

## Appendix 1

### 1. **Prototype valence measure: Examples of task and relationship oriented comments.**

Positive relationship oriented comments reflect friendship or positive bonds between members of the group as a whole. For example, descriptors that we coded as positive relationship oriented statement include “There is a true friendship among team members” (Respondent # 241990) or “We got on very well at a personal level” (Respondent # 240069). Statements that were coded as negative relationship oriented comments reflected dislike for each other in the group, or the expression of negative emotions about members of the group. Examples of this type of statement include “My current workgroup has experienced an unacceptable level of personal difficulties and conflict” (Respondent # 240926) or “There is often antagonism (and) resentment ... among team members” (Respondent # 246222). Task oriented comments related to prototype descriptions that made mention of the group’s tasks either in the form of how they did the task, or how they felt about the task. Examples of positive task oriented comments are “Very committed to efficient operation to achieve result” (Respondent #249360) and “My group is hardworking, committed to the task and good at what it does” (Respondent # 240993). Examples of negative task oriented comments include “My group would do a much better job if they met together to discuss work plans irrespective of affiliations” (Respondent # 139503) or “Motivation to do the job is sometimes lacking” (Respondent #135963).

### 2. **Operationalization of legitimacy and stability of status differences**

Our operationalization of legitimacy reflects the definition and use of this term in social identity theory. According to Bettencourt and Bartholow (1998) legitimacy of status differences between categories refers to the extent to which individuals believe that the status accorded to a category reflects the category’s true status. We interpreted this to suggest that respondents will believe the status hierarchy is legitimate (i.e. that temporary workers should have lower status, and thus

lower rewards, than standard workers) only if temporary workers' training, education, responsibility, or effort is lower than that of standard workers. To the extent that temporary workers' rewards are lower in spite of equal training, education, responsibility, or effort the status hierarchy is illegitimate. We assessed the legitimacy of status differences with an adaptation of the distributive justice scale created by Price and Mueller (1981). Sample items include those that ask if standard and temporary employees in the organization are rewarded equally "if they put in equal effort into their job" or "if they are equal in education and training". The stability of status boundaries refers to the degree to which an individual perceives that the status of an entire category can appreciate or depreciate relative to other categories in a hierarchy. It was assessed with three questions adapted from Federico (1999) asking respondents the extent to which the status of standard and temporary workers in this organization were changing.

### **3. Interview responses about the status of temporary workers in the organization.**

In our interviews with 33 individuals we asked them, among other questions, two open ended questions about what it was like working in this organization, and in the current work group. The responses of these individuals suggested that their preference of standard work was not only on account of security but also because of how they think temporary workers are viewed by both standard and temporary employees in terms of their place in the organization's status hierarchy. The following are some examples of statements that indicate these sentiments.

"I have to be made permanent to develop new projects, which I have to do if I want to progress in the system. Being temporary had really hindered my progress in the system." (Interview 002, Temporary)

“Temporaries are of lower status. You can tell who is a temporary person in a group. You have more influence over a temporary to do things.” (Interview 004, Standard)

“I don’t really feel that I belong to the group. I am a temp. My allegiance is there for as long as they can offer me work but I fully understand if they can’t offer me work. I have no reason to hang around or expect them to move me onto the next one” (Interview 017, Temporary)

“Temps are at the lowest level. There is no commitment to the organization, as the organization has no commitment to us. I’m just doing what I am told to—at one stage of the project. I don’t know what the outcome of the project is and I’m not contributing ideas to the project. I have no knowledge as to the productivity or innovation of the group I work in.” (Interview 019, Temporary)

“When I was temporary trying to look for work, I felt discriminated because I was female and older. Those in the twenties age group have more chance of getting the job and especially those males. Once you get into a permanent position you feel a bit more up the scale and you feel as though you belong a bit more, because you are given more responsibility and there is more expected of you. (Interview 021, Temporary)

“I know temp is at the lowest level. The involvement with the group is much less. And you don’t feel the need of contributing ideas to the group. You may not have a whole picture of the project. (Interview 027, Temporary)

#### **4. Details of supplementary analysis**

##### **a. Additional Factor analysis:**

Since the modest fit statistics for the six factor model could be attributed to the fact that our sample size was relatively small (Byrne 2005), given the number of factors and the indicators per factor (Gagne and Hancock 2006; Kline 1998) we did three more iterations of the CFA, simplifying the model to compensate for our sample size, as suggested by McCallum et al. (1999). In each run we included the three dependent variables, and two of the three variables describing the status hierarchy (i.e. perceived mobility, legitimacy, and stability). Results showed that on average our models with the three dependent variables and some combination of two of the three variables (i.e. perceived mobility, legitimacy, and stability) have adequate fit with an average CFI of .95, IFI of .91 and SRMSR of .03. We considered this as evidence of good fit based on Kline's (1998) recommendation of CFI and IFI values greater than .90, and SRMSR value below .10. Also the factor loadings ranged from .33 to .95 with a mean of .74.

#### **b. Tests of robustness of the hypothesized findings**

First, we checked whether the total effects of proportion of temporary workers \* perceived mobility on prototype valence and the three dependent variables differ for temporary and standard workers. We included an interaction term perceived mobility \* proportion of temporary workers \* work status (i.e. whether the individual is a standard or temporary worker) in our multilevel models for prototype valence and the three dependent variables. We found this term not to be significant in any of the models, suggesting that the effects did not differ for temporary and standard workers.

We also wanted to check if the interaction between proportion of temporary workers and perceived mobility differed between technical and professional workers. We included the three way interaction term perceived mobility \* proportion of temporary workers \* job type (i.e., whether the individual was a professional or technical worker) in our multilevel models for prototype valence and the three dependent variables. Since the interaction term was not significant in any of the models, we concluded that professional and technical employees are similarly influenced by proportion of temporary workers \* perceived mobility.

Next, we wanted to examine if our results would hold if we split the prototype valence construct into its two components, task and relationship related valence. To do this, we coded task and relationship valence into separate 3-point scales, with 1 representing a negative mention of either a task or a relationship aspect of the group and 3 representing a positive mention of either dimension. We found task and relationship valence to be fairly highly correlated ( $r = .56$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This is consistent with results that examine, for example, conflict related to tasks and relationship, which were found to be correlated at  $r = .52$  in a meta-analysis conducted by De Dreu and Weingart (2003). We reran our analysis with these two measures of task and relationship valence in our model rather than the single measure of prototype valence and found similar but weaker results. This is not surprising given the overlap between the two constructs and the lower variance associated with the two 3-point scales when compared with the 5-point valence scale. Specifically, although the effects of proportion of temporary employees \* perceived mobility on group identification and OBSE were fully mediated by task valence, relationship valence mediation effects were only marginal for both group identification and OBSE. This resulted from the impact of proportion of temporary employees \* perceived mobility on relationship valence being marginal for both the group identification and OBSE models. However, relationship valence remained strongly related to both group identification and OBSE. With regard to OCB, as with the model using prototype valence, proportion of temporary employees \* perceived mobility influenced both task and relationship valence but task and relationship valence did not influence OCB.

Finally we ran some additional analysis to test our assumption that both temporary and standard workers want to work with more standard workers when they perceive their own mobility to be high (i.e. temporary workers want to work with others of different work status and standard workers want to work with others of the same work status). Our survey included a single item measure asking respondents the

extent to which they agree or disagree (on a 7-point scale) with the statement that they prefer to work with someone of the same work status. We constructed an interaction term between perceived mobility and whether work status is temporary or standard and examined a multi-level model that includes this interaction term as well as all the control variables in our other models, with the similarity item as the dependent variable. We found that perceived mobility \* work status is related to the desire to work with others of the same work status ( $t = -2.13, p < .05$ ). A plot of the interaction showed that as perceived mobility increases, temporary workers want to work more with dissimilar others whereas standard workers want to work more with similar others (i.e. both want to work with standard workers). This data supports the idea that both temporary and standard employees with lower perceived mobility react more positively to a higher proportion of temporary workers in the group and those with higher perceived mobility react more negatively.

Bettencourt, B., B. Bartholow. 1998. The importance of status legitimacy for intergroup attitudes among numerical minorities. *J. of Soc. Issues* **54** 759-775.

Byrne., B. 2005. Factor analytic models: Viewing the structure of an assessment instrument from three perspectives. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, **85** 17-32.

Gagne, P., G. Hancock. 2006. Measurement Model Quality, Sample Size, and Solution Propriety in Confirmatory Factor Models. [Multivariate Behavioral Research](#). **41**, 65-83.

Kline, R.B. 1998. *Principals and Practice of Structural Equation Modelling*. New York: The Guilford Press.

McCallum, R., K. Widaman, S. Zhang, S. Hong. 1999. Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological Methods*, **4**: 84-99.