**What do they expect? Constructing and Validating a Generic Scale to Measure Students’ Psychological Contract Violation**

**Abstract**

This study maps, constructs, and validates a new scale for measuring students’ psychological contract violation (SPCV). The mixed method approach is implemented in three stages, namely Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3. During the first phase, a qualitative method is used to capture and analyze students’ perceived entitlements, as described by 78 college students. The results foregrounded 37 items. In the second stage, a sample of 244 students is utilized to identify the profoundly violated expectations as perceived by students. In the final phase, items are rephrased as expectations and used to validate the new scale. The third sample of 154 undergraduate college students indicates the level of fulfilment for those expectations. Additionally, as part of discriminate and convergent validity measures, students are asked about the extent to which they experience faculty incivility (discriminant validity) and their frustration with the quality of interaction with their faculty (convergent validity). A new scale measuring students’ psychological contract violation is constructed and validated. Implications of these outcomes and directions for future research are discussed.

Introduction

‘Psychological contract’ is defined as the subjective perception of entitlements and obligations that are based on perceived promises (Robinson and Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 2014). These perceived promises, whether fulfilled or not, are rooted in the foundations of social exchange theory. As such, they drive both positive as well as adverse interrelations between individuals and organizations (Itzkovich and Heilbrunn 2016). Indeed, the psychological contract theory is rooted in work organizations and employee-employer relationships. However, in trying to understand the foundations of student expectations in verity of higher education institutions over the past years, researchers have employed the theory of psychological contracts to the academic setting. They focused on investigating psychological contracts of specific sub-populations of students and their expectations concerning their advisors, including Master’s and PhD students, (Bordia et al. 2010); international students (Bordia et al. 2019) pharmacy students (Spies et al. 2010); student-athletes (Barnhill and Turner, 2015); and student volunteers (Haski-Leventhal et al. 2020). Some of these studies were qualitative (Koskina 2013; Haski-Leventhal et al. 2020) and some used specific measures to capture the uniqueness of a target population, as in the case of investigating student expectations from online teaching (Dziuban et al. 2015) or in the case of pharmacy students (Spies et al. 2010).

 Although recent qualitative work has identified generic features of psychological contracts in higher education (Koskina 2013), no research has thus far used a mixed-method approach to validate a generic quantitative measure of SPCV. Understanding student expectations, namely the psychological contract components, is crucial for planning, developing, and managing higher education systems, particularly when they are evolving into profit-driven systems in which students function as customers (Koskina 2013). Failing to capture the components of such contracts could impact the capability of higher-education systems to answer student expectations, in consequent violation of those psychological contracts.

The cost of unfulfilled expectations is a key factor for research on psychological contracts with a focus on contract violation. The violation of psychological contracts has been studied in a broad organizational context; however, the research of psychological contract violation in higher education and its interrelations with other constructs has remained overlooked. No previous research considers the potential correlation between psychological contract violation and perceptions of faculty incivility (Itzkovich, Alt, and Dolev 2020), which can be expressed as lack of support, lack of fairness, and lack of positiveness, all of which are vital components of student expectations (Koskina 2013). In turn, these factors of support, fairness, and positiveness are crucial for higher education systems to survive in the present era of supplier-customer relationships, which are increasingly shaping our higher education systems.

The current research can help the emerging, profit-driven higher-education systems to answer student expectations by examining how components of student psychological contracts in higher education are violated through factors of faculty incivility. Understanding student expectations has recently been shown to help reshape learning outcomes; Beenen and Arbaugh (2019) investigated student expectations from flipped classrooms and identified that students’ expectations, namely psychological contract entitlements, impacted flipped class learning outcomes. Students who knew what to expect could deal with flipped classrooms better. The authors suggested that institutions clarify expectations before class in order to manage the process. Such a process reduces the psychological contract violation (Rousseau 2014). These explanations in turn, can shape more accurate expectations of students. In the same vein, a broader understanding of the generic components of students’ psychological contract with regards to their overall learning process.

 Additionally, the current research will contribute to the research of incivility in higher education by clarifying the process underlying perceptions of faculty incivility, namely, psychological contract violation (Itzkovich et al. 2020).

Psychological contract

The term ‘psychological contract’ defines a set of entitlements and obligations that comprise an individual’s expectations in the workplace (Setter 2001). Entitlements refer to a person’s expectations of positive outcomes due to his or her belonging to a particular social or organizational system or by merit of their own contributions. The sense of entitlement is based on the individual’s expectations for achieving the desired results.

Conversely, obligations relate to the subjective duties that individuals feel towards a particular set of inputs due to their status in a social system or the rewards that they receive for that privilege (Setter 2001). Until the 1990’s, the psychological contract was considered to be the outcome of shared expectations resulting from a mutual dialogue between employees and organizations. Rousseau (2014) was the first to interpret the contract as an individual’s subjective perception concerning his or her expectations (to give and receive) in the context of the workplace. Rousseau’s illuminating work emphasized that reciprocity or agreement between the parties of the contract is not required for the creation of a psychological contract. Such contracts are created, nourished, upheld, and even broken as part of the individual’s perception of the organizational reality. Rousseau additionally emphasized that the contract is based on perceived pledges and is thus largely a conceptual product, whose elements are created by the individual’s understanding of what has been promised.

When contracts are violated, they damage people’s trust in the organization, diminishing their satisfaction with work and reducing their commitment to the organization along with their desire to remain with the organization over time (De Clercq, Azeem, and Haq 2020). In faculty-student relationships, the expression of violation takes many forms. Faculty react in different ways when they feel that the psychological contract is violated due to their own unfulfilled expectations regarding student behavior, such as disinterest or lack of respect. Some of these reaction patterns may foster an atmosphere of rudeness in class and even beyond it (Itzkovich et al. 2020).

The same goes for students. A student who feels that a faculty member has failed to fulfill whatever core expectations he or she might have, such as engaging thoughtfully or being attentive to student needs, might feel that the psychological contract was violated and react in a manner that could be perceived by the faculty member as a contract violation. Consequently, these adverse reciprocal reactions can be interpreted by students as faculty incivility.

Faculty incivility

Incivility perpetrated by faculty is commonly directed toward one of two targets: students or other faculty members (Clark 2013; Goldberg et al. 2013; Itzkovich et al. 2020). While both share the same source of perpetration, the latter (i.e., faculty-to-faculty incivility) is considered a sub-category of workplace incivility, as both perpetrators and targets are employed as part of the same organization. Indeed, faculty-to-faculty incivility and workplace incivility are manifested in similar behaviors: giving colleagues or subordinates the silent treatment; micromanaging others; patronizing others; belittling the work of others; and so forth (Wright and Hill 2015).

Conversely, faculty-to-student incivility is more specific to academia and educational institutions. Together with student-to faculty incivility, faculty-to-student incivility is part of the potentially adverse interrelations between students and faculty.

Many definitions of incivility in academic settings describe it as an act of interference within a harmonious and cooperative learning atmosphere (Berger 2000; Knepp 2012). It is also viewed in a broader sense as part of institutional incivility, defined as ‘*repeated interpersonal mistreatment that violates institutional (including but not limited to academic institutes) and/or social norms of civil conduct*’ (Itzkovich et al. 2020, 20).

 Clark, Farnsworth, and Landrum (2009) conducted their survey on Incivility in Nursing Education (INE) to examine uncivil behaviors within nursing schools. They found that faculty-to-student incivility ranges from generally disrespectful behaviors to poor classroom management and flexibility issues. Having identified the need for more generic measurement, Alt and Itzkovich (2015) constructed and validated a tool to measure the more general phenomenon of faculty incivility. Their results corroborated the active (serious) vs passive (less severe or subtle) theoretical structure of academic incivility introduced by previous research (Berger 2000; Knepp 2012).

Psychological contract violation - A process that underlies perceived faculty incivility

The psychological contract mechanism is rooted in exchange relationships, whereby one party reciprocates the other’s contributions based on perceived gaps between expectations and fulfilment. These reciprocal interactions are, in turn, part of the Social Exchange Theory (SET) which postulates that calculating cost and benefit is fundamental in human interactions (Itzkovich and Heilbrunn 2016; Schilpzand, De Pater, and Erez 2016). The theory further proposes that individuals use social interactions to maximize their self-interests (either tangible, such as grades, or intangible, such as attention or respect). The theory goes beyond its economic exchange roots. The emotional aspects inherent to all psychological contracts can be linked to Blau’s (1964) social exchange model, which suggests that social exchange runs parallel to economic exchange in relationships between individuals. Since the exchange of interpersonal relationships is part of all psychological contracts, inappropriate exchange in these relationships could result in a breach of contract and vice versa - unfulfilled expectations can be interpreted as inadequate exchange, namely, faculty incivility. If students feel that some of their core expectations are unfulfilled, such as teachers being interesting, thoughtful or attentive to student needs, they may feel that the psychological contract between them and faculty is violated. Moreover, they might interpret a teacher’s uncivil behavior as deliberate. They might even reciprocate with manners that could be interpreted as student incivility toward faculty. Retaliatory actions between students and faculty promote incivility on both sides (Itzkovich et al. 2020).

The present study

The goal of the present study is to construct and validate efficient measurement of the violations of the Student-Faculty Psychological Contract, capturing the different dimensions of such violation. Data from undergraduate students in Israel were gathered in three phases by research assistants. The overall strategy for this scale development project was based on a deductive-inductive approach, in which both logically derived categories and those that have ‘serendipitously’ arisen from the data may find their way into the research (Merton 1968; Strauss 1987). This approach can determine the definition of teacher-student contract violation while identifying additional meaningful categories pertinent to that definition.

In Phase 1, a large set of student suppositions concerning their expectations of faculty behavior was gathered. Experts reviewed and culled these descriptions, then distributed the collected items to a second sample of students in Phase 2 of the study in order to detect which items expressed violated expectations of students. In Phase 3, data from a third sample of students were gathered to examine measurement validity. Specifically, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was utilized to explore the factor structure. Finally, the newly developed scale was tested for divergent and convergent validity.

Procedure

In all study phases, participants were recruited by placing Internet ads in student forums inviting undergraduate students to participate in the research. The purpose of the study was explained as examining student perceptions of their teachers’ obligations. Participant consent to complete the questionnaire was attained, and the anonymity of participants was explicitly assured.

Phase 1 – Qualitative study

Method

Participants.This study was aimed at gathering student expectations to operationalize the psychological contract in the educational setting. The study included 78 undergraduate students from one academic college (24% male and 76% female; 40% second-year students and 60% third-year students; 32 Jews, 36 Muslims, and 10 Christians).

Instrument and Procedure. An open-ended questionnaire was utilized to gather data. The participants were asked to describe, in their own words, the expectations they had of their lecturers (one or more).

Results

 Two raters, who were experts in the research area of higher education learning environments and interrelations between individuals in academic and work context, analyzed the answers that students gave as short paragraphs. For inter-rater reliability, Kappa (k) (Cohen, 1960), which is commonly used in psychological research, was assessed. The raters were asked to categorize the students’ observation reports. The *k* values were interpreted as follows: k < 0.20 poor agreement; 0.21 < k < 0.40 fair agreement; 0.41 < k < 0.60 moderate agreement; 0.61 < k < 0.80 good agreement; 0.81 < k < 1.00 very good agreement. Results of 0.61 < k < 1 were considered acceptable for the current phase of the study. All descriptions lacking consensus were discarded from the analysis. Descriptions that were identified as unclear or too similar to another description were also omitted. As a result of this process, the number of descriptions was reduced from 64 valid responses to 40. After this process was complete, the raters analyzed and categorized the responses for content.

After achieving consensus, the items were sent to two associate professors of Education and Psychology for review. The experts were instructed to inspect the responses for their adherence to the suggested categories and for their overall clarity. This resulted in the removal of three responses and a total of seven categories: 1) adapted teaching methods (eight responses); 2) fairness (four responses); 3) knowledge in student assessment (five responses); 4) supporting students (four responses); 5) in-depth knowledge of the course material (four responses); 6) personal characteristics (four responses); and 7) deviated expectations (eight responses). The descriptions were formulated as short statements by the experts.

Efforts were made to formulate the statements as simple and as short as possible. For example, the following quote from student testimony,

 This is the first year of my undergraduate degree. Sometimes I feel that faculty speaks very fast. Due to my language difficulties (Hebrew is not my mother tongue), I don’t understand what is being said, and I would expect my teachers to be considerate and speak slower.

was rephrased as ‘I expect my teacher to take into consideration my language difficulties.’ The following quote, ‘I expect that faculty will listen to what we have to say during class and that they allow us to ask questions during class,’ was rephrased as, ‘I expect my teacher to allow me to ask questions during class.’ Overall, This process yielded 37 items distributed across the seven distinct categories.

Phase 2 – Capturing Violated Expectations

Method

Participants. Data were gathered from 244 undergraduate students with a mean age of 30.42 years (SD = 7.89). Participants self-identified as female (n = 116, 45.8%) and male (n = 137, 54.2%). The year-of-study distribution was as follows: 14.8% first-year, 29.1% second-year, 45.1% third-year, and 11.1 fourth-year students. Regarding ethnicity, 41.6% were Jewish students, 30.6% were Muslim, 14.3% were Christian, and 13.5% were Druze students.

Instrument and Procedure. The students were asked to review each item and indicate the extent to which they expected their lecturers to act as described (37 items). Additionally, they were asked to indicate whether their lecturers behaved as they expected (37 items). Thus, the questionnaire included 37 pairs of items. For example, (a) ‘I expect my teacher to give me high grades’ was paired with (b) ‘My teacher gives me high grades.’ Each item was given a Likert-type score ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

Results

Statistically, the sample mean score on the expectation was subtracted from the mean score on the actual behavior of the lecturers (as reported by the students). Positive results indicate that a particular behavior exceeded expectations. Outcomes that showed no difference between expectation and actual conduct (i.e., no violation), were excluded from Phase 2 of the study. This analysis aimed to include only items in which actual behavior was equal to exceeded expectations, as such situations reflect no violations. The procedure of Phase 1 culled seven pairs of items for exclusion, as they were unable to indicate a breach or violation and thus could not differentiate between students who experience violation and those whose expectations are met. This phase of the study produced a 30-item scale, hereinafter referred to as the Student Psychological Contract Violation [SPCV]), for use in Phase 3.

Phase 3 - Validating the Final Scale

Method

Participants. The sample for this phase held a broad range of representation including 154 undergraduate students from five randomly selected academic institutions, with a mean age of 24.46 years (SD = 5.01). Participants self-identified as female (n = 92, 61%) and male (n = 85, 39%). The year-of-study distribution was as follows: 20.8% first-year, 35.5% second-year, 42.5% third-year, and 1.2% fourth-year students. Regarding ethnicity, 41.6% were Jewish, 30.6% Muslim, 14.3% Christian, and 13.5% Druze. The participants were enrolled in the following departments: Education (25.3%), Psychology (16%), Special Education (8.7%), Economics (8%), Architecture (6.7%). Engineering (6.7%), Management (6%), Medicine (5.3%), Social Sciences (3.5%), Criminology (3.3%), Law (3.3%), Political Sciences (2%), Social Work (2%), and Physiotherapy (2%).

*Instrument and Procedure.* In this phase of the research, we asked participants to consider one of their courses and to refer to this course while answering the questions. The 30 items gathered in Phase 2 were phrased as perceived obligations, and participants were asked to answer the extent to which their lecturer fulfilled these obligations.

*Faculty Incivility Scale (PFIS)*. To test the discriminant validity of the scale, we used the Perceived Faculty Incivility Scale (PFIS) which is a distinct precursor similar to the construct of the psychological contract. The PFIS scale was designed by Alt and Itzkovich (2015) to measure the frequency of faculty incivility (FI) occurrences. The scale includes two FI constructs: The first, Factor I, contained 13 items representing active FI (AFI), for example, ‘The teacher yells at you as a response to misunderstanding’ which is also considered as an unfulfilled expectation for fair treatment. The second construct, Factor II, contained eight items pertaining to passive FI (PFI), for example, ‘The teacher ignores students’ questions during lectures.’ Each item was given a Likert-type score ranging from 1 = *almost never* to 5 = *nearly always*. Internal constituency reliability is shown in Table 1.

*Student Psychological Contract Violation (SPCV).*Based on Phase 2, respondents were asked to answer whether the lecturer fulfilled his/her obligations to the respondent. An example was, ‘To what extent did the lecturer in this course fulfill “his/her” obligation to treat you fairly?’ Each item was given a Likert-type score ranging from (the lecturer) 1 = *has not fulfilled his/her obligation at all* to 5 = *has highly fulfilled his/her obligation*.

Additionally, one question was designed to test the general convergent validity of the model, in line with the guidelines of Hair et al. (2016). The question was phrased as, ‘To what extent did the quality of interaction with your lecturer disappoint you considering your initial expectations of the interaction?’

 Outer (measurement) model assessment was conducted according to the guidelines of Hair et al. (2016) prior to the assessment of the structural model, as reflected in Table 1.

Table 1. Result summary for measurement models

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reflective Variables | Convergent Validity | Internal Constituency Reliability | Discriminant Validity |
|  | AVE | Cronbach's Alpha |  |
|  | > 0.50 | > 0.70 | HTMTConfidence Interval Does Not Contain 1 |
| Faculty Incivility | 0.544 | 0.952 | Yes |
| Psychological Contract Violation | 0.594 | 0.962 | Yes |
| Disappointment from Relations with Faculty (one item) | - | - | Yes |

*Results*

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used to validate the seven factors found in the Phase 1 of the study. A principal component analysis with varimax rotation was used to corroborate the stability of the SPCV structure (eigenvalue > 1.00; item loadings > .40). Following the EFA, the items were evaluated for evidence concerning content validity. We required that at least three items loaded .40 or higher on every factor. To avoid collinearity, we required the loading of an item on a single factor to be more than .15 apart from the loading of that item on another factor. The principal component analysis solution accounted for 77.38% of the variance and yielded only five categories, for which only four of the seven categories suggested by the content analysis were identified. Table 2 depicts the factor loadings of the EFA after item removal with items in bold corresponding to the factor they load on. Using the criteria detailed above, seven items were removed, based on content validity or not having met the threshold. Table 2 shows the 23 items clarified after collapsing into the four subscales. All subscales were significantly correlated with each other.

The final structure of the scale consists of four factors: Factor I contains nine items representing *fairness obligations*;Factor II contains eight items dealing with the teacher’s *obligations to use adaptive teaching practices*;Factor III contains three items related to the teacher’s *obligations to be informed and knowledgeable*; and Factor IV contains three items dealing with *deviant obligations*.

Table 2. *The SPCV: Factors, item descriptions and item loadings*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item description | Factors |
| F1 | F2 | F3 | F4 |
| Fairness expectations | Teaching expectations | Deviant expectations | Knowledge expectations |
| 1. The obligation to take into consideration your language difficulties
 | **.804** |  |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to treat you fairly
 | **.795** |  |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to allow you to ask questions during class
 | **.780** |  |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to act morally toward you
 | **.760** |  |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to allow you to participate during classes
 | **.678** |  |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to write fair exams
 | **.672** |  |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to build exams that fit your level
 | **.636** |  |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to give you fair grades (grades that reflect your level)
 | **.571** |  |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to focus your learning efforts prior to a test
 | **.569** |  |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to use a variety of teaching methods
 |  | **.789** |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to teach in a manner that encourages in-depth thinking
 |  | **.720** |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to help you understand the material after class hours
 |  | **.709** |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to support you to resolve learning difficulties
 |  | **.679** |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to teach in an interesting manner
 |  | **.648** |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to consider your needs
 |  | **.634** |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to illustrate learning materials (i.e., by giving examples)
 |  | **.576** |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to make sure you understood the material
 |  | **.564** |  |  |
| 1. The obligation to raise your grades easily
 |  |  | **.755** |  |
| 1. The obligation to give you high grades
 |  |  | **.753** |  |
| 1. The obligation to help you during tests
 |  |  | **.649** |  |
| 1. The obligation to demonstrate up-to-date knowledge in his/her courses
 |  |  |  | **.898** |
| 1. The obligation to be familiar with up-to-date literature in his/her courses
 |  |  |  | **.832** |
| 1. The obligation to demonstrate up-to-date knowledge regarding research related to the content he/she teaches
 |  |  |  | **.815** |

To establish discriminant and convergent validity of the newly developed scale, we used the construct of FI as a discriminant validity criterion and the single general question formulated as a reflective measurement scale for psychological contract violation to test convergent validity. Figure 1 illustrates the model as tested using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM).

Figure 1.Research model

Discriminant validity was assessed by using the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT) of the correlations (Henseler, Ringle, and Sarstedt 2015), defined as the mean of all correlations of indicators across constructs measuring different constructs. The HTMT serves as the basis for a discriminant validity test. An HTMT value above 0.90 suggests a lack of discriminant validity. Moreover, relying on a bootstrapping procedure, a bootstrap confidence interval containing a value of one indicates a lack of discriminant validity. The evaluation of Model 1 yielded satisfactory results. Namely, HTMT values ranged from 0.346 to 0.810, and the confidence interval did not include one, as can be seen in Table 1.

Moreover, in line with Hair et al. (2017), to assume convergent validity, the strength of the path coefficient between the newly developed scale and the single item scale must exceed the threshold of 0.70. In the current model, as can be seen in Table 3, the path coefficient is equal to 0.799, thus proving that the convergent validity of the newly developed scale also measures psychological contract violation, as illustrated in Table 3. Overall the four dimensions of SPCV explained 43.4% of the FI perceptions.

Table 3. *Mean, STDEV, T-Values, P-Values*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (|O/STDEV|) | P Values |
| Faculty incivility perceptions-> Active Faculty Incivility | 0.981 | 0.983 | 0.004 | 226.57 | 0.00 |
| Faculty incivility perceptions -> Passive Faculty Incivility | 0.879 | 0.89 | 0.018 | 49.58 | 0.00 |
| Students' psychological contract violation -> Deviant Expectations | 0.606 | 0.609 | 0.061 | 9.95 | 0.00 |
| Students' psychological contract violation-> Disappointed | -0.799 | -0.799 | 0.032 | 24.849 | 0.00 |
| Students' psychological contract violation -> Faculty incivility perceptions | -0.661 | -0.662 | 0.045 | 14.785 | 0.00 |
| Students' psychological contract violation -> Fairness Expectations  | 0.964 | 0.966 | 0.007 | 147.098 | 0.00 |
| Students' psychological contract violation -> Knowledge Expectations | 0.689 | 0.694 | 0.052 | 13.198 | 0.00 |
| Students' psychological contract violation -> Teaching Expectations | 0.951 | 0.954 | 0.008 | 113.989 | 0.00 |

***Discussion***

The aim of this study has been to construct and validate a generic scale formeasuringthe extent ofstudents’ psychological contract violation, namelySPCV, and to reveal the underlying components. The newly developed tool reflects the perceptions of students with regard to their perceived entitlements concerning expected faculty obligations. The scale measures four dimensions of expectations: 1) fairness – the expectation that faculty will treat students fairly; 2) teaching – the expectation that faculty will use adaptive teaching practices and a variety of teaching methods; 3) knowledge - the expectation that faculty will be knowledgeable, and 4) deviant expectations – which refer to the assumption that faculty will help students get higher grades in spite of their lack of effort or prior knowledge.

The first dimension of student expectations relates to fair treatment from faculty. In this regard, students expect faculty to consider the challenges their students face, such as language barriers, that they will allow students to ask questions during class, and that in general, the faculty will demonstrate high moral standards when teaching and evaluating student performance. This facet was also found in the work of Koskina (2013), who noted that students held expectations of being taught by faculty who were: ‘fair,’ ‘honest,’ ‘transparent,’ and ‘supportive’ (1029). The underlying meaning of this finding is that the psychological contract of students is at least partially based on moral rather than professional expectations from the faculty.

The second dimension of the psychological contract relates to the quality of teaching. In this regard, students expect faculty to use a variety of teaching methods, encourage in-depth thinking, and to be interesting. This finding supports Koskina’s (2013) finding that faculty are expected to bolster their students’ abilities, for example, by building their self-esteem. Core competencies which are much in demand by organizations and employers, such as problem-solving skills, flexibility, and resilience, can be enhanced by the use of varied teaching methods (Itzkovich et al. 2020). In light of today’s rapidly changing workplace, there is clearly a need for higher education institutions to provide their graduates with more tangible value that they can utilize in their future careers.

The third dimension of SPCV relates to faculty knowledge. This facet refers to the expectation for teachers to continually update their knowledge. Kosinka (2013) also noted that as part of the contract, faculty are expected to demonstrate excellent knowledge. The present study, however, phrased this expectation with a focus on the recency of learned material. In other words, it implied that faculty members should continue to do research in their field of expertise to keep their knowledge up to date. To some extent, this requires faculty to balance between two different expectations, that they will invest in meaningful teaching, and that they will actively engage in research to stay up to date on their subject matter. The need for this balance was also noted by Itzkovich et al. (2020), who pointed out that the ‘publish or perish’ culture might be in conflict with teaching tasks and thus distract from faculty investment in teaching.

The most surprising result of the current research was the finding that students also have deviant expectations. It means they expect faculty to raise student grades upon request, give out high grades in general, and to help students during tests. Altogether, these expectations shift the responsibility for students’ learning and achievements to their faculty. Such expectations have not been examined thus far, but they do correspond to earlier findings concerning students’ expectations for high grades and their retaliatory responses to unmet expectations (Vaillancourt 2013). It must be noted that deviant expectations are contradictory to students’ goals of enhancing their own competencies. Educational institutes are recommended to cultivate a culture in which faculty members can avoid meeting such deviant expectations while helping students understand the reasoning for such avoidance. Policies should be aimed at teaching them to take responsibility for their own education in support of their future as lifelong learners.

As part of the discriminant validity tests, a negative correlation was found between psychological contract fulfilment (i.e. the opposite of violation) and faculty incivility. This finding might suggest that perceptions of faculty incivility result from a process that starts when students begin to calculate the gap between their expectations and their fulfilment. Since some of their expectations are based on fairness, a gap between their expectations and their fulfilment is considered a violation of their psychological contract. That leads to an interpretation of faculty behavior as incivility (Itzkovich et al. 2020). This finding means that an effort to avoid violation of the students’ psychological construct can mitigate the perception of faculty incivility, which remains an issue in higher education (Itzkovich et al. 2020).

This research has employed a mixed-method approach to validate the dimensionsfound in the qualitative work of Koskina (2013), resulting in a generic scale able to capture student expectations and the extent to which they are perceived as fulfilled. In addition to the external validity, this study furthers her research by investigating the expectations of different student populations. The findings are also in-line with previous work of Ampofo-Ansah, Antiaye, and Ansah (2019), whose qualitative research found that a breach of the student psychological contract is due to a lack of support and poor faculty professionalism. These dimensions are thus embedded in the generic scale validated by the current research.

Although further research is needed to validate the scale and increase its external validity, especially its deviant dimension, it is step toward understanding the complicated relationship between students and educational institutions as represented by faculty members. Understanding these delicate relations and clarifying student expectations is essential both for the achievements of students and for the success of educational organizations.
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