



Jacqueline A-M. Coyle-Shapiro and  
Neil Conway

Exchange relationships : examining psychological  
contracts and perceived organizational support

Originally published in Journal of applied psychology, 90 (4). pp. 774-781 © 2005 American Psychological Association.

You may cite this version as:

Coyle-Shapiro, Jacqueline A-M. & Conway, Neil (2005). Exchange relationships : examining psychological contracts and perceived organizational support [online]. London: LSE Research Online.

Available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/archive/00000828>

Available online: July 2006

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.

This document is the author's final manuscript version of the journal article, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer review process. Some differences between this version and the publisher's version remain. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Exchange relationships: Examining psychological contracts and perceived organizational support

Jacqueline A-M. Coyle-Shapiro  
Department of Industrial Relations  
The London School of Economics  
Houghton Street  
London WC2A 2AE  
j.a.coyle-shapiro@lse.ac.uk  
Tel: +44 (0)207-955-7035  
Fax: +44 (0)207-955-7042

Neil Conway  
Department of Organizational Psychology  
Birkbeck  
University of London  
Malet Street  
London WC1E 7HX  
Tel: +44 (0)207 631-6744  
Fax: +44 (0)207 631-6750  
[n.conway@bbk.ac.uk](mailto:n.conway@bbk.ac.uk)

Coyle-Shapiro, J. A-M & Conway, N. (2005) Exchange relationships: An examination of psychological contracts and perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90 (4), 774-781.

The authors would like to thank Gregory Irving, Amanuel Tekleab and Susan Taylor for their comments. We would also like to thank the editor and reviewers for their insightful comments on previous versions of this manuscript. An early version of this paper was presented at the Annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Washington DC, August 2001. Neil Conway is a Leverhulme Trust Research Fellow and would like to thank the trust for their support.

Exchange relationships: Examining psychological contracts and perceived organizational support

Three hundred and forty seven public sector employees were surveyed on four measurement occasions to investigate the conceptual distinctiveness of the psychological contract and perceived organizational support (POS) and how they are associated over time. Results support the distinctiveness of the two concepts. In terms of their inter-relationships over time, drawing on psychological contract theory, we found little support for a reciprocal relationship between POS and psychological contract fulfillment. Under an alternative set of hypotheses, drawing on organizational support theory and by separating psychological contract fulfillment into its two components (perceived employer obligations and inducements), we found that perceived employer inducements was positively related to POS which, in turn, was negatively related to perceived employer obligations. Finally, the results suggest that POS and the components of psychological contract fulfillment are more important in predicting organizational citizenship behavior than psychological contract fulfillment.

Researchers have increasingly adopted social exchange as a theoretical foundation for understanding relationships between individuals and their organizations. Blau (1964) describes social exchange as entailing unspecified obligations; where an individual does another a favor, there is an expectation of some future return. The future return is based on an individual trusting the other party to fairly discharge their obligations over the long run (Holmes, 1981). Underlying is the norm of reciprocity, which obligates individuals to respond positively to favorable treatment received by others (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960). In operationalizing the employee-employer exchange, two frameworks have been increasingly but not exclusively adopted; namely, psychological contracts and perceived organizational support.

The psychological contract has been defined as an individual's belief regarding the terms and conditions of an exchange relationship with another party (Rousseau, 1989). Perceived organizational support (POS) captures an individual's perception concerning the degree to which an organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison & Sowa, 1986). Research on the two frameworks has largely remained independent although Aselage and Eisenberger (2003) have recently attempted to integrate POS and psychological contract theory. The authors argue that integrating both frameworks provides a more comprehensive understanding of the employee-employer relationship. Nonetheless, there exists a degree of divergence among psychological contract researchers as to the relationship between the two frameworks. The concepts as defined clearly refer to different phenomena; however, on occasion, researchers have treated them as synonymous (POS as a proxy for contract fulfillment – Millward & Brewerton, 2000) or as an element of an individual's psychological contract (Guzzo, Noonan & Elron, 1994). Other research has recognized the conceptual distinctiveness of the two concepts and investigated POS as an antecedent and

outcome of psychological contract fulfillment/breach (Tekleab, Takeuchi & Taylor, In press; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000).

In light of the ambiguity surrounding the relationship between the two concepts, our aim and contribution to existing research is twofold: to examine whether the concepts are distinct and to explore their relationship to each other over time. We draw on psychological contract theory to examine whether the potential relationship between the two constructs is reciprocal. We then use organizational support theory to provide an alternative explanation for this reciprocal relationship and explore the relationship between POS and the two components of contract fulfillment (i.e. perceived employer obligations and inducements). Finally, we examine the relative effect of POS and psychological contract fulfillment on two dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior.

### Comparing Psychological Contracts and POS

Psychological contracts and POS are similar in that they are both grounded in social exchange (Blau, 1964) and rely on the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) as the explanatory mechanism for their consequences on employee attitudes and behavior. A prominent strand of psychological contract research has explored reciprocity by investigating the consequences of perceived contract fulfillment/breach (i.e., the extent to which the employee believes the other party has fulfilled or failed to fulfill one or more of its promised obligations) on employee attitudes and behavior. Empirical evidence supports a positive relationship between perceived contract fulfillment and employees' commitment to the organization (Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000), organizational trust (Robinson, 1996), organizational citizenship behavior (Robinson & Morrison, 1995; Tekleab & Taylor, 2000) and a negative association with neglect of in-role job duties (Turnley & Feldman, 2000) and turnover intentions (Turnley & Feldman, 1999).

Supportive of the underlying norm of reciprocity, a positive relationship has been found between POS and organizational commitment (Eisenberger, Fasolo & Davis-LaMastro, 1990; Shore & Tetrick, 1991; Shore & Wayne, 1993), in-role performance (Eisenberger et al., 1986; 1990), organizational citizenship behavior (Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff, 1998; Shore & Wayne, 1993; Wayne, Shore & Liden 1997) and a negative relationship with absenteeism (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

Psychological contract fulfillment and POS are also both positioned as key means by which an employee globally evaluates the employment relationship with the organization. The content of psychological contracts may encompass potentially any item that might be exchanged between the organization and the employee (e.g., pay, training, support, in exchange for loyalty, performance, flexibility). Similarly, an employee's perception of organizational support ranges beyond emotion-relational items such as caring for their well being, to also include such things as assistance with job performance, job enrichment, and working conditions (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Hence, the content of POS and psychological contract fulfillment include a wide range of items relating to the employee–organization exchange.

The two concepts are distinct in a number of respects. Firstly, in the 'belief' referred to by each concept. POS captures employees' beliefs regarding the level of the organization's commitment to them (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Wayne, Shore & Liden, 1997). In contrast, psychological contract theory captures perceived mutual obligations and the extent to which those obligations are fulfilled in the employee-employer exchange relationship.

A second difference relates to the interdependence of the parties to the exchange. POS is one-sided in that it focuses on the employer's side of the exchange as perceived by employees. Psychological contract theory includes an employee and employer perspective; that is, the

contingent relationship between an employee's perception of the reciprocal obligations between that individual and the employer .

Finally, the two constructs differ in how they capture an employee's evaluation of the quality of the exchange. POS captures an individual's perception of organizational treatment regardless of whether that treatment was explicitly or implicitly promised. Perceived organizational support theory predicts that employees reciprocate based on the perceived *level* of organizational support. In contrast, psychological contract theory predicts that it is not the organization's treatment *per se* but the *discrepancy* between what is promised and what is fulfilled that provides the basis upon which employees reciprocate.

The common ground shared by the two constructs – in terms of their focus on the employee-organization relationship and their reliance on the norm of reciprocity to explain a similar set of employee outcomes (e.g., affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior) – questions the unique contribution of the concepts to understanding the exchange relationship. It is thus important to explore the interrelationship between the two concepts and to examine whether they make a distinct contribution to explaining employee outcomes when included in the same design.

#### Relating POS and Psychological Contract Fulfillment

Psychological contract theory states that psychological contract breach may lead to the erosion of the foundation of the relationship (Robinson, 1996; Rousseau, 1989). Rousseau (1989, p.129) argues that the intensity of how an individual responds to contract breach “is directly attributable not only to unmet expectations of specific rewards or benefits, but also to more general beliefs about respect of persons, codes of conduct and other patterns of behavior associated with relationships involving trust”. Employee perceptions of psychological contract

breach may undermine feeling valued by the employer, particularly if employees attribute the reason for the breach as the fault of the employer rather than due to factors outside the employer's control or as a consequence of incongruence. Employers that fulfill promises to employees signal that they are committed to employees, value employee contributions and intend to continue with the relationship. Such signals are consistent with favorable treatment and should contribute to the development of POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) and hence, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 1a: Psychological contract fulfillment will positively predict employee perceptions of organizational support.

Psychological contract theory would also suggest that POS should influence psychological contract fulfillment (Rousseau, 1995; Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Robinson, 1996). In other words, there should be a reciprocal relationship between POS and psychological contract fulfillment. Rhoades, Eisenberger and Armeli (2001) argue that perceived organizational support signals the organization's preference for relational contracts and Morrison and Robinson (1997) suggest that relational exchanges discourage employee vigilance and, hence, employees are less likely to perceive contract breach. Employees that have a supportive relationship with their employer may be less inclined to monitor, as they would have benevolent views of their employer's actions. Furthermore, Aselage and Eisenberger (2003) note that employees in supportive relationships give the employer the benefit of the doubt when evaluating the degree to which they believe obligations have been fulfilled. Thus, POS may create a positive evaluation bias in the degree to which employees believe that their employer has fulfilled its obligations in addition to reducing the extent to which employees monitor the exchange.



Hypothesis 1b: Employee perceptions of organizational support will positively predict psychological contract fulfillment.

While psychological contract fulfillment and POS are presented as a reciprocal relationship, the weight of expectation is that psychological contract fulfillment will be a stronger predictor of POS rather than *vice versa*. This is based on a number of studies that position cognitive evaluations of the work environment (in this case, psychological contract fulfillment) as determinants of affective outcomes (in this case, POS). These approaches include studies that have examined contract breach as an antecedent of affect (Conway & Briner, 2002; Robinson & Morrison, 2000).

#### Relating POS and the Components of Psychological Contract Fulfillment

An alternative way of understanding the relationship between psychological contract fulfillment and perceived organizational support is to unpack the concept of fulfillment into its two component elements (i.e., perceived employer obligations and inducements) and utilize organizational support theory. As noted earlier, psychological contract fulfillment is an employee's perceptions of whether the level of perceived obligations are matched by delivered inducements. Separating the two elements of psychological contract fulfillment permits a more fine-grained examination of the relationship between perceived organizational support and psychological contract fulfillment.

Drawing on organizational support theory and separating psychological contract fulfillment into its components, we propose alternative explanations for relationships predicted under Hypothesis 1a and 1b. Firstly, we argue that perceived inducements leads to perceived organizational support and that it is the inducements component of psychological contract fulfillment that explains the relationship between psychological contract fulfillment and POS (as

stated previously under Hypothesis 1a). Secondly, we argue that perceived organizational support reduces employees' perceptions of the organization's obligations towards them and that this, assuming inducements remain constant, explains the perceptions of increasing contract fulfillment (as stated previously under Hypothesis 1b).

There is accumulating empirical evidence supporting a positive relationship between supportive organizational practices and perceived organizational support. In particular, organizational practices such as participation in decision making (Allen, Shore & Griffeth, 2003), fairness of rewards (Allen et al., 2003), developmental experiences and promotions (Wayne, Shore & Liden, 1997), autonomy (Eisenberger, Rhoades & Cameron, 1999) and job security (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) have been demonstrated to have a positive effect on perceived organizational support. Eisenberger, Jones, Aselage and Sucharski (2004) note that strong investments of resources in employees contribute substantially to perceived organizational support. The effects of specific practices on perceived organizational support should be stronger if employees attribute these practices to the voluntary, intentional actions of the employer. Thus, we argue that the greater the inducements provided by the employer that signal investment in employees and recognizes their contributions, perceived organizational support is likely to be enhanced.

Hypothesis 2a: Perceived employer inducements will positively predict employees' perceived organizational support.

Organizational support theory suggests that high levels of perceived organizational support obliges employees to reciprocate, based on the norm of reciprocity. Greenberg (1980) argues that individuals reduce feelings of indebtedness upon receiving rewards by engaging in behavioral reciprocation and by cognitively restructuring the situation. In terms of the latter,

employees reduce indebtedness by increasing their own obligations to their employer or reducing what they perceive as their employer's obligations toward them. Cognitively adjusting the situation in terms of perceived obligations toward or from the other party may occur when employees feel that they have no immediate opportunity to reciprocate and adjusting obligations is a least costly mode of debt reduction (Greenberg, 1980). Eisenberger et al. (2001) found a positive relationship between perceived organizational support and employees' obligation to care about the organization and help the organization achieve its goals. Here we argue that cognitive adjustment following the receipt of support takes the form of employees reducing what they perceive as the employer's obligations towards them.

Hypothesis 2b: Perceived organizational support will negatively predict employees' perception of employer obligations.

#### Using POS and the Psychological Contract to Predict Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Researchers have argued that exchange-based frameworks are especially relevant to understanding discretionary behavior at work as situational constraints may limit an individual's ability to lower their in-role performance in response to employer treatment (Organ, 1990; Turnley & Feldman, 1999). POS and psychological contract fulfillment have separately been found to be associated with organizational citizenship behavior (Robinson & Morrison, 1995; Turnley & Feldman, 1999; Eisenberger et al., 1990; Moorman, Blakely & Niehoff, 1998). Researchers have proposed a number of dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior (Organ, 1988; Van Dyne, Graham & Dienesch, 1994) among which civic virtue and loyalty have been used in prior studies to examine the consequences of perceived organizational support (Moorman et al., 1998) and psychological contract fulfillment (Robinson & Morrison, 1995). As the two constructs adopt a different basis upon which employees reciprocate (level of

organizational support versus the discrepancy between what is promised and delivered), we propose that both will remain important predictors of citizenship behavior when examined concurrently.

Hypothesis 3: Perceived organizational support and psychological contract fulfillment will positively predict employees' reported organizational citizenship behavior.

### Method

The participants were employees of a local government located in the south east of England who were surveyed on four occasions (2.5, 3 and 5 years subsequent to the first survey). At time 1, 21,000 surveys were distributed and 6,900 returned completed surveys and at time 2, of the 20,000 distributed, approximately 6,000 were returned yielding a response rate of 33% and 30% respectively. The sample of employees responding at both time 1 and time 2 was found to be representative of the organization along a number of key demographic characteristics including gender, age, organizational tenure, work status and salary band. A random sub sample of 1400 employees was selected from the respondents at time 2 to complete a third survey (this was due to the financial constraints of administering an organization-wide survey), of which 660 returns yielding a response rate of 47%. Of the 462 employees who completed surveys at times 1, 2 and 3, 393 employees responded to the Time 4 survey. The sample was reduced to 347 when part-time employees and surveys with missing data were eliminated. The final sample to be used in the analysis was 31% male, with a mean age of 43.5 years, a mean job tenure of 6.3 years and a mean organizational tenure of 11.1 years. 61% of respondents were trade union members. The sample consisted of teachers (29%), social workers (7%), engineers (5%), other professionals (16%), administrators (10%), supervisors and managers (25%) and other (8%).

## Measures

The first and second survey captured perceived employer obligations and inducements and perceived organizational support. The third survey measured the two dimensions of citizenship behavior: civic virtue and loyalty. The first and fourth survey captured perceived psychological contract fulfillment.

### Measures of the psychological contract: obligations, inducements and contract fulfillment.

At time 1 and time 2 respondents indicated the extent to which they believed their employer was obliged to provide a list of 12 items. These items capture aspects of the employment relationship studied in the majority of previous research (Robinson, 1996; Rousseau, 1990; Turnley & Feldman, 1999) such as pay, job security and career prospects. Participants were provided with a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'not at all' to 'a very great extent' (in addition to a 'not appropriate/not sure' category).

Inducements were measured by presenting respondents with the same 12 items and requesting that they indicate the extent to which the item had actually been provided (along a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'not at all' to 'a very great extent').

At times 1 and time 4 respondents were asked to report the extent to which they believed their employer had fulfilled the same list of twelve obligations (along a five point scale ranging from 'not at all fulfilled' to 'very well fulfilled' in addition to a 'not obligated to provide' category). This approach to measuring contract fulfillment has been used in prior research (Craig & Tetrick, 2003; Turnley & Feldman, 2000).

POS. Perceived organizational support was measured at times 1 and time 2 using seven items from the scale developed by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison and Sowa (1986). Following Rhoades et al. (2000) we used the seven items with the highest factor loadings from

the original thirty-six item scale, as this study began prior to the publication of the short form of the perceived organizational support scale (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, Lynch & Rhoades 1997). The items were reworded replacing ‘organization’ with ‘employer’ to remain consistent with the measurement of the psychological contract. Although the terms employer and organization are frequently treated as synonymous in the psychological contract literature, we acknowledge that our rewording of the perceived organizational support scale narrows the focus of the original measure. We believe this alteration was justified to maintain consistency with the measure of the psychological contract and that the resultant measure is a very close proxy to the standard perceived organizational support scale.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Two dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior were measured at Time 3. Three items were taken from Van Dyne, Graham and Dienesch (1994) to capture loyalty and four items measuring civic virtue were taken from Podsakoff, McKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990). Items were rated on a five-point scale ranging from ‘not at all’ to ‘a very great extent’.

## Results

Items measuring POS and the two components of contract fulfillment (perceived employer obligations and inducements) were factor analyzed (principal components, varimax rotation) at time 1 and time 2. The results yielded the same factors at the two time periods (Table 1 presents the time 2 results). As shown, the results support the factorial independence of POS from the two components of contract fulfillment. With the exception of job security as an obligation, the factor analysis supports the distinctiveness of obligations and inducements. Items measuring obligations were aggregated into an overall measure, as were items measuring

inducements, as we are primarily interested in the psychological contract as a system of promises to parallel the global measure of POS.

INSERT TABLES 1 & 2 HERE

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, correlations and Cronbach reliability coefficients for the main study variables. Hierarchical regression analysis was used to test the Hypotheses. Five control variables were entered in all the equations (age, gender, organizational tenure, job tenure, and trade union membership) to reduce the possibility of spurious relationships based on these types of personal characteristics. As shown in Table 3, Hypothesis 1a is supported whereby contract fulfillment at time 1 has a positive effect on POS at time 2 ( $\beta = .21, p < .01$ ); however, no support was found for Hypothesis 1b as the relationship between POS at time 2 and psychological contract fulfillment at time 4 was non-significant ( $\beta = -.03$ ).

INSERT TABLES 3 & 4 HERE

As Table 3 shows, perceived employer inducements at time 1 positively predicts perceived employer support at time 2 ( $\beta = .26, p < .01$ ) supporting Hypothesis 2a. Psychological contract fulfillment is no longer significant suggesting that the component of inducements explains the relationship between the psychological contract and POS. Hypothesis 2b was tested by regressing perceived employer obligations at time 2 on the control variables, the dependent variable at time 1 and POS at time 1. As hypothesized, POS at time 1 negatively predicts perceived employer obligations at time 2 ( $\beta = -.13, p < .01$ ). In summary, these results support the proposition that the relationship between psychological contract fulfillment and POS can be understood through the components of contract fulfillment.

To test Hypothesis 3 the two dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior at time 3 were separately regressed on the time 1 variables of psychological contract fulfillment, POS,

perceived employer obligations and inducements. The results in Table 4 show that Hypothesis 3 is partially supported with respect to the effects of POS on loyalty ( $\beta = .23, p < .01$ ), but not civic virtue ( $\beta = .07, p$  non-significant). Psychological contract fulfillment is not significantly related to either dimension of organizational citizenship behavior after the components are entered; rather, it is the elements of contract fulfillment that are significant. Perceived employer inducements is positively related to civic virtue ( $\beta = .25, p < .05$ ) and perceived employer obligations is positively related to loyalty ( $\beta = .13, p < .05$ ) and civic virtue ( $\beta = .19, p < .01$ ).

### Discussion

Interest in the employment relationship shows no sign of abating and a key challenge for researchers is to understand how employees evaluate this exchange. This study attempts to advance research by examining two frameworks that are increasingly adopted to capture the exchange relationship between employees and their employer, but have so far been largely examined independently of one another. Our findings seem to support the view presented by Aselage and Eisenberger (2003) that an integration of organizational support theory and psychological contract theory may provide a more comprehensive basis to understanding the employment relationship.

The findings suggest that POS is distinct from the components of the psychological contract. Factor analysis results revealed that there was very little overlap across measures of POS and the psychological contract. The two frameworks were also found to differentially predict organizational citizenship behavior, further supporting the distinct contribution of the two frameworks to understanding the employment relationship.

The main contribution of this study was to examine how the psychological contract and POS are associated over time. One way of regarding the relationship between these two



concepts is a reciprocal relationship between POS and psychological contract fulfillment; however, our findings suggest that this reciprocal relationship is better understood by considering the relationship between POS and the components of psychological contract fulfillment. More specifically, it is inducements that appear to explain the effects of psychological contract fulfillment on POS and, while POS was not a significant predictor of psychological contract fulfillment, POS negatively predicted employees' perceptions of the organization's obligations towards them. Linking these results, it could be argued that there is an unfolding process whereby POS is an antecedent and outcome of the components of psychological contract fulfillment ( $\uparrow$  perceived employer inducements  $\rightarrow$   $\uparrow$  POS  $\rightarrow$   $\downarrow$  perceived employer obligations). This unfolding process is consistent with organizational support theory in that employer inducements signal to employees the extent to which their employer values their contributions and cares about their well-being that, in turn, prompts employees to reduce feelings of indebtedness by cognitively reducing their employer's perceived obligations to them.

The finding that POS leads to a reduction in employees' perception of employer obligations has also provided insight into the regulatory role of the psychological contract in the employee-employer relationship. It suggests that in relationships characterized by increasing levels of organizational support the importance of the psychological contract in terms of felt obligations recedes into the background, whereas in relationships characterized by decreasing organizational support employees are more likely to invoke the psychological contract, possibly as a means of regulating a deteriorating relationship. In the absence of POS employees may become more vigilant in monitoring the extent to which their employer is fulfilling the letter of the contract. This integrates several strands of literature relating to contracts in organizations. Work on relational contracts argues that individuals are less likely to perceive the relationship in

terms of reciprocal obligations (Fitzgibbons, 1992). Furthermore, research on agency theory (e.g., Sharma, 1997; Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1993) is based on the assumption that contracts are necessary in relationships where there is insufficient trust in the other party to execute their side of the bargain, hence the need for contracts. Our results suggest that employees also perceive psychological contracts to be necessary in relationships characterized by low support.

Our pattern of findings suggest that psychological contract fulfillment is not a strong predictor of organizational citizenship behavior relative to its component elements and POS. In other words, the motivating mechanism for organizational citizenship behavior is not psychological contract fulfillment, but what employees receive and anticipate receiving in the future. The finding that inducements and obligations matter more than contract fulfillment in terms of predicting organizational citizenship behaviors is in line with early social exchange theory that emphasized what is actually exchanged and resultant feeling of obligation and indebtedness (e.g., Blau, 1964), rather than supporting psychological contract theory, which would suggest that it is the discrepancy between what you expect to get and what you actually receive matters most in predicting behavior.

A strength of this study lies in its attempt to examine two closely related exchange constructs over time. However, several limitations should be noted. First, all the variables were captured using self-report survey measures. Consequently, the observed relationships may have been artificially inflated as a result of respondents' tendencies to respond in a consistent manner. However, the measurement of the independent and dependent variables over different measurement occasions in the present study reduces the potential for common method bias but does not eliminate it completely. Second, the range of outcomes considered here could be extended to further behavioral and attitudinal outcomes, such as job performance and turnover.

Third, the discussion of processes has been limited to a small number of time points. While clearly an advancement on cross-sectional approaches, it would have been beneficial to have a greater number of time points to further unravel the unfolding relationships. Fourth, the time lapse between surveys is arguably too long. However, at present there are no theoretical guidelines within psychological contract theory or social exchange theory specifying an acceptable time frame. Indeed, it could be argued that most longitudinal studies concerning the psychological contract, which typically adopt intervals of 6 months to 2 years (e.g., Robinson, 1996; Robinson & Morrison, 1995) are also too long. Notwithstanding the issue of time lags, our analysis still captures whether changes to variables assessed through repeated measures from the same individual follow predictable patterns across the sample.

Future research is needed to replicate and extend these findings. Additional research is needed to explore the relationship between POS and psychological contracts in other types of samples and with other outcomes such as organizational commitment and employee well-being. In this study, we have focused on employer obligations consistent with most of the psychological contract research. However, the psychological contract includes perceptions of employee and employer obligations so future research could pay greater attention to employee obligations toward the employer as a form of reciprocation and examine its potential relationship to POS. Most importantly, future research should further unpack the components of breach. Previous research on the psychological contract has largely considered breach as the main explanatory variable linking the psychological contract with outcomes. However, psychological contract fulfillment combines perceived obligations and the delivery of those obligations and this paper has shown there are insights to be gained from separating the components. This is in line with recent theoretical research by Rousseau (2001) who advocates a shift in emphasis towards

investigating the formation of reciprocal promises and obligations.

## References

- Allen, D.G., Shore, L.M., Griffeth, R.W (2003). The role of POS in the voluntary turnover process. *Journal of Management*, 29, 99-118.
- Aselage, J., Eisenberger, R. (2003). Perceived organizational support and psychological contracts: A theoretical integration, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 491-509.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Conway, N., Briner, R.B. (2002). A daily diary study of affective responses to psychological contract breach and exceeded promises, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 287-302.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. Kessler, I. (2000). Consequences of the psychological contract for the employment relationship: A large scale survey. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37, 903-930.
- Craig, D.D., Tetrick, L.E. (2001). Psychological contract breach and violation: The role of the employment relationship and organizational justice. Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management*, Washington D.C.
- Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived Organizational Support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 812-820.
- Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P.D., & Rhoades, L. (2001) Reciprocation of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 42-51.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 51-59.

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

Eisenberger, R., Jones, J.R., Aselage, J., Sucharski, I.L. (2004). Perceived organizational support. In J. A-M Coyle-Shapiro, L.M. Shore, M.S. Taylor & L.E. Tetrick (Eds), *The employment relationship: Psychological and contextual perspectives*, 206-225. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eisenberger, R., Rhoades, L., & Cameron, J. (1999). Does pay for performance increase or decrease perceived self-determination and intrinsic motivation? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 1026-1040.

Fitzgibbons, D.E. (1992). A critical reexamination of employee absence: the impact of relational contracting, the negotiated order, and the employment relationship. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 10*, 73-120.

Gouldner, A.W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity. *American Sociological Review, 25*, 161-178.

Greenberg, M.S (1980). A theory of indebtedness. In Gergen, K.J., Greenberg, M.S., & Willis, R.H. (Eds). *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research*. New York: Plenum Press.

Guzzo, R.A., Noonan, K.A., Elron, E. 1994. Expatriate managers and the psychological contract. *Journal of Applied Psychology 79*, 617-626.

Holmes, J.G. (1981). The exchange process in close relationships: Microbehavior and macro-motives. In M.J. Lerner & S.C. Lerner (Eds.) *The justice motive in social behavior* (pp.261-284). New York: Plenum.

Millward, L.J., Brewerton, P.M. (2000). Psychological contracts: Employee relations for the twenty-first century. In C.L. Cooper & I.T. Robertson (Eds.) *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 15, 1-61. John Wiley & Sons.

Moorman, R.H., Blakely, G.L., & Niehoff, B.P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 351-357.

Morrison, E.W. Robinson, S.L. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 226-256.

Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington Books: Lexington, MA.

Organ, D.W. (1990) The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Vol 12, pp. 43-72.

Podsakoff, P.M. MacKenzie, S.B. Moorman, R.H. Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142.

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698-714.

Rhoades, L Eisenberger, R. & Armeli, S. (2001). Employee commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 825-836.

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.

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

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. (2001). Schema, promise and mutuality: The building blocks of the psychological contract. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74*, 511-541.

Rousseau, D.M. & McLean Parks, J. (1993). The contracts of individuals and organizations. In L.L. Cummings & B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, (Vol 15, pp 1-43). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Sharma, A. (1997). Professional as agent: Knowledge asymmetry in agency exchange. *Academy of Management Review, 22*, 758-798.

Shore, L., & Tetrick, L. (1991). A construct validity study of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 637-643.

Shore, L., & Wayne, S. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior: Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 774-780.



Tekleab, A.G., Takeuchi, R., & Taylor, M.S. (In Press). Extending the chain of relationships among organizational justice, social exchange, and employee reactions: The role of contract violations. *Academy of Management Journal*

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

Turnley, W.H., & Feldman, D.C. (2000) Re-examining the effects of psychological contract violations: unmet expectations and job dissatisfaction as mediators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 25-42.

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

Wayne, S.J., Shore, L.M., & Liden, R.C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 82-111.

**Table 1**  
**Factor Analysis Results of Perceived Organizational Support, Employer Obligations and Inducements**

<i>Item</i>	<i>Factor</i>					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>Items</b>						
POS: My employer cares about my well-being	<b>.89</b>	.15	-.04	.08	-.03	.05
POS: My employer values my contributions to its well being	<b>.87</b>	.17	-.03	.09	-.02	.02
POS: My employer cares about my opinions	<b>.85</b>	..21	.00	.11	-.03	.01
POS: My employer considers my goals and values	<b>.85</b>	.21	-.02	.11	-.04	.07
POS: My employer cares about my general satisfaction at work	<b>.84</b>	.18	-.04	.13	-.02	.05
POS: My employer is willing to help me when I need a special favor	<b>.80</b>	.08	.00	.11	-.02	.00
POS: My employer shows very little concern for me ®	<b>.77</b>	.15	-.03	.07	-.03	.01
Induc: Up to date training and development	.15	<b>.80</b>	.00	.09	.05	.05
Induc: The necessary training to do my job well	.09	<b>.77</b>	.00	.09	.08	.04
Induc: Support when I want to learn new skills	.26	<b>.72</b>	.08	.17	.00	-.01
Induc: Freedom to do my job well	.27	<b>.65</b>	.04	.07	.03	.00
Induc: Opportunity to be involved in decisions that affect me	.39	<b>.60</b>	.04	.11	.01	.03
Induc: Interesting work	.05	<b>.50</b>	.24	.01	-.11	.19
Oblig: Up to date training and development	-.03	.06	<b>.79</b>	-.02	.14	.11
Oblig: The necessary training to do my job well	-.02	.07	<b>.71</b>	.04	.29	-.07
Oblig: Support when I want to learn new skills	.02	.03	<b>.64</b>	-.05	.28	-.01
Oblig: Interesting work	.03	.03	<b>.62</b>	-.04	-.03	.33
Oblig: Opportunity to be involved in decisions that affect me	-.01	.06	<b>.57</b>	.03	.30	-.09
Oblig: Freedom to do my job well	-.07	.09	<b>.54</b>	.06	.26	-.06
Oblig: Good career prospects	-.10	.00	.53	.01	.10	.50
Induc: Fair pay for responsibilities in job	.14	.10	.01	<b>.86</b>	-.07	-.01
Induc: Fair pay compared to staff doing similar work in other organizations	.11	.12	.01	<b>.84</b>	-.03	.02
Induc: Pay increases to maintain my standard of living	.12	.15	.01	<b>.77</b>	-.03	.10
Induc: Fringe benefits that are fair compared to what staff doing similar work in other organizations get	.16	.09	-.01	<b>.76</b>	-.02	-.04
Oblig: Fair pay compared to staff doing similar work in other organizations	-.03	.02	.28	-.03	<b>.78</b>	.05
Oblig: Fringe benefits that are fair compared to what staff doing similar work in other organizations get	-.01	.00	.17	-.03	<b>.77</b>	.09
Oblig: Fair pay for responsibilities in job	-.05	.02	.38	.00	<b>.75</b>	.01
Oblig: Pay increases to maintain my standard of living	-.05	.00	.24	-.15	<b>.69</b>	.22
Oblig: Long term job security	-.05	-.07	.19	-.10	.21	<b>.68</b>
Induc: Long term job security	.15	.23	-.09	.10	.08	<b>.58</b>
Induc: Good career prospects	.23	.39	-.01	.25	-.03	<b>.50</b>
Eigenvalue	7.33	5.05	2.43	1.86	1.33	1.18
Percentage of variance explained	23.7	16.3	7.9	6.0	4.3	3.8

Note. ® reversed scored

**Table 2**  
**Descriptive Statistics, Zero-Order Correlations, and Reliabilities for Major Variables**

	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Gender (F=1, M=0) T <sub>1</sub>	0.69	0.46															
2. Trade union membership T <sub>1</sub>	0.61	0.49	-.04														
3. Job tenure T <sub>1</sub>	6.32	5.46	-.03	.14													
4. Age T <sub>1</sub>	43.53	8.48	-.11	.22	.14												
5. Organizational tenure T <sub>1</sub>	11.13	7.59	-.21	.38	.21	.52											
6. Perceived organizational support T <sub>1</sub>	3.96	1.47	.00	.03	-.03	.03	.05	(.94)									
7. Perceived organizational support T <sub>2</sub>	4.30	1.45	.04	-.06	.04	.02	.03	.53	(.95)								
8. Perceived employer obligations T <sub>1</sub>	4.28	0.46	.04	-.05	.10	.04	.04	-.03	-.04	(.83)							
9. Perceived employer obligations T <sub>2</sub>	4.23	0.45	.06	.00	.13	.06	.02	-.12	-.14	.42	(.84)						
10. Perceived employer inducements T <sub>1</sub>	3.12	0.61	.02	.09	-.06	.07	.11	.57	.44	-.02	-.15	(.85)					
11. Perceived employer inducements T <sub>2</sub>	3.16	0.60	.04	.05	-.02	.04	.10	.42	.55	-.01	-.16	.67	(.87)				
12. Perceived contract fulfillment T <sub>1</sub>	3.11	0.61	.00	.08	-.03	.06	.10	.61	.43	-.07	-.16	.87	.61	(.86)			
13. Perceived contract fulfillment T <sub>4</sub>	3.27	0.66	.03	-.04	-.03	-.05	.03	.05	.07	-.06	-.03	.13	.10	.14	(.89)		
14. OCB: Loyalty T <sub>3</sub>	3.52	0.76	-.02	.06	.02	.05	.07	.36	.42	.10	.02	.30	.35	.30	.06	(.79)	
15. OCB: Civic virtue T <sub>3</sub>	3.61	0.73	.07	.08	.09	.02	.03	.14	.18	.18	.11	.16	.23	.11	.01	.45	(.81)

*Note.* Correlations > .13 are statistically significant at  $p < .01$ . Correlations > .09 are statistically significant at  $p < .05$ .

N=347

Cronbach's alpha coefficients are presented in parentheses along the diagonal.

**Table 3**  
**Regression Analysis of Predicting Psychological Contract Fulfillment and POS**

	Perceived Organizational Support T <sub>2</sub>			Contract fulfillment T <sub>4</sub>		
<b>Step 1</b>						
Gender T <sub>1</sub>	.02	.01	.00	.04	.04	.04
Age T <sub>1</sub>	-.07	-.07	-.08	-.07	-.07	-.08
Organizational tenure T <sub>1</sub>	.04	.02	.01	.10	.10	.10
Job Tenure T <sub>1</sub>	-.01	-.01	-.01	-.09	-.08	-.08
Trade union membership T <sub>1</sub>	.07	.07	.09	.00	.00	.01
Dependent variable T <sub>1</sub>	.55**	.42**	.41**	.10+	.11	.01
<b>Step 2</b>						
Contract fulfillment T <sub>1</sub>		.21**	-.01	---	---	---
Perceived organizational support T <sub>2</sub>		---	---	-.03	---	-.04
<b>Step 3</b>						
Perceived employer obligations T <sub>1</sub>			-.02			-.04
Perceived employer inducements T <sub>1</sub>			.26**			.09
$\Delta R^2$	.31	.03	.02	.02	.00	.00
$\Delta F$	24.99	13.53**	3.91*	1.15	.22	.57
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.29	.32	.33	.00	.00	.00
F	24.99**	24.15**	20.78**	1.15	1.01	.91

Note. N=347. Standardized regression coefficients are shown in columns.

\*\*  $p < .01$  \*  $p < .05$

**Table 4**  
**Regression Analysis of POS and Psychological Contract Fulfillment on Loyalty and Civic Virtue**

	Loyalty T <sub>3</sub>			Civic Virtue T <sub>3</sub>		
<b>Step 1</b>						
Gender T <sub>1</sub>	.00	.00	-.01	.08	.08	.06
Age T <sub>1</sub>	.05	.02	.03	.03	.02	.03
Organizational tenure T <sub>1</sub>	.06	.04	.02	.03	.02	-.01
Job tenure T <sub>1</sub>	-.03	-.01	-.01	-.02	-.02	-.03
Trade union membership T <sub>1</sub>	-.01	-.01	-.01	.07	.07	.07
<b>Step 2:</b>						
Contract fulfillment T <sub>1</sub>		.16**	.07		.08	-.10
Perceived organizational support T <sub>1</sub>		.24**	.23**		.09	.07
<b>Step 3</b>						
Perceived employer obligations T <sub>1</sub>			.13*			.19**
Perceived employer inducements T <sub>1</sub>			.11			.25*
ΔR <sup>2</sup>	.00	.13	.02	.00	.02	.06
ΔF	.52	25.42**	4.05**	1.00	4.16**	9.44**
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.00	.12	.14	.00	.02	.07
F	.52	7.69**	6.99**	1.00	1.92	3.67**

Note. N=347. Standardized regression coefficients are shown in columns.

\*\*  $p < .01$  \*  $p < .05$