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**Abstract:** In this study with self reports of 123 respondents who are employees from different organisations using an online survey, the relation between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation is examined, with Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture as mediators. The startingpoint is the Person-Environment fit theory. Self Identity at Work is expected to have a positive relation with Binding to the Organisation, Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture. Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture are in their turn expected to have a positive relation with Binding to the Organisation and therefore are expected to be mediators in the positive relation between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation. The Linear Regression Analysis showed that Self Identity at Work is positively related to Binding to the Organisation. The two mediation analyses each confirmed the mediations of Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture in the relation between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation (*p* < .05). The Conceptual Model as a whole is statistically significant, but the two mediators did not turn out to be statistically significant. Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture do not additionally contribute to predicting Binding to the Organisation on top of Self Identity at Work. One of the suggestions for future research is to focus on the high correlation between the scales used in this study. It is concluded that organisations have to select employees who stand for the same things the organisation stands for (e.g. values, norms, beliefs and identity) and employees should look for organisations that match their identity, to increase Binding to the Organisation.
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**Introduction**

In this thesis it is investigated what organisations can possibly do to bind their employees to them to increase the fit they experience with the organisation and thus reduce turnover intention. The Person-environment (PE) fit theory is proposed as a method for understanding the process of adjustment between organisational members (P) and their work environments (E; Caplan, 1987). The first assumption of the PE fit theory states that people seek out and create environments that allow them to behaviorally manifest their traits. The second assumption states that the extent to which people fit their work environments has significant consequences with better fit associated with better outcomes (e.g. satisfaction, performance, stress, productivity, turnover). Another assumption is that PE fit is a reciprocal and ongoing process whereby people shape their environments and environments shape people (Su et al., 2015). The focus of this study is on the role of Self Identity at Work, which is the extent to which employees feel they are an integral part of the organisation based on the experienced match between their and the organisation’s norms, values and beliefs. More specifically in this study the relation between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation is analysed. Binding to the Organisation is considered the opposite of turnover intention (Tummers et al., 2012). As the Netherlands is dealing with a tight labour market, Binding to the Organisation is a relevant construct to most companies. Self Identity at Work represents the Person, and the organisation represents the Environment in the PE fit theory. Also the roles of Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture are looked into, as they are expected to have a positive influence in mediating between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation (Ngo-Henha, 2018; Hyytiainen, 2020; Zwet et al., 2011; Brown, 2000; **Correll & Park, 2005; Fang et al., 2020).** This will be further elaborated in the Theory framework presented in this paper. A question that is central to this thesis is: What can organisations do to bind their employees to them? At **the second quarter of 2021, there were more vacancies than unemployed people in the Netherlands (CBS, 2021). The downside of a tight labour market may be that it causes structural staff shortages to arise. When the question for labour outperforms the offer, a lot of vacancies will remain unfulfilled for a long time (De Beer, 2008). This may cause more to be expected from current employees, as they have to fill in for the unfulfilled vacancies. Besides, these employees might get more job offers from other organisations, as they need to fill their vacancies as well.** This could make this research relevant and up-to-date. **Though the importance of binding employees may be emphasized in this labour market, not binding employees to the organisation could be a longer lasting and more fundamental problem.**The youngest generation of employees experience less organisational identification and their intention to change more jobs increases (Kirpik & Akdemir, 2019; Ivanovic & Ivancevic, 2019). Turnover and job hopping have always been common. Both organisation and society try to prevent this from happening too much, because high turnover requires a lot of investment including replacement costs (Cascio, 1991). So this is an organisational and a societal problem. The theoretical relevance of this research is to create more scientific insight into the constructs that relate to Binding to the Organisation, hoping these insights can be the base for more knowledge and interventions regarding Binding to the Organisation. **T**he added value of this research is that as far as we know this is the first study in The Netherlands in this decade where it is investigated whether there is a positive relationship between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation with Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture as mediators.

*The research question in this study is: To what extent is Self Identity at Work related to Binding to the Organisation and to what extent is this relation mediated by Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture?*

**Theoretical Framework**

The PE fit theory is the starting point. Self Identity at Work is a perception of how you see yourself and the organisation in terms of matching values. This means that Self Identity at Work represents PE fit in the areas of values, norms, identity and beliefs. Binding to the Organisation can be considered the opposite of turnover intention, because you feel more or less connected with the organisation. Turnover can be a consequence of low PE fit (Su et al., 2015). The PE fit theory is used in the first hypothesis to describe a direct relation. The Theory of Organizational Equilibrium and The Equity Theory are two existing turnover intention theories that state that there should be a balance between input (employee contributions) and output (organization inducements; Ngo-Henha, 2018). These theories are used for hypotheses 2, 3 and 4 to describe the mediation from Self Identity at Work to Developmental Rewards to Binding to the Organisation. These theories will be further elaborated when Developmental Rewards are introduced. Lastly, The Social Identity Theory states that social identity is derived primarily from group memberships (Brown, 2000). It proposes that people strive to achieve or maintain a positive social identity, which derives largely from favourable comparisons between ingroups and outgoups. When this identity is unsatisfactory, people may seek to leave their group. This theory is used for hypotheses 5, 6 and 7, to describe the mediation from Self Identity at Work to an Inclusive Organisational Culture to Binding to the Organisation. This theory will be further elaborated when Inclusive Organisational Culture is introduced. **The focus of the research question for the analysis of the Conceptual Model that is presented at the end of the Introduction in this paper, is examined in two mediations and in a Parallel Mediation Analysis.** From the theory, most is known about the individual mediations, which is why it is first checked if these mediations can also be seen in this research. Thereafter the focus will be on the model as a whole. **No control variables are used, since no clues about possible control variables which might affect the relationships in the Conceptual Model were found in the literature. Therefore, the focus of this study is on the hypotheses mentioned below.**

**Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation**

In this study, Binding to the Organisation is considered the opposite of turnover intention or the extent to which an employee thinks it is less likely that they will actively look for a different organisation to work for, due to feeling less connected to the organisation (Tummers et al., 2012; **Bozeman & Perrewé, 2001).** Self Identity at Work is defined as the extent to which one finds themselves as an integral part of their organisation, because their identity and values match those of the organisation (Sulphey, 2020).Based on the literature analysis, Sulphey (2020) defines Self Identity as a component of Workplace Identity. “Workplace identity is an attitude towards self that helps individual employees to identify themselves as crucial members in the organisation by shaping their roles in the employment context” (Sulphey, 2020, p. 53). When people have a strong Self Identity at Work, they feel part of the organisation, indicate that their values and those of the organisation match and would recommend the organisation to others. One of the assumptions of the PE fit theory is that the extent to which people fit their work environments has significant consequences with better fit associated with better outcomes. One of these outcomes is turnover (Su et al., 2015). This makes it reasonable to think that people with stronger Self Identity at Work, find it more difficult to leave the organisation they work for and thus experience more Binding to the Organisation, as they experience more PE fit with the organisation.

Also, previous research shows that work-based identity, referring to the answer to the question ‘Who am I at work’, seems to have a (small) negative predictive effect on turnover intention (Bothma & Roodt, 2012). This implies a negative relationship between Self Identity at Work and turnover intention, as Self Identity at Work is a similar construct to work-based identity. Based on the beforementioned arguments and literature Hypothesis 1 is introduced:

*H1: Self-Identity at Work* ***has a direct positive relationship with Binding to the Organisation***

**Self Identity at Work and Developmental Rewards according to Turnover Intention Theories**

The Theory of Organizational Equilibrium and The Equity Theory are turnover intention theories that state that there should be a balance between input (employee contributions, e.g. commitment, loyalty) and output (organisation inducements, e.g. fees, compensation; Ngo-Henha, 2018). It is argued that people with stronger Self Identity at Work give more input, as they are intrinsically motivated to do their work for the organisation. Organisation inducements are usually split into materialistic rewards and Developmental Rewards. Developmental Rewards refer to the extent in which employees experience that the organisation creates opportunities for them to develop their qualities in work and are given trust that these qualities are used as strengths (e.g. training on knowledge and skills for future career development; **Wang et al., 2003).** In this thesis the focus will be on Developmental Rewards, because a lot of organisations try to keep their employees by using Developmental Rewards.

Stronger Self Identity at Work could be related to more Developmental Rewards, because people who identify themselves in their work are more likely to show interest in participating in professional development (Hyytiainen, 2020). This is because an employee’s sense of who they are, based on the position they occupy in their workplace, shapes the work identity individuals create in their role, and how enthusiastic they are to participate in development opportunities (Hyytiainen, 2020). By adjusting Developmental Rewards (output) as an organisation, the input (Self Identity at Work) is strengthened, which may cause less turnover intention and thus more Binding to the Organisation. This brings forward the hypotheses that:

 *H2* ***Self Identity at Work has a positive relationship with Developmental Rewards;***

***H3 Developmental Rewards has a positive relationship with Binding to the Organisation***

Developmental space is necessary (and needs to be provided by the organisation) to develop professional identity (Zwet et al., 2011). Developmental Rewards describe how higher Self Identity at Work leads to more Binding to the Organisation, as Self Identity at Work may be reinforced by Developmental Rewards. This leads to the next hypothesis:

***H4: Developmental Rewards positively mediates the relationship between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation***

**Self Identity at Work and Inclusive Organisational Culture**

**An Inclusive Organisational Culture is an open organisational culture where employees form a unity, but within this unity get space to work in their own way, also when this way of working deviates from the prevailing norm (Celik et al., 2013).** The Social Identity Theory states that social identity is derived primarily from group memberships (Brown, 2000). It proposes that people strive to achieve or maintain a positive social identity, which derives largely from favourable comparisons between ingroups and outgroups (Brown, 2000). **People with a higher PE fit and thus higher Self Identity at Work, will identify stronger with the organisation and therefore stronger with one’s colleagues as they are part of the organisation as well. Therefore colleagues are seen as an ingroup. A consequence is that people have a favourable attitude toward the ingroup (Correll & Park, 2005). So despite differences within the organisation, people with stronger Self Identity at Work will include their colleagues more as they are seen as an ingroup, and therefore enhance an Inclusive Organisational Culture. Prior research shows that tolerance of employee’s opinions and failures and emphasis on employee’s advantages are significantly negatively correlated with turnover intention (Fang et al., 2020). Since those dimensions are important to an Inclusive Organisational Culture, it is expected that an Inclusive Organisational Culture has a negative effect on turnover intention and thus a positive effect on Binding to the Organisation.** This results in the hypotheses that:

*H5* ***Self Identity at Work has a positive relationship with an Inclusive Organisational Culture;***

***H6 An Inclusive Organisational Culture has a positive relationship with Binding to the Organisation;***

***H7: An Inclusive Organisational Culture positively mediates the relationship between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation***

**All hypotheses are displayed in Figure 1, which also represents the last hypothesis:**

***H8:*** *Self Identity at Work has a direct positive relation with Binding to the Organisation, and Developmental Rewards positively mediates the relation between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation and Inclusive Organisational Culture positively mediates the relation between Self Identity at Work and Binding* ***to the Organisation.***
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***Figure 1.* Conceptual Model (H8).**

***Note.* H1 up to and including H8 refer to the hypotheses.**

**Methods**

**Procedure**

**First, the research proposal for this thesis was approved of by the Ethical Board. In this research an online survey was chosen, as surveys can measure multiple aspects of the same theoretical construct and because this form of data collection is easily accessible.** A cross-sectional study was performed, because this type of study is cheaper and less time-consuming than other types of study. It allows to easily collect data that can be used as a basis for future research and data can be collected from a large pool of subjects. **Starting data collection, participants received a message, via LinkedIn, WhatsApp, Instagram or Facebook, where they were asked to participate in this research (Appendix A). Participating was voluntarily and anonymous. After they had read the information text and informed consent they filled in the questionnaires in Qualtrics Survey (Appendix B). The questionnaire was conducted in Dutch. First, the participants filled in the demographics. Then they filled in the questionnaire on Binding to the Organisation, followed by the Self Identity at Work scale, followed by the items for Developmental Rewards and finally the Measure of Organizational Inclusion. After finishing the survey, the participants got information about the research and the hypotheses. They were given a chance to withdraw their data from further analysis and could leave their personal information to receive the final results of the study.**

**Participants**

In this study, the population consists of working people in the Netherlands aged eight-teen years and older. **The sample therefore exists of the adult working population in the Netherlands. A convenience sample was used, because this way the data could be collected quickly and at low cost and because the participants for this type of sample could easily be recruited.** The sample size was calculated by using G\*Power 3.1 (Faul et al., 2009). A medium effect size of .15 is applied in this research, because previous research with similar constructs also showed medium-sized effects (Maneerat et al., 2005). Three **predictors, with *p* < .05, Cronbachs Alpha = .95 and an Effect Size of .15 showed that 119 participants were needed in this study. 151 participants participated in this study, of which 123 could be used for further analysis. The excluded responses consist of incomplete questionnaires and not working or underaged participants. The sample exists of 66 women and 57 men. The average age of the participants is 36.14 years (SD = 12.79; Min = 18; Max = 64). 36.6% of the participants works in the branch “Trade and services”, which is the biggest branche in this research, followed by “Health and Wellbeing” and “Engineering, production and construction”.**

**Measures**

There was asked for demographics; gender, age, work status and branch. Work status was asked to make sure the participants were working. The other demographics were used to describe the sample. As mentioned in the Conceptual Model, no control variables are used as no clues about possible control variables which might affect the relationships in the model were found in the literature. **Where possible, use is made of scales from literature with proven reliability and validity, suitable for the target group and scale definitions that fit the definitions of the construct in this study.** As Binding to the Organisation is considered the opposite of turnover intention or the extent to which an employee thinks it is less likely that they will actively look for a different organisation to work for, five turnover items based on the article of Bozeman and Perrewé (2001) were used to measure Binding to the Organisation (Appendix C). **Previous research showed content validity and a good fit for this measurement. The perceived reliability of the measurement was** α **= .90 (Bozeman & Perrewé, 2001).** The perceived reliability of the measurement in this research is α **= .90 with an average inter-item correlation of .64. The Factor Analysis in this research shows construct validity.** The items are measured on a Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Two items were reversed. An example item is: “It is unlikely that I will actively look for a different organisation to work for in the next year”. **To measure Self Identity at Work, the Self Identity dimension of the Workplace Identity Scale (WIS) was used (Appendix D). In previous research the WIS showed face-, content-, construct- and convergent validity and perceived internal consistency and reliability of** α **= .87 (Sulphey, 2020). In this study a Factor Analysis was conducted for Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation. One item of this scale is deleted, which is elaborated in the Result section presented in this paper. Construct validity is perceived in this Factor Analysis and the perceived reliability (without the deleted item) in this research is** α **= .73 with an average inter-item correlation of .42.** The reliability of the Self Identity at Work scale could have been higher, if one of the other items was deleted. However, the difference was only .01 and three items seemed not enough to measure the construct, which is why the item was not deleted. **There are four items, measured on a** Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). One item was reversed. An example item is: “My values and organisational values match each other”. To measure Developmental Rewards, the Developmental Rewards Inducement Items from the article of Wang et al., (2003) were used (Appendix E). These items were adjusted, in a way that the participants were the subject of the items. **In previous research the construct validity was examined with a Factor Analysis, which emerged as reasonable (Wang et al., 2003). The perceived reliability in the study of Wang et al., (2003) was** α **= .92.** The perceived reliability in this study isα **= .94 with an average inter-item correlation of .60.** There are ten items, measured on a Likert Scale, ranging from 1 (rarely provided or implemented) to 7 (abundantly provided or implemented). An example item is: “The organisation creates opportunities for you to show your talents”. To measure Inclusive Organisational Culture, the Measure of Organizational Inclusion that assesses perceptions of belonging as a welcomed member in the organisation as a whole and being valued by the organisation was used (Hayes, 2002; Appendix F). Previous research examined the construct validity with a Factor Analysis, which emerged as reasonable (Hayes, 2002). Hayes (2002) perceived a reliability of α **=** .71. In this study a reliability of α **=** .87 with an average inter-item correlation of .58 was perceived. The items are measured on a Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). An example item is: “I am included as a full member of this organisation”. The questionnaires fit with survey research, where participants do not have to fill in too long lists online. All questionnaires are expected to be appropriate for the population, since the questions are translated to Dutch.

**Data analysis**

**In this research, analyses will be conducted using SPSS. Reliability analyses will be conducted for all scales, to see if the used questionnaires are reliable. A Factor Analysis will be conducted for Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation, to check for construct validity between these measurements. The reason for this is that the definitions and scales of these constructs seem to suggest that overlap may be present. Descriptive statistics will be conducted to describe the sample and the distribution of and correlations between the variables. The averages of the items were computed into variables. All variables will be checked for the necessary statistical assumptions.** This will be further elaborated in the Results section in this paper. For testing the hypotheses a statistical significant level of *p* < .05 is used. Three ways to Binding to the Organisation are tested: **For H1 a Linear Regression Analysis will be conducted from Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation.**

**For H2, H3 and H4 a Mediation Analysis from Hayes’ PROCESS SPSS addition, Model 4 will be used (Hayes, 2017). Self Identity at Work will be the independent variable, Binding to the Organisation the dependent variable and Developmental Rewards the mediator.**

**For H5, H6 and H7, the same analysis will be done as the Mediation Analysis for H2, H3 and H4, but with Inclusive Organisational Culture as the mediator.**

**To check whether the model is significant as a whole, a Parallel Mediation Analysis will be conducted, with PROCESS Model 6. Parallel Mediation Analysis was chosen, to compare the mediation drives of Developmental Rewards and Inclusive Organisational Culture. Therefore, it is an appropriate analysis to test the supposed effects for the dependent variable. Self Identity at Work is the independent variable, Binding to the Organisation is the dependent variable and Developmental Rewards and Inclusive Organisational Culture are the mediators.**

**Results**

**Assumptions**

All variables have been tested for linearity, outliers, interval measurement level, normality, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity. All these assumptions are met. The assumption of normality is visually tested via Q-Q Plots, which indicated that the questionnaires follow the “normality line”. Multicollinearity was tested by looking at the VIF of the collinearity diagnostics, which was 1.00 for all the regressions. Homoscedasticity was also met, because the scores did not show any systematic pattern of clustering of scores.

**Factor Analysis**

An explorative Factor Analysis was performed on Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation, because these constructs and their definitions show overlap and to investigate whether the items belong to the two scales as they are supposed to do. The eigenvalues of the two dimensions in the Factor Analysis were 5.19 for the first and 1.16 for the second dimension. These two dimensions together showed 63.48% of explained variance and the scree plot shows a kink at the second dimension. An oblique rotation was used for this Factor Analysis, as the two dimensions were expected to correlate (Bothma & Roodt, 2012). The amount of fixed factors was set on two, however handling the Kaiser criterium still showed that two dimensions was the best option. The correlation between the dimensions is .55. The rotated pattern matrix showed that all items of the Binding to the Organisation scale load high on dimension one. The first four items of the Self Identity at Work scale load high on dimension two. There was one crossloading, item 5 of the Self Identity at Work scale ‘I feel like I am an integral part of my organisation’. This item loads higher on component one than on component two, though the difference is minimal (.01). **A substantive reason for deleting this item from further analysis is that the wording of the question may be unclear and therefore misinterpreted or not fully understood. For these two reasons, the item was deleted.**

A confirmative Factor Analysis with oblique rotation was performed, without this deleted item. This Factor Analysis had the number of fixed factors set on two, but using the Kaiser criterium would not change the amount of dimensions. The eigenvalues of the dimensions are 4.73 for the first and 1.16 for the second dimension. The scree plot shows a kink at the second dimension and the amount of explained variance by the two dimensions is 65.40% In this Factor Analysis there are no crossloadings. The correlation between the components is .54. As can be seen in Table 1, the scores on the scales of Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation are also strongly related.

**Descriptives and correlations**

In Table 1 the descriptives of and correlations between Gender, Age, Binding to the Organisation, Self Identity at Work, Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture are presented. The mean score of Binding to the Organisation (M = 3.56; SD = 1.09) indicates that on average participants are feeling a relatively strong binding to their organisation in this study. Self Identity at Work has an average score of 3.76 (SD = .68), indicating that participants in this study on average experience a relatively strong match between their norms and values and those of the organisation. The mean score of Developmental Rewards (M = 4.74; SD = 1.09) indicates that on average participants in this study experience that the organisation creates a lot of opportunities for them to develop their qualities in work and are given trust that these qualities are used as strengths. Inclusive Organisational Culture has an average score of 3.73 (SD = .76), indicating that on average participants in this study experience to a high extent that there is an open culture, where employees form a unity but are allowed to deviate from the prevailing norm. As the assumption of linearity is met, a Pearson correlation is used in the Correlation Analysis. The results of the Correlation Analysis show that Binding to the Organisation is negatively related to Gender, indicating that men experience more Binding to the Organisation than women (*r* = -.24). Self Identity at Work shows a positive relation with Binding to the Organisation, indicating that experiencing a relatively stronger match between your values and those of the organisation, relates to experiencing more Binding to the Organisation. Developmental Rewards are negatively related to Gender, indicating that men experience more opportunities are created for them to develop their qualities in work than women do (*r* = -.25). Developmental Rewards are positively related to Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation, indicating that the more given opportunities to develop in one’s work, the stronger the experienced match between the person and the organisation’s values and Binding to the Organisation is (*r* = .77; *r* = .56, respectively). Inclusive Organisational Culture is negatively related to Gender, indicating that men experience a more open culture, where people form a unity but can deviate from the prevailing norm than women (*r* = -.20). Inclusive Organisational Culture is positively related to Binding to the Organisation, Self Identity at Work and Developmental Rewards, indicating that experiencing an inclusive culture, relates to more Binding to the Organisation, a stronger experience of matching values with the organisation and more created development opportunities (*r* = .58; *r* = .77; *r* =. 86, respectively). Given the high correlations between some scales, a Harman one factor test was conducted, which showed that the total variance extracted by one factor exceeded the threshold and therefore common method bias is present in this study. This will be further elaborated in the Discussion presented in this paper.

**Table 1.**

***Descriptive statistics and correlations.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Mean** | **SD** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| 1. **Gender**a
2. **Age**b
3. **Binding to the Organisation**c
4. **Self Identity at Work**d
5. **Developmental Rewards**e
6. **Inclusive Organisational Culture**f
 | **1.54****36.14****3.56****3.76****4.74****3.73** | **.50****12.79****1.09****.68****1.09****.76** | **1****-.14****-.24\*****-.08****-.25\*****-.20\*** | **1****.11****-.06****-.06****-.03** | **1****.59\*****.56\*****.58\*** | **1****.77\*****.77\*** | **1****.86\*** | **1** |

***Note.*** a**Gender: 1= male 2 = female; bAge in years; cBinding to the Organisation items 1- 5; dSelf Identity at Work Scale 1-5; eDevelopmental Reward items 1-7; fInclusive Organisational Culture items 1-5 | \**p* < .05**

**H1: Direct positive relation between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation**

In this study three ways are specified to relate the relevant constructs to the dependent variable, Binding to the Organisation: from Self identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation, from Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation mediated by Developmental Rewards and from Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation mediated by Inclusive Organisational Culture.

Firstly, a Linear Regression Analysis from Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation was performed. H1 states that Self Identity at Work **has a direct positive relationship with Binding to the Organisation.**As can be seen in Table 2, the analysis shows that Self Identity at Work is positively related to Binding to the Organisation (*b* = .95, *p* < .05). The model from Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation is statistically significant (F (1, 121) = 64.27, *b* = .95, *p* < .05, R2 = .35). Therefore, the Linear Regression Analysis confirms H1.

Table 2.

*Linear Regression Analysis from Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *b* | Std. | t | R2 |
| ConstantSelf identity at Work | -.01.95\*a | .45.12 | -.028.02 | .35\* |

*Note.* a = H1; *b* = unstandardized coefficient | \**p* < .05

**H2, H3 and H4: Mediation Self Identity at Work - Developmental Rewards - Binding to the Organisation**

Secondly, for H2, H3 and H4 a Mediation Analysis was conducted to explore the direct and indirect effects from Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation via Developmental Rewards. In PROCESS, Model 4 was used for this analysis. See Figure 2 for the outcomes of the Mediation Analysis.
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***Figure 2.* Upper half Conceptual Model.**

***Note.*** a **=** indirect effect; b = direct effect(total effect) mediation; unstandardized coefficients are used | \**p* < .05

H2 states that Self-Identity at Work has a positive relationship with Developmental Rewards. The mediation showed that the effect of Self Identity at Work on Developmental Rewards is statistically significant (*b* = 1.24, t = 13.29, 95% CI [1.06, 1.43]; Table 3). H3 states that Developmental Rewards has a positive relationship with Binding to the Organisation. The mediation showed that the effect of Developmental Rewards to Binding to the Organisation is statistically significant (*b* = .26, t = 2.29, 95% CI [.04, .48]; Table 3). H4 states that Developmental Rewards positively mediates the relationship between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation. The mediation showed that the indirect effect of Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation, via Developmental Rewards is statistically significant (*b* = .32, 95% CI [.02, .63]; Table 3). When there is no 0 (nullhypothesis) in the interval between LLCI and ULCI, the results are significant as there is a 95% chance of the nullhypothesis not being in the interval. The Mediation Analysis confirms all three hypotheses (H2, H3 and H4). There is a statistical significant total effect (*b* = .95, t = 8.02, 95% CI [.72, 1.18]) from Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation and there is also a significant direct effect from Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation (*b* = .63, t = 3.44, 95% CI [.27, .99]; Table 3).

Table 3.

*Results from the Mediation Analysis Self Identity at Work – Developmental Rewards – Binding to the Organisation.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Binding to the Organisation | Developmental Rewards |
| ModelConstantSelf Identity at WorkDevelopmental RewardsMediation SI-DR-BOdR2 | -.03.63\*.26\*b.32\*c.37\* | .071.24\*a.59\* |

*Note.* a = H2; b = H3; c = H4; d = Self Identity at Work – Developmental Rewards – Binding to the Organisation; unstandardized coefficients are used | \**p* < .05

**H5, H6 and H7: Mediation Self Identity at Work – Inclusive Organisational Culture – Binding to the Organisation**

Thirdly, for H5, H6 and H7 a Mediation Analysis was conducted to explore the direct and indirect effects from Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation via an Inclusive Organisational Culture. In PROCESS, Model 4 was used for this analysis. See Figure 3 for the outcomes of the Mediation Analysis.
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***Figure 3.* Lower half Conceptual Model.**

***Note.*** a **= direct effect(total effect) mediation** b **= indirect effect; unstandardized coefficients are used | \**p* < .05**

H5 states that Self Idenity at Work has a positive relationship with an Inclusive Organisational Culture. The mediation showes that the effect of Self Identity at Work on an Inclusive Organisational Culture is statistically significant (*b* = .87, t = 13.41, 95% CI [.74, 1.00]; Table 4). H6 states that an Inclusive Organisational Culture has a positive relationship with Binding to the Organisation. The mediation shows that the effect of an Inclusive Organisational Culture to Binding to the Organisation is statistically significant (*b* = .45, t = 2.81, 95% CI [.13, .77]; Table 4). H7 states that an Inclusive Organisational Culture positively mediates the relationship between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation. The mediation showed that the indirect effect of Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation, via an Inclusive Organisational Culture is statistically significant (*b* = .39, 95% CI [.12, .73]; Table 4). The Mediation Analysis confirms all three hypotheses (H5, H6 and H7). There is a significant total effect (*b* = .95, t = 8.02, 95% CI [.72, 1.18]) from Self Identity at Work on Binding to the Organisation. In this Mediation Analysis there is also a significant direct effect from Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation (*b* = .55, t = 3.06, 95% CI [.20, .73]; Table 4).

Table 4.

*Results from the Mediation Analysis Self Identity at Work – Inclusive Organisational Culture – Binding to the Organisation.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Binding to the Organisation | Inclusive Organisational Culture |
| ModelConstantSelf Identity at WorkInclusive Organisational CultureMediation SI-IOC-BOdR2 | -.21.55\*.45\*b.39\*c.39\* | .45.87\*a.60\* |

*Note.* a = H5; b = H6; c = H7; d = Self Identity at Work – Inclusive Organisational Culture – Binding to the Organisation; unstandardized coefficients are used | \**p* < .05

**H8: Testing the Conceptual Model**

A Parallel Mediation Analysis was conducted for H8 to explore the direct and indirect effects from Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation. In PROCESS, Model 6 was used. See Figure 4 for the outcomes of the Parallel Mediation Analysis.
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***Figure 4.* Conceptual Model.**

***Note.*** a = indirect effect Developmental Rewards b = direct effect(total effect) c = indirect effect Inclusive Organisational Culture; unstandardized coefficients are used | \**p* < .05

H8 states that the Conceptual Model as a whole is statistically significant (R2 = .39, *p* < .05). This means that the Parallel Mediation Analysis confirms H8. The outcomes indicate that the direct relation between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation is statistically significant (*b* = .51, t = 2.66, 95% CI [.13, .90]; Table 5). Also, the relations from Self Identity at Work to Developmental Rewards (*b* = 1.24, t = 13.29, 95% CI [1.06, 1.43]; Table 5) and an Inclusive Organisational Culture (*b* = .31, t = 4.01, 95% CI [.16, .47]; Table 5) are statistically significant. However, the relations from Developmental Rewards (*b* = .10, t = .65, 95% CI [-.20, .39]; Table 5) and an Inclusive Organisational Culture (*b* = .36, t = 1.72, 95% CI [-.06, .78]; Table 5) to Binding to the Organisation are not statistically significant. The mediations/indirect effects of Developmental Rewards (*b* = .12, 95% CI [-.27, .49]; Table 5) and an Inclusive Organisational Culture (*b* = .11, 95% CI [-.01, .29]; Table 5) are not statistically significant. There is a significant total effect (*b* = .95, t = 8.02, 95% CI [.72, 1.18]) from Self Identity at Work on Binding to the Organisation.

Table 5.

*Results from the Parallel Mediation Analysis of Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation with Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture as mediators.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Binding to the Organisation | Developmental Rewards | Inclusive Organisational Culture |
| ModelConstantSelf identity at WorkDevelopmental RewardsInclusive Organisational CultureMediation SI-DR-BObMediation SI-IOC-BOcR2 | -.18.51\*.10.36.12.11.39\*a | .071.24\*.59\* | .42\*.31\*.45\*.77\* |

*Note.* a = H8; b = Self Identity at Work – Developmental Rewards – Binding to the Organisation; c = Self Identity at Work – Inclusive Organisational Culture – Binding to the Organisation; unstandardized coefficients are used | \**p* < .05

Conceptually, there are three possible ways to predict Binding to the Organisation, namely by Self Identity at Work, by Self Identity at Work mediated by Developmental Rewards and by Self Identity at Work mediated by an Inclusive Organisational Culture. However, the strongest effect on Binding to the Organisation is considered to originate from the direct effect of Self Identity at Work, which is the highest statistical significant predictor of Binding to the Organisation in the Conceptual Model as a whole (R2 = .35).

**Discussion**

In this thesis the relationship between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation has been examined and with that an attempt has been made to track down what organisations can do to keep their employees within the organisation. Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture were examined as mediators in the relation between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation. This was done on the basis of the following expectations: Self Identity at Work is positively related to Binding to the Organisation, Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture. Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture are positively related to Binding to the Organisation. Lastly, Developmental Rewards and Inclusive Organisational Culture mediate the relationship between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation. The results show that all hypotheses can be confirmed.

**The relationship between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation**

H1 states that Self Identity at Work has a direct positive relationship with Binding to the Organisation**.** A statistical significant positive relation is perceived for Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation. This is in line with the hypothesis and the literature. Previous literature leads to the assumption that better PE fit leads to less turnover and to the assumption that work-based identity shows a positive relationship with Binding to the Organisation (Su et al., 2015; Bothma & Roodt, 2012).

**The relations between Self Identity at Work, Developmental Rewards and Binding to the Organisation**

H2 states that Self Identity at Work has a positive relationship with Developmental Rewards. A statistical significant positive relation is perceived for Self Identity at Work and Developmental Rewards. H3 states that Developmental Rewards has a positive relationship with Binding to the Organisation. A statistical significant positive relation is perceived for Developmental Rewards and Binding to the Organisation. H4 states that **Developmental Rewards positively mediates the relationship between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation.** A statistically significant indirect effect is perceived of Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation via Developmental Rewards. **This is partial mediation, as the direct effect of Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation is still statistically significant as well.** These findings are in line with the literature and the hypotheses based on the Theory of Organizational Equilibrium and The Equity Theory, findings from previous research and the literature that leads to the assumption that people who identify themselves in their work are more likely to show interest in participating in professional development (Ngo-Henha, 2018; Hyytiainen, 2020; Zwet et al., 2011).

**The relations between Self Identity at Work, Inclusive Organisational Culture and Binding to the Organisation**

H5 states that Self Identity at Work has a positive relationship with an Inclusive Organisational Culture. A statistical significant positive relation is perceived for Self Identity at Work and an Inclusive Organisational Culture. H6 states that an Inclusive Organisational Culture has a positive relationship with Binding to the Organisation. A statistical significant positive relation is perceived for an Inclusive Organisational Culture and Binding to the Organisation. H7 states that **an Inclusive Organisational Culture positively mediates the relationship between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation.** A statistically significant indirect effect is perceived of Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation via an Inclusive Organisational Culture. **This is partial mediation, as the direct effect of Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation is still statistically significant as well. This is in line with the hypotheses and previous literature. Previous literature leads to the assumptions that** people with higher Self Identity at Work see their colleagues more as an ingroup and therefore enhance and experience a more Inclusive Organisational Culture and that some dimensions of an Inclusive Organisational Culture are negatively correlated with turnover intention **(Celik et al., 2013**; **Fang et al., 2020**; Brown, 2000; Correll & Park, 2005).

**Conceptual Model**

The Conceptual Model was tested as a whole (H8), by using a Parallel Mediation Analysis. The Conceptual Model as a whole is perceived to be statistically significant (R2 = .39, *p* < .05). However, within the constellation of the model, the two mediations do not contribute on a statistical significant level and only the direct relation from Self Identity at Work to Binding to the Organisation is statistically significant. This brings up the question whether it could be that Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture act better as independent variables in this model. To check this, a post hoc Multivariate Regression Analysis was conducted. The results of this analysis are in Table 6. The Multivariate Regression Analysis shows that Self Identity at Work, Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture together predict Binding to the Organisation (R2 = .39). This model is statistically significant (*p* < .05). However, only Self Identity at Work is a significant predictor for Binding to the Organisation, while Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational culture are not. It can be concluded that Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture do not additionally contribute to the model in predicting Binding to the Organisation when Self Identity at Work is included. If Self Identity at Work is not used in the model, Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture relate to Binding to the Organisation, but they do not do that in combination. This means that the way employees see themselves and the organisation contributes more to Binding to the Organisation and Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture do not add upon that. As a single predictor Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture do have a relation with Binding to the Organisation, but when Self Identity at Work is used, the contribution of Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture is not there.

Table 6.

*Multivariate Regression Analysis to predict Binding to the Organisation (R2 = .39).*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Independent variable | B | Std. Error | *t* |
| Self Identity at WorkDevelopmental RewardsInclusive Organisational Culture | .51\*.10.36 | .19.15.21 | 2.66.651.72 |

*Note.* \**p* < .05

A Factor Analysis was performed in this study that shows that the measurements of Binding to the Organisation and Self Identity at Work are loading on different dimensions in the Factor Analysis. This indicates that the set of items of Self Identity at Work and the set of items of Binding to the Organisation are two homogeneously coherent sets. This is a reason to suspect that the items within each scale relate more than the items between the two scales. This may indicate that two different constructs are measured. Two different constructs that however, given the correlations between the measurements of Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation show a high degree of coherence. The question here is whether the two measurements of Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation are measuring something different, because they correlate highly with each other, they correlate with the same demographic variables and the constructs show overlap in their definitions. Therefore, the question for future research is what the similarities and differences between the measurements of Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation are. In future research the validity of these measurements should be examined. The results of the Conceptual Model in this study, indicate that Self Identity at Work, a construct related more to the Person in the PE fit theory has more influence on Binding to the Organisation than Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture, the constructs that relate to the (work) Environment in the PE fit theory. However, when we take a look at the correlations, Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture certainly correlate with Binding to the Organisation. It is quite speculative, but this could mean that when Self Identity at Work is low, this can be compensated by the Environment (e.g. by Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture). The PE fit theory does not make assumptions about how adjustment is to take place and does not preclude adjustments via changes in both P and in E (Caplan, 1987). Consequently, it is shortsighted to assume that there is only one correct method of adjustment. Another alternative explanation could be job gravitation. “The concept of job gravitation refers to labour market behaviour whereby employees, self or employer inititated, sort themselves into jobs that are compatible with their interests, values and abilities” (Brenninkmeijer et al., 2018, p. 809). Job graviation is closely related to PE fit. When organisations select people that fit them and employees stay at the organisation they have this fit with, there is an automatic effect of fit.

**Practical advice**

The first advice, in relation to the alternative explanation of job gravitation and the role of Self Identity at Work, is that organisations should take the identity, norms, values, abilities and beliefs of the candidate into account during their recruitment and selection process. In other words, do the candidates stand for what the organisation stands for? This could be done by asking questions about the things the organisation stands for, to see if a candidate agrees. Organisations should also increase the PE fit by training employees and developing the behaviour that is relevant for the job and the organisation. Future research should focus on practical policies to do this (e.g. the Self Identity at Work questionnaire could be used in the recruitment & selection process). On the other hand, the advice for the individual is to apply for jobs at organisations that show a matching identity, when it is desired to have a higher Binding to the Organisation and to continue working there for a longer period of time. The results indicate that Self Identity at Work has a direct effect on Binding to the Organisation. Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture are not statistically significant mediators in this relation. However, Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture correlate highly with Binding to the Organisation. It could be that someone who scores low on Self Identity at Work, scores high on Developmental Rewards or an Inclusive Organisational Culture. This may not happen often, but it is not unthinkable. So when organisations can not recruit and select people with matching identities, norms, values, abilities and beliefs, this could maybe be compensated by Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture. This can not be known for sure, but it is an option when the correlations of Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture with Binding to the Organisation are taken into account (*r* = .58; *r* = .56 respectively). From the perspective of the Environment, it could pay to tackle organisational influences like Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture. Also, based on this research it is unknown whether levels of Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture below a certain point, are still compensated by Self Identity at Work. This is input for future research. Hence, there is practical advice for Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture as well.

Looking at Developmental Rewards, the practical advice resulting from the findings is to change or add a reward system to be more development-focused by using Developmental Rewards or replacing bonusses with training employees can use in their future career. The goal is to let employees participate in professional development and to give them opportunities and rewards that focus on their development, so the employees feel more Binding to the Organisation. Looking at an Inclusive Organisational Culture, the results indicate it would be beneficial for Binding to the Organisation to have an Inclusive Organisational Culture. In Afghanistan, diversity education along with an ethical climate is crucial if the aim is to create an inclusive culture (Mujtaba, 2013). So creating an Inclusive Organisational Culture could for example be done by giving diversity training. Diversity trainings are meetings in which a trained instructor educates employees about workplace diversity (Homan et al., 2015; Kulik & Roberson, 2008). They can create awareness of diversity issues and can build an Inclusive Organisational Culture, as it creates skills and attitudes needed to work with people who are different from themselves.

**Limitations**

The first limitation is the validity of the measurements used in this study. A Factor Analysis has been conducted for Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation, but due to beforementioned overlap and similar correlations between these measurements and other variables, it is debatable whether these measurements measure different constructs. It is not further checked if the measurements have been measuring what they are supposed to measure in this study. Also, a convenience sample was used, which means the sample was selected. The sample consists of people in the researchers’ network, and those people’s network. It could be that a part of the population that is attempted to be investigated is missing in the sample (e.g. low educated people). The conclusions from this study do not have to be thrown away, but since the external validity is low due to a convenience sample, the results should not be generalized to the entire population. Another limitation is the use of a survey in this research. Using a survey has disadvantages. Participants tend to give socially desired answers, even when the survey is anonymous. In this research, the mean of the turnover items that measure Binding to the Organisation is higher than the mean reported by Bozeman and Perrewé (2001). There is no possibility to dig deeper in the participants’ motivation. Participants can not deviate from the answer categories presented. Furthermore, people often wrongly predict their own behaviour (Pronin, 2009). Also, the correlations between the measurements can be caused by common method variance. Common method variance is the systematic error variance that is shared among variables which are measured with the same source method, occuring when the systematic variance is introduced into the measures by the measurement technique (Tehseen et al., 2017). The Harman one factor test has been conducted to check for common method variance and showed that the total variance extracted by one factor was 51.3% which exceeds the threshold of 50% and therefore shows that common method bias is present in this study. The last discussed limitation is that this research considered Binding to the Organisation the opposite of turnover. However, turnover is a negative decision to leave an organisation and Binding to the Organisation is a positive decision to stay at an organisation. Are Binding to the Organisation and turnover really the opposite of each other then? This is input for future research.

**Implications**

In this research more insight is provided into how to influence Binding to the Organisation. Aside from the above-mentioned suggestions and advice, the most important implication is the role of Self Identity at Work. This study indicates that Self Identity at Work is an essential construct to bind employees to the organisation. When an organisation does not take Self Identity at Work into account, there might be a bigger chance of not binding employees to the organisation, which could have negative consequences.

**Future research**

Given the results of this research, the priority for future research that may be most relevant now, is more research to predict Binding to the Organisation. Not binding employees is a fundamental problem for organisations and society. With more research, more interventions can be made to improve Binding to the Organisation. As mentioned before, the validity of the measurements used in this research needs to be checked and the questionnaires should be adjusted to these findings. If it is not clear whether it is actually Binding to the Organisation that is measured, possible interventions may not work and the problem of not binding employees will remain. I expect there is more to Binding to the Organisation than the opposite of turnover and more aspects need to be added to this questionnaire to cover the whole construct. This could be done by testing the measurement against existing theories and knowledge about the construct, by checking to what extent the measurements measure all aspects of the constructs, by looking at the origin of the questionnaires and how they were developed and by testing to what extent the results of this measurement are similar to those of other valid measurements measuring the same construct. The result would be a valid measurement for Binding to the Organisation. Research could be done to give insight into the roots of the existing problem of not binding employees. There are many exit interviews in organisations, but not much is public. Organisations might not want to publicly release these, as it might scare off potential new employees. However, there is a negative relationship between transparency and the intent to leave (Hofmann & Strobel, 2020). This and combining exit interviews of similar anonymous organisations might convince organisations to share their exit interviews and give more insight into the roots of the problem of not binding employees. An outcome would be possible interventions for tackling the problem from its roots.

**Conclusion**

In this thesis Binding to the Organisation has been examined and with that an attempt has been made to (partially) describe which constructs are underlying to this binding. Self Identity at Work is positively related to Binding to the Organisation, Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture. Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture are positively related to Binding to the Organisation and both act as partial mediators in the relation between Self Identity at Work and Binding to the Organisation, when they are measured in separate mediation analyses. The Conceptual Model as a whole is statistically significant as well, but shows that Developmental Rewards and an Inclusive Organisational Culture do not contribute to predicting Binding to the Organisation on top of Self Identity at Work. An implication of this study is the role of Self Identity at Work, which is an important factor for Binding to the Organisation that should not be ignored. Organisations have to make good selections and interventions to increase Self Identity at Work. Researchers have to look how Self Identity at Work can be trained and developed and validate the measurements used in this research. The Dutch working population has to take into account the match between their identity and that of the organisation they want to work for when they apply for a job. If the Dutch working population, researchers and organisations take these things into consideration, the problem of not binding employees to the organisation might be resolved in the Netherlands.
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**Appendix A**

**Recruitment text**

\*Help mij afstuderen😁\*

Beste netwerk,

Ik ben voor de master organisatiepsychologie mijn scriptie aan het schrijven, waarvoor ik een onderzoek moet uitvoeren. Het doel van dit onderzoek is om organisationele invloeden op de relatie van identiteit op het werk en binding met de organisatie in kaart te brengen.

Ik zou het erg fijn vinden als u mij hierbij wil helpen door onderstaande vragenlijst in te vullen. Het invullen van de vragenlijst duurt ongeveer tien minuten en is geheel anoniem. Uw deelname is vrijwillig en u kunt op elk moment stoppen met het onderzoek, zonder consequenties of opgave van redenen.

Mocht u vragen hebben over het onderzoek, stuur mij gerust een berichtje :)

Bij voorbaat dank voor het invullen van de vragenlijst en uw hulp bij mijn onderzoek.

<https://lnkd.in/dtHjwiph>

Invullen en delen wordt gewaardeerd!💙



**Appendix B**

**Information text and Informed consent**

Informatie over de deelname aan een onderzoek van de Universiteit Utrecht
Masteronderzoek: Zelfidentiteit op de werkvloer
Versie: 18/03/22

Het doel van dit onderzoek voor mijn masterthesis is het in kaart brengen van organisationele invloeden op de relatie tussen zelfidentiteit op de werkvloer en de binding met de organisatie waarvoor gewerkt word. Er zijn geen belangenverstrengelingen bekend ten aanzien van het uitvoeren van dit onderzoek. De deelname duurt ongeveer tien tot vijftien minuten.

Tijdens dit onderzoek wordt u gevraagd om alle vragen te beantwoorden. Er zijn geen juiste of onjuiste antwoorden, dus denkt u er niet te lang over na en volg uw eerste ingeving. Er zal geen oordeel volgen op uw mening of denkbeeld, alle antwoorden zijn goed. Het doel is om uw identiteit op de werkvloer en ervaring ten aanzien van binding met de organisatie in kaart te brengen, dus wees vooral eerlijk en uzelf.

Met betrekking tot onderzoeksprocedures gelden de volgende voorwaarden: - Uw deelname is geheel vrijwillig. U kunt weigeren om deel te nemen en/of op elk gewenst moment uw deelname te stoppen, zonder consequenties of opgave van redenen. - Mocht u zich ongemakkelijk voelen bij het beantwoorden van één of meerdere vragen, dan kunt u uw deelname op elk moment stopzetten.

Met betrekking tot het gebruik van uw onderzoeksgegevens, gelden de volgende voorwaarden: - Uw gegevens worden alleen gebruikt voor onderzoeksdoeleinden. - De in deze studie verzamelde gegevens zullen vertrouwelijk worden behandeld. - Anonieme en vertrouwelijke verwerking van data en opslag anonieme data volgens de richtlijnen en procedures van de ethical board.

Als u voor aanvang van deze sessie vragen heeft over het onderzoek kunt u via het onderstaande e-mailadres contact opnemen met de onderzoeker. Deze gegevens zijn ook aan het einde van het onderzoek te vinden, voor als u na de sessie nog vragen over dit onderzoek heeft.

Onderzoeker: j.kunneman@students.uu.nl
Begeleider: Wieby Altink-van den Berg

Gaat u akkoord met bovenstaande informatie?

**Appendix C**

**Turnover items to measure Binding to the Organisation**

1. I will probably look for a new job in the near future.
2. At the present time, I am actively searching for another job in a different organization
3. I do not intend to quit my job
4. It is unlikely that I will actively look for a different organization to work for in the next year
5. I am not thinking about quitting my job at the present time

**Appendix D**

**Self Identity dimension from the Workplace Identity Scale to measure Self Identtiy at Work**

1. My values and organizational values match each other
2. In my job, I have the freedom to decide what to do
3. I will recommend my organization to others
4. My job prevents me from becoming what I want to be
5. I find myself as an integral part of my organization

**Appendix E**

**Developmental Rewards Inducement Items to measure Developmental Rewards**

1. Treat each manager fairly
2. Create opportunities for managers to show their talents
3. Consider their suggestions and comments seriously
4. Consider carefully the career development of managers
5. Empower them fully within their sphere of responsibility
6. Encourage them to participate actively in decisions at the company level
7. Value their feedback on the decisions related to the entire company
8. Care about their general satisfaction at work
9. Respect their human dignity
10. Train them on knowledge and skills for future jobs and career development

**Appendix F**

**Measure of Organizational Inclusion to measure Inclusive Organisational Culture**

1. I am included as a full member of this organization
2. The organization lets me know I am one of its valued members
3. I rarely feel excluded by the organization
4. I feel like I belong at this company
5. I am fully involved in the “life” of my company