

ROLE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT ON PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AND JOB SATISFACTION AMONG HOTEL WORKERS IN AWKA, ANAMBRA STATE, NIGERIA

Chizobam Anyaoku

Department of Psychology, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State

E-Mail: anyaokuchizoba@gmail.com; Phone: +2348038818644

ABSTRACT: *The study investigated role of psychological contract on perceived organizational support and job satisfaction among hotel workers in Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. Participants were 139 hotel workers of 44 males and 95 females, age-range 18-33, mean-age 24.80 and SD 4.71. Sample was accidental technique. Instruments were Perceived Organizational Support, Job Satisfaction Survey, and Psychological Contract Scale. The study had factorial design and Multivariate Analysis of Variance. Findings were thus: Relational psychological contract did not indicate significant difference on perceived organizational support at $p > .05$, but indicated significant difference on job satisfaction at $p < .05$; transactional psychological contract indicated significant difference on both perceived organizational support and job satisfaction at $p < .05$; interaction, relation and transactional psychological contracts did not have significant interaction on perceived organizational support and job satisfaction at $p > .05$. Recommendations: Psychological contract needs to be promoted to enhance productivity and growth in hotel business.*

KEYWORDS: Psychological Contract, Organizational Support, Job satisfaction and Hotel Workers

INTRODUCTION

From personal experience, hotel workers in Anambra State, Nigeria, face a lot of problems. Ironically, these problems maybe prompted by less salary pay, lack of adequate benefits, training, personal development and perceived organizational support which may have also warranted less job satisfaction, decrease in service, absenteeism, turnover and poor performance of the workers. Hence, role of psychological contract on perceived organizational support and job satisfaction was explored among hotel workers in Anambra State. Hotel industry needs to support job satisfaction necessities of workers (Rothfelder, Ottenbacher & Harrington 2013).

Perceived organizational support (POS) refers to the general belief held by workers that the organisation values his or her continued membership and is generally concerned about his or her well-being (Aselage & Eisenberger, 2013; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison & Sowa, 1986; Rhoades, Eisenberger & Armeli, 2011). This idea of POS is of two perspectives. First, organisational support is a global belief that the

organisation recognises and values workers' contribution as reflected in tangible resources such as pay, rank, job enrichment, rewards or other forms of compensation and benefits (Eisenberger *et al.*, 1986; Levinson, 2015; Sinclair & Tetrick, 2015; Wayne, Shore & Liden, 2017). This notion of organisational support suggests that perceived support would raise an employee's expectancy that the organisation would reward greater effort toward meeting organisational goals.

The second perspective of organisational support is the belief that the organisation is concerned about the socio-emotional well-being of employees. This aspect of organisational support reflects workers' perceptions with regard to organisational policies and practices pertaining to time away from work for personal circumstances or family care. Studies have found that hotel workers with high POS suffer less stress at work and are more inclined to return to work sooner, and performed optimally after injury (Kurtessis, Eisenberger, Ford, Buffardi, Stewart & Adis, 2015; Rhoades & Eisenberger,

2012; Shaw, Reme, Pransky, Woiszwilllo, Steenstra & Linton, 2013).

Hotel workers value POS partly because it meets their needs for approval, esteem and affiliation, and provides comfort during times of stress (Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011). Based on the norm of reciprocity (i.e., the moral obligation to respond favourably to positive treatment, workers with high POS are more inclined to care about and further organizational goals. Thus, POS leads to increased employee performance and lessened absenteeism (Eisenberger, Wang, Mesdaghinia, Wu & Wickham, 2013; Gouldner, 2018).

Job satisfaction is the way workers feels about his or her job. It is a generalized attitude towards the job, based on evaluation of different aspects to the job. It was also 'any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that causes workers to truthfully say, "I am satisfied with my job (Rao, 2017). So it is the favourableness and unfavourableness with which these workers view their work whether it is quite dependent on the intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics of their job and their individual qualities (Davis, Stankov & Roberts, 2018; Vroom, 2014). Job satisfaction of hotel workers is associated with superior job performance, positive work values, elevated levels of employee motivation, and minor rate of absenteeism, turnover and burnout argued (Ngo, Foley & Loi, 2009). Hotel workers' satisfaction is the main cause of guest satisfaction (Bach & Milman, 2016). Hotel workers' hospitality is the common is an attribute of job satisfaction.

Psychological contract is worker's belief regarding reciprocal obligations in a dual relationship of employment (Sebastian, 2015). Psychological contract refers to the expectations which worker's and management have from each other and what they owe to each other (Agarwal, 2014). Psychological contract deals with implicit reciprocal promises and obligations the management and the workers have to manage as pertaining to personality characteristics, demographic factors, and environmental, organizational characteristics. Rousseau (2000) classifies psychological contract into two i.e. transactional contract and relational contract to define the kind of workers-management

relationship. Relational contracts concern a relationship built on trust, implicit emotional attachment and long term employment. Transactional contract is short term, monetary based, limited emotional attachment, direct exchange and identifiable competencies (Rousseau, 2000).

Shore and Tetrick (2014) argued that the component of psychological contract is determined by the workers' objective in an employment relationship. The workers with orientation in developing their career with their organization are likely to focus on psychological contract prioritized in a shared-responsibility. On the other hand, workers with a short-term orientation would only be interested in relationship unconnected with the career building in organization. Freese, Schalk and Croon (2011) affirmed that the effectiveness of psychological contract is determined by the extent the organization in providing the facilities for the workers to develop their ability and competence in the organization. If the facilities are available, the workers will think that the organization can fulfil their expectations to develop their talent, and to fulfil their psychological contract. When psychological contract is fulfilled workers not only strive for the duty given by the organization, but also experience high level of job satisfaction (Shore & Tetrick, 2014).

Statement of the Problem

As a hotel worker in Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria, I have observed that my colleagues (hotel workers) often experience lack of organizational support and decreased job satisfaction. This usually have negative impact in their commitment, motivation, trust, high absenteeism, turnover intentions and decreased performance. Studies have it that when workers experience psychological contract breach, their job satisfaction and organizational support decreases (Robinson & Rousseau, 2014; Knights & Kennedy, 2015; Zhao *et al.*, 2017). Psychological contract is associated with work tasks, salary, promotion, incentives, working conditions, relationship with co-workers, supervisors and job security. The present study aims at investigating whether psychological contract among hotel workers in Anambra State

plays role on their perceived organizational support and job satisfaction. Basically, researches are rare on psychological contract, perceived organizational support and job satisfaction among hotel workers in Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria, notwithstanding the numerous hotel businesses in the area. The present study will close this gap.

Research Questions

1. To what extent will relational psychological contract play a role on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Anambra State, Nigeria?
2. In what way will relational psychological contract play a role on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Anambra State?
3. To what degree can transactional psychological contract play a role on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Anambra State?
4. How will transactional psychological contract play role on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Anambra State?
5. How will relational and transactional psychological contracts have interaction effect on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Anambra State?
6. In what ways will relational and transactional psychological contract have interaction effect on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Anambra State?

Purpose of the Study

1. To investigate how relational psychological contract plays a role on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Anambra State, Nigeria.
2. To explore whether relational psychological contract plays a role on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Anambra State.
3. To determine the extent transactional psychological contract plays a role on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Anambra State.
4. To examine if transactional psychological contract plays a role on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Anambra State.

5. To discover if relational and transactional psychological contracts have interaction effect on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Anambra State.
6. To check if relational and transactional psychological contracts have interaction effect on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Anambra State.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Review

Social exchange theory by Blau (1964) serves as theoretical review for this study. According to the theory, social relationships consist of unspecified obligations and expectations of reciprocity (psychological contract) that promote perceived organizational support and job satisfaction of hotel workers. Blau's (1964) theory affirmed this relationship among the variables (psychological contract, perceived organizational support and job satisfaction) is based on the formal, legal terms of a written contract (such as exchange of wages for job-related services). However, in social exchanges that are often based on unwritten understandings about obligations, trust is a constant mediator. It is evaluated repeatedly on the basis of daily exchange that includes perceived organizational support that foster job satisfaction of the workers (Organ & Konovsky, 1989).

So hotel workers perceiving support from the organization they work for is likely to experience job satisfaction, based on trust that the management is acting fairly on the psychological contract. Thus, the worker will engage in productive behaviour, without needing to be compensated (Organ & Konovsky, 1989). The trust that the worker holds in his or her management is based on perceptions of fairness and support from the organization. This fairness perception can be mediated by established norms of reciprocity and equity which increase the worker's job satisfaction (Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; Dulac, Coyle-Shapiro, Henderson, & Wayne, 2008).

As this perception shifts, workers may alter the extent to which they reciprocate in the workplace. Due to the close relationship between

the study variables and social exchange, psychological contract, organizational support and workers job satisfaction can be highly relevant in understanding discretionary behaviour in the workplace (Organ 1990; Robinson & Morrison, 1995). Perceived low levels of trust and equity among hotel workers and management may decrease their in-role and extra-role behaviours (Tumley & Feldman, 2000).

Empirical Review

Bravo, Won and Chiu (2019) examined the relationship between psychological contract and three work attitudes, job satisfaction, affective commitment, and turnover intention in a sample of National Collegiate Athletic Association coaches. This study also explored the moderating role of the psychological contract by examining coaches' perceptions of the intentional and unintentional breach. A total of 383 coaches responded to the survey that included items in the transactional and relational psychological contract, job satisfaction, affective commitment, and turnover intention. In addition, the sample was split into two groups, intentional breach and unintentional breach based on their responses to a single question regarding the perceived breach status. Results revealed that the transactional contract had a positive influence on job satisfaction and a negative influence on affective commitment. On the other hand, the relational contract had positive influences on both job satisfaction and affective commitment. Job satisfaction had a positive influence on affective commitment, which negatively led to turnover intention, while affective commitment had no significant influence on turnover intention.

Ažić (2017) examined factors related to employee satisfaction and hospitality in order to understand positive behavior in organizations in Opatija, Croatia. In the study 266 participants were involved. Firstly, Ažić (2017) used Exploratory Factor Analysis to extract four factors which represent four main latent variables. Results from the EFA were also tested using Confirmatory Factor Analysis. Structural equation modelling (SEM) was applied to test the structural connection between concepts and to define which concepts are interconnected in order to help understand the nature of those

connections. The findings showed the importance of satisfaction with management relations and co-worker relations and their joint influence on overall job satisfaction and hospitality (positive behaviour inside the organization).

Argon and Ekinc (2017) determined the relationship between secondary school teachers' view regarding Organizational Support and Psychological Contract Violation in Bolu, Turkey. The study conducted with relational screening model included 230 secondary school teachers employed in Bolu central district in 2014-2015 academic years. Perceived Organizational Support Scale and Psychological Contract Violation Scale were used in the study as data collection tools. Means and standard deviation were analyzed and Mann Whitney U test, Kruskal Wallis and correlation analyses were used. According to research results, teachers "strongly agreed" to the views on organizational support and they had psychological contract violation perceptions. A medium level, negative and significant relationship was found between teacher views on organizational support and psychological contract violation.

Lijo and Lyngdoh (2016) investigated the relationship between psychological contract and job satisfaction among HR professionals in start-up organization in Karnataka, India. The tools used in that study were the Job Satisfaction scale by (Singh & Sharma, 2004) and Psychological Contract Inventory (Rousseau, 1989). The sample of the study consists of 40 HR professionals. Pearson product moment correlation and step-wise multiple regression was used for analyzing the data. The findings of the study showed that the dimensions of psychological contract inventory i.e. employee obligation, employer obligation and psychological contract fulfilment had significant correlation with job satisfaction of HR professionals in Start-up service sectors.

Hypotheses

1. Those with high relational contract will differ significantly from those with low relational contract on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria

2. There will be significant difference between those with high relational contract and those with low relational contract on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Awka, Anambra State.
3. Those with high transactional contract will differ significantly from those with low transactional contract on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Awka, Anambra State.
4. There will be significant difference between those with high transactional contract and those with low transactional contract on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Awka, Anambra State.
5. There will be significant interaction between relational and transactional contract on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Awka, Anambra State.
6. There will be significant interaction effect between relational and transactional contract on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Awka, Anambra State.

METHOD

Participants: The participants of this study were from hotels workers in Awka capital city of Anambra State, Nigeria. They comprised of one hundred and thirty-nine (139) participants of 44 (31.7%) males and 95 (68.3%) females. Their age starts from 18 to 33, while their mean age is 24.80 with standard deviation of 4.71. Their employment position revealed that 42 (30.2%) were bar attendant, 8 (5.8%) work as house keeper, 27 (19.4%) work as cook, 12 (8.6%) were security personnel, 24 (17.3%) were store keeper, and 26 (18.7%) were receptionists. The participants' marital status showed that 28 (20.1%) were married, 83 (59.7%) were single, while 28 (20.1%) were separated. Their educational level indicated that 55 (39.6%) have secondary school certificate examination, 44 (31.7%) have ordinary national diploma, 24 (17.3%) have higher national diploma, and 16 (11.5%) have first school leaving certificate. The sample used for the study was accidental sampling technique which was based on availability, accessibility, proximity, and

willingness of the participants to participate in the study.

Instruments: The first instrument used in the study was **Psychological Contract Scale** by Raja, Johns and Ntalianis (2004). The scale has 18 items designed to measure relational and transactional contract. Each of the subscales has 9 items. Each item is answered on a Likert scale, with 5 response options: From 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The scale has Cronbach alphas coefficient of 0.79 for relational contract and 0.72 for transactional contract. They reported validity of 0.71 and 0.59 for transactional and relational contracts by correlating Rousseau (2000) Psychological Contract Inventory, which provides evidence for convergent validity. However, in this study, 0.80 was reported for transactional, while 0.78 for relational contract.

The second instrument used in the study was **Perceived Organizational Support** by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison and Sowa (1986). Perceived organizational support was measured using eight-item scale. Participants were requested to assess the degree of their perceived organizational support by using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. The scale has internal consistency of 0.94. While in this current study, Cronbach alpha of 0.89 was obtained through a reliability test that involved 57 adults residing in Awka urban.

Another instrument used in the study was **Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)** by Developed by Spector (1985). The Job Satisfaction Survey, JSS is a 36 item, nine facet scales to assess employee attitudes about the job and aspects of the job. Each facet is assessed with four items, and a total score is computed from all items. A summated rating scale format is used, with six choices per item ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Items are written in both directions, so about half must be reverse scored. The nine facets are Pay= 0.75, Promotion= 0.73, Supervision= 0.82, Fringe Benefits= 0.73, Contingent Rewards (performance based rewards) = 0.76, Operating Procedures (required rules and procedures) = 0.62, Coworkers= 0.60, Nature of Work=0.78, and Communication=0.71.

For the overall scale= 0.91. The researcher in this study, confirmed internal consistencies: Pay= 0.85, Promotion= 0.77, Supervision= 0.72, Fringe Benefits= 0.68, Contingent Rewards (performance based rewards) = 0.86, Operating Procedures (required rules and procedures) = 0.92, Coworkers= 0.71, Nature of Work=0.88, and Communication=0.81. For the overall scale= 0.94.

Procedure: The researcher with help self-introductory letter sought the permission of the management of the hotels in order to obtain data needed for the study. After obtaining the permission, the researchers then worked with one staff from each of the hotels in order to reach the individual workers. The staff assisting the researcher was debriefed about the aim of the study and how to administer the questionnaire. Written instructions on how to respond to each of the items in the questionnaire were clearly detailed out for the participants. At first, their informed consent was established and therefore they were assured of confidentiality, anonymity, no deception, and privacy. However, the participants that were involved in the study are those that met the inclusion criteria. They must willingly accept to participate in the study, and

must have worked in that hotel for minimum of three months, while the exclusion criteria for not participating in the study was on the premises of un-willingness to participate, those at management like manager and supervisors and those workers that have not worked up to three months in that hotel. On the whole, total of 150 copies of the questionnaire were distributed out of which 145 were returned but 139 were properly completed and subjected to Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 for data analysis. The process took the researcher a month and three weeks to complete.

Design and Statistics: The study used factorial design and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) as appropriate statistics because the study is geared towards ascertaining the comparison among the study variables. The MANOVA test is one of the most versatile techniques in quantitative methodology testing more than one IV and one DV at same time. MANOVA assumes that at least one of the group mean is different from the other and it measures how different each group's mean is from the overall mean.

RESULT

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Relational Contract on Perceived Organizational Contract and Job Satisfaction

POS	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
High	18.04	2.51	68
Low	19.06	4.52	71
Total	18.56	3.70	139
Job Satisfaction	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
High	92.88	10.87	68
Low	88.86	9.17	71
Total	90.83	10.21	139

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Transactional Contract on Perceived Organizational Contract and Job Satisfaction

POS	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
High	17.84	2.46	76
Low	19.43	4.66	63
Total	18.56	3.70	139
Job Satisfaction	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
High	87.51	8.90	76
Low	94.83	10.31	63
Total	90.83	10.21	139

Table 3: Multi-Variate Analysis Of Variance of Relational and Transactional Contract on Perceived Organizational Contract and Job Satisfaction

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean		
				Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	POS	113.75 ^a	3	37.92	2.89	.038
	Job satisfaction	2711.62 ^b	3	903.87	10.46	.000
Relational Contract	POS	25.98	1	25.98	1.98	.162
	Job satisfaction	770.95	1	770.95	8.92	.003
Transactional Contract	POS	74.49	1	74.49	5.67	.019
	Job satisfaction	2067.19	1	2067.19	23.93	.000
Relational Contract	* POS	2.37	1	2.37	.18	.672
Transactional Contract	Job satisfaction	50.40	1	50.40	.58	.446
Error	POS	1774.49	135	13.14		
	Job satisfaction	11662.24	135	86.39		
Total	POS	49776.00	139			
	Job satisfaction	1161069.00	139			

a. R Squared = .060 (Adjusted R Squared = .039), b. R Squared = .189 (Adjusted R Squared = .171).

Interpretation

Based on the above tables, the corrected model A accounted for 60.0% variance on perceived organizational support, with ($F_{3,135}$) = 2.89, $p < .05$; $R = .060$, R^2 adjusted = .039. The corrected model B accounted for 89.1% variance on job satisfaction, with ($F_{3, 135}$) = 10.46, $p < .05$; $R = .189$, R^2 adjusted = .171. Hence, the first hypothesis which stated that those with high relational contract will differ significantly from those with low relational contract on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Anambra State was not confirmed at ($F_{1,135}$) = 1.98, $p > .05$. Also with mean differences and standard deviation within the relational contract: $M=18.04$, $SD= 2.51$ (high) and $M=19.06$, $SD=4.66$ (low), $N=139$. This means that workers with high relational contract experience perceived organizational support less than workers with low relational contract experience at 60.0%.

The second hypothesis which stated that there will be significant difference between those with high relational contract and those with low relational contract on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Anambra State was confirmed at ($F_{1,135}$) = 8.92, $p < .05$. Also with mean differences and standard deviation within the relational contract: $M=92.88$, $SD= 10.87$ (high) and $M=88.86$, $SD=9.17$ (low), $N=139$. This means that workers with high relational contract

experience job satisfaction more than those with low relational contract experience at 60.0%.

The third hypothesis which stated that those with high transactional contract will differ significantly from those with low relational contract on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Anambra State was confirmed at ($F_{1,135}$) = 5.67, $p < .05$. With mean differences and standard deviation within the transactional contract: $M=17.84$, $SD= 2.46$ (high) and $M=19.43$, $SD=4.66$ (low), $N=139$. This means that workers with high transactional contract experience perceived organizational support less than those with low transactional contract experience at 89.1%.

The fourth hypothesis which stated that there will be significant difference between those with high transactional contract and those with low transactional contract on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Anambra State was confirmed at ($F_{1, 135}$) = 23.93, $p < .05$. With mean differences and standard deviation within the transactional contract: $M=87.51$, $SD= 8.90$ (high) and $M=94.83$, $SD=10.31$ (low), $N=139$. This means that workers with high transactional experience job satisfaction less than those with low transactional contract at 89.1%.

The fifth hypothesis which stated that there will be significant interaction between relational and transactional contract on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Anambra State was not confirmed at ($F_{1,135}$) = .18,

$p > .05$. The sixth hypothesis which stated that there will be significant interaction between relational and transactional contract on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Anambra State was not confirmed at $(F_{1,135}) = .58, p > .05$.

DISCUSSION

The first hypothesis which stated that those with high relational contract will differ significantly from those with low relational contract on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Anambra State was not confirmed. This means that workers with high relational contract experience perceived organizational support less than workers with low relational contract experience. This affirmed the observation of Argon and Ekinc (2017) that workers' perceived organizational support had psychological contract violation perceptions. Again, negative perception of organizational support had significant relationship with psychological contract violation. This implies that hotel workers with high relational contract tend to perceived support they received from their organization as breach of psychological contract. Maybe the support did not amount to their expectations or does not tally with what is in the relational contract. This means that the high the relational psychological contract the less the perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Anambra State.

The second hypothesis which stated that there will be significant difference between those with high relational contract and those with low relational contract on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Anambra State was confirmed. This means that workers with high relational contract experience job satisfaction more than those with low relational contract experience. This means that the high the relational psychological contract the high the job satisfaction among hotel workers in Anambra State. This is in line with the assertion of Bravo, Won and Chiu (2019) that the relational contract had positive influences on both job satisfactions. This in turn had positive influence on affective commitment, which negatively led to turnover intention.

The third hypothesis which stated that those with high transactional contract will differ

significantly from those with low relational contract on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Anambra State was confirmed. This means that workers with high transactional contract experience perceived organizational support less than those with low transactional contract experience. This showed that as transactional contract increase perceived organizational support decreases, while as transactional contract decrease perceived organizational support increases. Thus, hotel workers with high as transactional contract maybe perceiving its organizational support as bait that does not serve their need.

The fourth hypothesis which stated that there will be significant difference between those with high transactional contract and those with low transactional contract on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Anambra State was confirmed. This means that workers with high transactional experience job satisfaction less than those with low transactional contract. That indicated that as transactional contract increase job satisfaction decreases, while as transactional contract decrease job satisfaction increases. This coincides with the observation that the transactional contract influences job satisfaction and had negative influence affective commitment.

The fifth hypothesis which stated that there will be significant interaction between relational and transactional contract on perceived organizational support among hotel workers in Anambra State was not confirmed. This supported social exchange theory by Blau (1964) assertion that social relationships consist of unspecified obligations and expectations of reciprocity (psychological contract) that promote perceived organizational support of hotel workers.

The sixth hypothesis which stated that there will be significant interaction between relational and transactional contract on job satisfaction among hotel workers in Anambra State was not confirmed. Theoretically, this affirmed that hotel workers are likely to experience job satisfaction, based on trust that the management is acting fairly on the psychological contract. Thus, the worker will engage in productive behaviour, without needing to be

compensated. The trust that the worker holds in his or her management is based on perceptions of fairness and support from the organization. This fairness perception can be mediated by established norms of reciprocity and equity which increase the worker's job satisfaction (Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; Dulac, Coyle-Shapiro, Henderson, & Wayne, 2008; Organ & Konovsky, 1989).

Implications of the Study

1. The findings of the study will be very beneficial to hoteliers/hotel owners and managers. It will help them understand the psychological state of their workers, so as to improve their hospitality.
2. The findings of the study will also benefit general business owners in managing the psychological state of their workers.
3. Experts like industrial/organizational psychologists will through this study derive strategies and policies that will foster effective and efficient symbiotic relationship between the management and the workers. When both parties value and respect each other's contract, it will promote perceived organizational support, job satisfaction and productivity.

Conclusion

The study investigated role of psychological contract on perceived organizational support and job satisfaction among hotel workers in Anambra State. The following were the findings: Relational psychological contract did not indicated significant difference on perceived organizational support, but was significant on job satisfaction; transactional psychological contract indicated significant difference on both perceived organizational support and job satisfaction; interaction, relation and transactional psychological contract did not have any significant interaction on perceived organizational support and job satisfaction.

Recommendations of the Study

1. Psychological contract that is binding between the workers and management needs review occasionally. This will help improve the perception of workers as

regards to support and satisfaction they derived from their organization and job.

2. The psychological contract needs to be respected by parties in the workplace. This will ensure harmony in the workplace.
3. Workers should develop themselves in areas likely to give them satisfaction and feeling of support from the organization. Essentially, satisfaction in one's work will never be complete if the individual fails to attribute the responsibility and result to himself.

Limitations of the Study

1. One limitation of the study is the sample size, which was not conducive for extensive sub-group analysis, which a larger sample size could afford.
2. Generalization of the findings needs to be done with caution. This because the geosocial focus of the study may impact on the outcomes.

Suggestions for Further Studies

1. Replicating this study in other settings with different demographics is needed. Such replication needs to examine more variables different from those investigated in this.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, P. (2011). Relationship between psychological contract & organizational commitment in Indian IT industry. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 47(2), 290-305.
- Argon, T. & Ekinc, S. (2017). Teacher views on organizational support and psychological contract violation. *Journal of Education and Practice* 8(2), 44-52.
- Aselage, J., & Eisenberger, R. (2013). Perceived organisational support and psychological contracts: A theoretical integration. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 24(5), 491-509.
- Ažić, M.L. (2017). The impact of hotel employee satisfaction on hospitality performance. *Tourism and Hospitality Management* 23(1), 105-117.
- Bach, S.A. & Milman, A. (2016). A novel technique for reviewing a hospitality

- management curriculum. *Hospitality and Tourism Educator* 8(1), 37-40.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Bravo, G.A, Won, D. & Chiu, W. (2019). Psychological contract, job satisfaction, commitment, and turnover intention: Exploring the moderating role of psychological contract breach in National Collegiate Athletic Association coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching* 14(3), 273–284.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J.A.M. (2002). A psychological contract perspective on organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour* 2(3), 927-946.
- Davis, M., Stankov, L., & Roberts, R. D. (2018). Emotional intelligence: In Search of an elusive construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 7(5), 989-1015.
- Dulac, T., Coyle-Shapiro, J. A.-M., Henderson, D. J., & Wayne, S. J. (2008). Not all responses to breach are the same: The interconnection of social exchange and psychological contract processes in organizations. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 57(6), 1079-1098.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organisational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507.
- Eisenberger, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). *Perceived organizational support: Fostering enthusiastic and productive employees*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Eisenberger, R., Wang, Z., Mesdaghinia, S., Wu, H., & Wickham, R. (2013). *Perceived follower support: Contributions to supportive supervision and workgroup outcomes*. Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Houston, TX.
- Freese, C., Schalk, R., & Croon, M. (2011). The Impact of Organizational Change on Psychological Contract: A Longitudinal Study. *Personnel Review* 40(4), 404-422.
- Gouldner, A.W. (2018). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review* 2(5), 161-178.
- Knights, J.A. & Kennedy, B.J. (2015). Psychological contract violation: Impact on job satisfaction and organizational commitment among Australian senior public servants. *Applied Human Resources Management Research* 10(2), 57-72.
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2015). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of Management* 1(2), 57-72.
- Levinson, H. (2015). Reciprocation: The relationship between man and organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 9(4), 370–390.
- Lijo, K.J., & Lyngdoh, W.S. (2016). Psychological contract and job satisfaction among HR professionals in start-up service sector. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology* 3(2), 128-136.
- Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. (2016). An empirical study on absenteeism in Garment industry. *Management Science Letters* 6(4), 275-284.
- Ngo, H.Y., Foley, S., & Loi, R. (2009). Family friendly work practices, organizational climate, and firm performance: A study of multinational corporations in Hong Kong. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour* 30(5), 665-680.
- Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In B.M. Staw, & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 43-72). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 157-164.
- Raja, U., Johns, G., & Ntalianis, F. (2004). The impact of personality on psychological contracts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 350-367.
- Rao, G. D. (2017). *Attitude, values and perceptions*. (New Delhi: Kanisha Publications). 40-82.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2011). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organisational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 825–836.

- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 8(7), 698-714.
- Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E.W. (1995). Psychological contracts and OCB: The effect of unfulfilled obligations on civic virtue behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 16(3), 289-298.
- Robinson, S.L. & Rousseau, D.M. (2014). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour* 1(15), 245-259.
- Rothfelder, K., Ottenbacher, M.C., & Harrington, R.J. (2013). The impact of transformational, transactional and non-leadership styles on employee job satisfaction in the German hospitality industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 12 (4), 201–214.
- Rousseau, D.M. (2000). *Psychological contract inventory, revised version: Technical report.*
- Sebastian, M.S. (2015). Psychological Contract in the Indian Aviation. *Indian Journal of Research*, 8, 78-94.
- Shaw, W.S., Reme, S.E., Pransky, G., Woiszwilllo, M. J., Steenstra, I.A., & Linton, S.J. (2013). The pain recovery inventory of concerns and expectations: a psychosocial screening instrument to identify intervention needs among patients at elevated risk of back disability. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine/American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 55, 885-894.
- Shore, & Tetrick (2014). The Psychological Contract as an Explanatory Framework in the employment relationship. *Trends in Organizational Behaviour* 2(1), 91-107.
- Sinclair, R.R., & Tetrick, L.E. (2015). Social exchange and union commitment: A comparison of union instrumentality and union support perceptions. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour* 16(6), 669–680.
- Spector, P.E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713.
- Swamy, D.R., Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S., & Rashmi, S. (2015). Quality of work life: Scale development and validation. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 8(2), 281-300.
- Tumley, W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (1999). The impact of psychological contract violations on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect. *Human Relations*, 52(1), 895-922.
- Tumley, W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2000). Re-examining the effects of psychological contract violations: Unmet expectations and job. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 21(1), 25.
- Vroom, V.H. (2014). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Wayne, S.J., Shore, L.M., & Liden, R.C. (2017). Perceived organisational support ad leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management* 40(1), 82–111.
- Zhao, H., Wayne J.S., Glibkowski, C.B. & Bravo, J. (2017). The impact of psychological contract breach on work-related outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 647–680.

APPENDIX 1

Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)

Instructions: Please circle the one number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it. Disagree very much=1, Disagree moderately=2, Disagree slightly=3, Agree slightly=4, Agree moderately=5, Agree very much=6.

S/N	Items	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.						
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.						
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.						
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.						
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.						
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.						
7	I like the people I work with.						
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.						

9	Communications seem good within this organization.										32	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.									
10	Raises are too few and far between.										33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.									
11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.										34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.									
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.										35	My job is enjoyable.									
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.										36	Work assignments are not fully explained.									
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.										Developed by Spector, P. (1985)										
15	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.										Psychological Contract Scale										
16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.										S/N	Items	1	2	3	4	5				
17	I like doing the things I do at work.											Relational									
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.										1	I expect to grow in this organization.									
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.										2	I feel part of a team in this organization.									
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.										3	I have a reasonable chance of promotion if I work hard.									
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.										4	To me working for this organization is like being a member of a family.									
22	The benefit package we have is equitable.										5	The organization develops/rewards employees who work hard and exert themselves.									
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.										6	I expect to gain promotion in this company with length of service and effort to achieve goals.									
24	I have too much to do at work.										7	I feel this company reciprocates the effort put in by its employees.									
25	I enjoy my coworkers.										8	My career path in the organization is clearly mapped out.									
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.										9	I am motivated to contribute 100% to this company in return for future employment benefits.									
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.											Transactional									
28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.										10	I work only the hours set out in my contract and no more.									
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.										11	My commitment to this organization is defined by my contract.									
30	I like my supervisor.										12	My loyalty to the organization is contract specific.									
31	I have too much paperwork.										13	I prefer to work a strictly defined set of working hours.									
											14	I only carry out what is necessary to get the job done									
											15	I do not identify with the organization's goals.									

16	I work to achieve the purely short-term goals of my job.						
17	My job means more to me than just a means of paying the bills. (reverse-coded)						
18	It is important to be flexible and to work irregular hours if necessary. (reverse-coded)						

Developed by Raja, U., Johns, G., & Ntalianis, F. (2004)

Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

Instruction: The following questions ask about the organization for which you work and your experience at your organization. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements using the choices below. Strongly Disagree=1, Moderately Disagree=2, Slightly Disagree=3, Neither Disagree Nor Agree=4, Slightly Agree=5, Moderately Agree=6, Strongly Agree=7.

S/N	Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	My organization values my contribution to its well-being.							
2	My organization strongly considers							

	my goals and values.							
3	Help is available from my organization when I have a problem.							
4	My organization really cares about my well-being.							
5	My organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.							
6	My organization cares about my opinions.							
7	My organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.							
8	My organization tries to make my job as interesting as possible.							

Developed by Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986)