



[Jacqueline A-M. Coyle-Shapiro](#)

Managers: caught in the middle of a psychological contract muddle

Paper presented at the symposium 'The employer's side: Advancing our understanding of the psychological contract framework?', Annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Washington DC, August 2001.

You may cite this version as:

Coyle-Shapiro, J. (2001) *Managers: caught in the middle of a psychological contract muddle*. In: Annual meeting of the Academy of Management, August 2001, Washington DC. [online]. London: LSE Research Online.

Available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/2815/>

Available online: October 2007

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>

Contact LSE Research Online at: Library.Researchonline@lse.ac.uk

**MANAGERS: CAUGHT IN THE MIDDLE OF A PSYCHOLOGICAL
CONTRACT MUDDLE**

Jacqueline A-M. Coyle-Shapiro
Industrial Relations
The London School of Economics
Houghton St
London WC2A 2AE
j.a.coyle-shapiro@lse.ac.uk
Tel: +44 207-955-7035
Fax: +44 207-955-7042

Paper presented at the symposium 'The employer's side: Advancing our understanding of the psychological contract framework?', Annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Washington DC, August 2001.

MANAGERS: CAUGHT IN THE MIDDLE OF A PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT MUDDLE

This study examines reciprocity between the employer and employees' psychological contract from the employer's perspective through the lens of middle and senior managers. In addition, the effects of a manager's own psychological contract with the employer, on how they construe the employer's psychological contract with employees, is explored. Using longitudinal data, the findings support the norm of reciprocity from the employer's perspective. A manager's own psychological contract was found to influence how the individual manager interpreted the employer's obligations to employees and how well the employer is fulfilling those obligations. The implications and limitations of the employer's perspective are discussed.

The last decade has seen a marked increase in the attention given to the psychological contract as a framework for understanding the employment relationship. Rousseau (1989) defines the psychological contract as an individual's beliefs regarding the terms and conditions of an exchange relationship between himself/herself and another party (Rousseau, 1989). The majority of researchers have adopted this definition and operationalized the psychological contract in terms of an employee's beliefs regarding the mutual obligations between him/her and his/her employer. As such, it has now become standard to adopt the employee perspective in examining the psychological contract. Research exploring the consequences of the psychological contract is plentiful – the empirical evidence to date is convincing in demonstrating the consequences of contract fulfillment/breach on the attitudes and behavior of employees. Perceived contract breach has been associated with reduced organizational commitment (Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; Tekleab & Taylor, 2000), reduced organizational trust (Robinson, 1996), reduced willingness to engage in organizational citizenship behavior (Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; Robinson & Morrison, 1995; Tekleab & Taylor, 2000; Turnley & Feldman, 1999), and lower employee obligations to the organization (Robinson, Kraatz & Rousseau, 1994).

Although the employee perspective is prevalent, Rousseau's (1989) definition does not exclude the employer's perspective. The use of the term "an individual's beliefs.." opens the door for the employer's perspective through the lens of individual managers. Therefore, a manager's beliefs regarding the mutual obligations between the employer and employee would be consistent with Rousseau's (1989) definition.

However, research attention on the employer's perspective is sparse although some initial attempts have been made (Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 1998; Guest & Conway, 2000; McClear-Lewis & Taylor, 1998).

This paper attempts to extend prior research on the employer's perspective by addressing two questions: Do managers, as employer representatives see a relationship between the employer and employee's contribution to the relationship? In other words, do managers view the relationship as a reciprocal exchange? The second aim of the paper attempts to explore the factors that influence how managers construe the employer's psychological contract? Specifically, as managers have dual roles as organizational representatives and as employees, to what extent does their own psychological contract with their employer influence how they view the employer's psychological contract with employees?

The employer's perspective

The employer's perspective is important as employers, by and large, dictate the terms of the employment relationship. They exercise varying degrees of choice in how they respond to increased competitive pressures and the associated consequences for the management of the employee-employer relationship. Tsui, Pearce, Porter & Tripoli (1997) categorize employer relationships with employees into four using balance and type of exchange as dimensions. The balanced relationships include economic and social based exchanges. The unbalanced exchanges involve relationships where the type of exchange is incongruent between the employer and employees (e.g., employer offering social exchange in return for economic exchange from the employee or the employee adopts a social exchange perspective in return for an economic exchange offered by the

employer). Not only will employers differ in terms of the type of relationship offered to employees, within organizations, the type of relationship may vary across employees. The authors empirically demonstrate that a balanced social exchange perspective or an unbalanced exchange in which the employer offers a social exchange are associated with higher levels of performance and more favorable attitudes than the remaining two relationships.

Managers, as employer representatives play an important role in conveying the parameters of the exchange relationship with employees. While recognizing that managers are not exclusive contract makers, they have a managerial responsibility to monitor and manage the exchange relationship. Lewis-McClear and Taylor (1998) argue that “*only by studying the interactions between these two parties, and the way these interactions evolve over time, can we begin to understand the essence of the employment exchange*” (p.3). Therefore, one contribution of including the employer’s perspective is that it provides a more complete picture by allowing an investigation of the actions and reactions of both parties to the exchange.

A second potential contribution of the employer’s perspective is to assess the degree of mutuality that exists in the relationship. Obtaining the employee and employer perspectives permit an assessment of the extent to which there is agreement on the obligations of both parties and the fulfillment of those obligations. Any disagreement between the two parties could indicate the potential development of contract breach and potentially give insight into whether incongruence or renegeing is the cause of contract breach. Current research generally subscribes to the view that contract breach is a subjective phenomenon- perceptions matter. An individual who is highly vigilant may

search for confirming evidence that his/her employer has breached their psychological contract and may be more likely to perceive a breach at the hint of a transgression. Consequently, it is difficult to ascertain whether a promise was really broken or whether an obligation existed. As Robinson and Morrison (2000) note, it is the inherent subjectivity that makes the examination of contract breach challenging. In other strands of research, researchers attempt to improve the accuracy of measurement of the phenomenon being investigated by gathering data from another source (e.g., supervisory assessment of the extent to which a designated employee engages in citizenship behavior). Therefore, the inclusion of the employer's perspective may improve the accuracy of whether a perceived breach has occurred and the magnitude of that breach. This, in turn raises an interesting question in terms of the relative effect of a perceived breach by one party vis a vis agreement/disagreement on the breach between the two parties. Overall, in view of the potential contribution of the employer's perspective, a priori, we need to gain further insight into how managers view and interpret the psychological contract as employer representatives.

Hypotheses

A key element of the psychological contract draws on the norm of reciprocity from social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). From an employee perspective, the empirical evidence is convincing in its support of the norm of reciprocity in which employees reciprocate the treatment received by the employer. However, there is little empirical support that examines reciprocity from the employer's perspective. In view of the manager's role in the contracting process, it is important to explore whether they see a

relationship between the employer's contribution and that of employees. The following two hypotheses explore this:

Hypothesis 1: Managers' assessment of the employer's obligations will be positively associated with managers' assessment of employee obligations.

Hypothesis 2: Managers' assessment of the fulfillment of employer's obligations will be positively associated with managers' assessment of the fulfillment of those obligations by employees and the extent to which employees display organizational citizenship behavior (OCB).

In attempting to understand the employer's perspective through the lens of managers, one important issue is how managers construe the employer's perspective to the exchange relationship. The creation of employees' psychological contracts can result from several means to include overt statements, expressions of organizational policies and social cues (Rousseau, 1995). These mechanisms through which promises are conveyed vary in the degree to which they are implicit/explicit. When promises are based on an individual's interpretation of ambiguous stimuli, individuals engage in a construal process relying on contextual cues or prior information to interpret the vagueness of a promise. As Rousseau and McLean Parks (1993) note, implicit promises are particularly prone to the construal process and hence may result in incongruent perceptions of the same promise.

In interpreting what the employer has promised and the extent to which the employer has fulfilled those promises, managers may also engage in a construal process.

Particularly in the case of implicit promises, managers may rely on their interpretation of structural signals in arriving at a schema of contracting. Rousseau (1995) argues that organizations may rely on systems to convey intentions to manage the exchange relationship and these systems may be of greater saliency than managers in the contract making process. Guest and Conway (2000) found a positive relationship between the proportion of employees covered by high commitment management practices as assessed by senior managers and the extent to which managers' reported that the organization had fulfilled its obligations to employees. Thus, managers interpret human resource management systems as signals that the employer is delivering on its commitments to employees.

An additional influence in the construal process of managers may be their own psychological contract with their employer. Within the psychological contract framework, managers are unique in that they have dual roles as employees and as employer representatives. Therefore, how managers interpret the employer's perspective does not begin with a "clean slate". Rather, managers may incorporate their own experiences into schemas that influence how they interpret the broader psychological contract an employer has with its employees. Empirical evidence suggests that an individual's experience may have quite powerful effects on how an individual's construal process. Pugh, Skarlicki and Passell (2000) provide empirical evidence supporting the enduring effect of an individual's experience with one employer on how they view the relationship with a subsequent employer. Furthermore, an experience of contract violation can result in negative attitudes that are generalized to other organizations (Andersson & Bateman, 1997). In view of the evidence supporting the generalization

process that individuals engage in, I explore the extent to which managers generalize from their own experience to employees in general.

Hypothesis 3: A manager's own perception of employer obligations to him/her, as an employee will be positively associated with their subsequent interpretation of perceived employer obligations to employees in general.

In evaluating how well the employer is fulfilling its obligations to employees, managers may be influenced by their own experience in terms of how well they believe they have been treated as employees (i.e. how well the employer has fulfilled its obligations to them as employees).

Hypothesis 4: There will be a positive association between a manager's perception of how well the employer is fulfilling its obligations to himself/herself as an individual and how he/she interprets the extent to which the employer is fulfilling its obligations to employees in general.

Furthermore, individuals with high levels of perceived organizational support (POS) are more likely to have a positive bias (as a consequence of affective commitment) toward positively evaluating organizational activities (Eisenberger et al. 1986). Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler (2000) found that employees' level of perceived organizational support was positively associated with subsequent evaluation of employer inducements. If this holds true, managers who report high levels of POS are more likely to hold a positive view of how well the employer is fulfilling its obligations to employees.

Hypothesis 5: There will be a positive association between a manager's perception of organizational support and how he/she interprets the extent to which the employer is fulfilling its obligations to employees in general.

Method

The data used in this longitudinal study utilizes four surveys collected at four measurement occasions spanning two and a half years. The first survey was directed at managers as representatives of the organization assessing employer and employee obligations and fulfillment from the employer perspective. A second survey was administered to managers assessing their own psychological contract with the employer. The third survey replicated the second survey and the final survey replicated the initial survey capturing the employer's perspective to the psychological contract. 37% and 63% of the sample were middle and senior level managers respectively.

Of the 1000 managers surveyed at time 1 capturing the employer's perspective, 708 responded yielding a response rate of 71%. The subsequent survey (time 4) capturing the employer's perspective was mailed to 900 managers. The response rate for this survey was 73%. However, the sample of managers that completed both surveys on the employer's perspective consisted of 328 managers (excluding junior managers and supervisors). 81 managers completed all four surveys over the time period under investigation.

Measures

Managers as employer representatives

Employer obligations as perceived by employer representatives. Managers, as organizational representatives were asked to indicate the extent to which they believed the employer was obligated to provide employees with fifteen obligations based on Rousseau's (1990) work. ($\alpha = .81$ at time 1 and $.80$ at time 4). These obligations included: long term job security, good career prospects, up to date training and development, pay increases to maintain standard of living, fair pay in comparison to employees doing similar work in other organizations, necessary training to do job well, support to learn new skills, fair pay for responsibilities in the job and fringe benefits that are comparable to employees doing similar work in other organizations.

Employer fulfillment of obligations as perceived by employer representatives. Managers were subsequently asked to indicate the extent to which employees in practice had been provided with the same list of fifteen employer obligations. ($\alpha = .86$ and $.89$ at time 1 and time 4 respectively).

Employee obligations as perceived by employer representatives. Managers were asked to indicate the extent to which they believed employees were obligated to provide the employer with ten obligations to include, for example, working extra hours when necessary, volunteering to do tasks that are not part of the job and looking for better ways of doing the job. ($\alpha = .82$ and $.82$ at time 1 and time 4 respectively).

Employee fulfillment of obligations as perceived by employer representatives. Subsequently, managers were asked to indicate the extent to which employees' in practice fulfilled those obligations ($\alpha = .89$ and $.89$ at time 1 and time 4).

Employee Organizational Citizenship Behavior as assessed by employer representatives. Managers were asked to indicate their agreement/disagreement to statements capturing employees' citizenship behavior. This sixteen-item scale was adapted from Van Dyne, Dienesch and Graham (1994). ($\alpha = .75$ and time 1 and $.77$ at time 4).

Managers as employees

Employer obligations as perceived by managers as employees. Managers, as employees were asked to indicate the extent to which they believed their employer was obligated to provide them with a the same list of fifteen employer obligations. ($\alpha = .80$ at time 2).

Employer fulfillment of obligations as perceived by managers as employees. Managers, as employees were asked to indicate the extent to which they in practice had been provided with the same list of fifteen employer obligations. ($\alpha = .86$ at Time 2).

Organizational Support as perceived by managers as employees. Perceived organizational support was measured at Time 3 using seven items from the scale developed by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison and Sowa (1986). ($\alpha = .94$.)

Analysis

Hierarchical regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses. The data used to test hypothesis 1 and 2 exclusively relies on managers responding as organizational representatives. To reduce the possibility of spurious relationships, four demographic variables (gender, age, job and organizational tenure) were entered in step 1 of all the equations. The analysis was conducted on the cross sectional data at Time 1 and Time 4 as well as the longitudinal data. Regarding the latter, the dependent variables (employee

obligations, the fulfillment of those obligations and employees' citizenship behavior measured at time 4) were separately regressed on the demographic variables, perceived employer obligations and fulfillment measured at time 1.

Hypothesis 3 was tested by regressing *perceived employer obligations to employees as assessed by organizational representatives* (Time 4) on the demographic variables (Time 1) and a managers' perception of employer obligations to him/her as an employee (Time 2). Hypothesis 4 was tested by regressing *perceived employer fulfillment of obligations to employees as assessed by organizational representatives* (Time 4) on the demographic variables (Time 1), a manager's perception of the employer's fulfillment of its obligations to him/her as an employee (Time 2). To test hypothesis 5, perceived organizational support (time 3) was entered in the third step of the equation thereby allowing an examination of the unique contribution of POS to explaining variance in the dependent variable.

Results

The results of hypothesis 1 and 2 using the cross sectional data at time 1 and time 4 are presented in Appendix 1 and 2 respectively. Table 2 presents the results using the longitudinal data and provides support for both hypotheses. Perceived employer obligations at time 1 is positively associated with perceived employee obligations at time 4 ($\beta = .26, p < .01$) and explains unique variance in employee obligations ($\Delta F 6.19 \Delta R^2 .06, p < .01$) above that accounted for by fulfillment of employer obligations and the demographic variables. Hypothesis 2 predicted that perceived employer fulfillment of obligations would be positively associated with employee fulfillment of obligations and

organizational citizenship behavior. As shown in Table 2, perceived employer fulfillment of obligations is positively related to employee fulfillment of obligations ($\beta = .21, p < .05 \Delta F 3.38 \Delta R^2 .04, p < .05$) and OCB ($\beta = .23, p < .05 \Delta F 4.21 \Delta R^2 .05, p < .05$) after controlling for perceived employer obligations and the demographic variables.

Table 3 presents the results of hypotheses 3-5. Hypothesis 3 predicted that a manager's own view of his/her employer's obligations to him/her as an employee would influence their interpretation of the employer's obligations to employees in general. As Table 3 (column 1) shows, a manager's own psychological contract explains unique variance ($\Delta F 22.10 \Delta R^2 .16, p < .01$) in how they interpret the employer's psychological contract, as employer representatives. Specifically, a manager's own view of perceived employer obligations to them as employees is positively associated with their view of the employer's obligations to employees more generally ($\beta = .41, p < .01$).

Hypothesis 4 predicted that a manager's view of how well his/her employer was fulfilling its obligations to him/her would be positively associated with how managers assessed the degree to which the employer was fulfilling its obligations to employees in general. The inclusion of a manager's own psychological contract explained unique variance ($\Delta F 9.91 \Delta R^2 .20, p < .01$) in how managers, as employer representatives, interpreted the degree to which the employer was delivering on its obligations to employees. Managerial perceptions of how well the employer is fulfilling its obligations to managers as employees is positively associated with how well managers feel the employer is fulfilling its obligations to employees ($\beta = .27, p < .01$). Hypothesis 5 is supported whereby the degree to which managers felt that the organization supports them

as individuals positively biased their evaluation of the degree to which the employer was fulfilling its obligations to employees generally ($\beta=.42$, $p<.01$ ΔF 16.85 ΔR^2 .14, $p<.01$).

Discussion

The findings of this study support previous research examining the consequences of the psychological contract from an employee perspective. The findings here suggest that the type of relationship managers feel that the employer is signaling to employees and the extent to which they believe those obligations are being fulfilled have important consequences on the degree to which employees fulfill their obligations to the employer and the extent to which they are willing to engage in OCB. Thus, the norm of reciprocity seems to hold true from the employer's perspective indicating that employer representatives recognize the reciprocal nature of the exchange relationship despite the power imbalance that characterizes most employment relationships.

Although the strength of the norm of reciprocity may vary between the two parties to the exchange, these findings add weight to research supporting reciprocal actions from an employee perspective. The strength of the norm of reciprocity needs to be explored from both the employee and employer perspective. Employers who believe that the behavior of its employees is more contingent upon how the employer behaves may be more likely to develop a sophisticated set of practices in an attempt to minimize perceptions of contract breach. Furthermore, employees and their employer may have different perceptions of the strength of reciprocity that operates within the exchange relationship. This may give rise to perceptions of contract breach by employees as a consequence of incongruence between the two parties regarding the norm governing the relationship.

In construing the employer's psychological contract with employees, managers are influenced by their own experience in terms of their psychological contract with the employer. In view of the duality of roles that are a feature of managerial positions, it may be difficult to separate a manager's own experience as a contract recipient from how they interpret the employer's perspective as a contract maker. This may have a potential knock on effect if managers based their behavior as contract makers on their experience as contract recipients; managers who perceive contract breach in their own psychological contract may be less willing to fulfill employees' psychological contracts to the extent that they could.

There are a number of limitations of this study that deserve comment. First, a methodological limitation concerns the time lags between surveys. In examining reciprocity between the perceived employer's psychological contract and that of employees, there was a time lag of two and half years. No account was given to the potential changes in the employer's psychological contract captured at Time 1 to explaining the employees' psychological contract at time 4. The seriousness of this limitation is reduced by the stability of the employer's psychological contract between the two time periods (table 1). Furthermore, the findings of the cross sectional data support the longitudinal findings giving some robustness to the findings. Second, the study is limited in focus as the only predictor used to predict the employer's psychological contract was a manager's own experience as an employee. Whether a manager's own experience has predictive power beyond their assessment of, for example, the organization's human resource practices, needs to be examined in future research.

More broadly, this study faces potential limitations concerning the operationalization of the employer's perspective. This study assumes that managers are employer representatives. This was not empirically examined by asking managers whether they viewed themselves as representing the employer. Whether managers see themselves as representing the employer may be important in understanding how they evaluate the employer's fulfillment of obligations. For example, managers at lower levels of the organization may have less knowledge about organizational practices and policies upon which to make an evaluation of the employer's delivery on its promises. This study attempted to overcome this by excluding junior level managers and supervisors from the managerial sample. However, the counterargument is that regardless of what individual managers believe vis a vis representing the employer, they are in a position of responsibility for the overall management of the employment relationship, at least in the eyes of employees.

A second limitation relates to the level of the relationship examined in assessing the employer's psychological contract with employees. This study adopted a global view whereby managers were asked to assess the employer's psychological contract with employees in general. Other researchers have focused on the dyadic relationship between a manager and an employee (McClear-Lewis & Taylor, 1998). The latter perspective may better capture the idiosyncratic nature of the individual contract between the employer and employee.

A third limitation of this study relates to the operationalization of the employer's perspective and the role of managers. Here, we need to distinguish between a psychological contract between a manager and his/her employees and a manager's

interpretation of the psychological contract between the employer and employee. In the former, the manager is undeniably a party to the psychological contract in which he/she holds certain beliefs regarding the mutual obligations that exist between himself/herself and the employee. The latter perspective captures a manager's interpretation of the relationship between the employer and employees. As this is more general, managers may rely on inferences or observations in evaluating the content of the exchange relationship. Also, managers may be a party to a greater or lesser extent in the relationship with employees. The degree to which they are party to that relationship may influence whether it is the psychological contract or an implied contract that is being captured.

Capturing the employer's perspective goes some way toward developing a more comprehensive understanding of the two-way exchange that underlies the employment relationship. However, a conceptual framework (that extends beyond organizational policies and practices) detailing the factors that affect how managers interpret the employer's psychological contract may be necessary if the psychological contract framework is to accurately reflect the contingent interplay between the exchange parties. We need to know more about how the employer approaches and manages the exchange relationship with employees. To accomplish this, a number of research questions need to be addressed: who represents the employer? Should the relationship be characterized at the global or dyadic level? Is there a difference in the content of the psychological contract at the two levels and how employees respond to that breach? How do managers respond to employee contract breach? Does the model outlined by Morrison and Robinson (1997) detailing the factors contributing to contract breach apply to employer

representatives? Any incidence of perceived employee contract breach may ultimately be a consequence of incongruence or renegeing. The attribution of why employees' have breached their contract may be important in explaining how employer representatives respond to that breach.

References

Andersson, L.M., Bateman, T.S. 1997. Cynicism in the workplace: some causes and effects. Journal of Organizational Behavior 18: 449-469.

Blau, P. 1964. Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley.

Coyle-Shapiro, J., Kessler, I. 1998. The psychological contract in the UK public sector: Employer and employee obligations and contract fulfillment. In S.J. Havlovic (Ed.), Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings 58

Coyle-Shapiro, J. Kessler, I. 2000. Consequences of the psychological contract for the employment relationship: A large scale survey. Journal of Management Studies 37(7): 903-930.

Eisenberger, R. Huntington, R. Hutchison, S. Sowa, D. 1986. Perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology 71: 500-507.

Guest, D., Conway, N. 2000. Can an organization have a psychological contract? A conceptual and empirical analysis. Paper presented at the annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Toronto.

Lewis-McClear, K., Taylor, S. 1998. Psychological contract breach and the employment exchange: Perceptions from employees and employers. In S.J. Havlovic (Ed.), Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings 58

Pugh, S.D., Skarlicki, D.P., Passell, B.S. 2000. After the fall: Layoff victims' trust and cynicism in re-employment. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans.

Robinson, S.L. 1996. Trust and breach of the psychological contract. Administrative Science Quarterly, 41, 574-599.

Robinson, S.L., Kraatz, M.S., & Rousseau, D.M. 1994. Changing obligations and the psychological contract: A longitudinal study. Academy of Management Journal, 37, 137-152.

Robinson, S.L., & Morrison, E.W. 1995. Psychological contracts and OCB: The effect of unfulfilled obligations on civic virtue. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16, 289-298.

Robinson, S.L., & Morrison, E.W. 2000. The development of psychological contract breach and violation: a longitudinal study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21, 525-546.

Rousseau, D.M. 1989. Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal 2: 121-139.

Rousseau, D.M. 1990. New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: A study of psychological contracts. Journal of Organizational Behavior 11: 389-400.

Rousseau, D.M. 1995. Psychological Contracts in Organizations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rousseau, D.M., McLean Parks, J. 1993. The contracts of individuals and organizations. Research in Organizational Behavior. (Vol 15, 1-43). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Tekleab, A.G., Taylor, M.S. 2000. Easing the pain: Determinants and effects of psychological contract violations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Toronto.

Tsui, A.S., Pearce, J.L., Porter, L.W., & Tripoli, A.M. 1997. Alternative approaches to the employee-organization relationship: Does Investment in employees pay off? Academy of Management Journal, 40, 1089-1121.

Turnley, W.H., & Feldman, D.C. 1999. The impact of psychological contract violations on exit, loyalty and neglect. Human Relations, 52, 895-922

Van Dyne, L., Graham, J.W., & Dienesch, R.M. 1994. Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement and validation. Academy of Management Journal 37: 765-802.

TABLE 1. Descriptive statistics and correlations

	Mean	S.D	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Employer obligations T ₂ *	4.25	0.41								
2. Employer fulfillment of obligations T ₂ *	3.32	0.56	.02							
3. Perceived organizational support T ₃ *	4.57	1.23	-.07	.31						
4. Employer obligations as employer reps T ₁	4.26	0.41	.58	-.02	.12					
5. Employer obligations as employer reps T ₄	4.19	0.40	.36	.00	.02	.38				
6. Employer fulfillment as employer reps T ₁	3.06	0.52	.02	.63	.27	.12	.00			
7. Employer fulfillment as employer reps T ₄	3.10	0.58	.08	.44	.50	.14	.12	.52		
8. Employee obligations as employer reps T ₄	3.70	0.57	.19	.17	.09	.17	.26	.23	.20	
9. Employee fulfillment as employer reps T ₄	3.74	0.65	.07	.16	.02	.12	.22	.07	.16	.28
10. Employees' OCB as employer reps T ₁	5.00	0.64	.12	.13	.04	.19	.12	.15	.14	.19
11. Employees' OCB as employer reps T ₄	5.00	0.65	.12	.21	.18	.24	.11	.14	.20	.13

Correlations > .23 are statistically significant at $p < .01$. Correlations > .12 are statistically significant at $p < .05$.

Note * indicates that managers are responding as employees

Table 2 Hierarchical regressions predicting the impact of perceived employer obligations and fulfillment on employees' obligations, fulfillment and OCB as assessed by organizational representatives

	T₄		
	Perceived employee obligations	Perceived employee fulfillment of obligations	Employees' citizenship behavior
Step 1:			
Gender (0=M, 1=F) T ₁	.00	.30**	.24*
Age T ₁	-.05	-.10	-.03
Organizational tenure T ₁	-.10	-.01	.00
Job tenure T ₁	.08	.07	.00
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$.02/.38ns	.05/1.01ns	.03/.50ns
Step 2:			
Perceived employer fulfillment T ₁	.35**	----	----
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$.14/12.92**	----	----
Step 3:			
Perceived employer obligations T ₁	.26**	----	----
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$.06/6.19**	----	----
Step 2:			
Perceived employer obligations T ₁		.20‡	.25*
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$.05/4.49*	.08/6.42**
Step 3:			
Perceived employer fulfillment T ₁		.21‡	.23*
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$.04/3.38‡	.05/4.21*
Adjusted R ₂	.17	.07	.08
Overall F	3.65**	2.06*	2.19*
N	84	84	84

** P<.01 * P<.05 ‡ P<.06 Beta coefficients are reported in columns

Table 3 Hierarchical regression predicting the impact of a manager's own experience as an employee on how they interpret the employer's psychological contract with employees

	Managers, as organizational representatives	
	Employer obligations to employees (time 4)	Employer fulfillment of obligations to employees (time 4)
Step 1:		
Gender (0=M, 1=F) T ₁	.10	-.07
Age T ₁	.06	.01
Organizational tenure T ₁	.00	-.08
Job tenure T ₁	-.10	.00
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$.01/1.04	.01/.24ns
Step 2: Managers as employees		
Perceived employer obligations	.41**	.09
Perceived employer fulfillment of obligations	-.01	.27**
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$.16/22.10**	.20/9.91**
Step 3: Managers as employees		
Perceived organizational Support T ₃	----	.42**
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$	----	.14/16.85**
Adjusted R ₂	.16	.30
Overall F	8.19**	6.02**
N	230	84

** P<.01 * P <.05

Beta coefficients are reported in columns

Appendix 1 Hierarchical regressions predicting the impact of perceived employer obligations and fulfillment on employees' obligations, fulfillment and OCB as assessed by organizational representatives at Time 1

	T₁		
	Perceived employee obligations	Perceived employee fulfillment of obligations	Employees' citizenship behavior
Step 1:			
Gender (0=M, 1=F) T ₁	-.09*	.15**	.13*
Age T ₁	.14**	.06	.04
Organizational tenure T ₁	-.06	.07	-.05
Job tenure T ₁	.02	.07	.07
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$.02/4.10**	.05/9.42**	.05/7.96**
Step 2:			
Perceived employer fulfillment T ₁	.11**	----	----
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$.02/14.22**	----	----
Step 3:			
Perceived employer obligations T ₁	.26**	----	----
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$.06/46.78**	----	----
Step 2:			
Perceived employer obligations T ₁	----	.15**	.18**
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$	----	.03/18.34	.03/26.00**
Step 3:			
Perceived employer fulfillment T ₁	----	.08*	.11‡
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$	----	.01/4.31*	.01/8.72**
Adjusted R ₂	.10	.08	.09
Overall F	13.31**	10.27**	11.41
N	675	669	667

** P<.01 * P<.05 ‡ P<.06 Beta coefficients are reported in columns

Appendix 2 Hierarchical regressions predicting the impact of perceived employer obligations and fulfillment on employees' obligations, fulfillment and OCB as assessed by organizational representatives at Time 4

	T₄		
	Perceived employee obligations	Perceived employee fulfillment of obligations	Employees' citizenship behavior
Step 1:			
Gender (0=M, 1=F) T ₄	.02	.16**	.17**
Age T ₄	-.02	-.04	.08
Organizational tenure T ₄	-.21**	-.02	.04
Job tenure T ₄	.21**	.07	.00
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$.04/3.35**	.03/2.94*	.03/2.45*
Step 2:			
Perceived employer fulfillment T ₄	.26**	---	---
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$.08/30.46**	---	---
Step 3:			
Perceived employer obligations T ₄	.17**	---	---
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$.03/10.87**	---	---
Step 2:			
Perceived employer obligations T ₄	---	.16**	.10
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$	---	.03/11.19**	.01/4.77*
Step 3:			
Perceived employer fulfillment T ₄	---	.12*	.16**
$\Delta R^2 / \Delta F$	---	.01/4.89*	.03/9.15**
Adjusted R ₂	.13	.06	.05
Overall F	9.54**	4.75**	4.03
N	338	337	337

** P<.01 * P<.05 ‡ P<.06 Beta coefficients are reported in columns