

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

2012

Dispositional predictors of psychological contract perceptions

Karen Louise Grab

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Grab, Karen Louise, "Dispositional predictors of psychological contract perceptions" (2012). *Theses Digitization Project*. 4125.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/4125>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

DISPOSITIONAL PREDICTORS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL
CONTRACT PERCEPTIONS

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science
in
Psychology:
Industrial/Organizational

by
Karen Louise Grab
December 2012

DISPOSITIONAL PREDICTORS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL
CONTRACT PERCEPTIONS

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Karen Louise Grab
December 2012

Approved by:


Janelle Gilbert, Ph.D., Chair, Psychology

11/5/12
Date


Janet Kottke, Ph.D.


Matt Riggs, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

With the concept of psychological contracts becoming more acknowledged and widely studied in the literature, it is important to explore a variety of perspectives to ensure that a meaningful path toward understanding is not overlooked. Parallel to the historical trends in job attitudes research, the psychological contract literature has also seen a dominant preference toward studying situational over dispositional variables, which has led to a lack of dispositional understanding of the construct. Individual differences affect the ways in which individuals interpret and perceive the world, which can alter the kinds of judgments people make about their psychological contracts. Using a series of multiple regressions and moderated linear regressions, this study analyzed the predictive value of personality traits on psychological contract type, breach and violation, and whether exchange or creditor ideologies moderate these relationships. A number of significant relationships were observed and analyzed. Discussion presents the importance of this study, its limitations, the directions for future research, and the implications for future researchers and practitioners. While not all hypotheses were supported, this research demonstrates a potentially meaningful impact

of dispositional characteristics within the realm of psychological contracts that would be valuable to explore further.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my family and Ben for all of their support throughout this process. I could not have done this without you. Thank you to my friends for reminding me that I have a life outside of school. Thank you to all of the teachers and professors who fostered my desire to further my education. Thank you to the Industrial and Organizational Psychology faculty members who taught me so much and made my experience at California State University, San Bernardino exceed my expectations. Thank you to my Thesis Committee, particularly my Adviser, Dr. Janelle Gilbert, for pushing me to reach my potential. I am so thankful to have you all in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Psychological Contracts	3
Factors of Psychological Contract Formation	8
The Importance of Dispositional Factors in the Workplace	11
The Impact of Individual Differences	16
Predicting Psychological Contracts Using the Big Five	17
Neuroticism	20
Agreeableness	21
Conscientiousness	23
Extraversion	24
Openness to Experience	26
Ideology	27
Hypothesis	28
CHAPTER TWO: METHOD	
Participants	30
Procedure	31
Measures	32
Personality	32
Psychological Contract Type	35

Breach and Violation	36
Exchange Ideology Questionnaire	37
Creditor Ideology	38
Demographics	38
CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS	40
Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Psychological Contract Type Scale	41
Correlations between Scales	42
Multiple Regression Analyses	45
Moderated Regression Analyses	49
Mediated Regression Analyses	51
Ideologies as Dispositional Predictors	53
CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION	
The Big Five	55
Exchange and Creditor Ideologies	57
Limitations	58
Directions for Future Research	59
Implications	63
APPENDIX A: THE BIG FIVE ASPECT SCALES	65
APPENDIX B: PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT TYPE SCALES	69
APPENDIX C: PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT BREACH AND VIOLATION SCALES	71
APPENDIX D: EXCHANGE AND CREDITOR IDEOLOGY SCALES	73
REFERENCES	75

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics	32
Table 2. Internal Consistency of Scales and Subscales	34
Table 3. Pearson Correlations between Predictor Variables	43
Table 4. Pearson Correlations between Outcome Variables	44
Table 5. Pearson Correlations between Predictors and Outcomes	46
Table 6. Results of Multiple Regression Analyses for Transactional and Relational Contracts, Breach, and Violation	47
Table 7. Results of Moderated Regression Analyses Predicting Transactional and Relational Contracts, Breach, and Violation	50
Table 8. Indirect Effect Coefficients of Mediation Analyses	52
Table 9. Results of Hierarchical Linear Regression Analyses Including Ideologies as Predictors	54

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Employment is a reciprocal relationship whereby both employers and employees expect to receive goods or services for the goods or services they provide. There are a number of factors that come into play when understanding the reciprocal relationship between an employee and an employer. Overt promises by the other party that are written or stated are the most visible or obvious type of agreement, while at the same time the other party's unstated, assumed, or insinuated promises are also very important. These more implicit promises and expectations can include concepts such as expected fairness or good intentions. The term *psychological contract* surfaced just before the 1960s and began to develop and become popular within the field after Rousseau's (1989) seminal work on the topic. *Psychological contracts* take into account both unwritten and written, and explicit and implied agreements while focusing in on an individual's perceived reciprocal relationship with another party. Psychological contract can be defined as "an individual's beliefs regarding the terms and conditions of a reciprocal exchange agreement between that focal person and another person" (Rousseau,

1989, p. 123). An individual employee believes that based on the contribution he/she makes, there is an "obligation of reciprocity" on the part of the organization, employer, or supervisor (Rousseau, 1989, p. 124). A psychological contract is experienced subjectively and uniquely by each individual within an organization (Raja, Johns, & Ntalianis, 2004).

Over the years, researchers have mostly looked at situational factors inside and outside of the organization when seeking to understand individuals' psychological contract development. Situational factors such as organizational communication and structure, as well as societal, cultural, economic or political situation, and a person's life experiences can all greatly impact contract development (Conway & Briner, 2005). However, more recently, some authors have sought to identify individual differences or dispositional characteristics that may contribute to contract formation (Coyle-Shapiro & Neuman, 2004; Raja et al., 2004; Rousseau, 2001). *Dispositional traits* can be defined as "stable tendencies in patterns of response across a wide variety of situations" (Griffin, 2001, p. 1143). The longtime debate over whether dispositional factors have an important influence on psychological constructs becomes especially relevant in

this new direction of psychological contract research. While some researchers believe that any impact dispositional factors may have on psychological constructs are outweighed by the impacts of situational factors, other researchers believe that dispositional factors play an important role in perceiving the world and that failing to acknowledge these impacts would be failing to fully understand constructs (Staw & Cohen-Charash, 2005). Therefore, it becomes important to explore the potential impacts of individual differences to better understand how psychological contracts are formed. This study seeks to look at the impact of dispositional factors, specifically the Big 5 personality traits, on psychological contracts.

Psychological Contracts

When studying psychological contracts, the specific terminology becomes important. A contract breach or violation occurs when the other party involved does not abide by an employee's psychological contract terms. Essentially, "psychological contract breach captures employees' perceptions of the extent to which the employer has failed to fulfill one or more of its obligations" (Parzefall & Coyle-Shapiro, 2011, p. 12). Violation of a psychological contract is similar to breach but focuses

more on emotion. Violation is a less cognitively-based reaction referring to "emotional distress and feelings of betrayal, anger, and wrongful harm arising from the realization that one's organization has not fulfilled a highly salient promise" (Raja et al., 2004, p. 350). Breaches are cognitive evaluations of broken contracts, whereas violation is a more deep-seeded emotional response to broken psychological contracts. When employees feel that their employer has violated or breached their psychological contract, these employees can demonstrate a variety of negative outcome behaviors that can be harmful to the organization. Breach of the psychological contract has been shown to be associated with reduced contributions to the organization. This includes reduced organizational citizenship or extra-role behavior (Morrison & Robinson, 1997) and increased counterproductive work behaviors, including withdrawal, purposefully not completing job requirements, and abuse of other employees (Jensen, Opland, & Ryan, 2010). Psychological contract breach has also been associated with reduced trust in employers, as well as reduced job and organizational satisfaction. When their psychological contracts are violated, employees tend to feel reduced obligation to the organization and have increased turnover intentions. In extreme cases,

psychological contract breach has been shown to be related to retaliation or revenge behaviors, such as theft, aggression, or sabotage. Breaches can also lead to lawsuits, which can end up being expensive for companies (Morrison & Robinson, 1997).

The literature has suggested that there are two widely accepted forms of psychological contracts: transactional and relational. While the distinction between these two terms falls on a continuum, each type has unique characteristics. Transactional psychological contracts are "composed of specific, short-term, and monetizable obligations entailing limited involvement of the parties" (Morrison & Robinson, 1997, p. 229). In other words, "transactional contract promises are characterized by specific, economically oriented exchanges between the employer and employee, which happen during a specific period of time" (Jensen et al., 2010, p. 557). The terms of these types of contracts are often monetarily-based and expected within a limited amount of time. These contracts can include such topics as working set hours, pay for services, and working toward the job's short-term goals (Jensen et al., 2010; Millward & Hopkins, 1998; Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Raja et al., 2004). On the other end of the spectrum, relational psychological contracts "entail

broad, open-ended, and long-term obligations, and [they are] based on the exchange of not only monetizable elements (e.g. pay for service) but also socioemotional elements such as loyalty and support" (Morrison & Robinson, 1997, p. 229). Said another way, relational contract promises can be "characterized by open-ended noneconomic agreements focused on maintaining the long-term relationship between the employer and employee" (Jensen et al., 2010, p. 557). The terms of this longer-term and relationship-focused form of psychological contract can include topics such as training and development (Jensen et al., 2010).

While outcomes associated with transactional and relational psychological contract breach overlap in some ways, research has found distinct differences between these two types of breach. One area of overlap is that experiencing breach of either type of contract is associated with abuse of other employees, behaviors which can include threatening, belittling, or ignoring other employees (Jensen et al., 2010). A study conducted in India found that both types of contracts have also been shown to predict psychological ownership, or attitudes of attachment to issues employees value and feel deserve attention (Aggarwal & Bhargava, 2010). Despite the

overlaps, research has supported the distinction between these two different constructs and has found varying behavioral outcomes based on the type of psychological contract experienced by different employees. Reduced cohesion and organizational citizenship behavior have been found to be associated with breaches of transactional psychological contracts, but not with breaches of relational psychological contracts (Jensen et al., 2010). Also, only transactional contracts have been shown to predict innovative work behavior (Aggarwal & Bhargava, 2010). On the other hand, reduced employee civic virtue and organizational trust has been found to be linked to relational contract breach, but not to transactional contract breach. Also, production deviance, or intentional failure to complete one's job in the correct manner, and withdrawal, or reduction in the amount of time dedicated to the job to lower than what is required, have been tied only to relational contract breach (Jensen et al., 2010). Research has helped to clarify the differences between the outcomes of transactional and relational psychological contracts and has demonstrated that these differences become important in the study of psychological contracts.

Factors of Psychological Contract Formation

A number of factors can theoretically contribute to the expectations an employee develops within his or her psychological contract. Conway and Briner (2005) suggest that most communication or behavior by the organization or employer can contribute to the perception of promises experienced by the employee. These authors give the example that if an organization claims to be "family friendly," some employees might take this as an unstated promise to be flexible with work schedules (p. 48). All of the messages that an organization sends out can contribute to the perceived terms of the psychological contracts that employees develop, but there can also be other factors that contribute as well. The current or changing economic, political, or legal climate can potentially affect employees' expectations of employers and organizations. Also, incoming employees' prior work experiences can influence the perceptions they have about employment and employers. Even past experiences that do not appear to be related to work such as previous social interactions or relationships can influence expectations. Conway and Briner (2005, pp. 48-49) give the examples that significant life events such as parenthood or bereavement can contribute to renewed or altered evaluations of work

and expectations of employers. These are all ways in which the context has been shown to affect psychological contracts. Situational variables such as these tend to be the more common research topics when considering predictors of psychological contracts, but some past research suggests that dispositional factors may also be important when considering psychological contracts.

Conway and Briner (2005, p. 51) discuss the potential of individual characteristics contributing to psychological contract formation. They emphasize the subjectivity of psychological contracts and indicate that even if a company made a structured attempt to create equivalent promises to all employees, individual employees would interpret the situations and agreements differently. A number of individual factors have been hypothesized or shown to influence psychological contract formation. Conway and Briner (2005, pp. 52-53) discuss previous research on cognitive biases, such as self-serving biases (Robinson, Kraatz, & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 2001), that suggest that these characteristics likely influence the creation and evaluation of psychological contracts, although this relationship has not been tested empirically.

A study by Coyle-Shapiro and Neuman (2004) found that certain types of dispositional ideologies, specifically exchange and creditor ideologies, in employees have been found to be associated with the perceived content and fulfillment of psychological contracts in employees. Exchange ideology specifically refers to "the degree to which an individual's work effort is contingent upon perceived organizational treatment" (Coyle-Shapiro & Neuman, 2004, p. 153). The idea of exchange ideology suggests that individuals high in this characteristic make their level of work contingent upon organizational treatment, whereas people who do not prescribe to the ideas of exchange ideology as readily will continue working irrespective of the treatment they receive. Creditor ideology encompasses "a dispositional orientation towards the giving of greater value than that received" (Coyle-Shapiro & Neuman, 2004, p. 154). People high in creditor ideology prefer holding the indebtedness of others over feeling the unease of being indebted themselves. These dispositional characteristics predicted the extent employees felt obligated to the organization and the perceived level of fulfillment of those obligations. These significant findings prompted the authors to suggest that future researchers continue to

study the largely overlooked area of individual differences within psychological contracts.

Similar to these other dispositional topics, only a limited number of studies have looked at how personality traits relate to psychological contracts. Although it is a relatively new and emerging area of research, a number of studies have found significant relationships between personality traits and psychological contracts (Pouncey, 2010; Raja et al., 2004; Tallman & Bruning, 2008), indicating that this subject warrants more attention. This present study investigates the relationship between personality traits and psychological contract type, breach, and violation.

The Importance of Dispositional Factors in the Workplace

While there appears to be some recent momentum pushing psychological contract research toward the inclusion of dispositional factors inherent to the individual (Aggarwal & Bhargava, 2010; Jensen et al., 2010; Tallman & Bruning, 2008), the lack of research in this area is still apparent (Raja et al., 2004; Tallman & Bruning, 2008). This seeming gap in the literature is indicative of other historical trends that the field of organizational psychology has seen over the years.

Specifically, job attitudes research clearly depicts major arguments and shifts in dispositional research trends over the years. The underlying meaning and purpose of job attitudes, such as job satisfaction, is similar to that of psychological contracts: to describe how people feel about conditions of their work. Both of these constructs assess individual worker feelings about and reactions to experiences at work. The trends of job attitudes research depicts a meaningful movement in the past two and a half decades toward an increase in the amount of dispositional research (Staw & Cohen-Charash, 2005), which provides support for a similar movement within the study of psychological contracts.

The field of job attitudes research has seen a historic shift over the years in the content of predictors being researched. According to Staw and Cohen-Charash (2005), there has been a debate within the field of psychology since at least the early 1900s over whether to describe attitudes as either primarily dispositional in nature or as more dependent upon the situation and environment. The early parts of the 20th century tended to focus on dispositional explanations for attitudes and behaviors. During this time, researchers tended to focus on individual characteristics such as personality, work

attitudes, or intelligence when describing job attitudes (Staw & Cohen-Charash, 2005). After World War II with the rise of field theory and behaviorism, the overall discipline of psychology saw a large shift away from dispositional approaches and toward situational perspectives, and the field of organizational psychology reflected this trend, as well (Staw & Cohen-Charash, 2005, p. 60). The shift away from dispositional research was likely due in part to the low explanatory value being found when studying the role of personality in organizational behavior (Weiss & Adler, 1984). Dispositional approaches continued to lack popularity through the 1970s and early 80s, but a number of researchers defended dispositional research by attributing the lack of significant dispositional findings to design, methodological, or conceptual inadequacies of studies (Epstein, 1979; Monson, Hesley, & Chernick, 1982; Weiss & Adler, 1984).

In 1986, Staw, Bell, and Clausen made a formal argument in favor of studying dispositional sources of job satisfaction. The authors cited research evidence suggesting indications of temporal stability in job satisfaction. Coinciding with the arguments by Staw and colleagues (1986), the job satisfaction field began to see

some resurgence of dispositional research in the mid-1980s. More studies began to look at the stability of job satisfaction over time and situation and possible sources of this stability. Researchers indicated that the sources of the stability would probably be a stable and lasting individual characteristic (Staw & Cohen-Charash, 2005), and numerous researchers found support for the impacts of dispositional factors on job attitudes (Arvey, Bouchard, Segal, & Abraham, 1989; Judge & Locke, 1993; Levin & Stokes, 1989; Pulakos & Schmitt, 1983; Staw et al., 1986).

Walsh and Eggerth (2005) describe a number of practical reasons for the recent increase in personality research in the workplace. Specifically, cognitive assessments during the personnel selection process have been found to have adverse impact against minority groups. Personality tests, which tend to be more neutral to racial differences, could potentially serve as an alternative. Additionally, improvements in meta-analytic research strategies have allowed for more accurate appraisal of the value of personality traits. These techniques have demonstrated that personality traits do influence work-related behaviors. Also, the development and validation of the Five-Factor Model of personality created

a more unified framework from which to draw conclusions (Walsh & Eggerth, 2005). These developments helped to bring attention back to personality traits in the workplace.

Overall, history has seen a meaningful and intentional shift in the trends of research analyzing dispositional factors of job attitudes. The past two and a half decades have demonstrated increased attention to individual characteristics and dispositional factors. This shift, as defended by multiple researchers, suggests it may be important for researchers to make a similar push toward increased attention to dispositional factors with the construct of psychological contracts. Based on arguments made by job attitudes researchers (Davis-Blake & Pfeffer, 1989; Staw & Cohen-Charash, 2005), the debate over the true impact of dispositional factors still remains to be settled, which suggests the need for further study of dispositional topics in order to come to a more comprehensive and meaningful understanding of dispositional topics within organizational psychology. These trends and debates in job attitudes research demonstrate the current era's need to analyze the impacts of dispositional factors on workplace constructs.

The Impact of Individual Differences

Individual difference theories suggest that people's stable and unique characteristics influence their reactions and behaviors. Research supports the idea that individual differences, such as personality traits, have meaningful effects on behavior. Theorists suggest that the impact individual differences have on behavior stems from the way in which these characteristics alter perceptions. Specifically, individual differences affect the ways in which individuals view the world around them. People interpret their surroundings from the lens of their own unique individual characteristics (DelCampo, 2007). Two different individuals can look at the same event and see it very differently. Based on individual difference, one individual might perceive the implementation of a new computer system in the office as a large challenge, while another might perceive it as an exciting learning experience.

Scheck and Kinicki (2000) proposed and supported a structural model of coping in which individuals undergo a process of "primary appraisal" that affects how they will react to events, such as with the authors' example of organizational acquisition. They define primary appraisal within their example as "an evaluative process which

reflects the degree to which an event is considered to be stressful or a threat to well-being" (p. 630). Individuals can appraise environmental conditions related to organizational acquisition as "irrelevant, benign-positive, or stressful" (p. 631). Emotional and behavioral responses then arise from this initial, subjective assessment of events and situations. According to DelCampo (2007), many individual differences influence this process of primary appraisal. This model suggests that individual differences play an important role in interpreting situations and in forming opinions.

Predicting Psychological Contracts Using the Big Five

In recent decades, the five-factor model of personality has become widely recognized and accepted in the psychological community as an effective way of analyzing and describing individual differences related to personality (Goldberg, 1990; Raja et al., 2004). Personality traits are dispositional characteristics of individuals that remain relatively stable over time and have been found to be generalizable across many different cultures (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999), and these traits affect how individuals interpret aspects of their lives and the world in which they live (DelCampo,

2007). The five-factor model of personality dominates much of the research on personality traits in today's literature and has been shown to have consistent effects on behaviors in the workplace (Liao-Troth, 2005), making the five-factor model a logical and meaningful dispositional direction for research on psychological contracts. The purpose of this study is to analyze the impact of the Big Five Personality Traits on psychological contract type (transactional or relational), perceptions of psychological contract breach, and feelings of contract violation.

A limited number of studies have looked at the effects of personality traits on a variety of aspects of the psychological contract (Pouncey, 2010; Raja et al., 2004; Tallman & Bruning, 2008). A couple of studies have specifically looked at how personality traits predict psychological contract type or perceptions of violation in the specific populations of temporary or volunteer workers, and significant, meaningful results were found (Liao-Troth, 2005; Pouncey, 2010). However, only one previous study has looked at the predictive effects of personality traits on psychological contract type, perceptions of contract breach, and feelings of contract violation for the general work population (Raja et al.,

2004); the intent of this current study is to look more deeply into these relationships. This study will involve new directions of research. Particularly, while Raja and colleagues (2004) examined the effects of three of the Big Five personality traits on psychological contract type, breach, and violation, a study has yet to examine the effects of all five personality traits on these outcomes; this study will do just that. Also, the study by Raja and colleagues (2004) was conducted in Pakistan, and therefore the generalizability of the results to American organizations may be in question. This proposed study will be run in the United States, which could provide information more directly related to American organizations and researchers.

The underlying mechanism suggested in this paper is the way in which personality traits affect psychological contract formation. Personality traits basically serve as the lens for which individuals interpret all aspects of the world around them (DelCampo, 2007). Individuals high or low on different traits are more or less likely to focus in on positive or negative aspects of their environment, relational or transactional aspects of situations, creative or concrete solutions to problems, etc. In this way, personality traits are associated with

behavioral, cognitive, and emotional tendencies.

Essentially, the differential views of the world stemming from differing personality traits affect how individuals develop and interpret their own psychological contracts (DelCampo, 2007). The following sections describe the Big Five personality traits and the hypotheses that can be deduced for this study based on past research and personality trait theory.

Neuroticism

Neuroticism involves issues related to stress and personal wellbeing. Specifically, individuals with high levels of neuroticism tend to be more unstable, to be more prone to stress, and to have higher levels of personal insecurity and depression. Individuals with high levels of neuroticism tend to experience negative moods more frequently, including fear, anxiety, and irritability. These individuals have a difficult time recovering from a bad mood and negative life events (Judge et al., 1999). Viewing the world as stressful could likely cause a primary focus on job aspects related to survival, such as those described in transactional psychological contracts. Individuals high on neuroticism will also likely tend to gravitate toward more immediate, monetary goals and relationships that do not require long-term, social skills

and social interactions (Raja et al., 2004). This aspect of neuroticism, as well as supporting findings by Raja and colleagues (2004) suggests that neuroticism is positively associated with transactional psychological contract formation. Along this same line of thought, it is also expected that neuroticism will be shown to be negatively associated with relational psychological contract creation. Additionally, individuals high on neuroticism are more likely to feel anxiety and negative emotions. They tend to "select themselves into situations that foster negative affect" (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002, p. 531) and are more likely to focus in on negative aspects of situations (Ho, Weingart, & Rousseau, 2004). This suggests that individuals high on neuroticism might be more likely to interpret psychological contracts negatively, feel that they have not gotten a fair deal, and therefore perceive that their contract has been breached and violated.

Agreeableness

Agreeableness is tied to cooperativeness and likability. Individuals who score high on agreeableness tend to be more trusting and caring of others, and be more good-natured, cheerful, and gentle (Judge et al., 1999). Agreeable employees tend to trust their organization, have

higher job satisfaction, and have better performance in teams than employees who score lower on agreeableness (Tallman & Bruning, 2008). Agreeable individuals demonstrate a preference for social interactions and value these interpersonal interactions (Ho et al., 2004). The job satisfaction literature suggests that agreeable individuals "have greater motivation to achieve interpersonal intimacy" (Judge et al., 2002, p. 531). Agreeable individuals likely focus on relational aspects of organizations during their formation of their psychological contracts. Because agreeable individuals value close relationships (Raja et al., 2004), it is predicted that agreeableness will be positively related to relational contract type. Also, because of their trusting and gentle nature, agreeable employees will be less likely to focus on or complain about transactional aspects of a psychological contract. Additionally, the caring and cheerful nature of agreeable individuals would suggest that they would be more understanding of potential psychological breaches in the psychological contract and that they would be less likely to report breaches or violations (Raja et al., 2004).

Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness tends to be related to three aspects: "achievement orientation (hardworking and persistent), dependability (responsible and careful), and orderliness (planful and organized)" (Judge et al., 1999, p. 624). Conscientious individuals have higher need for achievement and order, and have higher levels of self control. Conscientiousness has been shown to be a predictor of work success. It has been tied to retention, attendance, and job performance (Judge et al., 1999). Employees with high levels of conscientiousness tend to show strong commitment to their work and go above and beyond job requirements (Tallman & Bruning, 2008). Past literature appears to be mixed as to theoretical conceptualizations of whether conscientious individuals should be more likely to develop relational or transactional psychological contracts (Liao-Troth, 2005; Raja et al., 2004). The job satisfaction literature suggests that conscientiousness "represents a general work-involvement tendency and thus leads to a greater likelihood of obtaining satisfying work rewards, both formal (e.g., pay, promotions) and informal (e.g., recognition, respect, feelings of personal accomplishment)" (Judge et al., 2002, p. 531). The high

need for achievement and focus on completing tasks would indicate that individuals with high levels of conscientiousness would be more oriented toward transactional psychological contracts that focus on specific 'monetizable' rewards for particular tasks completed. These individuals would be more likely to keep track of the different exchanges between themselves and the organization (Liao-Troth, 2005). At the same time, it would appear that conscientious individuals would see the value in a relational agreement with employers; their high need for achievement might guide them to expect more from employers and individuals around them in order to help them reach their high goals and objectives (Raja et al., 2004). Related to perceptions of breach and violation, conscientious individuals would likely see a greater purpose to organizational behaviors. Their hard working nature might allow them to see the value in an unbroken psychological contract. They might be more forgiving of minor violations, and therefore report lower levels of perceived breach and violation (DelCampo, 2007).

Extraversion

Extraversion is related to higher sociability as well as a number of other social characteristics. Specifically, extraverts tend to seek out more adventure and be more

assertive. They are more dominant and ambitious. Extraverts are more oriented toward social situations. They tend to be more outgoing and gregarious. Extraverts take on leadership roles more often than introverts do and tend to have more close friends than introverts (Judge et al., 1999). Raja and colleagues (2004) found a negative relationship between extraversion and transactional contracts, which they proposed was because short-term, monetary social interactions do not provide the opportunities for advancement or recognition that extraverts desire. So, while extraverts do seek out monetary rewards for their work, the relationships and contracts they form tend to be more long-term in order to reach their additional social and advancement goals. The job satisfaction literature suggests that extraverts, "because of their social facility, are more likely to find interpersonal interactions (such as those that occur at work) more rewarding" (Judge et al., 2002, p. 531). Because of this tendency to gravitate toward social relationships and view the world from a social lens, extraversion is expected to be positively associated with relational psychological contracts and negatively related to transactional contracts. Additionally, with their heightened social skills and communication abilities,

extraverts might be more likely to monitor their experiences of psychological contract breach and violation in hopes of acting to improve the situation within the social context of the work environment (DelCampo, 2007; Raja et al., 2004). They therefore might be more sensitive to breach and violation.

Openness to Experience

Openness to experience has been described as "intellectance (philosophical and intellectual) and unconventionality (imaginative, autonomous, and nonconforming)" (Judge et al., 1999, p. 625). Individuals who are highly open to experience have a higher need for autonomy and tend to be more flexible and accepting of change (Tallman & Bruning, 2008). While there have been some doubts as to the relevance of openness to experience in predicting psychological contracts (Liao-Troth, 2005; Raja et al., 2004), it is a topic lacking in research and could potentially be a meaningful and valuable construct to analyze. The conceptual understanding of openness to experience would indicate that this trait is positively associated with relational contracts because a person who is open to experience might find a higher purpose in relational goals as compared to the tangible, short-term rewards of transactional goals. Essentially, individuals

high on openness to experience view the world uniquely and create nontraditional and relational expectations of employers, not just the monetary expectations associated with transactional contracts. Their tendency to accept change and think outside of the box would indicate that individuals high in openness to experience would be more likely to reshape their psychological contracts rather than report violation (DelCampo, 2007), forgive the potential breach, or create a solution for themselves.

Ideology

Referring back to the earlier discussion related to Exchange and Creditor Ideologies, these were two dispositional characteristics related to reciprocation preferences. Exchange ideology refers to how much a person bases his or her work effort on the treatment he or she receives from the organization, while creditor ideology refers to one's preference toward giving greater value to others than is received. These ideologies tap into a dispositional tendency toward emphasis on certain aspects of exchange relationships, a focus on the equity of relationships (Coyle-Shapiro & Neuman, 2004). It would be logical to think that the more a person buys into the ideals of reciprocation, the more strongly a relationship between personality traits and psychological contracts can

be detected. That is to say, maybe people high in these ideologies pay more attention to and keep better track of their psychological contracts, thus magnifying the effects of personality traits on psychological contracts.

Hypothesis

Hypothesis 1: The Big Five Personality Traits predict Transactional Psychological Contracts.

- Neuroticism and Conscientiousness positively predict Transactional Contracts.
- Agreeableness, Extraversion, and Openness negatively predict Transactional Contracts

Hypothesis 2: The Big Five Personality Traits predict Relational Psychological Contracts.

- Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Openness positively predict Relational Contracts.
- Neuroticism negatively predicts Relational Contracts.

Hypothesis 3: The Big Five Personality Traits predict Psychological Contract Breach.

- Neuroticism and Extraversion positively predict Psychological Contract Breach.

- Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness negatively predict Psychological Contract Breach.

Hypothesis 4: The Big Five Personality Traits predict Psychological Contract Violation.

- Neuroticism and Extraversion positively predict Psychological Contract Violation.
- Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness negatively predict Psychological Contract Violation.

Hypothesis 5: Exchange and Creditor ideologies each moderate the above hypothesized relationships between personality traits and psychological contract type, breach, and violation, whereby the stronger the exchange or creditor ideology, the stronger the personality-contract relationship.

CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants

This study consisted of 223 adult, full-time employees who worked at least 30 hours per week and had been with their current organization for at least 6 months. Of the participants, 72.2% were female and 27.4% were male. The majority, 51.1%, were White (non-Hispanic), while 24.2% were Asian, 9.0% were Hispanic, 6.3% were Multi-racial, 3.1% were Black or African American, and 6.2% described themselves as other or declined to state their ethnicity. Participants ranged in age from 21 to 65 years old, with the mean age being 32.04 years old and the median age being 27 years old. The distribution of ages reflected a positive skew with most of the participants falling on the lower ages within the range. The majority of participants, 50.2%, reported that their highest level of education completed was a 4-year college degree, while 26.5% reported having earned a Master's degree, 7.2% a professional degree, 6.7% some college, 4.5% a 2-year college degree, 4.5% a doctorate degree, and 0.4% a high school degree. Participants had been working for their current organization on average 4.38 years and had been in

the workforce working for any organization on average 8.90 years. Both of these distributions reflected a positive skew. Of the participants, 46.2% held an established, professional-level position within their organization, 22.4% held an entry-level position, 13.5% held a low-level managerial position, such as supervisor or section lead, 8.5% held a middle-level managerial position, such as department or store manager, 4.0% held a top-level managerial position, such as president or executive, and 5.4% reported holding other levels within their organization. Table 1 presents means and standard deviations for variables of interest for this sample.

Procedure

A convenience sample was recruited through online requests via social networking websites and via email. The recruitment message asked eligible individuals to participate in the survey and share the message with others. The recruitment message had a link to the electronic survey containing an informed consent form, each of the measures, and post-study information. No incentive was given for participation.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	M	SD
Age (in years)	32.04	11.07
Years working for current organization	4.38	5.78
Years working for any organization	8.90	8.93
Neuroticism	2.60	0.63
Agreeableness	4.08	0.46
Conscientiousness	3.61	0.59
Extraversion	3.64	0.62
Openness	3.88	0.51
Exchange Ideology	2.96	0.77
Creditor Ideology	3.20	0.58
Transactional Contract Type	2.00	0.75
Relational Contract Type	3.33	0.95
Psychological Contract Breach	2.56	0.95
Psychological Contract Violation	1.96	1.07

Measures

Personality

Based on evidence from previous research, DeYoung, Quilty, and Peterson (2007) set out to explore the possible presence and importance of an intermediate factor level between the Big Five Personality Traits and each of the six facet scales making up those traits within the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R, Costa & McCrae, 1992). Using results from established scales, DeYoung and colleagues (2007) conducted factor analyses

and a series of correlations to observe which items and facets correlated highly. DeYoung and colleagues (2007) found support for a model of personality with ten aspects. Specifically, each of the Big Five personality traits breaks down into two distinct, but correlated aspects (ten items per aspect), for a total of 100 items in a scale they termed the Big Five Aspect Scale (BFAS). Neuroticism consists of the aspects of volatility and withdrawal, Agreeableness consists of compassion and politeness, Conscientiousness consists of industriousness and orderliness, Extraversion consists of enthusiasm and assertiveness, and Openness/Intellect consists of openness and intellect. Administration of the measure consists of instructions that ask participants to describe themselves as they are currently compared to other individuals of their same age and gender. Participants rate each adjective as it pertains to them on a 5-point Likert-style scale (1 = Very Inaccurate; 9 = Very Accurate). Factors on the BFAS correlated highly with other established and respected personality measures; when corrected for attenuation, the BFAS factors correlated between .80 and .92 with factors on the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992) and between .80 and .85 with factors on Saucier's (1994) Mini-Markers. The researchers found good internal

consistency for each of the five factors and each of the ten aspects (Cronbach's alpha ranging from .72 to .91). This present study found very good internal consistency for each of the five factors (Cronbach's alpha ranging from .84 to .90; see Table 2 for specific alphas).

Table 2. Internal Consistency of Scales and Subscales

Scale	Cronbach Alpha
Neuroticism	.89
Volatility	.87
Withdrawal	.83
Agreeableness	.85
Compassion	.86
Politeness	.78
Conscientiousness	.88
Industriousness	.86
Orderliness	.85
Extraversion	.90
Enthusiasm	.87
Assertiveness	.90
Openness/Intellect	.84
Intellect	.87
Openness	.83
Exchange Ideology	.76
Creditor Ideology	.78
Transactional Psychological Contract Type	.88
Relational Psychological Contract Type	.91
Psychological Contract Breach	.92
Psychological Contract Violation	.94

Psychological Contract Type

Two 9-item scales utilized by Raja and colleagues (2004) and abbreviated from a 20-item and a 11-item created by Millward and Hopkins (1998) were used to measure transactional contract type and relational contract type respectively. The scale was shortened by Raja and colleagues (2004) upon factor analysis to eliminate items that did not load on either factor, items that cross loaded, and items that loaded negatively on the incorrect scale. Their study of 197 employees from a range of businesses in Pakistan found that this two-factor structure explained 36.4 percent of the total variance and the Cronbach's alphas were acceptable (.72 for transactional and .79 for relational). This study found very good Cronbach's alphas for each of these scales (.88 for transactional and .91 for relational). On a sample of 103 university employees, Raja and colleagues (2004) found high correlations between each component of their scale and the corresponding subscale of Rousseau's (2000) Psychological Contract Inventory (correlations of .71 for transactional and .59 for relational), thus providing evidence of convergent validity. The nine items of each of the scales consists of statements pertaining to either transactional or relational contracts and will be

evaluated on a 5-point Likert-style response scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). A few minor changes were made to the relational contract scale to replace three mentions of "company" with "organization" to be more consistent with other items.

Breach and Violation

A measure created by Robinson and Morrison (2000) containing five items pertaining to psychological contract breach and four items pertaining to violation was utilized. The breach scale assesses cognitions related to broken psychological contracts, and the violation scale assesses feelings related to broken contracts. Both scales were found to have good internal consistency in the Robinson and Morrison (2000) (Cronbach's alpha for breach scale = .92 and for violation scale = .92) and the Raja and colleagues (2004) (Cronbach's alpha for breach scale = .79 and for violation scale = .81) studies of employees. The current study also found very good internal consistency for each of these scales (Cronbach's alpha for breach scale = .92 and for violation scale = .94). Raja and colleagues (2004) found a high correlation between the breach and violation ($r = .72$) scales posing a potential question over construct distinctness. Their confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated that a two-factor model

($\chi^2 = 68.43$, $df = 26$, $CFI = .94$, $RMSEA = .09$) was a slightly better fit than the single-factor model ($\chi^2 = 76.20$, $df = 27$, $CFI = .92$, $RMSEA = .10$), and the differences between chi-squares was significant ($\Delta\chi^2 = 7.77$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$), thus supporting ability to discriminate between breach and violation using these scales. Slight modifications to the breach scale items will be made to replace "employer" with "organization" to make wording more consistent with the other psychological contract scales that refer to the organization as the point of reference. A 5-point Likert-style response scale will be used (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree).

Exchange Ideology Questionnaire

The five-item exchange ideology questionnaire created by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986) was used to measure participants' exchange ideology. The items were written to "measure the strength of an employee's belief that work effort should depend on treatment by the organization" (Eisenberger et al., 1986, p. 503). Their survey of 97 private high school teachers found good internal consistency for the measure (Cronbach's $\alpha = .80$) (Eisenberger et al., 1986). The present study found adequate internal consistency for this scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .76$). The response scale will be a

5-point Likert-style (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree).

Creditor Ideology

Eisenberger, Cotterell, and Marvel (1987) created a nine-item creditor ideology scale as part of a Reciprocation Ideology Questionnaire. A factor analysis with varimax rotation supported a distinct three-factor model, supporting the uniqueness of each of the three subscales: creditor ideology, reciprocation wariness, and reciprocity-norm acceptance. Additionally, the creditor ideology scale that will be used for this study demonstrated good internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .79$). The current study found adequate internal consistency for this scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .78$). The questions ask respondents about their tendency to want to give more to others than they receive from those other individuals (Eisenberger et al., 1987). A 5-point Likert-style response scale will be used (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree).

Demographics

Basic demographics questions were also measured, including gender, ethnicity, age, highest level of education completed, time working for their current

organization, time they have been in the workforce, and level within their organization.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Before analysis, the five personality traits, psychological contract perceptions, and exchange and creditor ideologies were examined through a number of SPSS programs for data entry accuracy, missing values, and the fit of their distributions with the assumptions of regression analysis. The single missing value on Exchange and Creditor Ideology and the compassion aspect of Agreeableness was allowed to remain as it was for analyses for which it would be eligible. Histograms of the distributions reflected proximity to normality for all the scales, except for the Violation distribution which appeared to be somewhat positively skewed. Upon further evaluation, skewness and kurtosis analyses indicated that all scales, including Violation, were near enough to normal to be utilized for analyses. One case with an extremely low z score on Agreeableness was found to be an outlier and was removed. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) for each of the main variables of interest.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Psychological Contract Type Scale

A Confirmatory Factor Analysis using EQS software evaluated the factorization of the 18 psychological contract type items utilized by Raja and colleagues (2004) that contains nine items for the transactional type and the other nine items for the relational contract. The large Normalized Estimate of Mardia's Coefficient for Multivariate Kurtosis (26.56) prompted the use of the Robust Method for Goodness of Fit. The original model (Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-Square = 442.088 on 135 degrees of freedom, CFI = .826, RMSEA = .101) was relaxed to improve the fit of the model based on the Multivariate Lagrange Multiplier Test. The two factors were allowed to covary because it makes sense theoretically that transactional and relational contracts would inversely correlate and because the Multivariate Lagrange Multiplier Test indicated it would increase the fit. Additionally, eight pairs of error parameters were allowed to covary to reach a better fit. The moderate fit (Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-Square = 243.418 on 126 degrees of freedom, CFI = .933, RMSEA = .065) of the final solution appeared to reflect the original model, thus providing support for this factorization model and the use of this measure.

Correlations between Scales

SPSS was used to evaluate the Pearson correlation values between each of the scales used for this study. It would make sense for certain personality traits to covary amongst each other because they are tapping in on stable qualities of individuals, some of which can be linked theoretically. Amongst the personality traits (see Table 3), Neuroticism was significantly negatively correlated with Conscientiousness ($r = -.286, p < .001$), Extraversion ($r = -.379, p < .001$), and Openness ($r = -.170, p = .011$), Agreeableness was significantly positively correlated with Conscientiousness ($r = .247, p < .001$) and Openness ($r = .236, p < .001$), and Extraversion was significantly positively correlated with Conscientiousness ($r = .297, p < .001$) and Openness ($r = .307, p < .001$). Additionally, it is logical for Exchange and Creditor Ideologies to correlate, as was observed ($r = .146, p = .030$), because both are evaluating perspectives on aspects of reciprocal relationships. All of the psychological contract outcome variables correlated significantly with one another in the directions that theory would suggest (see Table 4). Specifically, Transactional Contract Type negatively correlates with Relational Contract Type ($r = -.482, p < .001$) but positively correlates with Breach ($r = .279,$

Table 3. Pearson Correlations between Predictor Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 - Neuroticism	--						
2 - Agreeableness	-.128	--					
3 - Conscientiousness	-.268***	.247***	--				
4 - Extraversion	-.379***	.119	.297***	--			
5 - Openness	-.170*	.236***	.075	.307***	--		
6 - Exchange Ideology	.099	-.072	-.114	.001	.061	--	
7 - Creditor Ideology	.091	.067	.064	-.010	-.052	.146*	--

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Table 4. Pearson Correlations between Outcome Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4
1 - Transactional Contract Type	--			
2 - Relational Contract Type	-.482***	--		
3 - Psychological Contract Breach	.279***	-.489***	--	
4 - Psychological Contract Violation	.328***	-.638***	.679***	--

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

$p < .001$) and Violation ($r = .328, p < .001$), Relational Contract Type negatively correlates with Breach ($r = -.489, p < .001$) and Violation ($r = -.638, p < .001$), and Breach is strongly positively correlated with Violation ($r = -.679, p < .001$). Table 5 shows the Pearson correlations between predictor and outcome variables for reference.

Multiple Regression Analyses

Using SPSS, a Multiple Regression was run to evaluate Hypothesis 1 and whether the Big Five Personality Traits predict Transactional Psychological Contracts in the directions hypothesized. Table 6 presents the results of the multiple regression analyses conducted. The analysis was shown to be significant with a medium effect size ($R^2 = .102, F[5,217] = 4.946, p < .001$). Within this analysis, Openness significantly negatively predicted Transactional Contracts ($b = -.221, \beta = -.151, p = .031$), as was predicted, and demonstrated a moderate effect size. Also, although not significant, Neuroticism trended toward positively predicting ($b = .163, \beta = .183, p = .053$) and Extraversion trended toward negatively predicting ($b = -.159, \beta = -.131, p = .078$) Transactional Contracts both with moderate effect sizes, which coincided directionally with original hypotheses.

Table 5. Pearson Correlations between Predictors and Outcomes

Variable	Transactional	Relational	Breach	Violation
Neuroticism	.216**	-.194**	.079	.199**
Agreeableness	-.134*	-.006	-.031	-.069
Conscientiousness	-.083	.176**	-.065	-.124
Extraversion	-.231**	.164*	-.038	-.052
Openness	-.229**	-.015	.040	.040
Exchange Ideology	.169*	-.092	.149*	.125
Creditor Ideology	-.049	.097	-.039	.004

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Table 6. Results of Multiple Regression Analyses for Transactional and Relational Contracts, Breach, and Violation

Predictors	Transactional		Relational		Breach		Violation	
	B	β	B	β	B	β	B	β
Neuroticism	.163†	.183	-.209†	-.140	.105	.070	.333**	.197
Agreeableness	-.115	-.071	-.105	-.152	-.052	-.025	-.112	-.049
Conscientiousness	.028	.022	.203†	.127	-.065	-.040	-.132	-.073
Extraversion	-.159†	-.131	.152	.100	-.025	-.017	.044	.025
Openness	-.221*	-.151	-.123	-.066	.122	.066	.172	.083
	F = 4.946***		F = 3.123**		F = 0.535		F = 2.462*	
	R ² = .102		R ² = .067		R ² = .012		R ² = .054	
	Adjusted R ² = .082		Adjusted R ² = .046		Adjusted R ² = -.011		Adjusted R ² = .032	
	R = 0.32		R = 0.259		R = .110		R = 0.232	

† p < .10

* p < .05

** p < .01

*** p < .001

Another Multiple Regression evaluated Hypothesis 2, which proposed that the Big Five Personality Traits predict Relational Psychological Contracts in hypothesized directions. The analysis showed that the Big Five significantly predicted Relational Contracts with a small to medium effect size ($R^2 = .067$, $F[5,217] = 3.123$, $p = .010$). Although none of the individual personality traits were shown to significantly explain enough variance on its own to be significant, Neuroticism ($b = -.209$, $\beta = -.140$, $p = .054$) and Conscientiousness ($b = .203$, $\beta = .127$, $p = .078$) showed some indication of predicting Relational Contracts in the directions hypothesized. Both of these traits suggested a small to moderate effect size.

A third Multiple Regression explored Hypothesis 3 that projected that the Big Five Personality Traits would predict Psychological Contact Breach in particular directions. This overall model was not shown to be significant ($R^2 = .012$, $F[5,217] = 0.535$, $p = .750$). None of the individual predictors were significant, and none appeared to have a meaningful effect on Psychological Contract Breach.

Hypothesis 4, which proposed that the Big Five Personality Traits predict Violation in particular directions, was analyzed using a fourth Multiple

Regression analysis. The overall model was shown to be significant and had a small to medium effect size ($R^2 = .054$, $F[5,217] = 2.462$, $p = .034$). Of the predictors, Neuroticism was positively predictive in the hypothesized positive direction, with a moderate effect size ($b = .333$, $\beta = .197$, $p = .007$).

Moderated Regression Analyses

Exchange and Creditor Ideologies were each examined as possible moderators of the linear regression relationships between each of the Big Five Personality Traits and each of the psychological contract perceptions (Hypothesis 5). Using SPSS, each personality trait and ideology were standardized and multiplied to create an interaction term. Each of these interaction terms were then added into a hierarchical regression on top of each of the individual factors to examine any additional variance explained by the interaction term. Table 7 presents the results of these moderation analyses. There was little support for the hypothesized moderation effect. Specifically, only 4 significant moderation effects were found out of the forty examined, and more were found to have negative effects than positive, even though the prediction was that the direction of the moderation would

Table 7. Results of Moderated Regression Analyses Predicting Transactional and Relational Contracts, Breach, and Violation

		Transactional		Relational		Breach		Violation		
Predictors	Moderator	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	
Neuroticism	X	E.I.	.006	.078	.000	-.012	.003	-.057	.000	-.012
	X	C.I.	.001	.038	.006	-.082	.000	-.010	.000	.013
Agreeableness	X	E.I.	.003	-.055	.017†	.133†	.011	-.105	.016†	-.128†
	X	C.I.	.003	-.058	.000	.011	.000	.006	.004	-.062
Conscientiousness	X	E.I.	.001	.031	.004	.067	.005	-.068	.000	.002
	X	C.I.	.001	-.025	.009	.096	.003	-.052	.019*	-.141*
Extraversion	X	E.I.	.017*	-.130*	.000	-.019	.001	.035	.001	.028
	X	C.I.	.013†	-.119†	.007	.089	.004	.066	.000	-.002
Openness	X	E.I.	.005	-.072	.000	-.009	.000	-.012	.000	-.004
	X	C.I.	.002	-.042	.029*	.177*	.004	-.068	.021*	-.151*

E.I.=Exchange Ideology

C.I.= Creditor Ideology

† $p < .10$

* $p < .05$

be positive. Specifically, Creditor Ideology was found to significantly moderate the relationship between Openness and Relational contract type ($\Delta R^2 = .029$, $\beta = .177$, $p = .012$), the relationship between Openness and Violation ($\Delta R^2 = .021$, $\beta = -.151$, $p = .032$), and the relationship between Conscientiousness and Violation ($\Delta R^2 = .019$, $\beta = -.141$, $p = .037$), but two out of three of these had negative moderation effects. Exchange Ideology significantly moderated the relationship between Extraversion and Transactional contract type in a negative direction ($\Delta R^2 = .017$, $\beta = -.130$, $p = .045$).

Mediated Regression Analyses

Although not hypothesized, as an added exploration the predictive relationship between each of the Big Five Personality Traits and each psychological contract perception was analyzed for possible mediation effects of each Ideology using the Med Three mediation SPSS macro (Hayes, Preacher, & Myers, 2010). No significant mediation effects were found. Table 8 presents the medication coefficients for each of these insignificant mediation effects.

Table 8. Indirect Effect Coefficients of Mediation Analyses*

Predictors		Mediator		Transactional	Relational	Breach	Violation
Neuroticism	-->	E.I.	-->	.017	-.011	.021	.018
	-->	C.I.	-->	-.008	.016	-.006	-.002
Agreeableness	-->	E.I.	-->	-.019	.014	-.022	-.020
	-->	C.I.	-->	-.004	.133	-.005	.001
Conscientiousness	-->	E.I.	-->	-.023	.013	-.026	-.023
	-->	C.I.	-->	-.004	.009	-.004	.001
Extraversion	-->	E.I.	-->	.000	.000	.000	.000
	-->	C.I.	-->	.001	-.001	.001	.000
Openness	-->	E.I.	-->	.016	-.010	.017	.016
	-->	C.I.	-->	.005	-.009	.004	-.001

E.I.= Exchange Ideology

C.I.= Creditor Ideology

*None Significant

Ideologies as Dispositional Predictors

Using a series of four Hierarchical Regressions in SPSS, the data were explored to see if Exchange and Creditor Ideologies explained variance above and beyond that explained by the Big Five Personality Traits when predicting each of the four Psychological Contract perceptions: Transactional, Relational, Breach, and Violation (see Table 9). Exchange and Creditor Ideologies significantly explained additional variance beyond that explained by the Personality Traits only when predicting Transactional contracts ($\Delta R^2 = .036$, $F[2,214] = 4.449$, $p = .013$), although these result reflected a very small effect size. In this model, beyond Openness that was significant ($b = -.246$, $\beta = -.168$, $p = .015$), Exchange Ideology also demonstrated a significant effect on Transactional Contracts and a moderate effect size ($b = .177$, $\beta = .182$, $p = .006$). Additionally, although the overall model predicting Breach was not significant like the value added by Exchange and Creditor Ideologies ($\Delta R^2 = .021$, $F[2,214] = 2.377$, $p = .095$), Exchange Ideology individually did appear to have a significant and small to moderate effect on Breach ($b = .180$, $\beta = .145$, $p = .036$).

Table 9. Results of Hierarchical Linear Regression Analyses Including Ideologies as Predictors

	Transactional		Relational		Breach		Violation	
Predictors	B	β	B	β	B	β	B	β
Block 1								
Neuroticism	.166*	.141	-.209	-.140	.106	.070	.328	.195**
Agreeableness	-.114	-.071	-.105	-.052	-.052	-.025	-.114	-.049
Conscientiousness	.029	.023	.203	.127	-.065	-.040	-.133	-.074
Extraversion	-.155	-.128	.152	.100	-.025	-.016	.039	.023
Openness	-.215*	-.147	-.123	-.066	.123	.066	.165	.079
	F = 4.824***		F = 3.109**		F = .534		F = 2.420*	
	R ² = .100		R ² = .067		R ² = .012		R ² = .053	
	Adjusted R ² = .080		Adjusted R ² = .046		Adjusted R ² = -.011		Adjusted R ² = .031	
	R = .317		R = .259		R = .111		R = .230	
Block 2								
Neuroticism	.159	.135	-.218	-.146	.095	.063	.316	.187*
Agreeableness	-.084	-.052	-.134	-.066	-.024	-.012	-.097	-.042
Conscientiousness	.059	.047	.176	.110	-.036	-.022	-.115	-.064
Extraversion	-.163	-.135	.154	.101	-.033	-.022	.032	.019
Openness	-.246*	-.168	-.096	-.052	.093	.050	.146	.070
Exchange Ideology	.177**	.182	-.103	-.084	.180	.145*	.131	.095
Creditor Ideology	-.125	-.097	.191	.118	-.100	-.061	-.029	-.016
	F = 4.827***		F = 2.822**		F = 1.066		F = 2.003	
	R ² = .136		R ² = .085		R ² = .034		R ² = .061	
	Adjusted R ² = .108		Adjusted R ² = .055		Adjusted R ² = .002		Adjusted R ² = .031	
	R = .396		R = .291		R = .184		R = .248	
	F Change = 4.449*		F Change = 2.032		F Change = 2.377		F Change = .964	
	R ² Change = .036		R ² Change = .017		R ² Change = .021		R ² Change = .008	

* p < .05

** p < .01

*** p < .001

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

The Big Five

There appeared to be some support for Hypotheses 1, 2, and 4, but not for Hypothesis 3. In other words, the Big Five Personality Traits as a group significantly predicted Transactional and Relational contracts and Violation, but did not significantly predict Breach. Of the Personality Traits, Neuroticism seemed to have the greatest effects on Psychological Contract Perceptions in the directions predicted. Neuroticism significantly predicted Violation at a $p < .001$ level with a moderate effect size and indicated some trending in the hypothesized direction by predicting Transactional and Relational Contracts at a $p < .10$ level with moderate effect sizes. Openness significantly predicted Transactional Contracts in the hypothesized direction, but none of the others Psychological Contract Perceptions. While Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Extraversion did not significantly explain enough variance on their own to be significant within the models, they showed some trending in the correct directions for some of the Contract Perceptions. With many of the Personality Traits

correlating significantly with one another, it is possible that individual effects of the traits were more difficult to observe within the Multiple Regressions. Despite only partially supporting Hypotheses 1, 2, and 4 and not supporting Hypothesis 3, the results indicate some meaningful impact of Personality Traits on Psychological Contract Perceptions in the hypothesized directions.

This present study partially supported the findings from Raja and colleagues (2004) that looked at three of the Big Five Personality Traits, Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Conscientiousness, in predicting Psychological Contract Perceptions. Like the Raja and colleagues (2004) study, the present study found that some Personality Traits predicted some Psychological Contract Perceptions. The models predicting Relational Contracts, Transactional Contracts, and Violation were significant in both studies. However, the present study did not find all of the significant relationships that were indicated in the Raja and colleagues (2004) study. Specifically, in the Raja and colleagues (2004) study, Neuroticism significantly predicted Relational Contracts, Extraversion significantly predicted Transactional Contracts, and Conscientiousness significantly predicted Relational Contracts and Breach, which the present study did not

find. Additionally, the present study did not find the model of the Big Five Personality Traits predicting Breach to be significant, whereas the previous study found that the model containing their three personality traits of interest significantly predicted Breach. These inconsistencies suggest that further research in this area would be beneficial. The present study looked at an American sample, whereas the Raja and colleagues (2004) study looked at a sample from Pakistan, indicating that there could be some cultural differences influencing psychological contracts, which would be an interesting direction for future research, as well.

Exchange and Creditor Ideologies

A number of methods were used to examine whether Exchange and Creditor Ideologies impacted Psychological Contract Perceptions or the relationships between Personality Traits and Contract Perceptions. Results indicated little to no support for the moderation effects of these Ideologies (Hypothesis 5) and no support for the mediation effect of these ideologies. There was some indication that Exchange and Creditor Ideologies added explanatory value beyond the Big Five Personality Traits. The Hierarchical Regressions indicated the Ideologies

combined explained a significant amount of variance above and beyond the Personality Traits when predicting Transactional Contracts; within this model, Exchange Ideology explained a significant amount of variance when predicting Transactional Contracts. Although none of the overall models indicated explanatory value beyond the Big Five Personality Traits, Exchange Ideology appeared to have some significant explanatory value on its own in predicting Breach, when none of the other predictors indicated meaningful effects on Breach. Although the hypothesized moderation effects were not observed, there appear to be some interesting impacts of the Ideologies, in particular Exchange Ideology, that could be meaningful.

Limitations

There were a number of limitations to this study. This study explored the basic Big Five Personality Traits and Exchange and Creditor Ideologies as predictors of Psychological Contracts. This is an important starting point for evaluating the impact of dispositional characteristics. However, the lack of more specific dispositional characteristics and the significant correlations between predictors can potentially blur some of the impacts.

The method of recruiting participants is a possible limitation. Participants were not randomly selected, which can limit generalizability of these results. The demographics of this sample tended to be skewed. Because this researcher utilized her own personal online contacts through social networks and email, the demographics of the participants appeared to possibly reflect who the researcher knows rather than the general American population. In particular, many of the participants were relatively young, had worked for a relatively short amount of time for their current organization or any organization, and a college education or higher. Also, there were a high percentage of females and the ethnic demographics did not match that of the general population. These differences could indicate that this sample might not generalize as well to the overall population.

Directions for Future Research

Based on the present study, a number of directions for future research become meaningful. This study showed that Dispositional Traits can have significant impacts on Psychological Contract Perceptions. However, not all hypotheses were supported. Perhaps the basic Big Five Personality Traits have too distant of an effect to show

meaningful explanation of variance in each case. Because some significant effects were suggested, it becomes important to examine the effects of other Dispositional characteristics that might be more closely tied to the contracts. For example, the interesting findings Exchange and Creditor Ideologies had in this present study and in past studies (Coyle-Shapiro & Neuman, 2004) suggests that this topic would be useful to explore further.

Additionally, Equity Sensitivity, Locus of Control, and Self-Esteem have been shown to have significant impacts on Psychological Contract Perceptions (Raja et al., 2004), and would be a valuable direction for future research in this area.

Another issue to consider is that the measure of the Big Five Personality Traits utilized in this study could have impacted the results. Within the Big Five Aspect Scales measure (DeYoung et al., 2007), each personality trait is comprised of two unique but correlated aspects. Some of these aspects might shape the measure of each trait into a distinct direction, potentially different from other measures of the same trait. For example, within the Big Five Aspect Scales, Neuroticism is comprised of Volatility and Withdrawal, whereas the definition of Neuroticism can include a propensity toward emotional

instability, stress, anxiety, personal insecurity, depression, and other negative emotions (Judge et al., 1999). Possibly by focusing on these two distinct Aspects of Volatility and Withdrawal, the meaning behind Neuroticism portrayed in this measure might have been swayed away from typical or more general understandings of the trait. A future study could utilize a more general measure of the Big Five Personality traits to explore whether this might have a clearer relationship with Psychological Contracts.

Additionally, the Psychological Contract Perceptions that were utilized in this study were supported as distinct variables in the literature. However, it appeared that they all correlated highly with one another, especially Breach with Violation. It would be beneficial for future researchers to further evaluate these perceptions to explore whether they are truly separate constructs or not. Also, there might be other, newer Psychological Contract perceptions in the literature that would be beneficial to study in a future dispositional study such as this one. For example, Intrinsic and Extrinsic Psychological Contract Inducements have been found to be related to the certain Personality Traits

(Nikolaou, Tomprou, & Vakola, 2007), and would be interesting to study further.

Another interesting direction for future research would be to explore Psychological Contracts over time by individual, by organization, and by era. There are currently economic hardships that are limiting the number of jobs available and that might encourage individuals to stay with their current organizations despite potentially Breached or Violated psychological contracts. This might increase the appearance of Breach and Violation, despite possible dispositional or situational predictors. Also, if a study focused in on particular organizations going through hardships such as layoffs or transitions in leadership, the turmoil within the organization might have meaningful effects on Psychological Contract Perceptions. Future studies could explore whether dispositional characteristics affect how a person's Psychological Contract Perceptions are impacted by organizational change or turmoil. Similarly, it would be interesting to see how Psychological Contract perceptions change over time within the individual across different circumstances to further explore the impact of dispositions.

Implications

This study has some valuable implications for future researchers and practitioners. Most immediately, this study demonstrates the importance of dispositional characteristics in the study of Psychological Contract Perceptions. It serves as an early exploration that can contribute to the development of future theory. Both the significant and the null results found in this study provide pieces for future theoretical modeling and can help guide future thinking.

In the long-term, related studies can provide implications for practitioners. Eventually, practitioners might be able to evaluate dispositional characteristics when looking for answers regarding Psychological Contract Perceptions. The findings of related research can advise organizations on ways of increasing person-organization fit through the evaluation and understanding of the expectations set forth in employees' psychological contracts as they relate to dispositional characteristics. Practitioners can become more aware of these individual differences and make targeted efforts to reduce the potential for dissatisfaction depending on the needs of particular employees. Eventually, related studies may provide some insight regarding recruitment, selection, and

training opportunities that take into account dispositional characteristics and psychological contracts (Pouncey, 2010).

Because little research has been conducted on the topic of dispositional predictors of Psychological Contracts (Raja et al., 2004), this research served an important step in deepening the understanding of a concept that is becoming widely recognized in the field. The results from this study show that dispositional characteristics do have a meaningful effect on Psychological Contracts. This study reinforces that situational and dispositional variables are both important when evaluating Psychological Contracts. The dispositional void in the psychological contract literature is apparent and more directed research is needed in this area to further explain how and why these contracts are formed.

APPENDIX A
THE BIG FIVE ASPECT SCALES

The Big Five Aspect Scales (DeYoung et al., 2007)

On the following pages, there are phrases describing people's behaviors. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes **you**. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence. Please read each statement carefully, and then fill in the bubble that corresponds to the number on the scale.

Neuroticism

Volatility

1. Get angry easily.
2. Rarely get irritated. (R)
3. Get upset easily.
4. Keep my emotions under control. (R)
5. Change my mood a lot.
6. Rarely lose my composure. (R)
7. Am a person whose moods go up and down easily.
8. Am not easily annoyed. (R)
9. Get easily agitated.
10. Can be stirred up easily.

Withdrawal

11. Seldom feel blue. (R)
12. Am filled with doubts about things.
13. Feel comfortable with myself. (R)
14. Feel threatened easily.
15. Rarely feel depressed. (R)
16. Worry about things.
17. Am easily discouraged.
18. Am not embarrassed easily. (R)
19. Become overwhelmed by events.
20. Am afraid of many things.

Agreeableness

Compassion

1. Am not interested in other people's problems. (R)
2. Feel others' emotions.
3. Inquire about others' well-being.
4. Can't be bothered with others' needs. (R)
5. Sympathize with others' feelings.
6. Am indifferent to the feelings of others. (R)
7. Take no time for others. (R)
8. Take an interest in other people's lives.
9. Don't have a soft side. (R)
10. Like to do things for others.

Politeness

11. Respect authority.
12. Insult people. (R)
13. Hate to seem pushy.
14. Believe that I am better than others. (R)
15. Avoid imposing my will on others.
16. Rarely put people under pressure.
17. Take advantage of others. (R)
18. Seek conflict. (R)
19. Love a good fight. (R)
20. Am out for my own personal gain. (R)

Conscientiousness

Industriousness

1. Carry out my plans.
2. Waste my time. (R)
3. Find it difficult to get down to work. (R)
4. Mess things up. (R)
5. Finish what I start.
6. Don't put my mind on the task at hand. (R)
7. Get things done quickly.
8. Always know what I am doing.
9. Postpone decisions. (R)
10. Am easily distracted. (R)

Orderliness

11. Leave my belongings around. (R)
12. Like order.
13. Keep things tidy.
14. Follow a schedule.
15. Am not bothered by messy people. (R)
16. Want everything to be "just right."
17. Am not bothered by disorder. (R)
18. Dislike routine. (R)
19. See that rules are observed.
20. Want every detail taken care of.

Extraversion

Enthusiasm

1. Make friends easily.
2. Am hard to get to know. (R)
3. Keep others at a distance. (R)
4. Reveal little about myself. (R)
5. Warm up quickly to others.
6. Rarely get caught up in the excitement. (R)
7. Am not a very enthusiastic person. (R)
8. Show my feelings when I'm happy.
9. Have a lot of fun.
10. Laugh a lot.

Assertiveness

11. Take charge.
12. Have a strong personality.
13. Lack the talent for influencing people. (R)
14. Know how to captivate people.
15. Wait for others to lead the way. (R)
16. See myself as a good leader.
17. Can talk others into doing things.
18. Hold back my opinions. (R)
19. Am the first to act.
20. Do not have an assertive personality. (R)

Openness/Intellect

Intellect

1. Am quick to understand things.
2. Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas. (R)
3. Can handle a lot of information.
4. Like to solve complex problems.
5. Avoid philosophical discussions. (R)
6. Avoid difficult reading material. (R)
7. Have a rich vocabulary.
8. Think quickly.
9. Learn things slowly. (R)
10. Formulate ideas clearly.

Openness

10. Enjoy the beauty of nature.
11. Believe in the importance of art.
12. Love to reflect on things.
13. Get deeply immersed in music.
14. Do not like poetry. (R)
15. See beauty in things that others might not notice.
16. Need a creative outlet.
17. Seldom get lost in thought. (R)
18. Seldom daydream. (R)
19. Seldom notice the emotional aspects of paintings and pictures. (R)

DeYoung, C. G., Quilty, L. C., & Peterson, J. B. (2007). Between facets and domains: 10 aspects of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(5), 880.

APPENDIX B

PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT TYPE SCALES

Psychological Contract Type Scales
(Raja et al., 2004)

Transactional contracts

1. I work only the hours set out in my contract and no more.
2. My commitment to this organization is defined by my contract.
3. My loyalty to the organization is contract specific.
4. I prefer to work a strictly defined set of working hours.
5. I only carry out what is necessary to get the job done.
6. I do not identify with the organization's goals.
7. I work to achieve the purely short-term goals of my job.
8. My job means more to me than just a means of paying the bills. (R)
9. It is important to be flexible and to work irregular hours if necessary. (R)

Relational Contracts

1. I expect to grow in this organization.
2. I feel part of a team in this organization.
3. I have a reasonable chance of promotion if I work hard.
4. To me working for this organization is like being a member of a family.
5. The organization develops/rewards employees who work hard and exert themselves.
6. I expect to gain promotion in this organization with length of service and effort to achieve goals.
7. I feel this organization reciprocates the effort put in by its employees.
8. My career path in the organization is clearly mapped out.
9. I am motivated to contribute 100 percent to this organization in return for future employment benefits.

(R) indicates reverse scale item

Raja, U., Johns, G., & Ntalianis, F. (2004). The impact of personality on psychological contracts. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 350–367. doi:10.2307/20159586

APPENDIX C
PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT BREACH AND
VIOLATION SCALES

Psychological Contract Breach and Violation Scales
(Robinson & Morrison, 2000)

Psychological Contract Breach

1. Almost all the promises made by my organization during recruitment have been kept so far. (R)
2. I feel that my organization has come through in fulfilling the promises made to me when I was hired. (R)
3. So far my organization has done an excellent job of fulfilling its promises to me. (R)
4. I have not received everything promised to me in exchange for my contributions.
5. My organization has broken many of its promised to me even though I've upheld my side of the deal.

Psychological Contract Violation

1. I feel a great deal of anger toward my organization.
2. I feel betrayed by my organization.
3. I feel that my organization has violated the contract between us.
4. I feel extremely frustrated by how I have been treated by my organization.

(R) indicates reverse scale item

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.
doi:10.1002/1099-1379(200008)21:5<525::AID-JOB40>3.0.CO;2-T

APPENDIX D

EXCHANGE AND CREDITOR IDEOLOGY SCALES

Exchange and Creditor Ideology Scales

Exchange Ideology Questionnaire (Eisenberger et al., 1986)

1. An employee's work effort should depend partly on how well the organization deals with his or her desires and concerns.
2. An employee who is treated badly by the organization should lower his or her work effort.
3. How hard an employee works should not be affected by how well the organization treats him or her. (R)
4. An employee's work effort should have nothing to do with the fairness of his or her pay. (R)
5. The failure of the organization to appreciate an employee's contribution should not affect how hard he or she works. (R)

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 71(3), 500–507.

Creditor Ideology Scale (Eisenberger et al., 1987)

1. If someone does something for you, you should do something of greater value for them.
2. If someone does you a favor, you should do even more in return.
3. If someone goes out of their way to help me, I feel as though I should do more for them than merely a favor.
4. If a person does you a favor, it's a good idea to repay that person with a greater favor.
5. It's not necessary to return favors quickly. (R)
6. As a rule, I don't accept a favor if I can't return the favor.
7. If you frequent a certain restaurant, you should leave large tips to ensure good service.
8. If a stranger helped you start your stalled car, you would not feel obligated to return the favor. (R)
9. If someone returned a wallet you lost, you should try to do something in order to repay him/her.

(R) indicates reverse scale item

Eisenberger, R., Cotterell, N., & Marvel, J. (1987). Reciprocation ideology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(4), 743–750.
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.53.4.743

REFERENCES

- Aggarwal, U., & Bhargava, S. (2010). Predictors and outcomes of relational and transactional psychological contract. *Psychological Studies*, 55(3), 195-207. doi:10.1007/s12646-010-0033-2
- Arvey, R. D., Bouchard, T. J., Segal, N. L., & Abraham, L. M. (1989). Job satisfaction: Environmental and genetic components. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(2), 187-192. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.74.2.187
- Conway, N., & Briner, R. B. (2005). *Understanding psychological contracts at work: A critical evaluation of theory and research*. Oxford University Press.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO PI-R professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A.-M., & Neuman, J. H. (2004). The psychological contract and individual differences: The role of exchange and creditor ideologies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(1), 150-164. doi:10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00031-9

- Davis-Blake, A., & Pfeffer, J. (1989). Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(3), 385-400. doi:10.2307/258174
- DelCampo, R. (2007). Psychological contract violation: An individual difference perspective. *International Journal of Management*, 24(1), 43-52.
- DeYoung, C. G., Quilty, L. C., & Peterson, J. B. (2007). Between facets and domains: 10 aspects of the big five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(5), 880.
- Eisenberger, R., Cotterell, N., & Marvel, J. (1987). Reciprocation ideology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(4), 743-750.
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.53.4.743
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.
- Epstein, S. (1979). The stability of behavior: I. On predicting most of the people much of the time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(7), 1097-1126. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.37.7.1097

- Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "description of personality": The big-five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1216-1229. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1216
- Griffin, M. A. (2001). Dispositions and work reactions: A multilevel approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1142-1151. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.6.1142
- Hayes, A. F., Preacher, K. J., & Myers, T. A. (2010). Mediation and the estimation of indirect effects in political communication research. In E. P. Bucy & R. L. Holbert (Eds.), *Sourcebook for political communication research: Methods, measures, and analytical techniques* (pp. 434-465). New York: Routledge.
- Ho, V. T., Weingart, L. R., & Rousseau, D. M. (2004). Responses to broken promises: Does personality matter? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65(2), 276-293. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2003.08.001
- Jensen, J. M., Opland, R. A., & Ryan, A. M. (2010). Psychological contracts and counterproductive work behaviors: Employee responses to transactional and relational breach. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1-14.

- Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002).
Five-factor model of personality and job
satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied
Psychology*, 87(3), 530-541.
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.530
- Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., Thoresen, C. J., & Barrick,
M. R. (1999). The Big Five Personality Traits,
general mental ability, and career success across the
life span. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(3), 621-652.
doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1999.tb00174.x
- Judge, T. A., & Locke, E. A. (1993). Effect of
dysfunctional thought processes on subjective
well-being and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied
Psychology*, 78(3), 475-490.
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.78.3.475
- Levin, I., & Stokes, J. P. (1989). Dispositional approach
to job satisfaction: Role of negative affectivity.
Journal of Applied Psychology, 74(5), 752-758.
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.74.5.752

- Liao-Troth, M. A. (2005). Are they here for the long haul? The effects of functional motives and personality factors on the psychological contracts of volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 34(4), 510-530. doi:10.1177/0899764005279513
- Millward, L. J., & Hopkins, L. J. (1998). Organizational commitment and the psychological contract. *Journal of Social and Applied Psychology*, 28(16), 16-31.
- Monson, T. C., Hesley, J. W., & Chernick, L. (1982). Specifying when personality traits can and cannot predict behavior: An alternative to abandoning the attempt to predict single-act criteria. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43(2), 385-399. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.43.2.385
- Morrison, E. W., & Robinson, S. L. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. *The Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 226-256. doi:10.2307/259230
- Nikolaou, I., Tomprou, M., & Vakola, M. (2007). Individuals' inducements and the role of personality: Implications for psychological contracts. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(7), 649-663. doi:10.1108/0268394071082008

- Parzefall, M.-R., & Coyle-Shapiro, J. A.-M. (2011). Making sense of psychological contract breach. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(1), 12-27.
doi:10.1108/02683941111099592
- Pouncey, Y. Y. (2010). *The relational component of the psychological contract: The big five personality traits & violation perception of the temporary employee*. ProQuest Information & Learning, US.
- Pulakos, E. D., & Schmitt, N. (1983). A longitudinal study of a valence model approach for the prediction of job satisfaction of new employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(2), 307-312.
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.68.2.307
- Raja, U., Johns, G., & Ntalianis, F. (2004). The impact of personality on psychological contracts. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 350-367.
doi:10.2307/20159586
- Robinson, S. L., Kraatz, M. S., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Changing obligations and the psychological contract: A longitudinal study. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(1), 137-152. doi:10.2307/256773

- 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.
doi:10.1002/1099-1379(200008)21:5<525::AID-JOB40>3.0.CO;2-T
- Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2(2), 121-139.
doi:10.1007/BF01384942
- Rousseau, D. M. (2000). *Psychological contract inventory*. Technical report no. 2000-02. Pittsburgh, PA: Heinz School of Public Policy and Management, Carnegie Mellon University.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2001). Schema, promise and mutuality: The building blocks of the psychological contract. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(4), 511-541.
doi:10.1348/096317901167505
- Saucier, G. (1994). Mini-Markers: A brief version of Goldberg's unipolar big-five markers. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 63(3), 506-516.
doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa6303_8

- Scheck, C. L., & Kinicki, A. J. (2000). Identifying the antecedents of coping with an organizational acquisition: A structural assessment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(6), 627-648.
doi:10.1002/1099-1379(200009)21:6<627::AID-JOB43>3.0.CO;2-D
- Staw, B. M., Bell, N. E., & Clausen, J. A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31(1), 56-77.
- Staw, B. M., & Cohen-Charash, Y. (2005). The dispositional approach to job satisfaction: More than a mirage, but not yet an oasis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(1), 59-78.
- Tallman, R. R. J., & Bruning, N. S. (2008). Relating employees' psychological contracts to their personality. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(6), 688-712. doi:10.1108/02683940810894756

- Walsh, W. B., & Eggerth, D. E. (2005). Vocational psychology and personality: The relationship of the Five-Factor Model to job performance and job satisfaction. In W. B. Walsh & M. L. Savickas (Eds.), *Handbook of vocational psychology: Theory, research, and practice* (3rd ed.). Contemporary topics in vocational psychology (pp. 267-295). Mahwah, NJ US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Weiss, H. M., & Adler, S. (1984). Personality and organizational behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 6, 1-50.