



Investigating the Relations of Psychological Contract, Organizational Transparency and Leader-Member Exchange with Employee Performance Behaviors

Çiğdem Üçler^{*a}, Seçil Bal Taştan^a
^aMarmara Üniversitesi

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received

16.10.2017

Received in revised form

24.11.2017

Accepted

09.12.2017

Key Words:

In-role performance behaviors, extra-role performance behaviors, psychological contract, organizational transparency, leader-member exchange.

ABSTRACT

Objectives: The main objective of this study is to investigate the relations of psychological contract, organizational transparency and leader-member exchange with employee performance behaviors in the hospitality sector.

Methods: A questionnaire with a multiple source approach was applied in an international luxury city hotel in Istanbul. Data was collected among 221 employees for psychological contract, organizational transparency, leader-member exchange. The assessment of employees in-role and extra-role performance was done by 21 supervisors with a survey. First, factor analysis was applied to all the scales of the study and all items and dimensions were investigated. Correlation and regression analysis were applied to confirm the set hypothesis.

Results: Psychological contract, organizational transparency and leader-member exchange were found to have significant and positive relations both the in-role and extra-role performance behaviors of the employees.

Originality: The antecedents of employee performance behaviors were investigated in many sectors in Turkey, however no study was conducted before in the hospitality sector in a large city within international competition. This study contributes to the literature as this is the first work carried out in city hotels of Turkey, where evidence to the antecedents of employee performance behaviors was concluded. Moreover, organizational transparency was not studied before in the hospitality sector in Turkey. Thus, the first novelties are in the national context. Then, the literature only includes questionnaires answered by employees as self-reports, reflecting single source data collection method. Here, the employee performance behavior questionnaires were answered by the supervisors and managers, while the remaining questions were answered by the employees. This is the multiple source data collection approach, and this is another contribution to the literature.

Psikolojik Sözleşme, Örgütsel Şeffaflık ve Lider-Üye Etkileşiminin Çalışan Performans Davranışları ile İlişkisinin İncelenmesi

Çiğdem Üçler^{*a}, Seçil Bal Taştan^a
^aMarmara University,

MAKALE BİLGİSİ

Makale Tarihiçesi:

Başvuru

16.10.2017

Revizyon

24.11.2017

Kabul

09.12.2017

Anahtar Kelimeler:

Görev içi performans davranışları, görev ötesi performans davranışları, psikolojik sözleşme, örgütsel şeffaflık, lider-üye etkileşimi.

ÖZ

Amaç: Bu araştırmanın temel amacı, konaklama sektöründe psikolojik sözleşme, örgütsel şeffaflık ve lider üye etkileşimi ile çalışan performans davranışları arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırmaktır.

Tasarım/Yöntem: İstanbul'da yer alan uluslararası lüks bir şehir otelinde çoklu kaynak yaklaşımı ile anket çalışması gerçekleştirilmiştir. 221 çalışandan, psikolojik sözleşme, örgütsel şeffaflık ve lider üye etkileşimi konularında veriler toplanmıştır. Çalışanların görev içi ve görev ötesi performansları ile ilgili değerlendirmeleri 21 yönetici tarafından doldurulan anketler ile sağlanmıştır. Öncelikle araştırmada yer alan tüm ölçeklere faktör analizi yapılmış ve ölçeklere ait madde ve boyutlar incelenmiştir. Oluşturulmuş hipotezlerin test edilmesinde korelasyon ve regresyon analizleri uygulanmıştır.

Sonuçlar: Psikolojik sözleşme, örgütsel şeffaflık ve lider üye etkileşimi ile çalışanların görev içi ve görev ötesi davranışları arasında anlamlı ve pozitif ilişki bulunmuştur.

Özgün Değer: Türkiye'de çalışan performans davranışları öncülleri ile ilgili bir çok sektörde araştırmalar yapılmış ancak uluslararası rekabetin yer aldığı büyük bir şehirde, konaklama sektöründe bir çalışma henüz gerçekleştirilmemiştir. Bu çalışma Türkiye'de şehir otellerinde çalışan performans davranışları öncüllerine bulgular sağlamıştır. Bununla beraber, örgütsel şeffaflık konusu da Türkiye'de konaklama sektöründe daha önce çalışılmamış bir konudur. Bu sebeplerden dolayı, ilk katkılar ulusal bağlamda değerlendirilmektedir. Bunların yanında, literatür sadece çalışanlar tarafından öz değerlendirme yöntemi ile yanıtlanmış, tek kaynaklı veri toplama yöntemini içeren çalışmalar içermektedir. Bu çalışmada ise, çalışanların performans davranışları ile ilgili değerlendirme anketleri şef ve müdürleri tarafından, kalan sorular ise çalışanlar tarafından yanıtlanmıştır. Çoklu kaynak yaklaşımı olan bu veri toplama yöntemi ise, araştırmanın diğer bir katkısıdır.

* Corresponding Author Email: cigdem_ucler@yahoo.com.tr ORCID: 0000-0003-4296-7036

1. Introduction

The globalization in the business impacts every sector including the hospitality; there is an international tough market ruled by global companies. Moreover, acquisitions and mergers become a daily routine due to the strong competition among international chains (Mathews, 2000). Hotels are trying to gain competitive advantage by strategies such as discounted offerings for accommodation and/or food & beverage (Li, 2014). However, the quality of such services highly depends on the employees, whose motivation is negatively influenced by these economizing strategies. The performance and success of organizations depend mainly on the employees, shaped by effective application of human resources practices and the quality of work life (Kanten, 2014). The output of hotels is measured by the service quality, starting with the measurement of the performance of labor intensive jobs. With that respect, human resources perspective is mostly concentrated on performance behaviors of employees, which can be classified as in-role and extra-role performance behaviors for assigned duties and additional duties on volunteer basis respectfully (Katz, 1964; Zhu, 2013; Ziegler & Schlett, 2016). Consequently, this study is focused on the employee performance behaviors and its antecedents in the hospitality sector regarding to the relations between psychological contract, organizational transparency and leader-member exchange with in-role and extra-role performance behaviors of the employees.

2. Literature Review

2.1. In Role and Extra Role Employee Performance Behaviors

The performance evaluation of organizations utilizes usually financial indicators, which are outputs of one organization. Nevertheless, the early phase assessments shall focus on mechanisms and transactions within the organization, where for the measurement of employee's basic assignments and expected behavior can deliver a reflection (Motowidlo, 2003). These behaviors do form the individual performances, and since the organizational success highly depends on high performed employees (Colquitt, Le Pinne & Wesson, 2010), organizations shall enable an environment for the continuous development of performance. Katz (1964, p.132) described three categories of employee behaviors in an organization that effects the operation as; (i) "People must determine whether entering the organization and maintaining the identity of an organization member", (ii) "the organizational member must fulfill the specific requirements for the role in an interdependent way", (iii) "the organizational member will spontaneously generate many acts other than the role requires, which reflects the extra role behavior".

The first category is related to the acceptance of the organization. The second category explains the basis of the employee performance behavior and is known as the in-role behavior. It can be defined as the completion of tasks mentioned in the job description. Accordingly, all duties at work can be summarized in the in-role performance behavior of the employees (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Then, the third category refers to the extra-role behavior, which include all additional tasks carried out by employees on voluntarily basis, which are not directly included in the job descriptions.

In fact, the in-role behavior helps to understand extra-role behavior (Katz, 1964). Thus, first the in-role behavior should be investigated, which is reflected by performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997:99). In the organizations, the evaluation standards of the in-role performance can be categorized by ratings, evaluations of the quality, quantity and data records of safety, absenteeism etc. (Williams & Anderson, 1991). In-role performance is an indicator of the positive engagement levels of the employees as it is considered that engaged employees are more focused on their work tasks with energy and passion (Kahn, 1990; Christian, Garza & Slaughter, 2011). Moreover, performance quality, productivity (Vandaele & Gemmel, 2006), affective commitment (Becker & Kernan, 2003), psychological empowerment perception (Taştan, 2011), organizational identification (Ashforth, Harrison & Corley, 2008), engagement (Eldor & Harpaz, 2016), participative work environment perceptions and individual responsibility (Taştan, 2011) effect the employee in-role performance behaviors, where job satisfaction and organizational commitment are some of the important positive consequences (MacKenzie, Podsakoff & Ahearne, 1988).

As mentioned, extra-role performance behavior does cover everything else, which is not within in-role responsibilities. Beside in-role duties all extra-role behaviors are keys for the success in the competitive market. Extra-role performance was first defined by Katz's (1964) third behavior category as mentioned above. Some examples of extra-role performance behaviors are maintaining of the cleanliness of work area, helping to a coworker in solving job problems, sharing information, coaching to a new employee and effective using of organizational resources (Bateman & Organ, 1983). Employees offering suggestions and emphasizing their opinions without being asked to increase the organizational efficiency can be considered as showing extra-role performance behaviors (Becker & Kernan, 2003). The hospitality sector is especially affected by extra-role behaviors. Employees are expected there to show also extra-role behaviors, which go beyond the job descriptions defined as contextual performance or extra-role behaviors (Katz & Kahn, 1966). These are proactive behaviors (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), enabling the wellbeing of the organization (Kanten, 2014). Both, in-role and extra-role employee performance behaviors are vitally important for organizations and scholars research their antecedents to increase them appropriately (Taştan, 2011). Consequently, in the next sections, depending the literature review does focus on the antecedents of these behaviors, which are namely psychological contract, organizational transparency and LMX.

2.2. Psychological Contract

In the study, the first antecedent is proposed to be the psychological contract, which is defined as "an individual's belief regarding the terms and conditions of a reciprocal exchange between that focal person and another party" (Rousseau, 1989:123). Today, creating positive relations between the employees and employers has turned into a management priority, which can be gained by maintaining a good psychological contract level of the employees. Psychological contract is a framework to understand the employee and employment relationship (Zhoa, Wayne & Glibkowski, 2007) that comprises the expectations from each other (Agarwal & Bhargava, 2013). It can be considered as a mechanism that links human resources systems and employee attitudes and behaviors (Wright & Boswell, 2002). This concept is depending on the beliefs or perceptions by the two parties (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994) and balances work and the personal life (Sam & Anitha, 2014). In general, two types of psychological contract were defined by Rousseau (1995; 2001) as transactional and relational contracts. First, the transactional contract refers to the economical basis related with expectations of fairly compensation, working conditions and short-term employment guarantee. Transactional psychological contracts are related with short term exchanges (Uen, Chien and Yen, 2009) in a less flexible environment (Rousseau, 1995) and in a negative relation with job satisfaction and affective commitment (Raja, John & Ntalianis, 2004). Second, the relational contract is referring to socio-emotional basis depending on respect, support and shared values like training and professional development, and it is the most dominant type (Demirkasımoğlu, 2004). Relational oriented psychological contracts are more long term oriented, dynamic and subjective (Rousseau, 1995). They contribute positively with commitment based human resources systems, job satisfaction, organizational and affective commitment (Özgen & Özgen, 2010; Raja, John & Ntalianis, 2004).

The effects of psychological contract on the dimensions of performance were examined by many researches. As psychological contract shapes the behavior of the employees, it was conducted that under high psychological contract levels, employees are supposed to show attitudes and behaviors resulting in a higher level of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Cihangiroğlu & Şahin, 2010). Furthermore, there are positive relations of psychological contract fulfillment with in-role performance behaviors, organization and individual based OCB (Turnley et al., 2003). Engaged employees perform more extra-role performance behaviors, because they either consider all aspects of the work under their own responsibility or they have free resources after completing their own tasks (Christian, Garza & Slaughter, 2011). Based on the importance of psychological contract, the relations between psychological contract with employee performance behaviors were investigated in the study and the hypothesis were set as below;

Hypothesis 1: There is a positive relationship between psychological contract and employee performance behaviors.

Hypothesis 1_a: *There is a positive relationship between psychological contract and in-role performance behaviors.*

Hypothesis 1_b: *There is a positive relationship between psychological contract and extra-role performance behaviors.*

2.3. Organizational Transparency

Transparency is another concept of this study, because it is assumed to ensure the visibility in the organization, leading towards healthy interactions and correct behaviors (Kaptein, 2008). The term transparency was started to be used in the early 21st century in economic context (Rawlins, 2008). The transparency was defined in (2017) as “lack of hidden agendas and conditions, accompanied by the availability of full information required for collaboration, cooperation, and collective decision making” and “essential condition for a free and open exchange whereby the rules and reasons behind regulatory measures are fair and clear to all participants”. Grimmelikhuijsen (2012:55) defined transparency as “the availability of information about an organization or allowing external actors to monitor the internal workings or performance of that organization”. Nowadays, the employees are expecting more information-flow from their organizations, so that the importance of transparency has increased. Transparency and communication are the basics that employees are looking after for employee engagement in organizations, which can be developed by leaders and followed by everyone’s commitment. When employees don’t have enough information about the decision-making process and the updates about their organization, they may have a perception of lack of transparency, which creates a lack of employee trust feeling on their expertise.

Transparency is important by its effects on the culture of the organizations regarding the increased communication and openness. Organizational transparency enables a more effective and efficient business, which also directs a transparent culture in an organization (Bennis & O’Toole, 2009). Transparent organizations provide information to the employees at the right time by purpose, which creates a healthy culture in the organization (Baltzley & Lawrence, 2016) leading to higher levels of perceived trustworthiness (Grimmelikhuijsen & Meijer, 2014; Schnackenberg & Tomlinson, 2016). In transparent organizations, management will engage in proper and lawful behaviors (Fung, 2014), which lead to trust between the employees and employers. Moreover, managerial trustworthy behavior is positively related with OCB in organizations (Korsgaard, Brodt & Whitener, 2002). Within this framework, it is obvious that transparency can create a healthy working environment, where employees are contributing to organization’s goals (Baltzley & Lawrence, 2016) and they get motivated with the shared vision. Consequently, transparency in organizations is crucial in retaining the high- performance employees as well (Berggren & Bernshteyn, 2007). As a result, transparency is in relation with trust, creativity, engagement, productivity, performance and the success of the organizations. Accordingly, the relation between organizational transparency and employee performance behaviors were investigated and the hypothesis were set as below;

Hypothesis 2: *There is a positive relationship between organizational transparency and employee performance behaviors.*

Hypothesis 2_a: *There is a positive relationship between organizational transparency and in-role performance behaviors.*

Hypothesis 2_b: *There is a positive relationship between organizational transparency and extra-role performance behaviors.*

2.4. Leader-Member Exchange

Leader-member exchange (LMX) is another important antecedent. Today it is researched mainly with respect to its effects on individual and managerial success. LMX is based on the interpersonal relationship between employee and supervisor/leader. LMX focuses on different types of relationships developed between leaders and their subordinates/members. These relationships are characterized by physical/mental effort, material resources,

information and/or emotional support exchanged between the two parties, and the quality of these relationships determines the subordinate/member's responsibility level, access to resources, participation in decision making process and performance. (Liden, Sparrowe & Wayne, 1997).

The theoretical roots of the LMX depends on the reciprocity norm of Gouldner (1960), who defined reciprocity "as a mutually contingent exchange of benefits between two or more units". Accordingly, individuals should help and not injure the ones, who helped them resulting by a mutual obligation that the leader and the subordinate are in a relation of obligation in return to equal and fair behavior (Gouldner, 1960). The social exchange theory of Homans (1958) and Blau (1964) is important in understanding LMX. It explains exchange as a social behavior resulting by social and economic outcomes (Lambe, Wittmann & Spekman, 2001). Individuals enter to new relations while maintaining the current ones with the expectation that it will be rewarded, including not only by the economic terms as money, but also by social rewards like recognition, friendship, spiritual values and respect (Homans, 1958; Blau, 1964; Lambe, Wittmann & Spekman, 2001). Homans (1961) introduced the social behavior as a relation of exchange of activity, tangible or intangible, more or less rewarding or costly, resulting by social processes of mutual reinforcement (Cook & Rice, 2003) especially focusing on psychological behavior (Emerson, 1976). Blau (1964) first used the "Social Exchange Theory" term and considered the social exchange as social life's central point by emphasizing the "fairness" in relations between individuals and groups for the "proper" exchanges (Cook & Rice, 2003) by underlying the technical and economical examination of the social exchange (Emerson, 1976). Exchanges are based on trust and commitment, which shows the goodwill, so it will be reciprocated (Lambe, Wittmann & Spekman, 2001). According to Blau (1964) reciprocal exchange is anticipated for the continuity of the relationships. Social exchange theory interprets the relations between individuals like economic exchange in terms of cost-benefit analysis as individuals enter the relations only if they think that they will receive a reward (Bolat, Bolat & Seymen, 2009). At this point, in social exchange, there are no rules and agreements, so the reward is not guaranteed, but the "belief" of the response is the main decisive factor that shapes the relation (Bolat, Bolat & Seymen, 2009).

Social exchange theory focuses on the exchange, and in an organization the social exchange is existing between employers, employees, managers, suppliers, customers and unions (Bolat, Bolat & Seymen, 2009). Moreover, from the employee perspective, it is believed that positive effects of an organization motivate the employee to reciprocate these positive feelings. That kind of a reciprocal relation is also effective between an employee and the leader, in which social exchange theory is mostly used in explaining the effects of high LMX, as good relations create expectations (Rockstuhl et al., 2012, p.1097). The role theory of Katz and Kahn (1978) also highly contributes to LMX indicating that a leader has different roles in the interaction phases. It is expected from a leader to show different behaviors towards the subordinates.

The vertical dyad linkage theory of Dansereau, Graen and Haga (1975) also contributes to LMX. It focuses on the types of leader and subordinate relations. All the leadership theories like trait, behavioral, contingency and goal-path emphasized that leaders have an average perception about their subordinates (Liden & Graen, 1980) and shows the same type of leadership to all. The only theory against this assumption was the vertical dyad linkage theory. According to this theory, a leader is in contact with a group of subordinates, which can be classified as in-group and out-group. In-group members have more responsibilities by accessing to the resources and can express their ideas and opinions easier. In decision making process, in-group member's recommendations are taken into consideration by the leaders. In-group member relations can be recognized as "high quality exchanges" by high levels of trust and respect (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). On the contrary, the relations with out-group members are more formal and the opinions of this group are less considered by the leader. Out-group members have less access to the resources, which results by less responsibilities and obligations. Out-group member relations can be defined as "low-quality exchanges" by low levels of trust and respect (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Empirical research results implied that in-group relations are more essential in reaching desired results for leaders, work groups and the whole organization so it is indicated that leaders should focus on establishing in-group relationship (Winkler, 2010).

The dimensions of LMX were indicated as (i) contribution, (ii) loyalty, and (iii) affect (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). Later, Liden and Maslyn (1998) added one more dimension as (iv) professional respect. First, the contribution

dimension of LMX is the quality and quantity of work related activities for the common goals that are above the job description of the employee. Contribution depends on the willingness level of the employee and the resources/opportunities provided by the manager. Second, loyalty represents the support and the level of protection between the leader and the subordinate and has a critical role on the development of LMX. If the leader feels certain about the loyalty of the subordinate, then supports the subordinate in the long-term developments. Third, affect dimension is more about interpersonal attraction that derives from mutual affection and creates a friendly and warm atmosphere. It is a mutual liking that is expected in the development of LMX between the leader and the member (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). The final dimension is professional respect, related with the reputation of the leader's historical data, awards and/or professional recognition from in/outside of the organization (Liden & Maslyn, 1998).

Many researchers studied on the relation between LMX and the employee performance behaviors, because leader behaviors have a positive effect on the OCBs of employees (Podsakoff et al., 2000). An employee, who has a supportive leader shows more effort, which can be defined as OCB to help his/her manager through the norm of reciprocity (Podsakoff et al., 2000). LMX is in relation to in-role performance, which emphasizes the critical role of establishing a good relationship between the supervisor and the employee to increase the job performance (Wayne et al., 2002). Lonsdale (2016) implied that LMX had significant correlations with the OCBs both on individual and organizational level, thus under high LMX quality, higher in role and extra role performance behaviors are expected. When employees perceive a high quality LMX, they tend to help, spoke up and express their ideas more often (Dyne, Kamdar & Joireman, 2008). Law et al. (2009) indicated from their studies that LMX was in a positive relation between task performance, contextual performance and OCB. Consequently, LMX is in a positive relation with employee altruism and work performance (Loi et al., 2011). Accordingly, the third antecedent to be studied regarding to employee performance behaviors was determined as LMX in this study and the hypothesis were set as below;

***Hypothesis 3:** There is a positive relationship between leader member exchange and employee performance behaviors.*

***Hypothesis 3a:** There is a positive relationship between leader member exchange and in-role performance behaviors.*

***Hypothesis 3b:** There is a positive relationship between leader member exchange and extra-role performance behaviors.*

3. Methodology

3.1. Sample

The study was conducted in an international luxury hotel in Istanbul on a time interval between November 2016 and January 2017 by the participation of 221 employees and 21 supervisors. There were 306 employees in the hotel and the participation return rate of 79% was reached. All departments in the hotel did participate the surveys, including housekeeping, front office, food and beverage service, kitchen, engineering, security, sales and marketing, human resources and finance. 31.2% of the participants were women and 68.8% were men. The mean of participants' age was 35.5. There was a wide spread of graduation degrees of the participants as 16.7% from primary school, 33.5% from high school, 45.2% from university, 4.1% from master's degree and 0.5% PhD degree. 30.7% of the participants had a work experience of 5 years and below, 21.3% between 6 to 10 years, 27.6% had an experience of 11 to 16 years and 20.4% has an experience of 17 years. 61.5% of the participants had a company experience of 6 years and below, 17.7% between 6.5 to 15 years and 20.8% more than 16 years. Additionally, 56.1% of the participants had a position experience of 3 years and below, 20.4% between 3.5 to 8 years and 23.5% had a position experience of 9 years and above.

3.2. Procedure

The research was conducted based on quantitative method and the numerical data was collected by paper surveys. A cross-sectional field survey was conducted due to the nature of the research questions and hypothesis. To reflect the complex view of the field (Grayson et al., 2002), multiple source data collection method was used. The multiple source data collection method minimizes the single source method bias and skew, which may result from the responses from the same person to all the variables of the model (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Alvesson & Sköldbberg, 2009). The questionnaires of independent variables as psychological contract, organizational transparency and leader member exchange were answered by the employees, whereas the dependent variables, in-role and extra-role performance behaviors questionnaires were answered by their supervisors and managers. A detailed participant selection process was conducted as well. First, numbers were given to each defined employee name and the related questionnaire. Then, during the distribution phase, the managers were asked to give the numbered questionnaires to the defined employees as if it is a random distribution. Only the managers were informed about the distribution procedure that employees only realized a number on the questionnaire as 1, 2, 3, and so forth. So, no names were mentioned on the questionnaires and an anonymous perception was evoked. Consequently, the employees answered the questions in an open way, but researchers were able to match the questionnaires. At the same time, the supervisors and managers did answer the in-role and extra-role employee performance questionnaires with respect to employees' performances. After collecting the data from two different sources, the survey questionnaires were consolidated for the statistical analysis. The collection period of the data was approximately 70-75 days long.

3.3. Survey Instruments

In the study, seven different scales were used, and all the scale items of the study were rated on a 6-point Likert type scale ranging from "totally disagree" to "totally agree". The in-role performance behaviors of the employees were measured by 9 items. 6 of the items were from Goodman and Svyantek's (1999) "Job Performance Scale" that are related with task performance. Additionally, from Williams and Anderson's (1991) "Job Performance Scale", 3 questions were selected out of 7 items referring to the job descriptions and consistency dimensions of the in-role performance. The selection of these three questions were conducted by considering the service sector expectations from the employees and the dynamics of the sector. There is no single scale covering all related items. Thus, two different scales were combined.

In order to deliver a complete picture of the extra-role performance behaviors of the employees, a total of 19 items were selected from different resources again. This enabled the consideration of the service sector employee's daily operation and expected behaviors depending on the sample hotel's organizational culture. 8 items were selected by Tsui et al. (1997)'s "Citizenship Behavior Scale" out of 9 questions. 1 item is selected from Williams and Anderson's "Job Performance Scale" related with OCB towards individuals. 3 items were selected from Podsakoff et al.'s (1990) "OCB Scale" related with altruism and conscientiousness. Furthermore, 3 items from Goodman and Svyantek's (1999) "Job Performance Scale" were added for conscientiousness dimension and 4 items from Fahr et al.'s (1997) "Contextual Performance Scale" were selected to analyze the boosterism, altruism, conscientiousness and protecting company resources dimensions.

Raja and colleagues' (2004) "Psychological Contract Scale" was used to measure the psychological contract level of the employees, which has 18 items in total. Organizational transparency was measured by 19 items. 15 items were selected from Rawlins's (2006) "Organizational Transparency Scale". Rawlin's organizational transparency scale has 27 items consisting of overall transparency, participation, substantial information and accountability factors. Totally 4 items from overall transparency, 4 items from participation, 5 items from substantial information and 2 items from accountability were selected again considering the sample hotel's organizational dynamics and culture. Additionally, 4 items were added from Yılmaz's thesis (2012), that contributes to organizational transparency. In his study, after his research, Yılmaz (2012) defined the organizational transparency factor by the questions from Bromiley and Cummings's (1996) and Nyhan and Marlowe's (1997) Organizational Trust Inventories. Liden and

Maslyn's (1998) 12 item scale was used to assess the LMX that has four dimensions as loyalty, affect, contribution to the exchange and professional respect.

During the generation of the scales, as mentioned above, a consolidation was done depending on the sample hotel's culture and dynamics. Afterwards, a pilot study was completed in order to test the inter judge reliability of all the scales by calculating Cronbach 's α value. Total of 60 employees and 6 supervisors answered the questionnaires. According to the results of the exploratory factor analysis, all the scales had high internal consistency, which was shown by Cronbach α values. In-role and extra-role performance behavior scale's Cronbach α values were 0.956 and 0.909. As further, psychological contract scale, organizational transparency scale and leader-member exchange scales had 0.921, 0.965 and 0.938 Cronbach α values respectively. Moreover, all the scales' KMO and Barlett's test of sphericity scores were significant. Thus, none of the items were excluded from the scales according to the findings of the pilot study and the main study conducted by all the items.

4. Findings

4.1. Factor and reliability analysis of the scales

Exploratory Factor Analysis was applied to all scales by using Principal Component Method with varimax rotation. The mean scores and Cronbach α values of the scales were presented in Table 1. As seen from the results, all the scales had high mean scores and high internal reliability scores, which were represented by Cronbach α values.

Table 1

The Mean and Reliability Values of the Variables

Variables	N of Items	Mean	SD	α
In-Role Performance Behaviors	9	5.13	.743	.961
Extra-Role Performance Behaviors	19	5.28	.640	.956
Psychological Contract	18	5.43	.643	.935
Organizational Transparency	19	5.27	.772	.970
Leader-Member Exchange	12	5.53	.575	.932

The in-role performance behavior scale had one factor as one-dimensional construct and extra-role performance scale had three factors. In both scales, all the items had factor loadings of ≥ 0.50 so none of the items were excluded from the scales. Moreover, the KMO coefficient was .940 and .932 respectively to in-role and extra-role performance behaviors. The results of Bartlett 's test of sphericity was also significant at ≤ 0.05 in both scales. The factor analysis results of in-role and extra-role performance behavior scales are presented in Table 2 and 3.

Table 2

Factor Analysis Results of In-Role Performance Behavior Scale

Item No.	In-Role Performance Behavior Factors	% Variance Explained	Factor Loading	Cronbach α
	<i>Factor I: In-Role Performance Behavior</i>	76.589		0.961
1	Achieves the objectives of the job		0.859	
2	Meets criteria for performance		0.895	
3	Demonstrates expertise in all job-related tasks		0.852	
4	Is competent in all areas of the job, handles tasks with proficiency		0.883	
5	Performs well in the overall job by carrying out tasks as expected		0.904	
6	Plans and organizes to achieve objectives of the job and meet deadlines		0.845	
7	Fulfills responsibilities specified in the job description.		0.895	
8	Performs tasks that are expected of him or her.		0.857	
9	Consistently performs work tasks in a high- quality manner.		0.884	

KMO=0.940 Chi-Square Bartlett's Test= 2057.663 P=0.000

Table 3
Factor Analysis Results of Extra-Role Performance Behavior Scale

Item No.	Extra-Role Performance Behavior Factors	% Variance Explained	Factor Loading	Cronbach α
	<i>Factor I: Organizational Improvement</i>	30.156		0.934
4	Makes suggestions to improve organization		0.865	
1	Makes suggestions to improve work procedures		0.845	
6	Makes innovative suggestions to improve department		0.824	
8	Suggests revisions in work to achieve organizational or departmental objectives		0.753	
7	Informs management of potentially unproductive policies and practices		0.724	
3	Does not keep doubts about a work issue to him/herself, even when everyone else disagrees		0.707	
2	Expresses opinions honestly when others think differently		0.702	
5	Calls management attention to dysfunctional activities		0.671	
	<i>Factor II: Conscientiousness</i>	23.875		0.927
15	Gives notice if unable to come to work		0.898	
19	Views sick leave as benefit and makes excuse for taking sick leave(R)		0.852	
16	Willing to stand up to protect the reputation of the company		0.810	
14	Takes undeserved work breaks (R)		0.773	
13	Exhibits punctuality arriving at work on time in the morning and after lunch breaks		0.691	
12	Obeys company rules and regulations even when no one is watching		0.572	
	<i>Factor III: Altruism</i>	21.419		0.940
11	Is always ready to lend a helping hand to those around him/her		0.820	
9	Helps others who have heavy work load.		0.791	
10	Helps orient new people even though it is not required		0.749	
17	Willing to help colleagues solve work-related problems		0.703	
18	Tries hard to self-study to increase the quality of work outputs		0.617	
KMO=0.932 Chi-Square Bartlett's Test= 4126.154 P=0.000		75.450		0.956

In psychological contract scale, questions number 9 and 8 were excluded from the scale after factor analysis due to the low factor loadings less than 0.50. This resulted in an updated Cronbach α value of the three-factorial psychological contract scale as .935. KMO coefficient was .908, which is on a significant level and Bartlett 's test of sphericity was also significant as ≤ 0.05 . The results were presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Factor Analysis Results of Psychological Contract Scale

Item No.	Psychological Contract Factors	% Variance Explained	Factor Loading	Cronbach α
	<i>Factor I: Transactional Contract</i>	30.698		0.922
3	My loyalty to the organization is contract specific		0.827	
2	My commitment to this organization is defined by my contract		0.791	
5	I only carry out what is necessary to get the job done		0.790	
1	I work only the hours set out in my contract and no more		0.741	
4	I prefer to work a strictly defined set of working hours		0.731	
6	I do not identify with the organization's goals		0.676	
7	I work to achieve the purely short-term goals of my job		0.642	
18	I am motivated to contribute 100% to this company in return for future employment benefits		0.518	
	<i>Factor II: Relational Contract</i>	24.332		0.874
14	The organization develops/rewards employees who work hard and exert themselves		0.881	
16	I feel this company reciprocates the effort put in by its employees		0.776	
12	I have a reasonable chance of promotion if I work hard		0.764	
11	I feel part of a team in this organization		0.704	
13	To me working for this organization is like being a member of a family		0.648	
	<i>Factor III: Career Expectations</i>	15.030		0.775
15	I expect to gain promotion in this company with length of service and effort to achieve goals		0.800	
10	I expect to grow in this organization		0.738	
17	My career path in the organization is clearly mapped out		0.623	
	KMO=0.908 Chi-Square Bartlett's Test= 2612.672 P=0.000	70.060		0.935

Organizational transparency scale had two factors and all the items had factor loadings of ≥ 0.50 so none of the items were excluded from the scale. The KMO coefficient was .955, which was on a significant level and Bartlett's test of sphericity was lower than 0.05, which also represents a significant level. The results were presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Factor Analysis Results of Organizational Transparency Scale

Item No.	Organizational Transparency Factors	% Variance Explained	Factor Loading	Cronbach α
	<i>Factor I: Transparency</i>	39.283		0.958
6	The organization provides information that is useful to people like me for making informed decisions.		0.812	
7	The organization wants to be accountable to people like me for its actions.		0.803	
3	My organization's policies and regulations are clearly communicated to us.		0.802	
8	The organization wants people like me to know what it is doing and why it is doing it.		0.789	
2	In my organization, usually everything is executed in an open way, there is no hidden applications, except for special business-related topics		0.752	
5	The organization wants to understand how its decisions affect people like me.		0.746	
1	In my organization, information is transferred to us in a complete and accurate way.		0.707	
15	Provides information that is complete.		0.679	
10	Provides detailed information to people like me.		0.658	
16	Provides information that is reliable		0.657	
	<i>Factor II: Accountability</i>	34.184		0.942
11	Asks the opinions of people like me before making decisions.		0.824	
12	Takes the time with people like me to understand who we are and what we need.		0.822	
17	Is open to criticism by people like me.		0.811	
18	Freely admits when it has made mistakes.		0.773	
14	Provides information that can be compared to previous performance.		0.682	
13	Provides information in a timely fashion to people like me.		0.677	
4	In my organization, performance appraisals are executed by an objective approach.		0.636	
9	Involves people like me to help identify the information I need.		0.586	
	KMO=0.955 Chi-Square Bartlett's Test= 4061.763 P=0.000	73.467		0.970

According to our study's factor analysis results, LMX scale had two factors. All the items had factor loadings of ≥ 0.50 . KMO coefficient was .891, which was on a significant level and Bartlett's test of sphericity was also significant as presented in Table 6. Moreover, the first factors of all the scales explained more than 30% of the total variance, which shows the representative ability so in the further statistical analysis, the scales were conducted as a total construct (Büyüköztürk, 2007:125; Çokluk, Şekercioğlu & Büyüköztürk, 2016: 227).

Table 6
Factor Analysis Results of LMX Scale

Item No.	Leader - Member Exchange Factors	% Variance Explained	Factor Loading	Cronbach α
	<i>Factor I: Professional Respect, Affect, Contribution to the Exchange</i>	50.275		0.948
12	I am impressed with my manager's knowledge of his/her job.		0.880	
10	I respect my manager's knowledge of and competence on the job.		0.852	
11	I admire my manager's professional skills		0.846	
5	I like my manager very much as a person.		0.824	
7	I provide support and resources for my subordinate that goes beyond what is specified in my job description.		0.767	
6	My manager is the kind of person one would like to have as a friend.		0.758	
8	I am willing to apply extra efforts, beyond those normally required, to meet my manager's work goals.		0.753	
9	I do not mind working my hardest for my manager.		0.730	
4	My manager is a lot of fun to work with.		0.695	
	<i>Factor II: Loyalty and Concern</i>	21.384		0.710
3	My manager defends (would defend) my work actions to a superior, even without complete knowledge of the issue in question.		0.819	
1	My manager would defend me to others in the organization if I made an honest mistake.		0.744	
2	My manager would come to my defense if I were "attacked" by others.		0.705	
	KMO=0.891 Chi-Square Bartlett's Test= 2365.722 P=0.000	71.659		0.932

4.2. Descriptive statistics and correlations among study variables

After completing the factor analysis results, the correlation analysis was applied by Pearson Correlation test to find out the level of relations between all the dependent and independent variables of the study (see Table 7).

Table 7.
Correlation Results of the Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1 Psychological Contract	1	.604**	.711**	.169*	.320**
2 Leader - Member Exchange	.604**	1	.649**	.157*	.236**
3 Organizational Transparency	.711**	.649**	1	.151*	.210**
4 In-Role Performance Behaviors	.169*	.157*	.151*	1	.775**
5 Extra-Role Performance Behaviors	.320**	.236**	.210**	.775**	1

N=221, ** p< .001; * p< .005, (2-tailed)

When we summarize the findings regarding the hypothesis of the study;

- positive relations were found between psychological contract and in-role and extra-role employee performance behaviors, which supported the Hypothesis 1a and Hypothesis 1b of the study ($r=0.169$; $p<.005$ and $r=0.320$; $p<.001$).
- positive relations were found between organizational transparency and in-role and extra-role employee performance behaviors, which supported the Hypothesis 2a and Hypothesis 2b of the study ($r=0.151$; $p<.005$ and $r=0.210$; $p<.001$).
- positive relations were found between LMX and in-role and extra-role employee performance behaviors, which supported the Hypothesis 3a and Hypothesis 3b of the study ($r=0.157$; $p<.005$ and $r=0.236$; $p<.001$).

Then correlations between variables were investigated for potential multicollinearities. Hair et.al (2010, p.197; 214) concluded that "the presence of high correlations as .90 or higher is the first indication of substantial collinearity" and suggested the Variance Inflation Factor Value (VIF) cut off point as 10.0. Here, no multicollinearity problem was

observed as Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r) results were lower than .90 between the variables with a VIF value of less than 2.8. The correlations between the variables were lower than .90 and the VIF values were less than 2.8 that linear regression was conducted rather than the multiple regression analysis due to relatively high Pearson Correlation Coefficients between the variables.

4.3. Regression analysis among the dependent and independent variables

In the study, linear regression analysis was also conducted to find out the amount of change in the dependent variable due to the independent variable. Each independent (psychological contract, organizational transparency, leader-member exchange) and dependent variables (in-role and extra-role employee performance behaviors) were conducted into the linear regression analysis to explain the contributions of independent variable on the dependent variable (Hair et al., 2010).

The results of the linear regression analysis about the contribution of psychological contract on in-role employee performance behaviors concluded that, psychological contract explained 3% of the total variance in the in-role employee performance behaviors ($F=6.448$; $p<0.05$). The R Square was 0.029 and the F was 6.448 with a significance level of 0.012. The results confirmed Hypothesis H1a. The results about the contribution of psychological contract on extra-role employee performance behaviors concluded that, psychological contract explained 10% of the total variance in the extra-role employee performance behaviors ($F=25.019$; $p<0.05$). The R Square was 0.103 and the F was 25.019 with a significance level of 0.000. The results confirmed Hypothesis H1b.

Moreover, according to the linear regression results, organizational transparency explained 2% of the total variance in the in-role employee performance behaviors ($F=5.108$; $p<0.05$). The R Square was 0.023 and the F was 5.108 with a significance level of 0.025. The results confirmed Hypothesis H2a. Additionally, psychological contract explained 4% of the total variance in the extra-role employee performance behaviors ($F=10.082$; $p<0.05$). The R Square was 0.044 and the F was 10.082 with a significance level of 0.002. The results also confirmed Hypothesis H2b.

Finally, according to the linear regression results, the leader-member exchange explained 3% of the total variance in the in- role employee performance behaviors ($F=5.566$; $p<0.05$). The R Square was 0.025 and the F was 5.566 with a significance level of 0.019. The results confirmed Hypothesis H3a. The leader-member exchange explained 6% of the total variance in the extra-role employee performance behaviors ($F=12.888$; $p<0.05$). The R Square was 0.056 and the F was 12.888 with a significance level of 0.000. The results confirmed Hypothesis H3b.

5. Discussions

The aim of the study is to investigate the employee performance behaviors of the employees in the hospitality sector to find out the relations between psychological contract, organizational transparency and LMX with employee performance behaviors. It should be underlined that multiple source data collection approach was utilized in the survey. Consequently, two different data sources were used for collecting the data: While in-role and extra-role employee performance behavior scales were filled by supervisors and managers, all the other scales including psychological contract, organizational transparency and LMX were filled by the subordinates. This simply minimizes the single source bias and enhances the quality of the data. Consequently, this multiple source data collection method delivered a major contribution to the literature, especially for the hospitality sector studies in Turkey.

The first finding related with the hypothesis of the study was that the relation between psychological contract and the in-role performance behaviors of the employees was positive. The mean scores of psychological contracts scale was 5.43, which represented the high psychological contract levels of the employees. Additionally, a positive weak relation was found between psychological contract and in-role performance behaviors of the employees ($r=0.169$; $p<.005$) as well, emphasizing that in-role performance behaviors of the employees increases, when they have higher psychological contract levels. The psychological contract explained 3% of the total variance in the in- role performance behaviors of the employees ($F=6.448$; $p<0.05$), which reflects the significant and positive contribution of psychological contract on in-role employee performance. Thus, the results supported H1a.

Consequently, these findings were in line with the literature review as in Turnley et al. (2003), also confirmed the relation of psychological contract fulfillment and in-role performance behaviors in a study. Additionally, Lu et al.'s (2016) findings in the tourism sector were confirmed, that relational contract of the employees has a positive relation with service oriented in-role performance behaviors. Another finding of the study was that there is a positive relation between psychological contract and extra-role performance behaviors of the employees, where a moderate positive correlation of ($r=0.320$; $p<.001$) was found. According to the linear regression analysis, the contribution of psychological contract on extra-role employee performance was significant and psychological contract explained 10% of the total variance in the extra-role employee performance behaviors ($F=25.019$; $p<.05$). Consequently, the results of the study supported H1b. This also confirms the studies of Li (2014) and Lu et al. (2016) in the tourism sector in Taiwan and Philippines.

Hypothesis H2a and H2b regarding the relation between organizational transparency and in-role and extra-role performance behaviors of the employees were represented in this study with a weak positive correlation for in-role ($r=0.151$; $p<.005$) and for extra-role ($r=0.210$; $p<.001$) performance behaviors. Furthermore, the statistical results revealed that the contribution of organizational transparency both on in-role and extra-role employee performance behaviors were significant. The organizational transparency explained 2% of the total variance in the in-role employee performance behaviors ($F=5.108$; $p<.05$) and 4% of the total variance in the extra-role employee performance behaviors ($F=10.082$; $p<.05$). In the study, organizational transparency mean score was found as 5.27, which reflects the high transparent culture of the organization. As a result, it can be stated that transparency in an organization increases the in-role and extra-role performance of the employees. Again, the findings of the study were in-line with Fung (2014), mentioning that a transparent management leads the trust, which according to Korsgaard, Brodt and Whitener (2002) leads to OCB. Palanski, Kahai and Yammarino (2011) also confirmed that the transparency in the teams has a positive relation with team integrity that enables the trust and in turn affecting the team performance positively. Furthermore, by the balance of transparency and privacy, employees share their opinions openly and feel accountable, and the performance increases (Bernstein, 2014).

In the study, Hypothesis H3a and H3b were also supported, as positive relations were found between LMX and in-role and extra-role employee performance behaviors of the employees ($r=0.157$; $p<.005$ and $r=0.236$; $p<.001$). The linear regression results also conducted that leader-member exchange explained 3% of the total variance in the in-role employee performance behaviors ($F=5.566$; $p<.05$) and 6% of the total variance in the extra-role employee performance behaviors ($F=12.888$; $p<.05$). The mean score of LMX scale was 5.53, remarking the high level of supervisor and subordinate relations. The results emphasized the importance of LMX in the organizations as it was confirmed that, the in-role and extra-role performance behaviors of the employees increases when high level LMX with supervisors. This was in-line with Wayne et al., (2002) and Lonsdale (2016), Trybou et al. (2013), Loi et al., (2011) and especially in Turkey with Ürek (2015) and Çetin et al., (2012).

All in one, the relations of psychological contract, organizational transparency and LMX are higher with extra-role performance behaviors of the employees, when compared with in-role performance behaviors. It can be concluded that the employees have a perception that task related jobs, which directs to in-role performance behaviors, are the ones that should be followed up and completed in any case. However, for an employee in the hotel, showing an extra-role performance behavior was much more related with having a high level of psychological contract with the organization, high transparency level of the organization and the quality of LMX with their supervisors.

6. Conclusion

Researchers in organizational behavior are working on models to maximize organizational performance, which is contributing further to the aggregated success of organizations. Personal contributions of the individuals are key for organizational success, and thus the behavioral patterns are an important focal point of organizational research. Within that context, employee performance behaviors are grouped mainly in in-role and extra-role behaviors, which

are studied extensively in recent literature as well. Especially service industry and particularly hospitality sector emerge in this research due to the dominant impacts of these behaviors on individual, managerial and organizational results. From practical point of view, it is also essentially critical for the managers to find out the ways to increase the performance behaviors of their employees. Consequently, the antecedents of the in-role and extra-role performance behaviors were studied here by focusing on dimensions of the psychological contract, organizational transparency and LMX within the hospitality sector.

Data was gathered from an established international luxury hotel in Istanbul, Turkey. There are two specific reasons for this sample. First there was no similar study in the hospitality sector, including a comprehensive model. Second, the study did also emerge from the need to improve performance of the hospitality business, which is one of the major driving forces of the economy in large cities. Consequently, the hotel management of the sample did support this research extensively and to our best knowledge the multiple source data collection method data was applied for the first time in the Turkish hospitality sector. This support was an enabler and maybe the reason why it was done for the first time, since this method requires intensive time and effort, but delivers better results. According to these results of the analysis, significant positive relationships were found between psychological contract, organizational transparency, LMX and in-role and extra-role employee performance behaviors.

When looking on the scales, there are also several findings. First, the factor analysis results of the psychological contract scale are an important contribution for the hospitality sector studies, since instead of the classical two factorial approach of the literature, the items were classified statistically under three factors, one of which consolidated all career related items. The fact that the items related with career expectations of the employees were loaded under this third factor, indicates also the importance of career expectations for the employees. This result could be considered under academic implications for the further studies as well. Second, the organizational transparency is one of the dimensions, which was not studied well in the hospitality sector. Therefore, the high scores of organizational transparency scale and the significant relations between in-role and extra-role performance scores emphasized the importance of transparency in the hotels, underlining an academic and managerial implication of this research.

Outcomes of this research also constitute major managerial implications: First, the research demonstrated that career expectations play a critical role on the psychological contract levels of the employees. Consequently, the hotel management should focus on career development for the employees. Especially, internal transfers and promotions, cross training opportunities between departments and abroad employment possibilities should be provided by the management. Then, it is revealed from the study that the valued and respected relationships between the employee and the supervisor/manager have a direct effect on the in-role and extra-role performance behaviors. Thus, one important duty of the upper management could be defined as building close personal relationships with the employees. Besides, this sincere relationship could be developed by clear recognition and rewarding mechanisms for the further sustainability. Furthermore, the research results emphasized the importance of transparency in the organizations. Since transparent work environment increases the in-role and extra-role performance behaviors of the employees, managers should be open in communication by telling the truth and explaining the reasons of their decisions. Consequently, the feedbacks shall be given in a proper way by also asking the opinions of the employees that the culture of the organization can be developed in a transparent manner. Finally, the extra-role employee performance behaviors should be recognized and integrated into the performance appraisal systems combined by a fair rewarding policy, which further could increase the organizational performance.

7. Suggestions

The first limitation is related to the sectoral scope of the context. This study was conducted in a single hotel sample located in Istanbul/Turkey, which is a very mature organization. Therefore, the findings should not be generalized to the whole Turkish hospitality sector, particularly to (i) new established hotels with their different organizational structure due to the building relationships of new hired employees, and to (ii) resort hotels in the southern part of

Turkey with a seasonal operation frequency. Then, the sample hotel is part of an international chain. International chains do have standardized management systems and they have a high reputation for being a good and secure working environment with high career development potential. To sustain this reputation, such organizations emphasize also long-term commitments. In addition, the sample hotel does operate for a very long time, and this royalty further contributes to the safe environment. It shall be emphasized that therefore the holiday resort business is totally out of scope. Resort hotels do have a high turnover due to the closing season in the winter and the profile of the employees are different than city hotels. This work is focused on city hotels.

Furthermore, the interaction of the local content could be investigated, since different cultures and different behaviors are to be expected in distinct locations. A comprehensive study looking at different locations could lead to whether or not there is a difference in major cities. This would contribute to the research of local micro cultural interactions with the behavioral patterns. Also, other hospitality related businesses such as restaurants, spas or sport clubs could be looked at, since the core business of them are similar to the business of hotels. Such a wide coverage would also increase the sample size. Additionally, the time horizon could be incorporated into the future research, where several organizational phases over time within larger samples could indicate the development of these behavioral patterns. Since the study was conducted by the data collected by cross sectional surveys, in which the interactions and changes between the variables were not measured and observed over periods. Thus, future researchers could design a longitudinal research study testing such relations over time.

Finally, quantitative research method was used in the study. When qualitative data research could be incorporated, the combination of these two different methods would result in a mixed method, enabling the researcher to evaluate the quality of the dimensions derived from the literature. This potentially could also lead to specific dimensions for hospitality sector as well, since mixed methods deliver more accurate and integrated information on a broader perspective (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). The multiple source data collection method used here is highly recommended to researchers, since this also would deliver comparable results for the hospitality sector studies.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, A., & Bhargava, S. (2013). Effects of psychological contract breach on organizational outcomes: Moderating role of tenure and educational levels. *The Journal for Decision Makers Vikalpa*, 38 (1), 13-27.
- Alvesson, M., & Sköldböck, K. (2009). *Reflexive methodology. New vistas for qualitative research*. 2nd Edition. Sage Publications.
- Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S.H., & Corley, K.G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 325-374.
- Baltzley, D., & Lawrence, J. (2016). Candor and transparency in the service of purpose. *People + Strategy*, 39(4), 21.
- Bateman, T. S., & D. W. Organ (1983). Job Satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587 - 595.
- Becker, T. E., & M. C. Kernan. (2003). Matching commitment to supervisors and organizations to in- role and extra-role performance. *Human Performance*, 16(4), 327-348.
- Bennis, W., & O'Toole, J. (2009). *A Culture of Candor*, Harvard Business Review.
- Berggren, E., & Bernshteyn, R. (2007). Organizational transparency drives company Performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 26 (5), 411-417.
- Bernstein, E. (2014). The Transparency Trap. *Harvard Business Review*. October Issue.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley.
- Bolat, O., Bolat, T., & Seymen, O. (2009). Güçlendirici Lider Davranışları ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Arasındaki İlişkinin Sosyal Mübadele Kuramından Hareketle İncelenmesi. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 12 (21), 215-239.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10, 99-109.
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial Organizational Behaviors. *The Academy of Management Review*, 11 (4), 710-725.
- Büyükoztürk, Ş. (2007). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı (İstatistik, araştırma deseni, SPSS uygulamaları ve yorum)*, 8. Baskı, Pegem Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Cihangiroğlu, N., & Şahin, N. (2010). Organizasyonlarda önemli bir fenomen: Psikolojik sözleşme. *ZKÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6 (11), 1-16.
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter J. E. (2011). *Work Engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations*

- with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 89-136.
- Cook, K. S., & Rice, E. (2003). Social exchange theory. In J. Delamater (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology* (pp.53-76). New York, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Colquitt, J., Le Pine, J., & Wesson, M. (2010). *Organizational Behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the workplace*, McGraw-Hill Education.
- Çetin, Korkmaz, M., & Cakmakçı, C. (2012). Dönüşümsel ve etkilesimsel liderlik ile lider-üye etkileşiminin öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı üzerindeki etkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 18(1), 7-36.
- Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G., & Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2016). Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organisations. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
- Demirkasimoğlu, N. (2014). Teachers' psychological contract perceptions and person-environment fit levels. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 56, 45-68.
- Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), 618-634.
- Dyne, L. V., Kamdar, D., & Joireman, J. (2008). In-role perceptions buffer the negative impact of low LMX on helping and enhance the positive impact of high LMX on voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93 (6), 1195-1207.
- Eldor, L., & Harpaz, I. (2016). A process model of employee engagement: The learning climate and its relationship with extra-role performance behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(2), 213 -235.
- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social Exchange Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 335-362.
- Fahr, J., Earley, P. C., & Lin, S. (1997). Impetus for action: A cultural analysis of justice and organizational citizenship behavior in chinese society. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 421-444.
- Fung, B. (2014). The demand and need for transparency and disclosure in corporate governance. *Universal Journal of Management* 2(2), 72-80. Retrieved from <http://www.hrpub.org> DOI: 10.13189/ujm.2014.020203 (January 30, 2017).
- Goodman, S., & Svyantek, D. (1999). Person-organization fit and contextual performance: Do shared values matter. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55, 254 -275.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly* 6 (2), 219-247.
- Grayson N. H., Li. S. T., Schurman, J. V., Friedman, D., & Coakley, R. M. (2002). Collecting and managing multisource and multimethod data in studies of pediatric populations. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 27, (1),1, 5-18.
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S.G. (2012). Transparency and trust. An experimental study of on line disclosure and trust in government. Dissertation, Utrecht University.
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S.G., & Meijer, A.J. (2014). The effects of transparency on the perceived trustworthiness of a government organization: Evidence from an on-line experiment. *Journal of Public Administration Theory and Research* 24(1), 137-157.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E., & Tatham, R.L. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis*. 7th Ed., USA: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63 (6), 597-606.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 692-724.
- Kanten, P. (2014). Effect of quality of work life on proactive and prosocial organizational behaviors: A research on health sector employees. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19 (1), 251-274.
- Kaptein, M. (2008). Developing and testing a measure for the ethical culture of organizations: The corporate ethical virtues model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 923-947.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131-146.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Katz, D., & R.L. Kahn. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. 2nd Edition. USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Korsgaard, M. A., Brodt, S. E., & Whitener, E. M. (2002). Trust in the face of conflict: The role of managerial trustworthy behavior and organizational context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 312-319.
- Lambe, C. J., Wittmann, C. M., & Spekman, R. E. (2001). Social exchange theory and research on business-to business relational exchange. *Journal of Business to Business Marketing*, 8(3), 1-36.
- Law, K. S., Wang, H., & Hui, C. (2009). Currencies of exchange and global LMX: How they Affect Employee Task Performance and Extra-Role Performance. *Asia Pacific Journal Management*, 27, 625-646.
- Li, Y. (2014). A study on the correlations among psychological contract, organizational citizenship behavior, and performance in the hotel industry. Published by: Expert Projects Publishing House, 250 - 260.
- Liden, R.C., & G. Graen. (1980). Generalizability of the Vertical Dyad Linkage model of leadership, *Academy of Management Journal*, 23(3), 451-465.
- Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader - Member Exchange Theory: The past and potential for the future. *Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 15, 47-119.
- Liden, R. C., & Maslyn, J. M. (1998). Multi- dimensionality of LMX: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, 24, 43-72.
- Loi, R., Ngo, H., Zhang, L., & Lau, V. P. (2011). The interaction between leader-member exchange and perceived job security in predicting employee altruism and work performance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84(4), 669-685.
- Lonsdale, D. J. (2016). The effects of leader-member exchange and the feedback environment on organizational citizenship and withdrawal. *The Psychologist Manager Journal*, 19(1), 41-59.
- Lu, V. N., Capezio, A., Restubog, S. L. D., Garcia, P. R. J. M., & Wang, L. (2016). In pursuit of service excellence: Investigating the

- role of psychological contracts and organizational identification of frontline hotel employees. *Tourism Management* 56, 8-19.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Ahearne, M. (1998). Some possible antecedents and consequences of in-role and extra-role salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 62, 87-98.
- Mathews, V.E. (2000). Competition in the international hotel industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 12(2), 114-118.
- Motowidlo, S. J. (2003). Job performance. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen., & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*, (12) 39-53. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Özgen, H. M., & Özgen, M. (2010). Psikolojik sözleşme ve boyutlarının iş tatmini, örgütsel bağlılık ve işten ayrılma niyetine etkileri: Tıbbi satış temsilcileri üzerinde bir araştırma. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 19(1), 1-19.
- Palanski, M. E., Kahai, S. S., & Yammarino, F. J. (2011). Team virtues and performance: An examination of transparency, behavioral integrity and trust. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99(2), 201-216.
- Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational Leader Behaviors on Their Effect on Followers' Trust in Leader, Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine J. B., & Bachrach D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
- Raja, U., G. Johns., & F. Ntalianis. (2004). The impact of personality on psychological contract. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 350-367.
- Rawlins, B. (2006, November). Give the emperor a mirror: Toward developing a stakeholder measurement of organizational transparency. Paper presented at Educators Academy, Public Relations Society of America International Conference, Salt Lake City, UT.
- Rawlins, B. L. (2008). Measuring the relationship between organizational transparency and employee trust. *Public Relations Journal*, 2(2).
- Robinson, S. L., Kraatz, M. S., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Changing obligations and the psychological contract: A longitudinal study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(1), 137-152.
- Rockstuhl, T., Ang, S., Dulebohn, J. H., & Shore, L. M. (2012). Leader-member exchange (LMX) and culture: A meta-analysis of correlates of LMX across 23 Countries. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(6), 1097-1130.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2, 121-139.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Sage Publications.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2001). Schema, promises, and mutuality: The psychology of the psychological contract. *Journal of Organisational and Occupational Psychology*, 24, 511-541.
- Sam, A., & Anitha, K. (2014). A conceptual study on impact of psychological contract on work-life integration. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 2(4), 1058-1062.
- Schnackenberg, A. K., & Tomlinson, E. C. (2016). Organizational transparency: A new perspective on managing trust in organization-stakeholder relationships. *Journal of Management*, 42(7), 1784-1810.
- Taştan, B. S. (2011). The mediating role of psychological empowerment on the relationship between participative organizational climate, self efficacy and individual performance behaviors. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Marmara University, Istanbul.
- Transparency. BusinessDictionary.com. Retrieved from <http://www.BusinessDictionary.com> website: businessdictionary.com/definition/transparency.html (February 01, 2017).
- Trybou, J., Gemmel, P., Pauwels, Y., Henninck, C., & Clays, E. (2013). The impact of organizational support and leader-member exchange on the work-related behaviour of nursing professionals: The moderating effect of professional and organizational identification. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 70(2), 373-382.
- Tsui, A.; Pearce, J.L.; Porter, L. W., & Tripoli, A. M. (1997). Alternative approaches to the employee-organization relationship: Does investment in employees pay off? *Academy of Management Journal*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(5), 1089-1121.
- Turnley, W. H., Bolino, M. C., Lester, S. W., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2003). The impact of psychological contract fulfillment on the performance of in-role and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*. 29(2), 187-206.
- Uen, J., Chien, M. S., & Yen, Y. (2009). The mediating effects of psychological contracts on the relationship between human resource systems and role behaviors: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 24, 215-223.
- Ürek, D., & Uğurluoğlu, Ö. (2015). Sağlık çalışanlarının lider-üye etkileşim düzeylerinin çeşitli özellikler açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Sosyoekonomi*, 23(25), 7-30.
- Vandaele, D., & Gemmel, P. (2006). Performance implications of in-role and extra-role behavior of frontline service employees. *Working Papers of Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Ghent University*, 411,1-35.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., Bommer, W. H., & Tetrick, L. E. (2002). The Role of fair treatment and rewards in perceptions of organizational support and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 590-598.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617.
- Wright, P. M., & Boswell, W. R. (2002). Desegregating HRM: A review and synthesis of micro and macro human resource management research. *Journal of Management*, 28, 247-276.
- Yılmaz, A. (2012). Psikolojik sözleşme ve örgütsel güven arasındaki ilişkinin analizi: Teorik ve uygulamalı bir çalışma. Selçuk Üniversitesi Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
- Zhao, H., Wayne, S. J., Glibkowski, B. C., & Bravo, J. (2007). The impact of psychological contract breach on work-related outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 1(60), 647-680.
- Zhu, Y. (2013). Individual Behavior: In-role and extra-role. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 4(1), 23-27.

Ziegler, R., & Schlett, C. (2016). An attitude strength and self-perception framework regarding the bi-directional relationship of job satisfaction with extra-role and in-role behavior: The doubly moderating role of work centrality. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7*(235), 1-17.

How to Cite This Article:

Üçler, Ç., Taştan, S.B. (2017) Investigating the Relations of Psychological Contract, Organizational Transparency and Leader-Member Exchange with Employee Performance Behaviors. *of Behavior at Work (JB@W), 2*(2), 89-107.