

Title	What do we measure and how do we elicit it? The case for the use of repertory grid technique in multi-party psychological contract research
Authors	Sherman, Ultan P.;Morley, Michael J.
Publication date	2019-09-27
Original Citation	Sherman, U. P. and Morley, M. J. (2019) 'What do we measure and how do we elicit it? The case for the use of repertory grid technique in multi-party psychological contract research', European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology. doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2019.1668844
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	10.1080/1359432X.2019.1668844
Rights	© 2019, Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group. This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology on 27 September 2019, available online: http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/1359432X.2019.1668844
Download date	2025-06-01 19:38:08
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/9012

**What do we Measure and how do we Elicit it? The Case for the use of Repertory Grid
Technique in Multi-Party Psychological Contract Research**

Ultan P Sherman (corresponding author)

Cork University Business School

University College Cork

ultan.sherman@ucc.ie

Tel: +353879924196

Fax: +353214904735

Michael J Morley

Kemmy Business School

University of Limerick

michael.morley@ul.ie

Tel: +35361202273

Fax: +35361334859

Author Biographies

Ultan P. Sherman is a lecturer in Organisational Behaviour and Human Resource Management at Cork University Business School, University College Cork, Ireland. His primary research interests lie broadly in the relationship between work and psychology focusing on issues such as the psychological contract and mental models of work.

Michael J. Morley is Professor of Management at the Kemmy Business School, University of Limerick, Ireland. His research interests encompass international, comparative and cross-cultural issues in human resource management which he investigates at micro, meso and macro levels.

Abstract

The psychological contract is a multi-faceted construct and, with the rise of gig work, increasingly the contract extends beyond the conventional employer-employee relationship to encompass multi-party exchanges. Against this backdrop, the question of what should be measured when assessing the contract and how it should be elicited remains a significant issue for scholars. We argue that the potential of psychological contract theory as an explanatory lens in understanding contemporary multi-party working relationships is constrained by two key limitations inherent in conventional measurement approaches. Firstly, such approaches have favoured singular rather than multiparty perspectives, and secondly, they have broadly accorded equal weight and significance to the content dimensions unearthed, despite the fact that they may differ markedly in how they are understood by each party to the employment relationship. In order to remedy these shortcomings, we make the case for adopting repertory grid technique as a methodological framework to address measurement limitations and to more rigorously assess the content of the complex multi-party psychological contract.

KEY WORDS: Psychological Contract Measurement; Repertory Grid Technique; Methodology; Assessing Employment Relationship; Gig work.

Introduction

While the origins of the psychological contract can be traced back to the research of Argyris (1960) who, when studying working relationships in large factories, observed a *psychological work contract* between foremen and employees, it was only following Rousseau's (1989) reconceptualization of the theory that the psychological contract emerged as a central construct to analyse and understand exchange relationships. By repositioning the psychological contract as to exist in the mind of the individual, thus allowing it to become more tractable to researchers attempting to explore it, in many ways the Rousseau paper is a watershed study in psychological contract research. Indeed, in the thirty years following its publication there has been an explosion of theoretical and empirical work on the subject in line with both the individualisation of the employment relationship (Guest, 2004), the emergence of idiosyncratic deals (Rousseau, Ho & Greenberg, 2006) and the rise of more atomistic, unconventional and temporary forms of organizing (Burke & Morley, 2016; Brès, Raufflet, & Boghossian, 2018).

Researchers drawing on psychological contract theory have generated fresh insights into important organisational outcomes such as engagement (e.g. Bal, Kooij & De Jong, 2013), voluntary turnover (e.g. Clinton & Guest, 2014) and citizenship behaviour (e.g. Priesemuth & Taylor, 2016) amongst others. While these and related studies have undeniably broadened our understanding of the contemporary evolving employment relationship, significant gaps remain in our knowledge of the nuances of the psychological contract which may, in part at least, be a consequence of how researchers have attempted to measure it (Bankins, 2011). Indeed, psychological contract measurement is an enduring issue for researchers (Conway & Briner, 2005) with the high number of extant distinctive assessments reflecting the uncertainty surrounding how to most effectively measure it (Rousseau &

Tijoriwala, 1998). For instance, focus groups (e.g. Martin, Staines & Pate, 1998), laboratory experiments (e.g. Lambert, 2011), vignettes (e.g. Montes & Zweig, 2009; Jeroen, de Jong, Rigotti & Mulder, 2017), and diaries (e.g. Conway & Briner, 2002; Griep, Vantilborgh, Baillien & Pepermans, 2016) have all been employed to explore different facets of the psychological contract. However, the validity of these, and other approaches have been questioned by researchers in terms of how closely they actually capture psychological contracting (e.g. Freese & Schalk, 2008).

To help address this concern, this methodological paper proposes an alternative way to more effectively measure the content of the psychological contract. Such a proposal, we argue, is timely, given that recent research suggests a ‘new’ psychological contract may be developing following the emergence of novel forms of organisations, atypical work arrangements, and employment relationships connecting multiple parties (e.g. Petriglieri, Ashford, Wrzesniewski, 2019; Guest, 2017; Lemmon, Wilson, Posig & Klibkowski, 2016; Alcover, Rico, Turnley & Bolino, 2017a). For instance, work patterns in the evolving ‘gig economy’ are indicative of many of these changes. For most gig workers in courier positions, for example, their work arrangement is not rooted in a traditional employee-employer dyad but rather in more precarious triads or tetrads involving multiple parties such as restaurants and customers, all connected and ultimately controlled by an algorithm designed by the employing ‘gig’ organisation (Wood, Graham, Lehdonvirta, & Hjorth, 2019; Duggan, Sherman, Carbery & McDonnell, *in press*). The absence of a robust legal architecture underpinning this arrangement further strengthens the argument that existing measures of the psychological contract cannot fully capture the realities of the nuances of these new types of multi-party working relationships.

Building on this idea, we make the case for the use of the repertory grid technique (RGT), an established measurement tool in psychology, as a methodological approach to

better capture more and richer data about the minutiae of the content of the multi-party psychological contract in terms of what is expected of each party and why. That some contemporary employment relationships are moving away from traditional employee/employer dyads into work arrangements connecting multiple parties merits further exploration as it is likely that distinct content dimensions will be exchanged as part of the agreement. Indeed, measuring the content of the multi-party psychological contract reveals how individuals construct their understanding of their employment relationship. This, we contend, may help uncover novel employee and employer obligations as well as revealing the architecture of the relationship, thus better understanding the intricacies of new work arrangements in a way that existing measures of the psychological contract are unlikely to capture. Indeed, exploring this new form of psychological contract is fundamental to the development of the field but may also help all contributing parties address the enduring challenge of building and maintaining effective work relationships. In illustrating the contribution of this paper, we delineate three distinct but related lines of enquiry:

1. The extent to which traditional measurement approaches fall short of assessing the contemporary multi-party psychological contract
2. How RGT has the potential to uncover new insights into the content of the multi-party psychological contract ; and
3. A heuristic model of the RGT for measuring the multi-party psychological contract

From our perspective, the benefits of these lines of enquiry to the field are threefold. First, they hold the prospect of tapping into the layered experiences of employees and other associated parties thus uncovering novel ties and connections between content dimensions within the exchange arrangement. Second, it can help make better predictions about how each party is likely to behave in a triadic or tetradic psychological contract (Alcover, Rico, Turnley & Bolino, 2017b). Both of these issues have been identified as under explored areas by

psychological contract researchers (e.g. Coyle-Shapiro & Conway, 2004; Rousseau, 2001).

Third, by offering a navigating template on how to effectively use RGT to measure psychological contract content in multi-party employment relationships, our paper provides an initial heuristic framework through which researchers and practitioners can better understand the increasingly idiosyncratic employment relationship. We contend that RGT has the capacity to capture new data about the intricacies of the multi-party psychological contract. The remainder of our article is structured around a discussion of the three lines of enquiry enumerated above.

Section 1: Limitations of Traditional Approaches to Psychological Contract

Measurement

Identifying Content Dimensions

While competing definitions of the psychological contract exist (see Guest, 1998), as explained, there has been a general convergence towards Rousseau's reconfiguration of the theory in the last thirty years. She views the psychological contract as a cognitive structure, or schema, comprising individual beliefs, shaped by the organization, concerning an exchange agreement between individuals and their organization (Rousseau, 1989; 1995). Her work emphasises the promissory nature of the psychological contract in that perceived obligations emerge following the belief that a promise had been expressed or implied (Rousseau, Hansen & Tomprou, 2018). For example, an employee may be willing to work evenings but only on the belief that they have been promised accelerated promotional opportunities in the future. From this perspective the psychological contract is inherently subjective in that the individual's base understanding or schema of the working arrangement is what drives their behaviour in the employment relationship (Conway & Briner, 2005). A schema is a mental model of conceptually related "elements" which directs how new

information is organized (Stein, 1992). Gaining insight into the elements of this schema is one of the fundamental challenges of psychological contract measurement (Sherman & Morley, 2015).

Of course, the multi-faceted nature of the psychological contract ensures that the question of ‘what should be measured’ remains a significant issue for researchers attempting to explore it. Indeed, different aspects of the contract can be measured or not measured accordingly. The work of Rousseau and Tijoriwala (1998) is helpful in this regard in bringing clarity to what can be a troublesome concern. The authors identify three distinct ways the contract can be measured as follows: a *feature oriented* approach (investigating the underlying properties of the contract itself such as the time-frame, stability and so on) (See for example the work of Sels, Janssens & Van den Brande (2004)); an *evaluation oriented* approach (assessing the degree of fulfilment or breach of the contract which represents the dominant form of measurement in the literature with researchers particularly interested in the consequences of perceived breach or fulfilment for the employment relationship (e.g. Turnley & Feldman, 1999; Tomprou & Rousseau, 2015; Conway, Kiefer, Hartley & Briner, 2014)); and a *content oriented* approach (examining the specific obligations exchanged within the psychological contract such as the provision of development opportunities for extra role behaviours) (e.g. Herriot, Manning & Kidd., 1997; Low, Bordia & Bordia., 2016). The anticipated fulfilment of these content dimensions is what drives the employment relationship.

How closely the feature and evaluation approaches tap into the schematic properties of the psychological contract is open to debate (Freese & Schalk, 2008). Certainly, a traditional features approach is primarily aimed at assessing the underlying properties of the contract as a whole, independent of the content dimensions. This is moving away from Rousseau’s argument that the content dimensions, or elements, constitute the cognitive

structure of the psychological contract. While an evaluation approach often assesses which content dimensions are being breached or fulfilled, this perspective is primarily and more broadly concerned with the overall 'state' of the psychological contract. Again, this assessment approach is a departure from exploring the schematic nature of the psychological contract. So, while these two approaches each measure different facets of the psychological contract, for the purposes of this methodological contribution we are designedly focusing our attention on a **content** oriented measurement approach. We have two particular reasons for making this our specific focus: first, researchers suggest that how the psychological contract operates as a schema is best understood by initially identifying its inherent elements or employee and employer obligations (e.g. Taylor & Tekleab, 2004); and second, the content dimensions illustrate most vividly how a party uniquely understands their relationship with another party. If a novel psychological contract is indeed emerging, its 'newness' will be revealed through the content dimensions elicited. While the utility of the other two methodological approaches is not in question, a content-oriented approach is, in particular, more conducive to providing fresh insights into the characteristics of contemporary employment relationships and multi-party work arrangements.

The basic schematic structure of the elements or content dimensions of the psychological contract is not generally agreed upon, as, by definition, every psychological contract is unique. Indeed, Freese and Schalk (2008) argue that any instrument designed to measure its content should be grounded in theory or be based on a comprehensive inductive analysis of empirical data. The vast majority of studies use a questionnaire to measure the psychological contract with researchers either designing their own tool or adopting one from another study. However, of those researchers using the self-design approach, only some have provided a theoretical or empirical rationale for the items used in their questionnaires (e.g. Rousseau, 1990, Herriot *et al.*, 1997). One such survey, the Psychological Contract Inventory

(PCI) (Rousseau, 2000) designed to measure the generalizable content of the psychological contract, has been used by multiple researchers in different contexts (e.g. Cheung, Wong & Yuan, 2016; Dabos & Rousseau, 2004). In constructing and validating the PCI, Rousseau surveyed a broad and diverse sample of professionals, graduates and executive education students across two continents with contrasting national cultures. While the scientific underpinnings of the PCI have been acknowledged by some researchers (e.g. Freese & Schalk, 2008) and it is widely used in psychological contract research, some issues remain regarding the generalizability of psychological contract questionnaires.

Certainly, external factors like national culture are likely to shape an individual's understanding of their employment relationship (see Cassar & Briner's (2009) study of psychological contracts in Malta for example). Adopting a psychological contract tool from one context without due consideration for the utility of using it in another context is a potential limitation in the extant literature to date. As Westwood, Sparrow and Leung (2001) argue, psychological contracts are best understood by emphasizing the organizational context of the exchange relationship. For instance, a seminal psychological contract study is Thomas and Anderson's (1998) exploration of British Army recruits. The content dimensions measured in that study include very context specific concerns for that particular sample such as 'accommodation' which are unlikely to be as relevant in other settings. Relatedly, a typical content dimension included in most psychological contract studies, 'training and educational opportunities', was omitted entirely from their study as a content dimension, given respondents were already in training mode. Thus the items used in their survey, of necessity, designedly closely reflected the organisational context in which these respondents were operating.

However, in some instances the justification for the questionnaire used is not as obvious and the psychological contracts of a specific cohort are assessed using a

measurement tool derived from another sample. This of and for itself is not an issue provided that the working arrangements in both contexts have some broad alignment. Certainly, the suitability of the content dimensions for the sample being studied needs to capture the specifics of exchange relationships within the organisational context of that particular cohort. However, as previously mentioned, to suit the needs of their particular study researchers sometimes add or delete items to established psychological contract measures without necessarily specifying a theoretical rationale. Consequently, a particular methodological shortcoming in psychological contract studies concerns the provenance of the questionnaire and more specifically the utility of the content items that make up the measurement tool itself in light of the context in which it is being deployed.

However, there have been significant advances in more general quantitative approaches in recent years with researchers assessing the psychological contract in a more nuanced way. For example, Griep and Vantilborgh (2018) in their study of the relationship between psychological contracts and organizational citizenship and counterproductive work behaviours initially asked respondents to assess the extent to which the content dimensions included in the survey were personally relevant. Solinger, Hofmans, Bal and Jansen (2016) in their investigation into psychological contract breach asked respondents to describe an event believed to constitute a broken promise. The resultant description was then analysed by two experts to determine whether the promise was a relational, a transactional or an ideological content dimension. These approaches allow a greater sense of participant ownership over the content dimensions assessed in the survey. In the interests of more closely capturing the nuances of the psychological contract, such developments in the survey approach are to be welcomed.

Nonetheless, how effectively the survey approach captures the idiosyncratic and contextualised nature of the ‘new’, emerging psychological contract is open to debate.

Certainly, in the interest of theory-building and for the purposes of unearthing the textured, tacit dimensions of the multi-party psychological contract we would argue that a more exploratory methodology be employed at this stage in the research. As explained above, a limited number of qualitative approaches have been adopted by researchers to assess the content of the psychological contract. For instance, Martin, Staines and Pate (1998) used focus groups to determine the extent to which certain employee and employer obligations became more or less important over time. Most researchers utilizing a qualitative approach typically use interviews (e.g. Canibano, 2019), critical incident technique (e.g. Herriot *et al.*, 1997), or a combination of both (e.g. Purvis & Cropley, 2003). Recent work by Bankins (2015) adopted this latter approach, not only to assess the content dimensions but to then determine the nature of the exchange relationship. Qualitative approaches for measuring psychological contract content are useful in that they capture the contextualised aspects of the exchange arrangement and any emerging content dimensions from this approach should more closely reflect the organisational setting. Exploring the contract in this way facilitates the elicitation of more idiosyncratic content.

However, in the interests of understanding and assessing the increasingly common multi-party psychological contract we argue that interviews are somewhat limited in this regard. Often, interviews frequently fail to tap into the unconscious or less conscious aspects of one's view of the world that organizational processes engender within that individual (Rousseau, 2003). Extant research on psychological contracts in general has focused more on the conscious rather than the unconscious perceptions of the employment relationship. Indeed, Rousseau (2003) argues that the psychological contract can function as an unconscious schema, influencing the individual's behaviour without them necessarily recognizing or being aware of the meanings or motives involved. That is, the employee may create a psychological contract with another party without consciously knowing why certain

content dimensions have been included or excluded. Accordingly, we argue that for the purposes of measuring the content of the contemporary multi-party psychological contract a more exploratory technique is required to not only elicit novel content dimensions, but to also probe below the surface in order to unearth why these dimensions exist.

Moving from Unilateral to Multilateral

There is almost universal agreement amongst researchers that any measure of the content dimensions of the psychological contract must assess both employee and employer obligations (Rousseau, 2009). However, a deal of research has focused exclusively on one party's contributions to the other when assessing the psychological contract (e.g. Porter, Pearce, Tripoli & Lewis, 1998; Turnley & Feldman, 1999; Coyle-Shapiro, 2002). While these, and related studies, have much value in that they provide insight into what one party expects of the other in the workplace context, by designedly measuring just one party's contributions alone, they do not capture the mutual understanding each party holds regarding their obligations.

To measure the content of the psychological contract, researchers have typically preferred the 'unilateral' approach. The unilateral perspective advances the idea that one party's *view* of the psychological contract (typically the employee) is an appropriate measurement approach. The argument here is the individual's perspective of *both* employee and employer obligations effectively captures psychological contract dynamics. Of course, this is in keeping with Rousseau's reconceptualization that the psychological contract is a subjective perception. However, the 'individual' view typically captured in psychological contract literature is that of the employee resulting in an under exploration of the employer perspective (Guest & Conway, 2002). Of course, the agency question of who represents the employer has been a longstanding issue in psychological contract research (Schein, 1980;

Rousseau, 1995). Some studies have attempted to capture the employer's view of the psychological contract. For instance, Dabos and Rousseau (2004) identify research directors as the archetypical employer for staff scientists in university settings and utilised them accordingly. Chen, Tsui and Zhong (2008) used the HR department in a shoe manufacturer to identify supervisors most likely to fit the 'employer' role for employees. These, and other studies, adopt the 'bilateral' approach where both parties perspectives of the employment relationship are assessed.

However, a more pressing issue in the contemporary literature on psychological contracts is that in many work arrangements there are now multiple parties contributing to the employment relationship, a contemporary development which represents a move away from the dominant employee-employer dyad focus of traditional psychological contract research (Baruch & Rousseau, 2019)). Recent work by Alcover *et al.*, (2017b) refer to both *distal* agents such as recruiters and *proximal* agents such as co-workers influencing the psychological contract the employee holds with the organisation. They argue that a 'multi-foci' perspective capturing the role of these agents is needed in contemporary research on psychological contracts. Nonetheless, their work is still rooted in an employee-employer dyad in that they ultimately view the psychological contract as an agreement between two parties. However, Marks (2001) argues that an individual may hold multiple psychological contracts with different agents in the organisation depending on whether they are members of multiple workgroups or report into more than one person for instance. The general argument put forward by these and other studies is that the purely bilateral perspective falls short of fully understanding the complexities of new employment relationships, often involving several parties.

Recently, some workers find themselves in forms of employment where the successful functioning of the work arrangement is dependent on multiple connected parties each fulfilling their side of the agreement. Each party in these situations are ‘active’ in the contract arrangement in comparison to more ‘passive’ agents such as a recruiter or certain personnel during induction training for example. A case in point is Deliveroo, a food courier organisation, which involves employees collecting food from restaurants and delivering it to customers. This is a tetradic employment relationship with each party (Deliveroo, courier, customer and restaurant) creating a psychological contract with the other. Thus, for example, the courier’s relationship with Deliveroo is significantly contingent on the customer being happy with how the restaurant has prepared the food. The restaurateur’s psychological contract with Deliveroo is contingent on them recruiting and managing competent couriers, and so on. Indeed, the effectiveness of this work arrangement and the maintenance of this multi-party psychological contract is dependent on each party fulfilling their obligations to each other. It follows that in this arrangement a tetradic perspective on measuring the psychological contract would be the required approach. This type of working relationship is more akin to Marks (2001) argument that an individual may hold multiple psychological contracts with multiple parties. So, while we acknowledge the shaping role of agents like recruiters and mentors on the psychological contract (Baruch & Rousseau, 2019), the focus of our paper is designedly on multi-party psychological contracts in the gig economy where the focal individual creates a psychological contract with each party in the work arrangement.

While multi-party measurement may yield a more comprehensive understanding of the psychological contract (Schalk & Rousseau, 2001), the unilateral perspective has traditionally been the dominant methodological approach in psychological contract literature to date. Yet, recent developments to working arrangements, particularly in the growing gig economy which now involve several parties, are challenging the idea that the psychological

contract is rooted in a basic employee-employer dyad. Of course, the psychological contract is by definition an individual perception. Perceptions of the exchange arrangement from a psychological contract perspective are inherently subjective and likely differences amongst the active parties need to be measured and understood. Indeed, these new emerging psychological contracts now require a more comprehensive measurement approach.

Content Dimensions Foundations

Rousseau and Tijoriwala (1998, p. 692) contend that “central to the workings of psychological contracts is the interplay between employee and employer obligations, their relative magnitude and contingent relations as individual contract holders perceive them”. Indeed, the *quid pro quo* of content dimensions drives behaviour within the context of the employment relationship. That is, the exchange agreement is founded on the idea that behaviour is contingent on the other party fulfilling their obligations. To measure this contingent relationship, researchers typically explore correlations between the various obligations. For example, Rousseau’s (1990) landmark study of psychological contracts found a correlation between employee obligations of loyalty to the organisation and employer obligations of job security. However, as most researchers agree, not every content dimension can be considered equal in terms of magnitude or importance and violation of these obligations may not constitute a broken agreement. While organizational factors do shape the content dimensions (see Thomas & Anderson, 1998), as Conway and Briner (2002) argue, content dimensions differ markedly in their relative importance, something which is shaped by individual factors such as personality (Raja, Johns & Ntalianis, 2004) or age (Bal & Kooij, 2011) for example. Indeed, research suggests that the individual will pay greater attention to the interplay of employee and employer obligations which are considered both personally and relationally significant (Rousseau, 1995; Turnley & Feldman, 1999).

Implicit in these, and other studies, is the notion that constituting the content dimensions of the psychological contract are fundamental underlying properties such as *importance*. There are likely to be many other foundational properties of the content dimensions. Exploring these properties may help to more effectively understand how the psychological contract as schema organizes one's thoughts regarding their employment relationship. It may also address the methodological challenge outlined by Rousseau (2001; 2003) of exploring the mutual understandings each party holds regarding their discrete obligations to each other. Measuring underlying properties is synonymous with the 'features' assessment approach. In extant research, the traditional data collection approach pursuing this line of enquiry measures the underlying properties of the contract as a whole such as scope, stability, and so on (Sels *et al.*, 2004). However, adopting this approach to assess the content dimensions has never been considered by psychological contract researchers to date. We argue that this more granular assessment of content dimensions offers researchers the opportunity, as Rousseau and Tijoriwala elucidate above, to better capture the foundations of employee and employer obligations. This approach holds the prospect of uncovering other underlying properties of content dimensions besides *importance*, resulting in a deeper understanding of the connections between employee and employer obligations, thus shedding new light on the relationship between employee and employer.

Within the context of multiparty psychological contracts it stands to reason that individuals will create unique relationships and connections with different parties within the work arrangement. For instance, when a courier interacts regularly with one particular restaurant, the relationship developed will be different to the one created with the gig organization where interactions are more sporadic. The ensuing content dimensions will reflect this difference and the foundational properties or features of the obligations may help to explain the contrasting relationships (see Tables 1-6).

To date, research on the schematic properties of the psychological contract has primarily focused on how the content dimensions are created (e.g. Sherman & Morley, 2015) and how it functions (e.g. Rousseau, 2001). A deeper exploration of the micro-foundations of these dimensions may provide fresh insight into the intricacies of the psychological contract. At this juncture in the research, studies pursuing this line of enquiry are fundamental to better understanding the nuances of multi-party work arrangements.

Overall, we contend that the potential of psychological contract theory as an explanatory lens in understanding contemporary multi-party working relationships is constrained by the limitations of its traditional measurement approaches, as discussed above. In the next section, we make the case for the use of RGT as a methodological framework to address some of these measurement limitations and to more rigorously assess the content of this increasingly prevalent form of multi-party psychological contract.

Section 2: The Potential of Repertory Grid Technique to assess the content of a Multi-Party Psychological Contract

Grounded in clinical psychology, the RGT is a cognitive mapping tool designed to elicit how people understand their interactions with the world (Kelly, 1955). Kelly's theory of Personal Constructs positions individuals as constructivists habitually reshaping and revising how they 'make sense' of their everyday experiences. Individuals develop a system of constructs to understand and guide them through their day to day interactions. Kelly was particularly interested in measuring this structure. As explained, this system of constructs is synonymous with the concept of a 'schema' in cognitive and clinical psychology literature. He derived the repertory grid as a technique to assess this schema. The grid is a helpful way of not only illustrating cognition but also measuring it (Wright, 2008). Relatedly, the grid neatly aligns

with Weick's (1995) idea of 'sense-making' in that it captures how an individual comes to understand a new experience, a key line of enquiry in psychological contract research (e.g. Morrison & Robinson, 1997; De Vos & Freese, 2011).

On the surface the 'grid' itself seems quite a basic concept. In some ways it is a generic term for a number of simple rating-scale procedures. The columns in the grid are known as 'elements'. An element is "*an example of, exemplar of, instance of, sampling of, or occurrence within, a particular topic*" (Jankowicz, 2003. P. 13). These elements constitute the focus or the subject of the grid. Within the grid, the rows are known as 'constructs'. These constructs represent the participant's understanding of the topic. They are the basic unit of description and analysis of the elements. Each row is poled by the opposite descriptor within each construct. A construct always represents a contrast and one needs to spell out the contrast before the meaning intended by the whole construct is understood (Fransella, 2004). Each element is then rated along each bi-polar construct, to provide a thorough picture of what the person wishes to express about each element within the topic. In a psychological contract context, a typical element could be a content dimension such as '*flexible availability*' for example. An elicited construct may be '*difficult*' referring to the perceived difficulty the employee experiences in seeking to fulfil this obligation.

However, a formative question when using RGT concerns the origin of both the elements and the constructs. Indeed, scholars disagree over how these should be sourced in terms of whether they should be supplied to, or elicited from, the individual (whose psychological contract is being assessed for example). Studies to date have seen many researchers provide the elements and elicit the constructs (e.g. Wright & Lam, 2002), others have elicited the elements and provided the constructs (e.g. Bannister & Mair, 1968) while a small number have supplied both the elements and the constructs (e.g. Bell, 2000). Supplying elements and constructs can be an efficient means of gathering data and can be a useful

approach for comparing grids across large samples (Wright, 2008). However, as personal construct psychology (PCP) advocates the cause of and celebrates the individuality of the person, RGT is perhaps most effective when both the elements and constructs are elicited from the individual (Fransella, Bell & Bannister, 2004). Therefore, in the interests of uncovering novel aspects of the contemporary multi-party psychological contract we argue that the elicitation approach to identifying both the elements and constructs is a more appropriate use of RGT.

Traditionally, RGT was used in clinical settings to explore issues such as schizophrenic cognition (Bannister, 1960) and depression (Ashworth, Blackburn & McPherson, 1982) for instance. However, over the years, it has transitioned into management research emerging as a powerful methodological tool to better understand multiple domains of management theory and practice, including key themes such as manager identity (Pavlica & Thorpe, 1998), mergers (Dackert, Jackson, Brenner & Johansson, 2003), new product development (Bouncken, Fredrich, Ritala & Kraus, 2018), performance appraisal (Wright, 2004), and organisational learning (Baxter, Colledge & Turner., 2017) for instance. The following is an illustrative example of how the RGT functions in a management context based on the recent work of van Rossem, (*in press*): In terms of understanding generational stereotyping and identity one might construe Generation Y employees as *ambitious* and Baby Boomers as *not ambitious*, or construe Generation X employees as *conservative* and Generation Y as *innovative*. It is vital to view constructs in their bipolarity because individually focusing on a single pole misses the vitality of the relation between them (Wright, 2004). The constructs italicised above are helpful for revealing how employees stereotype based on generational membership which may in turn impact on their work relationship. In general, the data the grid provides facilitates a deeper insight into the more abstract, less verbalised aspects of our schema (Jankowicz, 2004).

That researchers choosing to measure the psychological contract have, in relative terms, largely ignored RGT as a possible methodological approach is somewhat surprising given the contribution it has made in other areas of management. Indeed, Gardner (2017) argues that utilising methodologies that facilitate a more thorough examination of psychological contract mechanics is fundamental to the development of the field. Specifically, Sherman and Morley (2015) contend that RGT provides an effective means of further illuminating the minutiae of contemporary psychological contracts. Purvis and Cropley (2003) in their study of the psychological contracts of nurses used RGT to assess levels of fulfilment or breach. The elements incorporated in their grid were participant descriptions of incidents of fulfilment and breach. The constructs elicited focused on how they felt about these different experiences. While this study is helpful to understand how participants construe their experience of contract fulfilment or breach, it is important to note that the researchers have chosen not to focus on employee and employer obligations. We argue that in the interests of exploring novel forms of psychological contracts the focus of the grid should be the content dimensions as the constructs elicited will reveal the more tacit dimensions of the employee schema which can help to explain likely behaviour in the context of the work arrangement. The next section demonstrates how RGT can be used to assess a multi-party psychological contract. As an illustrative example, we draw on work arrangements typically found in the gig economy such as those in Deliveroo or Uber Eats (see above) where there are often several parties contributing to the effective functioning of this contemporary and increasingly prevalent employment relationship (Kuhn & Maleki, 2017). Specifically, we explain how the psychological contracts in these exemplifying cases can be explored and measured using RGT.

Section 3: Employing RGT for Measuring Multi-Party Psychological Contracts

The case illustration presented here is derived from a larger study of working relationships in the gig economy. Specifically, couriers working for delivery platforms such as Deliveroo, UberEats and JustEat in Ireland and the UK participated in the study. The courier in this illustration was initially a participant in the larger project and agreed to complete the grids as a follow-up study.

The research questions framing this case are as follows:

1. What is the content of the multi-party psychological contract?
2. What do these content dimensions mean to the focal party?

We designedly focus on just one party's psychological contract for illustrative purposes (the courier). The participant in this case was a 24 year old male who had been working on the platform for two months. Tables 1-6 below illustrate the completed grids for the courier in terms of their perceived contributions to each of the other parties and vice versa. Of course, to arrive at a fuller understanding of the multi-focused psychological contract, grids need to be completed with all contributing parties. What follows is a step-by-step guide on how to use the RGT to explore a multi-party psychological contract:

[Insert Tables 1-6 about here]

Step 1: Preparation for the Interview

As explained the work arrangement in a Deliveroo or Uber Eats employment model is based on a tetradic employment relationship. Accordingly, all four parties, courier, restaurant, customer and Deliveroo agent would need to independently complete the grid. The focal party for Deliveroo would ideally be a data scientist who designs and develops the algorithm underpinning the application as a large part of the employment arrangement such as pay and performance management is governed by this algorithm (Curchod, Patriotta & Cohen, 2019).

The restaurant representative would be a restaurateur who has signed up to the application and the customer representative would be a customer who uses the Deliveroo application to order food. The grid template should be brought to each session and can be completed by hand or on computer. Available computer software such as Idiogrid or Wingrid assists with the statistical analysis of the collected data.

Step 2: Conducting the Interview/Eliciting the Elements

When the psychological contract is the topic, it would be a little artless to simply ask the participant to list out the content dimensions (especially when the participant may not be familiar with the very term itself). Instead, the researcher should spend some time asking questions about the interviewee's job and what they expect from each party in terms of obligations and what they think each party expects the interviewee is obliged to do. The interviewee, for instance, in this case mentioned 'saying hello' as something they are seeking from the restaurant. Further probing and exploration of this issue revealed that the participant is specifically looking for '*recognition as a contributor*' from the restaurant in terms of acknowledging their role as central to the functioning of their restaurant (Table 1, column 2). This elicited element is now much more nuanced than the initial obligation. Of course, one of the advantages of the interview approach to assessing the content of the psychological contract is that you can yield much more personally relevant information (Low *et al.*, 2016). This interviewing process should continue until a sufficient number of elements have been elicited that best represent the individual's relationship with each party. The content dimensions elicited represent the courier's in-depth understanding of the contributions expected in a multi-party psychological contract and can help to answer research question 1. For example, the content dimension '*patience*' (Table 2, column 3) refers to the courier's

acceptance that restaurants are dealing with multiple orders at any given time and that he must be patient if a delay occurs. Conversely, the content dimension ‘*efficiency*’ (Table 1, column 1) refers to the courier’s belief that the restaurant is obliged to have orders prepared quickly and accurately as any delays directly impact their earning potential. This supports recent findings on the difficulties faced by many couriers in this type of employment (e.g. Goods, Veen & Barratt, *in press*). The restaurant obligation ‘*accountability*’ (Table 1, column 3) points to the argument by Alcover *et al.*, (2017a) that accountability is a significant challenge in multi-party working arrangements. In this instance, the courier discussed the frustration of restaurants occasionally making errors with the order resulting in the incorrect food being delivered to an unhappy customer. The courier’s desire for the restaurant to take ownership of their mistakes seems to be a significant issue in the emerging literature on this type of gig working (e.g. Veen, Barratt, & Goods, *in press*). More broadly speaking, as far as we are aware, no study has previously included ‘*accountability*’ as a content dimension of the psychological contract. Findings like these support the argument that multi-party work arrangements in the gig economy are likely to generate novel and distinct obligations of the psychological contract when compared with typical forms of employment, as well as reinforcing the assertion that more exploratory assessment approaches should be employed at this stage in the field. While this phase of the RGT cannot be considered a novel methodological approach, the next phase of eliciting the constructs is what distinguishes it from other methodological perspectives and is where it, in particular, offers the potential to uncover new aspects of the content of the multi-party psychological contract.

Step 3: Eliciting the Constructs

Once the elements in the grid have been identified the elicitation of constructs can begin. This process is known as triadic elicitation. The interviewer takes three elements and asks the respondent to identify which two elements are the same in some way, and different from the

third. It is important at this stage to assure the respondent that there is no correct answer, just how they view or construe the elements. The respondent is then asked to explain what the two similar elements have in common as opposed to the third. What makes the two elements similar should be recorded on the left side of the grid and the opposite of this (the distinctive aspect of the third element) should be recorded on the right side of the grid along the same row. Occasionally, the researcher has to 'ladder down' from the initial construct to arrive at a more specific and precise construct. This is especially important if the initial constructs elicited are either too generic or too obscure. For instance, the content dimension '*respectful of property*' (Table 6, Column 3) was initially recorded as '*close the gate*'. Further probing and discussion with the participant captured their intending meaning of respecting the customer's property. Ultimately, the words or phrases used to express this contrast represent the person's construct. That is, they reveal how the person makes sense of the topic (Fransella *et al.*, 2004). For example, the courier explained that employee obligations to the restaurant concerning '*accountability*' (Table 2, column 2) and '*patience*' (Table 2, column 3) are different to an obligation of '*punctuality*' (Table 2, column 1) because the latter is '*important to the customer*' and the former are '*less important to the customer*' (Table 2, row 3). So, using the example above, *customer importance* is a conduit through which the courier makes sense of their obligations to the restaurant. The triadic elicitation process is repeated multiple times using different combinations of elements until the participant can no longer offer new constructs to assess the elements. The constructs elicited reveal the foundational properties of the content of the individual's schema. They provide insight into how the courier uniquely makes sense of his relationship with the other parties in the employment arrangement (research question 2).

Step 4: Rating the Constructs

Each construct is then presented to the respondent as a rating (or ranking) scale and they are asked to assess each element across that construct using this scale. In this case we used a 7 point Likert scale. However, the Likert scale in repertory grids is slightly different to a standard Likert scale. Scores of (1-3) relate to the left pole of the construct and scores of (5-7) relate to the right pole. This means that the ‘strongest’ rating for each element along the construct is at either pole and is rated as ‘1’ or ‘7’. For instance, the gig organisation’s obligation to the courier concerning ‘*rewarding good ratings*’ (Table 3, column 1) across the *urgent/future* (Table 3, row 3) construct was considered very urgent by the courier so was awarded a score of ‘1’ by the respondent. The obligation ‘*maintain perks*’ (Table 3, column 4) was considered to be less urgent and was considered more of a contribution expected in the future so was awarded a score of ‘6’ by the respondent. The grid is complete when each elicited element has been rated across each elicited construct. However, not every elicited construct may be relevant to an element. When this happens there are two options available. It can be left blank, or, a mid-range score can be assigned to that element (in this case ‘4’) (Jankowicz, 2004). However, it is worth noting that assigning a mid-range score does not always mean that the elicited construct is inapplicable to that element. For instance, the courier explained that he needs the customer to remain ‘*patient*’ (Table 5, column 5) while the order is in transit but understood that this is dependent on how long they have been waiting. Therefore, he felt the mid-range score of ‘4’ on the ‘*always/discretionary*’ (Table 5, row 2) construct was appropriate. Each grid takes approximately 45 minutes to complete.

Step 5: Analysing Grid Data

Jankowicz (2004) argues that content analysis is the most effective means of analysing grid data. Of course, when different elements and different constructs have been elicited in each grid it makes the task of multi-grid analysis much more challenging (Fransella *et al*, 2004). Within the context of exploring the psychological contract in gig work arrangements,

identifying broad categories that summarise the elicited constructs and elements is moving away from the real value the RGT offers in capturing the tacit, less verbalised foundations of the content dimensions. We support the argument put forward by Cassell *et al.*, (2000) that the utility of RGT in assessing constructs like the psychological contract lies not in the statistical analysis that accompanies grid data but in the unearthing of the ‘language’ that the individual uses to make sense of their work arrangements. When all four parties have completed the process the researcher will have ‘constructed’ 24 grids. There are several analytical approaches available to the researcher. First, grids could be compared across the multiple parties to explore the level of mutuality in terms of the elicited content dimensions. Grids could also be analysed to explore the level of agreement in terms of how the content dimensions are construed. For instance, to what extent does the courier and restaurant agree on the content of their psychological contract? Are similar constructs used by both parties to make sense of these content dimensions? If so, are there differences in how these elements are scored across each construct. The answers to these questions will provide a more comprehensive understanding of the ‘narrative’ of this type of work arrangement than traditional psychological contract methodologies (Ashleigh & Meyer, 2012). Second, an interesting analytic approach in a psychological contract context is the partnering or exchange grid. This approach requires different respondents to put themselves explicitly in the other party’s shoes by completing grids using the partner’s construing system. Effectively, you are asking each party to make sense of the work arrangement using the constructs of the other respondents (Jankowicz, 2003). Any agreement or disagreement can be discussed in a plenary session chaired by the researcher. This provides the opportunity for each party to discuss in a candid way those particular aspects of the work arrangement that are typically less verbalised.

Discussion

The data we elicited using RGT provide significant insight into the psychological contracts held by one party in a tetradic employment relationship. As explained, for illustrative purposes, the grids above only represent a unilateral perspective on the psychological contract and to arrive at a fuller understanding of the multi-party psychological contract, grids would need to be constructed with each of the contributing parties. Reflecting on the grids above, it is clear that distinctive content dimensions emerge capturing the different expectations the courier holds towards the other three parties. This outcome lends support to the argument put forward by Schalk and Rousseau (2001) that the various contributing parties in the employment relationship each hold different beliefs of what the other parties are obliged to provide and what is expected in return. For instance, the courier believes both he and the restaurant have an obligation to each other centred on '*accountability*' (Table 1, column 3 & Table 2, column 2) in terms of taking personal responsibility over mistakes made, a likely occurrence in a fast moving work environment such as food delivery. It is also interesting to note that the courier felt an obligation to the gig organisation to maintain his working relationship with the restaurant ('*respectful of restaurant*') (Table 4, column 3), reinforcing the suggestion that the psychological contract held with one party impinges on the contract created with the other party (Alcover *et al.*, 2017a) resulting in complications that arise owing to multiple dependence.

While identifying the content dimensions of psychological contracts in gig working facilitates a better understanding of the specific terms of the agreement in this emerging form of employment, we argue that RGT makes its most substantial contribution to research on the psychological contract through the actual constructs elicited. These constructs reveal how an individual makes sense of their work arrangement and have the potential to uncover novel aspects of the psychological contract beyond what traditional methodological approaches have unearthed. In terms of the elicited constructs in our case, it is clear that the content

dimensions of the three psychological contracts they hold with the other parties are all viewed differently by the courier and these constructs, or underlying characteristics, reveal the distinct features of these obligations. For example, the constructs *always/discretionary* (Table 1, row 4; Table 4, row 2; & Table 5, row 2) and *urgent/sometimes* (Table 3, row 1) touch on the temporal underpinnings of psychological contract processes, an emerging line of enquiry in the literature (e.g. Griep & Vantilborgh, 2018; Rousseau *et al.*, 2018). The indication here is that certain obligations differ in terms of the immediacy of their expected fulfilment, potentially putting added pressure on the parties in the relationship to uphold the existing relationship. The construct *always/discretionary* also reveals more on the reciprocal nature of the agreement in terms of which fulfilled obligations must be reciprocated and which are at the volition of each party. The practical implication of an insight such as this is that it signals to the other parties which obligations are perceived to really matter in the work exchange.

The constructs *easy/difficult* (Table 2, row 1; Table 5, row 1 & Table 6, row 2) and *causes stress* (Table 2, row 4) suggest that the fulfilment of certain obligations not only present different challenges to the courier but also differentially may be a source of stress. Typically, research on emotions in the context of psychological contracts focuses on the affective reactions to breach or fulfilment (Solinger *et al.*, 2016). However, the suggestion here is that the effort involved to build, maintain and manage the multi-party psychological contract evokes an emotional reaction from the individual even before perceptions of breach or fulfilment may occur. Relatedly, it gives us a sense of the resources an individual has to expend to fulfil an obligation. Recent research by Deng, Coyle-Shapiro and Yang (2018) suggest that this is a significant issue in multi-party work arrangements as there may be consequences for the other parties if an individual has depleted resources after expending a lot of energy trying to fulfil an obligation for one particular party.

Finally, the construct *can control/can't control* (Table 6, row 1) captures the challenges of working effectively in certain multi-party relationships. As explained above, research demonstrates that couriers are often very frustrated when a restaurant delays the order as it impacts their ability to deliver the food to the customer on time, which may influence their performance metrics. The implication here is that interference from one party affects the agreement with another and the courier can do very little to address this problem. Again recent research by Wiechers, Coyle-Shapiro, Lub and Have (2019) highlights that the nature of multi-party work relationships often means that breach of the psychological contract with one party can be triggered by the relationship with another.

These, and the other constructs elicited in our case, reveal new aspects of the psychological contract. Of course, much more work is needed to explore the underlying characteristics of the content dimensions in psychological contracts to arrive at a deeper understanding of work arrangements in new and emerging contexts. We hope that by illustrating how RGT can be used to investigate the nuances of the employment relationship, future research on the changing nature of the psychological contract will give fuller consideration to the adopting of this methodological approach.

Future Research Areas

We argue that the potential of the RGT to assess contemporary psychological contracts is worth exploring. Of note, however, is that our illustrative example was conducted in a very contextualised work arrangement. Undoubtedly, utilizing RGT in different employment relationships would yield distinct elements and constructs. For instance, the work association in the context of Uber is a triadic arrangement with the customer playing a much more central role in comparison to their contribution in the Deliveroo arrangement given their extended

interaction with the Uber driver. The psychological contract between these two parties would be particularly formative in the development of the working relationship.

Given that RGT's real contribution lies in its capacity to rigorously explore diverse contexts, perhaps its utility could be further strengthened by deploying it in combination with other methods to more comprehensively investigate psychological contracts. For instance, the constructs and elements elicited in our Deliveroo work arrangement could be used to inform the development of a scale to more quantitatively measure content dimensions if researchers were seeking to assess the psychological contract in large-scale Deliveroo labour arrangements. That obligations differ across constructs such as *importance*, *always*, & *urgency* merits further investigation particularly in fast-paced, dynamic environments like gig working. The potential of RGT to track parties over time to discover if either the content dimensions or the constructs have changed, or are rated differently, should also be further examined given the increased focus on the dynamics of psychological contract research in recent years (e.g. Griep & Vantilborgh, 2018; Rousseau *et al.*, 2018; etc.). Data elicited in this way may help explain the schematic foundations of the psychological contract which can make it easier to predict future behaviour within the context of the employment arrangement.

Emerging forms of work in the gig economy require exploratory methodologies designed to uncover the micro-foundations of the idiosyncratic employment relationships found in this domain. RGT holds the prospect of better revealing the fundamental architecture of the multi-party psychological contract by identifying the constructs used by each party to make sense of their work arrangement. Future research pursuing this line of enquiry will undoubtedly further our understanding of this novel form of employment relationship.

Limitations

As with all methodological approaches, RGT has its limitations. First, eliciting data using RGT is a labour intensive process. As explained, if every contributing party in Deliveroo work arrangements completed a grid the researcher would have to analyse 24 distinct grids to understand how the multi-party psychological contract functions. Certainly, the quantity of data generated is a significant analytical challenge (Fransella *et al.*, 2004). Nonetheless, we would caution against psychological contract researchers designing a universal grid that can be applied across multiple, contextually unique settings with a broad range of participants. This would represent a departure from the real value RGT offers in gaining a more nuanced insight into the layered experiences embedded in the psychological contract's schematic underpinnings. Indeed, given that RGT yields textured information about the workings of a topic, we argue that the method itself perhaps makes its most substantial contribution to inquiry on psychological contracts when it is applied in a developmental way in diverse research settings (Fransella *et al.*, 2004). Certainly, in the interests of theory-building, we believe that multi-party psychological contracts typically found in work arrangements in the gig economy for example, require more exploratory methodological approaches like RGT given their seemingly distinctive and idiosyncratic nature.

Additionally, the fast-paced nature of app work with organisations like Deliveroo sees the courier interacting with multiple restaurants and customers all within the same shift. Each individual restaurant and customer could be considered a party in this arrangement. From a practical perspective, it is not feasible to include them all when applying the grid. Therefore, the participants in the grids are perhaps best viewed as 'representative parties' of a multi-party psychological contract. Relatedly, it is difficult to discern who can represent the 'app' when completing the grid. Given that Deliveroo does not see itself as the employer of its couriers, we would argue that the data scientists who design its underlying algorithm may be

the most appropriate agent given the centrality of the app in managing and connecting all parties in the relationship. Nonetheless, access to these parties would be difficult.

Of course, cognition can be represented or illustrated in a variety of different ways (Fiol & Huff, 1992) and that a singular form of grid prevents a deeper exploration of schematic thinking. Certainly, there are a variety of grids in use today but the majority do adhere to the structure outlined in Tables 1-6 (Jankowicz, 2004). It must also be stated that the cognitive foundations of psychological contracts could be investigated using alternative methodologies. For instance, previously we have advocated the use of cognitive maps to access and represent the schematic nature of psychological contracts (Sherman & Morley, 2015). However, as a methodological tool, cognitive mapping typically does not include a measurement or rating component, and serves merely as a representation of cognition or schematic processing. By comparison, that advantage that we see attaching to RGT relates not only to its capacity to capture the content dimensions of the schema, but also that it facilitates the measuring of their underlying properties. Indeed, the elicitation of constructs serves as a useful approach to measure additional, and novel aspects of how individuals make sense of their work arrangement. Additionally, by having the opportunity to rate each element across the elicited constructs, RGT allows researchers to measure the psychological contract in an alternative way to the traditional approach to assessing content dimensions.

Conclusion

Overcoming measurement challenges in psychological contract research is critical in order to ensure that it remains a valuable lens through which the contemporary multi-party employment relationship in a range of contextual and evolving settings can be understood. Our paper represents an initial step in advancing the discourse beyond traditional

measurement approaches. In so doing, we do not seek to negate formative psychological contract studies but rather supplement them by offering a more delineated discussion on some of the challenges of measuring this contemporary psychological contract. Specifically, we highlight the potential of RGT as a viable methodology to allow researchers to uncover novel facets of the increasingly prevalent multi-party psychological contract. We contend that RGT is a particularly nuanced technique that can be useful to researchers seeking to explore and assess conceptually complex topics like the psychological contract.

As can be seen in Tables 1-6, utilising RGT encourages researchers to examine the psychological contract in a more filtered way. While eliciting content dimensions is an established methodology in the field, eliciting the underlying properties of these dimensions represents a novel approach. Assessing the obligations in this manner reveals how the individual differentially understands their agreement with the other contributing parties and allows researchers to explore issues like mutuality and agreement amongst the parties. For instance, determining which obligations are seen as *personally important* (Table 1, row 2) and which obligations are considered *important to the customer* (Table 1, row 1) provides significant information about how the courier uniquely makes sense of his job. From a practical perspective it also allows the other parties to make predictions about the courier's future behaviour and to tailor the work arrangement accordingly. In this way RGT serves as an accessible heuristic to explore a multi-party employment relationship.

Overall, we have sought to demonstrate that RGT is a viable methodology through which the multi-party psychological contract can be systematically and explicitly analysed. By surfacing its cognitive foundations, RGT holds the prospect of offering fresh insights into emerging and increasingly complex employment relationships.

References

- Alcover, C.M., Rico, R., Turnley, W.H. & Bolino, M.C., (2017a). Multi-dependence in the formation and development of the distributed psychological contract. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(1), 16-29.
- Alcover, C.M., Rico, R., Turnley, W.H. & Bolino, M.C., (2017b). Understanding the changing nature of psychological contracts in 21st century organizations: A multiple-foci exchange relationships approach and proposed framework. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 7(1), 4-35.
- Argyris, C. (1960). *Understanding Organizational Behavior*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Ashworth, C.M., Blackburn, I.M. & McPherson, F.M., (1982). The performance of depressed and manic patients on some repertory grid measures: A cross-sectional study. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 55(3), 247-255.
- Asleigh, M. & Meyer, E. (2011), "Deepening the understanding of trust: Combining Repertory Grid and narrative to explore the uniqueness of trust," in Lyon, F., Möllering, G., and Saunders M. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research Methods on Trust*, Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, Cheltenham, 138-148.
- Bal, P.M. & Kooij, D., (2011). The relations between work centrality, psychological contracts, and job attitudes: The influence of age. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(4), 497-523.
- Bal, P. M., Kooij, D. T., & De Jong, S. B. (2013). How do developmental and accommodative HRM enhance employee engagement and commitment? The role of psychological contract and SOC strategies. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50, 545-572.

- Bankins, S. (2011). Tracking employees' twists and turns: Describing a mixed methods approach to assessing change in the psychological contract. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 5(3), 351–366.
- Bankins, S. (2015). A process perspective on psychological contract change: Making sense of, and repairing, psychological contract breach and violation through employee coping actions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(8), 1071-1095.
- Bannister, D., (1960). Conceptual structure in thought-disordered schizophrenics. *Journal of Mental Science*, 106(445), 1230-1249.
- Bannister, D., & Nair, J. M. M. (1968). *The evaluation of personal constructs*. London: Academic Press
- Baruch, Y., & Rousseau, D. M. (2019). Integrating psychological contracts and ecosystems in career studies and management. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(1), 84-111.
- Baxter, D., Colledge, T. & Turner, N., (2017). A study of accountability in two organizational learning frameworks: why accountability for learning is critical. *European Management Review*, 14(3), 319-332.
- Bell, R.C., (2000). On testing the commonality of constructs in supplied grids. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 13(4), 303-311.
- Bouncken, R.B., Fredrich, V., Ritala, P. & Kraus, S., (2017). Coopetition in new product development alliances: advantages and tensions for incremental and radical innovation. *British Journal of Management*, 29(3), 391-410.
- Brès L, Raufflet E. & Boghossian J, (2017). Pluralism in Organizations: Learning from Unconventional Forms of Organizations. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20, 364-386.

- Burke, C.M. & Morley, M.J., (2016). On temporary organizations: A review, synthesis and research agenda. *Human Relations*, 69(6), 1235-1258.
- Cañibano, A. (2019). Workplace flexibility as a paradoxical phenomenon: Exploring employee experiences. *Human Relations*, 72(2), 444-470.
- Cassar, V. & Briner, R., (2009). Contextualizing the features of the psychological contract: the case of Malta. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(7), 677-694.
- Cassell, C., Close, P., Duberley, J. & Johnson, P., (2000). Surfacing embedded assumptions: using repertory grid methodology to facilitate organizational change. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 9(4), 561-573.
- Chen, Z.X., Tsui, A.S. & Zhong, L., (2008). Reactions to psychological contract breach: A dual perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(5), 527-548.
- Cheung, M.F., Wong, C.S. & Yuan, G.Y., (2017). Why mutual trust leads to highest performance: the mediating role of psychological contract fulfilment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 55(4), 430-453.
- Clinton, M. E., & Guest, D. E., (2014). Psychological contract breach and voluntary turnover: Testing a multiple mediation model. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(1), 200-207.
- Conway, N. & Briner, R.B., (2002). A daily diary study of affective responses to psychological contract breach and exceeded promises. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 287-302.
- Conway, N. & Briner, R.B., (2005). *Understanding psychological contracts at work: A critical evaluation of theory and research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Conway, N. & Briner, R.B., (2009). Fifty years of psychological contract research: What do we know and what are the main challenges. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 24(71), 71-131.
- Conway, N., Kiefer, T., Hartley, J., & Briner, R. B. (2014). Doing more with less? Employee reactions to psychological contract breach via target similarity or spillover during public sector organizational change. *British Journal of Management*, 25(4), 737-754.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J.A.M., (2002). A psychological contract perspective on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(8), 927-946.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A.-M., & Conway, N. (2004). The employment relationship through the lens of social exchange theory. In J. Coyle-Shapiro, L. M. Shore, M. S. Taylor, & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *The Employment Relationship: Examining Psychological and Contextual Perspectives*: 5-28. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Curchod, C., Patriotta, G., Cohen, L., & Neysen, N. (2019). Working for an Algorithm: Power Asymmetries and Agency in Online Work Settings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, DOI: 0001839219867024.
- Dabos, G.E. & Rousseau, D.M., (2004). Mutuality and reciprocity in the psychological contracts of employees and employers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1), 52-72.
- Dackert, I., Jackson, P.R., Brenner, S.O. & Johansson, C.R., (2003). Eliciting and analysing employees' expectations of a merger. *Human Relations*, 56(6), 705-725.
- De Jong, J., Rigotti, T., & Mulder, J. (2017). One after the other: Effects of sequence patterns of breached and overfulfilled obligations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(3), 337-355.

- Deng, H., Coyle-Shapiro, J., & Yang, Q. (2018). Beyond reciprocity: A conservation of resources view on the effects of psychological contract violation on third parties. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 103*(5), 561-577.
- De Vos, A., & Freese, C. (2011). Sensemaking during organizational entry: Changes in newcomer information seeking and the relationship with psychological contract fulfilment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84*(2), 288-314.
- Duggan, J., Sherman, U., Carbery, R. & McDonnell, A. (*in press*). Algorithmic Management & App-Work in the Gig Economy: A Research Agenda for Employment Relations & HRM. *Human Resource Management Journal*.
- Fassin, Y., Werner, A., Van Rossem, A., Signori, S., Garriga, E., von Weltzien Hoivik, H. & Schlierer, H.J., (2015). CSR and related terms in SME owner-managers' mental models in six European countries: National context matters. *Journal of Business Ethics, 128*(2), 433-456.
- Fiol, C.M. & Huff, A.S., (1992). Maps for managers: Where are we? Where do we go from here? *Journal of Management Studies, 29*(3), 267-285.
- Fournier, V., (1997). Graduates Construction Systems and Career Development. *Human Relations, 50*(4), 363-391.
- Fransella, F., R. Bell, & Bannister, D., (2004). *A manual for repertory grid technique*. 2nd ed. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Freese, C. & Schalk, R., (2008). How to measure the psychological contract? A critical criteria-based review of measures. *South African Journal of Psychology, 38*(2), 269-286.
- Gardner, W.L., (2017). Riddle Me This: What Do Co-Evolution, Leveraging Leaders, Transformational Leadership, Psychological Contracts, the "TREO" and Sinking Versus

- Swimming Together Have in Common? Answer: Outstanding 2015 GOM Articles. *Group & Organization Management*, 42(1), 3-10.
- Goods, C., Veen, A., & Barratt, T. (in press). "Is your gig any good?" Analysing job quality in the Australian platform-based food-delivery sector. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, DOI: 0022185618817069.
- Griep, Y., & Vantilborgh, T. (2018). Let's get cynical about this! Recursive relationships between psychological contract breach and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91(2), 421-429.
- Griep, Y., & Vantilborgh, T. (2018). Reciprocal effects of psychological contract breach on counterproductive and organizational citizenship behaviors: The role of time. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 104(1), 141-153.
- Griep, Y., Vantilborgh, T., Baillien, E., & Pepermans, R. (2016). The mitigating role of leader-member exchange when perceiving psychological contract violation: a diary survey study among volunteers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25(2), 254-271.
- Guest, D.E., 1998. Is the psychological contract worth taking seriously? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(S1), 649-664.
- Guest, D. E. (2004). The psychology of the employment relationship: An analysis based on the psychological contract. *Applied Psychology*, 53, 541-555.
- Guest, D.E., (2017). Human resource management and employee well-being: Towards a new analytic framework. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27(1), 22-38.
- Guest, D.E. & Conway, N., (2002). Communicating the psychological contract: an employer perspective. *Human resource management journal*, 12(2), 22-38.

- Herriot, P., Manning, W.E.G. & Kidd, J.M., (1997). The content of the psychological contract. *British Journal of management*, 8(2), 151-162.
- Jankowicz, D., (2004). *The easy guide to repertory grids*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Kelly, G., (1955). *Personal construct psychology*. New York: Norton.
- Kuhn, K.M. & Maleki, A., (2017). Micro-entrepreneurs, dependent contractors, and instaserfs: Understanding online labor platform workforces. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 31(3), 183-200.
- Lambert, L. S. (2011). Promised and delivered inducements and contributions: An integrated view of psychological contract appraisal. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 695.
- Lemmon, G., Wilson, M.S., Posig, M. & Glibkowski, B.C., (2016). Psychological Contract Development, distributive justice, and performance of independent Contractors: the role of negotiation behaviors and the fulfillment of resources. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 23(4), 424-439.
- Low, C.H., Bordia, P. & Bordia, S., (2016). What do employees want and why? An exploration of employees' preferred psychological contract elements across career stages. *Human Relations*, 69(7), 1457-1481.
- Marks, A. (2001). Developing a multiple foci conceptualization of the psychological contract. *Employee relations*, 23(5), 454-469.
- Martin, G., Staines, H. & Pate, J., (1998). Linking job security and career development in a new psychological contract. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 8(3), 20-40.
- Montes, S. D., & Zweig, D. (2009). Do promises matter? An exploration of the role of promises in psychological contract breach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5), 1243.

- Nadin, S.J. & Williams, C.C., (2011). Psychological contract violation beyond an employees' perspective: The perspective of employers. *Employee Relations*, 34(2), 110-125.
- Parzefall, M.R. & Coyle-Shapiro, J.A.M, (2011). Making sense of psychological contract breach. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(1), 12-27.
- Pavlica, K. & Thorpe, R., (1998). Managers' perceptions of their identity: A comparative study between the Czech Republic and Britain. *British Journal of Management*, 9(2), 133-149.
- Petriglieri, G., Ashford, S. J., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2019). Agony and ecstasy in the gig economy: Cultivating holding environments for precarious and personalized work identities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 64(1), 124-170.
- Porter, L.W., Pearce, J.L., Tripoli, A.M. & Lewis, K.M., (1998). Differential perceptions of employers' inducements: Implications for psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(S1), 769-782.
- Priesemuth, M., & Taylor, R. M. (2016). The more I want, the less I have left to give: The moderating role of psychological entitlement on the relationship between psychological contract violation, depressive mood states, and citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(7), 967- 982
- Purvis, L.J.M. & Cropley, M., (2003). Psychological contracting: Processes of contract formation during interviews between nannies and their 'employers'. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76(2), 213-241.
- Raja, U., Johns, G. & Ntalianis, F., (2004). The impact of personality on psychological contracts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 350-367.

- Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2, 121-139.
- Rousseau, D.M., (1990). New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: A study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(5), 389-400.
- Rousseau, D.M., (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. CA: Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks.
- Rousseau, D.M., (2000). Psychological contract inventory technical report. *Pittsburgh: 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.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2003). Extending the psychology of the psychological contract: a reply to "Putting Psychology Back In to Psychological Contracts". *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 12(3), 229-238.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2010). The individual-organization relationship: The psychological contract. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, 191–220). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Rousseau, D. M., Hansen, S. D., & Tomprou, M. (2018). A dynamic phase model of psychological contract processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(9), 1081-1098.
- Rousseau, D.M., Ho, V.T. & Greenberg, J. (2006), I-deals: idiosyncratic terms in employment relationships, *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 977-994.

- Rousseau, D.M. & Tijoriwala, S.A., (1998). Assessing psychological contracts: Issues, alternatives and measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(S1), 679-695.
- Schalk R. & Rousseau D.M. (2001). Psychological contracts in employment. In *Handbook of industrial, work & organizational psychology*. N Anderson, D S Ones, H Kepir Sinangil and C Viswesvaran (Eds.), (133-142), Sage Publications, Thousand Oakes.
- Schein EH. (1980). *Organizational psychology* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Sels, L., Janssens, M. & Van den Brande, I., (2004). Assessing the nature of psychological contracts: A validation of six dimensions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(4), 461-488.
- Senior, B. & Swailes, S., (2007). Inside management teams: Developing a teamwork survey instrument. *British Journal of Management*, 18(2), 138-153.
- Sherman, U.P. & Morley, M.J., (2015). On the formation of the psychological contract: A schema theory perspective. *Group & Organization Management*, 40(2), 160-192.
- Solinger, O. N., Hofmans, J., Bal, P. M., & Jansen, P. G. (2016). Bouncing back from psychological contract breach: How commitment recovers over time. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(4), 494-514.
- Stein, D. J. (1992). Schemas in the cognitive and clinical sciences. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 2, 45-63.
- Taylor, M. S., & Tekleab, A. G. (2004). Taking stock of psychological contract research: Assessing progress, addressing troublesome issues, and setting research priorities. In J. A. M. Coyle-Shapiro, L. M. Shore, M. S. Taylor, & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *The*

- employment relationship. *Examining psychological and contextual perspectives* (253–283). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Thomas, H.D. & Anderson, N., (1998). Changes in newcomers' psychological contracts during organizational socialization: A study of recruits entering the British Army. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(S1), 745-767.
- Tomprou, M., Rousseau, D. M., & Hansen, S. D. (2015). The psychological contracts of violation victims: A post-violation model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(4), 561-581.
- Turnley, W.H. & Feldman, D.C., (1999). A discrepancy model of psychological contract violations. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(3), 367-386.
- Turnley, W.H. & Feldman, D.C., (1999). The impact of psychological contract violations on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect. *Human Relations*, 52(7), 895-922.
- Van Rossem, A. H. (*in press*). Generations as social categories: An exploratory cognitive study of generational identity and generational stereotypes in a multigenerational workforce. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, DOI: 10.1002/job.2341
- Veen, A., Barratt, T. & Goods, C. (*in press*). Platform-Capital's 'App-etite' for Control: A Labour Process Analysis of Food-Delivery Work in Australia. *Work, Employment and Society*, DOI: 0950017019836911.
- Wiechers, H., Coyle-Shapiro, J.A.M., Lub, X. D. & ten Have, S. (2019). Triggering psychological contract breach. In Y. Griep, & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the psychological contract at work* (272-291). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. London. Sage.

- Westwood, R., Sparrow, P. & Leung, A., (2001). Challenges to the psychological contract in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(4), 621-651.
- Wood, A. J., Graham, M., Lehdonvirta, V., & Hjorth, I. (2019). Good gig, bad gig: autonomy and algorithmic control in the global gig economy. *Work, Employment and Society*, 33(1), 56-75.
- Wright, R.P., (2004). Mapping cognitions to better understand attitudinal and behavioral responses in appraisal research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 339-374.
- Wright, R.P., (2008). Eliciting cognitions of strategizing using advanced repertory grids in a world constructed and reconstructed. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(4), 753-769.
- Wright, R.P. & Lam, S.S., (2002). Comparing apples with apples: The importance of element wording in grid applications. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 15(2), 109-119.

Table 1: Restaurant Obligations to Courier Grid

Elements				
Rating: 1-3	Efficiency	Recognition as contributor	Accountability	Rating: 5-7
Important to Customer	1	3	5	Less important to Customer
Personally Important	2	2	1	Less Personally Important
Contingent on me	6	4	6	Obligated to provide it
Always	1	3	1	Sometimes
		Constructs		

Table 2: Courier Obligations to Restaurant Grid

Rating: 1-3	Punctuality	Accountability	Patience	Being Careful with Order	Rating: 5-7
Difficult	3	6	2	6	Easy
Contingent	3	6	5	7	Obligated to provide
Important to Customer	1	6	6	1	Less important to Customer
Causes Stress	2	6	3	2	Does not cause stress

Table 3: Organisation's Obligations to Courier Grid

Rating: 1-3	Rewarding Good Ratings	Allowing Flexibility	Introduce Alcohol Policy	Maintain Perks	Rating: 5-7
Always	2	5	2	2	Sometimes
Contingent on me	1	2	7	2	Obligated to provide it
Urgent	1	2	3	6	Future

Table 4: Courier's Obligations to Organisation Grid

<i>Rating: 1-3</i>	Availability	Customer-Focused	Respectful of Restaurant	<i>Rating: 5-7</i>
Contingent	2	6	6	Obligated to Provide it
Always	2	1	4	Sometimes
Important to Customer	1	1	6	Less Important to Customer

Table 5: Customer's Obligations to Courier Grid

<i>Rating: 1-3</i>	Ensure Address is Correct	Be Ready for Delivery	Fair Evaluation	Tipping	Patience	<i>Rating: 5-7</i>
Easy	1	2	3	3	5	Difficult
Always	1	2	1	6	4	Discretionary
Important to Restaurant	1	6	6	7	1	Less Important to Restaurant
Present Consequences	1	1	7	4	4	Future Consequences

Table 6: Courier's Obligations to Customer Grid

<i>Rating: 1-3</i>	Efficient	No Spills	Respectful of Property	<i>Rating: 5-7</i>
Can control	5	2	2	Can not control
Easy	5	5	1	Difficult
Contingent	1	2	7	Obligated to Provide it