

Psychological Contract Breach: Consequences of Unkept Promises of Permanent Employment

Ezaz Ahmed
Central Queensland University
E-Mail: e.ahmed@csqu.edu.au

Brian D'Netto
Curtin University
E-Mail: brian.dnetto@curtin.edu.au

John Chelliah
Fiji National University
E-Mail: jchelliah123@gmail.com

Erich Fein
University of Southern Queensland
E-Mail: erich.fein@ussq.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Adopting a psychological contract perspective, this study examines attitudinal and behavioral reactions of temporary employees to repeated broken promises of permanent employment by their employers. Data were collected through self-report and co-worker rating surveys from 140 bank employees in Bangladesh. To identify psychological contract breaches and employees' reactions, the data were analyzed using correlations and regressions. Past research has focused mainly on the organizational benefits of using temporary employees. In contrast, the results of our empirical study indicate that the continuous extension of involuntary temporary status resulted in lower self-reported and co-worker-rated organizational citizenship behaviors, higher self-reported and co-worker ratings of job neglect, and increased turnover intentions. The implications of a psychological contract breach in terms of managing a temporary workforce are also discussed. The findings present new knowledge of the attitudinal and behavioral consequences arising from employers' failure to honor their promise of permanent employment to long-term temporary

employees. This research will be of particular interest to employers, employee advocates, human resource management practitioners, and academics in the field of management. However, the results cannot be generalized to all industry sectors or all types of temporary employees as the study covered temporary employees in the banking sector only.

Keywords: Psychological Contracts, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Temporary Employees, Human Resource Management

INTRODUCTION

Organizations employ temporary employees in order to be flexible in managing human resources to reduce employee costs and to simplify administrative complexity (Burgess & Connell, 2006; Chambel & Alcover, 2011; Chambel & Castanheira, 2012; De Cuyper et al., 2008; Guest, 2004a; Guest, 2004b; Kim & Lee, 2014). Given the increasing global uncertainty, the use of temporary employment in organizations has increased significantly in the last decade in Europe, North America, and Asia (Chambel, 2014; De Cuyper et al., 2008; Karim, 2014). Although some employees may choose temporary employment voluntarily, past research has indicated that most temporary employees directly recruited by organizations wanted to become permanent employees (De Cuyper & De Witte, 2007; Kim & Lee, 2014). Transitioning temporary employment into permanent employment fosters fairness in employment systems by making working conditions equivalent and increases employee identification with the company (Kim & Lee, 2014).

Organizational researchers have found that involuntary temporary employment affects work behaviors, attitudes, and performance (De Cuyper et al., 2008; Connelly & Gallagher, 2004; Ongera, 2015). However research is lacking on the perceptions of temporary employees toward the organization, job performance, and job attitudes when their temporary status is continuously extended. To fill this gap in the literature, we investigated the consequences of continued involuntary temporary status. In this study, we adopted a psychological contract perspective to assess temporary employees' reactions when employers repeatedly break promises of permanency and employees end up working on temporary employment contracts for several years. In a competitive employment environment, a permanent job is the dream of every temporary employee. In order to attract good employees, Bangladeshi banks promise permanent employment upon completion of a prescribed temporary employment period. Thus, temporary employees generally form a psychological contract in which

a permanent job is the reward for successful completion of a prescribed temporary period of service. New temporary employees work extremely hard, demonstrate high levels of commitment, and engage in organizational citizenship behaviors in order to be made permanent. The organization's failure to uphold the promise of permanency is likely to have severe adverse consequences on employee performance and behavior. Our study investigates the attitudinal and behavioral consequences of temporary employees when their job status is not made permanent in the organization. The study also identifies the impact on individuals' job performance after the breach of the psychological contract. Accordingly, our empirical study seeks to obtain a comprehensive understanding of temporary employees' cognitive and behavioral reactions after a psychological contract breach.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Concept of Temporary Employment

Researchers have differentiated temporary employment from standard employment in terms of a) permanency and continuity of jobs, b) continuity of work premises, and c) entitlement of statutory benefits (De Cuyper et al., 2008). Temporary employees can be fixed term or on call as well as from a temporary agency or directly hired (Chambel & Castanheira, 2007). "Temporary employment" has been termed "contingent employment" in North American management studies and "temporary," "fixed term," and "non-permanent employment" in the European management literature (Allen, 2011; De Cuyper & De Witte, 2005a; De Cuyper, De Witte, & Isaksson, 2005b; Connelly & Gallagher, 2004). Organizational researchers have revealed that temporary employees employed directly by the organization would prefer permanent employment status in the organization (De Cuyper et al., 2008). One of the reasons for temporary employees' desire to become permanent is their perception of job insecurity and uncertainty attached with temporary employment status (Berton, Devicienti & Pacelli, 2011). A temporary employee can be terminated for poor performance, whereas a permanent employee will usually be cautioned first (Augustsson, 2012). The extent to which the employees feel higher or lower job satisfaction depends on whether they became temporary employees by choice or because of a lack of alternate employment options (e.g., employability and career opportunity) (Connelly & Gallagher, 2004). In their longitudinal study, Parker et al. (2002) found that the perception of job security increased after the temporary employees became permanent in the organization.

Psychological Contract, Breach of Contract, and Temporary Employment

A psychological contract is defined as “an individual’s beliefs regarding the terms and conditions of a reciprocal exchange agreement between that focal person and another party” (Rousseau, 1989). The basic nature of the contract is “reciprocal obligation” as the employees expect to receive benefits in exchange for their contribution to the organization. A psychological contract is perceptual, dynamic, and evolving in nature as employees understand and interpret their employment relationships in their own way (Rousseau, 1995). The notion of “promise” is an important part of the contract as some of the employee’s expectations are formally or informally confirmed by the organization. Two types of psychological contracts have been widely accepted by organizational researchers: transactional psychological contracts and relational psychological contracts. Transactional psychological relationships are based on the economic transactions between the employee and the employer based on performance whereas relational psychological relationships are based on the social exchange between the two parties (Robinson et al., 1994; Rousseau, 1990, 1989). Temporary employees are believed to have explicitly defined transactional contracts rather than relational psychological contracts with their organizations (Connelly & Gallagher, 2004; Guest, 2004a; Guest, 2004b; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; McDonald & Makin, 2000; Rousseau, 1995; Rousseau & Wade-Benzoni, 1995). Organizational researchers have also suggested that temporary employees’ psychological contracts have short and finite time frames, are narrower in scope, and are less dynamic than relationship contracts (Chambel & Alcover, 2011; Connelly & Gallagher, 2004; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; McDonald & Makin, 2000; McLean Parks et al., 1998). Chambel and Castanheira (2006) found that temporary employees hired directly by the organization develop similar psychological contracts as permanent employees, and these temporary employees build up relational psychological contracts with the organization. Their study found that this relational psychological contract positively influences the temporary employees’ organizational citizenship behaviors. Thus, temporary employees hired directly by the organization have higher levels of transactional relationships when they have a high voluntariness to become temporary employees (Chambel & Castanheira, 2006). However, temporary employees who want to become permanent exhibit favorable attitudes and behaviors in their workplace to increase the possibility of obtaining this permanent status (Connelly & Gallagher, 2004). The research has indicated that the perception of job insecurity is positively related to reduced job satisfaction, lower organizational commitment, lower work engagement, higher turnover intentions, and higher job strain (Mauno et al., 2005; Parker et al., 2002). Guest and Conway (1997) suggested

that psychological contract breach should mediate the relationship between objective and subjective job security. Furthermore, De Cuyper and De Witte (2007) found that the perception of job insecurity is related to unfavorable employee outcomes for both relational and transactional contract breaches.

A psychological contract breach is the cognitive perception that an employee has not received everything that was promised formally or informally by the organization (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). However, few studies (Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2002; Guest & Conway, 2000; Guest & Conway, 1998; Guest, Mackenzie Davey, & Patch, 2003; Millward & Hopkins, 1998; Van Dyne & Ang, 1998) have explicitly investigated and incorporated psychological contracts into temporary employment. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), which is one of the theoretical bases of psychological contracts, states that the employment relationship between the employee and employer can be interpreted in terms of exchanges. The theory advocates that the employee and employer would be satisfied in their relationship as long as they meet each other's requirements. Thus, a psychological contract is an exchange-related concept that shows the nature of the exchange relationship between the employee and the employer. In the case of a psychological contract, temporary employees are likely to maintain a positive relationship with their employer as long as the employer fulfills the employees' psychological contract adequately. In the case of a psychological contract breach; temporary employees are likely to experience mistrust toward their employer and develop a negative relationship with their employer. Employees' perceptions of justice as well as fulfillment of promissory expectations influence their engagement levels through trust (Agarwal, 2014).

Impact of Psychological Contract Breach

Research over the past two decades has indicated that the perception of a psychological contract breach is directly related to the employee's performance, behaviors, and attitudes toward the organization. For example, a psychological contract breach is negatively related to the employee's trust in management (Chelliah et al., 2009; Deery, Iverson, & Walsh, 2006; Zhao, Wayne, Glibkowski, & Bravo, 2007), job satisfaction (Gakovic & Tetrick, 2003; Zhao et al., 2007), intention to remain with the organization (Kickul et al., 2002; Zhao et al., 2007), employee performances (Restubog et al., 2007; Suazo et al., 2005), citizenship behaviors (Suazo & Stone-Romero, 2011; Zhao et al., 2007), civic virtue behavior (Chambel & Alcover, 2011), and employee commitment (Johnson & O'Leary-Kelly, 2003; Raja et al., 2004) and positively related to workplace deviant behaviors (Bordia et al., 2008; Restubog et al., 2007), employees' neglect of job duties (Turnley & Feldman, 1998, 1999, 2000),

job burnout (Chambel & Oliveira-Cruz, 2010), employees' cynicism about their employer (Johnson & O'Leary-Kelly, 2003), higher absenteeism (Deery et al., 2006; Johnson & O'Leary-Kelly, 2003), and revenge cognitions (Ahmed et al., 2007; Bordia et al., 2008). Such findings indicate that the psychological contract breach is negatively related with three forms of employee contributions to the organization: day-to-day performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, and intentions to remain with the organization (Robinson, 1996). In the present study, we examined the relationship between the dependent variables—namely, organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward individual employees and the organization, intentions to leave the organization, and neglect of the job—and the independent variable: temporary employees' psychological contract breach.

DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESES

Impact of Psychological Contract Breach on Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) can be referred to as a set of discretionary workplace behaviors that exceed the employee's basic job requirements (Organ, 1988). OCB is a type of voluntary behavior that benefits the organization as well as task performance (Xuan & Park, 2012). Organizational researchers have divided OCB into two broad categories: behaviors directed toward individuals in the organization (OCB-I) and behaviors concerned more with helping the organization (OCB-O) (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Courtesy and altruism are viewed as mainly benefitting co-workers (OCB-I) while conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue are directed at the organization (OCB-O) (Williams & Anderson, 1991). These behaviors include assisting new employees in the organization, attending optional organization meetings, making constructive suggestions, and volunteering for tasks that are not mandatory.

Although the relationship between affective commitment and discretionary behaviors has generally been studied in traditional employment relationships, some authors have confirmed its existence in relationships involving temporary workers (Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2002; Moorman & Harland, 2002; Lapalme, Simard & Tremblay, 2011). For example, Liden et al. (2003) showed that temporary agency workers' commitment to the client was positively related to altruistic discretionary behaviors in the organization. Rassuli, Karim, and Bingi (2012) found that temporary workers provide the client firm with OCB as the client firm will rehire temporary workers for new project contracts and provide positive references. Moorman and

Harland (2002) also found a positive correlation between client commitment and a more general measure of discretionary behaviors. Chambel and Castanheira (2006) found that direct-hire temporary workers' psychological contract fulfillment had a positive influence on organizational citizen behaviors.

However, psychological contract breach has a negative impact on this relationship. Psychological contract breach is a form of perceived imbalance in the social exchange relationship and can be termed as distributive injustice (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Rousseau, 1995; Turnley & Feldman, 2000). In order to "get even" with the organization after a psychological contract breach, employees tend to reduce their commitment to the organization and display less organizational citizenship behaviors (Turnley et al., 2003). A recent study found that psychological contract breach was negatively related to supervisor rated OCB-I and OCB-O (Restubog et al., 2007). A meta-analysis of 51 empirical studies revealed that perceived psychological contract breach was negatively related to employees' citizenship behaviors (Zhao et al., 2007). Van Dyne and Ang (1998) compared temporary and permanent professional service employees in Singapore in terms of psychological contract, organizational commitment, and citizenship behavior. Their study found that employment contract status moderated the relationship between employees' psychological contract and their organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler (2002) found that temporary employees engage in higher levels of organizational citizenship behaviors than permanent employees when they receive organizational support or higher organizational inducements. Lapalme, Simard, and Tremblay (2011) found that a psychological contract breach is negatively related to temporary workers' discretionary behaviors in the organization. Thus, it is likely that a psychological contract breach will be negatively related to temporary employees' organizational citizenship behaviors toward the organization and individual employees. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed.

Hypothesis 1: A psychological contract breach is negatively related to temporary employees' organizational citizenship behaviors toward individual employees (OCB-I).

Hypothesis 2: A psychological contract breach is negatively related to temporary employees' organizational citizenship behaviors toward the organization (OCB-O).

Psychological Contract Breach and Employees' Intention to Leave the Organization

Research indicates that a psychological contract breach is directly related to increased turnover intentions (Paille, 2015; Tekleab, Orvis, & Taylor, 2013). After a psychological contract breach, employees lose trust in the organization and question whether to remain in the employment relationship (Turnley & Feldman, 1999). Past research indicates that trust is significantly related to organizational commitment (Chen et al., 2005; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Whitener, 2001). If employees perceive a high imbalance in the relationship after a psychological contract breach and expect future mistreatments of the same kind, it is likely that they will look for employment elsewhere. Unfulfilled promises trigger strong negative behavioral outcomes, such as intention to leave the organization (Chi-jung & Chin-i, 2014). This can also be explained from the social exchange perspective. In the event of a psychological contract breach, employees' trust in fulfillment of future exchanges is severely damaged and the situation denies employees' valued benefits. Employees may view the discrepancy in employment due to a psychological contract breach as large and impossible to resolve. As a result, employees may believe that it is important to look for alternative employment opportunities in order to obtain valued benefits in the future. Robinson et al. (1994) found that perceptions about a psychological contract breach are negatively related to the intention to remain with the organization. Other researchers have also established the relationship between the psychological contract breach and intent to leave the organization (Turnley & Feldman, 1998, 1999, 2000). These authors found that psychological contract breach is positively related to exit and voice and negatively related to employee loyalty. A meta-analysis indicated that perceived psychological contract breach is positively related to employees' turnover intentions (Zhao et al., 2007). If temporary employees evaluate the situation, perceive high imbalance in the relationship after a psychological contract breach, and expect future mistreatments of the same kind, we predict that these temporary employees will look for employment elsewhere. Thus, psychological contract breach is likely to be positively related to temporary employees' intention to leave the organization. To test this prediction, the following hypothesis is proposed.

Hypothesis 3: Psychological contract breach is positively related to temporary employees' intent to leave the organization.

Psychological Contract Breach and Employees' Neglect of the Job

Prior studies have suggested that psychological contract breach negatively influences employees' attitudes toward their organizations and jobs (Lee, Chaudhry, & Tekleab, 2014; Lester et al., 2002; Robinson, 1996). When employees lose trust in the organization, their level of work engagement decreases (Agarwal, 2014). It is also evident that psychological contract breach is positively related to employees' neglect of their in-role job duties (Robinson, 1996; Turnley & Feldman, 1999). According to social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), when employees perceive that their organization has not fulfilled its promises, employees are motivated to restore balance to the employment relationship. They may reduce their in-role job efforts to balance this relationship (Lester et al., 2002). Some examples of employees' neglect at work are their half-hearted efforts to complete a task, higher absenteeism from the workplace, failure to attend office or business meetings, and the failure to maintain the promised office hours. Neglect in response to psychological contract breach can also result in lower job performance. Previous research has demonstrated that perceived psychological contract breach leads employees to greater job neglect (Turnley & Feldman, 1998, 1999, 2000). Thus, psychological contract breach is expected to be positively related to temporary employees' neglect of job performance. Hence, the following hypothesis is proposed.

Hypothesis 4: Psychological contract breach is positively related to temporary employees' neglect of job performance.

METHODS

Data for this study were collected at a commercial bank in Dhaka, Bangladesh. The bank is in the private sector and has 26 branches in Bangladesh, of which 8 are in Dhaka. After we secured approval from the bank management, the bank's Human Resources Department introduced the research project to their employees through the bank's internal mailing system. Two hundred fifty temporary bank employees were randomly selected, and a survey pack (research information sheet, self-report questionnaire, co-worker rating form, and self-addressed envelopes) was sent to each employee. Respondents were asked to participate in the study only if they had been promised a permanent position in the bank and they personally wanted to become permanent employees. The respondents were requested to complete the Self-Report Survey (SRS) and were further requested to nominate and distribute the Co-worker Rating Form (CRF) among their co-workers who could comment on the respondents' job behaviors and attitudes. The purpose of the CRF was to obtain data on outcome variables from a different source to reduce common method bias. Both surveys (SRS

and CRF) were anonymous. The two surveys were linked using a non-identifying coding system generated by the respondents. SRS measured all variables in the study (i.e., psychological contract breach, organizational citizenship behaviors toward the organization and individual employees, intention to leave the organization, neglect of the job). CRF measured organizational citizenship behaviors toward the organization and individual employees as well as employees' neglect of the job and intention to leave the organization.

Ultimately, 140 completed and usable responses were received. The overall response rate was 56 percent; 78 percent (N=109) of the respondents were male and 22 percent (N=31) were female. The high number of male respondents reflects the fact that female employees have only recently entered the banking sector in Bangladesh. In terms of age, 26.4 percent (N=37) were under the age of 30, 59.3 percent (N=83) were between 30 and 40 years old, and the remaining 14.3 percent (N=20) were above 41 years of age. The information about educational qualifications revealed that 94.3 percent (N=132) of the respondents were university graduates. A significant number of respondents had worked for considerably long periods as temporary employees; indeed, the data showed that only 37.9 percent (N=53) had been employed for fewer than 5 years.

Measures

The scales used in this study sought to measure employees' perception of psychological contract breach, organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward individual employees and the organization, neglect of the job, and intention to leave the organization. All survey measures were based on reliable and valid scales used in other organizational studies. In the SRS and CRF, respondents were instructed to indicate the level to which they agree with each statement by using a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree).

• Demographic Information

On the SRS, participants were asked to provide information about their age, gender, educational qualifications, and employment tenure with the bank. For the CRF, respondents were asked to provide information about their age, gender, and duration of time they knew the employees.

• Psychological Contract Breach

Psychological contract breach was measured in the SRS using a five-item scale designed to globally assess the overall extent to which an organization has lived up to its obligations and promises (Robinson & Morrison, 2000). The authors

reported an internal consistency of 0.92 for the scale. A sample item from the instrument is: “So far my employer has done an excellent job of fulfilling its promises to me.” The test of reliability showed that removing two items from the measures resulted in substantial improvement in reliability (.67 to .87). Therefore, two items were removed from the scale, and we used the remaining three items as a measure of psychological contract breach. The removed items were: “I have not received everything promised to me in exchange for my contributions to the organization” and “My employer has broken many of its promises to me even though I have maintained my side of the deal.”

- **Organizational Citizenship Behavior toward Organization and Individuals**

Employees’ OCB was assessed using a 16-item scale adapted from Lee and Allen (2002) for both the self-reported and co-worker rated surveys. This scale measured OCB directed toward the organization (OCB-O: eight items) and toward fellow employees (OCB-I: eight items). The authors reported that the coefficient alpha reliabilities for the OCB-O and OCB-I measures were 0.83 and 0.77, respectively. Sample items from OCB-O and OCB-I are, respectively, “Attend functions that are not required but help the organization image” and “Assist others with their duties.” In our study, the reliability estimate for the self-reported and co-worker-rated OCB-O were .93 and .75, respectively. We also found that the internal consistencies for the self-reported (.91) and co-worker-rated (.89) OCB-I also fell in the acceptable range.

- **Intention to Leave the Organization**

Employees’ intention to leave the organization was measured using a five-item scale developed by Becker (1992). The measures were included in both the SRS and CRF. Coefficient alpha reliability for this instrument was reported to be 0.76 (Suazo et al., 2005). One sample item from the scale is: “It is likely that I will actively look for a new job in the next year.” The reliability estimates for the SRS and CRF intention to leave the organization were .90 and .93, respectively.

- **Neglect of the Job**

Employees’ neglect of the job was measured using six items from Turnley and Feldman (1999). The authors reported a Cronbach’s alpha reliability of 0.77 for the scale. The six items were originally taken from Rusbult et al. (1988) and Van Dyne et al. (1994). The scale assessed employees’ intention to avoid their in-role job responsibilities and their avoidance of extra-role assignments. The measure was

included in both the SRS and CRF. One sample item from the scale is: “I try to keep out of sight of my supervisor so I can talk to co-workers, take breaks, or take care of personal business.” The Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities for the SRS and CRF neglect of the job were .82 and .89, respectively. Table 1 summarizes the measures used in the study and their Cronbach’s alpha estimates. All variables had alpha coefficients ranging from 0.75 to 0.93. According to Sekaran (1992), a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient above 0.70 is acceptable. Thus, the scales used in this study have high internal reliability.

Table 1 List of Measures Used in The Study and Their Cronbach’s Alpha Estimates

Measure	Author	# of Items	Cronbach’s Alpha
Psychological Contract Breach	Robinson and Morrison (2000) (Reported Alpha 0.92)	3	(.87)
OCB I*	Lee and Allen (2002) (Reported Alpha 0.77)	8	(.91) ^a , (.89) ^b
OCB O**	Lee and Allen (2002) (Reported Alpha 0.83)	8	(.93) ^a , (.75) ^b
Intention to Leave the Organization	Becker (1992) (Reported Alpha 0.76)	5	(.90) ^a , (.93) ^b
Employee’s Neglect of the Job	Turnley and Feldman (1999) (Reported Alpha 0.77)	6	(.82) ^a , (.89) ^b

* Organizational Citizenship Behaviors towards Individual employees

** Organizational Citizenship Behaviors towards the Organization

^a Cronbach’s Alpha score of the measure used in the self-report survey of the study

^b Cronbach’s Alpha score of the measure used in co-worker rated survey of the study

All alpha coefficients are above 0.70 indicating high internal reliability of the scales (Sekaran, 1992)

Table 2 Mean, Standard Deviations, Zero-order Correlations and Reliability Coefficients for the Study Variables (N=140)

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Gender	1.22	.41													
2. Age	3.32	1.10	-.16												
3. Education	3.81	.54	.09	.35 ^{***}											
4. Tenure	2.51	.74	-.07	.72 ^{***}	.36 ^{**}										
5. Psychological Contract breach	3.68	.94	-.01	.00	.30 ^{**}	-.02									
6. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour towards individuals	5.06	.95	-.05	-.23 ^{**}	-.15	-.28 ^{**}	-.33 ^{***}								
7. Co-worker rated Organizational Citizenship Behaviour towards individuals	5.20	.79	-.16	.28 ^{**}	.00	.18 [*]	-.24 ^{**}	.29 ^{**}							
8. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour towards organization	5.02	1.09	-.05	-.30 ^{**}	-.10	-.33 ^{**}	-.24 ^{**}	.83 ^{***}	.28 ^{**}						
9. Co-worker rated Organizational Citizenship Behaviour towards organization	4.96	.68	-.07	-.06	-.28 ^{**}	-.15	-.42 ^{**}	.34 ^{***}	.62 ^{**}	.32 ^{**}					
10. Intention to leave the organization	3.48	1.15	-.01	.19 [*]	.10	.11	.51 ^{**}	-.45 ^{***}	-.09	-.48 ^{**}	-.21 [*]				
11. Co-worker rated Intention to leave the Organization	2.36	1.27	.05	-.25 ^{**}	-.09	-.33 ^{**}	.24 ^{**}	.04	-.40 ^{**}	.09	-.27 ^{***}	.09			

Table 2 Mean, Standard Deviations, Zero-order Correlations and Reliability Coefficients for the Study Variables (N=140)
(Continued)

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
12. Neglect of the job	2.14	.98	.00	-.19 ^b	-.28 ^{***}	-.21 [*]	.22 ^b	-.13	-.30 ^{***}	-.09	-.28 ^{***}	.26 ^{***}	.16	.82	
13. Co-worker rated Neglect of the job	2.31	1.01	-.04	-.15	-.08	-.08	.15	-.06	-.35 ^{***}	-.00	-.42 ^{***}	.00	.62 ^{***}	.25 ^{***}	.90

Note: Gender (1= male, 2= female), Age (1= 20-25 years, 2= 26-30 years, 3= 31-35 years, 4= 36-40 years, 5= 41-45 years, 6= 46 years and above),

Education (1= Higher secondary, 2= Bachelor Degree Pass Course, 3= Bachelor Degree Honors Course and 4= Master Degree),

Tenure (1= less than 1 year, 2= 1-5 years, 3= 6-10 years, 4= 11-15 years, 5= 16-20 years, 6= 21-25 years and 7= 25 years and above) ^{*} p<.05, ^{***} p<.01,

^{***} p<.001

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics, inter-correlations, and internal consistency reliabilities are summarized in Table 2. The internal consistency reliability coefficients are shown in parentheses along the main diagonal of the variable. To evaluate the hypothesized relationships among the variables, several hierarchical regressions were conducted. Hierarchical regression analyses were performed separately for the self-reported and co-worker rated surveys. The current study also included a number of control variables in the regression analysis. In the first step of the hierarchical regression analysis, the dependent variables (OCB-I, OCB-O, intention to leave the organization, and employees' neglect of the job) were regressed on the control variables (gender, age, educational qualifications, and employment tenure). In the next step, psychological contract breach was entered in the regression to test the main effect. Summaries of the regression analysis for the SRS and CRF are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

A correlation analysis was used to examine the relationships among the study variables. Zero-order correlations were all in the expected directions. Psychological contract breach was negatively correlated to both the self-reported ($r = -.33, p < .01$) and co-worker-rated organizational citizenship behaviors toward individual employees ($r = -.24, p < .01$). Furthermore, psychological contract breach was negatively correlated to self-reported ($r = -.24, p < .01$) and co-worker-rated organizational citizenship behaviors toward the organization ($r = -.42, p < .01$). It was also expected that psychological contract breach would be positively related to an employee's intention to leave the organization and employee's neglect of the job. This is supported by the positive correlation between psychological contract breach and both the self-reported ($r = .51, p < .01$) and co-worker-rated ($r = .24, p < .01$) intention to leave the organization. Furthermore, psychological contract breach was positively correlated to self-reported ($r = .22, p < .05$) employee's neglect of the job.

None of the demographic variables, with the exception of educational qualifications, were significantly correlated ($r = .30, p < .01$) to psychological contract breach. Further analysis showed that some demographic characteristics were significantly correlated to the outcome variables. For example, participants' age and employment tenure were negatively correlated to the self-rated organizational citizenship behaviors directed toward both individual employees ($r = -.23, p < .01$; $r = -.28, p < .01$) and the organization ($r = -.30, p < .01$; $r = -.33, p < .01$), respectively. Considering these relationships, demographic variables were controlled in the subsequent regression analyses.

Hypotheses 1 and 2 predicted that psychological contract breach was negatively related to an employee's organizational citizenship behaviors toward the individual employees and organization. As shown in Table 3, psychological contract breach was negatively related to self-reported ($\beta = -.36, p < .001$) and co-worker-rated ($\beta = -.24, p < .01$) organizational citizenship behaviors toward individual employees, providing support for Hypothesis 1. In the case of organizational citizenship behavior toward the organization, psychological contract breach was found to be negatively associated to self-reported ($\beta = -.30, p < .001$) and co-worker-rated ($\beta = -.40, p < .001$) organizational citizenship behaviors toward the organization, supporting Hypothesis 2. These results indicate that temporary employees who are directly hired by the organization demonstrate lower organizational citizenship behaviors toward the individual employees and organization in the event of a psychological contract breach. These findings are consistent with previous research of psychological contract breach and organizational citizenship behaviors toward individual employees and organizations (Turnley et al., 2003, Turnley & Feldman, 1999).

Hypothesis 3 posited that psychological contract breach was positively related to an employee's intent to leave the organization. Hypothesis 3 was supported through the analysis as psychological contract breach was positively associated with the self-reported ($\beta = .55, p < .001$) and co-worker-rated ($\beta = .24, p < .01$) intention to leave the organization (Table 4). These findings concur with earlier studies on psychological contract breach and employees' intent to leave the organization. Past research has also indicated that employees' intent to leave the organization is positively related to psychological contract breach (Raja et al., 2004; Robinson et al., 1994).

Hypothesis 4 stated that psychological contract breach was positively related to an employee's neglect of the job. As shown in Table 4, psychological contract breach was positively related to self-reported ($\beta = .32, p < .001$) employee's neglect of job. However, co-worker-rated ($\beta = .19$) employee's neglect of the job was found to be not significant in the analysis. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was partially supported as the self-rated neglect of the job was found to be significant. The results reveal that, although temporary employees actually decreased their job-related efforts after a psychological contract breach, this decrease was not visible to co-workers. The first part of these results supports previous research, which revealed that employees' neglect of their jobs is positively related to psychological contract breach (Lester et al., 2002; Robinson, 1996; Robinson et al., 1994).

Table 3 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Self Report and Co-worker rated Survey for OCB I and OCB O

Predictors	OCB I			Co-worker rated OCB I			OCB O			Co-worker rated OCB O		
	β	Adjusted R^2	ΔR^2	β	Adjusted R^2	ΔR^2	β	Adjusted R^2	ΔR^2	β	Adjusted R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1												
Gender	-.08			-.10			-.10			-.03		
Age	-.05			.30 [*]			-.17			.15		
Education	-.04			-.10			.05			-.26 ^{**}		
Tenure	-.23	.06 [*]		-.01	.07 ^{**}		-.22	.10 ^{**}		-.16	.06 [*]	
Step 2												
Gender	-.10			-.12			-.11			-.05		
Age	-.08			.29 [*]			-.19			.13		
Education	.09			-.00			.16			-.12		
Tenure	-.27 [*]			-.04			-.26 [*]			-.21		
Psychological Contract Breach	-.36 ^{***}	.17 ^{***}	.12 ^{***}	-.24 ^{**}	.12 ^{**}	.05 ^{**}	-.30 ^{***}	.18 ^{***}	.09 ^{***}	-.40 ^{***}	.20 ^{***}	.14 ^{***}

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Self Report and Co-worker rated Survey for Intention to Leave the Organization and Employee's Job Neglect

Predictors	Intention to leave organization		Co-worker rated Intention to leave organization		Employee's Job Neglect		Co-worker rated Employee's Job Neglect	
	β	Adjusted R ²	β	Adjusted R ²	β	Adjusted R ²	β	Adjusted R ²
Step 1								
Gender	.01		.01		.01		-.07	
Age	.22		-.07		-.05		-.20*	
Education	.05		.03		-.24**		-.03	
Tenure	-.06	.01	-.30**	.07**	-.08	.06**	.06	.00
Step 2								
Gender	.05		.03		.03		-.06	
Age	.25*		-.03		-.03		-.19	
Education	-.16		-.06		-.35***		-.09	
Tenure	.00		.28**		-.05		.08	
Psychological Contract Breach	.55***	.29***	.24***	.11**	.32***	.16***	.18	.02
			.27***		.05**		.10***	
								.02

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Temporary employees play an important role in organizations. Temporary work is associated with more flexibility and lower labor costs (Torka & Schyns, 2010). Yet most employers pay little attention to the needs of these employees due to their assumption that temporary employees have only short-term transactional psychological contracts (Chambel & Alcover, 2011). The main focus of our research was to assess how temporary employees react when the promise of permanent employment is broken, resulting in a continuous extension of involuntary temporary status.

Our study differs from past research on temporary employees, where the duration of temporary employment was relatively short and temporary employees were on fixed-term contracts or on call (Chambel & Castanheira, 2007). Nearly 60 percent of our respondents had been working as temporary employees with the same bank for more than five years. Contrary to past research, which indicated that temporary employees formed only transactional psychological contracts (Connelly & Gallagher, 2004), our results indicated that temporary employees hired directly by the bank with the promise of permanency after a certain time period appeared to develop long-term relational psychological contracts. When this type of psychological contract is formed, the employee's expectations are much higher and the effect of the breach of these expectations will be more severe. As these temporary bank employees may work directly with customers, the quality of customer service is likely to decrease considerably, reducing the competitive advantage of the bank. Hence, the breach of psychological contracts for these temporary employees can have significant adverse consequences for the bank. Our empirical study concurs with past research indicating that perceived psychological contract breach negatively influences temporary employees' citizenship behaviors toward individual employees (OCB-I) and toward the organization (OCB-O) (Suazo & Stone-Romero, 2011). We also found psychological contract breach to be positively related to employees' intention to leave the organization and neglect of job duties. It is interesting to note that, although temporary employees reported that they actually neglected their job duties after a psychological contract breach, this neglect was not detected by their co-workers. In a country like Bangladesh, temporary employees do not have attractive job options. As they have to continue working in the organization, these employees ensure that neither their co-workers nor supervisors detect any decrease in job performance, even though such neglect of job duties actually occurs.

These results support the findings of previous research on psychological contract breach, which indicated that individuals withdraw their citizenship behaviors,

neglect job duties that help the organization, and increase their intention to leave the organization (Paille, 2015). Any decrease in employee commitment and/or morale is detrimental to the organization. The results of our research add to the increasing psychological contract literature suggesting that employees' perceived psychological contract breach is negatively related to organizational citizenship behaviors (Robinson & Morrison, 1995; Turnley et al., 2003; Turnley & Feldman, 1999). This finding is consistent with previous research on permanent employees, where higher perceptions of psychological contract breach are related to lower organizational citizenship behaviors toward individual employees and the organization (Turnley et al., 2003; Turnley & Feldman, 1999), higher intentions to leave the organization (Raja et al., 2004; Turnley & Feldman, 1998, 1999, 2000), and higher employee job neglect (Lester et al., 2002; Robinson, 1996; Robinson et al., 1994).

The findings of the current research have significant implications for individual employees and organizations. In a world of increasing economic uncertainty, the value of a permanent job is extremely high. Thus, a psychological contract breach, which involves the failure to fulfill a promise of permanent employment, can have serious consequences. For individual employees, higher perceptions of psychological contract breach will result in lower employee job performance, higher job neglect, and higher intention to leave the organization. For the organization, temporary employees' psychological contract breach will affect organizational performance and the retention of employees. Similar to past research, our study revealed that temporary employees reduce organizational citizenship behaviors after a psychological contract breach (Zhao et al., 2007). Employees' organizational citizenship behaviors are believed to be important for the effective functioning of the organization (Tsui-HsuTsai & Jing Lin, 2014). It can be predicted that organizational performance will be negatively affected when temporary employees reduce their organizational citizenship behavior after a psychological contract breach. Employee retention will be another issue for the organization when temporary employees are not made permanent. When employers fail to fulfill their promise of permanency, temporary employees constantly look for opportunities outside the organization, resulting in a dual impact on the organization's human resource management. First, a vacuum of employees will immediately be created within the organization; second, the organization will incur the cost of recruiting, training, and retaining new employees. In workplaces where these disgruntled temporary employees do not leave the organization and continue to work for several years as temporary employees, the negative consequences are likely to be prolonged and more intense. It is thus important for the organization to formulate employee-friendly human resource policies for temporary employees and ensure that

the promise of permanency is fulfilled. Finally, human resource management practitioners will benefit from the current study by realizing the significance of making promises to temporary employees about their job status. The findings of our study will enable practitioners to effectively manage the employment relationship with temporary employees.

Limitations of the Study and Scope for Future Research

There are some limitations of the current study. First, the study was limited to temporary employees directly hired by the organization. Thus, the results of the study cannot be generalized to all types of temporary employees because of the existence of different types of temporary employees in the literature (on call workers, agency workers, casual workers, etc.; Guest, 2004a; Guest, 2004b). Second, the study was cross-sectional in nature. Although self-report and co-worker-rated surveys were used in the study to reduce common method bias, a longitudinal research design could be more convincing. Third, data for the study were only collected from the banking sector. The results may vary in other sectors. Finally, the study was conducted only in Bangladesh. Hence, the generalizability of the results of our studies to other countries will have to be done with caution.

Our study contributes to the existing literature by explaining the consequences of continued involuntary temporary status within an organization. However, the results of our study also suggest future research directions. First, there has been limited research on behavior, attitude, and performance of temporary employees employed directly by organizations, rather than through recruitment agencies (Connelly & Gallagher, 2004; Guest, 2004a; Guest, 2004b). More research should be conducted on temporary employees directly employed by the organization. Second, future research should incorporate a longitudinal research design to identify causal relationships among the studied variables. Third, future research should also consider conducting similar studies in different industries to assess if any difference exists among the responses of temporary employees. Finally, to increase the generalizability of the findings, future research can replicate our study in other countries.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, U.A. (2014). Linking justice, trust and innovative work behaviour to work engagement. *Personnel Review*, 43(1), 41-73.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-2012-0019>

- Ahmed, E., Bordia, P., & Restubog, S.L.D. (2007). Revenge seeking and forgiveness: employees' cognitive responses after a psychological contract breach. *In proceedings of the 9th South Asian Management Forum, Dhaka, 2007.*
- Allen, B. C. (2011). The role of professional identity commitment in understanding the relationship between casual employment and perceptions of career success. *Career Development International*, 16(2), 195-216. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13620431111115631>
- Augustsson, G. (2012). The organizational control of temporary workers: An interview study in Sweden. *International Journal of Management*, 29(3), 48-63.
- Becker, T.E. (1992). Foci and bases of commitment: Are they distinctions worth making. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(1), 232-244. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256481>
- Berton, F., Devicienti, F., & Pacelli, L. (2011). Are temporary jobs a port of entry into permanent employment? *International Journal of Manpower*, 32(8), 879-899. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437721111181651>
- Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Bordia P., Restubog, S.L.D., & Tang, R.L. (2008). When employees strike back: investigating mediating mechanisms between psychological contract breach and workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1104-1117. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1104>
- Burgess, J., & Connell, J. (2006). Temporary work and human resources management: issues, challenges and responses. *Personnel Review*, 35(2), 129-140. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483480610645786>
- Chambel, M. J. (2014). Does the fulfillment of supervisor psychological contract make a difference? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 35(1), 20-37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-03-2012-0031>
- Chambel, M.J., & Alcover, C.M. (2011). The psychological contract of call-centre workers: employment conditions, satisfaction and civic virtue behaviours. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 32(1), 115-134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0143831X10376421>
- Chambel, M.J., & Castanheira, F. (2006). Different temporary work status, different behaviors in organization. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20(3), 351-367. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-005-9015-0>
- Chambel, M.J., & Castanheira, F. (2007). They don't want to be temporaries: similarities between temps and core workers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(8), 943-959. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.471>

- Chambel, M. J., & Castanheira, F. (2012). Training of temporary workers and the social exchange process. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(2), 191-209. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683941211199563>
- Chambel, M.J., & Oliveira-Cruz, F. (2010). Breach of psychological contract and the development of burnout and engagement: a longitudinal study among soldiers on a peace-keeping mission. *Military Psychology*, 22(1), 110-127. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08995601003638934>
- Chelliah, J., Nikolova, N., & Davis, D. (2009). Outsourcing to self-employed knowledge workers: what are the key success factors? *New Zealand Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9(2), 72-85.
- Chen, Z. X., Aryee, S., & Lee, C. (2005). Test of a mediation model of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(3), 457-470. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.01.001>
- Chi-jung, F., & Chin-i, C. (2014). Unfulfilled expectations and promises, and behavioral outcomes. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 22(1), 61-75 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-08-2011-0505>
- Connelly, C.E., & Gallagher D.G. (2004). Emerging Trends in Contingent Work Research. *Journal of Management*, 30(6), 959-983. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2004.06.008>
- Coyle-Shapiro, J.A.M., & Kessler, I. (2002). Contingent and non-contingent working in local government: Contrasting psychological contracts. *Public Administration*, 80(1), 77-101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9299.00295>
- Coyle-Shapiro, J.A.M., & Kessler, I. (2000). Consequences of the psychological contract for the employment relationship: a large scale survey. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(7), 903-930. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00210>
- Coyle-Shapiro, J.A.M., & Kessler, I. (2002). Exploring reciprocity through the lens of the psychological contract: employee and employer perspectives. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 11(1), 69-86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13594320143000852>
- De Cuyper, N., De Jong, J., De Witte, H., Isaksson, K., Rigotti, T., & Schalk, R. (2008). Literature review of theory and research on the psychological impact of temporary employment: towards a conceptual model. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10(1), 25-51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2007.00221.x>

- De Cuyper, N., & De Witte, H. (2005a). Job insecurity: mediator or moderator of the relationship between contract type and well-being. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 31(4), 79-86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v31i4.211>
- De Cuyper, N., & De Witte, H. (2007). Associations between contract preference and attitudes, well-being and behavioral intentions of temporary workers. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 28(2), 292-312 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0143831X07076122>
- De Cuyper, N., De Witte, H., & Isaksson, K. (2005b). Temporary employment in Europe: conclusions. In De Cuyper, N., De Witte, H. and Isaksson, K (Eds), *Employment Contracts and Well-Being among European Workers*, Ashgate, Hampshire, 225-243.
- Deery, S.J., Iverson, R.D., & Walsh J.T. (2006). Toward a better understanding of psychological contract breach: a study of customer service employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 166-175. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.166>
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Metaanalytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611-628. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.611>
- Gakovic, A., & Tetrick, L.E. (2003). Perceived organizational support and work status: a comparison of the employment relationships of part-time and full-time employees attending university classes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(5), 649-666. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.206>
- Guest, D. (2004a). Flexible employment contracts, the psychological contract and employee outcomes: an analysis and review of the evidence. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 5(1), 1-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-8545.2004.00094.x>
- Guest, D.E. (2004b). The psychology of the employment relationship: an analysis based on the psychological contract. *Applied Psychology*, 53(4), 541-555. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-8545.2004.00094.x>
- Guest, D., & Conway, N. (1997). *Employee Motivation and the Psychological Contract*. CIPD, London.
- Guest, D.E., & Conway, N. (1998). *Fairness and Work and the Psychological Contract*. CIPD, London.
- Guest, D., & Conway, N (2000). *The Psychological Contract in the Public Sector*. CIPD, London.

- Guest, D., Mackenzie Davey, K., & Patch, A. (2003). The psychological contracts, attitudes and behaviour of workers on temporary and permanent contracts. Working paper, Management Centre, King's College, London.
- Johnson, J.L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A.M. (2003). The effects of psychological contract breach and organizational cynicism: not all social exchange violations are created equal. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(5), 627-647. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.207>
- Karim, A. (2014). The increasing usage of professional contingent workers: A review. *Journal of Global Business Management*, 10(1), 33-37.
- Kickul, J., Lester, S.W., & Finkl, J. (2002). Promise breaking during radical organizational change: do justice interventions make a difference? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(4), 469-488. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.151>
- Kim, H., & Lee, D. (2014). The relationship between the internal labour market and transitions from temporary to permanent employment in Korea. *Relations Industrielles*, 69(3), 597-620. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7202/1026760ar>
- Lapalme, M., Simard, G., & Tremblay, M. (2011). The influence of psychological contract breach on temporary workers' commitment and behaviors: A multiple agency perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(3), 311-324. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9190-5>
- Lee, J., Chaudhry, A., & Tekleab, A.G. (2014). An interactionist perspective on employee performance as a response to psychological contract breach. *Personnel Review*, 43(6), 861-880. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/PR-10-2012-0173>
- Lee, K., & Allen, N.J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: the role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 131-142. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.1.131>
- Lester, S.W., Turnley, W.H., Bloodgood, J.M., & Bolino, M.C. (2002). Not seeing eye to eye: differences in supervisor and subordinate perceptions of and attributions for psychological contract breach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(1), pp.39-56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.126>
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Kraimer, M. L., & Sparrowe, R. T. (2003). The dual commitment of contingent workers: An examination of contingents' commitment to the agency and the organization. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(5), 609-625. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.208>
- Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., Mäkikangas, A., & Nätti, J. (2005). Psychological consequences of fixed-term employment and perceived job insecurity among

- health care staff. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 14(3), 209-237. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13594320500146649>
- McDonald, D.J., & Makin, P.J. (2000). The psychological contract, organizational commitment and job satisfaction of temporary staff. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 21(2), 84-91. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437730010318174>
- McLean Parks, J., Kidder, D.L. & Gallagher, D.G. (1998). Fitting square pegs into round holes: mapping the domain of contingent work arrangements onto the psychological contract. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(1), 697-730. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(1998\)19:1+%3C697::AID-JOB974%3E3.0.CO;2-I](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(1998)19:1+%3C697::AID-JOB974%3E3.0.CO;2-I)
- Millward, L.J., & Hopkins, L.J. (1998). Psychological contracts, organizational and job commitment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(1), 1530-1556.
- Moorman, R. H., & Harland, L. K. (2002). Temporary employees as good citizens: Factors influencing their OCB performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(2), 171-187. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1019629330766>
- Morrison, E.W., & Robinson S.L. (1997). When Employees Feel Betrayed: A Model of How Psychological Contract Violation Develops. *The Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 226-256. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/259230>
- Ongera, R. M. (2015). Influence of temporary employment on employee performance: A case study of Safaricom Limited. *International Journal of Business and Commerce*, 4(4), 1-37.
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington Books, Lexington, M.A.
- Paillé, P. (2015). Perceived organizational support and work outcomes: the mediating role of psychological contract violation. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 23(2), 91-212. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-11-2012-0627>
- Parker, S.K., Griffin, M.A., Sprigg, C.A., & Wall, T.D. (2002). The effect of temporary contracts on perceived work characteristics and job strain: a longitudinal study. *Personnel Psychology*, 55(3), 689-719. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2002.tb00126.x>
- Raja, U., Johns, G., & Ntalianis, F. (2004). The impact of personality on psychological contracts. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 350-367. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/20159586>

- Rassuli, A., Karim, A., & Bingi, P. (2012). The contributory role of professionalism in shaping contingent workers' OCB. *Journal of International Management Studies*, 7(2), 112-119.
- Restubog, S.L.D., Bordia, P., & Tang, R.L. (2007). Behavioural outcomes of psychological contract breach in a non-Western culture: the moderating role of equity sensitivity. *British Journal of Management*, 18(4), 376-386. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2007.00531.x>
- Robinson, S.L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(4), 574-599. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2393868>
- Robinson, S.L., Kraatz, M.S., & Rousseau, D.M. (1994). Changing obligations and the psychological contract: a longitudinal study. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(1), 137-152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256773>
- Robinson, S.L., & Morrison, E.W. (1995). Psychological contracts and OCB: the effect of unfulfilled obligations on civic virtue behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(1), 289-298. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.4030160309>
- Robinson, S.L., & Morrison, E.W. (2000). The development of psychological contract breach and violation: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(5), 525-546. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379\(200008\)21:5%3C525::AID-JOB40%3E3.0.CO;2-T](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379(200008)21:5%3C525::AID-JOB40%3E3.0.CO;2-T)
- Rousseau D.M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2(1), 121-139. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01384942>
- Rousseau, D.M. (1990). New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: a study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(1), 389-400. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110506>
- Rousseau, D.M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452231594>
- Wade-Benzoni K.A. (1995). Changing individual-organization attachments: a two-way street. In Howard, A. (Ed) *The Changing Nature of Work*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, 290-321.
- Rusbult, C.E., Farrell, D., Rogers, G., & Iii, A.G.M. (1988). Impact of exchange variables on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: an integrative model of responses to declining job satisfaction. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 31(3), 599-627. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256461>

- Sekaran, U. (1992). *Research Methods for Business: A skill building approach*, New York: Wiley.
- Suazo, M. M., & Stone-Romero, E. (2011). Implications of psychological contract breach. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(5), 366-382
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683941111138994>
- Suazo, M.M., Turnley, W.H., & Mai-Dalton, R.R. (2005). The role of perceived violation in determining employees' reactions to psychological contract breach. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 12(1), 24-36.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/107179190501200104>
- Suazo, M.M., & Stone-Romero, E.F. (2011). Implications of psychological contract breach: A perceived organizational support perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(5), 366-382. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683941111138994>
- Tekleab, A. G., Orvis, K. A., & Taylor, M. S. (2013). Deleterious consequences of change in newcomers' employer-based psychological contract obligations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 28(3), 361-374.
- Torka, N., & Schyns, B. (2010). On the job and co-worker commitment of Dutch agency workers and permanent employees. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(8), 1307-1322.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2010.483858>
- Tsui-Hsu Tsai, T., & Jing Lin, A. (2014). Do psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior affect organizational performance in non-profit organizations? *Chinese Management Studies*, 8(3), 397-417.
- Turnley, W.H., Bolino, M.C., Lester, S.W., & Bloodgood, J.M. (2003). The impact of psychological contract fulfilment on the performance of in-role and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 29(1), 187-206.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(02\)00214-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(02)00214-3)
- Turnley, W.H., & Feldman, D.C. (1998). Psychological contract violations during corporate restructuring. *Human Resource Management*, 37(1), 71-83.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-050X\(199821\)37:1%3C71::AID-RM7%3E3.3.CO;2-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-050X(199821)37:1%3C71::AID-RM7%3E3.3.CO;2-5)
- Turnley, W.H., & Feldman, D.C. (1999). The impact of psychological contract violations on exit, voice, loyalty and neglect. *Human Relations*, 52(1), 895-922.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001872679905200703>
- Turnley, W.H., & Feldman, D.C. (2000). Re-examining the effects of psychological contract violations: unmet expectations and job dissatisfaction as mediators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(1), 25-42.

- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(200002\)21:1%3C25::AID-JOB2%3E3.0.CO;2-Z](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200002)21:1%3C25::AID-JOB2%3E3.0.CO;2-Z)
- Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S (1998). Organizational citizenship behavior of contingent workers in Singapore. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 41(6), 692-703. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256965>
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J.W., & Dienesch R.M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 765-802. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256600>
- Whitener, E.M. (2001). Do 'high commitment' human resource practices affect employee commitment? A cross-level analysis using hierarchical linear modelling. *Journal of Management*, 27(5), 515-535.
- Williams, L.J., & Anderson, S.E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305>
- Xuan, J., & Park, D. S. (2012). Effects of psychological contract on organizational citizenship behavior: The mediating role of professors' emotional labor strategy. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(24), 7184-7197.
- Zhao, H., Wayne, S.J., Glibkowski, B.C. & Bravo, J. (2007). The impact of psychological contract breach on work related outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 647-680. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00087.x>

