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Abstract

This research contributes to an integration of the implications surrounding multiple team membership (MTM) and intentions to leave. This research will contribute to the relative new area of research, and in particular will provide more insight in the negative effects of multiple team membership. As more organization have the prevalence to design their organization with multiple teams, it becomes more important to understand what the implications are of this style of work. This study focuses on the negative side of multiple team membership. The hypothesized model has tested the effect of multiple team membership on individual, intentions to leave, stress levels and whether these associations are moderated by organizational support. This study contributes to the literature by gaining insight in the negative implications surrounding MTM. Using data of 103 professionals of multiple organizations, several Hayes (2013) analyses at individual level were conducted in order to assess to what extent multiple team membership influences intentions to leave and to what extent this association is mediated through stress, and to what extent this possible indirect effect is moderated by organizational support. The results of this study provide no support for the formulated hypotheses. It can be concluded that no significant evidence was found between multiple team membership and intentions to leave. No evidence was found for an at least partial mediation effect of multiple team membership on intentions to leave, through stress. Lastly, no significant effect was found between multiple team membership on intentions to leave, through stress, at different levels of organizational support.
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1. Introduction

In modern organizations it is self-evident that individuals work together in teams. Several scholars have stressed the importance of working in teams in previous research. For instance, working together in teams involves interpersonal contact and improves the learning behavior of the organization (Argyris, as cited in Edmondson, 1999) and groups hold the potential to simultaneously increase both productivity and employee satisfaction (Katzell & Guzzo, 1983). Furthermore, structure and design are the most important antecedents to improve work-team performance (Campion, Medsker, & Higgs, 1993; Cohen & Ledford, 1994).

Next to being a member of only one team at a time, being a member of multiple teams is another way to structure work. Nowadays, individual employees tend to have more responsibilities concerning their own development, allocating their own time and focusing their own attention. Being part of multiple teams, and answering to multiple superiors, increases the relevancy of these increasing responsibilities (O’Leary, Mortensen, & Woolley, 2011).

As an example, a manager in the customer service department within a Dutch energy company, is leader of its own customer service team. That manager is, among other things, responsible for the key performance indicators, the employee satisfaction and the review cycle of his own team. Next, he and his fellow customer service managers also form a team. Within this team they discuss the developments of the performance of the customer service as a whole. Moreover, among the managers, different tasks and related responsibilities have been distributed. The manager in question is responsible for human resources and is in this capacity part of another team with other assigned HR officials and HR professionals. Not only does he experience difficulties with allocating his time in an orderly fashion due to the multiple team membership, the manager is also confronted with conflicting interests, as he is in possession of essential information which he cannot share with the other teams.

As more organizations have the prevalence to design their organization with multiple teams, it becomes more important to understand what the implications are of this style of work (Pluut, Flestea, & Curșeu, 2014). One of the implications could be the intentions of an individual to leave their organization. Scholars have indicated different reasons why employees build up intentions to leave the organization they are currently working for. As an example, Dutton and Dukerich (1991) argue that a decrease in the legitimacy of an organization can eventually lead to employees wanting to leave their employer. A loss of legitimacy can be seen as an organizational predictor of intentions to leave. Subsequently, when an employee is not
satisfied with their work or organization and build up intentions to leave, this could lead to lower enthusiasm or higher absenteeism, and ultimately lead to higher organizational costs as for example the organizations needs to hire new employees and train them (Russ & McNeilly, 1995). Furthermore, as the war for talent continues (Beechler & Woodward, 2009), keeping talented workers is of essence for the organization. In this research organizational support will act as a moderator between the association of multiple team membership and intentions to leave, through stress, as organizational support can act as a buffer for different kinds of resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

Another implications of working within multiple teams is a certain level of stress of individuals. According to Bonoma and Zaltsman (1981) stress arises from the interaction of work environment and individual characteristics. As a consequence, stress could lead to outcomes which can be categorized as psychological (such as job satisfaction), physical (such as blood pressure) and organizational (such as job turnover). Stress can impact the existence of an individual. It is widely accepted that the level of stress at work has a damaging effect on a person (Kuper & Marmot, 2003). That being the case, high levels of stress could have negative consequences for organizations, such as lower job performance and organizational commitment (Jamal, 1984). Therefore, it is of importance to research to what extent multiple team membership is related to levels of stress of individuals. Hence, this study will focus on the psychological outcomes of multiple team membership, being intentions to leave and stress.

Although much research has explored the implications of working in teams, these studies mainly focused on individuals who were part of only one team (Mortensen, Woolley, & O'Leary, 2007). Conversely, studies concerning working in multiple teams at the same period of time are scarce, when in fact the relevancy to research multiple team membership increases as more organization become project based (Mortensen et al., 2007) and it becomes more common to work in multiple teams within the same time period (O'Leary, Mortensen, & Woolley, 2011). Previous research have stressed the benefits surrounding working in multiple teams concurrently. For instance, Mortensen et al. (2007) argued that MTM enables cross-project learning and leads to the enrichment of the social structure of an organization. However, previous studies have also indicated that multiple team membership entails higher responsibility of the team members, as they need to manage time more carefully and need to divide their attention among multiple teams (O'Leary et al., 2011). Moreover, O'Leary et al. (2011) mention that switching between teams involves switching between different roles and context, which could lead to lower productivity. Pluut et al. (2014) also suggest that working in multiple teams could be harmful for productivity and perceives multiple team membership as a job demand.
Assuming that MTM is a job demand, this study will focus on further exploring the negative implications surrounding multiple team membership.

Altogether, the main aim of this study is to empirically explore the association between multiple team membership and intentions to leave the organization. Moreover, the underlying mechanism of this association will be studied, including the indirect effect of multiple team membership on intentions to leave, through stress and the moderation of the indirect effect by organizational support. The level of analysis of this research is on the individual level. This has resulted in the following research question:

*To what extent does multiple team membership on an individual level influence intentions to leave on an individual level and to what extent is this association mediated through stress on an individual level, and to what extent is this possible indirect effect moderated by organizational support on an individual level?*

### 1.1 Research relevance

Even though working on more than one team at a time is quite common (Mortensen et al., 2007), multiple team membership is not widely studied. Merely a few scholars directly studied the effect that multiple team membership has on individuals, teams or organizations (O’Leary et al., 2011; Plut et al., 2014). This research will contribute to the new area of research, and in particular will provide more insight in the negative effects of multiple team membership. In other words, this research focuses on the effect of multiple team membership on 1) the intentions to leave the concerning organization and 2) individual stress levels, using organizational support as a moderator variable.

Scholars have studied the concepts why employees would leave an organization voluntarily. Hereby, scholars have studied concepts external to the employee, such as work alternatives (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). On the other hand, researchers have focused on concepts internal to the employee, such as the association between work-related perceptions and intention to leave the organization (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). The internal concepts studies have explained less than 20 percent of the variance in voluntarily turnover (Mobley, Griffeth, & Meglino, 1979; Lee & Mitchell, 1994). Previous research has shown that a good antecedent for actual turnover are turnover intentions (Kopelman, Rovenpor, & Millsap, 1992; Mobley et al., 1979). Heavily used constructs in previous studies, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment, are the core mechanism of turnover theory, but are not the complete story (Steel
This study will try to gain more insights in the understanding of the intention to leave the organization based on concepts internal to the employee.

Many studies have used the demand-control model (Karasek, 1979) to predict employee well-being. This study will build on the demand-control model (Karasek, 1979) as a theoretical framework, will perceive multiple team membership as a job demand and stress as a job strain (Pluut, et al., 2014). To the best of my ability, previous research concerning data about the association between begin part of multiple teams, intentions to leave and stress was not found. Only Zika-Viktorsson, Sundstrom, & Engwall (2006), mention the relationship between project overload and stress reactions. Thus, this will contribute to fulfil a gap in the existing literature.

Furthermore, this study will add practical relevance to the team members, teams and managers that deal with multiple team membership in day to day life. This study tries to give them more insights in the negative implications surrounding multiple team membership so that they are better able to manage these implications. For instance, based on this study managers could assess whether their way of organizing work influences the intentions of their employees to leave the organization, and could therefore maintain essential talent within their organization.
2. Theoretical framework

Before elaborating the variables at hand in this research, it is important to give insight in the boundary conditions of this research (Whetten, 1989). The research is focused on inter-organizational relationships among individuals within organizations operating in the following industries: education, prison, healthcare, insurance, accountancy, government, industrial, hospitality & events, and IT.

“A classical study by Karasek (as cited by Ishida, 2013) advocates the job strain model which claims that demanding work condition and a lack of autonomy in decision-making at the workplace lead to deteriorating health outcomes” (p. 501). The demand-control model is a well-known model to predict employee well-being and will be used in this study as framework in order to map the association between multiple team membership, stress, intentions to leave and supportive climate. The demand-control model explains that the employee being able to decide individually how to meet their job demands do not experience job strain and this model dominates the empirical research on jobs stress for the last 20 years (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). In the perspective of the Job Demands-Resource model by Bakker & Demerouti (2007), Pluut et al. (2014) argue that being part of multiple teams is a job demand and will be seen as such in this study. In addition, supportive climate will be seen as a resource within this theoretical framework.

2.1 Multiple team membership (MTM)

For this study teams can be defined as a bundle of individuals that work interpedently towards a common goals and share responsibility and rewards for the outcome and perceive themselves as team members (O’Leary, Mortensen, & Woolley, 2011). Organizations tend to organize their activities in teamwork, as teams are flexible, and as a result, could lead to competitive advantage (Delarue, Van Hootegem, Procter, & Burridge, 2008). Multiple team membership work environments involve people splitting their time across multiple teams (Mortensen et al., 2007). To be clear on what the approach is of multiple team membership, this study only focuses on the number of teams individuals are part of based on the following definition: “…a situation in which individuals are concurrently members of two or more teams within a given period of time” (O’Leary et al., 2011). This study will focus on further exploring the negative implications surrounding multiple team membership.
2.2 Intentions to leave

Job satisfaction and intentions of employees to leave their organizations are seen as psychological outcomes (Shalley, Gilson, & Blum, 2000) and both variables are in previous research linked to performance (Ostroff, 1992). Bluedorn (1982) describes intentions to leave as the behavioral intention of an employee to withdraw from the organization.

Freund (2005) summarizes that most managers would perceive turnover intentions as a negative occurrence, but others argue that this phenomena is an inseparable part of organizational existence as it assists individuals to fulfil expectations and needs within the framework of career development. Harrington, Bean, Pintello, and Mathews (2001) point out that several factors predict the intentions to leave an organization. An organizational predictor of thinking about leaving the organization, is a decrease in the perceived legitimacy of the organization by an employee (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). This can be triggered by, for instance, corporate scandals and bad publicity.

Jourdain and Chênevert (2010) found that an increase in job demands leads to an increase in intentions to leave. Multiple team membership is seen as job demand due to high personal discipline and interpersonal competence (Mortensen et al., 2007; Pluut et al., 2014). As previous mentioned, Zika-Viktorsson et al. (2006) also argue that multiple team membership can be seen as a job demand, due to the fact that it is associated with time scarcity and role conflict. In line with Shelledy et al. (1992), in this study, intentions to leave is seen as a psychological outcome on an individual level. Role conflict may occur due to the various roles an individual may have in different teams, and these roles entail different tasks, expectations and responsibilities. When incompatible role demands occur, employees may exit this work situation. Thus, role conflict induces withdrawal cognition, triggering intentions to leave independently from stress on an individual level (Hom & Kinicki, 2001).

Villanova, Bernardin, Johnson, and Dahmus (1994) argue that an individual who perceives a misfit between what is preferred and the actual job characteristics, are more likely to voluntarily terminate their job. Jackofsky (1984) points out that an increase in job complexity is an antecedent for intentions to quit. Therefore, the more teams an individual is part of, the more time scarcity and role conflict the individual may experience, the more complex the job may be, the higher the likelihood that a misfit is perceived between the preferred and actual job, and ultimately, the more intentions an individual may develop to leave the organization.
Consequently, the following hypothesis emerges.

Hypothesis 1: An individual being part of multiple teams has a positive effect on the intentions to leave the concerning organization on an individual level.

2.3 Stress

Hovmark and Thomson (as cited in Zika-Viktorsson, Sundstrom, & Engwall, 2006) define stress reactions as having sleeping problems, being fatigue and the inability to let go of problems when a working day is over. Karasek and Theorell (as cited in Zika-Viktorsson et al., 2006) suggest that to reduce stress, the perception of control in work is important. Within the job strain model, Karasek (1979) does not use stress itself as a dependent variable, but measures of stress sources were being used. These stress sources are job demands (work load demands) and job control (work control).

Based on the Karasek’s job strain model, Kuper and Marmot (2003) concluded that constraints on decision making and higher demands produce stress at work. Leroy and Sproul (as cited in Mortensen et al., 2007) mention results on stress which is caused by working with multiple team membership. Lastly, Zika-Viktorsson et al. (2006) indicate that multi-team settings are associated with lower levels of control in work, as they presume that multi-team settings lead to too much fragmentation, due to conflicting demands from different teams, difficulties in obtaining an overview and planning constraints. An increase in quality and time pressures (e.g. work harder, work faster, less time to complete the task, and interferences to the work) is associated with more stress (Karasek, 1979).

Several scholars have identified relationships between stress levels and intentions to withdraw from an organization. For instance, Nissly, Mor Barak and Levin (2005) indicated that employees with higher levels of stress were more likely to think about leaving their organization. Furthermore, Lee, Kim, and Yoon (2011) reported that stress had a significant influence on intentions to leave among Korean nurses. Additionally, some researchers see burnout as an unique expression of stress (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993) and as such burnout has been associated with work withdrawal behaviors (Jackson, Schwab, & Schuler, 1986; Shelledy, Mikles, May, & Youtsey, 1992).
Thus, the more teams an individual is part of, the higher the job demands and fragmentation, the lower the perceived control, and the higher the likelihood of an increase in stress on an individual level, which in turn leads to higher intentions to leave the organization. This leads to the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: The association of being part of multiple teams on an individual level and intentions to leave an organization on an individual level is at least partly positively mediated by stress on an individual level.

2.4 Organizational support
High familiarity and trust among team members and between teams is one of the conditions to increase the effectiveness within a multiple team membership environment (Mortensen et al., 2007). As multiple team membership work could be related to tension, on an individual level multiple team membership could be easier to deal with when members trust each other and have built a solid relationship (Mortensen et al., 2007). According to Litwin and Stringer (as cited in Hollmøn, 1976) organizational climate can be described as “…a set of measurable properties of the work environment, perceived directly or indirectly by the people who live and work in this environment and assumed to influence their motivation and behaviour” (p. 562). Hollmann (1976) interprets supportive climate as a combination of the following characterizations: high levels of trust and confidence between superiors and subordinates, multidirectional rather than just vertical communication, cooperative teamwork among workgroup members, a reasonable degree of subordinate involvement in decision-making and general goal setting, and an emphasis on self-control rather than superior-imposed control.

Howes, Cropanzano, Grandey, and Mohler (2000) use team support and organizational support to measure the perceived support of participants. Bakker and Demerouti (2007) argue that organizational support can act as a buffer against job strain and has been used as such in past studies (Haines, Hurlbert, & Zimmer, 1991; Johnson & Hall, 1988). Furthermore, other scholars have argued that organizational support helps individuals to deal with the consequences of stressful experiences (Cohen & Willis, 1985).

The Demand-Control-Support model assumes that employees who perceive high job demands and low organizational support are likely to develop stress reactions (Johnson & Hall, 1988). Thus, individuals who are subjected to higher value of organizational support, are better able to cope with pressures from multiple team settings and thus are able to adjust better to their
work setting and, as a result, will experience less stress. The opposite is true for lower value of organizational support. Hence, the positive linear association between multiple team membership and stress may become less steep, due to higher levels of organizational support.

More organizational support may increase the ability of team members to cope with demand from multiple team settings, which will prevent negative attitude toward the organization and will result in higher levels of intention to remain in the organization. The opposite is expected when organizational support is absent. In such cases, employees might feel frustrated by the their inability to fulfil their responsibilities in a multiple team setting. Some of this frustration will be pointed towards the work setting, and will result in stronger intentions to leave. Therefore, the following hypothesis is being proposed.

Hypothesis 3: The indirect effect of multiple team membership on intentions to leave, through stress is negatively moderated by organizational support on an individual level.

The conceptual model for this research is as follows:

Figure 1.
Conceptual model.
3. Methodological framework

3.1 Research design
A research design deductive of nature has been used to answer the research question and hypotheses. In order to analyze the relationship between several variables, a quantitative study was most appropriate. Given the timeframe and the use of quantitative methods, a cross-sectional design was the most appropriate design to perform this study. Furthermore, this design enables to focus on the wider context in which an actor is situated (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). A cross-sectional design involves data collection at one set moment in which all the variables have been collected (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). The data has been conducted by extracting a survey among current employees. The unit of observation and the unit of analysis will both be on the individual level.

3.2 Sample
With the purpose of gaining as much respondents as possible, the data was collected collectively amongst organizations in a wide range of industries. Therefore, the organizations at hand were companies ranging from profit to non-profit operating in the following nine different industries: education, prison, healthcare, insurance, accountancy, government, industrial, hospitality & events, and IT. However, the respondents were not equally distributed among the different industries and therefore would not benefit the generalizability of this research and consequently impact the external validity of this research.

As this study only focuses on people working in multiple teams, purposive data sampling has been chosen. Next, a snowball effect emerged by asking participants to suggest another person who might be suited for this research. Furthermore, convenient data sampling was chosen by searching for participants through personal or professional networks. Most of the time team members were contacted by e-mail or phone in order to get in contact with the supervisor of a team.

This study strove to collect data from non-overlapping teams. This means that team members cannot work together within a different team. This non-overlapping criteria was a result of collective data collection, as overlapping data might impact the data analysis on a team level. However, overlapping data has no impact on the data analysis on the individual level.

This study aimed to collect data from teams with individuals that are part of at least two teams. On the contrary, this study aimed to collect complete team data and therefore the initial
data set included individuals that were not part of at least two teams at a given period of time. Moreover, teams had to consist of at least three individuals in order to participate in this research. As a consequence, data selection resulted in a total of 103 respondents that worked in at least two teams in a given period of time instead of the initial 129 respondents.

The sample did have a good distribution of gender, as 53 per cent of the sample was male and 47 per cent of the sample was female. This enhances the representability of this study. More sample characteristics can be found in Appendix II.

3.3 Data collection
A questionnaire has been conducted within multiple organizations in order to identify the relationship between the variables at hand. This has been managed by means of joint data collection with students from the same master thesis circle for the reason that time is limited and all students are studying multiple team membership. The items that have been used are explained in Appendix I. Furthermore, the variables multiple team membership, intentions to leave, stress and organizational support are operationalized using questions from multiple existing and validated surveys. This questionnaire also contained questions from the other students, concerning variables which they use to conduct their research. To ensure the power of the data, this study aimed for a N of at least 80 teams. The use of well-constructed and well-tested measurement scales in combination with theorized hypotheses ensured the construct validity of this research.

For this study completed questionnaires were received from individuals that worked within a multiple team environment. In order to collect data, the supervisor of the concerning teams assisted in distributing the questionnaire among their team members. In order to ensure the anonymity of the respondents and the possibility for team level analyses, the team members received unique codes. These codes made it possible to overview which responsible belonged to which team. To ensure that the respondents were fully informed, they received a letter of introduction in which the aim of this research, confidentiality, and instructions on how to fill in and hand in the questionnaires were explained. As all respondents were Dutch and the constructed items were all written in English, the items had to be translated into Dutch. In order to remove errors the questionnaire was filled in multiple times and was corrected in several occasions. This translation and correctional process enlarges the internal validity of this study.

Unfortunately, difficulties were experienced during the data collection process as the response rate was not that high and resulted in a lower amount of organizations than the
concerning master circle aspired to collect. The small sample size undermines the external validity of this study. It appeared that some (potential) respondents perceived that the questionnaire was too long and took too much of their scarce time. One potential respondent underlined these signals and noted on the questionnaire that he or she experienced difficulties in comprehending the questions at hand and therefore handed in an incomplete questionnaire. Keeping this in mind, the questions concerning intentions to leave and organizational were the last questions of the questionnaire and this may have influenced the level of correctness of the answers given by respondents that may perceived the questionnaire to be too long. Lastly, the constraints of collecting data including the supervisor and that teams needed to consists of more than three team members, limited the target group in a negative manner as these constraints are not necessary for analyses on an individual such as this study.

3.4 Measurement of variables

3.4.1 Multiple team membership
The dependent variable multiple team membership has been measured by researching individuals who are concurrently member of two or more teams within a given period of time. This variable has been measured based on the Work Design Questionnaire by Morgeson and Humphrey (2006) by means of indicating the amount of different teams each individual is part of. Hence, MTM number has been calculated by means of the total number given per individual.

3.4.2. Intentions to leave
An existing validated index has been used for the independent variable of this study. Therefore, no factor analyses has been done, because the items have proven to measure what it is supposed to measure in previous research. To measure the participant’s intentions to leave, the Propensity to Leave Scale (Lyons, 1971) has been used. Koberg and Hood (1991) reported in their study a Cronbach’s alpha of .83 after using the Propensity to Leave Scale. This is an index with three items, each with five alternatives. The operationalization of this variable can be found in Appendix I. Naturally, in this study the internal consistency has also been measured by analyzing whether the scale of intentions to leave meets the standard of the assumptions of the Cronbach’s alpha. The results can be seen in table 1.
3.4.3. Stress

The mediation variable stress has been measured based on the questionnaire of Cohen, Karmack, and Mermelstein (1983) called the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS). This scale has been used frequently by scholars in order to measure the variable stress. The coefficient alpha reliability for the Perceived Stress Scale was .85 (Cohen et al., 1983) and therefore this scale had been chosen. This questionnaire consist of 14 items and was measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). The 14 items can be found in Appendix I. The internal consistency has been measured by analyzing whether the scale meets the standard of the assumptions of the Cronbach’s alpha. The results can be seen in table 1. By means of an additional analysis it appeared that when deleting four items according the set rules, the Cronbach’s Alpha improved. Therefore, these items have been deleted.

3.4.4 Organizational support

In order to measure the moderating variable organizational support, a modified version of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986) has been used. This survey consists of 8 items and has been measured on a 7-point Likert scale. The original scale is unidimensional and has high internal reliability, which indicates that the use of a shorter version was not a problem (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). In order to measure team support and supervisor support, the referent "organization" was replaced with "team" (Howes, Cropanzano, Grandey, & Mohler, 2000) and “supervisor” (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenbergh, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002). The coefficient alpha reliability for the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support was .90 (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) and .85 (Eisenberger et al., 2002). The operationalization of this variable can be found in Appendix I. The internal consistency of organizational support in this study has been measured by analyzing the Cronbach’s alpha of this scale. The results can be seen in table 1.

3.4.5 Control variables

For this study the following control variables were selected: team tenure and percentage of time spent on focal team. These control variables are included as they are believed to possibly affect the dependent variable, mediating variable and/or moderating variable.

The first control variable is team tenure and was measured by asking the amount of time in months the participant holds position within the focal team. According to (Sturman, 2003)
higher team tenure values lead to accumulation of relevant knowledge and skills, which in turn leads to higher job control and could therefore influence individual stress levels (Karasek, 1979).

The control variable percentage of time spent on focal team has been measured by asking the participant how they would distribute their working time across the various teams they are working for if 100 percent would be the total amount of time. Harrison, Price, Gavin, and Florey (2002) showed the more time spent in a team, the more a team member is able to assess and exchange task-related information, and could therefore be better able to cope with higher job demands that multiple team membership entails.

The control variables are explained in the operationalization table and can be found in Appendix I. By using these variables the internal validity of this research is positively influenced.
Table 1.
Reliability analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>based on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions to leave</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>.747 / items</td>
<td>.752 / items</td>
<td>14 / items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deleted: 10</td>
<td>deleted: 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational support</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Data analysis

3.5.1 Creating a data file

A response analysis has been done in order to check the data on any missing values. The total research sample contained out of a possible number of 129. The final sample, when discarding the incomplete responses and the respondents with only a MTM number of 1, considered for the variables is 103 observations, which is 83.06%.

Furthermore, every variable within the dataset has been checked on scores that were out of range. These errors have been corrected. Another step was to define the variables and correctly insert the width, decimals, labels and values of every variable.

When analyzing the non-response rate it appeared that a few respondents who completed the questionnaire had indicated that they were part of only one team at that moment of time. As a result, these respondents did not meet the criteria of multiple team membership as described above. Therefore, these respondents were deleted from the data set and were not part of the analyses within this study.

3.5.2 Descriptive analysis

Furthermore, it is assumed that the distribution of the dependent variable (intentions to leave) is normally distributed (Pallant, 2013). In this context normally distributed means a bell-shaped, symmetrical curve, which has smaller frequencies on the sides and the greatest frequencies in the middle of the bell-shaped curve. Figure 2 presents the range of scores of the dependent
variable. The range of scores in figure 2 are reasonably normally distributed. At the right side of the histogram are scores that have extreme people. These respondents score the highest value on the independent variable. This means that they have high intentions to leave the organization. This can explain why the distribution of the independent variable is not fully normal.

**Figure 2.**
Normal distribution intentions to leave.

**Figure 3.**
Graph homoscedastic intentions to leave.

When the distribution is skewed such as the example above, there are several ways to deal with this. One possibility is to transform the variable in question by mathematically modifying the scores using various formulas until the distribution looks more normal. Unfortunately, all these formulas did not lead to a more normal distribution for the independent variable. Therefore, the original variable has been used.
3.5.3 PROCESS macro Hayes

In order to analyze all three theorized hypotheses in SPSS, this study made use of the PROCESS macro developed by Hayes (2013). This resulted in simple mediation, simple moderation and conditional indirect effect analyses using model 4 and model 7 of the PROCESS macro. First, to analyze Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2, intentions to leave was put in the Outcome Variable (Y) box, multiple team membership was put in the Independent Variable (X) box and stress was put in the M Variable(s) box using model number 4. Model number 4 provides insights in the association between multiple team membership and intentions to leave and the same association through stress. Next, to analyze the last hypothesis, organizational support was added into the Proposed Moderator W box using model 7. Model 7 provides insights in the conditional indirect effect at different values of the proposed moderator. In both analyses the control variables team tenure and percentage of time spent on focal team were included in the Covariate(s) box.
4. Results

In order to get a better perception of the data under study, an insight has been gained in the number of participants, means, standard deviations, minimum scores, maximum scores and correlations among all predictor and control variables used in this study. The descriptive statistics are shown in table 2. In order to see whether the variables are correlated a correlation matrix based on a Pearson Correlation analysis is presented in table 3. To test the hypotheses of this study, model 4 and model 7 of the PROCESS macro by Hayes (2013) was used. Model 4 was used to perform a simple mediation analysis and model 7 was used to test a simple moderation analysis and to perform a moderated mediation analysis.

4.1 Descriptive statistics

Similarly to the normal distribution of the independent variable presented in the previous chapter, the descriptive statistics in table 2 also indicate a skewed distribution to the left side for intentions to leave with a mean of 2.27 and standard deviation of .99. The same can be suggested for the dependent variable MTM, as the mean in combination with the standard deviation lean towards the left side of the variety of scores that have been given by the participants under study. In contrast, organization support has a mean above the middle of its scale, suggesting a right-skewed distribution. Only stress seems to be normally distributed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intentions to leave</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple team membership</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational support</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team tenure</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>41.98</td>
<td>49.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent on focal team</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>49.62</td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When looking at the main antecedents of this study, it can be noticed that there is only one significant relationship. Between stress and intentions to leave a positive significant relationship occurs ($r = .287, p < .01$).

When looking at the other variables within this study, organizational support correlates significantly negative and strong with both intentions to leave ($r = -.393, p < .001$) and stress ($r = -.417, p < .001$). Moreover, percentage of time spent on focal team is significantly negative related to multiple team membership ($r = -.322, p < .01$).

Table 3.

Pearson Correlation analysis (N=103).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intentions to leave</td>
<td>1 (.844)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Multiple team membership</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stress</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>1 (.803)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational support</td>
<td>-.393***</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.417***</td>
<td>1 (.917)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control variables</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Team tenure</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time spent on focal team</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.322**</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, Cronbach’s alpha in parentheses.
4.2 Simple mediation analysis

Simple mediation analysis was used to estimate and test hypotheses about the paths of casual influence from multiple team membership to intentions to leave, one through the proposed mediator stress and a second independent of the $X \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y$ mechanism. In order to calculate the direct and indirect effect of this simple mediation, Model 4 in the PROCESS macro of Hayes (2013) was used.

Note that in both the conceptual model (figure 1) and in the statistical model (figure 4) the two covariates ($U_1$: team tenure, and $U_2$: percentage of time spent on focal team) are not depicted. The path diagram of the simple mediation analysis represents two linear equations:

\[
M = i_M + a_1X + a_4U_1 + a_5U_2 + e_M \tag{1}
\]

\[
Y = i_Y + c'M + b_1M + b_2U_1 + b_3U_2 + e_Y \tag{2}
\]

Figure 4.

Direct and indirect effect of Multiple team membership on Intentions to leave through Stress.

Multiple team membership

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to assess each component of the proposed mediation model. The results are presented in table 4 and table 5. The results consist of the association between multiple team membership and intentions to leave ($c$-path), the effect of multiple team membership on stress ($a$-path) and the association between multiple team membership and intentions to leave, through stress ($c'$-path). First, table 4 shows that multiple team membership was negatively associated with intentions to leave ($\beta = -.072, t(98) = -1.398, p = .165$). By means of this analysis it can be concluded that hypothesis 1 is not confirmed. It was also found that multiple team membership was negatively related to stress ($\beta = -.020, t(98) = -.654, p = .515$), which can be seen in table 6. Lastly, results indicated that the mediator,
stress, was positively associated with intentions to leave ($\beta = .456$, $t(97) = 2.737$, $p < .01$). Although the $a$-path was not significant and the $b$-path was significant, mediation analyses were tested using the Hayes (2013) method. In the present study, the 95% confidence interval of the indirect effects was obtained with 5,000 bootstrap samples (Hayes, 2013). To illustrate, table 5 indicates that the $c'$-path of the association between multiple team membership and intentions to leave remained non-significant ($\beta = -0.063$, $t(97) = -1.260$, $p = .211$) when controlling for stress, thus not suggesting mediation. This means that the results of the mediation analysis did not support the mediating role of stress in the relation between multiple team membership and intentions to leave. By means of this analysis it can be concluded that hypothesis 2 is not confirmed.

Table 4.
Total effect model (N=102)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.585***</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>7.425</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple team membership (c path)</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-1.398</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team tenure</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.393</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent on focal team</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.853</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .043$

$F(3,98) = 1.466, p = .229$
Table 5.
Mediation analysis: Dependent variable model (N=102).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.442**</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>2.686</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple team membership (c’ path)</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-1.260</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>.456**</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>2.737</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team tenure</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent on focal team</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-0.742</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = .112^* \]
\[ F(4,97) = 3.045, p = .021 \]

Note: *p < .05, ** p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 6.
Mediation analysis: Mediator variable model (N=102).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.505***</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>12.264</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple team membership</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-0.654</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team tenure</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.138</td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent on focal team</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-0.497</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = .019 \]
\[ F(3,98) = .646, p = .588 \]

Note: *p < .05, ** p < .01, ***p < .001
4.3 Simple moderation analysis

Simple moderation analysis was used to estimate and test hypotheses about the paths of casual influence from multiple team membership on stress, through the proposed moderator organizational support. In order to calculate the effect of this simple moderation, Model 7 in the PROCESS macro of Hayes (2013) was used.

Note that in both the conceptual model (figure 1) and in the statistical model (figure 5) the two covariates ($U_1$: team tenure, and $U_2$: percentage of time spent on focal team) are not depicted. The path diagram of the simple mediation analysis represents one linear equations:

$$M = i_M + a_1X + a_2W + a_3XW + a_4U_1 + a_5U_2 + e_M$$ (3)

Figure 5.

Indirect effect of Multiple team membership on Stress through different values of Organizational support.

Multiple regression analyses were conducted to assess each component of the proposed moderation model. The results are presented in table 7 and figure 6. The results consist of the association between multiple team membership and stress ($a$-path) and the interaction effect of multiple team membership and organizational support on stress. This model shows the first part of the moderated mediation effect.
First, the results of table 7 show that multiple team membership has no significant involvement in stress ($\beta = -.007$, $t(96) = -.259$, $p = .796$). The interaction effect of multiple team membership and organizational support on stress has also no significant involvement ($\beta = .006$, $t(96) = .199$, $p = .843$). Moreover, results indicated that organizational support was negatively associated with stress with a significant effect ($\beta = -.325$, $t(96) = .093$, $p = .001$), which can also be seen in table 7. This leads to the following function:

$$\text{Stress (M)} = 2.378 - .007 \text{ (multiple team membership)} - .325 \text{ (organizational support)}$$
$$+ .006 \text{ (multiple team membership x organizational support)} + .002 \text{ (team tenure)}$$
$$- .001 \text{ (percentage of time spent on focal team)}.$$

Lastly, this model significantly explained 20% of the variance in stress. In figure 6 a complete model can be found, which clearly summarizes the associations and the corresponding coefficients of the moderation analysis.

Table 7.
Conditional process analysis: Mediator variable model (N=102)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.378***</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>15.513</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple team membership</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational support</td>
<td>-.325***</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>-3.479</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple team membership x Organizational support</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team tenure</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.484</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent on focal team</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .198**$

$F(5,96) = 3.670, p = .004$

Note: *p < .05, ** p < .01, ***p < .001
Figure 6.
A-path coefficient moderation analysis.

Multiple team membership → Stress
\[ a_1 = -0.007 \text{ SE } = 0.026 \]

Organizational support → Stress
\[ a_2 = -0.325*** \text{ SE } = 0.093 \]

Multiple team membership x Organizational support → Stress
\[ a_3 = 0.006 \text{ SE } = 0.032 \]
4.4 Moderated mediation analysis

When performing a mediation analysis, no significant association was found between multiple team membership and intentions to leave through stress. Hypothesis 3 predicted that inferences of stress moderated by organizational support, would mediate the relationship between multiple team membership and intentions to leave. To test this hypothesis the PROCESS macro for SPSS was run (Hayes, 2013). In order to test the association between multiple team membership and intentions to leave through stress, moderated by organizational support in more detail, the model generated bias corrected 95% bootstrap confidence intervals for the indirect effects using 5,000 bootstrap samples.

Notably, the confidence intervals surrounding the indirect effect of stress did span zero, which indicates that no significant indirect effect has been found at low levels of stress ($\beta = -0.0053, 95\% \text{ Conf. Interval: } -0.0670 \text{ to } 0.0147$), moderate levels of stress ($\beta = -0.0031, 95\% \text{ Conf. Interval: } -0.0362 \text{ to } 0.0194$), and high levels of stress ($\beta = -0.0008, 95\% \text{ Conf. Interval: } -0.0292 \text{ to } 0.0377$).

As zero is present in the confidence intervals, the results show no evidence of conditional indirect effect which is different from zero with 95% confidence interval. Therefore, the association between multiple team membership and intentions to leave through stress does not significantly increase when an increase in organizational support occurs. Consequently, hypothesis 3 is not supported.

Table 8.
Conditional indirect effects of multiple team membership through stress at values of organizational support (N=102).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational support</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Confidence level of 95% for confidence intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (-.7651 / before centering: 4.2827)</td>
<td>-.0053</td>
<td>-.0670 to .0147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (.0000 / before centering: 5.0478)</td>
<td>-.0031</td>
<td>-.0362 to .0194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (.7651 / before centering: 5.8129)</td>
<td>-.0008</td>
<td>-.0292 to .0377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 5,000 bootstrap samples
Figure 7.
Plot of the conditional indirect effect at values of organizational support (N=102).

Conditional Indirect Effect for Organizational support
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Level of Moderator: Organizational support
The results of these analyses lead to the following conclusion concerning the hypotheses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. An individual being part of multiple teams has a positive effect on the intentions to leave the concerning organization on an individual level.</td>
<td>Not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The association of being part of multiple teams on an individual level and intentions to leave an organization on an individual level is at least partly positively mediated by stress on an individual level.</td>
<td>Not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The indirect effect of multiple team membership on intentions to leave, through stress is negatively moderated by organizational support on an individual level.</td>
<td>Not confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Discussion

This theory represents a theory-driven examination on how multiple team membership is associated with psychological outcomes. In the introduction of this research the question was raised about the contribution that multiple membership might have to intentions to leave, through stress, moderated by organizational support on an individual level. Intentions to leave is seen as a psychological outcome, as this research focused on the individual, instead of actual job turnover which is seen as an organizational outcome. Previous research concerning stress have used the demand-control model (Karasek, 1979) to predict employee well-being. This study was built on the demand-control model (Karasek, 1979) as a theoretical framework, that perceived multiple team membership as a job demand and stress as a job strain (Pluut, et al., 2014).

5.1 Multiple team membership and intentions to leave

This study did not find a significant negative relationship concerning an individual who is part of multiple teams and the intentions to leave the concerning organization on an individual level. This suggests that there is no evidence that an increase in one unit multiple team membership leads to an increase in the intentions of the same individual to leave their organization. This is not in line with the theorized hypothesis, which states that an increase in the number of teams leads to an increase in intentions to leave based on the research of Jourdain and Chênevert (2010). They found that an increase in job demands leads to an increase in intentions to leave. This means that there is no evidence found that an individual who works concurrently in five teams has more intentions to leave than an employee who works in three teams in a given time period. Therefore, hypothesis 1 is not supported. The assumption was made that multiple team membership is perceived as a job demand (Zika-Viktorsson et al., 2006). Nevertheless, the results of this study suggest that working in multiple team may not be a job demand and would therefore not imply psychological stressors such as time pressures and conflicting demands. This may arises from an increase in job fulfillment, when individuals work in more teams at a time, they are maybe able to reach their full potential and in turn do not think about leaving their organization.

Another aspect that should be taken into consideration for all constructs within this research is the dimensions of multiple team membership that were used within this research. It could be that when taking possible other dimensions of multiple team membership into
consideration do relate to intentions to leave. For instance, the dimensions variety, which measures perceived differences between teams concerning the dimensions knowledge and skills, work processes, outcomes, task complexity and task interdependence (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006).

5.2 Multiple team membership, stress and intentions to leave

Based on the results of this research there was no significant relationship found between multiple team membership and intentions to leave, through stress on an individual level. Hypothesis 2 expected that the association of being part of multiple teams and intentions to leave an organization would at least be partly positively mediated by stress on an individual level. In accordance with the absent of a relationship between multiple team membership and intentions to leave, there was no evidence found that stress would at least partly mediate the association between multiple team membership and intentions to leave.

Contrary to what was expected, additional analysis did not find support regarding a significant effect between multiple team membership and stress. This result is not in line with previous study which claimed that working in multiple teams concurrently is associated with lower levels of job control due to an increase in time fragmentation and conflicting demands (Zika-Viktorsson et al., 2006), consequently producing higher demands on the employee and as a result experience more work stress (Kuper & Marmot, 2003). This means that no evidence was found that when an increase in the number of teams an individual is working occurs, that same individual will experience more stress. Zika-Viktorsson et al. (2006) measured next to the number of projects an individual had to switch, also measured the number of projects an individual needed to adjust their personal schedule and plans. More importantly, these scholars took into account the opportunities to recuperate after a peak in multi-team settings (Zika-Viktorsson et al., 2006). In this line of reasoning, it is arguable that employees who do not have the time to reflect and recover between peaks of activities in multi-team setting, may experience more project overload and therefore perceive higher stress reactions. This may explain why other scholars did find an effect, in contrast to what this current study implies.

In line with Nissly, Barak, and Levin (2005) finding that employees with higher levels of organizational stress were more likely to think about leaving their organization, the expectation was that individual stress levels would be a predictor of the intentions of an individual to leave the organization. As expected, a positive significant effect was found. This means that when a worker experiences higher levels of stress this would lead to higher
intentions of an employee to leave the organization. An explanation of this phenomena could be that an individual who experiences an increase in stress levels, perceives lower levels of job fulfillment as the job itself apparently gets to demanding and therefore costs more energy, and as a result may think more about alternative jobs in a different work environment.

5.3 Multiple team membership, organizational support, stress and intentions to leave
This research did not find statistically support for the moderating effect by organizational support, which means that hypothesis 3 was not supported. This result would yield the conclusion that the indirect effect of multiple team membership on the intentions to leave through stress does not appear to be moderated by organizational support. That is, because the confidence interval for the regression coefficient of the product of $X$ and $W$ is not significant and includes zero, this study cannot definitely claim that organizational support is moderating any mediation of the effect of multiple team membership on stress. Additionally, the confidence intervals of the conditional indirect effect for organizational support are not different from zero, which means that the indirect effect of multiple team membership on intentions to leave through stress seems to be independent of organizational support. This is not consistent with prior research, as Mortensen et al. (2007) constructed that the development of one’s social base, familiarity and trust, reduces tensions of multiple team work. In contrast to the current study, Mortensen et al. (2007) provided merely suggestions based on an exploratory qualitative data analysis. Furthermore, it could be possible that multiple team settings attract and enlist individuals who have experiences in teamwork, and in turn have more planning skills and therefore may not experience stress reactions.

Additional analysis did show a significant negative effect between organizational support and stress. This means that an increase in support from within the organizations, leads to lower stress levels. No significant effect was found between multiple team membership and stress. This appears to be inconsistent with prior research, as Wills and Langner argued that multiple accumulated problems exert pressure on the problem solving skills of an individual could lead to stress and illness (as cited in Cohen & Willis, 1985).

5.4 Team tenure and percentage of time spent on focal team
Contrary to what was expected, no evidence has been found for a significant effect between both team tenure and percentage of time spent on focal team, and individual stress levels. Nor were there any significant effects found between the proposed control variables and intentions
to leave. Based on these results, it can be concluded that team tenure and percentage of time spent on focal team do not affect the main effects. Furthermore, the control variables were not correlated with stress. This study found an negative correlation between percentage of time spent on focal team and multiple team membership.

5.5 Limitations
A number of limitations to this study must be acknowledged. First of all, the response rate. The objective was to conduct as many questionnaires as possible in order to have an equal distribution of the number of multiple teams an individual is part of. Furthermore, individuals being part of only one team were not included within this research. Therefore, it was necessary to find enough respondents who were part of multiple teams. The average number of multiple teams individuals are part of was 3.64 which is relatively low. Thus, there is less variance in the number of multiple teams, which makes it rather difficult to measure the influence of an increase in the number of multiple teams effects the relationship. Hence, it could be possible that a significant would have been found when this variance would exist, because the higher the number of multiple teams, the less manageable it is.

Every single respondent received an unique code to make team level analysis possible and still ensure confidentiality. However, it is possible that although this study tried to ensure the anonymity of every respondents as good as possible, the respondents may not be as honest as hoped for concerning the intentions to leave items, for the reason that employees are afraid that this information could end up with their management. This could be the case since some respondents did not hand in their questionnaire directly to the researchers.

As with any data collected from a single self-report survey, common method variance is a potential problem in behavioral research (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). This refers to the possible bias that can occur in the measurement method used rather than the construct of interest, which might harm the validity of this research. Within this research, the constructs have been measured by means of the same methods, namely a questionnaire. Moreover, the questions concerning intentions to leave and organizational were the last questions of the questionnaire and this may have influenced the level of correctness of the answers given by respondents that may perceived the questionnaire to be too long. Method bias can also result from the fact that the respondent has been the source for both the independent and dependent variable, which is a type of self-report bias. This is again influences by common rate effects such as social desirability (favorable answers), consistency motif (desire to appear
consistent in the responses), and mood state (the current mood someone has which influences his/her view). Nevertheless, common method variance tends to be less of concern when the research concerns factual and verifiable data (Podsakoff & Organ as cited in Forret & Dougherty, 2001).

Finally, cross-sectional research is a limitation as well. The data for this research has been conducted at one point in time. Therefore, no change or process over time could be researched. It would have been valuable to have a dynamic model and see whether a difference in the number of multiple teams an individual is part of would have an effect on the relationship at hand.
6. Conclusion

The aim of this study was to explore antecedents of multiple team membership. Furthermore, the objective of this study was diminishing the literature gap that exists concerning multiple team membership as well as to facilitate managers with more knowledge regarding work composition and to grasp a part of the mechanism which explains the reasoning why individuals leave an organization. Even though working on more than one team at a time is quite common (Mortensen, Woolley, & O'Leary, 2007), multiple team membership is not widely studied. This research will contribute to the new area of research, and in particular provide more insight in the negative effects of multiple team membership. The expectation was that the intentions to leave an organization might be captured by organizing work in different teams with individuals working in several different teams concurrently, which consequently might result into experiencing individual stress levels. This study tried to answer the following research question as presented in the introduction:

To what extent does multiple team membership on an individual level influence intentions to leave on an individual level and to what extent is this association mediated through stress on an individual level, and to what extent is this possible indirect effect moderated by organizational support on an individual level?

In order to examine and answer the research question, hypotheses were formulated based on existing theory. First, it was hypothesized that multiple team membership would have a positive effect on intentions to leave. Second, it was hypothesized that the association of being part of multiple teams and intentions to leave would be at least partly positively mediated by stress. The last hypotheses took the moderating effect of organizational support into account, which argued that it would negatively influence the relationship. A questionnaire was conducted within multiple organizations in order to identify the relationship between the variables at hand. In order to test all three theorized hypotheses in SPSS, this study made use of the PROCESS macro developed by Hayes (2013).

The results indicate that intentions to leave an organization is not significantly influenced by multiple team membership. Thus, when a person is working concurrently in two or more teams within a given period, this study did not find prove that this affects the intentions of an individual to leave the concerning organization. Therefore, it can be concluded that the
number of teams a team member is concurrently part of, does not matter for the intentions to leave on an individual level. Furthermore, it can be concluded that stress has no mediation effect on the association between multiple team membership and intentions to leave. Lastly, there were no significant effects found between multiple team membership on intentions to leave, through stress, at levels of organizational support.

6.1 Future research
This study offers a contribution to previous studies concerning intentions to leave by examining multiple team membership as possible antecedent. Although the evidence from this research suggests that multiple team membership has no influence on an individual’s intention to leave the organization, it might be different for another multiple team membership dimension. It could be that when taking possible other dimensions of multiple team membership into consideration do relate to intentions to leave. For instance, the dimension multiple team membership number variety. Multiple team membership variety entails a measurement concerning to what extent the respondent experiences differences between the focal team and the other teams in which the respondent is concurrently part of, ranging from knowledge and skills, work processes, outcomes, task complexity and task interdependence (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). When following the reasoning that an increase in MTM variety leads to higher overall job complexity and demands, and as a result, leads to higher levels of stress (Karasek, 1979), Therefore, it would be advised to look at these aspects in future research. Especially since research examining multiple team membership is limited.

In addition, it would be valuable to do a longitudinal research in order to get more insight the effects that changes might have on multiple team membership. Such a dynamic research would give more insight in the changes of the number of multiple team of which an individual is part of. For instance, it could be that an individual is in the beginning of the year part of only three teams while he/she is part of six different teams after six months. It is expected that this would increase the job demands and fragmentation, which would lead to lower perceived control and the higher the likelihood of an increase in the level of stress and consequently would result into a higher level of intentions to leave. This in line with the research of Karasek (1979), Zika-Viktorsson et al. (2006) and Nissly, Mor Barak and Levin (2005). Longitudinal data give insight in different developmental stages of multiple team membership over time.

To conclude, future research could examine if too much can be as bad as too little. It could be that moderate levels of multiple team membership leads to preferable outcomes. To
gain deeper insights in this matter, future research could test if a turning point exist within relationships between the amount of teams an individual is part of in a given time and particular outcome variables. Knowing if an optimal level of multiple team membership number can be proven, and therefore possibly knowing of how many teams an individual should be part of, would be a valuable contribution to the existing literature.
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## APPENDIX I: Operationalization table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Calculation of scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intentions to leave</strong></td>
<td>Intentions to leave</td>
<td>Based on Lyons (1971). An index of three items with five alternatives each.</td>
<td>Intensions to leave is calculated taken the mean score of all items per respondent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“..behavioral intention of an employee to withdraw from the organization”. (Bluedorn, 1982)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. If you were completely free to choose, would you prefer to continue working in this organization or would you prefer not to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. How long would you like to stay in this organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. If you had to quit work for a while (for example, because of pregnancy), would you return to this organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple team membership</strong></td>
<td>Multiple team membership number</td>
<td>Based on Morgeson and Humphrey (2006). In how many different teams you are part of in this organization?</td>
<td>Multiple team membership number is calculated by total number given per respondent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“..a situation in which individuals are concurrently members of two or more teams within a given period of time”. (O’Leary, Mortensen, &amp; Wooll, 2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>Perceived stress</td>
<td>a*: Scored in the reverse direction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hovmark &amp; Thomson (1995) define stress reactions as having sleeping problems, being fatigue and the inability to let go of problems when a working day is over (as cited in Zika-Viktorsson, Sundstrom, &amp; Engwall, 2006, p. 388).</td>
<td>Based on Cohen, Karmack, and Mermelstein (1983). Measured on 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). 1. In the last month, how often have you been upset because of something that happened unexpectedly? 2. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were unable to control the important things in your life? 3. In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and &quot;stressed&quot;? 4. a* In the last month, how often have you dealt successfully with irritating life hassles? 5. a* In the last month, how often have you felt that you were effectively coping with important changes that were occurring in your life? 6. a* In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems? 7. a* In the last month, how often have you felt</td>
<td>Stress is calculated taken the mean score of all items per respondent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that things were going your way?
8. In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?
9. a* In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations in your life?
10. a* In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things?
11. In the last month, how often have you been angered because of things that happened that were outside of your control?
12. In the last month, how often have you found yourself thinking about things that you have to accomplish?
13. a* In the last month, how often have you been able to control the way you spend your time?
14. In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?
**Organizational support**

“...a set of measurable properties of the work environment, perceived directly or indirectly by the people who live and work in this environment and assumed to influence their motivation and behavior”.

(Litwin & Stringer 1968, as cited in Hollmann, 1976, p. 562)

| Organizational support | Based on Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986). Measured on 7-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). 1. The organization values my contribution to its well-being. 2. The organization fails to appreciate any extra effort from me. (R) 3. The organization would ignore any complaint from me. (R) 4. The organization really cares about my well-being. 5. Even if I did the best job possible, the organization would fail to notice. (R) 6. The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work. 7. The organization shows very little concern for me. (R) 8. The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work. (R): Scored in the reverse direction. Organizational support, team support and supervisor support are calculated taken the mean score of all items per respondent. |
| Team support | 1. The teams value my contribution to its well-being.  
2. The teams fail to appreciate any extra effort from me. (R)  
3. The teams would ignore any complaint from me. (R)  
4. The teams really care about my well-being.  
5. Even if I did the best job possible, the teams would fail to notice. (R)  
6. The teams care about my general satisfaction at work.  
7. The teams show very little concern for me. (R)  
8. The teams take pride in my accomplishments at work. |
| Supervisor support | 1. The supervisor values my contribution to its well-being.  
2. The supervisor fails to appreciate any extra effort from me. (R)  
3. The supervisor would ignore any complaint from me. (R)  
4. The supervisor really cares about my well-being. |
| 5. Even if I did the best job possible, the supervisor would fail to notice. (R) |
| 6. The supervisor cares about my general satisfaction at work. |
| 7. The supervisor shows very little concern for me. (R) |
| 8. The supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments at work. |

| Team tenure | Question concerning the amount of time in months the participant holds position within the focal teams. | The sum of number of months. |
| Percentage of time spent on focal team | Question concerning the fragmentation of time. If 100% would be the total amount of your working time how would you distribute this amount across the various teams you are working in? | The percentage of time spent on focal team of each respondent in each team will be calculated. |

<p>| Team size | Individual members | Question concerning the amount of team members. | Team size is calculated by the sum of the amount of individual team members. |
| Industry | Question concerning the industry the participant is working in. | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Question concerning the age of participant will be formulated.</th>
<th>Number of years.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Male or female</td>
<td>Male = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question concerning the gender of participant will be formulated.</td>
<td>Female = 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX II: Descriptive

Categorical variables table: frequency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality &amp; Events</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indirect effect of $X$ on $Y$ through $M_i = a_i b_i$

Direct effect of $X$ on $Y = c'$

Note: Model 4 allows up to 10 mediators operating in parallel.
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Note: Model 7 allows up to 10 mediators operating in parallel.