Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository

7-3-2014 12:00 AM

Psychological Contracts: A Feature Based Approach to Understanding Transactional and Relational Contracts

Brittney K. Anderson, *The University of Western Ontario*

Supervisor: Dr. John Meyer, *The University of Western Ontario*
A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Science degree in Psychology
© Brittney K. Anderson 2014

Recommended Citation

Anderson, Brittney K., "Psychological Contracts: A Feature Based Approach to Understanding Transactional and Relational Contracts" (2014). *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. 2264.
https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/2264

Psychological Contracts: A Feature Based Approach to
Understanding Transactional and Relational Contracts

(Thesis format: Monograph)

by

Brittney Kathleen <u>Anderson</u>

Graduate Program in Psychology

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

The School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

Abstract

Feature-based measures have been suggested as a solution to some of the many issues associated with measuring psychological contracts. This study involved the refinement of an existing feature-based measure, including adding and rewriting items, to provide a concise but comprehensive and generalizable measure of transactional and relational psychological contracts. Data were collected from an online sample of full-time employees. Analyses revealed three main psychological contract feature dimensions (transactional, individual relational, and group relational) clustered into three contract types (predominantly transactional, predominantly relational, and balanced). Moreover, the balanced contract type had the highest mean score on positive workplace outcome variables, such as commitment, engagement, and organizational citizenship behaviours. The predominantly transactional contract type had the lowest mean score for each of these variables, as well as the highest mean score for turnover intentions. Theoretical and practical implications for this measure, as well as future directions for research, are discussed.

Keywords: psychological contracts, feature-based measure, transactional, relational, measure refinement, commitment, employee engagement, organizational citizenship behaviours, turnover intentions

Acknowledgements

This thesis is the both the culmination of two years of hard work and dedication, as well as the next step in my academic journey. There are many people that helped me in creating this work, and I would like to thank them now. First, I wish to thank my supervisor, Dr. John Meyer. Without him, this thesis would not have been possible. In addition to the hours of meetings, brainstorming, troubleshooting, and editing Dr. Meyer put into this thesis, it is really the general autonomy he gave me through this process that I appreciate most. He let me choose the direction I wanted this thesis to take, and to make decisions about what I wanted to study and how. I valued the chance to test and develop my abilities as a researchers and an academic while still having consistent guidance and support. I also always appreciated the speed with which he would respond to my panicked emails as the deadlines drew nearer!

Second, I want to thank my supervisor committee and examiners, Dr. Natalie Allen, Dr. Athena Xenikou, Dr. Joan Finegan, and Dr. Ann Peng. Without their feedback, suggestions, and support, I would not have been able to produce not only a thesis to complete my Master's degree, but a document I can be proud to attach my name to. I appreciated the opportunity to discuss my work with such respected researchers, and to have their input as I begin my own research career. Thank you for being a thought-provoking and encouraging committee.

I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the IO department at Western itself. I have learned more in my two years here at Western than I thought possible, both in terms of the classes taught and the skills I have been encouraged to cultivate. I know that my

time here has made me a better researcher, and I could not have asked for a more supportive, stimulating environment. I also want to acknowledge my fellow students, and thank those who have helped guide me through this process, provided challenging and interesting discussions on both my own work and the work of others, and become my friends in the process.

Finally, I want to thank my family and friends. There have been so many people who helped me get where I am today, not just over the last two years but in all the years leading up to this. First, I want to thank all the new friends I have made in London. You made a tough transition to a new school and a new city not only easier but also enjoyable. I'm grateful for every game night, barbeque, and Just Dance party we had, as it all helped keep me going. Next, I want to thank my life-long friends for all their support. Without Christine, Emma, Becky, and Karla, I don't know where I would be. For every night spent studying and every event missed because I was miles away, I always knew they were one text, call, or email away. I'm proud to have such an amazing group of friends.

Lastly, I want to thank the most important people in my life: my family. Thank you to Mom, Dad, Char, Kate, Adam, and Eric. I am so lucky to have these people by my side, and I know I can count on each and every one for love, for support, and for a laugh. I also want to thank my family-to-be, Rick, Tracy, and Mark, who have been a source of strength for Matthew and I every step of the way. Finally, I want to send a huge thank you to my fiancé Matthew. I'm so grateful for you and for all your guidance as we went through this thesis process together. Thank you for the love, insights, and light-heartedness, it was exactly what I needed, and I wouldn't have gotten through it all without you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

Introduction

Every employee has a sense of what their employers expect of them and what they can expect in return. These implicit beliefs make up an employee's psychological contract and act as schema or mental models that employees use to categorize information about their workplace relationships (Rousseau, 1995). Psychological contracts have been linked to a host of organizational outcome variables, such as job satisfaction, affective commitment, and job performance (e.g., Zhoa et al., 2007). Each of these variables is of interest, not only academically, but to practitioners and employers concerned with the everyday relationships between themselves and their employees.

Although there is now an extensive body of research on psychological contracts, there remain concerns about how the construct is measured (e.g. Conway & Briner, 2009; DelCampo, 2007; Montes & Zweig, 2009). This has important implications for the interpretation of research findings. Several different approaches have been taken to the measurement of psychological contracts, including content-focused, fulfillment/breach, and feature-based approaches. Of these approaches, the feature-based approach is the most recent and has been identified as showing considerable promise (e.g. Conway & Briner, 2005; Rousseau, 2010). However, there is as yet no well-established feature-based measure. The major objective of the current research is to build on previous research to develop a refined feature-based measure, and to use this measure to re-examine the relations between psychological contracts and several potential outcomes, including employee commitment, engagement, and turnover intention.

To provide a context for the present research, I first provide an overview of psychological contract theory with emphasis on its meaning and implications for

organizational behavior. I then address the issue of measurement and elaborate on the strengths and weaknesses of the three approaches described above, with emphasis on the feature-based approach. Here I describe earlier attempts at developing a feature-based measure to illustrate the need for and benefits of a refinement. Finally, I explain why a feature-based approach is ideally suited to address key aspects of psychological contract theory, including the distinction between different types of contract (e.g., transactional and relational) and their implications for behavior. This discussion provides the basis for the development of my study hypotheses. The research itself focuses on measurement refinement using data collected using an on-line survey of employees working in a variety of different organizations and occupations.

Psychological Contracts

Psychological contracts first appeared in the academic literature in the 1960s (e.g., Argyris, 1960) and were originally defined as the "individual's beliefs regarding the terms and conditions of a reciprocal exchange agreement" (Rousseau, 1989, p. 123). Since its original inception, much of the current research stems from Rousseau's (1989, 1995) work conceptualizing the psychological contract as a reciprocal obligation between employees and their employers, namely the organization, creating an exchange relationship. This definition did not require the sense of obligation to be mutual, although a recognition of the exchange needs to exist (Arnold, 1996). Generally, the literature focuses on the employees' perception of what they have been promised, and the outcomes, or implications, that stem from these promises and/or their fulfillment/non-fulfillment (Robinson, Kraatz & Rousseau, 1994).

The psychological contract can be broken down into two basic types: transactional and relational (e.g., Robinson, Kraatz, & Rousseau, 1994; Robinson & Morrison, 1995; Rousseau, 1990; 1995). Transactional contracts comprise concrete resources that are exchanged between parties over a defined period of time. The focus of a transactional psychological contract (TPC) is economic, motivated by external, observable rewards. The resources exchanged are tangible, most often money-based. This can be thought of as a "baseline" contract type between an employee and employer.

In contrast, relational contracts comprise more subjective types of resources that are exchanged over an undefined period of time. Relational psychological contracts (RPC) focus on the maintenance of a positive relationship and can be both intrinsically and extrinsically valuable (Rousseau, 1990). Generally, researchers have agreed that most psychological contracts contain elements of both relational and transactional contracts (e.g., Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; McLean Parks, Kidder, & Gallagher, 1998; Montes & Irving, 2008; Rousseau, 1990). Overall, more positive outcomes have been associated with relational as opposed to transactional contracts, as will be described below (e.g., Cohen, 2011; Raja, Johns, & Ntalianis, 2004).

Measurement of the Psychological Contract

There are three general ways in which the psychological contract is measured: the content-based approach, the fulfilment or breach approach, and the feature-based approach. Here, I will briefly discuss each type of measurement and the benefits and limitations to each.

Content-based measures. Content-based measures focus on the specific resources exchanged in an employee-employer relationship. These specific resources are

written into items, separated into employee and employer-based obligations. Examples of some of the specific resources identified in existing content-based measures are: challenging work, social aspects, rewards (e.g. bonuses), training, and long-term job security (e.g., Conway & Briner, 2005; Freese & Schalk, 1996; Robinson, Kraatz, & Rousseau, 1994). As discussed above, there is often a division between transactional and relational psychological contracts, and specific types of resources identified in some items are said to be more transactional (i.e. promising benefits or raises), while others are said to be more relational (i.e. caring about employee well-being; celebrating individual accomplishments). Although Freese and Schalk (1996), as well as Robinson et al. (1994), have both developed popular content-based measures, there is no one generally accepted measure used across studies.

Despite the popularity of the content-based approach, creating a valid, generalizable measure is not easy. There are two main reasons why these measures are inherently difficult to create. First, the experience and theoretical background of the researcher can change how certain items are perceived: what one researcher might label as a transactional resource, another may view as a relational item (Freese & Schalk, 2008). Even if researchers were able to categorize content consistently, the types of resources expected and received by employees on the job vary greatly by position, company, and industry. We cannot expect that a measure assessing the content of a psychological contract for a line worker in a factory will be consistent with the content for a childcare worker. We cannot even expect that the content will be consistent for members of the same occupation (e.g., teachers) across contexts (e.g., school boards). The content contained in a psychological contract is highly specific to the individual, and

is influenced by his or her own expectations. The difficulty in creating useful measures, as well as the high degree of specificity and individual differences in items makes the content-based approach less than ideal for measuring psychological contracts.

Fulfillment/breach measures. The second common approach to measurement is the fulfillment or breach approach. This method deals with whether or not the terms of an individual's psychological contract have been fulfilled. If there is a discrepancy between what employees feel their employer is obligated to provide and what they actually provide, this disconnect is called a "breach". These measures often ask explicit question such as "Has your organization broken any implicit promises to you today?" (Conway & Briner, 2002) and "(Company) has done a good job of meeting its obligations to me." (Tekleab & Taylor, 2003).

Fulfilled psychological contracts have been shown to relate positively to job satisfaction, work satisfaction, and job enthusiasm (Conway, Guest, & Trenberth, 2011), whereas a sense of unfulfilled obligations has been tied to a number of negative outcomes, including decreased in-role performance and increased absenteeism (Johnson & O'Leary-Kelly, 2003); mistrust toward management, and turnover intentions, with decreased job satisfaction (Zhao, Wayne, Glibowski, & Bravo, 2007); and increased depression (Conway, Guest & Trenberth, 2011). Meta-analytic evidence indicates that employee reactions are far more negative following a relational contract breach than a transactional one (Zhoa et al., 2007).

Again, this is a popular method to study psychological contracts, but there are also concerns about this approach. In a three-study series, Montes and Zweig (2009) found that employees' perceptions of breach were more strongly influenced by delivered

inducements than the discrepancy between what they felt they were promised and what they actually received. In fact, breach was even perceived by employees who noted an absence of promises from their employer altogether (Montes & Zweig, 2009). Put simply, employees sometimes report a breach in their psychological contract even when employees reported not having a psychological contract with their employer. The authors noted that the current conceptual and operationalization issues with fulfillment/breach approach require serious attention before continuing to use this construct.

Feature-based measures. Finally, the feature-based approach looks at the broad attributes one might use to describe mutual obligations between employers and employees (i.e., trust-based, long-term). This approach is valuable to measure the characteristics of psychological contracts across work situations (Conway & Briner, 2005), as it is more inclusive and generalizable, allowing us to make comparisons across fields. Many prominent psychological contract researchers (e.g., DelCampo, 2007; Freese & Schalk, 2008; Rousseau, 2010) agree that the feature-based approach has the potential to address many of the issues raised by the content-based approach, and that it is a valuable way to gain information about psychological contracts, allowing for comparisons across jobs or industries. Preliminary research also suggests that the feature-based approach more closely reflects the way employees talk about psychological contracts (McInnis, 2012), thus making the construct more applicable.

The feature-based approach to measuring psychological contracts is not new: McLean Parks and Van Dyke created the first measure of this type in 1995. However, further correspondence with these authors indicates they do not recommend its continued use (McInnis, 2012). Since then, Sels, Janssens and Van der Brande (2003, 2004) have

created a feature-based measure to assess six contract features: time frame, tangibility, scope (broad vs. narrow), stability, exchange symmetry, and contract level. McInnis, Meyer, and Feldman (2009) adapted Janssens et al.'s measure and added a number of their own features: explicitness, formality of the contract, and degree of negotiation in contract development. In addition to adding new features, McInnis et al. (2009) also used a different conceptualization of the features. Janssens et al. (2004) assumed that each feature was bipolar, with the opposing poles being mutually exclusive. For example, for the feature stability, it was assumed that the opposite of "stable" was "flexible", and that one who scores low on stability would be high on flexibility. McInnis et al. (2009), however, included items for each "pole" of the features and concluded that components of each end of the features (e.g. flexibility and stability) were in fact not opposites- the strong negative correlations you would expect from polar opposites were not found, and many correlations between "poles" were either non-significant or mildly positive. McInnis et al. (2009) suggested that two features that were previously thought of as opposites could in fact both be part of the same psychological contract.

McInnis (2012) used the knowledge obtained in her 2009 study, and the information from a qualitative study (McInnis, 2012) to further adjust her measure. The qualitative study, consisting of interviews with current full-time employees, indicated that employees talk about their psychological contract with regard to how it creates a relationship between themselves and their employer. McInnis (2012) used the kinds of words and language employees were using in the qualitative study and applied it to develop a revised version of her 2009 measure. She then used a principal components analysis on the items in her measure and found evidence for factors that represented

transactional and relational contract features. Although the items were not specifically written to capture transactional psychological contracts and relational psychological contracts, McInnis (2012) discovered that the features associated with these two contract types tended to define separate factors in her analyses. With this discovery, this measure can now be adapted to specifically measure transactional and relational contracts, and this is the aim of the current investigation.

A Feature-Based Approach to the Measurement of Psychological Contracts

The background on feature-based approaches shows that, although there is much promise to these measures (Rousseau, 2010), there are still developments being made along the way. McInnis et al. (2009) discovered that transactional and relational features could be assessed using their measure. McInnis (2012) later revised this measure and replicated that key finding. There were, however, some concerns with her measure that I wish to address in this research.

First, although McInnis (2012) discussed the structure of transactional and relational contracts in terms of features, she conducted her analysis at the item level. This was due to the fact that some of the items written to measure particular features did not correlate sufficiently with one another to be aggregated to create a feature score. This suggests the need for additional item refinement. This was one of the objectives of the present research.

The second issue with the existing McInnis (2012) measure is awkwardness in some of the item wording. More specifically, to simplify the administration of the measure, McInnis used a common lead statement ("How would you describe the nature of the relationship that you currently have with your employer?", 2012, p. 91) followed

by a set of feature descriptions. However, in some cases the feature descriptions did not correspond well with the lead. Moreover, some items were unduly complex which may have created some confusion, particularly for employees with lower reading levels. Therefore, the one of the primary objectives of the present study was to use stand-alone items with simpler and more concise wording.

In summary, one of the primary objectives of this study is to develop a more refined measure of psychological contract features and to demonstrate that this measure can be used as the basis for the assessment of the two basic types of psychological contract: transactional contracts and relational contracts. I also have some expectations as to which features will define the transactional and relational contract features. Based on the conceptual definitions and previous research (i.e., McInnis, 2012), I expect features such as explicit, tangible, and regulated to characterize transactional features, and ones such as open communication, long-term, and trust-based to characterize the relational feature.

Hypothesis 1: The refined feature-based measure will have at least two factors, representing transactional (consisting of explicit, regulated, and tangible features) and relational (consisting of long-term, open communication, and trust-based features) psychological contract features.

It is important to note that factor analysis of the new measure will give us the features of transactional and relational contracts, which is not the full picture of the contract types. As mentioned above, it is generally agreed that most psychological contracts contain elements of both transactional and relational features. Therefore, transactional psychological contracts are characterized by high scores on transactional

features and lower scores on relational features. Similarly, relational psychological

contracts are characterized by lower scores on transactional features and high scores on

relational features.

In order to assess contract types, and to relate these types to the outcome assessed

here, further analysis must be conducted. Cluster analysis is an exploratory analytical

procedure used to organize data into distinct groups, or *clusters*, which "maximizes the

similarity of cases within each cluster while maximizing dissimilarity between groups

that are initially unknown" (Burns & Burns, 2008, p. 553). In this study, I will use cluster

analysis to find distinct patterns of responding on the factors for transactional and

relational features. Although one can envision four potential cluster combinations (both

high; high transactional with low relational; low transactional with high relational; and

both low), I argue that a model with three cluster types makes the most theoretical sense.

Based on the knowledge we have about transactional and relational contracts -that

transactional is a baseline, tangible resource-based contract, and relational contracts are

subjective and implicit- I predict that there will be few cases that exhibit a "low

transactional features, high relational features" pattern. Researchers tend to agree that a

transactional contract develops first, and that a relational contract may, or may not,

follow. Therefore, it seems unlikely that there will be a case where employees feels their

employer is obligated to provide them with the trust-based, implicit resources without

any expectation of the more tangible features. I can, however, imagine instances where

only a transactional contract has developed (high transactional psychological contract

features, low relational psychological contract features), or instances of newer

employees, where neither has fully developed, or in employees who have not put a lot of

thought into their employment agreement and have a low endorsement of each feature (low transactional features, low relational features). Finally, a classic relational psychological contract would have the "base" transactional features, thus showing a cluster type where both transactional and relational features are highly endorsed.

This investigation of the cluster combinations will contribute to the literature that suggests there are often components of both types of contracts in each individual psychological contract. Additionally, once the clusters have been established, I can investigate how specific clusters, or contract types, relate to the outcomes assessed in this study. I can test for group differences between clusters and look for significant mean differences between these cluster types on commitment, employee engagement, organizational citizenship behaviours, and turnover intentions. This study will be, to my knowledge, the first study using a feature-based approach to investigate these combinations and their relationship to workplace outcome variables.

Hypothesis 2. Three clusters reflecting different patterns of the transactional and relational feature dimensions will be identified: one in which high scores for both transactional and relational contracts are endorsed (high-high); one in which few of each are endorsed (low-low); one in which a high score on transactional features but a low score on relational features are reported (high-low).

Organizational Commitment

To test how these psychological contract features and types will relate to workplace outcomes, I will first test the relationships between the factor scores for transactional and relational features and commitment using Meyer and Allen's (1997) Three-Component Model. Following this correlational analysis, I will test the relationship

between the cluster types and commitment. The Three-Component Model states there are three components of organizational commitment: affective, normative, and continuance (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1997). Affective, normative, and continuance commitment can be succinctly described as an emotional attachment to the organization, a moral obligation to remain with the organization, and a need to remain with the organization for economic or social reasons, respectively.

The studies that have related psychological contacts to commitment have mostly been guided by the fulfilment/breach approach. Affective commitment and breach have been well studied, with Cohen (2011) showing that psychological contract breach is related to lower affective commitment toward multiple foci of commitment, including the organization, occupation, work group, and unions. Further, meta-analytic results have shown that breaches in contracts are related to low affective commitment (Zhoa et al., 2007).

In concert with the breach literature, Sturges, Conway, Guest, and Liefooghe (2005) found that psychological contract fulfilment was positively related to affective commitment and negatively correlated with continuance commitment. Other studies have also supported this link between psychological contract fulfilment and increased affective commitment (e.g., Bunderson, 2001; Johnson & O'Leary-Kelly, 2003). The general conclusion has been drawn that when employees experience psychological contract fulfilment, they generally reciprocate by fulfilling perceived obligations to their employer (Coyle-Shapiro, 2002).

The focus of this study, however, is not on this fulfillment or breach approach, but rather the feature-based approach. Some recent research exists in this area. First, a few

studies have been conducted on the types of psychological contracts and their relationship with the three components of organizational commitment, although the results are often inconsistent. For transactional contracts, for example, there have been studies to suggest its relationship with affective commitment is positive (Hughes & Palmer, 2007), negative (Shore et al., 2006), or non-significant (Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; McInnis, 2012). This may be because of inconsistency in the specific measures used. Given McInnis' (2012) recent finding of a non-significant correlation, and the fact that the measure currently under revision in this study is based on the measure used by McInnis, I predict that this study will, too, will find a non-significant relationship between affective commitment and transactional features. This makes theoretical sense when one considers that a transactional relationship refers to a basic, money-based, tangible exchange of resources. While this does not imply any further affective component, it also does not imply a *lack* of affect. A non-significant correlation fits better with this contract type than does a negative correlation, implying having a transactional contract correlates with *less* affective investment.

A positive relationship has been found between transactional psychological contracts and normative commitment (McInnis et al., 2009), although McInnis, predicting a negative correlation between the two, found a non-significant relationship (2012). This area of study has not received further attention, although it makes sense that those in a short-term, resource-based relationship may not perceive a sense of obligation to remain with their employer. I predict that transactional contracts, as measured here, will not have a significant relationship with normative commitment.

Finally, it theoretically makes sense that transactional contracts would be related to continuance commitment. These contracts have a focus on tangible, often money-based, resources. Employees who are employed in an organization with good pay or benefits may find it difficult to leave and risk lower compensation elsewhere. Some research has supported this assumption, with McInnis (2012), Hughes and Palmer (2007) and Shore et al. (2006) all finding significant positive correlations between transactional contracts and continuance commitment, although other studies, using different measures, have found negative (Shore et al., 2006) or non-significant results (Sloboda, 1999). I predict that the revised feature-based measure will also result in a positive correlation between continuance commitment and transactional contracts. Based on the conceptual definitions of the constructs and on the previous research highlighted here, the following predications can be made:

Hypothesis 3. Transactional psychological contract features will be significantly positively related to continuance commitment and will have a non-significant relationship with both affective and normative commitment.

As for relational contracts, McInnis (McInnis et al., 2009; 2012) found that this type of psychological contract was significantly and positively related to both affective and normative commitment. Although there are few further studies examining the link between relational contracts and normative commitment, this link between relational contracts and affective commitment has general support in the literature (e.g., Hughes & Palmer, 2007; Shore, Tetrick, Lynch, & Barksdale, 2006).

More specifically, McInnis et al. (2009) used a feature-based approach to examining psychological contracts and found that affective commitment was highly

related to the following features: long-term, collective, trust-based, equally balanced between favouring employee and employer, stable, negotiated, and tangible. Some of these findings were in support of research by Battisti et al. (2007), and Sels et al. (2004), who also found that affective commitment was significantly related to long-term and collective features. These features are all conceptually linked to relational contracts, which focus on long-term employment relationships that are mutually beneficial to employee and employer alike, and therefore could be considered relational features. Additionally, affective and normative commitment are often highly correlated, so despite a dearth of literature hypothesizing the link between relational contracts and normative commitment, it follows that this relationship likely exists. Based on these previous studies, I predict that relational contracts will be positively correlated with affective and normative commitment.

The relationship between continuance commitment and relational contracts is a little more difficult to assess. The research thus far has been mixed (e.g., King, 2003; McInnis, 2007; Shore et al., 2006), although McInnis (2012) notes that this may be due to the widely different measures used in each study. Recent work on feature-based contracts and commitment found a significant positive relationship between continuance commitment and relational contracts (McInnis, 2012), thus I predict this current investigation will find the same. This again has a theoretical base to it, as those who feel their organization has invested time, money, or training in them will be less inclined to leave their organization.

Hypothesis 4. Relational psychological contract features will be significantly positively correlated with affective, normative, and continuance commitment.

I also predict that there will be mean differences between the transactional contract cluster and the relational contract cluster. As I have already outlined, I believe relational features will be significantly positively correlated with affective and normative commitment, while transactional features will not. In a similar vein, I expect that relational contract types, as described by the cluster analysis, will have a higher mean score for affective and normative commitment than will the transactional contract type. I predict, however, that those with the transactional contract type will have a higher mean score on continuance commitment than will those with a relational contract type. Although I predicted a positive correlation between both transactional and relational contract features and continuance commitment, I believe this correlation will be stronger for the transactional features. Similarly, I expect those with a transactional contract type will have a higher mean score on continuance commitment, but that this discrepancy will not be as high as for affective and normative commitment.

Despite the fact that there is no prior research, to the best of my knowledge, on the "low" contract, I hypothesize that this contract type will have the lowest correlation with each of the components of commitment. This is because I expect few features to be endorsed in this weakly formed contract, and therefore expect the lowest mean scores on each of the outcome variables.

Hypothesis 5. Employees with a relational contract type will have higher mean scores on affective and normative commitment than those with transactional contract types. Those with transactional contract types will have higher mean scores on continuance commitment than those with the relational contract type. Those with the low contract type will have the lowest mean scores on all three components of commitment.

Employee Engagement

This study is only the second to connect the feature-based approach to psychological contracts with employee engagement. Employee engagement is defined as a state of mind that is fulfilling for employees (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002). It is considered a positive workplace outcome and can be categorized into three forms: dedication, absorption, and vigour. Dedication can be defined as enthusiasm, pride, and a sense of significance at work. Absorption is engrossment and involvement in one's work. Finally, vigour is high energy and persistent in one's work. The fulfillment literature has demonstrated that contract fulfillment is positively related to work engagement (Parzefall & Hakanen, 2010).

In the first study to connect these concepts, McInnis (2012) found that the factor scores for transactional and relational contract features both had significant positive correlations with each of the three facets of employee engagement. A regression analysis also found that both transactional and relational contracts were significant positive predictors of dedication, absorption, and vigour (McInnis, 2012). Similarly, I expect that relational contract features, with their focus on subjective, positive relationships with work, will be positively related to employee-rated engagement. As for transactional contract features, I predict that we will replicate the findings of McInnis (2012) that transactional contract feature will positively relate to employee engagement, although not as strongly as relational contract features will.

It is important to note that, although McInnis (2012) predicted a negative relationship with transactional contracts and engagement, her research showing a positive correlation is the only existing research on this study, and I expect to replicate her results.

It may be that endorsing features such as explicit, stable, and regulated does not imply that employees cannot be engaged, involved, and invested in their work. It may suggest that the mere existence of a psychological contract allows employees to connect to their work and be engaged. This is supported by McInnis' (2012) findings.

Hypothesis 6. Transactional psychological contract features will be positively correlated with each of the three facets of engagement: dedication, absorption, and vigour.

Hypothesis 7. Relational psychological contract features will be positively correlated with dedication, absorption, and vigour, and these correlations will be larger than those between transactional psychological contract and the forms of employee engagement.

Similar to my prediction that relational contract features will have a higher positive correlation with engagement than will the transactional contract features, I believe the relational contract cluster will have a higher mean score on all three forms of engagement than will the transactional contract cluster. Again, that is not to say that those with a transactional contract type will be unengaged, simply that those with relational contract types will report higher instances of engagement. Finally, I expect the low contract type, expected in new employees, will have the lowest mean scores.

Hypothesis 8. Employees with a relational contract will have higher mean scores on dedication, absorption, and vigour than will either transactional or low contract types.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviours

To the best of my knowledge, this is the first study investigating organizational citizenship behaviours and psychological contracts using a feature-based approach. Although the feature-based literature is relatively new, this is still surprising, given the general interest and impact of organizational citizenship behaviours in the literature and

in practice. Organizational citizenship behaviours can be defined as employee behaviours that are not part of their job or role, which help the organization to function. Previously meta-analytical work has shown that organizational citizenship behaviours are negatively correlated with psychological contract breaches (Zhoa et al., 2007).

Much of the previous research, including the Zhoa et al. (2007) meta-analysis, however, has looked at organizational citizenship behaviours as one large, encompassing class of behaviours. The current study follows McNeely's (1994) approach to defining prosocial citizenship behaviours based on the target they are directed at- that is, individuals within an organization, or the organization itself. Citizenship behaviours directed at individuals (OCBI) involve helping other employees' within a workplace. The targets of these behaviours are one's coworkers, and are related to an employee's affect (Lee & Allen, 2002). Organizationally-directed citizenship behaviours (OCBO), however, are a better reflection of how employees think about their employing organization and are more strongly correlated with cognitions about one's job than with affect (Lee & Allen, 2002). Relating these two targets of organizational citizenship behaviours back to the psychological contract, Turnley (2003) found that psychological contract fulfillment was more strongly related to citizenship behaviours directed at the organization than to those directed at individuals..

None of this research addresses the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviours, either as a general construct or delineating between different targets, and the two types of psychological contracts. Theoretically, we might expect to see a stronger relationship between organizational citizenship behaviours in general and relational psychological contract features. As described above, transactional contract

features are often considered components of a baseline relationship, so it seems unlikely that these tangible, money-focused features of relationship would include the performance of extra-role behaviours toward the organization. With transactional contract features, employees would not feel the obligation to act outside of their role for their employer without receiving some compensation or benefits, thus making these behaviours part of their role. Similarly, I hypothesize that there will not be a relationship between affective commitment and transactional contract features, and we have seen in Lee and Allen's (2002) work that individually direction citizenship behaviours are based on affect. Therefore, I predict there will not be a significant relationship between transactional psychological contract features and individually direction citizenship behaviours.

I do, however, expect to find a relationship between both forms of organizational citizenship behaviours and relational contract features. Again, the features of this type of psychological contract are seen as above and beyond the terms in a transactional contract. There is more of a focus on subjective, intangible exchanges, which may include behaviours that help the organization, without being simply a part of role fulfillment. I also predict an affective component to be correlated with relational contract features, and therefore expect to see significant positive correlations between each type of citizenship behaviour and relational features.

Hypothesis 9. Both organizational citizenship behaviours directed at the individual and at the organization will be significantly correlated with relational psychological contract features, and will not be correlated with transactional contract features.

For the reasons outlined above, I predict there will be significant mean differences between transactional and relational contract types on both targets of organizational citizenship behaviours. The conceptualization of transactional contracts does not fit with acting to benefit the organization or peers without any expectation of rewards in return. I predict that the average ratings of citizenship behaviours, for either target, will be low for those with transactional contract types. Those with relational contract types will report significantly more instances of citizenship behaviours directed at both their organizational and their coworkers.

Hypothesis 10. There will be significant mean differences on organizational citizenship behaviours, such that those with a relational contract type will report higher levels of individually directed organizational citizenship behaviours and organizationally directed citizenship behaviours than those with transactional or balanced contract types.

Turnover Intentions

Like organizational citizenship behaviours, turnover intentions are another workplace outcome that is often studied throughout industrial and organizational psychology but has not been seen much in the psychological contract literature. Turnover intentions reflect an employee's desire, motivation, or intention to leave their employing organization. Therefore, to be high on turnover intention means an employee may have been searching elsewhere for work, or at least interested in their opportunities elsewhere.

Past research has found that employee turnover intention is positively correlated with transactional contracts and negatively correlated with relational contracts (Raja, Johns, & Ntalianis, 2044; McInnis, 2012). The theoretical basis behind these correlations is that those who endorse transactional features, such as explicit and tangible, may be

more receptive to better offers from other employers. I have already hypothesized that those with transactional contracts will have the strongly correlation with continuance commitment. Previous meta-analytical results have shown that continuance commitment is weakly negatively correlation with turnover intentions (Meyer et al., 2002). Similarly, those with a relational psychological contract features are more invested in a long-term, lasting relationship with their employer. These employees may be less open to leaving their employer, and are hypothesized to have stronger commitment to stay, leading to a negative correlation with turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 11. Turnover intentions will be significantly negatively correlated with both transactional and relational psychological contract features.

Considering the predicted relationships above, it seems intuitive that there will be mean differences between the different contract types. Again, it is important to remember that higher turnover intentions indicate a greater willingness or desire to seek employment elsewhere, or otherwise leave the current organization. I predict that those with transactional contract types will report high levels of turnover intentions, and that these values will be significantly higher than the levels reported by those with relational contracts.

Hypothesis 12. Those with transactional contracts will have significantly higher mean scores on turnover intentions than those with relational or balanced contracts.

Purpose of Present Research

The primary purpose of the present research is to refine an existing feature-based psychological contract measure. I will then use this measure to determine whether it is possible to distinguish between features associated with transactional psychological contracts and relational psychological contracts, and whether these feature dimensions combine to form distinct contract types. A secondary purpose of the study is to determine whether the feature dimensions can be used to predict important motivational (commitment, engagement) and behavioural (turnover intention, organizational citizenship behaviours) outcomes, and whether these same outcomes differ across contract types.

Methods

Pilot Study

The primary focus of this research was to further revise McInnis' original feature-based measure of psychological contracts (2012). Therefore, before data were collected, a number of steps were undertaken to improve the existing psychological contract measure (See Appendix C for the measure before revisions). Items were reworded to be complete, independent statements, eliminating the need for a standard question stem. This question stem was sometimes ill-fitting with the items on the scale, so independent items were created for general ease and readability of the items.

In addition to general grammatical changes to the items, the item-pair correlations for each of the two items within components of features (i.e. the two items that comprise "long-term", a component of the feature "time-frame") were reviewed to identify any correlations of concern (see Table 4 for a full list of correlations). These item pairs were

inspected for low correlations (i.e. between the two items for "Regulated"), indicating the items were not both capturing the same construct, or that an important aspect of the construct was not represented. Additionally, item-pairs that were exceptionally high (such as between the items for "Short-term") were reviewed as potentially too similar, without enough breadth to fully capture the construct.

Following these revisions to the feature-based scale, the new items were reviewed by a panel of graduate students with some knowledge of the construct and measurement of psychological contracts. This panel of experts reviewed the definitions of the features used and the new items and provided feedback on two aspects: The readability and ease of comprehension of the items and the degree to which the items fit the features they were created to measure. They were also asked to review the pairs of items to ensure they were both seemingly asking about the same construct, which addressed the concern of low inter-item correlations for some features. The feedback provided in this session was reviewed and incorporated into the final set of items that were given to participants.

Procedure and Participants

Participants were obtained from Amazon's Mechanical Turk (mTurk) sample of "workers". This system allows mTurk participants (called "workers") to complete short online tasks, such as judging or rating photos, evaluating websites, and filling in brief surveys, for financial compensation. Although the financial rewards offered for these tasks are generally low, research has indicated that mTurk participants are intrinsically motivated to complete these tasks (Buhrmester, Kwang & Gosling, 2011). In the present study, participants were compensated $1 for their time, which is in keeping with other similar projects posted to this site. Inclusion criteria for this sample were being a United

States citizen (as nearly 70% of mTurk participants reside in the US; Buhrmester, Kwang & Gosling, 2011) with current full-time employment. A total sample of 400 participants was used to allow for enough power for my statistical analyses.

The members in this panel generally come from a variety of backgrounds, with diversity in age, race, education, and work industry and have shown to be a more diverse sample than those found in college or other Internet samples (Buhrmester, Kwang & Gosling, 2011). The current sample had an average age of 39.5 (ranging from 18 to 68 years). The sample had a fairly even split between the genders, with 63% identifying as male. The majority of the sample was Caucasian (72.1%), followed by Asian (8.8%), African American (7.7%), Hispanic (7.2%) and Native American (1.6%). A range of industries were represented in this sample, including retail (12.9%), education (12%), health care (11.4%) computer software (11.1%), and food and beverage (10%). 25.6% of participants described themselves as management, with 52.5% of these participants in lower management, 35.2% in middle management, and 12.3% in upper management. Additionally, only 9.3% of participants were unionized.

Measures

Psychological Contract Measure

The revised feature-based measure, developed in the pilot study, was used to assess the features of individual's psychological contract. There were at least two items to measure each feature. The items in this measure were rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. See Appendix E for the full measure.

Organizational Commitment

To assess organizational commitment as outlined by the Three-Component Model (1997) two scales were used; first, affective (AC) and normative commitment (NC) were measured using Meyer, Allen and Smith's (1993) measure. Continuance commitment (CC) was assessed with Powell and Meyer's (2004) measure. Sample items include "This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me"; " I owe a great deal to my organization"; and "I have invested too much time in this organization to consider working elsewhere" for affective, normative, and continuance commitment, respectively. Each of these scales rated the components with six items on a seven-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. These scales showed good internal consistency, with Cronbach alpha values of above .85 for each (affective commitment = 0.866; normative commitment = 0.888; continuance commitment = 0.857).

Employee Engagement

The three dimensions of engagement (vigour, dedication, and absorption) were measured using Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, and Bakker's (2002) measure. Sample items include "At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well"; "My job inspires me"; and "I am immersed in my work" for vigour, dedication, and absorption, respectively. The six items for vigour and absorption and five items for dedication were rated on a seven-point Likert-type scale, asking participants how often they experienced in the items in the previous two months, from 1 = never to 7 = daily. Again, strong reliabilities were found for these three subscales, with $\alpha = 0.865$ for vigour, $\alpha = 0.914$ for dedication, and $\alpha = 0.887$ for absorption.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

Both facets of organizational citizenship behaviours were assessed using Lee and Allen's (2002) measure of OCB-I and OCB-O. Eight items for each were used to assess the frequency with which participants engaged in the two facets on a seven-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 = never to 7 = always. Sample items include "Help others who have been absent" for individually directed behaviours and "Keep up with developments in the organization" for organizationally directed behaviours. The two subscales also showed very strong internal reliability, with alphas of 0.921 and 0.932 for OCB-I and OCB-O, respectively.

Turnover Intentions

Turnover intentions were assessed using both a single-item measure as well as a four-item measure. The single item question asked participants how long they planned on continuing working with their employer on a five-point scale: less than one year; one to three years; four to five years; more than five years; and more than 10 years. The four-item measure was created by Chalykoff and Kochan (1989) and uses a seven-point Likert-type scale, from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. A sample item is "I view this job as something to do until I find a better job outside of this organization". The reliability for this measure was $\alpha = 0.847$.

Analytical Procedures

Factor Analysis

First, factor analysis was used to determine the number of factors underlying the feature-based measure. A principal axis factor analysis was used because I was interested in the underlying latent constructs of psychological contract features, rather than item

reduction (Bandalos & Boehm-Kaufman, 2009). Correlations between the factors were not anticipated, so an orthogonal rotation was also used when analyzing the data. In addition to including eigenvalue cut offs of greater than one and a review of the scree plot, a parallel analysis was used to determine the number of factors that should be extracted for interpretation.

Cluster Analysis

Following the factor analysis, I used a k-means cluster analysis in SPSS to determine if there were certain "types" of response patterns for the two main types of psychological contracts. That is, were there different patterns of transactional and relational contract levels across participants? The number of clusters to extract in a k-means cluster analysis is up to the researcher, and I saw a number of logical possibilities that could occur based on the literature. To ensure a thorough investigation, three cluster analyses were performed: the first, extracting two k-mean clusters, the second extracting three clusters, and the third and final analysis extracting four. This allowed consideration for the hypothesis that a number of different patterns in reporting levels of transactional and relational features of psychological contracts exist in employees.

Correlation Analysis

Finally, I investigated how these psychological contract features correlated with a number of workplace outcome variables. Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients were used to determine the strength, direction, and significance of the relationship between each of the psychological contract features (transactional and relational) and commitment, employee engagement, organizational citizenship behaviours, and turnover intentions.

One-Way ANOVA and Post Hoc Comparisons

To test for group differences between the psychological contract clusters (Hypotheses 5, 8, 11, and 14), I conducted a one-way ANOVA for each of the demographic and outcome variables. For each of the significant one-way ANOVAs, I conducted a series of post hoc analyses to analyze the significant mean differences. A Bonferroni adjustment was used in these post hoc tests as a conservative estimate of alpha. These analyses allowed me to investigate the mean differences between each type of psychological contract and my outcome variables.

Results

Scale Evaluation

As noted earlier, there were at least two items to measure each feature. These items were combined to create a composite for each feature. The focus of this study was at the feature, rather than the item, level. The correlations between items within each of the individual feature measures are reported in Table 1.

There are three correlations that warrant attention. First, the correlation between items 2 and 4 for the implicit feature (see Appendix E) did not reach significance. Second, the correlation between the static feature items 2 and 3 did not reach significance.

Table 1: *Correlations between dimension items.*

	$r_{1,2}$	$r_{1,3}$	$r_{1,4}$	$r_{2,3}$	$r_{2,4}$	$r_{3,4}$
Long Term	.729**	-	-	-	-	-
Short Term	.428**	-	-	-	-	-
Explicit	.579**	-	-	-	-	-
Implicit	.197**	.206**	.142**	.194**	.073	.205**
Static	.114*	.189**	-	.056	-	-
Flexible	.442**	-	-	-	-	-
Regulated	.498**	.651**	-	.459**	-	-
Trust Based	.515**	.652**	-	.302**	-	-
Individual	.523**	-	-	-	-	-
Collective	.533**	-	-	-	-	-
Negotiated	.531**	-	-	-	-	-
Employee Focused	.616**	-	-	-	-	-
Employer Focused	.521**	-	-	-	-	-
Narrow	.244**	-	-	-	-	-
Broad	.529**	.389**	-	.457**	-	-
Imposed	.267**	.340**	-	.533**	-	-
Equal	.452**	-	-	-	-	-
Tangible	.590**	-	-	-	-	-
Intangible	.451**	-	-	-	-	-
Impersonal	-.083	-	-	-	-	-
Open Communication	.459**	-	-	-	-	-
Respect	.659**	-	-	-	-	-
Minimal Communication	.491**	-	-	-	-	-

*Note: * p < .05; ** p < .001* (two tailed).

For the current study, I decided to keep all the items in the analyses and creation of feature scores. This was done for two reasons: first, the items were newly written for the purpose of this study, and I wanted to explore how the measure in its current form performed.

Second, despite each feature score having a low inter-item correlation, there was no obvious item that simply didn't fit. For example, the correlation between items 2 and 4 for implicit was low, however the correlations for 2 with 1 and 3, and for 4 with 1 and 3 were all significant. It may be that these items each capture some aspect of the construct, without all of these aspects overlapping. In future work, researchers might consider dropping or adjusting one of these items on these two features to test how this changes the interpretation of the data, however that was beyond the scope of this study.

The third correlation that is a cause for concern is the non-significant relationship between the two items for the feature impersonal. The two items for this feature are "My relationship with my employer is highly objective and impersonal" and "my relationship with my employer is largely based on give and take". The first item is a better match with the conceptual definition of impersonal, given in Appendix D. After running the planned analysis, both with the two original items and with the first item only, I found that there were few differences. In fact, there was a slight improvement in reliability in the final measure when both items were included (α = .831) rather than with only the one item (α = .829). This indicates that, while this item may not be a good indicator of the impersonal feature, it may still be relevant in the measurement of psychological contracts.

Principal axis factor analysis was used to investigate the underlying latent structure of the psychological contract measure. An orthogonal rotation (varimax) was

applied. A parallel analysis was used to determine how many factors from this analysis

should be extracted. A parallel analysis involves comparing the eigenvalues found in a

factor analysis to a set of randomly obtained eigenvalues, given the same number of

variables and participants (Hinkin, 1998). Factors with eigenvalues that are higher than

those found in the random parallel analysis should be retained. The program MacParallel

Analysis 1.5.0.3.0, developed by Dr. Marley W. Watkins was used, which is described as

a Mac computer-based application for use in Monte Carlo Parallel Analysis (available at

http://mac.softpedia.com/get/Math-Scientific/MacParallel-Analysis.shtml).

Based on the parallel analysis, five factors were retained in this study. This is

consistent with a scree plot analysis of the results. Only items loading 0.40 or above were

considered to define the factor (Hinkin, 1998). These five factors accounted for 55.36%

of the common variance. The factor structure is detailed in Table 2.

After rotation, Factor 1 accounted for 14.8% of the common variance and was

defined by the following features: explicit, regulated, tangible, collective, stable,

impersonal, and narrow. These factors are consistent with the definition for transactional

psychological features, and this factor was labelled *transactional.* This factor included

the features, among others, I predicted would represent that transactional feature.

Factor 2 accounted for an additional 14.3% of the common variance. It is defined

by the following features: open, individual, unequal symmetry (employee focused),

broad, and flexible. Additionally, minimal communication loaded negatively on Factor 2.

Respect, trust-based, and equal symmetry between employee and employer interests also

loaded significantly onto this factor, although they had strong item loadings on Factor 3.

Table 2: *Rotated Principal Axis Results.*

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
Explicit	**.800**	.082	.062	-.326	.064
Regulated	**.774**	.039	-.123	-.255	-.017
Tangible	**.728**	.126	.135	-.370	.059
Collective	**.601**	-.146	.170	-.027	-.087
Stable	**.570**	-.041	.343	-.034	-.308
Impersonal	**.557**	.035	-.117	.214	.012
Narrow	**.480**	-.113	-.134	.086	-.056
Open	.049	**.714**	.225	-.105	.068
Individual	-.186	**.632**	-.011	.329	.123
Employee-Focused	.099	**.608**	.079	.134	.234
Broad*	-.050	**.578**	**.555**	.121	.117
Flexible	-.133	**.570**	.309	.310	.090
Minimal*	.225	**-.419**	-.303	**.413**	-.082
Respect	.046	**.503**	**.682**	.075	.044
Short-Term	.116	.077	**-.664**	.232	-.087
Long-Term	.162	.189	**.636**	.056	.098
Trust-Based	-.046	**.526**	**.588**	.216	.060
Equal Symmetry	.233	**.437**	**.569**	-.019	.234
Employer-Focused	.187	-.254	**-.460**	.237	-.298
Intangible	-.186	.158	-.043	**.600**	.083
Implicit	-.116	.290	.061	**.561**	-.111
Imposed	.318	-.244	-.312	.175	**-.750**
Negotiated	.099	.356	.239	.157	**.522**

* indicates features with cross-loadings of above .40.

These features are generally consistent with the definitions of relational psychological contracts; however, they tended to focus on the individual, rather than group, relational features. Due to this individual focus, it was labelled *individual relational.* This factor had two of the three features I anticipated would characterize the relational feature.

Factor 3 accounted for 13.6% of the common variance. The following features defined this factor: respect, long-term, trust-based, and equal symmetry, although long-term was the only distinct feature that did not also have significant item loadings on Factor 2. In addition, the feature "broad" defined Factor 3, although it had a higher item loading with Factor 2. Short-term and unequal symmetry (employer focused) related negatively to Factor 3. This cluster of features is also very similar to the definitions of relational features. There are two significant cross-loadings between Factor 2 and Factor 3, with a number of other loadings approaching significance (i.e. above 0.30). Many of the features of this factor were consistent with the definition of relational contracts, and included the theoretical relational features that did not load onto Factor 2. In fact, this factor also had two of the three features I anticipated would characterize the relational feature. The main difference was that this factor did not contain the individual component. Therefore, this factor was labelled *group relational.* Although I only predicted two factors to represent transactional and relational features, this third factor suggests that relational features can be divided based on their target, and many of the defining item loadings are consistent with both factors.

Factor 4 accounted for 7.3% of the common variance after rotation and was composed of the following features: intangible and implicit. Factor 5 accounted for 5.4%

of the total variance and, like Factor 4, was also defined by only two features: negotiated and imposed, although imposed loaded negatively. Rather than reflecting coherent feature patterns, it appears that Factors 4 and 5 represent features not relevant to the more common transactional and relational contracts. Consequently, these factors were not included in subsequent analyses.

As described here, I did find evidence for factors characterized by features commonly associated with as transactional and relational psychological contracts. This finding did support Hypothesis 1. However, I found that the first three factors were required to fully capture the transactional and relational features, with two factors for the relational type, depending on the target.

The results of this factor analysis can be used to create the subscales for transactional and relational psychological contracts. Practically, it is important to have these subscales for future researchers wishing to measure transactional and relational features. Unit-weighted composites can be created based on the features found to characterize transactional, individual relational, and group relational features. These composites involve created a mean score based on the following features explicit, regulated, tangible, collective, stable, impersonal, and narrow for transactional psychological contract features; open, trust-based, individual, equal symmetry, employee focused, broad, flexible, minimal communication (negative), and respect for individual relational psychological contract features; and broad, respect, short-term, long-term (negative), trust-based, equal symmetry, and employer focused (negative) for group relational psychological contract features. These subscales had reliabilities values of $\alpha =$ .831 for transactional features, $\alpha = .871$ for individual relational features, and $\alpha = .857$ for

group relational features. The correlations among these subscales can be found in Table 3.

Table 3: *Correlations between Unit-Weighted Composites.*

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Factor 1	-		
Factor 2	.013	-	
Factor 3	.171**	.859**	-

*Note: * p < .05; ** p < .001* (two tailed). N = 379.

Cluster Analysis

Next, cluster analysis was used to test Hypothesis 2. To ensure thoroughness, three models were tested, generating three separate, competing solutions. These three models involved testing for two, three, and four distinct clusters. Additionally, two sets of cluster analyses were run: the first using only the psychological contract features I had predicted in my initial hypothesis, excluding the unexpected group relational feature. The second set of analyses run was an exploratory analysis using the three psychological contract features. For each, I expected that a three-cluster solution would provide the greatest consistency with the existing literature. Although there are no tests of significance for cluster analysis, the number of clusters extracted should be consistent with theory and determined by one's existing hypotheses (Burns & Burns, 2008). As noted, justification has been provided for why a three-cluster solution is consistent with existing theory and research.

The first set of analyses, using the two predicted psychological contract features, had a nearly equal number of cases in each of the three clusters (N = 147, 114, and 120).

The first cluster was characterized by mid-range scores on transactional features and

higher scores on the individual relational feature. The second cluster was characterized

by high scores on the transactional feature and mid-range scores on the relational feature.

The third and final cluster was characterized by high scores on both features. The final

cluster centres are reported below in Table 4.

Table 4. *Final Cluster Centres for Hypothesized Cluster Analysis*

	Cluster		
	1	2	3
TPC	3.73	5.11	5.15
IRPC	4.19	3.34	4.85

*Note: TPC = transactional psychology contract, IRPC = individual relational
psychological contract

The second, exploratory analysis used the largest three factors. The results of

these analyses also found that the three-cluster solution had the lowest set of mean square

errors and almost an equal number of cases in each cluster (N = 97, 156, and 128). The

final cluster centres for this analysis are reported in Table 5 below.

Table 5. *Final Cluster Centres for the Exploratory Cluster Analysis*

	Cluster		
	1	2	3
TPC	.475	3.88	5.34
IRPC	3.08	4.42	4.61
GRPC	3.59	4.45	4.80

*Note: TPC = transactional psychology contract, IRPC = individual relational
psychological contract, GRPC = group relational psychological contract

The three clusters that were extracted were categorized by the following patterns: the first cluster consisted of high scores of transactional and lower scores on individual and group relational features. This cluster represents a psychological contract which is predominantly transactional. The second cluster consisted of low values for transactional features and high values for both types of relational features. This cluster represents a predominantly relational contract, where a transactional contract still exists, perhaps as a "baseline", as other researchers have suggested, but many relational features are endorsed. The final cluster consisted of high scores on transactional contracts and high scores on both types of relational feature sets. This final cluster represents a balanced contract, where features of both transactional and relational contracts are high.

These cluster analyses are in partial support of Hypothesis 2, in that three clusters did exist, and I found evidence for a situation where transactional features are predominant and few relational features are endorsed (the high-low situation predicted), however, the high-high situation I predicted only held for the group, not individual, set of relational features and there was no low-low situation. Instead, there was a cluster where transactional features were endorsed at low rates, and both types of relational targeted features were endorsed at high rates. It should also be noted that the discrepancy between psychological contract features was larger on the exploratory analysis than in the planned analysis. Because these cluster types were not all in line with my hypotheses, regardless of the psychological contract features used on the analysis, I performed further exploratory analyses into the group differences that exist between clusters based on the second analysis.

Correlation Analysis

The correlations required to test Hypotheses 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, and 13 are reported below in Table 6. In addition, the full table of correlations among all of the variables in this study can be found in Appendix F. Because the focus of the study was on transactional and relational features only the correlations between the study outcomes variables and these factors are reported.

As seen in Table 6, transactional relational contracts were not significantly related to either affective or normative commitment. They were significantly positively correlated with continuance commitment ($r = .112$, $p = .03$). All three of these correlations are supportive of Hypothesis 3. Individual relational contracts were significantly positively correlated with all three components of commitment (affective $r = .482$, $p < .001$; normative $r = .479$, $p < .001$; continuance $r = .282$, $p < .001$). Group relational contracts displayed these same patterns of correlations (affective $r = .620$, $p < .001$; normative $r = .572$, $p < .001$; continuance $r = .348$, $p < .001$). These positive correlations lend support to Hypothesis 4.

Hypotheses 6 and 7 were also supported, as seen by the positive correlations between transactional, individual relational and group relational contracts with: employee dedication ($r = .111$, $p = .032$, $r = .378$, $p < .001$, and $r = .488$, $p < .001$ respectively), employee absorption ($r = .116$, $p = .024$, $r = .366$, $p < .001$, and $r = .407$, $p < .001$ respectively) and employee vigour ($r = .150$, $p < .001$, $r = .278$, $p < .001$, and $r = .423$, $p < .001$ respectively. Again, based on McInnis' (2012) results, I had predicted significant positive correlations across the board between both psychological contract types and each form of employee engagement.

Hypothesis 9 predicted that transactional contracts would not be significantly correlated with either form of organizational citizenship behaviours and positive correlations between relational contracts and each type of citizenship behaviour. The results supported these hypotheses, with non-significant correlations between transactional contract features and citizenship behaviours directed at both the individual and organization, and a correlation of $r = .152$ ($p = .003$) between individual relational contracts and citizenship behaviours directed at the individual and a correlation of $r = .386$ ($p < .001$) between individual relational contracts and citizenship behaviours directed at the organization. Similarly, I found correlations of $r = .193$ and $.438$ ($p < .001$) between group relational contracts and citizenship behaviours directed at the individual and organization, respectively.

Finally, the correlations between the factor scores and turnover intentions partially supported Hypothesis 12, which predicted transactional contracts would be weakly negatively correlated to turnover intentions. A non-significant correlation was found ($r = -.043$, $p = $ n.s.). Additionally, Hypothesis 12, predicted a negative correlation between relational psychological contracts and turnover intentions was supported for both individual and group relational contracts ($r = -.242$, $-.609$, $p < .001$).

Following this analysis, I tested Hypotheses 3 through 11 again, this time using the unit-weight composites of these factor scales. The results are reported in Table 7. Comparing Tables 6 and 7, there are few differences in the correlations between the factor scores and the composites with outcome variables. This is unsurprising, as the correlations between the factors and composites were quite high; $r = .97$ for transactional, $r = .84$ for individual relational, and $r = .61$ for group relational features.

Table 6. Correlations between Transactional and Relational Psychological Contract Factor Scores and Organizational Commitment, Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behaviours, and Turnover Intentions.

	Organizational Commitment			Employee Engagement			OCB		Turnover
	Affective	Normative	Continuance	Dedication	Absorption	Vigour	Individual	Organization	
Transact. Individual	-.031	-.004	.112*	.111*	.116*	.150**	-.055	-.046	-.043
Relational Individual	.482**	.479**	.282**	.378**	.366**	.278**	.152**	.386**	-.242**
Group Relational	.620**	.572**	.348**	.488**	.407**	.423**	.193**	.438**	-.609**

*Note: * p < .05; ** p < .001* (two tailed). N = 379. OCB = organizational citizenship behaviours.

Using this composite variable of transactional contracts, I found partial support for Hypothesis 3. There were non-significant correlations between transactional psychological contract and both affective and normative commitment, as predicted. There was also a non-significant correlation, however, between transactional psychological contract and continuance commitment, although I had predicted a positive correlation. This result differed from the analyses using the factor score for transactional psychological contract. Hypothesis 4 was fully supported for both the individual and group relational contracts. I found significant positive correlations between the individual relational contracts composite and affective commitment ($r = .642$, $p < .001$), normative commitment ($r = .644$, $p < .001$), and continuance commitment ($r = .376$, $p < .001$), as well as between the group relational contracts composite and affective commitment ($r = .586$, $p < .001$), normative commitment ($r = .602$, $p < .001$), and continuance commitment ($r = .397$, $p < .001$).

Both Hypotheses 6 and 7 were fully supported, with significant positive correlations between the transactional contract composite and dedication ($r = .123$, $p = .017$), absorption ($r = .115$, $p = .025$), and vigour ($r = .155$, $p = .002$), between the individual relational contract composite and each of the three forms of engagement ($r = .483$, $.448$, and $.383$, $p < .001$ for dedication, absorption, and vigour respectively), and between the group relational contract composite and each form of engagement ($r = .517$, $.482$, and $.455$, $p < .001$ for dedication, absorption, and vigour respectively). These results were consistent with the previous set of analyses.

Table 7. *Correlations between Transactional and Relational Psychological Contract Composites and Organizational Commitment, Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behaviours, and Turnover Intentions.*

| | Organizational Commitment | | | Employee Engagement | | | OCB | | Turnover |
	Affective	Normative	Continuance	Dedication	Absorption	Vigour	Individual	Organization	
Transact. Individual	-.002	.007	.100	.123*	.115*	.155*	-.054	-.034	-.073
Relational	.642**	.644**	.376**	.483**	.448**	.383**	.170**	.479**	-.445**
Group Relational	.586**	.602**	.397**	.517**	.482**	.455**	.215**	.497**	-.441**

*Note: * p < .05; ** p < .001* (two tailed). N = 379. OCB = organizational citizenship behaviours.

There were no significant correlations between the transactional psychological contract composite and organizational citizenship behaviours, however there was a significant positive correlation between individual and group relational psychological contract and each of the forms of organizational citizenship behaviour. These findings, with correlations of $r = .170$ and $r = .215$ ($p = .004$) respectively for relational psychological contracts with individually directed citizenship behaviours and $r = .479$ and $.497$ ($p < .001$) respectively for relational psychological contracts with organizationally directed citizenship behaviours, are in support of Hypothesis 9. These again reflect the correlations found using the psychological contract factor scores.

Finally, I tested Hypotheses 11 using the composite scores. I found partial support for this hypothesis, with a non-significant correlation between transactional contract features and turnover intentions ($r = -.073$, $p =$ ns) and a significant negative correlation between both individual and group relational psychological contracts and turnover intentions ($r = -.445$, and $r = -.441$ $p < .001$). These results were also in line with the previous analyses.

One-Way ANOVAs and Post Hoc Analyses

I tested Hypotheses 5, 8, 10, and 12 using a series of one-way ANOVAs, and found that there were group differences between the three cluster types of each of the outcomes variables: commitment, employee engagement, organizational citizenship behaviours, and turnover. The means, standard deviations, and reliabilities for these outcome variables can be found in Table 8.

In addition, there were significant group differences on two demographic variables: holding a management position, and salary. These differences were not

predicted, and therefore the comparisons were exploratory. To further investigate these

group differences, I conducted a post-hoc test of multiple comparisons using a

conservative Bonferroni adjustment. See Table 9 for the group mean differences, *F* tests,

and significance values.

Table 8. *Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach's Alphas for Study Organizational Commitment, Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behaviours, and Turnover Intentions*

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Alpha (α)
Affective Commitment	376	4.14	1.44	.866
Normative Commitment	376	4.03	1.43	.888
Continuance Commitment	376	4.11	1.32	.857
Engagement-Dedication	379	4.67	1.56	.914
Engagement-Absorption	379	4.43	1.40	.887
Engagement-Vigour	379	4.84	1.25	.865
OCB-Individual	376	4.52	1.31	.921
OCB-Organization	376	3.98	1.45	.932
Turnover Intentions	376	3.95	1.57	.847

First, I explored the differences between clusters on the demographic variables.

The one-way ANOVA resulted in a significant F-test ($F[369] = 5.91$, $p = .003$) for group

differences in management positions. This variable was coded so that a 1 represented

holding a management position, while 2 meant one was not a manager, therefore *lower*

values represented a high proportion of managers.

Looking further into the group differences, I found significant mean differences

between the transactional contract type and the relational contract type, with higher

averages for those in the predominantly transactional cluster than in the relational. There

were no other significant differences between the groups; therefore there are no

significant differences between those with relational and balanced contracts, or

transactional and balanced contracts on management position.

Table 9. *One-Way ANOVAs and Post Hoc Comparisons*

Dependent Variable	Cluster 1 Mean (TPC)	Cluster 2 Mean (RPC)	Cluster 3 Mean (BPC)	*F*	Significance
Management Position	1.87[a]	1.68[b]	1.75[a]	5.907	.003
Salary	2.27[a]	2.88[b]	3.02[b]	6.321	.002
Affective Commitment	2.84[a]	4.49[b]	4.69[b]	71.788	.000
Normative Commitment	2.70[a]	4.40[b]	4.58[b]	78.440	.000
Continuance Commitment	3.38[a]	4.17[b]	4.60[c]	26.670	.000
Engagement-Dedication	3.64[a]	4.71[b]	5.39[c]	42.662	.000
Engagement-Absorption	3.60[a]	4.47[b]	5.02[c]	33.021	.000
Engagement-Vigour	4.24[a]	4.82[b]	5.63[c]	22.983	.000
OCB-Individual	4.25[a]	4.65[a]	4.58[a]	3.007	.051
OCB-Organization	2.94[a]	4.27[b]	4.41[b]	39.753	.000
Turnover Intentions	4.87[a]	3.86[b]	3.95[c]	28.648	.000

Note: Cluster A (TPC) = predominantly transactional, Cluster B (RPC) = predominantly relational, Cluster C (BPC) = balanced psychological contract. Means with different superscripts are different at *p* < .05.

There were also significant group differences in salary (*F*[373] = 6.32, *p* = .002). Looking at the mean differences, there was a significant difference between the transactional and relational contract, in that those in the relational contract type reported higher average salaries than those with a transactional contract. There was also a

significant difference between the balanced contract and transactional contract on salary, with those with a balanced contract reporting higher salaries than those with transactional contracts. There were no significant group mean differences between the balanced and relational contract. Overall, the balanced contract had the highest mean salary and the transactional contract had the lowest.

There were significant group differences between the contract types for each of the outcome variables assessed in this study, excepting individually organizational citizenship behaviours, which had a non-significant F test. First, the ANOVAs tests for affective ($F[373] = 71.79$, $p < .001$), normative ($F[373] = 78.44$, $p < .001$), and continuance commitment ($F[373] = 26.67$, $p < .001$) were all significant. For both affective and normative commitment, there were significant group mean differences between transactional and relational contracts, as well as between transactional and balanced contracts. In each of these cases, the balanced contract had the high mean scores on affective and normative commitment, followed by the relational contract type, and the transactional contract type, respectively. The mean differences between relational and balanced contracts were not significant for either affective or normative commitment. For continuance commitment, there were significant mean differences between each of the contract types, with the balanced contract type having the highest mean, followed by relational contracts, then transactional contracts.

These results are in partial support of Hypothesis 5, which stated relational contracts would have higher means on affective and normative commitment above transactional contracts. I did not find support, however, for the hypothesis that the balanced contract would have the lowest means on commitment. Finally, none of the

hypotheses regarding continuance commitment were supported, as the balanced contract type had the highest mean score, and the relational contract mean score was higher than the transactional contract.

There were also significant group mean differences for employee dedication (F[376] = 42.66, $p < .001$), employee absorption (F[376] = 33.02, $p < .001$), and employee vigour (F[376] = 22.98, $p < .001$). In Hypothesis 8, I predicted that relational contracts would have the highest mean scores on each of the three subscales of engagement, which was not supported by the results. In fact, for dedication, absorption, and vigour, the differences between each cluster were all significant, and the balanced contract had the highest mean score for each of these engagement subscales. Relational contracts had a significantly lower mean score than the balanced contract, and transactional contracts had a significantly lower mean score than either of the other two contract types. Therefore, I did not find support for Hypothesis 8.

As noted above, there were no group mean differences for individually directed citizenship behaviours; however there was a significant F test for organizationally directed citizenship behaviours (F[373] = 69.36, $p < .001$). In terms of group mean differences, there were significant differences between transactional and relational contracts, and between transactional and balanced contracts. As with the other analyses, the balanced contracts had the highest mean scores, followed by relational and transactional contracts, respectively. Again, these results did not support Hypothesis 10, which predicted significant group mean differences on individually directed behaviours and that relational contracts would have the highest mean score. The only part of this

hypothesis that was confirmed was the higher mean score for relational over transactional contracts on organizationally directed behaviours.

Finally, there were significant differences between the groups on turnover intentions (F[373] = 28.65, $p < .001$), with significant mean differences between each of the clusters. Here, the highest mean scores on turnover intentions were for transactional contracts, followed by relational contracts, and then balanced contracts. This was in line with Hypothesis 12.

Discussion

The purpose of this investigation was to refine an existing feature-based psychological contract measure. In doing so, I developed a feature-based measure to assess transactional and relational psychological contract dimensions, which can be clustered into contract types. This feature-based measure can be used across jobs and industries, thus making it more generalizable than content-based or fulfilment/breach measures. To determine whether these measures reflect the constructs as I intended, I examined their relationship with workplace outcome variables that have been linked theoretically to psychological contracts. The implications of the results obtained in this study and additional insights for future directions for this line of research will be discussed here.

Psychological Contract Measure Refinement

As predicted, the measure reflected the two main psychological contract feature dimensions. Although I found support for the hypothesized distinction between transactional and relational feature dimensions, what was unexpected was that there were seemingly two factors for relational contracts – both which were characterized by respect,

broadness, a basis in trust, and balance between the interests of employee and employer. What distinguished these two forms of relational features was their differences: the individual relational feature dimension was characterized by open communication and an individual focus, while the group relational feature dimensions lacked these individual aspects but was characterized by long-term features. The original relational contract feature dimension I hypothesized was the individual relational dimension, and the group relational dimension was unexpected.

This finding was interesting and novel in that it suggests there may be more nuances to the relational feature than previously discussed in the literature. This distinct between individual- and group-targeted features have not previously been described in the literature, to the best of my knowledge. This has implications for further directions into the study of relational contract feature dimensions; therefore I conducted exploratory analyses using all three feature dimensions.

Although the overall feature-based measure showed good psychometric properties, there appear to be a few minor issues remaining: one of the features, impersonal, had a low inter-item correlation for the two items used to measure the construct. I noted above that, although these items did not correlate well with each other, both items still added to the reliability of the measure of transactional psychological contracts. The results did not seem to change if both, or only one, of the items were included in the analyses. To better understand the impersonal feature, I suggest that future researchers should consider adding an item to better capture the feature. I also suggest that further thought and inquiry focus on why these items both added to the measure reliability, despite not being correlated. If one item is not a strong representation

of the impersonal feature, it may be that it captures variance in another feature, and would be best placed with that composite instead. In the current analyses, however, I included both items in the measure.

The factor analysis also uncovered two additional factors of this measure: one, seemingly focused on a negotiated contract, and the other, focused on an implicit exchange between employee and employer. They accounted for a small proportion of the common variance, with only a few features defining each factor, and but did not contribute to either transactional or relational feature dimensions, and were outside the scope of the current study. Future researchers may consider these factors important in assessing psychological contracts in specific work samples, where negotiated or implicit features are the norm in psychological contracts. If these factors are representing a small part of potentially larger feature dimensions, more items or even features may need to be added in the future. This study only examined full-time employees, and replication with a sample that includes part-time employees should also be considered to further investigate all five factors.

Contract Types

The second aim of this study was to investigate the patterns of contract feature dimensions, or clusters. Two sets of this analysis were run: the first, in line with my hypotheses, only included the transactional and individual relational features I had originally predicted. The second included the three feature dimensions uncovered in the factor analysis, namely transactional, individual relational, and group relational. For both the planned and exploratory analyses, a three-cluster model was the most interpretable solution. The findings partially supported my hypothesis.

The three clusters obtained in the planned analysis were as follows: a predominantly relational contract, a predominantly transactional contract, and a balanced contract, with generally high values for both features. It should be noted that the differences in the final cluster centres between the features were not as high as I expected. That is, although the pattern was consistent with prediction, the relational features were not as predominant in the first cluster and the transactional features were not a predominant in the second cluster as I had anticipated.

Additionally, the third cluster was not as I had predicted. I had predicted a contract with low features, but found evidence for a balanced contract with high endorsement of all feature dimensions included in the analysis. Additionally, I had suggested that this low contract might be one held by those who have not placed much consideration into their work agreement, or by newer employees, who are still getting a sense of their employee-employer relationship. In fact, there were no significant group differences across the clusters for tenure or even age. Therefore, there was no evidence for a low, "forming" contract in new employees. This balanced contract did not support my hypothesis and was studied in an exploratory fashion in subsequent analyses.

In the exploratory cluster analysis, I found a similar solution to the first, however there was greater discrepancy between transactional and relational cluster centres. In this analysis, the three clusters were the same as above, with a predominantly transactional contract, a predominantly relational contract, and a balanced contract that consisted of high values on all three features. The individual and group relational features behaved very similarly in this analysis, lending support for the suggestion that these factors are two similar forms of relational contracts. The type of contract represented by each cluster

was more pronounced in this analysis than in the confirmatory version, although the same conclusions were reached. After conducting both versions of the cluster analysis, I felt that the individual-group relational distinction was an important one, and used the exploratory cluster analysis results as the basis for my further analyses.

Contract Features with Workplace Outcomes

In this study, I focused on the development, improvement, and evaluation of the feature-based measure. In addition, I wanted to include some theoretical analyses to test the accuracy with which the new measure subscales were related to outcomes that are linked to psychological contracts theoretically. In this vein, I conducted the correlational analysis on the more theoretically based factor scores, resulting from the principal axis factoring, as well as a unit-weighted composite score for each feature measure. I found not only few differences in the correlations between these factor scores and the study outcomes and the unit-weighted composites with study outcomes, but also that most of my hypotheses were supported. This suggests that the composite measures accurately reflect the factors, and that both the factor score and unit-weight measures were linked to the outcomes in the expected directions. The biggest difference between the factor correlations and the unit-weighted correlations is that the relationship between transactional features and continuance commitment was no longer significant using the unit-weighted scores, although the actual change in the correlation was .02. Some of the correlations, such as between individual relational features and turnover, changed in strength (the correlation was stronger), however there were no further changes in significance and no changes in direction.

As to my specific hypothesis, I found evidence for the hypothesized relationships between transactional and relational contract feature dimensions and affective and normative commitment, employee engagement, organizational citizenship behaviours, and turnover. There was, however, one instance where the results did not match my predictions, as there was no significant correlation between the feature composite score for transactional psychological contracts and continuance commitment. In fact, there were no significant correlations between transactional features and any of the forms of commitment. Transactional features alone are not enough to create commitment to the organization, although they are not connected to lower commitment either. Although this was not as I predicted, it is in line with previous findings of non-significance (Slobada, 1999). As noted above, this correlation between transactional psychological contract and continuance commitment was the one value that was significantly related to the feature factor scores and not the unit-weighted composite scores. It may be that the current correlation approaches significance, and future studies may find the positive correlation I predicted.

Additionally, I wish to draw attention to the correlation between the transactional feature and each subscale of employee engagement. These correlations were significantly positive, which is as I hypothesized, but is contrary to the predictions of previous researchers. This lends support to the idea that any psychological contract feature can be positively correlated with employee engagement. As mentioned before, this suggests that any form of psychological contract may be conducive to a sense of engagement. Additionally, the means values for engagement for those with relational contracts were higher than those with transactional contracts, which one might expect given the

definitions of transactional and relational contract features and the study's hypotheses. A future direction may be to investigate which features specifically are correlated with employee engagement, as it may be that there are certain features that relate highly with engagement, and that some of those are present in the transactional contract feature dimension, and that others (and perhaps more, as this relationship is stronger) are presented in the relational contract feature dimension. This study cannot speak to a causal reason why transactional features are positively related to engagement, and can only say that this is the second study to investigate these variables together, and the second to find these results.

Mean Differences in Contract Types

There were some unexpected results in the group comparisons and mean difference analyses. First, I did not make any specific predictions about group differences across demographic variables, although I suggested there might be some differences in tenure for those with the low contract cluster type. Differences did exist, however, and I conducted some further exploratory analyses into these differences. What I found was that those with relational contracts reported higher rates of management status, and that those with a balanced contract reported the highest salaries. No other demographic variable was associated with group differences. Those with transactional relationships had the lowest reported levels of management status and salary.

In all group mean comparisons except turnover intentions, the balanced contract had the highest outcome mean, over and above relational and transactional contracts. A balanced psychological contract where there was a relatively high value for both transactional and relational features was not hypothesized; therefore none of my original

hypotheses regarding group differences were fully supported. Additionally, except for turnover intentions, relational contracts had higher means for each of the workplace outcomes over and above transactional contracts. For most of the outcome variables, transactional contracts had the lowest mean score. The exception here is turnover intentions, where transactional contracts had the highest mean value. Therefore, I can conclude that although relational contracts are related to more positive work outcomes than transactional contracts, a balanced contract was related to the most positive work outcomes. Because I know of no other literature investigating this balanced contract type, this is a novel finding that furthers our understanding of psychological contracts and the outcomes associated with them.

Limitations and Future Directions

The largest concern I have raised with this measure is the issue of a non-significant correlation between the two items meant to represent the impersonal feature. Future research should include a further refinement of this feature, including additional items followed by a new investigation of its role in the factor structure underlying the measure, the reliability associated with the feature and with the transactional measure, and the resulting correlations with workplace outcomes. The current research was focused on assessing transactional and relational feature dimensions, but if future researchers are interested in the specific individual features, such as long-term or explicit, they should consider a multi-item measure for each feature with better reliabilities.

Another future direction is to further explore the few unexpected and novel findings in this study, namely the discovery of a distinction between individual and group relational features, and a balanced psychological contract type characterized by a high

level of endorsement of both transactional and relational features. Replication is required to strengthen the support for both of these findings. Additionally, the factor analysis produced five factors, two of which were not investigated in this study. Future research should consider using different samples, such as part-time or contract employees, to validate the results found here and further explore the two factors that were outside of the scope of this study.

This research was conducted using an online sample, and although the results were generally in line with existing research, my sample consisted of many Caucasian participants. Further tests should be conducted on larger samples to ensure these results hold. Also, because of the nature of online samples and the possibility for survey fatigue, I attempted to keep this survey as concise and short as possible. Overall, the study could have benefitted from the inclusion of a standard psychological contract measure to provide a further test of the construct and incremental validity of the newly created feature-based measure. McInnis (2012) included a measure of contract breach and found that the feature-based measure provided incremental validity over the breach items. In the future, I would also advise assessing this incremental validity with the current measure. Additionally, I used a cross-sectional design, which was consistent with my objective of measurement development. The next step would be using longitudinal analysis to investigate causal linkages between psychological contract feature dimensions and outcome variables. Finally, there were a number of checks used to filter out any non-purposeful responders, however dummy items were not included. Any future research on this topic should consider the inclusion of validity check items on most pages to better catch responders who are not providing honest, attentive answers.

Implications of the Research

The refinement and evaluation of this measure has both theoretical and practical implications. First, I have refined an existing measure and found evidence for the transactional and relational feature dimension that I expected, for strong internal reliability of a transactional, individual-relational, and group-relational subscale, and for general theoretical consistency in relationships between these subscales and commitment, engagement, organizational citizenship behaviours and turnover intentions. Aside from one outstanding issue with a feature in the transactional feature scale, I feel confident in using this measure to assess transactional and relational psychological contract feature dimensions in employees. By using a feature-based approach, I have avoided the issues associated with the specific items included in content-based measures. I have not only added to the sometimes-inconsistent literature on the relationships between these features and work outcomes, but have also provided support for significant group differences between the contract types. Additionally, by looking at the combinations of individual features into feature dimensions, and the combination of these dimensions into contract types, we can better explain why some correlations between individual features and outcomes have been inconsistent. This measure helps to provide a fuller picture of the interactions between features and the resulting relationships with outcome variables. The outcomes associated with a particular dimension may vary depending on the features it combines with.

These significant differences on workplace outcomes across contract types also ties into the practical significance of this study. We now have support for the notion that relational contracts often relate to more positive workplace outcomes than transactional

contracts, such as higher affective, normative, and even continuance commitment. We can then use these features as a guide to employers on the types of actions they can take to enhance perceptions of the kinds of features that are currently associated with positive work outcomes within their work context. We have evidence suggesting that there are even greater positive relationships for employees with a contract balancing high transactional and relational features with positive outcomes. The balanced contract was related to the highest levels of all components of commitment, all subscales of engagement, organizationally directed organizational citizenship behaviours, and to the lowest levels of turnover intentions. We can look at the type of features, such as explicit, tangible, broad, flexible, and respect-based, that are high in the balanced contract and associate these with positive work outcomes. From here, we can suggest to practitioners that trying to foster an exclusively money-based, transactional contract or a predominantly flexible, open relational contract with employees may not be as effective as a balancing act between the two types of features. We know that employees with this balanced contract have higher mean values of desired work outcomes, and although we cannot say that these contracts *cause* the positive relationships, we can say that they are more likely to go hand in hand. With this knowledge, we can make suggestions to employers about the kind of relationship they want to foster with their employees, and the kinds of features they may want to avoid to have the highest levels of commitment, engagement, organizational citizenship behaviours, and the lowest levels of turnover intentions possible.

References

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*, 1-18.

Argyris, C. (1960). *Understanding organizational behaviour.* Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Arnold, J. (1996). The psychological contract: A concept in need of closer scrutiny? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5*, 511-520.

Battisti, M., Fraucaroli, F., Fasol, R., & Depolo, M. (2007). Psychological contract and quality of organisational like- An empirical study on workers at a rest home. *Industrial Relations, 62*, 664-689.

Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's mechanical turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Sciences, 6*(1), 3-5.

Bunderson, S. (2001). How work ideologies shape the psychological contracts of professional employees: Doctor's responses to perceived breach. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 22,* 717-741.

Burns, R. B. & Burns, R. A. (2008). *Business research methods and statistics using SPSS.* UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Chalykoff, J., & Kochan, T. A. (1989). Computer-aided monitoring: Its influence on employee job satisfaction and turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, *42*, 807–829.

Cohen, A. (2011). Values and psychological contracts in their relationship to commitment in the workplace. *Career Development International, 16*(7), 646-667.

Conway, N. & Briner, R. B. (2002) A daily diary study of affective responses to psychological contract breach and expected promises. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 287-302.

Conway, N., & Briner, R. B. (2005). *Understanding psychological contract at work: A critical evaluation of theory and research.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Conway, N., & Briner, R. B. (2009). 50 years of psychological contract research: What do we know and what are the main challenges? In G. P. Hodgkinson & K. Ford (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 24, pp. 71-130). Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

Conway, N., Guest, D., & Trenberth, L. (2011). Testing the differential effects of changes in psychological contract breach and fulfillment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 79*, 267-276.

Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. –M. (2002). A psychological contract perceptive on organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 23*(8), 927-946.

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

DelCampo, R. G. (2007). Understanding the psychological contract: A direction for the future. *Management Research News, 30*, 432-440.

Freese, C., & Schalk, R. (2008). How to measure the psychological contract? A critical criteria-based review of measures. *South African Journal of Psychology, 38*(2), 269-286.

Gellatly, I. R., Meyer, J. P., & Luchak, A. A. (2006). Combined effects of the three commitment components on focal and discretionary behaviours: A test of Meyer and Herscovitch's propositions. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 69*, 331-345.

Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods, 1,* 104-121.

Hughes, L. W. & Palmer, D. K. (2007). An investigation of the effects of psychological contract and organizational-based self-esteem on organizational commitment in a sample of permanent and contingent workers. *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Studies, 14*, 143-156.

Johnson, J. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2003). The effects of psychological contract breach and organizational citizenship: Not all social exchange violations are created equal. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 24*, 627-647.

Lee, K. & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behaviour and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 131-142.

McInnis, K. J. (2012). *Psychological contracts in the workplace: A mixed methods design project.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Western Ontario, London, ON.

McInnis, K. J., Meyer, J. P., & Feldman, S. (2009). Psychological contracts and their implications for commitment: A feature-based approach. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 74*, 165-180.

McLean Parks, J., Kidder, D. L., & Gallagher, D. G. (1998). Fitting square pegs into round holes: Mapping the domain of contingent work arrangements onto the psychological contract. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19,* 697-730.

McNeely, B. L. & Meglino, B. M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behaviour: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(6), 836-844.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 538-551.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 61*(1), 20-52.

Montes, S. D., & Irving, P. G. (2008). Disentangling the effects of promised and delivered inducements: Relational and transactional contract elements and the mediating role of trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 1367-1381.

Montes, S., & Zweig, D. (2009). Do promises matter? An exploration of the role of promises in psychological contract breach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(5), 1243-1260.

Parzefall, M. R. & Hakanen, J. (2010). Psychological contract and its motivational health-enhancing properties. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25*, 4-21.

Powell, D. M., & Meyer, J. P. (2004). Side-bet theory and the three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 65*, 157-177.

Raja, U., Johns, G., & Ntalianis, F. (2004) The impact of personality on the psychological contract. *Academy of Management Journal*, *47*, 350-367.

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 behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16,* 289-298.

Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 2*(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 Behaviour, 11*(5), 389-400.

Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rousseau, D. M. (2010). The individual-organization relationship: The psychological contract. In S. Zedick (Ed in chief). *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 3: Maintaining, expanding, and contracting the organization* (pp. 191-214). Washington: American Psychological Association.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two simple confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *3*, 71-92.

Sels, L., Janssens, M., & Van Der Brande, I. (2004). Assessing the nature of psychological contracts: A validation of six dimensions. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 25*, 461-488.

Shore, L. M., Tetrick, L. E., Lynch, P., & Barksdale, K. (2006). Social and economic exchange: Construct development and validation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*, 837-867.

Sloboda, B. A. (1999). *Psychological experiences of contingent workers and their work and organizational outcomes*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations Abstracts International (No. AAT9934193).

Sturges, J., Conway, N., Guest, D., & Liefooghe, A. (2005). Managing the career deal: The psychological contract as a framework for understanding career management, organizational commitment and work behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26,* 821-838.

Tekleab, A. G. & Taylor, M. S. (2003). Aren't there two parties in an employment relationship? Antecedents and consequences of organization-employee agreement on contract obligations and violations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*, 585-608.

Turnley, W. H., Bolino, M. C., Lester, S. W., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2003). The impact of psychological contract fulfillment on the performance of in-role and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Journal of Management, 29*(2), 187-206.

Zhoa, H., Wayne, S. J., Glibkowski, B. C., &Bravo, J. (2007). The impact of

psychological contract breach on work-related outcomes: A meta-analysis.

Personnel Psychology, 60, 647-680.

Appendix A
Ethics Approval

Principal Investigator: Prof. John Meyer
File Number:105165
Review Level: Delegated
Protocol Title: Psychological Contracts: A Feature Based Approach to Understanding Transactional and Relational Contracts
Department & Institution: Social Science\Psychology,Western University
Sponsor: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

Ethics Approval Date: April 10, 2014 **Expiry Date:** August 31, 2014

Documents Reviewed & Approved & Documents Received for Information:

Document Name	Comments	Version Date
Instruments	This is the survey for the snowball sample. The letter of information contains inclusion and compensation information relevant to this sample.	2014/03/20
Instruments	This is the survey for the online panel sample. The letter of information contains inclusion and compensation information relevant to this sample.	2014/03/20
Recruitment Items	Email script for snowball sample	2014/04/03
Other	Introduction for snowball sample-Received Apr 7, 2014	
Other	Letter of Info for snowball sample-Received Apr 7, 2014	
Western University Protocol		2014/04/03

This is to notify you that The University of Western Ontario Research Ethics Board for Non-Medical Research Involving Human Subjects (NMREB) which is organized and operates according to the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Humans and the applicable laws and regulations of Ontario has granted approval to the above named research study on the approval date noted above.

This approval shall remain valid until the expiry date noted above assuming timely and acceptable responses to the NMREB's periodic requests for surveillance and monitoring information.

Members of the NMREB who are named as investigators in research studies, or declare a conflict of interest, do not participate in discussions related to, nor vote on, such studies when they are presented to the NMREB.

The Chair of the NMREB is Dr. Riley Hinson. The NMREB is registered with the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services under the IRB registration number IRB 00000941.

Appendix B

Recruitment Letter

Dear Participant:

You are being invited to participate in a research study exploring employee-employer relationships. In this study, we are interested in how you view your relationship with your current employer. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to respond to a number of questions regarding your current employment. The survey should take approx. 20 minutes and you will be compensated for your time.

Due to the nature of the study, we ask that participants be American citizens who are currently employed in a full-time job.

Participation in this survey is voluntary. You can choose to not answer any given question or to withdraw your consent at any given time by exiting the survey. All responses are confidential, and you will not be asked for any identifying information. Your name will never be connected to your responses.

Your participation on this survey would be greatly appreciated. If you have read the above information and agree to participate in this study, please indicate so by answering "Yes" to the next question.

You will be compensated $1 for your time. You should receive compensation within 24 hours of survey completion.

If you have any questions during, or after, this survey, please feel free to contact the researcher. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact the Director of the Office of Research Ethics at The University of Western Ontario.

Sincerely,
Brittney Anderson
M.Sc. Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario Canada

Appendix C

Feature-Based Psychological Contract Measure (McInnis, 2012)

Leading statement: How would you describe the nature of the relationship that you currently have with your employer?

Explicitness:
Explicit:
    1) includes terms that are specified clearly in writing or verbally.
    2) is explicitly defined.
Implicit:
    1) is implied by the way things are done.
    2) was shaped by ongoing interactions.

Flexibility:
Flexible:
    1) is open to modification if necessary.
    2) includes terms that are flexible and accommodating to changing conditions.
Static:
    1) is fixed (while in my current position).
    2) is static and predictable in nature.

Formality:
Regulated:
    1) includes terms that are formally developed and regulated.
    2) includes terms that are easily monitored by myself and my employer.
Trust-Based:
    1) is based on trust between myself and my employer.
    2) is unregulated and honour-bound.

Level:
Individual:
    1) is fairly unique.
    2) differs from that for other employees.
Collective:
    1) includes terms that are uniform across employees at my level.
    2) applies equally to employees in the same position.

Negotiation:
Negotiated:
    1) includes terms that were developed through negotiation.
    2) reflects a negotiated agreement.
Imposed:
    1) includes employer-imposed terms without input from me.
    2) includes terms I could not negotiate.

Appendix C continued.

Scope:
Narrow:
    1) focuses on conditions of employment.
    2) is limited to job-focused terms.
Broad:
    1) goes beyond the economic terms of employment.
    2) is about more than "just the money".

Symmetry:
Equal symmetry:
    1) involves balanced consideration of both parties' needs.
    2) includes terms that reflect equal partnership.
Unequal symmetry:
    1) favours the interests of the employer.
    2) is balanced in favour of the needs of my employer.

Tangibility:
Tangible:
    1) is well-defined and tangible in nature.
    2) contains measurable terms.
Intangible:
    1) is loosely defined and includes intangible terms.
    2) is open and contains abstract terms.

Time-Frame:
Short-term:
    1) has a short time horizon.
    2) assumes a limited-term relationship.
Long-term
    1) is long-term in focus.
    2) is future-oriented.

Communication:
Minimal:
    1) involves little discussion between me and my employer.
    2) is something we rarely talk about.
Open/Ongoing:
    1) involves ongoing communication between me and my employer.
    2) is openly discussed and evaluated.

Respect:
Respect:
    1) is based on mutual respect.
    2) involves appreciation and valuing of each other's opinions.

Appendix C continued

Impersonal:
1) is objective and impersonal.
2) focuses on facts rather than feeling.

Appendix D
Feature Descriptions

Explicitness:
1) Explicit: *The degree to which the terms of the relationship are clearly stated (e.g., during recruitment, selection, or socialization processes).*
2) Implicit: *The degree to which the terms of the relationship have to be inferred from policies and practices of the organization or its agents, or through interaction with other employees.*

Flexibility:
3) Flexible: *The extent to which the terms of the relationship can evolve and adapt in response to changing conditions.*
4) Static: *The extent to which the terms of the relationship are static and fixed at the time of formation.*

Formality:
5) Regulated: *The extent to which the terms of the relationship are regulated and monitored by the employer.*
6) Trust-based: *The extent to which the relationship is based on mutual trust.*

Level:
7) Individual: *The degree to which the employee perceives the terms of the relationship as being individually created for each employee.*
8) Collective: *The degree to which the terms of the relationship are collectively established to apply to all employees at a given level.*

Negotiation:
9) Negotiated: *The degree to which the terms of the relationship are negotiated with employees.*
10) Imposed: *The degree to which the terms of the relationship are imposed unilaterally by the organization.*

Scope:
11) Narrow: *The extent to which the relationship is restricted to job-relevant terms (e.g., attendance rates, vacation time).*
12) Broad: *The extent to which the relationship addresses personal issues (e.g., growth & development).*

Symmetry:
13) Equal symmetry: *The degree to which the needs of the employer and employee are considered equally.*
14) Unequal symmetry (employer focus): *The degree to which the relationship is biased in favour of the employer.*
15) Unequal symmetry (employee focus): *The degree to which the relationship is biased in favour of the employee.*

Appendix D continued.

Tangibility:
16) Tangible: *The degree to which the relationship focuses on concrete and measureable terms (e.g., work hours).*
17) Intangible: *The degree to which the relationship contains abstract terms and difficult to measurable concepts (e.g., opportunity).*

Time-frame:
18) Short-term: *The degree to which the relationship is short-term in duration*
19) Long-term: *The degree to which the relationship is long-term in duration*

Communication:
20) Minimal: *The degree to which the employee and employer communicate with each other on a minimal basis about the relationship.*
21) Open/Ongoing: *The degree to which the employee and employer communicate with each other on a regular basis about the relationship.*

Respect:
22) Respect: *The extent to which the relationship is based on mutual respect and appreciation for each other.*
23) Impersonal: *The extent to which the relationship is largely impersonal.*

Appendix E

Revised Feature-Based Psychological Contract Measure

Explicitness:
Explicit:
1) My and my employer's obligations to one another have been clearly specified verbally or in writing.
2) The terms of my relationship with my employer are explicitly defined.

Implicit:
1) My and my employer's obligations to one another are just naturally understood as "the way things are done."
2) My relationship with my employer is shaped though ongoing interactions.
3) My understanding of what I give and get in my employment relationship is largely learned through experience.
4) I have to figure out the terms of my employment; nothing is written down or stated explicitly.

Flexibility:
Flexible:
1) The terms of my relationship with my employer are open to modification if necessary.
2) The expectations my employer and I have for one another are flexible and can change with the situation.

Stable:
1) The terms of my relationship with my employer are unlikely to change while I remain in my current position.
2) My relationship with my employer is stable and predictable.
3) The terms of my employment were fixed at the time of my hiring.

Formality:
Regulated:
1) The terms of my employment are formally regulated.
2) There are formal rules governing most of the terms of the agreement I have with my employer.
3) The obligations my employer and I have to one another are structured by formal regulations.

Trust-Based:
1) My relationship with my employer is largely based on mutual trust.
2) The obligations my employer and I have to one another are largely based on trust rather than rules.
3) There is trust between my employer and I that our obligations will be fulfilled.

Appendix E continued.

Level:
Individual:
1) My relationship with my employer is fairly unique within my organization.
2) The terms of the relationship I have developed with my employer are different from that of other employees in similar positions.

Collective:
1) The terms of employment for all employees in my position are identical.
2) All employees in my position share the same employee-employer obligations.

Negotiation:
Negotiated:
1) The terms of my agreement with my employer were negotiated (by me or an employee association).
2) I had an influence in negotiating the terms of my employment relationship.

Imposed:
1) My employer largely set the terms of my employment agreement.
2) I had little opportunity to negotiate the terms of my employment agreement.
3) I have had little say in the terms of my relationship with my employer.

Scope:
Narrow:
1) My association with my employer focuses almost exclusively on conditions of continued employment.
2) The terms of my employment agreement are largely limited to job-specific duties.

Broad:
1) My relationship with my employer goes beyond the economic terms of employment.
2) My relationship with my employer is about more than "just the money".
3) The terms of my employment allow for my growth and development.

Symmetry:
Equal symmetry:
1) The terms of my employment involve balanced consideration of both my and my employer's needs.
2) My employer and I benefit equally from the terms of our agreement.

Unequal symmetry (employer focus):
1) The terms of my employment agreement largely favour the interests of my employer.
2) There is an imbalance in my employment agreement favouring the needs of my employer.

Appendix E continued.

Unequal symmetry (employee focus):
  1) The terms of the agreement between my employer and myself large favour my interests.
  2) The arrangement I have with my employer favours my needs over those of my employer.

Tangibility:
Tangible:
  1) The terms of my relationship with my employer are well-defined and tangible in nature.
  2) The terms of my agreement with my employee are concrete and measureable.
Intangible:
  1) The obligations that my employer and I have to one another are very loosely defined.
  2) My and my employer's obligations to one another are largely intangible and difficult to measure.

Time-Frame:
Short-term:
  1) My current employment relationship is short term.
  2) The obligations my employer and I have to one another do not imply a lasting relationship.
Long-term
  1) My and my employer's obligations to one another were formed with the expectation of a long-term relationship.
  2) The terms of my employment are based on expectations of a lasting relationship.

Communication:
Minimal:
  1) My employer and I rarely discuss my employment arrangement.
  2) I have had little communication with my employer regarding my employment situation.
Open/Ongoing:
  1) My employer and I regularly discuss my employment relationship.
  2) My employer and I openly discuss our mutual obligations to one another within our employment relationship.

Respect:
Respect:
  1) My relationship with my employer is based on mutual respect.
  2) My employer and I hold each other in high regard.
Impersonal:
  1) My relationship with my employer is objective and impersonal.
  2) My relationship with my employer is largely based on give and take.

Appendix F

Correlation Tables for Study Variables

Correlations between Transactional and Relational Factor Features and Organizational Commitment, Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behaviours, and Turnover Intentions.

	Factor			Organizational Commitment			Employee Engagement			OCB		T.I.
	1	2	3	AC	NC	CC	DE	AB	VI	I	O	
Factor 1: Transact	-											
Factor 2: Individual Relational	.023	-										
Factor 3: Group Relational	.003	.143**	-									
AC	-.031	.482**	.620**	-								
NC	-.004	.479**	.572**	.832**	-							
CC	.112*	.282**	.348**	.508**	.589**	-						
EE- DE	.111*	.378**	.488**	.676**	.616**	.440**	-					
EE- AB	.116*	.366**	.407**	.579**	.551**	.413**	.830**	-				
EE- VI	.150**	.278**	.423**	.556**	.509**	.357**	.817**	.837**	-			
OCB-I	-.055	.152**	.193**	.336**	.343**	.184**	.412**	.402**	.467**	-		
OCB-O	-.046	.386**	.438**	.670**	.634**	.477**	.644**	.558**	.602**	.612**	-	
T.I.	-.043	-.242**	-.609**	-.664**	-.621**	-.538**	-.555**	-.442**	-.430**	-.110**	-.468**	-

*Note: * p < .05; ** p < .001* (two tailed). AC = Affective Commitment, NC = Normative Commitment, CC = Continuance Commitment, EE = Employee Engagement, DE = Dedication, AB = Absorption, VI = Vigour, T.I. = Turnover Intentions. N = 379.

Appendix F continued.

Correlations between Transactional and Relational Feature Composites and Organizational Commitment, Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behaviours, and Turnover Intentions.

	Feature Types			Organizational Commitment			Employee Engagement			OCB		T.I.
	TPC	IRPC	GRPC	AC	NC	CC	DE	AB	VI	I	O	
Transact	-											
Individual Relational	.013	-										
Group Relational	.171**	.859**	-									
AC	-.002	.642**	.586**	-								
NC	.007	.644**	.602**	.832**	-							
CC	.100	.376**	.397**	.508**	.589**	-						
EE- DE	.123*	.483**	.517**	.676**	.616**	.440**	-					
EE- AB	.115*	.448**	.482**	.579**	.551**	.413**	.830**	-				
EE- VI	.155**	.383**	.455**	.556**	.509**	.357**	.817**	.837**	-			
OCB-I	-.054	.170**	.215**	.336**	.343**	.184**	.412**	.402**	.467**	-		
OCB-O	-.034	.479**	.497**	.670**	.634**	.477**	.644**	.558**	.602**	.612**	-	
T.I.	-.073	-.445**	-.441**	-.664**	-.621**	-.538**	-.555**	-.442**	-.430**	-.110**	-.468**	-

*Note: * p < .05; ** p < .001* (two tailed). TPC = Transactional Psychological Contract, IRPC = Individual Relational Psychological Contract, GRPC = Group Relational Psychological Contract, AC = Affective Commitment, NC = Normative Commitment, CC = Continuance Commitment, EE = Employee Engagement, DE = Dedication, AB = Absorption, VI = Vigour, T.I. = Turnover Intentions. N = 379.

Appendix G

Curriculum Vitae

BRITTNEY ANDERSON

EDUCATION

University of Toronto Scarborough   Sept 2007 – June 2012
    Candidate, Honours Bachelor of Science
    Psychology Specialist Co-op, Mental Health Stream

PUBLICATIONS

Velyvis, V., Parikh, S., Nguyen, R., Pezeseng, M., & Anderson, B. (2010). *Exploring the expressed concerns of bipolar disorder patients: Directions for psychosocial targets of treatment.* [abstract]. In abstracts of the 5rd Biennial ISAD Conference. April 16-19, 2010. Vancouver, B.C. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 122*, S46.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

Anderson, B. & Montes, S. D. (2013, June). *Resource theory in the workplace: Development of the employee-employer resource exchange scale.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of Administrative Sciences Association of Canada (ASAC), Calgary, AB.

POSTER PRESENTATIONS

Anderson, B., McInnis, K., & Meyer, J. P. (2014, June). *Using the feature-based approach to assess psychological contracts.* Canadian Psychological Association, Vancouver, B.C.

Velyvis, V., Parikh, S., Ivanova, A., Chan, S., **Anderson, B.,** & Penzeseng, M. (2010, April). *Exploring the expressed concerns of bipolar disorder patients: directions for psychosocial targets of treatment.* 6th Biennial ISAD Conference, Vancouver, B.C.

Dusek, J., Churchill, D., Velyvis, V., Ivanova, I., Flogen, S., **Anderson, B.,** & Hussain, A. (2010, June). *Effects of collaborative recovery training on mental health nurse wellbeing and burnout.* Nursing Research Day: Advancing Research for Health in our Global Community, Ryerson University, Toronto, ON.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Workshop: Module 5: "How to Write an Abstract and Prepare a Poster Presentation", Ontario Shores Centre for Mental Health Sciences, October 28, 2009.

GRADUATE WORK EXPERIENCE

Teaching Assistant   Sept 2012 – Present.
University of Western Ontario, London, ON

UNDERGRADUATE WORK EXPERIENCE
(Co-operative Education Placement)

Research Assistant   May 2009 – Aug 2009, May 2010 – Dec 2010.
Ontario Shores Centre for Mental Health Sciences, Whitby, ON

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Canadian Psychological Association (2012-2014)
Canadian Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (2012-2014)
Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (2014)