>-.189***</td>
<td>-.148***</td>
<td>-.143***</td>
<td>-.126***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>.083*</td>
<td>.066*</td>
<td>.116***</td>
<td>.108**</td>
<td>.118***</td>
<td>.106**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.176***</td>
<td>.085**</td>
<td>.144***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.072***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² change</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>14.19***</td>
<td>24.29***</td>
<td>23.42***</td>
<td>65.84***</td>
<td>12.59***</td>
<td>14.93***</td>
<td>11.66***</td>
<td>24.20***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes.
*= Significant at an .05 level
**= Significant at an .01 level
***= Significant at an .001 level

Dummy: temporary employees = 1, permanent employees = 0, payroll employees = 0

Dummy: payroll employees = 1, permanent employees = 0, temporary employees = 0
Evaluation of the psychological contract

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to explore whether the three labor contract types had a different fulfillment of their employer obligations of the psychological contract. As shown in table 12, the three labor contract types differed from each other except for Rewards. This is shown in table 8.

Payroll employees experience a better fulfillment of their Job Content and Work-Life Balance in contrast to permanent and temporary employees.

Employees with different labor contract types perceive different levels of fulfillment with regard to their Job Content (F=15.39 p<.001). The Tukey HSD test indicates that permanent and temporary employees perceived statistically lower fulfillment regarding their Job Content as compared to payroll employees (Mean differences are -.383 p<.001 and -.275 p<.01, Means are 3.46, 3.57 and 3.84 respectively). Permanent and temporary employees do not differ significantly from each other. Hypothesis 1b, permanent and payroll employees perceive better fulfillment of Job Content in contrast to temporary employees, is partially rejected.

Employees with different labor contract types perceive different levels of fulfillment with regard to Work-Life Balance (F=21.46 p<.001). The Tukey HSD test indicates that permanent and temporary employees perceive statistically lower fulfillment of their Work-Life Balance in contrast to payroll employees (Mean differences are -.471 and -.417 p<.001, Means are 3.54, 3.59 and 4.01 respectively). Permanent and temporary employees did not differ significantly from each other. Hypothesis 5b, permanent and payroll employees perceive better fulfillment of their Work-Life Balance in contrast to temporary employees, is thus partially rejected.

The experienced fulfillment of Social Atmosphere and Organizational Policies is less for the permanent employees in contrast to the temporary and payroll employees.

Employees with different labor contract types perceive different levels of fulfillment with regard to Social Atmosphere (F=14.21 p<.001). The Tukey HSD test indicates that permanent employees perceived statistically lower fulfillment of Social Atmosphere as compared to temporary and payroll employees (Mean differences are -.308 and -.266 p<.001, Means are 3.35, 3.66 and 3.61 respectively). Temporary and payroll employees did not differ significantly from each other. Hypothesis 3b, permanent employees perceive better fulfillment of the Social Atmosphere in contrast to temporary employees and payroll employees, is therefore rejected.
Employees with different labor contract types perceive different levels of fulfillment regarding Organizational Policies (F=15.34 p<.001). The Tukey HSD test indicates that permanent employees perceived statistically lower fulfillment of Organizational Policies as compared to temporary and payroll employees (Mean differences are -.233 p<.01 and -.343 p<.001, Means are 3.15, 3.34 and 3.49 respectively). Temporary and payroll employees did not differ significantly from each other. Hypothesis 4b, permanent employees perceive better fulfillment of the Organizational Policies in contrast to temporary employees and payroll employees, is thus rejected.

The experienced fulfillment of Career Development is better for permanent employees in contrast to payroll employees.

Employees with different labor contract types perceive different levels of fulfillment with regard to their Career Development (F=4.83 p<.01). The Tukey HSD test indicates that permanent employees perceived statistically higher fulfillment of their Career Development in contrast to payroll employees (Mean difference is .257 p<.01, Means are 3.28 and 3.02). Temporary employees do not significantly differ from either of those groups. Hypothesis 2b, temporary employees perceive less fulfillment of Career Development opportunities in contrast to permanent employees and payroll employees, is thus rejected.

Finally, employees with different labor contract types did not perceive different levels of fulfillment with regard to Rewards (F= 1.80).

Table 8. ANOVA and Post-hoc Comparison of the Fulfillment of the Employer Obligations of the Psychological Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fulfillment of the employer obligations of the psychological contract</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Contract types</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
<th>Post-hoc comparison (Tukey HSD)</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulfillment job content</td>
<td>15.939***</td>
<td>Permanent contract</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>P -T</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary contract</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>P-Pay</td>
<td>-.383***</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll contract</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>T-Pay</td>
<td>-.275**</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfillment career</td>
<td>4.838**</td>
<td>Permanent contract</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>P-T</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The effect sizes are also measured. These are shown in table 9. As can be seen these effect sizes are small according to Cohen (1988).

Table 9. Effect Sizes of the Fulfillment of the Psychological Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fulfillment of the employer obligations of the psychological contract</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job content</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social atmosphere</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational policies</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Cohen’s effect sizes: small = .2, medium = .5, large = .8
A hierarchical regression analysis is conducted to check the influence of the control variables on the fulfillment of the psychological contract. As seen in table 10, only age has a significant influence on Social Atmosphere ($\beta = -0.099 \ p<.01$) and Organizational Policies ($\beta = -0.069 \ p<.05$). When age of an employee increases, fulfillment of these aspects of the psychological contract decreases. Sex has a significant influence on Social Atmosphere ($\beta = 0.068 \ p<.05$). Women are more fulfilled with their Social Atmosphere then men. The other aspects are not influenced by these control variables. The overall affect of the control variables is small ($R^2 <.017$) which means they are not of great influence.

Table 10. Hierarchical Regression Analysis with Control Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social atmosphere</th>
<th>Organizational policies</th>
<th>Work-life balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.107***</td>
<td>-.099***</td>
<td>-.068*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.068*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary employees</td>
<td>.131***</td>
<td>.098**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll employees</td>
<td>.151***</td>
<td>.169***</td>
<td>.224***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.27**</td>
<td>9.35***</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F change</td>
<td>5.27**</td>
<td>15.23***</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes.
* = Significant at .05 level
** = Significant at .01 level
*** = Significant at .001 level
Dummy: temporary employee = 1, permanent employee = 0, payroll employees = 0
Dummy: payroll employee = 1. Permanent employee = 0, temporary employees = 0

Affective commitment and contract types

A hierarchical regression analysis has been conducted to test whether the evaluation of the psychological contract has an influence on Affective Commitment of the labor contract types. As can be seen in table 11, Affective Commitment is not influenced by type of contract. Permanent, temporary and payroll employees do not differ in their Affective Commitment toward the organization they work for. Although when Fulfillment is entered into the analysis, it shows that temporary employees show more Affective Commitment when their psychological contract is fulfilled ($\beta = .497 \ p< .05$) in contrast to permanent employees and payroll employees. As can be seen in figure 4. Hypothesis 9 stated that the relation between a
labor contract and Affective Commitment is moderated by the evaluation of the psychological contract and is therefore partially accepted. Control variables were added during the analysis and as can be seen in table 11, education had a small influence (β = -0.073, p<0.5). Employees with a lower education show more Affective Commitment.

Table 11: Hierarchical Regression Analyses Affective Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affective commitment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.072*</td>
<td>-.078*</td>
<td>-.073*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll employees</td>
<td>-.432***</td>
<td>-.420***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilment</td>
<td>.660***</td>
<td>.290***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilment x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R²                 | .008                 | .009   | .235   | .239   |
| R² change          | .008                 | .001   | .226   | .004   |
| F                  | 2.43                 | 1.69   | 47.22***| 36.09***|
| F change           | 2.43                 | .508   | 272.38***| 2.31   |

*= Significant at a .05 level  
**= Significant at a .01 level  
***=Significant at a .001 level

Dummy temporary employee = 2, permanent employee = 1, payroll employee = 1  
Dummy payroll employee = 2, permanent employee = 1, temporary employee = 1

Payroll employees have a tripartite labor relationship. This means that they can be committed toward the organization where they perform their work (client organization) or the payroll organization. A hierarchical regression analysis is conducted to check whether payroll employees show a different Affective Commitment toward the payroll organization if their psychological contract is fulfilled. As can be seen in table 12, if employee obligations of their psychological contract are fulfilled payroll employee show more Affective Commitment toward the client organization (β = .586 p< .001) in contrast to the payroll organization (β = .220 p< .05).
Table 12. Correlation Matrix of Affective Commitment toward the Payroll or Client Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affective commitment of the client organization</th>
<th>Affective commitment of the payroll organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fulfillment payroll employees</strong></td>
<td>β = .586***</td>
<td>β = .220*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R² Change</strong></td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>62.72***</td>
<td>6.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F Change</strong></td>
<td>62.72***</td>
<td>6.08*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes.
* = Significant at an .05 level
** = Significant at an .01 level
*** = Significant at an .001 level

Conclusion & Discussion

Psychological contract

This study shows that the psychological contract differs for different labor contracts. Although the differences are not as expected. Permanent and temporary employees do not differ on their expectations of employer obligations of their psychological contract. So, despite the division between permanent and temporary employees as can be seen in the HR architecture framework (Lepak & Snell, 1999) and the flexible firm model (Atkinson & Meager, 1986) (see table 1), they do not differ on employer obligations of the psychological contract. The findings that permanent and temporary employees do not differ is not in agreement with previous research. Temporary employees are suggested to have different employer obligations of the psychological contract in contrast to permanent employees (Saloniemi, Virtanen & Vahtera, 2004; Forrier & Sels, 2003; Lepak & Snell, 1999; Cranford, Vosko & Zukewich, 2003).

An explanation for this discrepancy is that this study is performed in the Netherlands and temporary work has a better position in the Netherlands then in most countries. According to De Jong, Schalk & Goesling (2007) the Netherlands are actively trying to protect temporary employees by law. For instance, “Wet gelijke behandeling tijdelijk en vaste werknemers” (the equal treatment of temporary and permanent employees law) prohibits unequal treatment of fixed-term employees in comparison to permanent employees with
similar job characteristics. Also, the “Wet flexibliteit en zekerheid” (law of flexibility and security also known as the “Flexwet”) which improves conditions for temporary employees on grounds like job security, payment and discharge regulations. This means that temporary employees have more rights in the Netherlands in contrast to other countries. Temporary work is not seen as secondary work in the Netherlands, as it is in other countries. This leads to equal expectations of employer obligations between permanent and temporary employees. Also, the fact that temporary employees can see temporary labor as a stepping stone to permanent labor (Giesecke & Gross, 2003) can explain that temporary and permanent employees have the same psychological contract. The fact that temporary employees expect to get a permanent labor contract from the organization can lead to the same expectations as permanent employees.

Payroll employees on the other hand differ on every aspect of employer obligations with temporary and permanent employees. The first four characteristics (job content, career development, social atmosphere and organizational policies) show that payroll employees have lower expectations of employer obligations in comparison to temporary and permanent employees. Interesting is that payroll employees have high expectations regarding their Work-Life Balance and Rewards in contrast to permanent and temporary employees.

An explanation could be the sector in which the respondents are working. The majority of the respondents who had a permanent or temporary labor contract worked in the healthcare sector. The majority of the respondents with a payroll contract worked in market research. The fact that permanent and temporary employees did not differ on their employer obligations could be because they work in the same sector, the healthcare sector. Payroll employees work in a totally different sector, market research, which could explain why their employer obligations are different in comparison to permanent and temporary employees.

To check whether the sector had an influence, a new dataset with temporary and permanent employees who worked in the call centre and market research sector has been compared with payroll employees of the same sector on their psychological contract. The results showed that permanent and temporary employees had more expectations regarding Job Content, Career Development, Social Atmosphere and Organizational Policies in contrast to payroll employees. Payroll employees had more expectations regarding Work-Life Balance in contrast to permanent and temporary employees. The employee labor contracts did not differ in their expectations regarding Rewards. This analyses shows that type of work does not account for the difference in psychological contract of payroll employees in contrast to permanent and temporary employees.
An explanation could be a difference in the organizations where the employees work. Organization characteristics could have an influence on the results. The social atmosphere, the rules and regulations that are in place, how common it is to help each other as colleagues or how formal or informal people communicate with each other are some things that can influence the outcomes of the psychological contract. For instance, if it is normal to help your colleagues in an organization then employees would have different expectations in contrast to employees who work in an organization where helping your colleagues is seen as something unusual. The fact that the sample of permanent and temporary employees are from the same organization in contract to the payroll employees could thus have an influenced the results.

The employee obligations consist of in-role and extra-role employee obligations. The differences found are not as expected. Permanent and payroll employees differ in their In-Role Employee Obligations. Permanent employees expect to engage more in In-Role Employee Obligations in contrast to payroll employees. This is mainly due to the fact that the majority of the sample consists of women (76%). As was shown in the results (table 7) women expect to engage more in In-Role Employee Obligations than men. The other part of the explanation is 72.1% from the respondents has a permanent labor contract and 13.1% of the respondents has a payroll contract. The majority of women in the sample and the fact that there are more respondents with a permanent labor contract explains the results for In-Role Employee Obligations.

For Extra-Role Employee Obligations, payroll employees have lower expectations in contrast to permanent and temporary employees. As mentioned above, permanent and temporary employees work mainly in the healthcare sector and payroll employees in the market research sector. For Extra-Role Employee Obligations the influence of the sector is also checked. The results showed that payroll employees had lower expectations regarding Extra-Role Obligations on contrast to permanent and temporary employees. This leads to the fact that the type of work also does not explain the difference in psychological contract for the Extra-Role Employee Obligations of the different labor contracts.

The difference in organizational characteristics could explain the expectations between the labor contracts and their Extra-Role Employee Obligations. For instance, if it is not common to help your colleagues or go the extra mile for the organization then this could lead to different expectations regarding Extra-Role Employee Obligations.

All in all, payroll employees have a different psychological contract in contrast to temporary and permanent employees. Payroll employees have lower expectations of their
psychological contract then temporary and permanent employees. Except for the expectations of their Work-Life Balance and their Rewards which are higher in contrast to temporary and permanent employees. Nevertheless the effect sizes are small. This means that the differences reported may not be that large. Which means that permanent, temporary and payroll employees have the same psychological contract with emphasis on different aspects of the psychological contract.

The evaluation of the psychological contract
Payroll employees perceive their employer obligations of the psychological contract as fulfilled. Except Career Development, payroll employees perceive less fulfillment regarding Career Development in contrast to permanent and temporary employees. Permanent employees have the least of their employer obligations fulfilled, they only have their Career Development aspect fulfilled. Temporary employees have the following aspects fulfilled, Social Atmosphere and Organizational Policies. There is no difference in fulfillment of the Rewards.

The Social Exchange Theory (Haslam, 2004) and the Expectancy Theory (Beardwell, Holden & Claydon, 2004) both state that employees will work for certain benefits they desire the most. These benefits are the expectations employees have of employer obligations of the psychological contract. As mentioned earlier, payroll employees had lower expectations of their psychological contract, except for the Work-Life Balance. This could mean that their psychological contract is easier fulfilled. Also, temporary employees expect less from their employer in contrast to permanent employees (Van Dyne & Ang, 1998) and because of these lower expectations their psychological contract is easier fulfilled.

Payroll employees evaluate employer obligations of the psychological contract as most fulfilled, followed by temporary and then permanent employees. The lower the expectations, the easier these expectations are fulfilled. However, the effect sizes found were small.

Affective commitment and type of contract
The different labor contract types do not differ on their Affective Commitment. They do differ when fulfillment is added into the analysis. Temporary employees feel more Affective Commitment if their psychological contract is fulfilled in contrast to permanent and payroll employees.
Due to the differences in fulfillment the labor contract types differ in their Affective Commitment. An explanation for this could be the fact temporary employees feel that they belong to the periphery in contrast to permanent and payroll employees who then are seen as core employees. Also as mentioned above, temporary employees expect less from their employer in contrast to permanent employees (Van Dyne & Ang, 1998). This means that temporary employees feel left out. Therefore, when their employee obligations of the psychological contract are fulfilled they show more affective commitment in contrast to permanent and payroll employees. By doing so they hope for a more permanent labor contract and be no longer part of the periphery. Temporary employees thus show more loyalty in contrast to permanent and payroll employees when their employee obligations are fulfilled.

Payroll employees have a tripartite labor relationship and therefore this study investigated where their loyalty lies. The Affective Commitment of payroll employees is higher toward the client organization then toward the payroll organization if employer obligations of their psychological contract are fulfilled. Payroll employees feel more loyalty towards the client organization because in this organization they perform their work. The client organization on the other hand is the organization where they get their pay from and is their legal employer on paper. Payroll employees will not spent time with the payroll organization but they will with the client organization. They can bond more easily with the client organization which leads to more loyalty (Van Dyne & Ang, 1998).

**Limitations**

When looking at the results of this study a few things have to be kept in mind. First, this study uses different datasets from different researchers. These researchers collected the data for their own research and thus with different intentions. The scope of this study is therefore limited because the researcher had to work with the already existing data. Due to these different datasets from different organizations the results of this study could be influenced by the different organizational characteristics in the organizations.

Also, the data is collected in different sectors and this could have an effect on the results of this study. It could lead to differences in the results that are not or less due to the differences between the labor contract types but due to the difference in sector. One of the effects is that due to the difference in sectors this sample is very heterogeneous and that can be the reason why the assumption of Levene’s test for homogeneity is violated. Although an analysis is done with the three labor contract types in the same sector, this still were different
datasets which may have influenced the outcome. Therefore this study should be replicated with the different labor contracts in the same organization.

Furthermore, the sample was unevenly divided concerning sectors, the respondents per labor contract and the male/female ratio. For some sectors there were only one or two respondents and therefore this study cannot be generalized to the entire labor market. The same goes for the respondents per labor contract type, the groups were unevenly divided. The male/female ratio was also unevenly divided, the sample consisted mostly of women (76%). Another limitation is that the data in this study is collected from one source in the organizations, the employee. This mean that this study is influenced by common method variance. This study needs to be replicated in a more equal research design to make a more valuable contribution.

The effect sizes were small which indicates that the differences reported may actually not be that big. In other words, there may be no differences at all in practice. In line with this is that in a large sample, small differences can become statistically significant between the groups (Pallant, 2005). In this study this means that the differences found are not of practical value. This study took place under very specified circumstances and therefore the results of this study may therefore not be generalized to other sectors and countries.

**Future research**

The findings of this study suggest that payroll employees have a different psychological contract in contrast to permanent and temporary employees. More research is needed to find out why payroll employees have a different psychological contract. Do they see themselves as different from the other labor contracts and does this affect their work. The fact that temporary employees have the same psychological contract as permanent employees is something that has to be studied as well. Especially since a number of different studies (Saloniemi, Virtanen & Vahtera, 2004; Forrier & Sels, 2003; Lepak & Snell, 1999; Cranford, Vosko & Zukewich, 2003) show that temporary and permanent employees have different expectations regarding their psychological contract. Future research should study if this has to do with the way people look at temporary labor in contrast to permanent labor in different countries or that it depends on the sector the employees work in.

Also, payroll employees had the best Fulfillment of the employer obligations of their psychological contract in comparison to permanent and temporary employees. Future research is needed to find out why payroll employees feel the most fulfilled with their psychological contract as well as why permanent employees feel the least fulfilled with their psychological contract. It could be that the lower expectations from the payroll employees and the high
expectations of the permanent employees can explain this. Another question that future research can answer is why permanent and temporary employees have the same psychological contract but have different levels of fulfillment.

Furthermore, future research is needed to explain why temporary employees have more Affective Commitment when their psychological contract is fulfilled in contrast to permanent and payroll employees. Do temporary employees show more affective commitment because they want a permanent labor contract.

Finally, future research could take a look into the importance of the aspects of the psychological contract for the different labor contracts. Maybe that could explain some of the results found in this study. For instance the low fulfillment of the psychological contract for permanent employees could lie in the fact that the most important aspects for permanent employees are not fulfilled.

**Practical implications**

The psychological contract shows what employees expect from their employer. For human resource (HR) managers it is important to know the expectations of the employees in the organization. A HR manager can adapt the HR practices in such a way that the needs of the employees are met. Due to the changes in labor contracts an HR manager has a greater challenge to keep every employee satisfied despite their different labor contracts. An HR manager should for instance pay extra attention to Work-Life Balance and Rewards of the payroll employees in comparison to permanent and temporary employees. If employees experience that these needs are not met, in other words that their psychological contract is not fulfilled then this leads to dissatisfied employees. They experience violation of their psychological contract which leads to more turnover intentions and less affective commitment.

Permanent employees had the least fulfilled employer obligations of their psychological contract in contrast to temporary and payroll employees. For HR managers it is important to realize this and act on this. Especially because permanent employees are seen as the core of the organization. HR managers should make sure that (permanent) employees experience a fulfilled psychological contract. This leads to more satisfied employees with more affective commitment toward the organization.

Also, when looking at the sample of this study it shows that payroll employees are older and lower educated in contrast to permanent and temporary employees. A HR manager should take into account who is being payrolled and adapt the HR practices according to that.
Older employees have different expectations of the psychological contract in contrast to younger employees. The same goes for employees who have a lower education in contrast to employees with a higher education.

All in all, a HR manager should be aware of the different labor contract types in the organization and adapt the HR practices to match the needs of the employees. By doing this the organization will have more satisfied and consequently more loyal employees.
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Appendix A  Translation of the example questions

The questionnaire is in Dutch. So, the questions are translated and the original Dutch question but between brackets.

The psychological contract

First the, employer obligations, an example question for job content is “In the employment relationship employees have expectations about what the organization will offer. To what extent is your organization obliged to offer you variation in your work?” (“In de arbeidsrelatie heeft u opvattingen over wat de organisatie u zal bieden. In hoeverre vindt u dat de organisatie de verplichting heeft u afwisselend werk te bieden?”).

For career development an example item is: “In the employment relationship employees have expectations about what the organization will offer. To what extent is your organization obliged to offer you career opportunities?” (“In de arbeidsrelatie heeft u opvattingen over wat de organisatie u zal bieden. In hoeverre vindt u dat de organisatie de verplichting heeft u loopbaanmogelijkheden te bieden?”).

An example item for social atmosphere is: “In the employment relationship employees have expectations about what the organization will offer. To what extent is your organization obliged to offer you a good working atmosphere?” (“In de arbeidsrelatie heeft u opvattingen over wat de organisatie u zal bieden. In hoeverre vindt u dat de organisatie de verplichting heeft u een goede werksfeer te bieden?”).

An example item for organizational policies is: “In the employment relationship employees have expectations about what the organization will offer. To what extent is your organization obliged to offer you participation in important decisions?” (“In de arbeidsrelatie heeft u opvattingen over wat de organisatie u zal bieden. In hoeverre vindt u dat de organisatie de verplichting heeft u inspraak bij belangrijke beslissingen te bieden?”).

An example question for work-life balance is: “In the employment relationship employees have expectations about what the organization will offer. To what extent is your organization obliged to have considerations for your personal circumstances?” (“In de arbeidsrelatie heeft u opvattingen over wat de organisatie u zal bieden. In hoeverre vindt u dat de organisatie de verplichting heeft begrip voor uw persoonlijke omstandigheden op te brengen?”).

Finally, an example item for the rewards is: "In the employment relationship employees have expectations about what the organization will offer. To what extent is your organization obliged to offer you an appropriate salary?” (“In de arbeidsrelatie heeft u
opvattingen over wat de organisatie u zal bieden. In hoeverre vindt u dat de organisatie de verplichting heeft u een passend salaris te bieden?”).

The employee obligations are next. An example item of the in-role employee obligations is: “In the employment relationship you have opinions on what you should offer the organization. To what extent do you feel obliged to cooperate in a good way with your colleagues?” (“In de arbeidsrelatie heeft u opvattingen over wat u de organisatie zal bieden. In hoeverre voelt u zich verplicht goed samenwerken met uw collega’s?”).

An example item of the extra-role employee obligations is: “In the employment relationship you have opinions on what you should offer the organization. To what extent do you feel obliged to keep your knowledge and skills up to date to be able to deal with changing requirements in the organization?” (“In de arbeidsrelatie heeft u opvattingen over wat u de organisatie zal bieden. In hoeverre voelt u zich verplicht de om u kennis en vaardigheden op peil houden om om te kunnen gaan met veranderende eisen in de organisatie?”).

**Evaluation of the psychological contract**

An example item is: “To what extent did your employer fulfil the obligations with regard to the rewards?” (“In hoeverre heeft de organisatie voldaan aan de verplichtingen ten aanzien van uw werkinhoud?”)

**Affective commitment**

An example item is “I am very glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined”. (“Ik ben heel blij dat ik ervoor gekozen heb om voor deze organisatie te gaan werken”).
Appendix B The scales of the psychological contract, the evaluation of the psychological contract and affective commitment.

The Dutch translation can be found between the brackets.

A) Organizational obligations (Organisatieverplichtingen):

1) Job Content (Inhoud van het werk) (6 items, $\alpha = 0.82$)
2) Career Development (Loopbaanontwikkeling) (6 items, $\alpha = 0.87$)
3) Social Atmosphere (Sociale sfeer) (5 items, $\alpha = 0.86$)
4) Organizational Policies (Organisatiebeleid) (8 items, $\alpha = 0.85$)
5) Work Life Balance (Werk-Privé balans) (4 items, $\alpha = 0.65$)
6) Rewards (Beloningen) (6 items, $\alpha = 0.80$)

Answering scales of the organizational/employer obligations

(Antwoorden van de organisatieverplichtingenschalen)

In the employment relationship employees have expectations about what the organization will offer. To what extent is your organization obliged to offer you the following?

(In de arbeidsrelatie heeft u opvattingen over wat de organisatie u zal bieden. In hoeverre vindt u dat de organisatie de verplichting heeft u het volgende te bieden?)

Not at all (Totaal geen verplichting)
Slightly (Nauwelijks een verplichting)
Somewhat (Enigszins een verplichting)
Moderately (Sterke verplichting)
To a great extent (Zeer sterke verplichting)

1) Job content (Inhoud van het werk)

- Variation in your work (Afwisselend werk)
- Challenging work. (Uitdagend werk)
- Balanced workload (Balans in werkdruk)
- Interesting work (Interessant werk)
- Autonomy (Autonomie)
- The opportunity to deliver quality goods/services (Mogelijkheid tot kwaliteit leveren)

2) Career Development (Loopbaanontwikkeling)

- Career opportunities (Loopbaanmogelijkheden)
- Training and education (Trainingen en opleidingen)
- Coaching on the job (Coaching in het werk)
- Professional development opportunities (Brede professionele ontwikkelingsmogelijkheden)
- Learning on the job (Leren van het werk)
- Opportunities to fully utilize knowledge and skills (Mogelijkheid tot volledig benutting van uw kennis en vaardigheden)

3) Social Atmosphere (Sociale sfeer)

- Good working atmosphere (Goede werksfeer)
Good cooperation (Mogelijkheden om plezierig samen te werken)
Support from colleagues (Steun door collega's)
Appreciation and recognition (Waardering)
Support from supervisor (Steun van leidinggevende)

4) Organizational Policies (Organisatiebeleid)
- Participation in important decisions (Inspraak bij belangrijke beslissingen)
- A fair supervisor (Een rechtvaardige leidinggevende)
- Feedback on performance (Feedback over het werk)
- Clear and fair rules and regulations (Duidelijke en rechtvaardige regels)
- Keeping you informed (U op de hoogte houden van ontwikkelingen)
- Open communication (Open communicatie)
- Ethical policies concerning society and environment (Ethisch beleid ten aanzien van maatschappij en omgeving)
- Confidence in the organization (Vertrouwen in de organisatie)

5) Work-life balance (Werk- privé balans)
- Consideration of personal circumstances (Begrip voor persoonlijke omstandigheden)
- Opportunity to schedule your own holidays (Zelf vakantiedagen kunnen inplannen)
- Working at home (Thuiswerken)
- Adjustment of working hours to fit personal life (Werktijden af kunnen stemmen op privé-leven)

6) Rewards (Beloningen)
- Employment security (Werkzekerheid)
- Appropriate salary (Passend salaris)
- Rewards for exceptional performance (Beloningen voor bijzondere prestaties)
- Reimbursement of training costs (Vergoedingen voor opleidingen)
- Good benefits package (Passende secundaire arbeidsvoorwaarden)
- Pay for performance (Prestatiebeloning)

B) Employee obligations (Werknemerverplichtingen):
1. Inrole obligations (Inrol verplichtingen) (11 items, α = 0,86)
   2. Extra-role obligations (Extra rol verplichtingen) (10 items, α = 0,82)

Answering scales of the employee obligations
(Antwoorden van de werknemerverplichtingenschalen)

In the employment relationship you have opinions on what you should offer the organization.
To what extent do you feel obliged to offer your organization the following?
(In de arbeidsrelatie heeft u opvattingen over wat u de organisatie zal bieden. In hoeverre voelt u zich verplicht de organisatie het volgende te bieden?)

Not at all (Totaal geen verplichting)
Slightly (Nauwelijks een verplichting)
Somewhat (Enigszins een verplichting)
Moderately (Sterke verplichting)
To a great extent (Zeer sterke verplichting)
1) Inrole obligations (Inrol verplichtingen)
- Good cooperation (Goed samenwerken)
- Helping colleagues (Collega’s helpen)
- Provide good service to customers (Goede service aan klanten bieden)
- Performing well on tasks you do not like (Taken die u liever niet doet, toch goed uitvoeren)
- Integrity (Integer handelen)
- Dedication to your work (Uw werk met toewijding uitvoeren)
- Being cost-conscious when dealing with organizational properties (Kostenbewust omgaan met organisatie-eigendommen)
- Dealing with private matters at home (Privé zaken thuis regelen)
- Complying with organizational rules and regulations (Regels en afspraken van de organisatie respecteren)
- Protect the organization’s image (Een positief imago van de organisatie uitdragen)
- Contributing to a pleasant working atmosphere (Bijdragen aan een goede sfeer op het werk)

2) Extra role obligations (Extra rol verplichtingen)
- Keeping knowledge and skills up to date to be able to deal with changing requirements (Kennis en vaardigheden op peil houden om om te kunnen gaan met veranderende eisen)
- Participating in training outside working hours that is important to do your job properly (Buiten werktijd opleidingen volgen die van belang zijn voor het goed uitvoeren van uw werk)
- Making suggestions for improvement (Voorstellen ter verbetering doen)
- Volunteering to do additional tasks (Vrijwillig extra taken op u nemen)
- Working overtime if that is necessary to get the job done (Overuren maken als dat noodzakelijk is om het werk af te krijgen)
- Working weekends (Werken in het weekend)
- Participation in training to enhance employability (Opleidingen volgen om uw kansen op de arbeidsmarkt te vergroten)
- Willingness to work in different positions (Voor verschillende functies inzetbaar zijn)
- The flexibility to change positions (De flexibiliteit om van functie te veranderen)
- Willingness to work in another region (Bereid zijn om in een andere regio te werken)
- Stay with the organization for several years (Bereid zijn om enkele jaren bij de organisatie te blijven)

C) Fulfillment (6 items, α = 0.80)

To what extent did your employer fulfil the obligations with regard to... (Job Content, Career Development, Social Atmosphere, Organizational Policies, Work Life Balance, Rewards)? (In hoeverre heeft de organisatie voldaan aan de verplichtingen ten aanzien van uw ...(werkinhoud, loopbaanontwikkeling, sociale sfeer, organisatiebeleid, beloningen)?)

Not at all (Totaal niet)
Slightly (Nauwelijks)
Somewhat (Enigszins)
Moderately (In grote mate)
To a great extent (In zeer grote mate)
D) Affective Commitment (7 items, $ \alpha = 0.82 \text{ en } 0.87$)

The following statements refer to your feelings about your organization. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements.
(De volgende uitspraken gaan over hoe u over de organisatie denkt. Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen:)

Totally disagree (Helemaal niet mee eens)
Disagree (Niet mee eens)
Neutral (Neutraal)
Agree (Mee eens)
Completely agree (Helemaal mee eens)

- I am very glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined (Ik ben heel blij dat ik ervoor gekozen heb om voor deze organisatie te gaan werken)
- I really care about the fate of this organization (Wat er met deze organisatie gebeurt, trek ik me aan)
- Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part (Mijn besluit om voor deze organisatie te gaan werken was een grote fout)
- My personal values and the organization’s values are very similar (Ik vind dat mijn persoonlijke normen en waarden sterk overeen komen met wat de organisatie belangrijk vindt)
- For me this is the best of all possible organizations to work for (Voor mij is deze organisatie verreweg de beste organisatie om voor te werken)
- I feel very little loyalty to this organization (Ik voel me nauwelijks verbonden met de organisatie)
- I don’t feel part of this organization (Ik voel me niet thuis bij de organisatie)