

Different links for the same work: organizational commitment of company workers and temporary workers:

Mafalda Batista, Instituto Politécnico de Setúbal- Escola Superior de Ciências Empresariais
Maria Amélia Marques, Instituto Politécnico de Setúbal- Escola Superior de Ciências Empresariais

In the contexts of recommending organizational flexibility, companies are increasingly turning to temporary work as a competitive strategy. Temporary work is presupposed in Atkinson's (1987) flexible enterprise design, which advocates the segmentation of the workforce into two distinct groups: nuclear workers and peripheral workers. Nuclear workers, being crucial to the core business of the organization, would have access to job stability, training and development. Peripheral workers would be hired according to firms' specific needs for non-nuclear activities, allowing a reduction of fixed costs and administrative burden with human resources (De Cuyper and De Witte, 2008; Nollen, 1996). In industry, temporary work has allowed companies to maintain a less qualified set of workers, using numerical flexibility, which ensures production at lower costs and at times of market oscillation (Garcia-Perez and Muñoz-Bullón, 2005). Notwithstanding the advantages advocated, the use of temporary work has presented some limitations, namely the high level of absenteeism of temporary workers, their discontent with different treatment, precariousness and lack of training (Booth, 2002; Nollen, 1996). This discontent depends on the socio-occupational profiles of the workers, and there are cases where they do not occur (Chambel, 2006).

Within this framework, and considering the organizational commitment, generically as the identification of the worker with the company, the will to remain and continue in the company and to get involved and to strive to achieve the objectives of the company (Meyer and Allen, 1997), the present objective of this study is to analyze the commitment of temporary workers (TT) and the company (TE) of an industrial company. Having as specific objectives: 1) To identify the levels of organizational commitment of TT and TE in the three components; 2) To understand the relationship between the levels of organizational commitment of TT and TE; 3) Understand the correlation of commitment with age and seniority.

From a methodological point of view, the questionnaire survey developed by Meyer and Allen (1991), validated for the Portuguese population by Nascimento, Lopes and Salgueiro (2008) was applied. The same considers three components of commitment: affective; normative; calculative. The survey was applied to a convenience sample of 85 workers: 59 temporary workers (TT) and 26 employees of the company (TE). All workers had low levels of literacy (2nd cycle) and qualification and belonged to the operational center. Data were analyzed through SPSS, version 21, using descriptive statistical analysis and correlations.

The main results were as follows: 1) affective commitment is the one that obtained the highest overall average; 2) TTs present a calculative impairment with the highest mean result and ETs present an affective compromise with the highest mean result; 3) there was a strong correlation between affective and normative impairment and between normative and calculative impairment and a weaker correlation between affective and calculative impairment; 4) in TT, there were negative correlations

between the three levels of organizational commitment and seniority, while in the ET there was no correlation between organizational commitment and seniority; 6) in TT there is a weak correlation between impairment and age, while in ET there was a strong and positive correlation between affective and normative impairment and age.

Atkinson, J. (1987). Flexibility of Fragmentation? The United Kingdom Labour Market in the Eighties. In *Labour and Society*, 12(1), pp: 87-105.

Booth, A. L. (2002). Temporary jobs: Stepping stones or dead ends. *The Economic Journal*, 189-213.

Chambel, M. J. (2006). Different temporary work status, different behaviours in organization. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20 (3), 351-367.

De Cuyper, N., & De Witte, H. (2008). Volition and reasons for accepting temporary employment: Associations with attitudes, well-being, and behavioural intentions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17 (3): 363-387.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, v. 1, p. 61-89, 1991.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace - Theory, Research and Application*. Califórnia. Sage Publications.

Nascimento, J., Lopes, A., & Salgueiro, M. (2008). Estudo sobre a validação do "Modelo de Comportamento Organizacional" de Meyer e Allen para o contexto português. *Comportamento Organizacional e Gestão*, vol 14, nº1, 115-133.

Nollen, S. D. (1996). Negative aspects of temporary employment. *Journal of Labor Research* 17 (4), 567-582.