

Chapter 2

The Psychological Contract

2.1 The Psychological Contract as Part of the Employee-Organisation Relationship (EOR)

The individual does not operate in isolation at work. The dynamics of social interactions in the workplace have an important influence on the experience of work wellness and the success of the organisation. According to Blyton and Turnbull (1998, p. 3), “work dominates the lives of most men and women, and the management of employees, both individually and collectively, remains a central feature of organisational life”. Hellgren (2003) elaborates on this and emphasises the influence of work, and workplace relations, on the wellness of the employee, the employer and their environment.

The influences at work and the management of work form a dynamic and complex system, involving various parties, structures and regulations (Salamon 1998), encompassing both the direct working environment (“microenvironment”) and the wider society (“macroenvironment”; Venter and Levy 2011, p. 18). Labour relations, and especially the relationship between employees and employers, play an important role in the dynamics of the wider society (Craig 1975).

The employee–organisation relationship (EOR) is the pivotal relationship in the labour relations system, since the individual relationships between the employees and their employers are the origin of the complexity and dynamics of the total

Chapter Aim The aim of this chapter is to investigate the role of the psychological contract as part of the employee–organisation relationship (EOR). The influence of the experience of contract breach and violation on the wellness of individuals will also be discussed.

The focus of this book is on work-related wellness and its value. This wellness does not only refer to the individual’s experience, but also refer to the work-related relational wellness. Chapter 3 will focus on the relational wellness, while this chapter investigates the role of the psychological contract with more individual wellness in a work context.

system (Bendix 2010; Salamon 1998; Tustin and Geldenhuys 2000). Shore et al. (2004) give an overview of various concepts that have been studied in relation to the EOR, including the psychological contract (Rousseau 1995), perceived organisational support (Eisenberger et al. 1986), leader member exchange (Graen and Uhl-Bien 1995) and the employment relationship (Shore et al. 2004). Research on the EOR has increased substantially in the past decade, especially with respect to research on psychological contracts (e.g. Hellgren 2003; Herriot and Pemberton 1996; McLean Parks et al. 1998; Pugh et al. 2003; Rousseau 1995, 2001; Schalk and Rousseau 2001) and employment relationships (Shore et al. 2004).

According to Shore et al. (2004, p. 296), there are four reasons why there is a focus on the psychological contract and employment relationships as important constructs of the EOR:

- both constructs focus on exchange, highlighting the importance of examining both parties' (employee's and organisation's) perceptions of the relationship;
- psychological contract research has focused on the individual perspective, and employment relationship literature on the group or organisational perspective;
- both concepts have inspired a great deal of research; and
- there are similarities and differences in the ways of synthesising the literatures on these constructs in the EOR domain.

In this chapter, the psychological contract will be highlighted, and in Chap. 3, the employment relationship, both as concepts of the EOR, since the identification and implementation of employment rules (explicit regulations), as experienced by the employee, are identified by the psychological contract, and their maintenance and implementation are controlled by the employment relationship. It is important to note that these two concepts cannot be wholly separated from each other. Guest (2004), for example, is of the opinion that the psychological contract constructs need extending to give greater weight to the "state" of the psychological contract, *incorporating* issues of fairness and trust that lie at the heart of employment relations.

The psychological contract and the employment relationship are discussed separately, taking the interdependence of the constructs into account.

Labour relations, with the EOR as the core relationship, play an essential role in society's economy and are closely related to the social welfare, political, legal, environmental, religious and educational spheres (Katz and Kochan 2000). The context of the societal environment brings about changes in labour relations that are experienced on both the macro- and the microenvironmental levels. Such changes, which are most visible in organisational transformations (including acquisitions and mergers), have a direct influence on the EOR and on employee wellness.

Since the early 1990s, interest in the concept of the psychological has grown tremendously, even though the concept was already introduced in 1960 by Argyris (1960). Levinson, Price, Munden, Mandl and Solley further elaborated on this concept in 1962 by identifying the psychological contract as an exchange relationship between employer and employee in which each party has expectations about mutual obligations. The psychological contract, defined as the set of practical and

emotional expectations of benefits that employers and employees can reasonably have of each other, was traditionally seen as an exchange of loyalty for security. However, as Hiltrop (1995) notes, “the psychological contract that gave security, stability and predictability to the relationship between employees and employers has dramatically altered in the past decades” (p. 286).

The definitions that enjoy current prominence tend to emphasise the importance of the subjective understanding and experience of the individual employee (McLean Parks et al. 1998). According to Rousseau (1995), the psychological contract includes “individual beliefs, shaped by the organisation, regarding terms of an exchange agreement between individuals and their organisation” (p. 9). These individual beliefs refer to expectations and obligations based on perceived promises. With regard to the employment relationship, Isaksson et al. (2003) define the psychological contract as “the perception of reciprocal expectations and obligations implied in the employment relationship” (p. 3). It must be noted that reference to the psychological contract usually refers to the *employee’s* experience of perceived promises, in the form of employee and employer obligations. Technically, however, the psychological contract is of a reciprocal nature, where the employer also participates in the experience of the psychological contract.

From the above-mentioned statements, a combined formal definition can be derived:

The psychological contract is the experience of employee and employer obligations through perceived promises made in the reciprocal employee–organisation relationship.

These expectations are not limited to the psychological contract only and are also integrated in the EOR through other influences, including the social and legal contracts (Shore et al. 2004).

The EOR, as the comprehensive relationship between the individual employee and the organisation, forms and operates in societies with specific societal and legal contexts. The societal context is reflected in the **social contract**: statements of obligations logically arising from a specific kind of societal relationship (Kary 2000). Rousseau (1995) states that the “social contract refers to cultural collective beliefs regarding appropriate behaviour in society” (p. 13). This identifies the social contract as a normative framework to resolve ethical dilemmas (Shore et al. 2004). In a labour-related perspective, this framework refers to internationally agreed best practices, including the International Labour Organisation’s (ILO’s) conventions and recommendations, as well as national labour legislation (Grogan 2009).

Employment contracts within the society must comply with the social contract to be considered as legitimate. Traditionally, such a **legal contract** will comprise the application of rigid rules, the formal promises in return for agreed obligations, objective evidence of an offer, an acceptance and the exchange of valuable consideration, and the agreement of being a static contract with terms that were fixed at the moment of formation (Eisenberg 2001). Shore et al. (2004) refer to the modern interpretation of contract law by recognising obligations as based on both promissory and non-promissory principles, as well as recognising the uniqueness of the individual relationship, and the subjectivity of the contract.

The perspective of a legal contract also takes the flexibility and individuality of an agreement into account and acknowledges that rigidity and total objectivity (reasonable person standard) in the contract is not always viable (Eisenberg 2001). When referring to employment contracts, the general reaction is that they entail only this, usually written, legal contract. Actually, employment contracts are also based on the aforementioned social contract and will include normative and implicit contracts.

Shore et al. (2004, p. 301) state that above-mentioned contracts (social and legal contracts), next to the influence of interorganisation group beliefs (the *normative contract*) and implied-in-fact perceived promises (the *implied contract*), are also the main contributing factors of the individual psychological contract that, on its own, establishes the foundation of the EOR. As illustrated by Rousseau (1995, p. 9; Table 2.1), psychological and implied contracts are experienced on an individual and personal level by the employee, while the normative, legal and social contracts are related to group levels of experience.

The social, legal and normative contracts are closely associated with the social context influences (as later discussed) on the employment relationships. Since the influences on the psychological contract are constantly changing, because of, for example, political transformation and amendments to labour laws, the EOR is also continuously exposed to a changing environment. To accommodate these influences and to avoid the experience of violation of the psychological contract, perceived organisation support, LMX and the other characteristics of the employment relationship play an important role (Shore et al. 2004). For purposes of this chapter, however, the focus will be limited to the psychological contract and the employment relationship's influence on it.

This model differentiates between individual and relational experiences. This is valuable to wellness studies, where the individual and relational—collective— influences are incorporated. The role of individual and collective, as well as formal and informal, contracts on wellness experiences will be investigated later in this book (Chap. 4).

Table 2.1 Contracts influencing the psychological contract

	Collective	Individual
Formal	<i>Social Contract</i>	<i>Legal contract</i>
	• ILO conventions • Societal norms • Constitution • Labour legislation • Collective agreements	• Written/verbal employment contract • Idiosyncratic deals
Informal	<i>Normative contract</i>	<i>Implicit contract</i>
	• Professional status • Generally accepted job behaviour • Group norms • Subculture norms	• Personality-type behaviour • Cultural background • Physical characteristics • Literacy levels

Source Adapted from Rousseau (1995, p. 9)

2.2 Breach and Violation of the Psychological Contract

Concerning breach and violation of the psychological contract, Rousseau (1995) states the following:

In the strictest sense, violation refers to a failure to comply with the terms of a contract. But, given the subjective nature of the psychological contract, how people interpret the circumstances of this failure determines whether they experience a violation. (p. 112)

Therefore, a violation of the psychological contract refers to emotional and affective reactions such as those that may arise when the individual feels that the organisation failed to uphold properly its end of the psychological contract, for whatever reason (Morrison and Robertson 1997). More specifically, a “violation of the psychological contract arises when the employee perceives a discrepancy between perceived obligations and promised obligations” (Schalk et al. 2001, p. 7). There can be various reasons why the employer does not comply with promised obligations to the employee. Rousseau (1995) identifies three sources of experienced violation, “inadvertent experience, disruption and breach of contract” (p. 112). The sources of the experience of violation determine the ability and willingness of the employer to comply with the promised obligations to the employee.

Table 2.2 identifies the sources and characteristics of experienced violation, according to Rousseau (1995), and possible examples thereof. Several researchers (e.g. Atkinson 2002; Lemire and Rouillard 2005; Newell and Dopson 1996) see breach of contract as a form of violation, rather than a cause. They associate a certain level of experience of violation with a specific reason. These researchers mainly refer to breach of contract as associated with the experience of violation, rather than taking other reasons into account. The intensity of the experience of violation, however, could not yet be directly associated with its source. Therefore, an employee’s level of experience of violation due to a merger of organisations (the cause being *disruption*) can be similar to an employee’s experiencing violation due to unfair labour practice, e.g. fewer rewards than promised (the cause being *breach of contract*). This implies that even though the employer wants to deliver the promises made, but is unable to do it due to external reasons, the

Table 2.2 Sources of experienced violation

Source	Characteristics	Examples
Inadvertent	Able and willing (divergent interpretations made in good faith)	Misunderstanding of promise or detail, e.g. employee accidentally at wrong place of work
Disruption	Willing, but unable (inability to fulfil contract)	Operational requirements, due to financial, structural or technological reasons, e.g. a forced merger
Breach of contract	Able, but unwilling (reneging)	Unilateral changes of contract without fair reason or process, e.g. substantive unfair dismissal

Source Adapted from Rousseau (1995, p. 113)

employee can experience violation of contract. Some of the most recent research in the experience of violation focuses on breach of contract (Atkinson 2002; Lemire and Rouillard 2005; Searle and Ball 2004), while the experience of violation can be the same, whatever the source.

Due to regular use of the term, “breach of contract”, referring to partial or all sources of experience of violation (Atkinson 2002; Lemire and Rouillard 2005; Morrison and Robertson 1997; Searle and Ball 2004), in this chapter, this term will subsequently also be used in this way. This implies that for the purpose of this chapter “breach of contract” refers to the action of the employer not to keep a promise made for whatever reason, as perceived by the employee, and “violation of contract” refers to the employee’s emotional and affective reactions to the experience of breach of contract, for whatever reason. The employee’s experience of breach and violation of contract is therefore mainly based on how the employee perceives promises made and kept by the employer.

Indicators and reactions of the experience of contract breach and violation are not only visible in individual short-term reactions (including experience of job satisfaction and job insecurity) and long-term reactions (including employee well-being and general health; Ferrie et al. 1995; Hellgren 2003; Roskies et al. 1993), but also include labour-related actions, such as high levels of absenteeism, lodging of organisational grievances by the employee, referring disputes by the employee, industrial actions (protected or unprotected industrial actions) and strong union activities (Bendix 2010; Nel 2012; Venter and Levy 2011).

2.3 Employee and Employer Obligations

The content of the psychological contract refers to the concrete terms that are part of the perceived relationship (Rousseau and Tijouriwala 1998). These concrete terms are embodied by employee and employer obligations, as perceived by the parties in the EOR. The range and level at which these obligations are perceived are guided by the social, legal, normative and implicit contracts (as previously discussed) that the employee is exposed to. As an example, an employee with a vague legal employment contract may easily perceive more employer obligations than an employee with a clear legal contract. This might lead to an elevated experience of breach and violation of contract by the employee, since the perceived employer obligation may not be similar to how the employer perceives the obligation.

The range of perceived obligations can be unlimited, due to the above-mentioned contractual influences on the psychological contract, causing difficulty in identifying specific employee and employer obligations. Using a limited subset of items for which scales are developed, researchers face the problem that no consensus is reached on which scales and items to use (De Vos et al. 2002; Van Den Brande 2002). A broad scale of psychological contract content can be identified through classifications by Robinson et al. (1994), De Vos et al. (2002), as summarised in Table 2.3 (as cited in PSYCONES 2005, p. 16).

Employer and employee obligations, as perceived by the employee, can be based on various promises made to the employer, as well as promises made by the employer to the employee. The range of perceived promises is unlimited and can differ significantly between various forms of employment, industries and sectors,

Table 2.3 Content of the psychological contract

Obligations of the employee		Obligations of the employer
Robinson et al. (1994)	De Vos et al. (2002)	De Vos et al. (2002)
Working overtime	Job performance	Job content
Loyalty	Flexibility	Opportunities for career development
Extra-role behaviour	Extra-role behaviour	Social aspects
Notice	Loyalty	Support
Transfers	Employability	Rewards
Competitor support	Ethics	Respect for private life
Proprietary protection		
Minimum stay		

Source Adapted from PSYCONES (2005, p. 16)

Table 2.4 Psychological contract obligations and promises guideline

Employee obligations	Employee promises	Employer obligations	Employer promises
Job performance	Good service	Job content	Varied work
	Professional manner		Limited disturbances
	General honesty		Own work fashion
	Skills development		Responsibility
	Satisfying performance		Right to supervise
	Team player		Right of own opinion Departmental influence
Loyalty	Protect organizational image	Rewards	Flexibility
	Confidentiality		Fair salary
	Not support competitors		Job security
Ethics	Honesty with leave		Additional rewards
	Resignation notice		Allowances
	Cost-effective		Recognition
Extra-role behaviour	Respect company time	Management policy	Procedural fairness
	Innovation		Fair discipline
	Assist others		Communication structures
	Social participation		Information

(continued)

Table 2.4 (continued)

Employee obligations	Employee promises	Employer obligations	Employer promises
Flexibility	Accept transfer	Social aspects	Co-employee relationships
	Do non-required tasks		Supporting social activities
	Work extra hours		Colleague assistance
	Geographical mobility		Good working atmosphere
			Social network
	Conformity	Career development	Reaching true potential
			Stimulating work
			Room for own initiatives
			Suitable work
			Ability to achieve progress
			Promotion abilities
			Skills development
			Horizontal job mobility
			Training opportunities
			Fair work pressure
		Organisational support	Quality products
			Customer satisfaction
			Feedback
			Righteous management
			Trust in management
			Efficient organisation
			Good working conditions
			Good HRM
			Fair work time
			Reimbursement of costs
			Respect for private life

Source Linde et al. (2008)

occupations and professions, workplaces and personality characteristics, to name but a few. A proposed guideline of types of employee and employer obligations, with the associated types of promises, has been compiled in Table 2.4, through adaptations of relevant sources (De Vos et al. 2002; PSYCONES 2005; Rousseau and Tijouriwala 1998; Van Den Brande 2002).

Owing to the subjective character of the psychological contract, the perceived promises and obligations associated with the uniqueness of each employment relationship and the structuring thereof can only be seen as a guideline, rather than a fixed scale. Furthermore, certain promises can be identified as part of more

than one obligation, depending on the situation in which they are made and/or perceived. Table 2.4 has therefore been specifically developed and structured in the context of South African-based research into the contents of the psychological contract, by Linde et al. (2008).

2.4 Influence of the Social Context on the Psychological Contract

As illustrated in Fig. 1.1, both the individual's characteristics and the social context associated with the EOR can influence the employee's experience of the psychological contract and employment relationship, as well as the following short-term reactions (e.g. job insecurity and job satisfaction) and long-term reactions (e.g. employee well-being and general health; Hellgren 2003; Hellgren et al. 1999). These individual characteristics can include the employee's personality characteristics, age, gender, emotional intelligence, literacy level and ability to understand—characteristics that have a prominent influence on the individual's formation of an implicit contract and which therefore also influence the psychological contract (Guest 2004; Rousseau 1995), as indicated in Table 2.1.

The psychological contract is also reciprocally related with the social, legal and normative contracts, which are sensitive to the social context in which they are formed and sustained. This social context can include the sociopolitical situation of a country or area, the demographic composition, levels of industrial development, societal norms, labour and other legislation, organisational culture and employment regulations and rules (Bendix 2010; Venter and Levy 2011). Therefore, the characteristics of an employment relationship can be entrenched by the direct social context influences to which it is exposed. As an example, employment relationships in the same sector and demographic area can be very different due to the management structures, organisational culture and collective bargaining processes of the organisation. The employees associated with these different employment relationships can experience different psychological contracts, as well as different breaches and violations of these contracts. The short-term and long-term reactions associated with these different experiences of the psychological contract can lead to very diverse wellness levels in the workforce.

Two main groups of social context influences on the employment relationship can be identified, namely external and internal. The external influences are beyond the reasonable control of the organisation (including labour law, sectoral determinations, national economic policies, the labour market and natural resources), and the internal influences are within the organisation's reasonable control (including organisational and management policies and structures, employment regulations, negotiation processes, personnel relationships and performance policies). Where different types of employment relationships operate under the same labour legislation and in the same labour sector, the internal social context becomes the primary cause for diverse relationships (Venter and Levy 2011).

The employment relationship, exposed to these influences, therefore has unique characteristics, causing the employer and employee to experience the psychological contract in context. The influences that the social context can have on the employment relationship will mostly be realised in the management system of the relationship (Tustin and Geldenhuys 2000), which comprises organisational rules and regulations and their application (Bendix 2010). Therefore, the clarity and consistency of the employment relationship, as experienced by the employee, are dictated by the contents, communication and fairness of employment-related contracts, policies, codes and procedures implemented by the employer (Nel 2012; Venter and Levy 2011). These employment relationship characteristics influence the employee's experience of employee and employer obligations, owing to the clarity of the mentioned promises made and the employee's trust in the employer to keep them.

The experience of the psychological contract clearly links to the employment relationship. Thus, the employees' wellness influences their state of the psychological contract, which also has an influence on the experience of the employment relationship. The dynamics of the employment relationship is discussed in the following chapter, where the changing labour relationships of South Africa are also discussed.

References

- Argyris C (1960) Understanding organizational behaviour. Dorsey Press, Homewood
- Atkinson C (2002) Career management and the changing psychological contract. *Career Develop Int* 7(1):14–23
- Bendix S (2010) Industrial relations in South Africa, 7th edn. Juta, Lansdowne
- Blyton P, Turnbull P (1998) The dynamics of employee relations, 2nd edn. MacMillan, Basingstoke, United Kingdom
- Craig AWJ (1975) The industrial relations system. In: Barret B, Rhodes E, Beishon Collier J (eds) Industrial relations and the wider society. MacMillan, London, pp 8–20
- De Vos J, Buyens D, Schalk R (2002) Psychological contract-related information seeking and the role of individual disposition. Poster accepted for the annual conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Toronto, Canada
- Eisenberg MA (2001) Contracts and property law: the emergence of dynamic contract law. *Theor Inq Law* 2:1–76
- Eisenberger R, Huntington R, Hutchison S, Sowa D (1986) Perceived organizational support. *J Appl Psychol* 71:500–507
- Ferrie JE, Shipley M, Marmot MG, Stansfield S, Davey-Smith G (1995) Health effects of anticipation of change and non-employment longitudinal data from the Whitehall II study. *Br Med J* 311:1264–1269
- Graen GB, Uhl-Bien M (1995) Relationship-based approach to leadership: development of Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years. *Leadersh Quart* 6:219–247
- Grogan J (2009) Workplace law, 9th edn. Juta, Kenwyn
- Guest D (2004) The psychology of the employment relationship: an analysis based on the psychological contract. *Appl Psychol* 53:541–555
- Hellgren J (2003) The times they are a-changin': job uncertainty and the flexible labor market. *Akademistryck, Edsbruk*

- Hellgren J, Sverke M, Isaksson K (1999) A two-dimensional approach to job insecurity: consequences for employee attitudes and well-being. *Eur J Work Organ Psychol* 8:179–195
- Herriot P, Pemberton C (1996) Contracting careers. *Hum Relat* 49:757–790
- Hiltrop JM (1995) The changing psychological contract: the human resource challenge of the 1990s. *Eur Manag J* 13:286–294
- Isaksson K, Bernhard C, Gustafsson K (2003) Betydelse av anställningsform och tillit till ledningen för personalens hälsa inom vården [Importance of employment form and trust into leadership for employee's health in the healthcare sector]. *Arbetsmarknad Arbetsliv* 9(2):5–16
- Kary JH (2000) Contract law and the social contract: what legal history can teach us about the political theory of Hobbes and Locke. *Univ Ottawa Law Rev* 31:73–91
- Katz H, Kochan T (2000) An introduction to collective bargaining and industrial relationships, 2nd edn. McGraw-Hill, Boston
- Lemire L, Rouillard C (2005) An empirical exploration of psychological contract violation and individual behaviour: the case of Canadian federal civil servants in Quebec. *J Manage Psychol* 20:150–163
- Levinson H, Price CR, Munden KJ, Mandl HJ, Solley CM (1962) Men, management and mental health. Harvard University Press, Cambridge
- Linde B, Schalk R, Linde HM (2008) Clarity and trust: the experience of workplace regulations by employees. *South Afr J Labour Relat* 32(2):86–103
- McLean Parks J, Kidder DL, Gallagher DG (1998) Fitting square pegs into round holes: mapping the domain of contingent work arrangements onto the psychological contract. *J Organ Behav* 19:697–730
- Morrison EW, Robinson SL (1997) When employees feel betrayed: a model of how psychological contract violation develops. *Acad Manage Rev* 1:226–256
- Nel PS (2012) South African employment relations: theory and practice, 7th edn. Van Schaik, Pretoria
- Newell H, Dopson S (1996) Muddle in the middle: organizational restructuring and middle management careers. *Pers Rev* 25(4):4–20
- PSYCONES (2005) WP1—state of the art: current evidence concerning employment contracts and employee/organizational well-being among workers in Europe. <http://www.psycones.sp>. Retrieved 11 Nov 2005
- Pugh SD, Scarlicki DP, Passell BS (2003) After the fall: layoff victims' trust and cynicism in re-employment. *J Occup Organ Psychol* 76:201–213
- Robinson SL, Kraatz MS, Rousseau DM (1994) Changing obligations and the psychological contract: a longitudinal study. *Acad Manage J* 37(1):137–152
- Roskies E, Lewis-Guerin C, Fournier C (1993) Coping with job insecurity: how does personality make a difference? *J Organ Behav* 14:617–630
- Rousseau DM (1995) Psychological contracts in organizations: understanding written and unwritten agreements. Sage, Thousand Oaks
- Rousseau DM (2001) Schema, promise and mutuality: the building blocks of the psychological contract. *J Occup Organ Psychol* 74:511–541
- Rousseau DM, Tijouriwala SA (1998) Assessing psychological contracts: issues, alternatives and measures. *J Organ Behav* 19:679–695
- Salamon M (1998) Industrial relations: theory and practice, 3rd edn. Prentice Hall, Hertfordshire
- Schalk R, Heinen J, Freese C (2001) Do organizational changes impact the psychological contract and workplace attitudes? a study of a merger of two home care organizations in the Netherlands. In: De Jonge J, Vlerick P, Büssing A, Schaufeli WB (eds) *Organizational psychology and health care at the start of a new millennium*. Rainer Hampp Verlag, Munich
- Schalk R, Rousseau DM (2001) Psychological contracts in employment. In: Anderson N (ed) *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology*. Sage, London, pp 133–142
- Searle RH, Ball KS (2004) The development of trust and distrust in a merger. *J Manage Psychol* 19:708–721

- Shore LM, Tetrick LE, Taylor S, Shapiro JA-MC, Liden R, Parks JM, Morrison EW, Porter LW, Robinson S, Roehling MV, Rousseau DM, Schalk R, Tsui A, Van Dyne L (2004) The employee-organization relationship: a timely concept in a period of transition. In: Martocchio JJ (ed) *Research in personnel and human resources management*, vol 23. Elsevier, Oxford, pp 291–370
- Tustin C, Geldenhuys D (2000) *Labour relations: the psychology of conflict and negotiation*. Oxford University Press, Cape Town
- Van den Brande I (2002) *Het psychologish contract tussen werknemer en werkgever: een survey-onderzoek by vlaamse werknemers* [The psychological contract between employee and employer: a survey with Flemish employees]. Unpublished master's thesis, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Leuven
- Venter R, Levy A (eds) (2011) *Labour relations in South Africa*, 3rd edn. Oxford University Press, Cape Town

<http://www.springer.com/978-981-287-401-6>

The Value of Wellness in the Workplace
A Perspective of the Employee-Organisation
Relationship in the South African Labour Market

Linde, B.

2015, VI, 65 p. 6 illus., Softcover

ISBN: 978-981-287-401-6