PERCEIVED BREACH and VIOLATION of the PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT in a COLLECTIVISTIC CULTURE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree

of

Masters of Business Administration

Rhodes Business School

RHODES UNIVERSITY

Submitted by

Somine van der Merwe

November 2014

Integrative Summary

The significance of relationships on economic actions and employee behaviour makes it critical for employers to understand the dynamics of employment through mutual obligations (Rousseau, 1990; Guest, 2004b). The psychological contract affords a broad platform to study the employment relationship (Thomas *et al.*, 2010), and is an important tool for organisational success (McDermott *et al*., 2013).

The literature review contained in this study indicates the differences in contracting environments due to the prevailing cultural orientation. However, there is a dearth of research in collectivistic culture, to which this study will add. The literature also makes a distinction between perceptions of breach and violation. While perceptions of breach of the psychological contract is the perception that the employer has not met all obligations and promises, violation is the emotional and affective state following breach (Morrison & Robinson, 1997) and results in negative or deviant behaviours (Chiu & Peng, 2008). Both breach and violation perceptions negatively affect employee behaviours and attitudes in the workplace (Aggarwal & Bhargava, 2014).

This research assumed a constructivist paradigm and builds understanding of the outcomes of breach and violation of the psychological contract on employees' working life in a collectivistic environment. Primary data collection was by in-depth semi-structured, one on one interviews with five employees of a state-subsidised organisation in East London, making use of convenience sampling. Follow up interviews were conducted, resulting in 7¼ hours of interviewing time. Cultural orientation was ascertained through the use of a questionnaire.

The findings of this study confirmed that the type of psychological contract entered into influences the outcomes of perceptions of breach and violation. Both dimensions of collectivism, namely institutional and in-group, were practised in this environment, which also impacted on both the individual's experience and outcomes for the organisation. The latter was influenced by commitment to organisational goals and supervisory or collegial relationships. Most notable of the results is the effect of expectations of transitional justice on experience of the psychological contract. Practical implications and recommendations for future research are made.

This research is presented in three sections; firstly the research is presented in the format of an **academic paper** and includes a concise summary of literature and research method. The second section is an expanded literature review of the psychological contract and its influencing factors, as well as the outcomes of breach and violation. The last section describes and justifies in detail the design of the research and the research procedure followed.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere thanks to Ms Geraldine Morcom of East London Museum who facilitated the data collection for this research, for which the Eastern Cape Department of Sport, Recreation Arts & Culture granted permission.

I am also deeply grateful to Prof Noel Pearse for his professional guidance, support and patience.

To Jorich, Daniël and Katerien; you are my inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page no
Integrative summary		2
Acknowledgements		4
	Section 1: THE ACADEMIC PAPER	
1.1	Abstract	8
1.2	Introduction	9
1.3	Psychological Contract	9
14	Culture	11
1.5	Breach of the Psychological contract	12
1.5.1	Outcomes of Breach	13
1.6	Violation of the Psychological Contract	14
1.6.1	Outcomes of Violation	15
1.7	Justice Theory	15
1.8	Methodology	17
1.8.1	Aim & Objectives	17
1.8.2	Research Method	17
1.8.3	Sampling	18
1.8.4	Data Collection	18
1.8.5	Data Analysis	18
1.9	Findings & Discussion	19
1.9.1	Introduction	19
1.9.2	Culture	19
1.9.2.1	Institutional Collectivism	20
1.9.2.2	In-group Collectivism	22
1.9.2.3	Communitarian Contracts	23
1.9.2.4	Custodial Contracts	25
1.9.3	Breach & Violation of the Psychological Contract	26
1.9.3.1	Incidents leading to Perceptions of Breach	26
1.9.3.2	Incidents leading to Perceptions of Violation	27
1.9.3.3	Outcomes	28
1.9.3.3.1	Influencing factors	31
1.9.4	Conclusion	33

1.10 Recommendations 33
1.10.1 Practice 33
1.10.2 Further Research 34
1.11 References 35
SECTION 2: LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 Context of the Study 44
2.2 Psychological Contract 44
2.2.1 Agents 46
2.2.2 Breach 47
2.2.2.1 Outcomes of Breach 48
2.2.3 Violation 49
2.2.3.1 Outcomes of Violation 50
2.2.3.1.1 Deviant Behaviour 51
2.2.3.1.2 Negative Voice 52
2.3 Social Exchange Theory 52
2.4 Equity Theory 53
2.5 Culture 55
2.5.1 Collectivism 56
2.5.1.1 Institutional Collectivism 58
2.5.1.2 In-group Collectivism 58
2.5.1.3 Types of Contract 59
2.5.1.3.1 Communitarian Contract 59
2.5.1.3.2 Custodial Contract 59
2.6 Conclusion 59
2.7 References 61

DESCRIPTION OF METHODOLOGY
3. Description of Methodology 70
3.1 Methodology 70
3.2 Research Method 70
3.3 Sampling 70
3.4 Data Collection 71
3.4.1 Psychological Contract 71
3.4.2 Cultural Orientation 72

3.5 Data Analysis 74
3.6 Ethical Considerations 75
3.7 References 76
Appendix 1: Profiles of Interviewees 80
Appendix 2: Interview Topics 81
Appendix 3: Questionnaire 84
Appendix 4: Results of Questionnaire 87
Appendix 5: Consent Form 88

SECTION 1: THE ACADEMIC PAPER: Perceived Breach and Violation of the Psychological Contract in a Collectivistic Environment

1.1 Abstract:

The psychological contract offers a broad platform to study the employment relationship and assists understanding of the factors which influence an employee's experience in the work place. In this paper the results of in-depth interviews conducted in a multi-cultural environment are discussed. The main aims of the study were to ascertain cultural orientation within the organisation, whether breach or violation of the psychological contract was perceived, and how those outcomes influenced their working life experience. . Primary data collection was by in-depth semi-structured, one on one interviews with five employees of a state-subsidised organisation in East London. Results confirmed the type of psychological contract entered into influences the outcomes of perceptions of breach and violation. Both dimensions of collectivism, namely institutional and in-group were practised in this environment, which also impacted on both the individual's experience and outcomes for the organisation. Themes common across all the interviews were the distinction made between unmet obligations and promises of the employer towards the employee and those to the institution; and the difference in outcome to perceptions of breach and violation experiences. The latter was influenced by a commitment to organisational goals and supervisory or collegial relationships.

Most notable of the results is the effect of expectations of transitional justice on experience of the psychological contract. Practical implications and recommendations for future research are made.

1.2 Introduction

The psychological contract affords a broad platform to study the employment relationship, as the concept denotes the perceptions of the terms of the exchange relationship between the employer and employee (Thomas *et al.*, 2010). Effective psychological contracts are critical for the success and competitiveness of an organisation (McDermott *et al.*, 2013). The guidance of employees' psychological contracts is therefore an essential management task (Guest & Conway, 2002). The impact of cultural orientation in psychological contract experience has of late been neglected (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012).

In this study breach and violation perceptions of the psychological contract in a collectivistic environment was investigated to build understanding of the effects it has on the organisation.

The literature review outlines the development of the concept as well as the outcomes of breach and violation on the employee – employer relationship. The influence of culture on the experience of the psychological contract and the perceptions of justice as it has been studied is also summarised.

1.3 Psychological Contract

The concept 'psychological work contract' was first used by Argyris in 1960 to describe the values and powers of perceptions held by both the organisation and the employee (Rousseau, 1989; Guest, 1998; Robinson, 1996; Cullinane & Dundon, 2006). Argyris (1960), Schein (1965) & Levinson *et al.* (1962) conceptualised the psychological contract (Lo & Aryee, 2003) to be a form of social exchange, which assists in understanding "the role of subjective and indeterminate interactions between two parties"; employee and employer (Cullinane & Dundon, 2006: 115). Schein (1978, as quoted by Guest, 1998: 650) defined the psychological contract as "a set of unwritten reciprocal expectations between an individual employee and the organization", and believed the psychological contract to be an influential determinant of how employees behave within organisations (Rousseau 1989: 126). This definition of Schein forms the basis of later research (Robinson, 1996, Johnson

O'Leary-Kelly, 2003, Restubog *et al.*, 2010; Jafri, 2011; Eckerd *et al.*, 2013; Epitropaki, 2013; Hermida & Luchman, 2013; Ng *et al.*, 2013), initiated by Rousseau in 1989.

The concept psychological contract stems from studies in the field of social exchange theory, central to which is that social relationships consist of unspecified responsibilities and unequal power resources among participants (Cullinane & Dundon, 2006). Guest (1998: 659) maintained that the study of the psychological contract in the changing labour market focuses consideration on the distribution of power, specifically in an economy which sees an increase in the inequality of wealth.

The psychological contract facilitates the investigation of the content and processes of the explicit and implicit dealings within the employment relationship, which might change over time, is influenced by a variety of contextual factors; and results in various possible consequences (Guest, 2004). Since the late 1980's the psychological contract has been associated with an employee's commitment to the organisation, evident in behaviour such as practising the organisation's values, being prepared to wield extra effort in achieving the goals of the organisation, and a wish to continue being an employee (Rousseau, 1989).

Psychological contracts can either be transactional or relational. Transactional contracts are economic in focus, for a specific time frame, static, narrow in scope and are public. Relational contracts are economic and socio-emotional in focus, over an indefinite period, dynamic, pervasive in scope and subjective (Rousseau, 1990; Suazo et al., 2009; Jafri, 2011).

A strong indicator of how an employee experiences and acts towards the organisation is the widespread belief in reciprocity across all human society (McDermott, *et al.*, 2013). Rousseau (1989) predicted that psychological contracts will become more prevalent where individuals believe in entitlement, as well as in the importance of relationships.

1.4 Culture

A significant role in psychological contracting is played by cultural values and -norms (Kickul *et al*., 2004). Hofstede defines culture as the common characteristics shared by a group through their customs and social behaviour (1980: 24). Culture has many purposes, including assisting people to make sense of what they encounter; defining right from wrong, establishing priorities, and determining appropriate and undesirable behaviour (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014).

Hofstede's landmark study in 1980, and revised in 2001, has been widely used in measuring the cultural dimension of individualism–collectivism (Taras *et al.*, 2010). Individualism – Collectivism is possibly the most powerful cultural dimensions through which a wide variety of social behavioural conduct can be examined (Thomas *et al.*, 2010). Individualism denotes the individual's predisposition to view himself as independent from others and being more focused on his personal goals; while collectivism refers to the tendency to be more focused on the "goals of the in-group" and being willing to sacrifice personal benefits for the welfare of the group (Thomas *et al.*, 2003: 455) while behaviour is often guided by obligations and norms to favour the in-group (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012).

In collective cultures equality is preferred as a rule of distributive justice, rather than equity, which is the case in individualistic cultures. Equality dictates that rewards are equally distributed among all the members of the group, irrespective of the individual's contribution. In addition, values such as harmony, loyalty, solidarity and cohesiveness are highly cherished (Fadil & Williamson, 2009: 136). In such a culture the employer is seen as fulfilling a parental role, taking care, assisting, supporting the employee, and consequently the impact of a breach would be more pronounced than in an individualistic culture (Restubog *et al*., 2009).

In collectivist cultures the accent is on relationship formation regardless of advantage to the individual; and attending to the "attributes" of the organisation, namely what supervisors and managers expect in terms of norms and roles (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012). Collectivists contribute what they can in exchange relationships, while taking what they need from the shared resources (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012).

Since perceptions are influenced by values, a collectivist's perception of what the employer's obligations are is formed in relational terms. A collectivist develops a positive self-image from belonging and being amenable to others (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012). Collectivists by nature engage in relational psychological contracts, which are underpinned by socio-emotional obligations such as loyalty and commitment (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012).

Every society has developed its own idiosyncratic pattern of cultural orientations, due to its particular history (Chirkov *et al.*, 2005). Triandis *et al.* (1986, as quoted by Ott-Holland *et al.*, 2014) was the first to make a distinction of familial, or in-group, and institutional collectivism. Institutional collectivism originates from a perception of equality, justice and collective action (Joy & Kolb, 2009), and is characterised by collective distribution of resources and collective actions (Naor *et al.*, 2010), to the benefit of the organisation or society rather than to the in-group or to the individual (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014). In-group collectivism is characterised by members yielding to the in-group's authority and will sacrifice themselves for their in-group (Triandis, 2001) and its leader (Chirkov *et al.*, 2005). While in-group collectivism promote loyalty, pride and cohesiveness in the group (Javidan et al., 2006), it has also been found to statistically significantly negatively correlated to general satisfaction and societal health (Alas, 2006).

1.5 Breach of the Psychological Contract

The continuous changes in the work environment result in changes in the psychological contract, which increase the possibility of misunderstanding and experience of perceived unmet obligations (Robinson, 1996). Breach is more than just unmet expectations, and is experienced by much stronger reactions (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). Breach is defined as the "cognition" of the employer's failure to respond to the obligations the employee believes it holds towards him / her in a manner proportionate to his / her contribution (Morrison & Robinson, 1997: 230). It is a subjective experience (Rousseau, 1989; Robinson, 1996; Johnson & O'Leary-Kelly, 2003; Lo & Aryee, 2003); a perception, not necessarily fact, which influences behaviour and attitude (Robinson, 1996).

Effects of perceptions of breach are more damaging to the employment relationship than fulfilment of the psychological contract has positive effects. This is substantiated by prospect theory which suggests that since people register a loss more intensely than any pleasure from a gain, they would rather concentrate resources on recovering losses than making gains (Conway *et al.*, 2011). In contrast, negative effects of a psychological contract breach are enhanced when employees believe that a high level of politicking is evident in their organisation (Kiewitz *et al*., 2009).

Because of a continuous changing workplace environment (Restubog *et al*., 2012), perceptions of breach is the norm rather than the exception (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Agarwal & Bhargava, 2014).

1.5.1 Outcomes of Breach

When employees feel that their outcomes do not measure up to what they were promised, they will engage in counterproductive, withdrawal, and / or negative behaviour to restore equity (Restubog *et al*., 2008). Kickul *et al*. (2004) categorised outcomes of breach as either behavioural or attitudinal reactions. Experiencing a significant negative workplace event produce affective reactions such as anger or frustration, which contribute to the formation of work behaviours and attitudes (Zhao *et al*., 2007). Perceptions of breach could have severe negative effects on relationships, which are not easily repaired (Conway *et al*., 2011).

Particularly in relational psychological contracts, breach negatively affects emotional commitment to the organisation (Jafri, 2011). Negative outcomes of perceptions of breach include withdrawal behaviours, poor work attitude, and reduced performance (Restubog *et al*., 2012).

1.6 Violation of the Psychological Contract

Perceptions of breach of the psychological contract frequently develop into perceptions of violation (Suazo & Stone-Romero, 2011). The greater the

discrepancy in perceptions held and actual experience, the higher the likelihood of perceptions of violation (Turnley & Feldman, 1999).

Violation is defined as an emotional and affective experience of anger, frustration, disappointment and resentment, which may follow from perceptions of breach. It is affected by (often flawed) perceptions, beliefs and judgements (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Suazo & Stone-Romero, 2011; Eckerd *et al.*, 2013; Ng *et al*., 2013).

The development of violation perceptions is affected by judgements regarding both outcomes and process. The outcomes are influenced by the employee's perception of the magnitude of the breach, as well as the extent of the implications following the breach. Process judgements refer to the employee's assessment as to why the breach evolved and the degree of unfairness involved in the breach experience (Morrison & Robinson, 1997).

The cognitive assessment of the perception of a breach leads to responses of mistrust and frustrations due to imbalance in the employer – employee relationship, to which the employee retaliates with negative, sometimes deviant, behaviours (Chiu & Peng, 2008) and revenge (Bordia *et al*., 2008). The cultural setting of the organisation, i.e. individualistic or collectivistic, has a bearing on the intensity of employee deviance (Chiu & Peng, 2008).

1.6.1 Outcomes of Violation

Outcomes of perceived violation of the psychological contract include negative behaviour such as reduced organisational commitment, reduced or complete withdrawal of organisational citizenship behaviour (Pate *et al.*, 2003; Ravlin *et al.*, 2012), discretionary absenteeism (Chiu & Peng, 2008), reduced effort and increased cynicism regarding the employer's integrity (Pate *et al*., 2003); increased turnover intentions (Robinson, 1996), as well as mistrust, decreased in-role performance (Ravlin *et al*., 2012) reduced performance on extra role behaviours (Turnley & Feldman, 1999).and, job neglect (Turnley & Feldman, 1999; Lo & Aryee, 2003). Extra-role behaviour is defined as actions not stipulated in the job description or related to employee's rank (Zhu, 2013).

The desire for, or thoughts of, revenge often lead to deviant workplace behaviour (Restubog *et al.*, 2012). Employee deviant behaviour is defined as "voluntary behavior that violates significant organisational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both" (Robinson & Bennett, 1995: 556; Chiu & Peng, 2008: 427). More than just withdrawal, it incorporates voluntary negative behaviour, including aggression, resulting in enormous cost in productivity and organisational performance (Chiu & Peng, 2008).

Employee deviant behaviour due to violation of psychological contract is classified into two forms, namely interpersonal deviance and organisational deviance. Interpersonal deviance is influenced by individual factors such as self-control, attributional style and negative affectivity, while organisational deviance is influenced by abusive supervision and organisational injustice (Chiu & Peng, 2008). In an aggressive work culture violations could lead to negative and confrontational employee behaviour (Restubog *et al*., 2012).

1.7 Justice Theory

Adams' (1965 as cited by Huseman *et al.,* 1987) equity theory is built on the proposition that individuals appraise their relationships with others by comparing their inputs in and resultant outcomes of the relationship to the inputs and outcomes of the other in that relationship. Social exchange behaviour is also ruled by organisational justice, which is how the individual perceives fairness to be acted out at the workplace (Biswas *et al*., 2013).

The stronger the opinions of fairness, the stronger the belief that norms of psychological contract were upheld, which enhances socio-emotional bonds between the employee and the organisation (Biswas *et al*., 2013).

Employees' attitudes and behaviour is affected by their perception of justice within the organisational system (Restubog *et al.*, 2009). Organisational justice represents the fairness of how an employee is treated by "an organisational system and its agents" (Linna *et al*., 2011: 706) and the process of allocating rewards (Biswas *et al*.,

2013). Distributive justice is concerned with how impartial recognition and rewards are allocated by the employer (Biswas *et al*., 2013). Procedural justice refers to the perceptions of how fair the procedures and policies are when making decisions (Greenberg, 1990, Brockner *et al*., 2001, Tzafrir *et al.*, 2004).

The use of accurate information, provision of voice and uniformity in decision-making processes are important aspects which contribute to procedural fairness (Rosen *et al.,* 2009). Voice refers to the degree to which people are allowed to contribute to the decision making process (Brockner *et al*., 2001). Aggressive and negative voice include behaviours such as continually confronting others until they give in to personal demands, deliberately overstating a grievance, and involving external constituencies to put pressure on internal opponents (Ng *et al*., 2013).

Since the turn of the century the concept of transitional justice has received more attention in theoretical research. Transitional justice is associated with periods of political change (Teitel, 2003) and is an instrument through which broad social transformation is sought (Andrieu, 2010). It is defined as "a response to systematic or widespread violations of human rights (Andrieu, 2010: 2) in the context of regime change" and comes into being when "the state seeks to redress authorised wrongdoing" (Winter, 2013: 231, 232).

Andrieu (2010) distinguishes 3 categories of action, namely restorative justice, legal justice and social justice. The latter is applied to address the political, economic and social injustices of the past, using measures such as financial or symbolic reparation, affirmative action, development and gender-specific approaches. Non-judicial measures employed to redress the legacies of the past include institutional reforms (International Center for Transitional Justice, 2014).

As no reparation programme can ever compensate for the past, structural distributive programmes could redress a general sense of victimhood (Andrieu, 2010). As the ultimate aim of transitional justice is a democratic and reconciled society, it does so by creating specific institutional conditions (Winter, 2013).

1,8 METHODOLOGY

1.8.1 Aim & Objectives

The aim of this research is to better understand if and how employees perceive a breach and/or violation of their psychological contract in a collectivistic culture.
The objectives are:

- To describe how an employee experiences his / her individual psychological contract; and
- Assess the impact on his / her working life in the event of perceptions of a breach and / or violation of the psychological contract; and
- The effect of a collectivistic culture on these experiences.

1,8.2 Research Method

This research is a case study, which is defined as an in-depth investigation of one instance of a social phenomenon (Babbie, 2011). The research assumed a constructivist philosophic stance (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), while adopting a deductive approach (Babbie, 2011), exploring the applicability of deductions from accepted theory on psychological contracts and collectivistic culture.

1.8.3 Sampling

The site of data collection was a government-subsidised entity in East London, Eastern Cape, where all employees are civil servants. Four volunteers from a total of 32 staff members were sought making use of convenience sampling, across cultural groups and position in hierarchy. A fifth interviewee, who had left the organisation 8 months prior to the study, also participated. Her experiences of unmet expectations would add further depth to the understanding of the research question.

1.8.4 Data Collection

Primary data collection was by in-depth semi-structured, one on one interviews ranging in time from 38 to 82 minutes. Follow up interviews were conducted with

three of the five interviewees, for clarity and deeper understanding. This resultant "rich" data from the interviews will increase validity (Maxwell, 2009).

Questions were centred on the state of the psychological contract, experiences of breach or violation, and cultural values observed (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau 2000; Tekleab & Taylor, 2003; Thomas *et al*., 2010). Interviews were conducted face to face, and recorded with the prior permission of interviewees. The interviewee now employed in a neighbouring province was interviewed via Google Hangouts, a similar video chat platform to Skype. Interviews were transcribed and supplied to interviewees for verification.

A questionnaire based on a referent-shift consensus model to ascertain cultural orientation (Fischer *et al*., 2009) was adapted and submitted for voluntary completion. Nineteen of the 32 staff members completed this questionnaire. A shortened version of the same questionnaire was offered to interviewees before commencing with their initial interview, in order to inform the questions in the interview regarding their own cultural orientation.

1.8.5 Data Analysis

The general strategy for analysis was pattern matching, with particular use of the explanation building technique (Yin, 2003).

1.9 FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

1.9.1 Introduction

The objectives of this study were to build an understanding of how employees experience their psychological contracts in a collectivistic environment, as well as the impact of breach and violation perceptions on their working life.

The five interviewees were of varying rank, and from different cultural backgrounds. The in-depth interviews supplied rich information and understanding of the interviewees' experience of their psychological contract. Firstly, the cultural orientation will be discussed, as it had a significant influence on their experiences.

Secondly, a discussion on breach and violation experiences will follow. Lastly other influencing factors will be explored.

1.9.2 Culture

A significant role in psychological contracting is played by the individual's cultural values (Kickul *et al*., 2004) which determine how people interact with each other (Den Hartog & Verburg, 2004). This study in a multi-cultural organisation aimed to ascertain whether a collectivistic culture prevailed, and how it affected psychological contract experiences.
It was evident from survey results that employees operated within a collectivistic culture.

Questionnaires were completed by staff, in which they reported on the typical norms and behaviours of their colleagues. The results indicated that participants score their colleagues towards the centre of the collectivism – individualism continuum. Similar results were found in a recent cross-national study (Bhagat *et al*., 2010). Of particular interest of the current study, was that the highest score on the collectivistic side was for the definition of the self, specifically "when in need, people turn to others for help", and "it is important for people to act as a member of their group". The other items measuring individualism – collectivism were all scored toward the centre of the continuum, skewed slightly towards collectivism, suggesting that overall a collectivist culture was in evidence. (See Appendix 4).
The interviewees' self-assessment in a shortened questionnaire revealed that three interviewees described themselves as a collectivistic, while the remaining two scored more to the centre of the continuum, skewed towards collectivism. Self-definition and norms and attitudes scored highly collectivistic for all interviewees. (See Appendix 4).

Collectivism is characterised by interdependency within the group (Triandis & Gelfand, 2012). Quality of relationships with colleagues featured strongly in employees' experience of the work environment. Interviewees expressed their connectedness to their colleagues as a group, for instance referring to colleagues collectively as "*the museum family."* Belonging to a group was evidenced through the constant use of plural pronouns when conversing about experiences at work, as was

working together towards a common goal. This is characteristic of a collectivistic orientation where group goals are prioritised over individual goals, and behaviour is guided by obligations and duties towards and norms of the group (Triandis & Gelfand, 2012). Most of the interviewees stated their contributions in achieving the goals of the organisation.

The consequence of a prevailing collectivistic culture is that members' behaviours, motivations, perceptions and emotions aim to promote connections with the group (Triandis & Gelfand, 2012). Statements of support of this include: "*Maybe you can help that person*." And "*I'm willing to help them."* Collectivists maintain a positive self-image through belonging to the group and maintaining harmony (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012). A statement expressing this sentiment was: *"We stand together and make things better."*

It was clear from the interviews that culture played a pivotal role in the understanding and experience of the psychological contract in several ways. Both dimensions of collectivism, namely institutional and in-group collectivism were distinguishable.

1.9.2.1 Institutional Collectivism

The majority of interviewees, from different cultural backgrounds, manifested characteristics of institutional collectivism. Firstly, participants of institutional collectivism are motivated to enhance the organisation (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014). Most interviewees expressed their commitment to the organisation. One stated: *"I'm here to make this the best institution."* Interviewees expressed the belief that the ultimate goal of the organisation was to serve the public, and that this belief was learned from previous directors and supervisors. Communication played a pivotal role in establishing and maintaining connectedness to the goals of the organisation. Interviewees described their commitment to the goals of the organisation: *"it is about the public"; and "we work for the public".*

Secondly, institutional collectivism is similar to horizontal collectivism described by researchers (Thomas *et al*., 2010) as an environment where people establish egalitarian relations regardless of status and qualities (Chirkov *et al*., 2005), and

collaborate with one another. Most interviewees expressed relationships across sections, cultural backgrounds and seniority.

Members tend to be interdependent, but extend this beyond the small in-group to relationships with the organisation (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014). Interviewees regularly communicated their inter-relatedness with other members of the organisation:

> *"And then the other departments in the museum I do assist there. … I'm glad that I'm doing that, because that is what I'm here for."*

In fact, collaborative behaviour is encouraged in an institutional collectivistic society (Ott-Holland *et al.*, 2014).

Thirdly, this leads to a conviction that belonging to the organisation is of higher importance than that of smaller in-groups (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014). Interviewees related instances where the leader of the smaller in-group collectivists attempted to win them over to enact negative behaviour in protest against perceived undesirable work aspects, but that they declined as their commitment to serving the public outweighed personal grievances.

> *"To them, they are angry, and then they won't do the work. But to me, I'm angry, but I'm still doing the work."*

Finally, high levels of interpersonal trust exist among members who are of an institutional collectivist orientation (Realo *et al.*, 2008) as evidenced by several interviewees who expressed their delight at experiencing trust from colleagues from other sections in the organisation and from those of higher rank. "*Later they left me to my own devices. That was wonderful."* It was found that these high levels of trust motivated interviewees to accept additional responsibility, which in turn lead to increased job satisfaction. One interviewee summarised this as follows: *"Go the extra mile, make sure that things happen."*

1.9.2.2 In-group Collectivism

Several interviewees described a smaller group of colleagues who manifested in-group collectivistic behaviour. Individuals within an in-group collectivistic orientation

see themselves as interdependent of each other, while there is also a difference in status within the in-group (Thomas *et al.*, 2010). A much smaller group, "*only four to five*", in the organisation, is led by a dominant individual, whom interviewees described variously as the "*ring-leader*" and the "*troublemaker*". Vocal critics, or users of aggressive or negative voice are often seen as trouble makers (Ng *et al*., 2013: 2).

Self-reported norms of this group are to stand together, to protect members of the in-group and to advance the goals of the in-group leader. One interview related how the in-group disapproves of any perceived negative experiences of its members and actively took measures to protect each other: "*That's why we stand as a group and fight …"* In-group collectivism emphasises obligations and duties to the members of this tight group (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014).

Interviewees expressed veiled irritation with this faction due to their commitment to the in-group's goals, which sometimes was in conflict with the goals of the organisation. The frustration could stem from the belief in collectivistic environments, that participants are expected to be loyal to the organisation first, as well as the nature of collectivists to form a unified front on how to behave (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012).

The presence of a strong leader among the in-group collectivists was evident. One interviewee remarked: *"There is only one who can influence the others to go with her or him. It happens very often."* As in-group collectivists are strongly motivated by a sense of belonging to the in-group, rather than a desire to matter or have influence in the organisation (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014), the institutional collectivists found it difficult to appreciate the in-group followers' apparent inability to stand up against their leader, and called them "weak willed".

Colleagues not belonging to the tight in-group are seen as out-group members by this small group, and are measured with a different set of standards (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014). All interviews reported how out-group members were treated with incivility and unsocial behaviour.

> *[they] "see me as the outsider. One will feel when you are passing (by), and then this group who are talking, they just keep quiet. I feel this negative vibe".*

Institutional collectivists' commitment to the organisation's goals could also elicit out-group status:

> *"When I do something [*that's not in my job description*], they look at me as if I'm betraying them."*

In-group collectivists tend to prioritise relationships with other members of the in-group above task completion (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014). Interviewees described the conduct of in-group members as at times to be "not availing themselves to help", or "they will make excuses not to do what is expected". However, self-reports by in-group members, express the same behaviour as improved working conditions. *"I can say I feel tired. Today I feel tired; I can't do this job now"*. It was found that the leader of the in-group collectivists experienced the ability to speak out as empowering and indicative of improved stature as the leader of the in-group collectivists.

1.9.2.3 Communitarian Contracts

Collectivists engage in relational contracts with the accent on long-term socio-emotional obligations (Jafri, 2011) fostering loyalty and commitment - values consistent with a collectivistic orientation (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012).

Relational contracts tend to be grounded in moral obligation (Ravlin *et al*., 2012). The institutional collectivists' frustration with negative behaviour by members of the in-group collectivists could be ascribed to perceptions that their behaviour was not within moral boundaries. Referring to negative behaviour, one interviewee said:

> "*That is a moral issue. How can someone justify acting in such a way? It is not right."*

Institutional collectivists tend to engage in communitarian psychological contracts, where general norms of reciprocity prevail and employees usually have equal status to each other (Thomas *et al.,* 2010). It was found that the majority of interviewees engaged in such a contract, and verbalised equal status. For instance: *"My supervisor, we're best of friends".* Participants also expressed a connectedness to colleagues *"for my colleagues who are dedicated; I do my best to support them."* This

corroborates findings by Thomas *et al.* (2010) that participants in communitarian contracts will most likely exceed requirements to enhance relationships.
An important element of communitarian contracts is that participants are perceived to have equal control over negotiations (Thomas *et al.*, 2010). One interviewee explained how she came to understand her role in the organisation as: [my supervisor and I] *"always talk about that. And that's how I know what to do."* Participants also expressed motivation to collectively achieve the goals of the organisation: *"But we love the work that we do. We work for the public."* This is indicative of the nature of such contracts, where participants are motivated to work for the good of the organisation (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014).

Relationships are long-term, governed by trust (Thomas et al., 2010). Interviewees noted that a large number of colleagues had been with the organisation for 20 to 30 years. It was found that colleagues, regardless of rank, shared strong bonds: *My supervisor we always talk about how we feel. We do the same work. We love what we do."* Colleagues, who engaged in communitarian contracts, trusted each other for support in both work-related and private matters: *"Because whenever I have a problem, I can talk to her or my supervisor. Her door is always open for us."* Relationships extended beyond small in-groups: *"There is so much diversity; always a specialist nearby who would support you."*

Holders of communitarian contracts also expressed their involvement beyond the basic requirements of their job descriptions. Interviewees conveyed their keenness to assist where dire needs were experienced across the organisation. They conveyed their pride and delight in the ability to do this for and with their colleagues, in the achievement of the organisation's goals. These characteristics have been found to be indicative of communitarian contracts (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014).

1.9.2.4 Custodial Contracts

Employees operating within in-group collectivism would enter into custodial contracts, characterised by paternalistic relationships, where the lower-power member (the employee) is significantly dependent on the higher-power member (the employer) (Thomas *et al.,* 2010). Holders of custodial contracts expect the employer to take on

a parental role (Restubog *et al.*, 2009). An interviewee, while showing compassion for a colleague who is unhappy at work due to her expectations not being fulfilled, explains:

> *"People are prone to say 'but management does not notice me. If management would just do something'.*

A custodial contract holder expressed the same sentiment:

> *"Why can't management use their mind: I can take this person to a higher post and next year another one? I'm not talking about me only, about* [whole in-group]*".*

The custodial contract holder described poor relationships with several of the out-group members, which neither disturbed her, nor necessarily negatively influenced her working life experience. The literature reveals that positive relationship with one group can compensate for poor relationship with another (Ng *et al.,* 2013).

A custodial contract holder described her expectations from the employer in transactional contract terms. This is in line with predictions that individuals with an in-group collectivistic cultural orientation will embrace a dual employee-organisation relationship, by seeking a relational association with supervisors and a more transactional relationship with the employer (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014).

1.9.3 Breach & Violation of the Psychological Contract

While perceptions of breach of the psychological contract is a cognitive realisation that the employer has not met all obligations and promises, violation is the emotional and affective state following this perception of breach (Morrison & Robinson, 1997) and results in negative or deviant behaviours (Chiu & Peng, 2008). In this section the different experiences of breach and violation will be outlined, including incidents described by the interviewees.

Collectivists in general have a higher tolerance for breach, because their focus is on maintaining relationships. However, once breach was experienced, collectivists tend to manifest more pronounced affective reactions (Agarwal & Bhargava, 2014). Breach and violation perceptions are theorised to indicate to employees that they are

not valued by the employer (Agarwal & Bhargava, 2014). The majority of interviewees expressed the sentiment: *"And the way I see it, to them I'm nothing."* Breach experiences reported by interviewees resulted in various manifestations of a loss of commitment to the organisation.

All the institutional collectivists interviewed, when asked whether the employer honoured commitments and promises to them as an individual, reported that transactional aspects were being honoured: *"Personally yes, institution no."* Several obligations to the organisation were not honoured, which impacted on their working life: *"But workwise, a lot* [obligations & promises] *has not been fulfilled".* Given their strong performance orientation (Joy & Kolb, 2009), the experience of the employer not fulfilling basic obligations and commitments to the organisation was thwarting institutional collectivists' collective focus on serving the public.

1.9.3.1 Incidents of Breach

Commitment to the enhancement of the organisation is a major motivator for institutional collectivists (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014), and failure by the employer to honour basic obligations to achieve the goals of the organisation, often set by the employer, such as transformation milestones, lead to perceptions of breach of psychological contract.

Several interviewees related the lack of training and self-development opportunities which should have been provided by the employer as cause for perceptions of breach. They expressed the belief that the employer should train employees, send them on specific courses, and provide bursaries for further professional studies. *"One wants to get skilled. Improve your current situation. There are supposed to be benefits like that."* Particularly in collectivistic societies the acquiring of skills, training and development are some of the most desirable work-related goals for employees (Vadi & Vereshagen, 2006), and the absence thereof will most likely cause perceptions of breach.

The employer reneging on promises of funding for specific projects was another cause of breach perceptions. Growth of their departments was hampered due to the

lack of funding. One employee remarked: *"The only expectations I had of the employer had financial implications. There never was enough money".* Also, as the employer expected certain transformation milestones, but provided no funding, it caused feelings of frustration. *"And also the money that is needed to transform, is not forthcoming, I feel that I'm just wasting my time."* Even the obligated annual subsidy for operations could not be counted on, as the employer would always effect payments very late into the next financial year.

1.9.3.2 Incidents of Violation

Following perceptions of breach regarding funding, several interviewees referred to the outcomes relating to the employer discontinuing payment for weekend-work. As a result the organisation was now closed to the public on weekends and public holidays for more than three years. The institutional collectivists felt especially aggrieved by the situation, as potential visitors were negatively affected, which is contrary to their goal of serving the public. Some of them continued to make representations to the employer to resolve the situation, but to no avail. Clear communication from the employer surrounding the situation was felt to be lacking, as was the will to effect changes to the situation. One employee reacted to this as follows: *"Don't give me a promise, because then I have hope, and then you don't do it."* It also caused occasional tension between colleagues, as some of the solutions suggested by staff members, such as time off for time worked over weekends, were not agreeable to all. Interviewees interpreted the employer's inaction as neither caring for the goals of the institution, nor for the employees. *"And the way I see it, they don't care about us."* The employer reneging on a promise has been shown to be an antecedent of perceptions of contraction violation (Robinson & Morrison, 2000).

One respondent categorised as an in-group collectivist, experienced violation of her psychological contract due to the lack of opportunities for promotion. In the apparent absence of direct mistreatment by the employer, these perceptions were influenced by expectations of transitional injustice.

Transitional justice refers to the measures put in place to redress "authorised wrongdoing" of a previous regime (Winter, 2013: 232). Transformation and change in the workplace are often viewed as too slow by previously disadvantaged groups (Booysen, 2007). This leads to great frustration and anger. An employee having worked in the same job for more than 20 years, had expectations of promotion into a higher salary level, "*I feel angry, because I did ask myself why and until when?*"

Aggrieved, deep perceptions of violation of the contract due to perceived transitional injustice resulted in a major event which left a deep scar on the institutional memory. The leader of the in-group collectivists instigated and led a successful protest against the proposed appointment of a colleague in an acting managerial position. The withdrawal of the appointment lead to division among staff, resignation of board members and negative publicity in the media. All the interviewees referred to this incident, expressing the damage it inflicted on the organisation, saying it was a "*public scandal"* and that *"authority was undermined".* Commenting on the pain caused to individuals one interviewee noted that this was: *"a rather hurtful experience"*.

1.9.3.3 Outcomes

Perceptions of breach and violation of the psychological contract negatively affect employee behaviours and attitudes in the workplace (Aggarwal & Bhargava, 2014). In this study the impact on the organisation due to perceptions of breach and violation ranged from decreased commitment to the organisation to deviant behaviour.

Firstly, collectivists are more likely to manifest passive behaviours, such as neglect, in response to perceptions of breach (Eckerd *et al.*, 2013). Ample evidence of this was found in this study in either reports or self-reports of work being postponed, poorly executed, or not done at all. It was reported that the in-group members would sometimes resist doing certain chores or *"making excuses not to do what is expected of them*", because they felt aggrieved. On occasion it would go so far as sabotaging a specific event, or "not availing themselves" during preparations. *"They are angry, and then they won't do the work."* When an employee perceives the employer not to

honour obligations, she will reciprocate by being detached from the organisation (Jafri, 2011).

As predicted, breach also affected general attitudes (Aggarwal & Bhargava, 2014). Interviewees reported *"having to beg people to help"* in everyday tasks, reduced performance and high levels of "*stealing time*", such as not returning to work after lunch break. This is corroborated by earlier research that perceptions of breach has a significantly negative effect on task behaviour (Eckerd *et al*. (2013), and leads to higher levels of absence (Johnson & O'Leary – Kelly, 2003).

Thirdly, similar to the findings by Turnley & Feldman (1990) this study offer evidence of the use of aggressive voice as a result of perceptions of violation of the psychological contract. Negative and aggressive voice was used to express discontent, in order to address a personal concern or problem.

One interviewee reported using aggressive voice tactics to continually bring her, and supposedly the in-group's, demands to the attention of colleagues as well as to motivate in-group members to decrease productivity. Ng e*t al.* (2013) found that the use of aggressive voice does not only distract the user herself, but also her colleagues, from actual work. On the other hand aggressive voice was used to gain a victory for the user, without concern for the effect it has on supervisors or colleagues. It also often leads to creating a hostile workplace environment and interferes with organisation's effectiveness (Ng *et al*., 2013). Asked whether the use of aggressive voice in preventing plans to appoint a colleague in an acting capacity, was to the ultimate good of the organisation, she responded: *"I think it was good for the people who fought for that. It was a win for that group."*

Fourthly, emotions such as anger, frustration and sadness were expressed rather than engaging in negative behaviours. *"I feel frustrated, but I don't let it disturb me in my work. Because I love what I'm doing."* As institutional collectivists are strongly motivated to enhance the organisation, it transpired from this study that perceptions of breach and violation had a less damaging effect on the organisation than breach and violation experiences of in-group collectivists. Research has shown that since employees view the organisation and the employer as distinct from each other,

experiences of violation of contract does not necessarily need to lead to organisational misbehaviour (Pate *et al*., 2003). Despite severe encounters of breach and violation one institutional collectivist expressed overall experience of her working life as:

> "*It's nice to work here, because I do what I want to do. Like there are those days you get frustrated and all that, 5% percent. Most of the time 95% happy."*

Especially for the institutional collectivists, failure to achieve their objectives towards the public due to the employer's negligence to meet commitments, leads to frustration. Employees expressed the wish to occasionally attempt avoiding facing the public as it is embarrassing to "make excuses for the employer". Since the employer has lost the employees' trust by not honouring obligations, employees could not muster the loyalty to defend situations created by the employer's negligence. Violation leads to decreased willingness to present the employer in a positive light to outsiders (Turnley & Feldman, 1999).

Fifthly, trust towards the employer had been seriously eroded. Perceived basic obligations, such as funding and recruitment, have been neglected by the employer for years on end, and have led to a loss in trust. Violation of the contract associated with and influenced by a state of mistrust leads to reduced commitment to the organisation, lower job satisfaction and decreased in-role performance, as well as lower organisational citizenship behaviour (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012). Institutional collectivists seemed to adopt an accepting attitude: the employer has reneged so often on promises and obligations, it would be better just to focus on what can be done at the organisational level. It was just "*typical*" of the employer to break their promises and commitment to the organisation. *"Not much one can do about it*." So, "*just do what you can*." However, once trust is shaken, it has negative consequences on employee behaviour (Agarwal & Bhargava, 2014). This in turn resulted in a "*negative impact on the institution and the community at large*", as expressed by one interviewee.

However, continued commitment even after perceptions of violation, may be due to a lack of choices, or a belief that the employer will honour obligations in future (Jafri,

2011). One interview described her lack of choices of employment coupled with a decision not to engage in negative behaviour due to perceptions of violation of her psychological contract as *"beggars can't be choosers."*

1.9.3.3.1 Influencing Factors

Interviewees disclosed the presence of certain elements which influenced the outcomes of breach and violation of the psychological contract. These are the value of relationships, commitment to goals, communication, and cultural orientation.

Firstly, several interviewees communicated the value of quality relationships with colleagues, and particularly supervisors, in alleviating the frustration and anger related to the breach and violation. This corroborates the recent finding that high quality relationships with an immediate supervisor decreases perceptions of breach and violation (Agarwal & Bhargava, 2014).

Secondly, it was found that goal orientation played a great role in influencing the outcomes of perceptions of psychological contract violation. Institutional collectivists were united in committing to the goals of the organisation. The goal expressed was *"to do my best for the public"* and *"making this the best institution"*. Commitment to the common goal and continuous communication was observed to be followed by extra-role behaviour. Although the employer's inability to address the high vacancy rate is reason for perceptions of breach or violation, interviewees are so committed to colleagues in serving the common goal that they willingly engage in work and support far beyond expectations. *"I do more. I feel like giving more. And I'm proud of that."* Building a sense of a team serving the public despite major challenges, was central to most of the interviews. Extra-role behaviour was in some cases expressed as second nature. *"I willingly do it* [extra role]*, because I'm part of the museum, not only of my section".*

On the other hand, the goals of the in-group collectivists were described as: *"It's about themselves, not about promoting other staff or promoting the institution".* The leader of the in-group collectivists, who engaged in a transactional contract with the

employer based on self-interest, self-expressed her goals to be in service of her own interests. Others reported her actions as: *"It was for her own gain."*

Thirdly, communication played a pivotal role in goal orientation. Interviewees related how the goals of the organisation were clearly transferred from management to supervisors and colleagues. The common understanding of the goals was made easy by the good relationships between ranks and across sections, which also allowed for continued and effective communication. On the other hand, poor communication by the employer, exacerbated perceptions of breach.

Fourthly, cultural orientation transpired to be a major influencing factor in outcomes to perceived breaches and violations of the psychological contract. Institutional collectivists are performance and future oriented, which they attempt to achieve without dominating or assertiveness (Joy & Kolb, 2009). The majority of interviewees, being institutional collectivists, appeared to keep the focus on their performance as a group, while not overtly confronting colleagues who reportedly partake in sabotaging activities or neglect of duties. Also, the connectedness to the larger group of colleagues inhibited negative behaviour towards colleagues or management. This connectedness to colleagues and the goals of the institution, led to extra-role behaviour, positively influenced outcomes of perception of violation. The in-group collectivists in this study were found to be focused on goals for personal gain.

1.9.4 Conclusion

Research on the psychological contract has neglected enquiry into the experience of the psychological contract within collectivistic cultures. Furthermore, there are few studies that have been undertaken in the South African context. This is where this study has made its major contribution. In particular, the role of transitional justice became apparent as a framework within which to understand the development of perceptions and outcomes of psychological contract violation in the absence of direct mistreatment by the employer.

In addition, an important finding of this research was that a marked difference was found between institutional and in-group collectivists in the outcomes of their

respective experiences of a perceived breach or violation. It was found that the institutional collectivist culture curbed the negative outcomes of their experiences of breach and violations. In fact, commitment to organisational goals, characteristic of institutional collectivists, even leads to extra role behaviour. This was not the case with the in-group collectivists. Typical negative outcomes included decrease affective commitment to the organisation, the use of aggressive voice, and loss of trust in the employer.

1.10. Recommendations

1.10.1 Practice

Effective psychological contracts are central to the success of an organisation (McDermott *et al.*, 2013). This study in a collectivistic environment affirmed that good relationships among staff are the cornerstone to a successful organisation. Leaders of organisations should therefore take an active role in developing a healthy employer - employee environment. Active participation in facilitating such relations is a good investment in the organisation's well-being.

However, perceptions of psychological contract breach are the norm rather than the exception (Agarwal & Bhargava, 2014), outcomes of such perceptions can be minimised by considering the findings of this study.

Recognising the nature of the psychological contract, leaders need to consider the relational impact that communication has on perceptions. The more effective communication is between manager and employee, the greater the experience of fairness, which is at the heart of the psychological contract (Guest & Conway, 2002).

Furthermore, when institutional goals are set, upheld and regularly communicated by leaders, it has positive outcomes on psychological contracts and its effects. Employees, who have a clear understanding of how they contribute to the goals of the organisation, feel valued and would exhibit less negative affective behaviour in experiences of psychological breach and violation.

Lastly, participatory decision making processes will foster good employee – employer relations and contribute to both employee and institutional health.

1.10.2 Further Research

A limitation of the current study is that data was collected from a small sample of only one organisation. Future studies in psychological contracting in South Africa, should increase the number and variety of organisations that are researched. As the findings of this study indicates that institutional and in-group collectivism had quite significant influences on experiences of breach and violation of the psychological contract, further studies should investigate such experiences in multi-cultural organisations in South Africa.

The large body of literature on psychological contract breach and violation perceptions mostly refer to western experience (Agarwal & Bhargava, 2014) which would appear to be quite culturally distinct from a South African experience. Further investigations should be made to advance the findings of this study regarding the psychological contract in multi-cultural South Africa, and in particular, the findings regarding the role of transitional justice in shaping perceptions, warrants further investigation.

1.11 References

Agarwal, U., & Bharghava, S., 2014. The role of social exchange on work outcomes: a study of Indian managers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management.* 25, 10: 1484 – 1504.

Alas, R., 2006. Ethics in countries with different cultural dimensions. *Journal of Business Ethics.* 69, 3: 237 – 247.

Andrieu, K., 2010. Transitional Justice: a new discipline in Human rights. *Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence.* Centre for International Studies & Research. [Online]. Available: http://www.massviolence.org/PdfVersion?id_article=359. [Accessed 22 August 2014].

Babbie, E., 2011. *Introduction to Social Research* (5e). Belmont, Ca: Wadsworth.

Bhagat, R., Krishnan, B., Nelson, T., Leonard, K., Ford, D., & Billing, T., 2010. Organisational stress, psychological strain, and work outcomes in six national context: a closer look at the moderating influences of coping styles and decision latitude. *Cross Cultural Management: an International Journal.* 17, 1: 10 – 29.

Biswas, S., Varma, A., & Ramaswami, A., 2013. Linking distributive and procedural justice to employee engagement through social exchange: a field study in India. *International Journal of Human Resource Management.* 24, 8: 1570 – 1587.

Booysen, L., 2007. Societal power shifts and changing social identities in South Africa: workplace implications. *South African Journal of Economic & Management Sciences.* 10, 1: 1 – 20.

Brockner, J., Ackerman, G., Greenberg, J., Gelfand, M., Jrancesco, A., Chen, Z., Leung, K., Bierbrauer, G., Gomez, C., Kirkman, B., & Shapiro, D., 2001.

Culture and procedural justice: the influence of power distance on reactions to voice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology.* 37,4 : 300 – 315.

Chirkov, C., Lynch, M., & Niwa, S., 2005. Application of the scenario questionnaire of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism to the assessment of cultural distance and cultural fit. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations.* 29, 4: 469 – 490.

Chiu, S., & Peng, J., 2008. The relationship between psychological contract breach and employee deviance: the moderating role of hostile attributional style. *Journal of Vocational Behavior.* 73, 3: 426 – 433.

Conway, N., Guest, D., & Trenberth, L., 2011. Testing the differential effects of changes in psychological contract breach and fulfilment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior.* 79, 1: 267 – 276.

Cullinane, N., & Dundon, T., 2006. The psychological contract: a critical review. *International Journal of Management Reviews.* 8, 2: 113 – 129.

Den Hartog, D., & Verburg, R., 2004. High performance work systems, organisational culture and firm effectiveness. *Human Resource Management.* 14, 1: 55 – 78.

Eckerd, S., Hill, J., Boyer, K., Donohue, K., & Ward, P., 2013. The relative impact of attribute, severity, and timing of psychological contract breach on behavioural and attitudinal outcomes. J*ournal of Operations Management*. 31, 7: 567 - 578.

Epitropaki, O., 2013. A multi-level investigation of psychological contract breach and organizational identification through the lens of perceived organizational membership: testing a moderated-mediated model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 34, 1: 65 – 86.

Fadil, P.A., & Williamson, S., 2009. A theoretical perspective of the cultural influences of individualism / collectivism, group membership, and performance variation on allocation behaviors of supervisors. *Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal.* 19, 2: 134 – 150.

Fischer, R., Ferreira, M. C., Assmar, E., Redford, P., Harb, C., Glazer, S., & Achoui, M., 2009. Individualism-collectivism as descriptive norms development of a subjective norm approach to culture measurement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology.* 40, 2: 187-213

Fitzsimmons, S., & Stamper, C., 2014. How societal culture influences friction in the employee - organization relationship. *Human Resource Management Review.* 24, 1: 80 – 94.

Greenberg, J., 1990. Organizational justice: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*. 16, 2: 399 – 432.

Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S., 1994. Competing paradigms in qualitative research. IN: Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. Handbook of Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage, pp. 105 – 117.

Guest, D.E., 1998. Is the psychological contract worth taking seriously? *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 19, S1: 649 – 664.

Guest, D.E., & Conway, N., 2002. Communicating the psychological contract: an employer perspective. *Human Resource Management Journal.* 12, 2: 22 – 38.

Guest, D., 2004. The psychology of the employment relationship: an analysis based on the psychological contract. *Applied Psychology: an International Review.* 53, 4: 541 – 555.

Hermida, R., & Luchman, J., 2013. The moderating role of locus of causality in the relationship between source of information and psychological contract breach perceptions. *Journal of Business Psychology.* 28, 2: 221 – 232.

Hofstede, G., 1980. Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization.* 10, 4: 15 – 41.

Huseman, R., Hatfield, J. & Miles, E., 1987. A new perspective on equity theory: the equity sensitivity construct. *Academy of Management Review.* 12, 2: 232 - 234.

International Center for Transitional Justice. 2014. *What is Transitional Justice?* [Online]. Available: ictj.org/about/transitional-justice. [Accessed 22 August 2014].

Jafri, H., 2011. Influence of Psychological contract breach on organizational commitment. *Synergy.* 9, 11: 19 – 30.

Javidan, M., Dorfman, De Luque, M., & House, R., 2006. In the eye of the beholder: cross cultural lessons in leadership from Project GLOBE *Academy of Management Perspectives.* 20, 1: 67 – 90.

Johnson, J.L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A., 2003. The effects of psychological contract breach and organizational cynicism: not all social exchange violations are created equal. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 24, 5: 627 – 647.

Joy, S. & Kolb, D., 2009. Are there cultural differences in learning style? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations.* 33, 1: 69 – 85.

Kickul, J., Lester, S, W. & Belgio, E., 2004. Attitudinal and behavioural outcomes of psychological contract breach: a cross cultural comparison of the United States and Hong Kong Chinese. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management.* 4, 2: 229 – 252.

Kiewitz, C., Restubog, S., Zagenczyk, T., & Hochwarter, W., 2009. The interactive effects of psychological contract breach and organizational politics on perceived organization support: evidence from two longitudinal studies. *Journal of Management Studies.* 46, 5: 806 – 834.

Linna, A., Väänänen, A., Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M., Pentti, J., & Vahtera, J., 2011. Effect of participative intervention on organisation justice perceptions: a quasi-experimental study on Finnish public sector employees. *International Journal of Human Resource Management.* 22, 3: 706 – 721.

Lo, S. & Aryee, S., 2003. Psychological contract breach in a Chinese context: an integrative approach. *Journal of Management Studies*. 10, 4: 1005 – 1020.

McDermott, A., Conway, E., Rousseau, D., & Flood, P., 2013. Promoting effective psychological contracts through leadership: the missing link between HR strategy and performance. *Human Resource Management.* 52, 2: 289 – 310.

Maxwell, J. A., 2009. Designing a qualitative study. IN: Bickman, L. & Rog, D.J., (eds). *Handbook of applied social research methods*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage, pp. 214 – 253.

Morrison, E. W., & Robinson, S. L., 1997. When employees feel betrayed: a model of how psychological contract violation develops. *Academy of Management Review.* 22: 1, 226 – 256.

Naor, M., Linderman, K., & Schroeder, R., 2010. The globalization of operations in Eastern and Western countries: unpacking the relationship between national and organizational culture and its impact on manufacturing performance. *Journal of Operations Management.* 28, 3: 194 – 205.

Ng, T., W., Feldman, D., & Butts, M., 2013. Psychological contract breaches and employee voice behavior: the moderating effects of changes in social relationships. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 23, 4: 537 – 553.

Ott-Holland, C., Huang, J., Ryan, A., Elizondo, F., & Wadlington, P., 2014. The effects of culture and gender on perceived self-other similarity in personality. *Journal of Research in Personality.* 53, 1: 13 – 21.

Pate, J., Martin, G., & McGoldrick, J., 2003. The impact of psychological contract violation on employee attitudes and behaviour. *Employee Relations.* 25, 6: 557 - 573.

Ravlin, E., Liao, Y., Morrell, D., Au, K., & Thomas, D., 2012. Collectivist orientation and the psychological contract: mediating effect of creditor exchange ideology. *Journal of International Business Studies.* 43, 8: 772 – 778.

Realo, A., Allik, J., & Greenfield, B., 2008. Radius of trust: social capital in relation to familism and institutional collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology.* 39, 4: 447 - 462.

Restubog, S., Bordia, P., & Tang, R., 2007. Behavioural outcomes of psychological contract breach in a non-Western culture: the moderating role of equity sensitivity. *British Journal of Management.* 18, 4: 376 – 386.

Restubog, S., Hornsy, M., Bordia, P., & Esposo, S., 2008. Effects of psychological contract breach on organizational citizenship behaviour: insights from the group value model. *Journal of Management Studies.* 45, 8: 1377 – 1400.

Restubog, S., Bordia, P., & Bordia, S., 2009. The interactive effects of procedural justice and equity sensitivity in predicting responses to psychological contract breach: an interactionist perspective. *Journal of Business Psychology.* 24, 2: 165 – 178.

Restubog, S., Bordia, P., Tang, R., & Krebs, S., 2010. Investigating the moderating effects of leader-member exchange in the psychological contract breach-employee performance relationship: a test of two competing perspectives. *British Journal of Management.* 21, 2: 422 – 437.

Restubog, S., Zagenczyk, T., Bordia, P., Bordia, S., & Chapman, G., 2012. If you wrong us, shall we not revenge? Moderating roles of self-control and perceived aggressive work culture in predicting responses to psychological contract breach. *Journal of Management.* May: 1 – 21. 0149206312443557.

Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M., 1994. Violating the psychological contact: the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 15, 3: 245 – 259.

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R., J., 1995. A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: a multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal.* 38, 2: 555 – 572.

Robinson, S. L., 1996. Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly.* 41, 4: 574 – 599.

Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. W.., 2000. The development of psychological contract breach and violation: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 21, 5: 525 – 546.

Rosen, C., Chang, C., Johnson, R., & Levy, P., 2009. Perceptions of the organizational context and psychological contract breach: assessing competing perspectives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes.* 108, 2: 202 – 217.

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

Rousseau, D. M., 2000. Psychological contract inventory: Technical report. British Library.

Suazo, M., & Stone-Romero, E., 2011. Implications of psychological contract breach: a perceived organizational support perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology.* 26, 5: 366 – 382.

Taras, V., Kirkman, B. L., & Steel, P., 2010. Examining the impact of Culture's Consequences: a three-decade, multilevel, meta-analytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 95, 3: 405 – 439.

Tekleab, A., & Taylor, S., 2003. Aren't there two parties in an employment relationship? Antecedents and consequences of organisation-employee agreement on contract obligations and violations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 24, 5: 585 – 608.

Thomas, D., Au, K., & Ravlin, E., 2003. Cultural variation and the psychological contract. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 24, 5: 451 – 471.

Thomas, D., Fitzsimmons, S., Ravlin, E., Au, K., Ekelund, B., & Barzantny, C., 2010. Psychological contracts across cultures. *Organization Studies.* 31, 11: 1437-1458.

Triandis, H., 2001. Individualism – Collectivism and personality. *Journal of Personality.* 69, 6: 907 – 924.

Triandis, J., & Gelfand, M., 2012. A theory of individualism and collectivism. In: *Handbook of Social Psychological Theories 2.* London: Sage.

Turnley, W., & Feldman, D., 1999. A discrepancy model of psychological contract violation. *Human Resource Management Review.* 9, 3: 367 – 386.

Vadi, M., & Vereshagin, M., 2006. The deposit of collectivism in organizational culture in Russia: some consequence of human resources management. *Baltic Journal of Management.* 1, 2: 188 – 200.

Winter, S., 2013. Towards a unified theory of transitional justice. *The International Journal of Transitional Justice.* 7, 2: 224 – 244.

Yin, R.K., 2003. Analyzing case study evidence. IN: *Case Study Research: Design & Methods*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage, pp. 109 – 140.

Zhao, H., Wayne, S., Glibowski, B., & Bravo, J., 2007. The impact of psychological contract breach on work-related outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology.* 60, 3: 647 – 680.

Zhu, Y., 2013. Individual behavior: in-role and extra-role. *International Journal of Business Administration.* 4, 1: 23 – 27.

SECTION 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Context of the Study

This research is situated in the area of organisational psychology, and more specifically employment relations (Guest, 2004). It aims to better understand how employees react when they perceive breach or violation in the psychological contract within the context of a collectivist culture. Furthermore, this study focuses on the psychological contract in the context of a collectivistic culture, as the literature shows a marked difference in employees who operate within an individualistic framework in contrast to those who are collectivistic in their orientation.

2.2 Psychological Contract

The psychological contract affords a broad platform to study the employment relationship, as the concept denotes the perceptions of the terms of the exchange relationship between the employer and employee (Thomas *et al.*, 2010).

The concept 'psychological work contract' was first used by Argyris in 1960 to describe the values and powers of perceptions held by both the organisation and the employee (Rousseau, 1989; Guest, 1998; Robinson, 1996; Cullinane & Dundon, 2006). Argyris (1960), Schein (1965) and Levinson *et al.* (1962) conceptualised the psychological contract (Lo & Aryee, 2003) to be a form of social exchange, which assists in understanding "the role of subjective and indeterminate interactions between two parties"; employee and employer (Cullinane & Dundon, 2006: 115). Central to social exchange theory is that social relationships consist of unspecified responsibilities and unequal power resources among participants (Cullinane & Dundon, 2006).

Schein (1978, as quoted by Guest, 1998: 650) defined the psychological contract as "a set of unwritten reciprocal expectations between an individual employee and the organization", and believed the psychological contract to be an influential determinant of how employees behave within organisations (Rousseau 1989: 126). This definition of Schein forms the basis of later research (Robinson, 1996, Johnson &

O'Leary-Kelly, 2003, Restubog *et al.*, 2010; Jafri, 2011; Eckerd *et al.*, 2013; Epitropaki, 2013; Hermida & Luchman, 2013; Ng *et al.*, 2013), initiated by Rousseau in 1989.

Rousseau expanded MacNeil's (1974 and 1985) work on contracts, to build the concept and described a continuum of contractual arrangements ranging from transactional to relational. Transactional contracts are economic in focus, for a specific time frame, static, narrow in scope and public. Relational contracts are economic and socio-emotional in focus, over an indefinite period, dynamic, pervasive in scope and subjective. However, even those individuals with transactional contracts need a certain relationship between the employer and employee (Rousseau, 1990; Suazo *et al*., 2009; Jafri, 2011).

Guest (1998) maintained that the study of the psychological contract in the changing labour market focuses consideration on the distribution of power, specifically in an economy which sees an increase in the inequality of wealth.

The psychological contract facilitates the investigation of the content and processes of the explicit or implicit dealings within the employment relationship, which might change over time, is influenced by a variety of contextual factors; and results in various possible consequences (Guest, 2004). Since the late 1980's the psychological contract has been associated with an employee's commitment to the organisation, evident in behaviour such as practising the organisation's values, being prepared to wield extra effort in achieving the goals of the organisation, and a wish to continue being an employee (Rousseau, 1989).

A strong indicator of how an employee experiences and acts towards the organisation is the widespread belief in reciprocity across all human society (McDermott, *et al.*, 2013). Rousseau (1989) predicted that psychological contracts will become more prevalent where individuals believe in entitlement, as well as in the importance of relationships.

The psychological contract has been used an analytical framework to study different aspects of the employment relationship, for instance from the employer's perspective

(Guest & Conway, 2002); different aspects of perceptions of breach (Robinson, 1996; Lo & Aryee, 2003; Zhao *et al.*, 2007; Suazo & Stone-Romero, 2011; Ng *et al.*, 2013); perceptions of violation (Jamil *et al*., 2013; Turnley & Feldman, 1999; Pate *et al*., 2003; Sayers *et al*., 2011; Brockner *et al*., 2001), and in a collectivistic environment (Kickul *et al.*, 2004; Restubog *et al*., 2010, Chiu & Peng, 2013; Jafri, 2011; Shih & Chuang, 2013);

Effective psychological contracts are critical for the success and competitiveness of an organisation (McDermott *et al*., 2013). The guidance of employees' psychological contracts is therefore an essential management task (Guest & Conway, 2002).

2.2.1 Agents

Rousseau (1998) believed the importance of the study of the psychological contract lies within understanding the agency problem. Information regarding expectations and obligations are gleaned from the organisation and its agents, as well as observations of the organization's common practices and its culture (Turnley & Feldman, 1999). Agents include direct supervisors, co-workers (Hermida & Luchman, 2013), recruiters, upper-level managers, organisational manuals (Turnley & Feldman, 1999), and HR staff (Restubog *et al.*, 2007). Interaction with the organisation's different agents (Hermida & Luchman, 2013), coupled with an employee's own idiosyncratic expectations (Turnley & Feldman, 1999), provide the information from which the employee forms perceptions about obligations (Hermida & Luchman, 2013).

Supervisors are principal agents, as they are knowledgeable about the work. Care should be taken that information from supervisors is accurate to facilitate valid perceptions of obligations (Hermida & Luchman, 2013). Seeking information from peers and co-workers could be more politically motivated, and consequently could also be intentionally misleading (Hermida & Luchman, 2013).

Employee trade unions also act as an agent, supplying information regarding the conditions of employment (Bashir & Nasir, 2013). As a union is defined as an association which campaigns to advance the benefits and interests of employees

(Bashir & Nasir, 2013: 61), it has a significant effect on remuneration, benefits, employee well-being, and official and legal matters (Turnley *et al.*, 2004). The union is one mechanism which can force the organisation to meet its obligations, and in the event of perceptions of breach or violation of the psychological contract, it can facilitate restoration of equity (Turnley *et al.*, 2004).

2.2.2 Breach

The continuous changes in the work environment result in changes in the psychological contract, which increase the likelihood of misunderstanding and perceptions that obligations were not adequately fulfilled (Robinson, 1996). Breach is more than just unmet expectations, and is experienced by much stronger reactions (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). Breach is defined as the "cognition" of the employer's failure to respond to the obligations the employee believes it holds towards him in a manner proportionate to his contribution (Morrison & Robinson, 1997: 230). It is a subjective experience (Rousseau, 1989; Robinson, 1996; Johnson & O'Leary-Kelly, 2003; Lo & Aryee, 2003); a perception, not necessarily fact, which influences behaviour and attitude (Robinson, 1996).

The effects of perceptions of breach are comparatively more damaging to the employment relationship than the positive effects of fulfilment. This is substantiated by prospect theory which suggests that since people register a loss more intensely than any pleasure from a gain, they would rather concentrate resources on recovering losses than making gains (Conway *et al.*, 2011).

In collectivistic cultures, the employer is seen as fulfilling a parental role, taking care, assisting, supporting the employee, and consequently the impact of a breach would be more pronounced than in an individualistic culture (Restubog *et al*., 2009).

Trust plays a central role in perceptions of breach. If an employee, at the time of contracting trusted the employer, breach is less likely to occur (Robinson, 1996). However, once trust is shaken, it has negative consequences on employee behaviour (Agarwal & Bhargava, 2014).

Negative effects of psychological contract breach are enhanced when employees believe that a high level of politicking is evident in their organisation (Kiewitz *et al.*, 2009).

Due to the changing nature of modern society (Restubog *et al., 2012)*, perceptions of breach have become the norm rather than the exception (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Agarwal & Bhargava, 2014).

2.2.2.1 Outcomes of Breach

Kickul *et al.* (2004) categorised outcomes of breach as either behavioural or attitudinal reactions. Experiencing a significant negative or positive workplace event, produce affective reactions such as anger or frustration, which contribute to the formation of work behaviours and attitudes (Zhao *et al.*, 2007). Perceptions of breach could have severe negative effects on relationships, which are not easily repaired (Conway *et al.*, 2011).

Collectivists in general have a higher tolerance for breach, because the focus is on maintaining relationships. However, once breach is experienced, collectivists manifest more pronounced affective reactions (Agarwal & Bhargava, 2014). Transactional contract breach significantly negatively affects organisational commitment. Relational elements of the psychological contact in a collectivistic environment are generally more important than the transactional. Breach in relational psychological contracts negatively affects emotional commitment to the organisation (Jafri, 2011).

Breach perceptions have an influence on organisational citizen behaviour (OCB), which is defined as discretionary behaviours beneficial to the organisation as a whole (Zhao *et al.*, 2007). Negative outcomes of perceptions of breach include withdrawal behaviours, poor work attitude, and reduced performance (Restubog *et al.*, 2012).

2.2.3 Violation

Perceptions of breach of the psychological contract frequently develop into perceptions of violation (Suazo & Stone-Romero, 2011). The greater the discrepancy in perceptions held and actual experience, the higher the likelihood of perceptions of violation (Turnley & Feldman, 1999).

Violation is defined as an emotional and affective experience of anger, frustration, disappointment and resentment, affected by perceptions, beliefs and judgements which are often flawed (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). That is, these are often emotional responses to the breach (Suazo & Stone-Romero, 2011; Eckerd *et al.*, 2013; Ng *et al.*, 2013).

The development of violation perceptions is affected by judgements regarding both outcomes and process. The outcomes are influenced by the employee's perception of the magnitude of the breach, as well as the extent of the implications following the breach. Process judgements refer to the employee's assessment as to why the breach evolved (e.g. employer reneging on promise or incongruent beliefs regarding obligations) and the degree of unfairness involved in the breach experience (Morrison & Robinson, 1997).

The cognitive assessment of breach perceptions leads to responses of mistrust and frustrations due to imbalance in the employer – employee relationship, and retaliation with negative, and sometimes deviant, behaviours (Chiu & Peng, 2008) and even revenge (Bordia *et al.*, 2008). Research has shown that since employees view the organisation and the employer as distinct from each other, experience of violation does not necessarily need to lead to organisational misbehaviour (Pate *et al.*, 2003). Furthermore, the cultural setting of the organisation (i.e. individualistic or collectivistic) may have a bearing on the intensity of deviance (Chiu & Peng 2008: 427).

To explain why individuals do experience violation, in the absence of direct mistreatment by the organisation, and why employees sometimes stay loyal to an organisation in spite of breach or violation, Thompson & Bunderson (2003) suggest

the inclusion of ideology as an influencing element. They build on Blau's (1964) notion of "ideological rewards" (Thompson & Bunderson, 2003: 573), which he distinguished from economic and socio-emotional benefits. They define ideological currency as "credible commitments to pursue a valued cause or principle (not limited to self-interest) that are implicitly exchanged at the nexus of the individual – organization relationship", allowing legitimacy to the individual to participate in the cause (Thompson & Bunderson, 2003: 574).

2.2.3.1 Outcomes of Violation

Violation indicates that good faith and trust have been undermined, from which follows a damaged relationship between the employee and the employer (Guest, 1998), and lead employees to believe that they are not valued by the employer (Agarwal & Bhargava, 2014).

Outcomes of perceived violation of the psychological contract include negative behaviour such as reduced organisational commitment, reduced or complete withdrawal of organisational citizenship behaviour (Pate *et al.*, 2003; Ravlin *et al.*, 2012), discretionary absenteeism (Chiu & Peng, 2008), reduced effort and increased cynicism regarding employer's integrity (Pate *et al*., 2003), increased turnover intentions (Robinson, 1996), as well as mistrust, decreased in-role performance (Ravlin *et al*., 2012), reduced performance on extra role behaviours (Turnley & Feldman, 1999) and job neglect (Turnley & Feldman, 1999; Lo & Aryee, 2003). Extra-role behaviour is defined as actions not stipulated in work statement or related to employee's rank (Zhu, 2013). In an aggressive work culture violations could lead to negative and confrontational employee behaviour (Restubog *et al.*, 2012).

The consequences to the company of these exhibited negative behaviour is costly, including a loss of man hours due to absenteeism, loss of training cost invested, and increased recruiting costs (Chiu & Peng, 2008). Also, an employee might become more career focused rather than having the interests of the organisation at heart (Turnley & Feldman, 1999).

2.2.3.1.1 Deviant Behaviour

A further dimension of employee negative behaviour is deviant behaviour (Chiu & Peng, 2008). The desire for, or thoughts of, revenge often lead to deviant workplace behaviour (Restubog *et al.*, 2012). Employee deviant behaviour is defined as "voluntary behavior that violates significant organisational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both" (Robinson & Bennett, 1995: 556; Chiu & Peng, 2008: 427). More than just withdrawal, it incorporates voluntary negative behaviour, including aggression, resulting in enormous cost in productivity and organisational performance (Chiu & Peng, 2008).

Employee deviant behaviour due to violation of the psychological contract is classified into two forms, namely interpersonal deviance and organisational deviance. Interpersonal deviance is influenced by individual factors such as self-control, attributional style and negative affectivity (Chiu & Peng, 2008), and is manifested by showing favouritism, blaming co-workers, verbal abuse and sexual harassment (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Organisational deviance is influenced by abusive supervision and organisational justice (Chiu & Peng, 2008), and includes behaviour such as stealing time, wasting or stealing resources, and sabotaging equipment (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). In an aggressive work culture violations could lead to negative and confrontational employee behaviour (Restubog *et al*., 2012). The cost of deviant behaviour is not only financial due to theft, vandalism and stealing time, but employees exposed to deviant behaviour could suffer from stress, damaged self-esteem, increased fear at the work-place, and decreased morale (Christian & Ellis, 2014).

These negative behaviours embarked upon by the employee are forms of revenge on the employer. Different stages of revenge can be identified: first the trigger is a perception of breach; secondly the perception develops to violation which leads to anger or moral outrage, and lastly the reaction stage where the employee can either decide to forgive and forget, or to engage in deviant behaviour as a form of revenge (Restubog *et al.*, 2012).

In a collectivistic environment, organisational deviance is not necessarily higher than interpersonal deviance. This can be explained by displaced aggression theory, which holds that a victim, in retaliation, will harm not only the harm-doer, but also other individuals, especially if it is difficult to access the harm-doer (Chiu & Peng, 2008).

2.2.3.1.2 Negative Voice

Turnley & Feldman (1999) found that violation of psychological contract was associated with greater use of negative voice to express discontent, in order to address a personal concern or problem. Aggressive voice is when an employee wants to tag a "win" without considering the consequences to colleagues and supervisors. Examples of aggressive voice behaviours include continually confronting others until they give in to personal demands, deliberately overstating a grievance in order to draw more attention to one's problems, and involving external constituencies to put pressure on internal opponents. It also often leads to creating a hostile workplace environment and interferes with organisation's effectiveness (Ng *et al.*, 2013). Union membership often provides a channel to raise voice (Bashir & Nasir, 2013). Aggressive voice not only distracts the user himself, but also colleagues from actual work. Users of voice are often seen as trouble makers (Ng *et al.*, 2013: 2).

2.3 Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory is one of the most powerful conceptual frameworks to explain the attitudes and behaviour of employees (Lo & Aryee, 2003), as well as, relevant to this study, justice-outcome relationships (Colquitt *et al.*, 2013: 213). It bridges disciplines such as social psychology, anthropology, and sociology (Zhu, 2012).

Blau's (1964 cited in Restubbog *et al.*, 2008) work in social exchange theory forms the basis for research in this field. He theorised that an antecedent to developing a positive employment relationship, is for the parties to adhere to certain rules of exchange. This can either be economic or social in nature. When employees feel that their outcomes do not measure up to what they were promised, they will engage

in counterproductive, withdrawal, and / or negative behaviour to restore equity (Restubog *et al.*, 2008). The most important of these rules of exchange is reciprocity. Three types of reciprocity have been identified; namely reciprocity as "a transactional pattern of interdependent exchanges" (one party's actions dependent on the other's behaviour); "a folk belief" (the cultural expectation that a person gets what he deserves); and "a moral norm" (a universal human principle) (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005: 876, 7). Social exchange also depends on negotiated rules in order to reach a beneficial arrangement between parties (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Other principles salient to social exchange are rationality, altruism, collective benefit, rank equilibrium, and competitiveness (relevant in revenge-seeking) (Zhu, 2012).

Trust is a very important ingredient in an exchange relationship (Mayer *et al.*, 1995; Robinson, 1996; Lo & Ayree, 2003; Restubog *et al.*, 2008; Eckerd *et al.*, 2013). Rousseau *et al.* (1998: 395) defined trust as "a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behaviour of another".

2.4 Equity Theory

An individual's ideological beliefs are a powerful schema influencing the psychological contract (Thompson & Bunderson, 2003). Employees' attitudes and behaviour is affected by their perception of justice within the organisational system (Restubog *et al*., 2009). Organisational justice pertains to how the individual perceives fairness to be acted out at the workplace (Biswas *et al.*, 2013). Adams' (1965) equity theory is built on the proposition that individuals appraise their relationships with others by comparing their inputs in and resultant outcomes of the relationship, to the inputs and outcomes of the other in that relationship (as quoted by Huseman *et al.*, 1987).

Reciprocity plays a pivotal role in equity sensitivity. Reciprocity lies within in a continuum of negative reciprocity on the one extreme to generalised reciprocity at the other. Negative reciprocity "is characterised by high levels of self-interest and a 'taking orientation' ", while generalised reciprocity "reflects an altruistic attitude not concerned with reward" (Sahlins, 1972, as quoted by Restubog *et al.*, 2007: 379).

There are a number of types of justice that the individual would consider when coming to a decision about equity. Firstly, distributive justice is concerned with how impartial recognition and rewards are allocated by the employer (Biswas *et al.*, 2013). Employees identify the level of distributive justice as an indication whether the employer values their contribution, cares for them and whether they are concerned about their welfare (Biswas *et al.*, 2013). Distributive justice, through the use of equality, could achieve social integration and a sense of community. Organisations engage in what is referred to in either status levelling or symbolic egalitarianism, by decreasing hierarchy, naming and titles, and offering equal opportunity - a classic symbol of democracy (Morand & Merriman, 2012). In contrast, distributive equality involves equivalent outcomes in interpersonal relationships (Morand & Merriman, 2012), including rewards to be distributed equally among all the members of the group. This results in values highly respected in collectivistic cultures: harmony, loyalty, solidarity and cohesiveness (Fadil & Williamson, 2009: 136). In their explorative study of how distributive justice is perceived within different cultures, Fadil & Williamson (2009: 136) found that equality not equity was the "reward allocation of choice" in Eastern, collectivistic, cultures. "Equity reflects a Western notion of fairness" (Yum & Canary, 2009: 399).

Secondly, procedural justice is defined as the perceptions of how fair the procedures and policies are when making decisions (Greenberg, 1990; Brockner *et al.*, 2001; Tzafrir *et al.*, 2004). The use of accurate information, provision of voice and uniformity in decision-making processes are important aspects which contribute to procedural fairness (Rosen *et al.*, 2009). Organisational politics, or "self-serving behaviors", affects interpersonal aspects among employees. Together with procedural justice it forms the context within which employees form general (i.e. fairness) and specific (i.e. evaluating the psychological contract) judgements (Rosen *et al.*, 2009: 214). The stronger the opinions of fairness, the stronger the belief that norms of psychological contract were upheld, which enhances socio-emotional bonds between the employee and the organisation (Biswas *et al.*, 2013).

Finally, the individual may be concerned with issues of transitional justice. Since the turn of the century the concept of transitional justice has received more attention in

theoretical research. Transitional justice is associated with periods of political change (Teitel, 2003) and is an instrument through which broad social transformation is sought (Andrieu, 2010). It is defined as “a response to systematic or widespread violations of human rights (Andrieu, 2010: 2) in the context of regime change” and comes into being when “the state seeks to redress authorised wrongdoing” (Winter, 2013: 231, 232).

Based on any perceptions of inequity in the psychological contract, action may be taken to restore any perceived injustices. Andrieu (2010) distinguishes three categories of actions towards transitional justice, namely restorative justice, legal justice and social justice. The latter is applied to address the political, economic and social injustices of the past, using measures such as financial or symbolic reparation, affirmative action, development, and gender-specific approaches. Non-judicial measures employed to redress the legacies of the past include institutional reforms (International Center for Transitional Justice, 2014). As no reparation programme can ever compensate for the past, structural distributive programmes could redress a general sense of victimhood (Andrieu, 2010). As the ultimate aim of transitional justice is a democratic and reconciled society, it does so by creating specific institutional conditions (Winter, 2013).

2.5. Culture

A significant role in psychological contracting is played by cultural values and norms (Kickul *et al*., 2004). Culture has many purposes, including assisting people to make sense of what they encounter; defining right from wrong, establishing priorities, and determining appropriate behaviour from undesirable behaviour (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014).

Hofstede defines culture as the common characteristics shared by a group through their customs and social behaviour (1980). His landmark study in 1980, and revised in 2001, has been widely used in measuring the cultural dimensions of individualism–collectivism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity–femininity. By 1988 Hofstede and Bond added a 5th dimension: long-term versus short-term orientation (Taras et al., 2010).

In relation to organisation culture, Den Hartog & Verburg, (2004: 58) define culture as a set of core values, artefacts, behavioural patterns and norms "which govern the way people in an organisation interact with each other and invest energy in their jobs and the organisation at large". Two layers of culture in an organisation can be distinguished, namely the behaviour expressed and observed, and invisible norms and values (Den Hartog & Verburg 2004: 59).

Managers, and especially top managers, play a crucial role in culture formation as they embed and transmit culture in the thinking, feeling and behaviour of members of the organisation. The primary culture-embedding mechanisms managers could employ include coaching and modelling of employees, which aspects they pay attention to and how it is controlled and measured (Den Hartog & Verburg 2004).

Cultural influence exists in two inter-related domains, namely cognitive (i.e. perception and interpretation of signals from the organisation as well as exhibited behaviour) and motivational (i.e. cultural self-concepts influencing desirable behaviour) (Thomas *et al.*, 2003).

2.5.1 Collectivism

Collectivism refers to the tendency to be more focused on the goals of the group and being willing to sacrifice personal benefits for the welfare of the group (Thomas *et al.*, 2003), while individualism denotes the individual's predisposition to view himself as independent from others and being more focused on his personal goals (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012). In South Africa recent research has made a distinction in cultural orientation among different race groups, finding Black South Africans to describe themselves as collectivistic, more so than Indians, Coloureds or Whites (Adams *et al*., 2012).

Collectivists emphasise values such as respect for tradition, social order, harmony and familial security (Triandis & Gelfand, 2012). In collectivistic cultures behaviour is guided by obligations and norms, strongly favouring the in-group (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012) and equality is preferred as a rule of distributive justice, rather than equity, which is the case in individualistic cultures. Equality dictates that rewards are equally

distributed among all the members of the group, irrespective of the individual's contribution. In addition, values such as harmony, loyalty, solidarity and cohesiveness are highly cherished (Fadil & Williamson, 2009: 136).

In collectivistic cultures, the employer is seen as fulfilling a parental role towards the employee (Restubog *et al*., 2009). The accent is on relationship formation regardless of advantage to the individual; and attending to the "attributes" of the organisation, namely what supervisors and managers expect in terms of norms and roles (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012: 773). Since perceptions are influenced by values, a collectivist's perception of what the employer's obligations are is formed in relational terms. A collectivist develops a positive self-image from belonging, being amenable to others, and maintaining harmony (Ravlin, 2012). Collectivists contribute what they can in exchange relationships, while taking what they need from the shared resources (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012). Collectivists are more likely to favour charismatic, team-oriented and self-protective leadership (Triandis & Gelfand, 2012). The acquiring of skills, training and development are some of the most desirable work-related goals for employees (Vadi & Vereshagen, 2006).

Every society has developed its own idiosyncratic pattern of cultural orientations, due to its particular history (Chirkov *et al.*, 2005). "There are as many varieties of collectivism as there are collectivist cultures" (Triandis, 2001: 909). In some cultures equality is highly valued, while others emphasise hierarchy.

Triandis et al. (1986, as quoted by Ott-Holland et al., 2014) was the first to make a distinction of familial, or in-group, and institutional collectivism. The four dimensions of culture are identified as Vertical Collectivism (VC) where the individual yields to the in-group's authority and will sacrifice themselves for their in-group (Triandis, 2001) and its leader (Chirkov *et al.*, 2005: 471); Horizontal Collectivism (HC) where collective identity is cultivated, with a strong sense of equality towards the in-group; Horizontal Individualist (HI) where people value doing "their own thing" and being unique; and Vertical Individualist (VI) where the individual wants to do his own thing, while being the best (Triandis, 2001:910). Fitzsimmons & Stamper (2014) use the terms institutional collectivism as a synonym for HC and in-group collectivism for HI.

2.5.1.1 Institutional Collectivism

Institutional collectivism can be defined as the culture where the collective distribution of resources and acting collectively is encouraged and rewarded (Naor *et al.*, 2010), to the benefit of the organisation or society rather than to the in-group or to the individual (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014). Institutional collectivism is similar to horizontal collectivism described by researchers (Thomas *et al.*, 2010), where people establish egalitarian relations regardless of status and qualities, coupled with a strong collective identity (Chirkov *et al.*, 2005). Institutional collectivism originates from a perception of equality, justice and collective action (Joy & Kolb, 2009), and encourages collaborative behaviour (Ott-Holland *et al.*, 2014). Members tend to be interdependent, but extend this beyond the small in-group to relationships with the organisation. This leads to the sense that belonging to the organisation is of higher importance than that of smaller in-group (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014). High levels of interpersonal trust exist among members of institutional collectivism orientation (Realo *et al.*, 2008).

Institutional collectivists value cooperation and modesty (Triandis & Gelfand, 2014). Participants are motivated to enhance the organisation (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014), and are performance and future oriented, which they attempt to achieve without dominating or assertiveness (Joy & Kolb, 2009). Institutional collectivism is characterised by camaraderie rather than kinship, as is the case with in-group collectivism (Joy & Kolb, 2009), which is discussed next.

2.5.1.2 In-group Collectivism

In-group collectivism is also referred to as Vertical Collectivism (VC) and is a cultural orientation where the individual yields to the in-group's authority and will sacrifice themselves for their in-group (Triandis, 2001) and its leader (Chirkov *et al.*, 2005). Although employees within an in-group collectivistic orientation sees themselves as interdependent to each other, there is also a difference in status among the in-group (Thomas *et al.*, 2010). Participants in in-group collectivism tend to prioritise relationships with other members of the in-group above task completion, and emphasise obligations and duties to the members of the tight group (Fitzsimmons &

Stamper, 2014). In-group collectivism promotes loyalty, pride and cohesiveness in the organisation (Javidan *et al.*, 2006). Individuals will embrace a dual employee-organisation relationship, by seeking a relational relationship with supervisors and a more transactional relationship with the employer (Fitzsimmons & Stamper, 2014). In-group collectivism is significantly negatively correlated to general satisfaction and societal health (Alas, 2006).

2.5.1.3 Types of contracts

Collectivists by nature engage in long-term relational psychological contracts. Consistent with collectivist characteristics, relational contracts are underpinned by socio-emotional obligations such as loyalty and commitment (Ravlin *et al.*, 2012). These can be either communitarian or custodial (Thomas *et al.*, 2010).

2.5.1.3.1 Communitarian Contracts

In communitarian contracts employees generally have equal status to each other. General norms of reciprocity prevail and participants will most likely exceed requirements to enhance relationships. The contracts are governed by trust and characterised by widespread obligations (Thomas *et al.*, 2010).

2.5.1.3.2 Custodial Contracts

Employees operating within vertical in-group collectivism would enter into custodial contracts. Participants have unequal status and relationships are based on socio-emotional connections. These custodial relationships are paternalistic, where the lower-power member is significantly dependent on the higher-power member (Thomas *et al.*, 2010).

2.6 Conclusion

In this literature review the psychological contract was discussed, including breach and violation and its outcomes. The importance of cultural orientation and perceptions of justice as it impacts on psychological contracting were summarised.

Research on psychological contracts in a South African context is very limited. Also, studies on perceptions of breach and violations are plentiful, but not within a collectivistic culture. The limited research on psychological contracts within a collectivistic culture does not include South Africa.

The study of the psychological contract and its outcomes builds understanding of the complex employee – employer relationship; and therefore warrant further investigation in the complex South African labour market.

2.7 References

Adams, B., Van de Vijver, F., & De Bruin, G., 2012. Identity in South Africa: examining self-descriptions across ethnic groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations.* 36, 3: 377– 388.

Agarwal, U., & Bharghava, S., 2014. The role of social exchange on work outcomes: a study of Indian managers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management.* 25, 10: 1484 – 1504.

Alas, R., 2006. Ethics in countries with different cultural dimensions. *Journal of Business Ethics.* 69, 3: 237 – 247.

Andrieu, K., 2010. Transitional Justice: a new discipline in Human rights. *Online Encyclopedia of Mass Violence.* Centre for International Studies & Research. [Online]. Available: http://www.massviolence.org/PdfVersion?id_article=359. [Accessed 22 August 2014].

Biswas, S., Varma, A., & Ramaswami, A., 2013. Linking distributive and procedural justice to employee engagement through social exchange: a field study in India. *International Journal of Human Resource Management.* 24, 8: 1570 – 1587.

Brockner, J., Ackerman, G., Greenberg, J., Gelfand, M., Jrancesco, A., Chen, Z., Leung, K., Bierbrauer, G., Gomez, C., Kirkman, B., & Shapiro, D., 2001. Culture and procedural justice: the influence of power distance on reactions to voice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology.* 37, 4: 300 – 315.

Chirkov, C., Lynch, M., & Niwa, S., 2005. Application of the scenario questionnaire of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism to the assessment of cultural distance and cultural fit. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations.* 29, 4: 469 – 490.

Chiu, S., & Peng, J., 2008. The relationship between psychological contract breach and employee deviance: the moderating role of hostile attributional style. *Journal of Vocational Behavior.* 73, 3: 426 – 433.

Christian, J., & Ellis, A., 2014. The crucial role of turnover intentions in transforming moral disengagement into deviant behavior at work. *Journal of Business Ethics.* 119, 2: 193 – 208.

Colquitt, J., Scott, B., Rodell, J., Long, D., Zapata, C., Conlon, D., & Wesson, M., 2013. Justice at the millennium, a decade later: a meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 98, 2: 199 – 236.

Conway, N., Guest, D., & Trenberth, L., 2011. Testing the differential effects of changes in psychological contract breach and fulfilment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior.* 79, 1: 267 – 276.

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M., 2005. Social exchange theory: an interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management.* 31, 6: 874 – 900.

Cullinane, N., & Dundon, T., 2006. The psychological contract: a critical review. *International Journal of Management Reviews.* 8, 2: 113 – 129.

Den Hartog, D., & Verburg, R.M., 2004. High performance work systems, organisational culture and firm effectiveness. *Human Resource Management*. 14, 1: 55 – 78.

Eckerd, S., Hill, J., Boyer, K., Donohue, K., & Ward, P., 2013. The relative impact of attribute, severity, and timing of psychological contract breach on behavioural and attitudinal outcomes. J*ournal of Operations Management*. 31, 7-8: 567 - 578.

Epitropaki, O., 2013. A multi-level investigation of psychological contract breach and organizational identification through the lens of perceived organizational

membership: testing a moderated-mediated model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 34, 1: 65 – 86.

Fadil, P.A., & Williamson, S., 2009. A theoretical perspective of the cultural influences of individualism / collectivism, group membership, and performance variation on allocation behaviors of supervisors. *Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal.* 19, 2: 134 – 150.

Fitzsimmons, S., & Stamper, C., 2014. How societal culture influences friction in the employee - organization relationship. *Human Resource Management Review.* 24, 1: 80 – 94.

Greenberg, J., 1990. Organizational justice: yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management.* 16, 2: 399 – 432.

Guest, D.E., 1998. Is the psychological contract worth taking seriously? *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 19, S1: 649 – 664.

Guest, D.E., & Conway, N., 2002. Communicating the psychological contract: an employer perspective. *Human Resource Management Journal.* 12, 2: 22 – 38.

Guest, D., 2004. The psychology of the employment relationship: an analysis based on the psychological contract. *Applied Psychology: an International Review* 53, 4: 541 – 555.

Hermida, R., & Luchman, J., 2013. The moderating role of locus of causality in the relationship between source of information and psychological contract breach perceptions. *Journal of Business Psychology.* 28, 2: 221 – 232.

Hofstede, G., 1980. Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization.* 10, 4: 15 – 41.

Huseman, R., Hatfield, J., & Miles, E., 1987. A new perspective on equity theory: the equity sensitivity construct. *Academy of Management Review.* 12, 2: 232 - 234.

International Center for Transitional Justice, 2014. *What is Transitional Justice?* [Online]. Available: ictj.org/about/transitional-justice. [Accessed 22 August 2014].

Jafri, H., 2011. Influence of Psychological contract breach on organizational commitment. *Synergy.* 9, 11: 19 – 30.

Jamil, A., Raja, U., & Darr, W., 2013. Psychological contract types as moderator in the breach – violation and violation – burnout relationships. *Journal of Psychology*. 147, 5: 491 - 515.

Javidan, M., Dorfman, De Luque, M., & House, R., 2006. In the eye of the beholder: cross cultural lessons in leadership from Project GLOBE *Academy of Perspectives.* 20, 1: 67 – 90.

Johnson, J.L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A., 2003. The effects of psychological contract breach and organizational cynicism: not all social exchange violations are created equal. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 24, 5: 627 – 647.

Joy, S. & Kolb, D., 2009. Are there cultural differences in learning style? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations.* 33, 1: 69 – 85.

Kickul, J., Lester, S, W. & Belgio, E., 2004. Attitudinal and behavioural outcomes of psychological contract breach: a cross cultural comparison of the United States and Hong Kong Chinese. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management.* 4, 2: 229 – 252.

Kiewitz, C., Restubog, S., Zagenczyk, T., & Hochwarter, W., 2009. The interactive effects of psychological contract breach and organizational politics on

perceived organization support: evidence from two longitudinal studies. *Journal of Management Studies*. 46, 5: 806 – 834.

Linna, A., Väänänen, A., Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M., Pentti, J., & Vahtera, J., 2011. Effect of participative intervention on organisation justice perceptions: a quasi-experimental study on Finnish public sector employees. *International Journal of Human Resource Management.* 22, 3: 706 – 721.

Lo, S. & Aryee, S., 2003. Psychological contract breach in a Chinese context: an integrative approach. *Journal of Management Studies*. 10, 4: 1005 – 1020.

McDermott, A., Conway, E., Rousseau, D., & Flood, P., 2013. Promoting effective psychological contracts through leadership: the missing link between HR strategy and performance. *Human Resource Management.* 52, 2: 289 – 310.

Mayer, R., Davis, J., & Schoorman, F., 1995. An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review.* 20. 3: 709 – 734.

Morand, D., & Merriman, K., 2012. "Equality Theory" as a counterbalance to equity theory in Human Resource Management. *Journal of Business Ethics.* 111, 1: 133 – 144.

Morrison, E. W., & Robinson, S. L., 1997. When employees feel betrayed: a model of how psychological contract violation develops. *Academy of Management Review.* 22: 1, 226 – 256.

Naor, M., Linderman, K., & Schroeder, R., 2010. The globalization of operations in Eastern and Western countries: unpacking the relationship between national and organizational culture and its impact on manufacturing performance. *Journal of Operations Management.* 28, 3: 194 – 205.

Ng, T., W., Feldman, D., & Butts, M., 2014. Psychological contract breaches and employee voice behavior: the moderating effects of changes in social

relationships. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology.* 23, 4: 537 – 553.

Ott-Holland, C., Huang, J., Ryan, A., Elizondo, F., & Wadlington, P., 2014. The effects of culture and gender on perceived self-other similarity in personality. *Journal of Research in Personality.* 53, 1: 13 – 21.

Pate, J., Martin, G., & McGoldrick, J., 2003. The impact of psychological contract violation on employee attitudes and behaviour. *Employee Relations.* 25, 6: 557 - 573.

Ravlin, E., Liao, Y., Morrell, D., Au, K., & Thomas, D., 2012. Collectivist orientation and the psychological contract: mediating effect of creditor exchange ideology. *Journal of International Business Studies.* 43, 8: 772 – 778.

Realo, A., Allik, J., & Greenfield, B., 2008. Radius of trust: social capital in relation to familism and institutional collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology.* 39, 4: 447 - 462.

Restubog, S., Bordia, P., & Tang, R., 2007. Behavioural outcomes of psychological contract breach in a non-Western culture: the moderating role of equity sensitivity. *British Journal of Management.* 18, 4: 376 – 386.

Restubog, S., Hornsy, M., Bordia, P., & Esposo, S., 2008. Effects of psychological contract breach on organizational citizenship behaviour: insights from the group value model. *Journal of Management Studies.* 45, 8: 1377 – 1400.

Restubog, S., Bordia, P., & Bordia, S., 2009. The interactive effects of procedural justice and equity sensitivity in predicting responses to psychological contract breach: an interactionist perspective. *Journal of Business Psychology.* 24, 2: 165 – 178.

Restubog, S., Bordia, P., Tang, R., & Krebs, S., 2010. Investigating the moderating effects of leader-member exchange in the psychological contract breach-

employee performance relationship: a test of two competing perspectives. *British Journal of Management.* 21, 2: 422 – 437.

Restubog, S., Zagenczyk, T., Bordia, P., Bordia, S., & Chapman, G., 2012. If you wrong us, shall we not revenge? Moderating roles of self-control and perceived aggressive work culture in predicting responses to psychological contract breach. *Journal of Management* May. 1 – 21. 0149206312443557.

Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M., 1994. Violating the psychological contact: the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 15, 3: 245 – 259.

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R., J., 1995. A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: a multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal.* 38, 2: 555 – 572.

Robinson, S. L., 1996. Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly.* 41, 4: 574 – 599.

Rosen, C., Chang, C., Johnson, R., & Levy, P., 2009. Perceptions of the organizational context and psychological contract breach: assessing c ompeting perspectives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes.* 108, 2: 202 – 217.

Rousseau, D. M., 1989. Psychological and implied contract in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal.* 2, 2: 139.

Rousseau, D. M., 1990. New hire perceptions of their won and their employer's obligations: a study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 11, 5: 389 – 400.

Rousseau, D. M., 1998. The 'problem' of the psychological contract considered. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 19, S1: 665 – 671.

Sayers, J.K., Sears, K.L., Kelly, K.M., & Harbke, C.R., 2011. When employees engage in workplace incivility: the interactive effect of psychological contract violation and organizational justice. *Employee Responsibilities & Rights Journal.* 23, 4: 269 – 283.

Suazo, Mark M., Martinez, P.G., & Sandoval, R., 2009. Creating psychological and legal contracts through human resource practices: a signalling theory perspective. *Human Resource Management Review.* 19 2: 154 – 166.

Suazo, M., & Stone-Romero, E., 2011. Implications of psychological contract breach: a perceived organizational support perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology.* 26, 5: 366 – 382.

Taras, V., Kirkman, B. L., & Steel, P., 2010. Examining the impact of Culture's Consequences: a three-decade, multilevel, meta-analytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 95, 3: 405 – 439.

Thomas, D., Au, K., & Ravlin, E., 2003. Cultural variation and the psychological contract. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 24, 5: 451 – 471.

Thomas, D., Fitzsimmons, S., Ravlin, E., Au, K., Ekelund, B., & Barzantny, C., 2010. Psychological contracts across cultures. *Organization* Studies. 31, 11: 1437-1458.

Thompson, J. & Bunderson, S., 2003. Violations of principle: ideological currency in the psychological contract. *Academy of Management Review.* 28, 4: 571 – 596.

Triandis, H., 2001. Individualism – Collectivism and personality. *Journal of Personality.* 69, 6: 907 – 924.

Triandis, J., & Gelfand, M., 2012. A theory of individualism and collectivism. In: *Handbook of Social Psychological Theories 2.* London: Sage.

Turnley, W., & Feldman, D., 1999. A discrepancy model of psychological contract violation. *Human Resource Management Review.* 9, 3: 367 – 386.

Tzafrir, S., Harel, G., Baruch, Y., & Dolan S., 2004. The consequences of emerging HRM practices for employees' trust in their managers. *Personnel Review.* 33, 6: 628 – 647.

Vadi, M., & Vereshagin, M., 2006. The deposit of collectivism in organizational culture in Russia: some consequence of human resources management. *Baltic Journal of Management.* 1, 2: 188 – 200.

Winter, S., 2013. Towards a unified theory of transitional justice. *The International Journal of Transitional Justice.* 7, 2: 224 – 244.

Yum, Y., & Canary, D., 2009. Cultural differences in equity theory predictions of relational maintenance strategies. *Human Communication Research.* 35, 3: 384 - 406.

Zhao, H., Wayne, S., Glibowski, B., & Bravo, J., 2007. The impact of psychological contract breach on work-related outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology.* 60, 3: 647 – 680.

Zhu, Y., 2012. A review of social exchange relationship. *Studies in Sociology of Science.* 3, 3: 57 – 61.

SECTION 3: DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Methodology

This section explains how the research was conducted. The research assumed a constructivist philosophic stance with a relativist approach, as the individual's reality is a subjective experience (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). A deductive method is adopted (Babbie, 2011), exploring the applicability of deductions from accepted theory on psychological contract in a collectivistic culture.

3.2 Research Method

This research is a case study, which is an ideal research method when a 'how' question is asked regarding contemporary events (Gray, 2004). A case study is defined as an in-depth investigation of one instance of a social phenomenon (Babbie, 2011: 301). The epistemology will be transactional and subjectivist, as the "findings" are created during the interaction between the researcher and interviewee (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

Content and construct validity were sought in the design of questions to ascertain experiences relating to the psychological contract as well as cultural orientation by employing previously established measurements.

3.3 Sampling

The site of data collection was a government-subsidised entity in East London, Eastern Cape, where all employees are civil servants. Five employees were sought making use of purposive sampling. The latter is defined as nonprobability sampling, where the researcher judges which respondents would be most representative and useful (Babbie, 2011). Criteria included different cultural backgrounds, and hierarchical positions in the organisation.

Four interviewees from the current staff establishment of 32 staff members agreed to participate in the study (See Appendix 1). A fifth interviewee, who had left the

organisation eight months prior to the study, was approached, as her experiences of the environment with the hindsight of time would add further depth to the understanding of the research question. She agreed. Representatives from traditionally different cultural orientations contribute to content validity as recent research has confirmed that Black South Africans describe themselves as collectivistic, more so than Indians, Coloureds or Whites (Adams *et al*., 2012: 386).

3.4 Data Collection

Primary data collection was by in-depth semi-structured, one on one interviews. Qualitative interviews are described as an interaction between an interviewer and respondent where a set of topics are discussed in-depth. These intensive interviews resulted in "rich" data, varied and detailed, depicting full and revealing accounts. This technique requires verbatim transcripts (Maxwell, 2009).

Initial interviewees lasted between 38 and 92 minutes. Follow up interviews were conducted with Interviewees A, C and D, ranging in time between 16 and 77 minutes. All interviewees consented to have interviewees recorded on tape. On one occasion the interviewee requested the tape to be switched off for the last 10 minutes of the interview. Interviews were transcribed and hard and electronic copies, where applicable, were returned to interviewees. By giving interviewees the opportunity to review and correct the draft transcripts, trustworthiness and authenticity (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), and therefore construct validity (Riege, 2003) is created.

3.4.1 Psychological Contract

Researchers have not reached agreement on how the content of psychological contract should be measured (Rousseau & Tijoriwala, 1998; Freese & Schalk, 2008).

As the psychological contract is a multi-faceted construct, measurement tools will have diverse foci (Freese & Schalk, 2008). Rousseau & Tijoriwala (1998) suggested three measurement forms, namely content-oriented (specific terms or elements or groups of elements of the contract; or relational – transactional); feature-oriented

(comparing to some dimension e.g. implicit – explicit or stable – unstable); and evaluation-oriented (degree of breach, violation or fulfilment, change). In assessing the operationalization of the contract the preferred focus is on "promises, resulting obligations and reciprocal exchanges" (Rousseau & Tijoriwala, 1998: 681).

The most direct source for information on the content and nature of the psychological contract is self-reported or subjective measures (Rousseau & Tijoriwala, 1998). Psychological contract aspects are most commonly measured with questionnaire surveys. In their study Freese & Schalk (2008) evaluated several measurement tools, and found only four which they recommended, namely those of Pscyones (2005), Freese & Schalk (1997), and Rousseau (1990 and 2000). However, since this study made use of in-depth interviews in a specific environment, questions were derived from prior research published by Robinson & Morrison (2000), Robinson & Rousseau (1994), Rousseau (2000), Tekleab & Taylor (2003), and Thomas et al. (2010) (see Appendix 2).

3.4.2 Cultural Orientation

Since Hofstede's publication of the highly influential *Culture's Consequences* in 1980, individualism – collectivism has been the most popular cultural construct in research, albeit the most controversial – especially concerning the dimensions of the construct. (Taras et al., 2014). His international study of country level cultural orientation has received considerable criticism (e.g. Baskerville, 2003 (as quoted by Shulruf et al., 2011), and Oyserman et al., 2002). Also, in countries where major social and political changes took place since 1980, major cultural orientation changes might have taken place (Shulruf et al., 2011). The relevance and quality of Hofstede's national culture scores have been questioned, such as sample size and age (Taras et al., 2012). Researchers have expressed concern in using Hofstede's ratings of country-level individualism – collectivism, instead of measuring it directly (Oyserman et al., 2002: 7). One cannot assume cultural homogeneity, across life domains such as work-life and families, particularly in multi-cultural countries. Researchers have posited that culture-related constructs cannot be measured through attitudinal surveys (Chirkov et al., 2005: 472).

One possible way of overcoming problems of measuring cultural orientation is by the use of perceived cultural context (PCC). This is the respondent's perception of the shared behaviours and values of other members of a certain cultural or social group (Chirkov et al., 2005).

One of the tools developed to measure many attributes of cultural orientation was INDCOL, developed by Hui (1988). However, participants were required to indicate to what level they agree with items concerning their values, attitudes and beliefs (Shulruf *et al*., 2011). Self-reporting on cultural orientation has limitations, for instance the subjectivity of the responses (Taras & Steel, 2009). A possibility to overcome the difficulties in self-reporting tools to measure cultural orientation is through the use of a scenario format (Chirkov, 2005), such as SINDCOL, devised by Triandis & Singelis (1998).

By the turn of the millennium, cross-cultural researchers had moved from studying individualism - collectivism separately, to examining several dimensions of the construct; or cultural orientation (Chirkov *et al*., 2005). The measurement tool developed by Singelis *et al*. (1995) includes all four dimensions of verticality and horizontality of individualism – collectivism. It consisted of 32 attitudinal items (eight items for each dimension) measured on an agree-disagree Lickert scale (Sivadas *et al*., 2008). This was reduced, and tested, to a 14 item scale in 2008 by Sivadas *et al*.

The vertical and horizontal aspects of the construct have been tested in both Western and non-Western cultures with both attitudinal and scenario-based measurement tools (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Increasingly research has shown that Westerners are not necessarily less collectivistic nor more individualistic than Asians (Shulruf *et al*., 2011).

In an effort to address the shortfall of previous tools to measure cultural orientation Shulruf, Hattie and Dixon (2007) therefore developed the Auckland Individualism and Collectivism Scale (AICS) in 2007, using a frequency scale (options vary from never or almost never to always) to indicate frequency of behaviour or thought (Shulruf *et al*., 2011). AICS has been validated as a reliable measure for

individualism and collectivism by using cluster analysis in cross-cultural research (Shulruf *et al*., 2011: 185).

In their review of 121 instruments to measure cultural orientation, Taras, Rowney & Steel (2009) acknowledge some progress in how culture is measured and conceptualised. They gave several recommendations to improve the validity of culture conceptualisation and measuring tools, including finding alternatives for self-response questionnaire. They also question whether quantitative data on cultural orientation is sufficient, and suggest that qualitative data might allow for much rich data capturing (Taras *et al*., 2009).

Because of the construct's complexity and varied views, an instrument should be chosen which fits the needs of the study best (Taras *et al*., 2014). Taras (2013) compiled a comprehensive list of instruments which led to the measurement tool devised by Fischer *et al*. (2009). This tool utilises the four defining attributes of Individualism – Collectivism as suggested by Triandis (1995). A referent-shift consensus model is employed in this tool whereby participants report on typical behaviours of the majority members of the group. This allows for the "capturing shared collective perceptions and experiences" (Fischer *et al.*, 2009: 189).

For this study the questionnaire devised by Fischer *et al.* (2009) was used, with minor changes. (See Appendix 3).

3.5 Data Analysis

Data can be analysed by examining, classifying, arranging, testing or recombining qualitative and quantitative data to address the objectives of a study (Yin, 2003). As Maxwell (2009) suggests, data analysis should be conducted simultaneously with data collection, as this focuses observations, and aids interviews. Data was therefore rearranged into categories derived from existing literature.

The general strategy for analysis in this study was pattern matching, which is particularly useful in case studies. The rationale behind this method is that patterns unfold from the data which match, or fail to match, existing data (Gray, 2004). A

special type of pattern matching employed is explanation building, whereby an explanation about the case study is built through analysis of the case study data. This is achieved by specifying an expected set of causal links, which can then be iteratively compared with other cases (Yin, 2003).

3.6 Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations in research studies are centred on the subject matter, data collection and how the results of the research are dealt with (Remenyi, 1998). The researcher has ethical obligations both to the interviewees and the scientific community (Babbie, 2011). Permission was sought and granted from Rhodes University's Ethical Standards Committee for this study.

As participation should be voluntary (Babbie, 2011), interviewees were recruited on that basis, and interviewees were given the option to withdraw at any stage of the research. The researcher is sensitive to the consequences of self-disclosure (Smythe & Murray, 2000) by the interviewee. The purpose and process of the research was carefully explained to all participants. Interviews were transcribed and return in hard copy or electronically, according to the preference of the interviewee, in order to make any changes if they so wished. A consent form (see Appendix 5) was explained to, and then signed by each interviewee. Confidentiality and anonymity (Babbie, 2011) were assured.

Also, in line with best ethical practices (Babbie, 2011: 500), before data collection commenced, approval was secured from the Rhodes Higher Degrees Committee, as well as the Department of Sport, Recreation, Arts & Culture.

3.7 References

Adams, B., Van de Vijver, F., & De Bruin, G., 2012. Identity in South Africa: examining self-descriptions across ethnic groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 36, 3: 377– 388.

Babbie, E., 2011. *Introduction to Social Research* (5e). Belmont, Ca: Wadsworth.

Chirkov, C., Lynch, M., & Niwa, S., 2005. Application of the scenario questionnaire of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism to the assessment of cultural distance and cultural fit. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations.* 29, 4: 469 – 490.

Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S., 1994. Competing paradigms in qualitative research. IN: Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage, pp. 105 – 117.

Fischer, R., Ferreira, M. C., Assmar, E., Redford, P., Harb, C., Glazer, S., & Achoui, M., 2009. Individualism-collectivism as descriptive norms development of a subjective norm approach to culture measurement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology.* 40, 2: 187-213.

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.

Gray, D., 2004. *Doing research in the real world*. London: Sage.

Maxwell, J. A., 2009. Designing a qualitative study. IN: Bickman, L. & Rog, D.J., (eds). *Handbook of applied social research methods*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage, pp. 214 – 253.

Remenyi, D., 1998. Central ethical considerations for masters and doctoral research in business and management studies. *South African Journal of Business Management* 29, 3: 109 – 118.

Riege, A. M., 2003. Validity and reliability tests in case study research: a literature review with “hands-on” applications for each research phase. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*. 6, 2: 75 - 86.

Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M., 1994. Violating the psychological contact: the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 15, 3: 245 – 259.

Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. W.., 2000. The development of psychological contract breach and violation: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 21, 5: 525 – 546.

Rousseau, D. M., & Tijoriwala, S. A., 1998. Assessing psychological contracts: issues, alternatives and measures. *Journal of organizational Behavior.* 19, S1: 679 – 695.

Rousseau, D. M., 2000. Psychological contract inventory: Technical report. British Library.

Shulruf, B., Alesi, M., Ciochina, L., Faria., L., Hattie, J., Hong, F., Pepi, A., & Watkins, D., 2011. Measuring Collectivism and Individualism in the third millennium. *Social Behavior and Personality.* 39, 2: 173 – 188.

Smythe, W. & Murray, M., 2000. Owning the story: ethical considerations in narrative research. *Ethics & Behavior.* 10, 4: 311 -336.

Sivadas, E., Bruvold, N., & Nelson, M., 2008. A reduced version of the horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism scale: a four-country assessment. *Journal of Business Research.* 61, 3: 201 – 210.

Taras, V., Rowney, J., & Steel., P., 2009. Half a century of measuring culture: review of approaches, challenges, and limitations based on the analysis of 121 instruments for quantifying culture. *Journal of International Management.* 15, 4: 357 – 373.

Taras, V. & Steel, P., 2009. Beyond Hofstede: challenging the ten commandments of cross-cultural research. In: Nakata, C. (ed.) *Beyond Hofstede: culture frameworks for global marketing and management*: [Online]. Available: http://www.palgraveconnect.com/pc/doifinder/10.1057/9780230240834. [Accessed: 13 May 2014]

Taras, V., Steel, P., & Kirkman, B., 2012. Improving national cultural indices using a longitudinal meta-analysis of Hofstede's dimensions. Journal of World Business. 47, 3: 329 – 341.

Taras, V., 2013. Catalogue of instruments for measuring culture. [Online]. Available: http://www.vtaras.com/Culture_Survey_Catalogue.pdf. [Accessed 13 May 2014]

Taras, V., Sarala, R., Muchinsky, P., Kemmelmeier, M., Singelis, T. M., Avsec, A., & Sinclair, H. C., 2014. Opposite ends of the same stick? Multi-method test of the dimensionality of Individualism and Collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology.* 45, 2: 213-245.

Tekleab, A., & Taylor, S., 2003. Aren't there two parties in an employment relationship? Antecedents and consequences of organisation-employee agreement on contract obligations and violations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 24, 5: 585 – 608.

Triandis, H., & Gelfand, M., 1998. Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74, 1: 118 – 128.

Triandis, J., & Singelis, T., 1998. Training to recognize individual differences in collectivism individualism within culture. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations.* 22¸1: 35 – 47.

Yin, R.K., 2003. Analyzing case study evidence. IN: *Case Study Research: Design & Methods*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage, pp. 109 – 140.

Appendix 1: Profiles of Interviewees

Interviewee	Sex	Years' experience	Race	Occupation
A	F	> 20 years	White	Managerial
B	F	>7 years	Black	Professional
C	M	>15 years	Black	Technical
D	F	>20 years	Black	Support
E	F	>10 years	Coloured	Professional

APPENDIX 2: Interview Topics

Psychological Contract Breach / Violation in a Collectivistic Culture

The purpose of the research will be explained to interviewees: studying the expectations employees have of their employer and how that impacts their work life.
Voluntary participation, as well as withdrawal.
Information regarding interviewees will be kept confidential.
Request permission to use digital tape recorder
Interviewees will be given the opportunity to review and correct a draft summary of the transcript.

Sign Interview Consent Form

Interview Questions

Semi-structured interviews

Study: I want to learn about people's expectations from their job / employer

A. Opening questions

- Tell me about your work life.
- What do you do at the museum?
- How do you feel about your work? Enjoy? Too hard / easy?

B. State of Psychological Contract

(What their employer promised them (Thomas et al., 2010))

- What are your employer's commitments to you? Which obligations did your employer promise you? (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994) (e.g. Pay; training; long-term job security; career development; support with personal problems)

(What obligations were required in return (Thomas et al., 2010))

- What do you think are your obligations to the organisation? (e.g. Doing one's best, working long hours, minimum length of stay)

(How they came to understand these promises and obligations, (Thomas et al., 2010)

- How did you come to understand these promises and obligations? (Friends, Colleagues, Union, Supervisor)

- To what extent has the organisation implicitly or explicitly made these promises to you? (Rousseau, 2000)

*(Whether their employer always met these obligations, and if not, what had occurred, (*Thomas *et al.,* 2010*))*

- Overall, how well does your employer fulfill its commitments / promises to you? (Rousseau, 2000)
- Overall, how well have you fulfilled your commitments / promises to organisation? (Rousseau, 2000)

- Who was in control of what had occurred ? *(*Thomas *et al.,* 2010*)*
- What did you do in response and why? *(*Thomas *et al.,* 2010*)*

C. Fulfilment

Employer has done a good job of meeting its obligations to me (Tekleab & Taylor, 2003)

Employer has fulfilled the most important obligations to me (Tekleab & Taylor, 2003)

I have done a good job of meeting my obligations to my employer (Tekleab & Taylor, 2003)

I have fulfilled the most important obligations to my employer (Tekleab & Taylor, 2003)

D. Impact of Breach of Psychological Contract

I have not received everything promised to me in exchange for my contributions (Robinson & Morrison, 2000)

My employer has broken many of its promises to me even though I've upheld my side of the deal (Robinson & Morrison, 2000)

E. Impact of Violation of Psychological Contract

I feel a great deal of anger toward my organisation (Robinson & Morrison, 2000)

I feel betrayed by my organisation (Robinson & Morrison, 2000)

I feel that my organisation has violated the contract between us (Robinson & Morrison, 2000)

I feel extremely frustrated by how I have been treated by my organisation (Robinson & Morrison, 2000)

*Follow-up or probing questions encouraged elaboration by asking, 'What next?', 'How did that feel?', 'Anything else?' and 'Please, continue'. (*Thomas *et al.,* 2010*)*

Sources for Interview Questions

Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. W.., 2000. The development of psychological contract breach and violation: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 21, 5: 525 – 546.

Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M., 1994. Violating the psychological contact: the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 15, 3: 245 – 259.

Rousseau, D. M., 2000. Psychological contract inventory: Technical report. British Library.

Tekleab & Taylor, 2003 (as quoted in 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.

Thomas, D., Fitzsimmons, S., Ravlin, E., Au, K., Ekelund, B., & Barzantny, C., 2010. Psychological contracts across cultures. *Organization Studies.* 31, 11: 1437-1458.

APPENDIX 3: Questionnaire

1. Questionnaire submitted to All Staff

Dear Colleagues

I am Somine van der Merwe and I'm in the final year of my MBA degree at Rhodes University. My research is about our expectations from work and how we react to it. I will be conducting in-depth interviews with four or five volunteers; as well as offering this questionnaire to all staff at East London Museum.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would participate in this research, by filling in the questionnaire below.
The purpose of the questionnaire is to establish which values people observe. Participation is anonymous and voluntary, and has no bearing on assessments or performance. You may withdraw at any stage; however, your participation would assist in understanding the environment in which people work.

Below are two opposite statements – A and B. **Thinking of the people at work, which statement describes most people?** Use the following scale to indicate your response:
Mostly: *Almost all* people are described by either Statement A or B.
Usually: *Most* people are described by either Statement A or B.
Sometimes: a *few* people are described by either Statement A or B.
Statements A and B are about **equal** in terms of the number of people at work that they describe**.**

Thank you very much for your time.

A	Mostly	Usually	Some-times	Statements are equal	Some-times	Usually	Mostly	**B**
People enjoy being similar to others.								People enjoy being different from others.
People stress accomplishments and achievements of their group when meeting new people.								People stress their personal accomplishments and achievements when meeting new people.
It is important for people to act as a member of their group.								It is important for people to act as an independent person.
When people have a need, they turn to others for help.								When people have a need, they rely on themselves.
If there is a conflict between personal values and the values of a group, people follow the values of their group.								If there is a conflict between personal values and the values of a group, people follow their personal values.
People carry out their group obligations.								People do what is enjoyable to them personally.
People pay attention to their group duties.								People pay attention to their Workplan Agreements / Job descriptions.

People obey their group norms and duties rather than Workplan Agreements / Job descriptions.								People obey their Workplan Agreements / Job descriptions rather than their group norms and duties.
People act in line with their group norms and duties.								People act in line with their rights.
People follow their group norms and rules.								People follow their personal attitudes.
People do their duties, even when they think they will not benefit.								People do their duties only if they think they will benefit from it.
People take feelings of people around them into account when making decisions.								When making decisions, people are not especially sensitive to feelings of people around them.
People consider needs of others in their group, even if they do not expect something from them in return.								People only consider needs of others in their group, if they expect something from them in return.
People focus on the relationship with other people without caring about associated costs and benefits.								People carefully calculate costs and benefits of their relationship with other people.
People generally help other people without considering costs.								Before helping other people, people consider the costs of helping.
People maintain established relationships, even if this is not in their best interest.								People do not hesitate to change established relationships if the relationship is not in their best interest anymore.
People are mainly concerned with the goals of their group.								People are mainly concerned with their own personal goals.
In situations of conflict between the goals of one's group and personal goals, people sacrifice their own goals to achieve the goals of the group.								In situations of conflict between the goals of one's group and personal goals, people pursue their own goals.
In cases of conflict, individuals do what the group expects and demands without opposing the will of the larger group.								In cases of conflict, individuals just ignore the goals of their group and they attempt to reach their personal goals.
The goals of the group and the goals of individuals within groups are often compatible.								The goals of individuals within a group and the goals of the group are often not compatible.
It feels natural for most people to pursue personal goals only if they do not conflict with goals of their group.								It feels natural for most people to pursue their personal goal without considering the goals of their group.

2. Questionnaire to Individual Interviewee prior to Interview

Cultural Values

Questionnaire to individual interviewee participating voluntarily, in support of a study on *the Perceptions of Breach or Violation of the Psychological Contract in a Collectivist Society***.**

The purpose of the questionnaire is to establish which values you observe.

Instruction: Below are two opposite statements – A and B. Which statement describes you most accurately? Use the following scale to indicate your response:

Mostly: Either Statement A or B is true for you almost all the time.

Usually: Either Statement A or B is true for you most of the time.

Sometimes: Either Statement A or B is true for you only some of the time.

Statements A and B are about equal in describing you.

	Mostly	Usually	Some-times	Statements are equal	Some-times	Usually	Mostly	
I see myself as part of the group.								I see myself as independent from others.
It is important for me to act as member of the group.								It is important for me to act as an independent person.
If there is a conflict between personal values and the values of the group, I follow the values of the group.								If there is a conflict between personal values and the values of a group, I follow my personal values.
I obey the norms and duties of the group rather than my Workplan Agreement / Job Description.								I obey my Workplan Agreement / Job Description rather than the norms and duties of the group.
I follow group norms and rules.								I follow my personal attitudes.
I take feelings of people around me into account when making decisions.								When making decisions, I am not especially sensitive to feelings of people around me.
I maintain established relationships, even if this is not in my best interest.								I do not hesitate to change established relationships if the relationship is not in my best interest anymore.
In situations of conflict between the goals of the group and my personal goals, I sacrifice my own goals to achieve the goals of the group.								In situations of conflict between the goals of the group and my personal goals, I pursue my own goals.
In cases of conflict, I do what the group expects and demands without opposing the will of the larger group.								In cases of conflict, I ignore the goals of the group and attempt to reach my personal goals.

APPENDIX 4: Questionnaire Results

Below are the means and standard deviations of the questionnaire results, as filled in by all staff.

Question1		*Question2*		*Question3*		*Question4*		*Question5*		*Question6*		*Question7*		*Question8*		*Question9*		*Question10*		*Question11*	
Mean	4.235294	Mean	4.058824	Mean	3.117647	Mean	2.647059	Mean	3.176471	Mean	4.764706	Mean	4.647059	Mean	4.058824	Mean	4	Mean	4.25	Mean	
Standard E	0.46597	Standard E	0.496092	Standard E	0.484179	Standard E	0.461306	Standard E	0.486851	Standard E	0.584917	Standard E	0.506873	Standard E	0.496092	Standard E	0.547723	Standard E	0.60208	Standard E	
Median	4	Median	4	Median	2	Median	2	Median	3	Median	6	Median	5	Median	3	Median	4	Median	3.5	Median	
Mode	2	Mode	3	Mode	2	Mode	1	Mode	1	Mode	7	Mode	6	Mode	2	Mode	2	Mode	7	Mode	
Standard D	1.921243	Standard D	2.04544	Standard D	1.99632	Standard D	1.902011	Standard D	2.007339	Standard D	2.411675	Standard D	2.089892	Standard D	2.04544	Standard D	2.19089	Standard D	2.408319	Standard D	
Sample Va	3.691176	Sample Va	4.183824	Sample Va	3.985294	Sample Va	3.617647	Sample Va	4.029412	Sample Va	5.816176	Sample Va	4.367647	Sample Va	4.183824	Sample Va	4.8	Sample Va	5.8	Sample Va	
Kurtosis	-1.48352	Kurtosis	-1.17981	Kurtosis	-0.1809	Kurtosis	0.294145	Kurtosis	-0.52438	Kurtosis	-1.29717	Kurtosis	-1.3888	Kurtosis	-1.68295	Kurtosis	-1.32173	Kurtosis	-1.78124	Kurtosis	
Skewness	0.160711	Skewness	-0.08953	Skewness	0.992416	Skewness	1.132733	Skewness	0.724895	Skewness	-0.65694	Skewness	-0.39778	Skewness	0.357433	Skewness	0.17388	Skewness	0.09	Skewness	
Range	5	Range	6	Range	6	Range	6	Range	6	Range	6	Range	6	Range	5	Range	6	Range	6	Range	
Minimum	2	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	
Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	
Sum	72	Sum	69	Sum	53	Sum	45	Sum	54	Sum	81	Sum	79	Sum	69	Sum	64	Sum	68	Sum	
Count	17	Count	17	Count	17	Count	17	Count	17	Count	17	Count	17	Count	17	Count	16	Count	16	Count	

Question12		*Question13*		*Question14*		*Question15*		*Question16*		*Question17*		*Question18*		*Question19*		*Question20*		*Question21*	
Mean	3.941176	Mean	3.529412	Mean	4.133333	Mean	4.235294	Mean	4.117647	Mean	5	Mean	4.5	Mean	3.9375	Mean	3.058824	Mean	4.529412
Standard E	0.481042	Standard E	0.429754	Standard E	0.476762	Standard E	0.55921	Standard E	0.506446	Standard E	0.485071	Standard E	0.508265	Standard E	0.580723	Standard E	0.326192	Standard E	0.46271
Median	4	Median	3	Median	4	Median	4	Median	3	Median	6	Median	4.5	Median	3.5	Median	3	Median	5
Mode	4	Mode	2	Mode	2	Mode	7	Mode	3	Mode	7	Mode	6	Mode	2	Mode	2	Mode	6
Standard D	1.983387	Standard D	1.771922	Standard D	1.84649	Standard D	2.305684	Standard D	2.088132	Standard D	2	Standard D	2.03306	Standard D	2.322893	Standard D	1.344925	Standard D	1.907801
Sample Va	3.933824	Sample Va	3.139706	Sample Va	3.409524	Sample Va	5.316176	Sample Va	4.360294	Sample Va	4	Sample Va	4.133333	Sample Va	5.395833	Sample Va	1.808824	Sample Va	3.639706
Kurtosis	-1.16144	Kurtosis	-0.64904	Kurtosis	-1.66651	Kurtosis	-1.57413	Kurtosis	-1.61127	Kurtosis	-1.51696	Kurtosis	-1.31774	Kurtosis	-1.70124	Kurtosis	-1.20894	Kurtosis	-1.03348
Skewness	0.091791	Skewness	0.670887	Skewness	0.011404	Skewness	-0.15177	Skewness	0.150534	Skewness	-0.425	Skewness	-0.2992	Skewness	0.086195	Skewness	0.05501	Skewness	-0.51019
Range	6	Range	6	Range	5	Range	6	Range	6	Range	5	Range	6	Range	6	Range	4	Range	6
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1
Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	5	Maximum	7
Sum	67	Sum	60	Sum	62	Sum	72	Sum	70	Sum	85	Sum	72	Sum	63	Sum	52	Sum	77
Count	17	Count	17	Count	15	Count	17	Count	17	Count	17	Count	16	Count	16	Count	17	Count	17

Below are the means and standard deviations of the results of the shortened questionnaire, as filled in by interviewees.

Question1		*Question2*		*Question3*		*Question4*		*Question5*		*Question6*		*Question7*		*Question8*		*Question9*	
Mean	2	Mean	2.6	Mean	6.2	Mean	6	Mean	3.6	Mean	1.8	Mean	3.2	Mean	3.2	Mean	4.4
Standard E	0.547723	Standard E	0.812404	Standard E	0.489898	Standard E	0.632456	Standard E	0.748331	Standard E	0.374166	Standard E	0.734847	Standard E	0.969536	Standard E	0.87178
Median	2	Median	2	Median	7	Median	7	Median	4	Median	2	Median	2	Median	2	Median	5
Mode	2	Mode	1	Mode	7	Mode	7	Mode	5	Mode	2	Mode	2	Mode	2	Mode	5
Standard D	1.224745	Standard D	1.81659	Standard D	1.095445	Standard D	1.414214	Standard D	1.67332	Standard D	0.83666	Standard D	1.643168	Standard D	2.167948	Standard D	1.949359
Sample Va	1.5	Sample Va	3.3	Sample Va	1.2	Sample Va	2	Sample Va	2.8	Sample Va	0.7	Sample Va	2.7	Sample Va	4.7	Sample Va	3.8
Kurtosis	2	Kurtosis	-2.2314	Kurtosis	-3.33333	Kurtosis	-1.75	Kurtosis	0.535714	Kurtosis	-0.61224	Kurtosis	-3.33333	Kurtosis	4.1512	Kurtosis	-0.81717
Skewness	1.360828	Skewness	0.567163	Skewness	-0.60858	Skewness	-0.88388	Skewness	-1.08851	Skewness	0.512241	Skewness	0.608581	Skewness	2.031531	Skewness	0.080998
Range	3	Range	4	Range	2	Range	3	Range	4	Range	2	Range	3	Range	5	Range	5
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	5	Minimum	4	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	2	Minimum	2
Maximum	4	Maximum	5	Maximum	7	Maximum	7	Maximum	5	Maximum	3	Maximum	5	Maximum	7	Maximum	7
Sum	10	Sum	13	Sum	31	Sum	30	Sum	18	Sum	9	Sum	16	Sum	16	Sum	22
Count	5	Count	5	Count	5	Count	5	Count	5	Count	5	Count	5	Count	5	Count	5

APPENDIX 5: Consent Form

Interview Consent Form

The purpose of this interview is in support of a study on the Perceptions of Breach or Violation of the Psychological Contract in a Collectivist Society. This research, conducted by Somine van der Merwe, is in partial fulfilment of an MBA-degree at Rhodes University.

I, _____ (interviewee) hereby agree that Somine van der Merwe (interviewer) may record and transcribe (type out what has been recorded) this interview for the purpose of studying the expectations employees have of their employer and how that impacts their worklife.
I will be given the opportunity to read the summary of this interview and make corrections if I so wish.

I understand that any personal details and discussions during these interviews will be kept confidential.
I understand that my participation in these discussions are voluntary and I may withdraw, if I so wish. My participation will be kept anonymous.
I understand that this study will be written up as an academic paper and submitted to Rhodes University. A copy will also be made available to the Eastern Cape Department of Sport Recreation Arts & Culture.

Interviewee Signature: _____
Signed at: _____
Date: _____
In the presence of (interviewer): _____