

**PERCEIVED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PSYCHOLOGICAL
CONTRACT AND EMPLOYEE TURNOVER AT BARCLAYS BANK
OF KENYA**

LINET KHADENJE ANYIKA

**A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE MASTER OF
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DEGREE, UNIVERSITY OF
NAIROBI**

NOVEMBER 2012

DECLARATION

This research project is my original work and has not been submitted for a degree in any other university.

Signature 

Date: 27/11/2012

LINET KHADENJE ANYIKA
D61/9032/2006

This project has been submitted with my approval as a University of Nairobi supervisor.

Signature 

Date: 27.11.12

GEORGE OMONDI
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

DEDICATION

This project paper is dedicated to my sister Loice Anyika.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I thank God for giving me the wisdom and courage and for guiding me throughout my life for without Him I would not have come this far.

Secondly, special thanks go to my supervisor, Duncan Ochoro, for providing unlimited, invaluable and active guidance throughout the study. His immense command and knowledge of the subject matter enabled me to shape this research project to the product that it is now.

Thirdly, I also thank my family for letting me use their valuable time to work on this project. Finally, I owe my gratitude to a number of people who in one way or another contributed towards completion of this project especially my fellow colleagues at work and students.

ABSTRACT

Every organisation recognises the importance of its key asset, its employees. In view of this, organisations seek to maintain a low turnover rate by reducing undesired voluntary turnover especially at senior management levels and in critical roles. Central to this is the establishment of linkages between the factors that influence employee turnover and thereafter employing the appropriate retention strategies. Many organisations make these linkages by employing the use of employee opinion surveys, dipstick surveys, focus groups, forums and exit interviews.

This study was a descriptive survey within Barclays Bank of Kenya. The population of this study comprised of all employees in Barclays Bank of Kenya, Head Office whose number was 3,103. A sample of 363 respondents was selected for the study who were drawn from all the Head Office departments in Nairobi, which are twelve in number namely: Barclays Business Support, Compliance, Consumer Credit, Corporate Affairs, Corporate Banking, Corporate Credit Risk, Finance, Human Resources, Legal, Managing Director's Office, Operational Risk and Control Rigour and Treasury. This comprises 12% of the entire population of study. The study employed the use of primary data collected through the use of a structured questionnaire. The collected data was analyzed using correlation analysis and presented in tables.

The study found that majority of employees at Barclays Bank of Kenya were dissatisfied with the current state of their psychological contract. Majority felt the bank had failed to honour its side of the contract leading to employees losing trust in the bank's management. Most employees felt dissatisfied with working at the institution with some saying they would want to leave for other institutions. The study showed that most employees at Barclays Bank of Kenya do not have the intention of leaving the bank with an overall score of 60% either strongly agreeing or disagreeing that they wanted to leave the organization. The study concludes that while psychological contract influences employee turnover, it may not be the sole contributor to employee turnover at the bank.

The study recommends that the Bank's management needs to understand what is triggering perceptions of breaches and violations in psychological contract on the part of its employees.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION.....	2
DEDICATION.....	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	4
ABSTRACT.....	5
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	8
1.1 Background of the study.....	8
1.1.1 Concept of perception.....	9
1.1.2 Concept of employee turnover.....	10
1.1.3 Concept of psychological contract.....	10
1.1.4 Barclays Bank of Kenya Ltd.....	12
1.2 Statement of the problem.....	13
1.3 Research objective.....	15
1.4 Value of the study.....	15
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	17
2.1 Employee turnover.....	17
2.1.1 Factors influencing employee turnover.....	19
2.2 Psychological contract.....	19
2.3 Employee turnover and psychological contract.....	22
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	26
3.1 Research design.....	26
3.2 Population of study.....	26
3.3 Sample.....	26
3.4 Data collection.....	26
3.5 Data analysis.....	26
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	28
4.1 Demographic data.....	28
4.1.1 Gender.....	28
4.1.2 Respondents designation.....	28
4.1.3 Work experience.....	28
4.2 Factors influencing employee turnover.....	28

4.3 Regression analysis results	30
4.3.1 Correlation analysis	30
4.3.2 Analysis of variance.....	30
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	34
5.1 Summary of findings.....	34
5.2 Conclusion	34
5.3 Limitations	34
5.4 Implications to theory and practice.....	35
5.5 Suggestions for further study	37
REFERENCES.....	38
APPENDICES	40

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Employees are an organization's most important asset. Increasingly, companies in a wide variety of businesses are finding that people can be their number one source of competitive advantage, Lawler (2008). This competitive advantage can only be achieved when employees of their own accord offer their discretionary effort. Employees will offer that discretionary effort only when the aspirations of the organization and those of the employee are so in sync, aligned, that the employee—of his or her own initiative—takes great pride in going the extra mile and adding that extra dash of creativity and professionalism to achieve a professional goal that, lo and behold, builds the organization's wealth or dramatically advances its goals, as the employee learns, grows, and prospers, Russo (2009). Employees want to make a contribution while doing something worthwhile. They want to do this in a place worthy of their efforts. They want to be recognized for what they do, they want to work in a place with high camaraderie, and they want to work in a place that is respected and respectable, Russo (2009).

In the face of globalisation and the increasing mobility of labour, hiring good people is tough and keeping them can be even tougher. It isn't enough to hire and train workers to meet an organization's immediate needs; they must also be successfully nurtured, supported, and retained. Organizations spend a great deal of time recruiting and hiring new employees, but too few pay close attention to the cost of turnover. Only in recent years have organizations examined the financial impact when an employee leaves, but the numbers are staggering, Wendover (2010). Some studies have shown that the cost to replace, retrain, and reintegrate a worker is more than one and a half times that lost worker's salary. Even then, as new employees come onboard, there are the hidden costs and intangible losses to the company from the rupture in cultural continuity and the transfer of institutional knowledge, Russo (2009).

Many of today's managers still believe that turnover is an acceptable cost of doing business and make statements such as: "People come and people go" or "You can't expect to hold on to everyone forever" or "Good people get better offers and move on." There is a healthy realism in all these statements. We cannot hope to keep all our valued

talent. But good managers care enough to try to understand why good people leave, especially when it could have been prevented, Branham (2012). This means that no manager can afford to maintain outdated attitudes about turnover, especially when it is regrettable and preventable. Competitive managers will need to adopt a new mindset: that every voluntary avoidable employee departure is a disappointment to be analyzed, learned from, and corrected, Branham (2012). Maintaining that mindset means managers can no longer just accept employees' superficial answers about why they quit, even though in some cases "better pay" or "better opportunity" may be the real reasons. Managers and senior executives need to know the truth about why they have lost valued talent, and they need to accept that maybe it was something they did or didn't do that pushed the employee out the door. It is increasingly apparently that employees exit organizations because of reasons that relate to the unarticulated perceptions, which are not written in the employment contract and constitute the psychological contract.

1.1.1 Concept of perception

Perception is the process by which we select, organise, and interpret information inputs to create a meaningful picture of the world, Kotler and Lane (2009). It is the process of receiving and deriving meaning from stimuli present in an individual's internal and external environment, Pun (2002). Perception depends not only on the physical stimuli, but also on the stimuli's relationship to the surrounding field and on conditions within each of us, Kotler and Lane (2009). Employees are different in terms of how they view the world around them, how they interpret and react to different situations, and how they assign meaning to different phenomena, Dember (1960). Because perception is influenced by both internal and external stimuli, every employee will perceive other persons, events and contracts differently. It therefore follows that two employees in possession of the exact same set of information will come to different conclusions as a result of their differing capacities for perceiving this information.

People can emerge with different perceptions of the same object because of three conceptual processes: selective attention, selective distortion and selective retention. Selective attention is the allocation of processing capacity to some stimulus. Voluntary attention is something purposeful. Selective distortion is the tendency to interpret information in a way that fits our perceptions. Selective retention refers to the fact that

most of us don't remember much of the information to which we are exposed, but we do retain information that supports our attitudes and beliefs, Kotler and Lane (2009). Perception is crucial when determining the variables that affect employee turnover in any organization. The reasons for turnover may vary individually as the perceivers will tend to use themselves as a basis for perceiving others, events and objects and the employment relationship.

1.1.2 Concept of Employee turnover

People are bound to join organizations for work and leave through resignation, dismissal, retirement or some other reasons, Nzuve (2010). Employee turnover is the rotation of workers around the labour market; between firms, jobs and occupations; and between the states of employment and unemployment, Abassi (2000). Promotions and transfers are not considered a part of labour turnover because they involve movement across the membership boundary of an organization, Nzuve (2010). Very few people appear to leave jobs in which they are broadly happy in search of something even better. Instead, the picture is overwhelmingly one in which dissatisfied employees seek alternatives because they no longer enjoy working for their current employer, Torrington et al (2008).

Branham (2005) identified the seven reasons why employees leave organizations to be: the job or workplace not living up to expectations, a mismatch between the person and the job, too little coaching and feedback, too few growth and advancement opportunities, feeling devalued and unrecognised, stress from overwork and work-life imbalance and loss of trust and confidence in senior leaders. Increasingly, employees are leaving organizations for reasons other than the traditional 'better pay' and which are more related to the unfulfilled perceptions by both parties to the employment relationship. These unarticulated perceptions on the part of the employee and employer give rise to the concept of the psychological contract and its role in the employment relationship and by extension, employee turnover.

1.1.3 Concept of psychological contract

The psychological contract underpins the employment relationship. The concept of psychological contract highlights the fact that employee/employer expectations take the form of unarticulated assumptions, Armstrong (2006). He argues that employees may

expect to be treated fairly as human beings, to be provided with work that uses their abilities, to be rewarded equitably in accordance with their contribution, to be able to display competence, to have opportunities for further growth, to know what is required of them and to be given feedback (preferably positive) on how they are doing. Employers may expect employees to do their best on behalf of the organization – ‘to put themselves out for the company’ – to be fully committed to its values, to be compliant and loyal, and to enhance the image of the organization with its customers and suppliers.

Because these assumptions remain unarticulated, then as Guest and Conway (1998) commented, the psychological contract lacks many of the characteristics of the formal contract: ‘It is not generally written down, it is somewhat blurred at the edges, and it cannot be enforced in a court or tribunal.’ Additionally, disappointments on the part of management as well as employees may therefore be inevitable. Mutual misunderstandings can cause friction and stress and lead to recriminations and poor performance, or to a termination of the employment relationship, Armstrong (2006).

As described by Guest et al (1996), the psychological contract may provide some indication of the answers to the two fundamental employment relationship questions which individuals pose: ‘What can I reasonably expect from the organization?’ and, ‘What should I reasonably be expected to contribute in return?’ But it is unlikely that the psychological contract and therefore the employment relationship will ever be fully understood by either party. Armstrong (2009), points out that the aspects of the employment relationship covered by the psychological contract will include, from the employees’ point of view: how they are treated in terms of fairness, equity and consistency; security of employment; scope to demonstrate competence; career expectations and the opportunity to develop skills; involvement and influence and trust in the management of the organization to keep their promises. From the employer’s point of view, the psychological contract covers such aspects of the employment relationship as competence, effort, compliance, commitment and loyalty.

The nature of the psychological contract is changing in many organizations in response to changes in their external and internal environments, Armstrong (2009). These changes include globalization of the world economy which has been a boon in many ways, but have not been without a price, Dessler (2009). At least in the short run, the same cost-

efficiencies, belt-tightening, and productivity improvements that globalization produced have also triggered numerous and ongoing workforce dislocations, Dessler (2009). He argues that the desire for efficiencies drove firms to downsize and to 'do more with less'. Changes like these understandably prompt many employees to ask why they should be loyal to their employers. 'Why' they ask, 'should I be loyal to you if you're just going to dump me when you decide to cut costs again?' He argues that yesterday's employee-employer psychological contract may have been something like, 'do your best and be loyal to us, and we'll take care of your career'. Today, he argues, it is, 'do your best for us and be loyal to us for as long as you're here, and we'll provide you with the developmental opportunities you'll need to move on and have a successful career'. In such situations, employers must think through what they're going to do to maintain employee commitment, if they are to minimise voluntary departures and maximise employee effort.

Robinson (1996), states that the constant change of the contract provides increased opportunities for misunderstandings and therefore causing contract breach. Sims (1994) concurs and states that 'a balanced psychological contract is necessary for a continuing, harmonious relationship between employee and the organization. However, the violation of the psychological contract can signal to the participants that the parties no longer shared (or never shared) a common set of values or goals.' When an employee feels that an employer has violated or breached the contract, it can result in his/her exit (termination of the relationship) which is one of the behaviours described by Rousseau (1995). The psychological contract breach has influence on some variables. Guest (2004) categorized the outcomes of non-fulfilment between attitudinal consequences and behavioural consequences. One of the behavioural consequences is turnover intention (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Robinson, 1996; Turnley & Feldman, 2000; Lo & Aryee, 2003) and actual turnover (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Robinson, 1996).

1.1.4 Barclays Bank of Kenya Ltd

Barclays Bank of Kenya Limited, a subsidiary of Barclays Plc. It has operated in Kenya for more than 90 years, and has an extensive network of 117 outlets with 230 ATMs countrywide. Barclay's business units fall under Consumer Banking, Commercial Banking, Treasury and Card Services with cross-functional relationships to support the

segments of local business and small to mid-sized enterprises (SME). Financial strength coupled with extensive local and international resources have positioned Barclays as a foremost provider of financial services. The bank's financial performance over the years has built confidence among the Bank's shareholders, with a reputation as one of the leading blue chip companies on the Nairobi Stock Exchange. (www.barclays.com/africa/kenya/index.php)

In the past five years, the bank has seen a drastic increase in its headcount which has been accompanied by a rise in employee turnover. This in itself may not necessarily present a problem as argued by Torrington et al (2008) who state that turnover is good to rejuvenate with fresh blood especially at senior levels where new faces bring new ideas and experiences to drive change forward, as well as help managers to keep firmer control over labour costs. However, in organisations that rely on teams or long-term customer contacts, such as Barclays, the loss of workers who are central to employee teams or customer networks can be especially disruptive (Noe et al, 2010). Additionally, voluntary quits which represent an exodus of human capital investment from organizations (Fair, 1992) and the subsequent replacement process entails manifold costs to the organization.

In view of this, Barclays seeks to maintain a turnover rate of less than 10% by reducing undesired voluntary turnover especially at senior management levels and in critical roles which may be as a result of disappointments on the part of employees. Central to this is the establishment of linkages between the psychological contract and turnover and thereafter employing the appropriate retention strategies. These linkages are established through the use of employee opinion surveys, dipstick surveys, focus groups, forums and exit interviews.

1.2 Statement of the problem

There is little that an organization can do to manage turnover unless there is an understanding of the reasons for it. Information about these reasons is notoriously difficult to collect, Torrington et al (2008). They assert that most commentators recommend exit interviews (that is, interviews with leavers about their reasons for resigning), but the problem here is whether the individual will feel able to tell the truth, and this will depend

on the culture of the organization, the specific reasons for leaving and support that the individual will need from the organization in the future in the form of references.

Barclays Bank of Kenya has adopted the use of exit interviews and employee opinion surveys and dipstick surveys to gather information on why employees leave or would want to leave the organization. This information is analysed and used to address the root cause of turnover and turnover intention. In the last five employee opinion surveys conducted in a span of three years, information gathered indicates that there is an increase in the number of employees who cite factors that relate to psychological contract breach or violation as the reason for their intention to exit. This is corroborated by the information collected via exit interviews conducted by the human resource department, which points to turnover which emanates from dissatisfaction with elements of the psychological contract.

The results of breach of psychological contract in behaviours, described by Rousseau (1995), are (a) the exit (termination of the relationship), (b) the voice (actions to remedy the violation), (c) the loyalty (silence, willingness to endure), and (d) the destruction (neglect, counterproductive behaviours). Herriot and Pemberton (1995) described those same behaviours as: 'get ahead' (voice), 'get safe' (loyalty), 'get even' (destruction), or 'get out' (exit). Empirical research suggests that breach of a psychological contract is negatively related to employee loyalty, (Masterson, 2001; Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2000) and positively related to filing grievances and seeking alternative employment (Cavanaugh and Noe, 1999; Rousseau and Anton, 1991, 1988). Conversely, fulfilled contracts lead to increased job satisfaction (Kickul et al 2004) and productivity Rousseau (1995). These robust findings relating fulfilled psychological contracts to positive employee and organizational outcomes beg an extension of the research to better understand the influence of psychological contract on employee turnover.

There are several studies that have been carried out locally on psychological contract and employee turnover. They include: Ambavo (2005); The psychological contract, organizational commitment and job satisfaction: A study of commercial banks in Nairobi, which established that there exists a significant positive correlation between employers' obligation/commitment and employees job satisfaction and a negative correlation between psychological contract and organization commitment. She observed that the findings were

contrary to earlier research conducted in other places (Eienenberger et al, 1986; Randall, 1999). Nambaka (2010); The relationship between employee psychological contract and organization citizenship behaviour at the National Social Security Fund in Nairobi, which affirmed that there is a positive correlation between employee psychological contract and organization citizenship behaviour such that the fulfilment of the organization's obligations towards its employees is important in explaining the willingness of employees to engage in organisation citizenship behaviour. Osoro (2010); Employees perceptions of psychological contract violation following implementation of performance contract at the Kenya Forestry Research Institute, whose findings indicated that the introduction and implementation of performance contracts in KEFRI did not affect employees' perception on psychological contract. Longurasia (2008); Employees' perception of psychological contract: A case study of Kenya Meat Commission where she found that the company fulfils its psychological contract largely by assigning jobs with responsibilities, facilitating a positive relationship between colleagues and fostering good communication while on the other hand employees fulfil their obligations to the company. Mungumi (2006) conducted a study on employee turnover in the Micro Finance Institutions and found that the institutions incurred high replacement costs and that they risked the leaking of internal information to their competitors. Oroni (2006) studied labour turnover at the Kenya Wildlife Services and established that employee turnover in the organization negatively affected service delivery due to the acute shortage of skills required to handle the daily operations.

This study seeks to establish the perceived the relationship between psychological contract as a factor influencing employee turnover by answering the question; what is the perceived relationship between psychological contract and employee turnover at Barclays Bank of Kenya?

1.3 Research Objective

To establish the perceived relationship between psychological contract and employee turnover in Barclays Bank of Kenya

1.4 Value of the Study

The study will provide insight to the human resource department at Barclays Bank of Kenya on the relationship between the psychological contract and employee turnover thereby assisting in decision making.

Academics will benefit from the findings of this study as it will add to the body of existing knowledge in human resource management. The study will be a source of reference material for future researchers on other related topics. It will also help other academicians who undertake the same topic in their studies

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Employee Turnover

Graham and Bennett (1998) define turnover as the movement of people into and out of the firm. This movement is normal since no one is indispensable. Movement of employees into and out of an organization may be at a low or high rate, Nzuve (2010). Turnover rate is a measure of the rate at which employees leave the firm, Gomez-Meija et al (2010). Well-managed companies try to monitor their turnover rate and identify and manage causes for turnover. The goal is to minimise turnover and the costs of replacing (recruitment costs, selection costs, training costs and separation costs) employees as this affects the bottom-line, Graham and Bennett (1998). It is usually convenient to measure it by recording movements out of the firm on the assumption that a new employee eventually replaces a leaver. Every organisation should expect a certain degree of labour turnover without which the company stagnates, Nzuve (2010). He argues that zero turnover; when no one leaves the organisation and there are no new employees will generally result in higher pay for the long serving employees who will be at the top of their pay scales resulting in higher total labour costs.

Measuring employee turnover for a department of an organization is important as it can be an important indicator of the efficiency with which the various management of human resources functions are performed by managerial and supervisory personnel as well as the human resources department, Nzuve (2010). Most organizations measure turnover differently but the most frequently used approaches are to express the number of separations as a percentage of the average number of employees on the payroll during the year, Nzuve (2010) or as a the ratio of the number of organizational members who have left during the period being considered divided by the average number of people in that organization during the period, Price (1977).

In a professional services organisation, where the personal relationships established between employees and clients are central to ongoing success, a turnover rate in excess of 10 per cent is likely to cause damage to the business, Torrington, Hall and Taylor (2008). Noe et al (2010) agree that in organizations that rely on teams or long-term customer contacts, the loss of workers who are central to employee teams or customer networks can be especially disruptive.

2.1.1 Factors influencing employee turnover

There are various factors that influence labour turnover that can be broadly categorised into outside factors, functional factors, push factors and pull factors. Outside factors relate to situations in which someone leaves for reasons that are largely unrelated to their work. The most common instances involve people moving away when a spouse or partner is relocated. Others include the wish to fulfil a long-term ambition to travel, pressures associated with juggling the needs of work and family and illness. To a large extent, such turnover is unavoidable, Torrington et al (2008). Functional turnover includes all resignations that are welcomed by both the employer and employee alike. The major examples are those that stem from an individual's poor work performance or failure to fit in comfortably with an organizational or department's culture. While such resignations are less damaging than others from an organisation's point of view, they should still be regarded as lost opportunities and as an unnecessary cost, Torrington et al (2008). With push factors, the problem is dissatisfaction with work or the organization, leading to unwanted turnover. A wide range of issues can be cited to explain such resignations. Insufficient development opportunities, boredom, inefficient supervision, poor levels of employee involvement and straightforward personality clashes are the most common precipitating factors. Organizations can readily address all of these issues, however, the main reason that so many fail to do so is the absence of mechanisms for picking up signs of dissatisfaction, Torrington et al (2008). Pull factors are the opposite side of the coin and relate to the attraction of rival employers. Salary levels are often a factor here; employees leaving in order to improve their living standards. In addition, there are broader notions of career development, the wish to move into new areas of work for which there are better opportunities elsewhere, the chance to work with particular people, and commuting time, Torrington et al (2008). Taylor et al (2002) found that push factors are a great deal more prevalent than pull factors as causes of voluntary turnover. Mutsuddi (2010) summarised the key reasons employees leave their organizations as job and person mismatch, lack of appreciation, no growth opportunities, lack of trust and support from co-workers, seniors and management, stress from overwork and work life balance, compensation, new job offer and the job turning out not to be what the employee expected it to be which leads to job dissatisfaction.

2.2 Psychological Contract

The psychological contract is an increasingly relevant aspect of workplace relationships. It constitutes a set of unwritten expectations that exist between individual employees and their employers, (Armstrong, 2009). It is a system of beliefs that encompasses the actions employees believe are expected of them and what response they expect in return from their employer and, reciprocally, the actions employers believe are expected of them and what response they expect in return from their employees. Guest (2007) noted that it is concerned with: ‘The perceptions of both parties to the employment relationship, organization and individual, of the reciprocal promises and obligations implied in that relationship.’ Rousseau and Wade-Benzoni (1994) concur and state that psychological contracts refer to beliefs that individuals hold regarding promises made, accepted and relied upon between themselves and another. (In the case of organizations, these parties include an employee, client, manager, and/or organization as a whole). Because psychological contracts represent how people interpret promises and commitments, both parties in the same employment relationship (employer and employee) can have different views regarding specific terms.

According to Tyson and York (2000), the psychological contract is the term used to describe the ‘deal’ between employer and employee, not the legal contract, but the bargain implicitly struck about what each party can expect from each other, and about the obligations each has to the other. Foot and Hook (2008) concur with this belief that it constitutes the expectations that each party holds with regard to the other, and is recognised as having an impact on the way people behave in the workplace. It is however, very resistant to change, Gomez-Mejia et al (2010). Within organisations, as Katz and Kahn (1966) pointed out, every role is basically a set of behavioural expectations. These expectations are often implicit – they are not defined in the employment contract. They believed that employees may expect to be treated fairly as human beings, to be provided with work that uses their abilities, to be rewarded equitably in accordance with their contribution, to be able to display competence, to have opportunities for further growth, to know what to expect of them and to be given feedback on how they are doing. Employers may expect employees to do their best on behalf of the organization – ‘to put themselves out for the company’ – to be fully committed to its values, to be compliant and loyal, and to enhance the image of the organization with its customers and suppliers,

Katz and Kahn (1966). Skinner (1974) maintains that employees will behave in ways they expect will produce positive outcomes. But they do not necessarily know what to expect.

As suggested by Spindler (1994), a psychological contract creates emotions and attitudes which form and control behaviour and since employee/employer expectations take the form of unarticulated assumptions, disappointments on the part of management as well as employees may therefore be inevitable, Armstrong (2009). These disappointments can be alleviated if management appreciate that one of their key roles is to manage expectations, which means clarifying what they believe employees should achieve, the competencies they should possess and the values they should uphold. People who have no clear idea about what they expect may, if such unexpressed expectations have not been fulfilled, have no clear idea why they have been disappointed. But they will be aware that something does not feel right.

Psychological contracts can be broadly categorised into three: The transactional type which has primarily economic terms, and is short-term in focus with explicit performance terms. Transactional contracts are described as those containing terms of exchange which have monetary value, are specific and of limited duration. These contracts can be characterized as “a fair day’s work for a fair day’s pay”. In terms of the psychological contract, transactional components could be described as being synonymous with the “effort bargain”, namely the reciprocal process of exchanging reasonable effort for extrinsic and intrinsic rewards, Spindler (1994). The relational type has primarily emotional terms, long-term commitments by both parties, and non-explicit performance terms. Relational contracts, by contrast, contain terms which may not be readily valued and which broadly concern the relationship between the individual employee and the organization, Spindler (1994). What sets a relational contract apart from other psychological contracts is the long-term focus that requires mutual satisfaction in both socio-emotional and economic relations rather than certain performance-reward contingencies, Hui et al (2004). In terms of the psychological contract, relational contract components encompass factors such as provision of commitment, company loyalty and trust in management on behalf of the employee in return for competent management, opportunity for input and sense of belonging, Spindler (1994). Relational contracts are typically found when a long-term arrangement is perceived to exist that does not have

specific performance-reward contingencies. Instead, we observe a mutually satisfying relationship between the parties, with open-ended arrangements that include both socio-emotional and economic terms. We see this type of contract in situations in which there is loyalty between the employer and the employee, and the parties believe an open-ended commitment to the future exists. The balanced (hybrid) type has a uniquely complex combination of transactional and relational terms, and aims at a long-term relationship while at the same time specifying performance requirements, Spindler (1994). It is becoming commonplace in today's workplace. The transactional and relational components of the psychological contract interact. Changes in the transactional terms of the contract can influence the kinds of relational rewards expected or obligations perceived by the employee. For example, when an employee is given extra tasks or more stressful work without additional compensation or increased prospects of promotion this is likely to be regarded as a negative shift in the transactional component of the employee's psychological contract. There may be little he/she can do to address the imbalance in respect to transactional items. For example, should employees be tempted to decrease effort or performance level to reduce the imbalance, this may act to worsen the situation. It is likely, in such a situation, that employees will withdraw some or all of their contribution to the relational component of the psychological contract by reducing commitment, loyalty or trust in management. It is this interactivity between transactional and relational components of the psychological contract which has the potential to create problems for organizations in times of organizational change. The transitional is the contract that offers no guarantees because of instability in the organization's environment and conditions, Spindler (1994).

According to Armstrong (2006), the nature of the psychological contract is changing in many organizations in response to changes in their external and internal environments. This is largely because of the impact of global competition and the effect this has had on how businesses operate, including moves into 'lean' forms of operation. The psychological contract has not been an issue in the past because usually it did not change much; this is no longer the case because business organizations are neither stable nor long-lived, uncertainty prevails, and job security is no longer an offer by employers who are less anxious to maintain a stable workforce. Flexibility, adaptability and speed of response are all important in order to ensure that an organization maintains a competitive

edge and individual roles may be subject to constant change – continuity and predictability are no longer available for employers. Leaner organizations mean that careers may mainly develop laterally – expectations that progress will be made by promotion through the hierarchy are no longer so valid. Additionally, leaner organizations may make greater demands on employees and are less likely to tolerate people who no longer precisely fit their requirements (Armstrong, 2006).

Kissler (1994) noted that the differences between the old and the new psychological contract are that in the old psychological contract, the relationship is predetermined and imposed, you are how you work and what you do, loyalty is defined by performance and employees who do what they are told will work until retirement. Conversely, in the new psychological contract, the relationship is mutual and negotiable, an employee is defined by multiple roles, loyalty is defined by output and equality, and long term employment is unlikely. The change in environment may lead to breach and violation of psychological contract. Psychological contract breach is the belief that the other party has not followed through on their promised obligations, Rousseau (1989). Breach is a subjective experience, based on actions and on individual's perceptions of actions, Robinson (1996). Psychological contract violation is a failure of the organization to fulfil one or more obligations of an individual's psychological contract Armstrong (2006). However, this definition focuses on the rational, mental calculation of what individuals have or have not received and downplays the emotional aspect of violation. Violation invokes responses of disappointment, frustration and distress. More extreme emotional responses include anger, resentment, bitterness and indignation. Violation has also been associated with behavioural outcomes such as lower organizational citizenship, reduced commitment, satisfaction and trust and employee turnover, Armstrong (2006).

2.3 Employee Turnover and Psychological Contract

According to Torrington, Hall and Taylor (2008), it is argued that high turnover rates are symptomatic of a poorly managed organisation. They suggest that people are dissatisfied with their jobs or with their employer and would prefer to work elsewhere. This dissatisfaction may arise from psychological breaches or violations, which may be rooted in an organization's inability to meet obligations regarding distributive, procedural and interactional aspects of justice. Distributive violation occurs when outcomes are perceived to be unfairly distributed for example, financial rewards. Procedural violation

refers to the perception of the unfair application of procedures, such as promotion. Interactional violation is linked to employees' perception of trust of superiors and the organization as a whole and occurs if employees feel they have been treated badly. Such notions of fairness trigger assessment of the psychological contract, Armstrong (2006).

According to Armstrong (2006), psychological contract violation is a failure of the organization to fulfil one or more obligations of an individual's psychological contract. However, this definition focuses on the rational, mental calculation of what individuals have or have not received and downplays the emotional aspect of violation. Violation invokes responses of disappointment, frustration and distress. More extreme emotional responses include anger, resentment, bitterness and indignation. Violation has also been associated with behavioural outcomes such as lower organizational citizenship, reduced commitment, satisfaction and trust and employee turnover.

Robinson (1996), views a breach as a subjective experience, referring to one's perception that another has failed to fulfil adequately the promised obligations of the psychological contract. Robinson and Morrison (2000) distinguished a breach from a violation of the psychological contract. Breach of psychological contract is a cognitive evaluation of what is received compared to what was promised. Violation would better describe the emotional and affective state that may follow this cognitive evaluation. Breach is less serious and a cognitive appraisal of the event, while violation is more serious and initiating behaviour, attitude, or emotional response beyond the cognitive appraisal. Breach or violation of psychological contract was found to be related to a lot of negative work attitudes and organizational consequences.

The results of breach of psychological contract in behaviours, described by Rousseau (1995), are (a) the exit (termination of the relationship), (b) the voice (actions to remedy the violation), (c) the loyalty (silence, willingness to endure), and (d) the destruction (neglect, counterproductive behaviours). Herriot and Pemberton (1995) described those same behaviours as: 'get ahead' (voice), 'get safe' (loyalty), 'get even' (destruction), or 'get out' (exit).

The psychological contract breach has influence on some variables. Guest (2004) categorized the outcomes of non-fulfilment between attitudinal consequences and behavioural consequences. Attitudinal consequences include firstly, job satisfaction. When an employee experiences a breach of the psychological contract, the job satisfaction of the employee may be reduced (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Gakovic & Tetrick, 2003; Johnson & O’Leary-Kelly, 2003). Secondly, a psychological contract breach results in a negative influence on job attitudes as well as the job behaviour of employees (Robinson, 1996; Robinson & Morrison, 1995).

Behavioural consequences are turnover intention which gets greater when employees’ recognition of unfairness gets larger and they feel that the organisation is not likely to keep up an employment relationship (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Robinson, 1996; Turnley & Feldman, 2000; Lo & Aryee, 2003) and actual turnover (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Robinson, 1996). Kotter (1973) defined the psychological contract as “an implicit contract between an individual and the organization which specifies what each expects to give and receive from each other in the relationship.” For example, when a new hire expects to receive a promotion after one year on the job, and the employer is not prepared to give a promotion that quickly, there is a mismatch. When the employer can and does promote the new employee after a year, there is a match. Kotter’s research confirmed what most of us would expect—that the greater the matching of mutual expectations, the greater the probability of job satisfaction, productivity, and reduced turnover.

According to Branham (2005), when an employee realizes that the employer cannot meet a key expectation in the contract, there is often a feeling of having been betrayed, as if a real contract has been broken in bad faith. This can become the “shock” or turning point that begins the downward cycle toward disengagement and departure. The more open the discussion that takes place about mutual expectations, the more probability of a satisfactory match. This doesn’t happen as frequently as it should, partly because interviewees often feel powerless in the interview process and are reluctant to ask questions, and partly because interviewers are too rushed, or are simply afraid that if they tell the whole truth about the job or workplace, the recruit will not accept the offer. The more clearly an employee understands his or her own expectations, the higher the

probability of a match. Many new employees fresh out of college, however, are only dimly aware of their wants and needs. The problem is compounded when the organization is also not clear about what it expects, which is often the case. Companies frequently make the mistake of thinking in terms of offering “the most” or receiving “the best,” when they would be better advised to think in terms of “fit.” For example, many companies seek to hire only the “top graduates” with the highest grade point averages, when some of these individuals, because of their cerebral bent or analytical nature, may not fit the company’s expectation that they become outgoing, street-smart sales people. If an employee and an employer discover after the hire that they have a serious mismatch of expectations, it may be in their best interests to shake hands and part ways. Of course, this is not always easy to do. Prior studies show that the diminution in trust about the organization and betrayal increase turnover intentions, and reduce job satisfaction through a psychological contract breach (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Robinson & Morrison, 1995).

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This was a descriptive survey within Barclays Bank of Kenya, Head Office. According to Cooper et al (2003), a descriptive study is concerned with explaining the who, what, when and how of a phenomenon. This design will allow the study of a proportion of the population and the findings thereof generalised and deemed to apply for the entire population.

3.2 Population of Study

The population of this study constituted all employees at Barclays Bank of Kenya, whose number stands at 3103.

3.3 Sample

The sample size comprised 363 respondents who were drawn from all the Head Office departments in Nairobi, which are twelve in number namely: Barclays Business Support, Compliance, Consumer Credit, Corporate Affairs, Corporate Banking, Corporate Credit Risk, Finance, Human Resources, Legal, MD's Office, Operational Risk and Control Rigour and Treasury. This comprises 12% of the entire population of study. According to Mugenda (2008), this is sufficient for the study.

3.4 Data Collection

The study collected primary data which is quantitative in nature. A structured questionnaire was used to collect the data and was administered through hand delivery and electronic mail. The responses to the questions were rated using a Likert Scale with response options being: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree.

3.5 Data Analysis

The data was summarized, coded and tabulated and entered into the SPSS for analysis. Descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviation and frequency distribution were used to analyze the data. Data presentation was done by the use of tables. A regression model of psychological contract and employee turnover at Barclays Bank of Kenya was applied to examine the relationship between the two variables. The model treats employee

turnover as the dependent variable while the independent variable was psychological contract. The model below was therefore employed:

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + e$$

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Demographic Data

4.1.1 Gender

The researcher sought to establish the gender of the respondents. The study found out that of the 306 respondents, 63.1 percent were males and 36.9 percent were females. This implies that both sexes are almost equally involved in this industry.

4.1.2 Respondents designation

The researcher sought to establish the respondents' current designations. From the findings: 32.4 percent of the respondents were from Corporate Banking, 19.6 percent of the respondents were from Consumer Credit, 12.7 percent of the respondents were from Corporate Credit, 8.8 percent of the respondents were from Human Resources, 0.7 percent were from Legal, 1 percent were from Managing Director's Office, 3.3 percent were from Operational Risk and Control Rigour, 3.9 percent were from Treasury, 7.5 percent of the respondents were from Finance, 5.2 percent of the respondents were from Barclays Business support, 4.6 percent of the respondents were from Compliance and 0.3 percent of the respondents were from Corporate Affairs and 32.4 percent were from Corporate Banking.

4.1.3 Work experience

The researcher sought to find out the respondents' working experience. From the findings majority of the respondents 57.2 percent had worked with the institution for between 11 – 15 years, 24.5 percent of the respondents had worked between 6-10 years, 16.3 percent of the respondents had worked between 1-5 years with a small number having worked for the bank for above 15 years.

4.2 Factors influencing employee turnover

The results in table 4.2 reveal that employees are optimistic about future job opportunities within the bank and do not believe that they will become redundant as a result of organizational restructuring. The results suggest that a majority of the employees are not satisfied with the reward system especially on issues to do with their current pay or the pay structures and controls current in place. Despite this, the results reveal that most

employees are not thinking about changing their profession and would recommend the bank as an employer to a friend. The results also reveal that employees are not greatly impacted by aspects of leadership and the organisation's value system.

Table 4.1: Factors influencing employee Turnover

Statement	Mean	Standard deviation
I believe that promotional opportunities may decrease or cease to exist.	1.1	0.8
I think that I may become redundant.	1.2	0.9
The current pay levels per grade are properly set.	1.2	0.9
I think that the future of my current department is questionable.	1.3	0.9
I am satisfied with the pay structure and controls.	1.4	1.01
I hope to get a job in another profession.	1.5	1.1
The organizations value system is similar to mine.	2.1	1.8
I am thinking about quitting my job or moving to another workplace.	2.6	1.9
I do not like going to the office.	2.8	2
There is relevant support for employee welfare.	2.8	2
I am satisfied with my current pay.	3.0	2.1
I respect my superiors.	3.0	2.1
I would like to move to another workplace with an identical business.	3.2	2.2
There is consistent application of the reward policy.	3.4	2.3
Leadership at the bank is energetic and active.	3.4	2.3
Leadership talks about job value.	3.6	2.4
I trust the decisions of my superiors.	3.8	2.5
Line managers do their best in carrying out jobs.	3.9	2.5
I would recommend Barclays to a friend who is searching for a job similar to mine.	4.1	2.9
There is adequate provision of information about how my pay is derived.	4.2	2.9
I am satisfied with my last / recent pay rise.	4.3	3
Management talks about the company's vision often.	4.3	3
There is the possibility of moving to a department lower than my current department.	4.5	3.1
The available communication channels are adequate.	4.5	3.1
I am satisfied with the working conditions.	4.6	3.1
I regret having chosen the current workplace.	5.8	4.2
Average	3.1	2.2

4.3 Regression Analysis Results

4.3.1 Correlation Analysis

Two predictor variables are said to be correlated if their coefficient of correlations is greater than 0.5. In such a situation one of the variables must be dropped or removed from the model. As shown in table below, none of the predictor variables had coefficient of correlation between themselves of more than 0.5 hence all of them were included in the model. The matrix also indicated high correlation between the response and predictor variable, that is, psychological contract.

Table 4.2 Pearson Correlation

	Psychological contract	Employee turnover
Psychological contract	1.000	
Employee turnover	.760	1.000

4.3.2 Analysis of variance

The probability value (p-value) of a statistical hypothesis test is the probability of getting a value of the test statistic as extreme as or more extreme than that observed by chance alone, if the null hypothesis H_0 is true. The p-value is compared with the actual significance level of the test and, if it is smaller, the result is significant. The smaller it is the more convincing is the rejection of the null hypothesis. ANOVA findings in table 4.3 show that there is correlation between the predictors' variable (psychological contract) and response variable (employee turnover) since P- value of 0.00 is less than 0.05.

Table 4.3 ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	135.830	4	33.958	102.784	.000(a)
	Residual	29.404	89	.330		
	Total	165.234	93			

Predictors: (Constant), psychological contract

The above summary of the basic logic of ANOVA is the discussion of the purpose and analysis of the variance. The purpose of the analysis of the variance is to test differences in means (for groups or variables) for statistical significance. The accomplishment is through analyzing the variance, which is by partitioning the total variance into the component that is due to true random error and the components that are due to differences between means. The ANOVA analysis is intended to investigate whether the variation in the independent variables explain the observed variance in the outcome, in this study, employee turnover.

The ANOVA results indicate that the independent variables significantly ($F=102.784$, $p=0.001$) explain the variance in employee turnover. In this context, as have been presented in the table above, the dependent variable is the level of employee turnover whilst the independent or the predictor is psychological contract.

The study was on dependent and independent relationship, and a moderate multiple regression analysis was used. The multiple regression analysis is mathematically expressed as shown below. A multivariate regression model was applied to determine the relative importance of each of the variables with respect to relationship between psychological contract and employee turnover.

The regression model was as follows:

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + e$$

Where:

y = Employee turnover

β_0 = Constant Term

β_1 = Beta coefficients

X_1 = Psychological contract

e = Constant error

Regression equation and the predictor relationship

The established multiple linear regression equation becomes:

$$Y = 0.497 + 0.439X_1$$

Where

Constant = 0.497, shows that if psychological contract were all rated as zero, employee turnover rating would be 0.497

$X_1 = 0.439$, shows that one unit change in psychological contract results in 0.439 units increase in employee turnover.

The results show aspects of job security strengthen the positive relationship between psychological contract violation and employee turnover. Employees who feel secure about the future of their jobs as well as that of their departments and the organisation as a whole are less likely to exit the bank. This finding may be due, in part, to the recent reorganisation that occurred in January 2011 which occasioned the redundancy of more than 200 employees and heightened sensitivity to the issue of job security. The study's results show a positive relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover, while indicating that there is no significant relationship between charismatic leadership and employee turnover.

Regression coefficients

Table 4.4 Regression coefficients

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.497	.167		2.980	.004
Psychological contract	.439	.212	.933	4.431	.000

Strength of the model

Analysis in table 4.4 shows that the coefficient of determination (the percentage variation in the dependent variable being explained by the changes in the independent variables) R^2 equals 0.822, that is, job security, employee welfare, strategic management, communication and reward, explain 82.2 percent of relationship between psychological contract and employee turnover; only 17.2 percent remains unexplained.

Model Summary

Table 4.5: Model Summary

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					
				R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. Change	F
.907 (a)	.822	.814	.57479	.822	102.784	4	89	.000	

Predictors: Constant Psychological contract.

Adjusted R^2 is called the coefficient of determination and tells us how employee turnover within the bank varied psychological contract. From Table 4.5 above, the value of adjusted R^2 is 0.814. This implies that, there was a variation of 81.4% of employee turnover varied with demographics and psychological contract at a confidence level of 95%. This study's results show a positive relationship between perceived unfair reward practices and employee turnover intention. This finding is important because although employees feel that their pay is not commensurate to their effort, the latest salary market survey conducted in 2011 indicated that the bank's pay scales are competitive.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine and understand the perceived relationship between psychological contract and employee turnover at Barclays Bank of Kenya. The study used employee turnover as the dependent variable while psychological contract was the independent variable. To this end, the research showed that employee turnover and psychological contract breaches and violations were positively related. The study found that perceptions on leadership and communication were not significant contributors to psychological contract breaches and violations and did not significantly influence employee turnover, (Rousseau 1995; Kickul et al 2004; Cavanaugh and Noe, 1999; Rousseau and Anton, 1991; Masterson, 2001; Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2000)

5.2 Conclusion

The study concluded that majority of employees at the Barclays Bank of Kenya were dissatisfied with the current state of their current psychological contract. Majority felt the bank had failed to honour its side of the contract leading to employees losing trust in the bank's management. Most employees felt dissatisfied with working at the institution with some saying they would want to leave for other institutions. The study showed that most employees at Barclays Bank of Kenya do not have the intention of leaving the bank with an overall score of 60% either strongly agreeing or disagreeing that they wanted to leave the organization. It can be concluded to mean that while psychological contract influences employee turnover, it may not be the sole contributor to employee turnover at the bank.

5.3 Limitations

A limitation of this study is that all the variables were measured at the same time and thus one cannot infer any causal relationships. Although it seems likely that a positive attitude about the job and organization reduces turnover intentions, one cannot say this definitely unless it is tested in a longitudinal study. In addition, the attitude towards leaving the organization was measured as intentions. The decision of an individual to actually leave the organization might be dependent on other or additional factors. Here again, a longitudinal study in which the bank employees are followed throughout their career

would yield valuable results. Finally, in this study, psychological contract has proven to be an important predictor. Although this study has shown the importance of psychological contract, further research into the aspects that makes an employee exit is necessary.

5.4 Implications to theory and practice

Results from this study have demonstrated that psychological contract variables can significantly explain a substantial amount of variance in turnover intentions for bank employees. Further, affective commitment was found to be an important mediating role in the relationship between psychological contract variables and turnover intentions. In addition, the analyses revealed that at different stages of adulthood, different factors might play a role when considering the intention to leave the organization.

Among the psychological contract variables, job contentment appeared to be the most significant predictor of bank employees' turnover intentions, followed by promotion opportunities and salary. Thus, the greater the extent to which individuals find their jobs to be challenging, comprehensive and diverse, the less likely they are to leave their organizations. This effect was partially mediated by affective commitment, i.e. the more respondents perceive their job as one which includes challenging, comprehensive and diverse tasks, the more they are committed to the organization and in turn, the less likely they are to leave the organization. Therefore, in terms of the psychological contract perceptions, this might mean that the expectations among bank employees are rather high and that a slight violation of this expectation towards the negative side is what makes them consider leaving the organization. Promotion opportunities and salary were also related to bank employees' turnover intentions. The more the respondents agreed to the fact that their organization offered them promotion opportunities and competitive salaries, the less inclined they were to consider leaving the organization.

The results also highlighted significant influence of equitable and competitive salary and availability of promotions for employees' turnover intentions. Psychological contract measures such as job content, promotion, salary, work-family balance and performance pay were significantly affected turnover intentions. These factors were also found to be directly related to affective commitment and in turn were also found to operate as a mediating variable between psychological contract measures and turnover intentions. It is

only the individuals who develop psychological contracts and not organizations. Organizations provide individuals with a context in which psychological contracts can evolve and develop. As such, the organization can influence the psychological contract of employees directly through its agents and indirectly through administrative contract makers. The findings of this research study provide some important suggestions for managers in the banking organizations to concentrate on the key predictors of the psychological contract for the explanation of managers turnover intentions.

One of the strongest predictors for turnover intentions in this study is job contentment, which is also an important predictor for affective commitment. This refers to the extent to which employees are satisfied with their jobs. Excessive work demands can lead to higher levels of psychological strain and job dissatisfaction. The impact of these demands may be offset by the perception that one has control over important aspects of the job environment. Indeed, highly challenging and demanding work combined with high control is considered an active job that has beneficial outcomes for individuals. On the other extreme, low- demanding work with low levels of control will lead to strain and reduced job satisfaction. Also, the combination of highly demanding work with low levels of control will lead to strain because anxiety will be created about the job performance and the personal consequences of not completing the work in a specified time frame. Low- demand work combined with high levels of control will lead to boredom and dissatisfaction. As such, jobs which are perceived as challenging and have enough possibilities for control may lead to a lower turnover intentions and also actual turnover. The practical implication of this perspective for bank employees is the design of jobs. Because individuals will become more experienced and task-mature in a specific job over time, bank employees should be able to design their jobs with flexible boundaries employees can obtain more tasks in a specific job (e.g. activities, responsibilities, intrinsic development opportunities) with the provision of more control opportunities (e.g. autonomy, power).

Practical implications for management may be twofold. Firstly, management should know whether the promotion possibilities and salary heights in their organization are perceived as unfair by employees in comparison with the conditions in other industries. Too much perceived unfairness by employees with too little compensation from other job

characteristics may lead to turnover intentions. Secondly, care should be taken in the communication in the recruitment process of new employees, to align the perceptions of new personnel with realistic possibilities for salary and promotion in the organization. Consistency in promises related to salary and promotion opportunities are important to prevent violation of the psychological contract.

5.5 Suggestions for further study

There is need to replicate this study in other institutions. A larger sample size is also recommended.

REFERENCES

- Ambavo, K. (2005), The psychological contract, organizational commitment and job satisfaction: A study of commercial banks in Nairobi. Unpublished MBA project. University of Nairobi.
- Anderson, N. and Schalk, R. (1998), The psychological contract in retrospect and prospect, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 19, 637-647.
- Argyris, C. and Schon, D. (1996), *Organizational Learning II theory, method and practices*, Addison Wesley.
- Armstrong, M. (2006), *A handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*, 10th Edition, Gopsons Papers Ltd, Noida, India.
- Beardwell, J. and Claydon, T. (2007), *Human Resource Management, A contemporary Approach*, 5th Edition, Prentice Hall.
- Branham, L. (2012), *The 7 Hidden Reasons Employees Leave:; How to Recognize the Subtle Signs and Act Before It's Too Late*, 2nd Edition, AMACO
- Cho, S., Cheong, K. & Kim, K. (2009), A psychological contract breach and turnover intention of telemarketers in South Korea, *Journal of Business and Policy Research*, Vol. 4 No. 1 Pp 66-78.
- Cole, G. A. (2002), *Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 5th Edition, T.J. International, Padston Cornwall, London.
- Easterby, S.M., Burgoyne, J. and Aranjó, L. (1999), *Organizational learning and the learning organization*, London.
- Graham, H.T and Bennet, R. (1998), *Human Resource Management* 9th Edition, Prentice Hall.
- Guest, D. and Conway, N. (2002), *Pressure at Work and the psychological contract*, Research report, *London Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development*.
- Hui, C., and D. M. Rousseau (2004), Psychological Contract and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in China: Investigating Generalizability and Instrumentality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Ingrid, W. (2004), *The Unique Nature of Psychological Contract in the Public Sector: An Exploration* Antwerp, University of Antwerp Belgium.
- Kotler, P. and Lane, K. (2009), *Marketing Management*, 13th Edition, Pearson International Edition.

- Kotter, J.P. (1973), *The Psychological Contract: Managing the Joining Up Process*, California Management Review, vol. 15 pp. 91–99.
- Lawler, E.E. (2008), *Talent: Making People Your Competitive Advantage*, Jossey-Bass
- Nambaka, F. (2010), *The relationship between employee psychological contract and organization citizenship behaviour at the National Social Security Fund in Nairobi*, Unpublished MBA project. University of Nairobi.
- Osoro, R.B. (2010), *Employees' perceptions of psychological contract violation following implementation of performance contract at the Kenya Forestry Research Institute*, Unpublished MBA project. University of Nairobi.
- Rousseau, D. (1996), *Changing the Deal While Keeping the People*, Academy of Management Executive, vol. 10.
- Rousseau, D. (1995), *Psychological Contracts in Organizations: Understanding written and unwritten Agreements*, Sage publications.
- Russo, D. (2009), *17 Rules Successful Companies Use to Attract and Keep Top Talent: Why Engaged Employees Are Your Greatest Sustainable Advantage*, Pearson Education.
- Schermerhorn, J. (2010), *Management*, 11th Edition, John Wiley & Sons.
- Torrington, D., Hall, H. and Taylor, S. (2008), *Human Resource Management 7th Edition*, Prentice Hall.
- Tyson, S. and York, A. (2000), *Essentials of HRM*, 4th Edition, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Wendover, R.W. (2010), *High Performance Hiring: Select the Best Every Time*, 3rd Edition, Axco Press
- Wiley, J.W. (2010), *Strategic Employee Surveys*, Jossey-Bass

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: QUESTIONNAIRE

PART A: General Information

1. Name of the department _____

2. Job level _____

3. Total work experience _____

4. Age category 20-30 () 31-40 () 41-50 () Above 51 ()

5. Gender Male () Female ()

PART B: Factors Influencing Psychological contract

The following are factors that impact psychological contract. To what extent do you agree with the below statements?

(1- Strongly disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 – Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 - Agree and 5 - Strongly agree)

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
There is the possibility of moving to a department lower than my current department.					
I believe that promotional opportunities may decrease or cease to exist.					
I think that I may become redundant.					
I think that the future of my current department is questionable.					
I am satisfied with my current pay.					
I am satisfied with my last / recent pay rise.					
The current pay levels per grade are properly set.					
I am satisfied with the pay structure and controls.					
There is adequate provision of information about how my pay is derived.					

There is consistent application of the reward policy.					
I would recommend Barclays to a friend who is searching for a job similar to mine.					
I do not like going to the office.					
The available communication channels are adequate.					
I am satisfied with the working conditions.					
I respect my superiors.					
I trust the decisions of my superiors.					
Leadership at the bank is energetic and active.					
Management talks about the company's vision often.					
The organizations value system is similar to mine.					
Leadership talks about job value.					
Line managers do their best in carrying out jobs.					
There is relevant support for employee welfare.					
I would like to move to another workplace with an identical business.					
I hope to get a job in another profession.					
I regret having chosen the current workplace.					
I am thinking about quitting my job or moving to another workplace.					

PART C: Factors influencing employee turnover

The following are factors that influence employee turnover. To what extent do you agree with the below statements?

(1- Strongly disagree, 2 - Disagree, 3 – Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 - Agree and 5 - Strongly agree)

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
There is the possibility of moving to a department lower than my current department.					
I believe that promotional opportunities may decrease or cease to exist.					
I think that I may become redundant.					
I think that the future of my current department is questionable.					
I am satisfied with my current pay.					
I am satisfied with my last / recent pay rise.					
The current pay levels per grade are properly set.					
I am satisfied with the pay structure and controls.					
There is adequate provision of information about how my pay is derived.					

There is consistent application of the reward policy.					
I would recommend Barclays to a friend who is searching for a job similar to mine.					
I do not like going to the office.					
The available communication channels are adequate.					
I am satisfied with the working conditions.					
I respect my superiors.					
I trust the decisions of my superiors.					
Leadership at the bank is energetic and active.					
Management talks about the company's vision often.					
The organizations value system is similar to mine.					
Leadership talks about job value.					
Line managers do their best in carrying out jobs.					
There is relevant support for employee welfare.					
I would like to move to another workplace with an identical business.					
I hope to get a job in another profession.					
I do not think that the current job is permanent.					
I regret having chosen the current workplace.					
I am thinking about quitting my job or moving to another workplace.					

THANKYOU