

Psychological Contract Breach and Organizational Deviance Behaviour: Mediating Role of Professional Commitment

Ganesh Bhattarai¹, Dipendra Karki², Rewan Kumar Dahal³

¹Principal author:

Tribhuvan University, Management Department, Nepal Commerce Campus, Kathmandu,
Nepal
ganesh@ncc.edu.np

²Corresponding author:

Tribhuvan University, Faculty of Management, Nepal Commerce Campus, Kathmandu,
Nepal
dipendra.karki@ncc.tu.edu.np

³Co-author

Rewan Kumar Dahal,
Tribhuvan University, Faculty of Management, Nepal Commerce Campus, Kathmandu,
Nepal
rewan.dahal@ncc.tu.edu.np

Received: November 11, 2020; Revised & Accepted: December 13, 2020; Published: January 10, 2021

© Copyright: Bhattarai et al. (2020).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

Abstract

This study was carried out to measure the direct impact of employees' psychological contract breach on organizational deviance behavior and professional commitment, direct impact of professional commitment on organizational deviance behavior, and mediating role of professional commitment in the relationship between psychological contract breaches to organizational deviance behavior. As the respondents, 426 employees working in Nepalese non-profit making organization (i.e. international non-government organization working in Nepal as well as national level non-government organization) were surveyed. Conclusions

were drawn from the analysis of cross-sectional perceptual data adopting quantitative research method, deducting reasoning approach and positivist research philosophy. Regression analysis, after the confirmatory factor analysis, revealed that (a) employee's psychological contract breach was positively associated with organizational deviance behavior, (b) employees' psychological contract was negatively associated with professional commitment, (c) employees' professional commitment was negatively associated with organizational deviance behavior, and (d) professional commitment mediated the relationship of psychological contract breach to organizational deviance behavior. Moreover, regarding effect size, the direct effect size of psychological contract breach to predict organizational deviance behavior was .86, and an indirect effect through professional commitment was -.12. Based on the study's conclusion, numbers of theoretical implication and practical implications are suggested.

Keywords: Mediating role, Nepalese non-profit-making organization, organizational deviance behavior, professional commitment, psychological contract breach

JEL Classification: M0 M1

Background

Organizational deviance behavior is counterproductive work behavior, which is also termed as corporate misbehavior, workplace deviance, workplace aggression, and antisocial behavior (Sulea et al., 2015). The common theme of all these terms is employees' voluntary acts of impairing or expecting to impair organization and their stakeholders (Giacalone & Greenberg, 1997). Organizational deviance behaviors are common in organizations and it reflects as theft, sabotage, absenteeism, violation of safety procedure (Cohen, 2016). Organizational deviance behavior is harmful for the credibility of the organization as well as the employees themselves. If an organization could not detect and cure employees' deviant behavior on time, they might endure enormous losses directly or indirectly. Therefore, practicing managers and academicians have to know why employees exhibit organizational deviance behavior and how it can be reduced.

As explained by social exchange theory, an employer and employee exchange reciprocal benefits (Conway & Briner, 2005) each other. Therefore, an employee might exhibit their deviance behavior when they perceive their employer breached the psychological contract. Psychological contract breach refers to the non-fulfillment of the unwritten elements of the exchange relationship between an employee and the organization (Rousseau, 1995). Psychological contract breach effects as lesser job satisfaction, lesser organizational trust, higher organizational cynicism, and a higher level of turnover intention (Turnley et al. 2003), lower commitment and performance, and increased deviance behavior (Bal et al., 2008; Bal et al., 2015). Moreover, Zhao et al. (2007) state psychological contract breach has an intense impact on employees' work behaviors. Therefore, minimization of employees' organizational deviance behavior is crucial by improving their psychological contract breach.

Besides the direct influence of employees' psychological contracts on their organizational deviance behavior, there might be an indirect effect through professional commitment. Professional commitment refers to the employees' dedication, loyalty, connection, belief, and attachment to their chosen career. It is essential for the success of someone's career and their organization's prosperity where they work. When employees perceive their organizations cannot fulfill their psychological contract, they feel insecure in their current job and might be less attached to their professional commitment. Again, it is natural that professionally less committed employees exhibit their organizational deviance behavior. Therefore, the role of the professional commitment in the path of the psychological contract breach to organizational deviance cannot be ignored in the literature of psychological contract breach. Hence, this study proposes the mediating role of professional commitment in the relationship between the psychological contract breach and organizational deviance behavior. However, many studies have focused on the moderators in the relationship between the psychological contract breach and work outcomes (Dulac et al., 2008).

Nevertheless, no study had paid attention to measure the impact of the psychological contract breach on organizational deviance behavior as well as the role of professional commitment in the relationship of psychological contract breach to organizational deviance behavior. As a response to such problems, this study aims to measure the direct impact of psychological contract breach on their organizational deviance behavior as well as the mediating role of professional commitment in the relationship between psychological contract breach and organizational deviance behavior in the context of employees working Nepalese non-profit making organization (i.e., international non-government organization working in Nepal as well as national level non-government organization).

Literature Review and Hypothesis

Psychological Contract Breach

Psychological contracts comprise the employees' perception concerning the terms and conditions of the exchange agreement between employees themselves and their organizations (Robinson, 1995). Chen et al. (2008) stated that an employee's psychological contract contains the beliefs about the employer's responsibilities to the employee and the employee's own responsibilities to the employer. Psychological contract breach happens after the employer becomes unsuccessful to satisfy one or more responsibilities within the psychological contract (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). Therefore, a psychological contract breach is viewed as the perceptive aspect of agreement assessment, and arises from an incident where an employee observes an inconsistency between what has been assured and what has been provided (Rousseau, 1995).

Because of the subjective nature of the psychological contract, perception of contract and its breach emerge during the interpretation process or sense making (Chaudhry et al., 2009).

One of the fundamental beliefs of psychological contract research has been the idea that understandings of contract breach and destruction rise from subjective insights about actions happening in the workplace, and that this procedure is prone to explanation and sense making (Solinger et al., 2015). Emphasizing the implicit type of the contract, Morrison and Robinson (1997) highlighted towards the important role of interpretation procedures as underpinning for how psychological contracts evolve and are observed to be destroyed.

Professional Commitments

Professional commitment involves employees' self-generated attachment with their careers. Professionally committed employees focus more on their attachment to the career and organization and expect a supportive environment from the employer. Blau (1985) defined professional commitment as "one's attitude towards one's profession or vocation" (p. 278). Professional commitment refers to developing an individual's career goals, attachment with a goal, credentials with goals, and participation to the goals (Colarelli & Bishop, 1990).

Organizational Deviance Behavior

Organizational deviance behavior is defined as "voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and, in so doing, threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both" (Robinson & Bennett, 1995: 556). Deviance is usually interpreted to be the result of endorsing the negative mutuality norm (Gouldner, 1960), which advocates that employees reply to conduct that trouble them with destruction. Organizational deviance includes behaviors directed at the organization itself or its systems, such as calling in sick when not ill, lying about the number of hours worked, or purposely ignoring a supervisor's instructions. Organizational deviance also correlated positively with the employee's negative affect. Organizational deviance correlated negatively with interactive justice (Aquino et al., 1999). Term organizational deviance behavior is empirically distinct from interpersonal deviance, distributive justice, interactive justice, and procedural justice (Aquino et al., 1999).

Psychological Contract Breach and Its Impact on Professional Commitment and Organizational Deviance Behavior

Psychological contract theory suggests that employment relationships can be conceived of as social exchanges administered by the mutuality rule (Gouldner, 1960) wherein personnel craft their job-related exertions for visible and public rewards from the organizations (e.g., Blau, 1964). The relationship between employer and employees depends on the degree to which organizations fulfill employees' psychological contracts. Psychological contracts have been shown to have significant implications for work-related outcomes like commitment, performance, satisfaction etc. that varies substantially as a function of the type of contract endorsed by an employee (Raja et al., 2004).

Turnley et al. (2003) mentioned that psychological contract breach effects in the comprehensive range of destructive consequences, containing condensed job satisfaction, condensed trust in the organization, amplified organizational cynicism, and amplified turnover intention. Moreover, destructive workstation happenings cause harmful emotive responses, like an annoyance or frustration (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). Likewise, Restubog et al. (2010) revealed that psychological contract breach has impacted as poor performance, poor work attitudes, withdrawal behaviors and workplace deviance (Bordia et al., 2008). Similarly, Deery et al. (2006) tested that psychological contract breach was related to lesser organizational trust, which, in turn was associated with perceptions of fewer supportive employment relations and greater levels of absenteeism. Hence, aligning with the social exchange theory, we assumed that breach in employees' psychological contract increases their organizational deviance behavior and decreases professional commitment as a balance of exchange between employer and employee. Consequently, based on these theoretical arguments and empirical evidence, we proposed the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: Employees' psychological contract breach negatively impacts on their professional commitment. This means an increase (or decrease) in the levels of perceived psychological contract breach cause to decrease (or increase) in their professional commitment.

Hypothesis 2: Employees psychological contract breach positively impacts on their organizational deviance behavior. This means an increase (or decrease) in their levels of perceived psychological contract breach cause to increase (or decrease) in their organizational deviance behavior.

Professional Commitment and Organizational Deviance Behavior

When employees are highly committed to their profession, they think for the betterment of the organization and themselves because they see their own progress within the progress and development of the organization. Once the organization is perceived as having fulfilled for its obligations, the employee is more satisfied and committed to the organization and reciprocates with higher job performance and better citizenship behaviors (Robinson & Morrison, 2000). Cohen (1999) stated that professional commitment correlated negatively with work stress, emotional exhaustion, low accomplishment, and the low alternatives dimension of continuance commitment. But positively correlates with perceived performance and life satisfaction, and the personal sacrifices dimension of continuance commitment (Reilly & Orsak, 1991). Considering these empirical evidences and theoretical assumption of social exchange theory, we purposed the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Employees' professional commitment negatively impacts their organizational deviance behavior. It means an increase (or decrease) in professional commitment levels cause to decrease (or increase) in their organizational deviance behavior.

Professional Commitment as a Mediator in the Relationship of Psychological Contract Breach to Organizational Deviance Behavior

Employees' perception of a psychological contract breach indicates the state at a work place where employees perceive a discrepancy in employer's commitment for them or perceive un-fulfillment of the implied expectation of employees from the employer. In such state, the employee does not feel protected with the correct employer and exhibits less committed behavior with own profession or duties, and consequently, employee reveals the organizational deviance behavior. Moreover, as proposed in hypothesis 1, hypothesis 2 and hypothesis 3, we claim that employees' perception of a psychological contract breach impacts their organizational deviance behavior via their professional commitment. Hence, we proposed the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: Professional commitment mediates the relationship between the psychological contract breach and organizational deviance behavior. It means the employees' psychological contract breach impacts on organizational deviance behavior through professional commitment at least partially (if not full).

Methodology

Research Design

This study has adopted the positivist research philosophy, deducting reasoning approach, quantitative methods to infer the causal relationship from the surveyed perceptual cross-sectional data. This design is normally considered as a more scientific approach to do social science research (Richard, 2009). Bhattarai (2016) states, indeed, the ability to make correct predictions are one of the most outstanding characteristics of quantitative methodology and it may be valuable for evaluating theory and testing whether the theory holds up under a variety of circumstances and instances.

Measure

Altogether 25 items measure was used in this study where 21 items were Likert-type scale and remaining were demographic information's. The Likert-type scale was measured in five point scale that was ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Respondents were requested to indicate a best described scale (e.g. 1 for strongly disagree) relating to them for each item. In this study, used measure are already developed and tested by prior studies in different contexts, but the items were rephrased to ease for the respondents in our contexts.

Professional Commitment

Professional commitment was measured using seven items scale developed by Blau (1989) which has been widely used to measure the employees' commitment towards their occupation, profession, and career (Fields, 2002). Chohen (1996) underscored that

professional commitment is distinct from affective organizational commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment, and even distinct from job involvement and work ethic (Cohen, 1999). Few sample items are: (a) if I had all the money I needed without working, I would probably continue to work in this profession, (b) I definitely want a career for myself in this profession, and (c) if I could do it all over again, I would choose to work in this profession. Composite reliability of the construct, in this study, was measured .93.

Psychological Contract Breach

The psychological contract breach was measured using the five items scale developed by Robinson and Morrison (2000). Few sample items are: (a) I feel that my employer had not come through in fulfilling the promises made to me when I was hired, (b) I have not received everything promised to me in exchange for my contributions, and (c) my employer has broken many of its promises to me even though I've upheld my side of the deal. In this study, the composite reliability of the construct was measured .85.

Organizational Deviant Behaviors

Deviant Behaviors were measured using the eight-item scale developed by Aquino et al. (1999). Aquino et al. classified the deviant behavior as interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance. Confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the two dimensions were empirically distinct from one another and distinct from distributive, interactive, and procedural justice (Aquino et al., 1999). Few sample items are: (a) Usually, I intentionally arrive late for work, (b) I used to work on a personal matter on the job instead of working for my employer, and (c) generally, I lie about the number of hours I worked. In this study, composite reliability was measured .95.

Sampling and Questionnaire Administration

Sample respondents were taken from the employees working in the international non-government organization (INGO) working in Nepal as well as a national level non-government organization (NGO). Altogether 11 INGOs and 16 NGOs were selected, from the list published by the Social Welfare Council (SWC), as per the researcher's convenience. Most of the respondents were working in their Kathmandu based office (but not limited). Within the selected organization, 600 questionnaires were distributed with the help of a reference person (a person assigned by each organization to facilitate the survey process within their organization). Out of the 600 distributed questionnaires, 525 (87.50 %) were filled up and returned. Only 490 (81.66%) questionnaires were found ready to use for the study purpose. But, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) considered only 426 (71 %) responses to meet the acceptable measurement model.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Before analyzing the data, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was employed in the Analysis of Momentum Structure (AMOS) version 24 to ensure the goodness of fit index. First of all, all the 19 measuring items were loaded for the respective three latent constructs. Out of 19 measuring items, three items of the construct organizational deviance behavior and one item of the construct professional commitment were removed from the measurement model as they were loading less than .60 (Awang, 2015) in their respective latent construct. In the next step, from the modification indices, two pairs of error terms within a respective latent construct (i.e. organizational deviance behavior) which showed the covariance error term more than .30 (Awang, 2015) were correlated to set as a free parameter estimate. Then, 45 outlier data were removed as they had P1 values of Mahalanobis d-square less than .05 as an influential outlier (Gaskin, 2011). Finally, CFA was able to achieve a good model fit index with CMIN/DF = 2.46, CFI = .97, NFI = .95, RMSEA = .059, and PCLOSE = .048.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability

Composite Reliability (CR) is adopted in SEM analysis as its value is usually higher than Cronbach Alpha in which the difference is insignificant (Peterson & Kim, 2013). To ensure the reliability of the measures, measures have to guarantee either internal reliability $\geq .70$ or composite reliability (CR) $\geq .60$, or Average variance extracted (AVE) $\geq .50$ (Awang, 2016). Moreover, Hair et al. (2010) have stated the composite reliability should be $\geq .70$ to ensure the measure's reliability. In the study, for each latent constructs, CR was higher than .70, i.e., CR of the psychological contract, professional commitment, and organizational deviance behavior was .85, .93, and .95, respectively. Likewise, wise AVE was higher than .50 (i.e. psychological contract breach = .53, professional commitment = .68, and organizational deviance behavior = .75) for each construct.

Validity

Awang (2015) and Hair et al. (2010) have stated that convergent validity is achieved when all the items in a measurement model are statistically significant, and Average Variance Extraction (AVE) for every latent construct is greater than .50. In this study, besides the statistically significant of all the retained items in the measurement model, AVE for each construct was more than .50 (i.e., psychological contract breach = .53, professional commitment = .68 organizational deviance behavior = .75).

Discriminant validity of the measures is ensured when the correlation between predictor variables are less than .85 (Awang, 2015), or Maximum Shared Variance (MSV) is less than AVE (Hair et al., 2010), or square root of AVE are higher than inter-construct correlation of corresponding factor (Gaskin & Lim, 2016). In this study, MSV (i.e. psychological contract breach = .39, professional commitment = .24, and organizational deviance behavior = .39) was less than AVE (i.e. psychological contract breach = .53, professional commitment = .68,

and organizational deviance behavior = .75) in every case. As depicted in Table 1, the correlation between every latent construct was less than .85. Likewise, the square root of every AVE was higher than their corresponding inter-construct correlation.

Common Method Variance

This study has followed the two suggestions of Podsakoff et al. (2003) as an effort to minimize the common method variance. Firstly, around 31% (six items) of questionnaires were reverse-scored to reduce the potential effects of response pattern biases by incorporating negatively worded items in the questionnaire. Secondly, items measuring different variables (i.e., psychological contract breach, professional commitment, and organizational deviance behavior) were counterbalanced so that respondents could not recognize the corresponding constructs of the items. After having these remedial measures, to know the presence of common method bias, the current study has tested Harman's one-factor test, adopting the principal component factor analysis. Podsakoff et al. (2003) state that it is one of the most widely used techniques used by researchers to measure the problem of common method variance. In this study, the analysis revealed that when a three-factor model was loaded on a single factor explained 28 % of the variance. There will be no serious issue of common method bias in the analysis if the variance is less than 50% (Cho and Lee (2012).

Control Variables

The respondents' demographic aspects were taken as a control variable as these variables might have a significant influence on study variable as depicted in Table 1. Employees' gender, marital status, nature of job contract, designation, etc. were controlled while measuring the causal relationship between and among psychological contract breach, professional commitment, and organizational deviance behavior.

Data Analysis

Employing the International Business Machine (IBM) Corporation's Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and Analysis of a Moment Structures (AMOS) version 23, data were analyzed in multiple stages. Firstly, manually, data were screened out, removing those respondents who either left to response items more than 10% or did respond without paying proper attention (unengaged). Secondly, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was employed to ensure the goodness of fit index. The goodness of fit index confirmed that collected and refined data were good fitted with a measurement model; therefore, factors were imputed from the latent construct to the observed variable (Gaskin, 2012) for further analysis. Thirdly, hierarchical regression analysis was carried out using an ordinary least square method after satisfying all assumptions. Hierarchical Regression Model (HRM), as the guidelines provided by Baron and Kenny (1986), have been calculated to measure the mediating effect of professional commitment in the relationship between the psychological

contract breach and organizational deviance behavior. Causal relationships of the variables were calculated after controlling the effect of the demographic variables.

Results

As shown in Table 1, the Pearson correlation between study variables was statistically significant, with correlation coefficients ranging from -.48 to .67. The nature of the relationship between tested variables was measured as assumed. As depicted in Table 1, there were no strong (maximum correlation is .67 between psychological contract breach and organizational deviance behavior) correlation coefficients between predictor variables; therefore, there were no significant multicollinearity problems.

As shown in Model A1 and B1 of Table 2, demographic variables (gender, marital status, service contract, and designation) explained 11% ($\Delta R^2 = .11$, $p < .01$) variance to predict professional commitment and 22% ($\Delta R^2 = .22$, $p < .01$) variance to predict organizational deviance behavior. As shown in Model A2 of Table 2, after controlling the effect of demographic variables (gender, marital status, service contract, and designation), the coefficient of psychological contract breach to predict professional commitment was negative and statistically significant ($B = -.77$, $p < .01$, $\Delta R^2 = .18$). Therefore, hypothesis 1 was supported by contributing 18% additional variance in the model. Similarly, as depicted in Model B2 of Table 2, after controlling the effect of demographic variables to predict organizational deviance behavior, the psychological contract breach's coefficient was positive and statistically significant ($B = .86$, $p < .01$, $\Delta R^2 = .27$).

Table 1
Correlations Between Study Variables

Study variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Gender	-						
2. Marital status	-.27**	-					
3. Service contract	-.13**	.19**	-				
4. Designation	.03	-.14**	-.08	-			
5. Professional commitment	.23**	-.09	-.25**	.04	-		
6. Psychological contract breach	-.52**	.54**	.45**	-.18**	-.48**	-	
7. Organizational deviance behavior	-.33**	.23**	.36**	-.05	-.50**	.67**	-

** . Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Hence, hypothesis 2 was supported by contributing an additional 27% variation in the model. Likewise, as shown in Step 2 in Model B3 of Table 2, after controlling the effect of demographic variables and psychological contract breach, to predict organizational deviance behavior, the coefficient of the professional commitment was negative and statistically significant ($B = -.18$, $p < .01$). Hence hypothesis 3 was supported.

Baron and Kenny (1986) developed three criteria that need to be satisfied to determine the mediator relationship were adopted. The first criterion, the independent variable (psychological contract breach), must be associated with the mediating variable (professional commitment) measured and achieved in tested hypothesis 1. The second criterion, the independent variable (psychological contract breach), must be associated with the dependent variables (organizational deviance behavior) before entering the mediator (professional commitment). This relationship was measured and achieved in tested hypothesis 2. The third criterion, after entering the mediator (professional commitment) variable in the regression model, the relationship between the independent (psychological contract breach) and dependent variables (organizational deviance behavior) should either disappear (full mediation) or significantly diminish (partial mediation). The third criterion was measured in Step 2 of Model B1 and B2 in Table 2. Where coefficient of psychological contract breach to predict organizational deviance behavior was diminished from .86 ($B = .86$, coefficient of psychological contract breach to predict organizational deviance behavior before entering professional commitment) to .74 ($B = .74$, coefficient of psychological contract breach to predict organizational deviance behavior after entering the professional commitment).

Table: 2

Hierarchical Regression Analysis: Association of the Variables

Independent Variables	Dependent variables				
	Professional Commitment		Organizational behavior		deviance
	Model A1	Model A2	Model B1	Model B2	Model B3
Step 1					
Gender	.37**	-.07	.07	-.29**	.06
Marital status	.02	.45**	-.32**	.18*	-.24**
Contract	-.52**	-.05	.10	.45**	.10
Designation	.03	-.10	.14*	.01	.12
Step 2					
Psychological contract breach		-.77**		.86**	
Professional commitment					-.18**
Step 3					
Psychological contract breach					.74**
ΔR^2	.11**	.18**	.22**	.27**	.02**

** , * , the mean difference is significant at the .01, and .05 levels, respectively

After having a diminished coefficient, the next step was to test whether these diminished coefficients of psychological contract breach were statistically significant or not; for this

purpose, the Sobel test (Preacher & Leonardelli, 2001) was applied. The Sobel test revealed that the psychological contract breach's diminished coefficient, after entering professional commitment, to predict organizational deviance behavior was statistically significant ($z = 4.12, p < .01$). Hence, hypothesis 4 was supported. As partial mediation was measured, further, it was stimulating to measure the direct effect size of the psychological contract breach on organizational deviance behavior as well as indirect effect size through professional commitment. For this purpose, we used MedGraph (Jose, 2008). Regarding effect size, it was revealed that total effect size (direct plus indirect) of psychological contract breach to predict organizational deviance behavior was .74, indirect effect size through professional commitment was -.12, and the direct effect was .86. Here, total effect size (i.e., .74) is less than direct effect (i.e., .86); it is because of inconsistent mediation (Kenny, 2018) where direct and indirect effects have been canceled each other out.

Discussion

Firstly, this study tested that their perceived psychological contract breach negatively impacted employees' professional commitment. It means the employee's perception of a psychological contract breach is harmful to their professional commitment. Though there was no prior study, the findings of the study support the similar nature of previous studies of Bal et al. (2008), Bal et al. (2015), and Turnkey et al. (2003). They have tested a psychological contract breach as a negative aspect of the organization's attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. Therefore, further studies under different contexts are needed before generalizing the findings.

Secondly, this study tested the positive impact of employees' psychological contract breach on organizational deviance behavior. It means an increase in employees' psychological contract breach cause to increase in their deviant organizational behavior. This finding consists with the prior studies of Bordia et al. (2008), Deery et al. (2006), Morrison and Robinson (1997), and Restubog et al. (2010), who have empirically tested psychological contract breach as a detrimental construct for the attitudinal and behavior employee outcomes like performance, higher intention to quit the job, less attachment to the organization. However, the exact impact of the psychological contract breach on organizational deviance behavior was not tested. Therefore, future studies will be benefited if replicated this study with more comprehensive samples.

Thirdly, this study tested that employees' professional commitment is negatively associated with their organizational deviance behavior. It means the employees' organizational deviance behavior will be decreased by increasing their professional commitment. Although there was no prior study that precisely measured the impact of employees' professional commitment on their organizational deviance behavior, this study's finding consisted of the theoretical argument of the reciprocal social exchange behavior between employers and

employees. Hence, before generalizing the results, further studies are necessary for different contexts.

Likewise, this study tested the partial mediating role of employees' professional commitment to the relationship between the psychological contract breach and organizational deviance behavior. This means a decrease in employees' perceived psychological contract breach causes an increase in their professional commitment and, again, increased professional commitment to decrease organizational deviance behavior. Before this study, there was no study to measure the mediating role of professional commitment in the relationship between the psychological contract breach and organizational deviance behavior. Therefore, further investigation is suggested to replicate this study with a larger number of samples so that theory will be generalizable.

Conclusion

Based on the findings as well as its discussion, this study draws a number of conclusions. Firstly, employees' psychological contract breach negatively impacts their professional commitment; therefore, professional commitment can be increased by fulfilling employees' psychological contract breach. Secondly, there was a positive impact of the psychological contract breach on organizational deviance behavior. Therefore, employee's organizational deviance behavior can be improved by improving the psychological contract breach. Thirdly, employees' contract breach negatively impacts organizational deviance behavior; hence, organizational deviance behavior can be enhanced by increasing professional commitment. Lastly, professional commitment mediates the relationship between the psychological contract breach and organizational deviance behavior.

Implication of the Study

Practical Implication

The findings of the study will be useful for managers to minimize the employees' organizational deviance behavior. Managers might take corrective action to improve the psychological contract breach, because psychological contract breach contributes to increase organizational deviance behavior directly as well as indirectly through professional commitment. Moreover, the manager can enhance employees' professional commitment by decreasing the psychological contract breach as this study tested the negative impact of psychological contract breach on professional commitment.

Theoretical Implication

In the literature of psychological contract breach, this study tested the positive impact of the psychological contract breach on organizational deviance behavior and the mediating role of professional commitment in the relationship between the psychological contract breach and

organizational deviance behavior. Moreover, this study revealed the direct and indirect effect (through professional commitment) of psychological contract breach to predict organizational deviance behavior. These findings are new knowledge generation in the literature of the psychological contract breach; therefore, these findings unwrap the avenue for future research in a different context to generalize the theory. Moreover, this study has contributed, revealing empirical evidence from a different context, to generalize the idea that psychological contract breach is an unfavorable construct for the behavioral and attitudinal employee outcomes, as explained by social exchange theory.

References

- Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U., and Bradfield, M. (1999). Justice constructs, negative affectivity, and employee deviance: a proposed model and empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 20, 1073-1091. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(199912\)20:7%3C1073::AID-JOB943%3E3.0.CO;2-7](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199912)20:7%3C1073::AID-JOB943%3E3.0.CO;2-7)
- Awang, Z. (2015). *SEM made simple: A gentle approach to learning structural equation modeling*. Bandar Baru Bangi, MPWS Rich Resources.
- Bal, P. M., De Lange, A. H., Jansen, P. G. W., & Van der Velde, M. E. (2008). Psychological contract breach and job attitudes: A meta-analysis of age as a moderator. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72, 143–158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.10.005>
- Bal, P. M., De Lange, A. H., Jansen, P. G., & Van der Velde, M. E. G. (2013). A longitudinal study of age-related differences in reactions to psychological contract breach. *Applied Psychology*, 62, 157–181. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2012.00524.x>
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173–1182. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173>
- Bhattacharai, G. (2016). *Perception of organizational politics and employee outcomes: Moderating role of core self-evaluation*. Deutschland, Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing. ISBN 978-3-330-02200-3.
- Blau, G. (1985). The measurement and prediction of career commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 58, 277-288. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1985.tb00201.x>
- Blau, G. (1989). Testing the generalizability of a career commitment measure and its impact on employee turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 35(1), 88–103. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(89\)90050-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(89)90050-X)
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1104>

- breach and violation: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*,
Chaudhry, A., Wayne, S. J., & Schalk, R. (2009). A sensemaking model of employee evaluation of psychological contract fulfillment: When and how do employees respond to change? *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 45(4), 498–520. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886309341739>
- Chen, Z. X., Tsui, A. S., & Zhong, L. (2008). Reactions to psychological contract breach: A dual perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(5), 527–548. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.481>
- Cho, J. C., & Lee, J. W. (2012). Performance management and trust in Supervisors. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 32(3), 236–259. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X11421496>
- Cohen, A. (1996). On the discriminant validity of the Meyer and Allen measure of organizational commitment: How does it fit with the work commitment construct? *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56(3), 494–503. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164496056003011>
- Cohen, A. (1999). Relationships among five forms of commitment: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 285-308. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(199905\)20:3%3C285::AID-JOB887%3E3.0.CO;2-R](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199905)20:3%3C285::AID-JOB887%3E3.0.CO;2-R)
- Cohen, A. (2016). Are they among us? a conceptual framework of the relationship between the dark triad personality and counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs). *Human Resource Management Review* 26, 69–85. <https://doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2015.07.003>
- Colarelli, S. M., & Bishop, R. C. (1990). Career commitment: Functions, correlates, and management. *Group & Organization Studies*, 15(2), 158–176. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105960119001500203>
- Conway, N., & Briner, R. (2005). *Understanding Psychological Contracts at Work: A Critical Evaluation of Theory and Research*. Oxford
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.166>
- Dulac, T., Coyle-Shapiro, J. A., Henderson, D. J., & Wayne, S. J. (2008). Not all responses to breach are the same: The interconnection of social exchange and psychological contract processes in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51, 1079–1098.
- Fields, D. L. (2002). *Thinking the measure of work: A guide to validated scale for organizational research and diagnosis*. Sage.
- Gaskin, J. & Lim, J. (2016). Model fit measures: AMOS plugin. Gaskination's statwiki.
- Gaskin, J. (2012, January 30). Imputing factor scores in AMOS. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dsOS9tQjxW8>
- Giacalone, R. A., & Greenberg, J. (1997). *Antisocial Behavior in Organizations*. Sage.

- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2092623>.
- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Jose, P. E. (2008). *ModGraph-I: A programme to compute cell means for the graphical display of moderational analyses: The internet version, Version 2.0*. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington. Retrieved from <http://www.victoria.ac.nz/psyc/staff/paul-jose-files/modgraph/modgraph.php>.
- Kenny, D. A. (2018). Mediation. Retrieved from: <http://davidakenny.net/cm/mediate.htm>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259230>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & N. P. Podsakoff (2003). Common method biases in behavioural research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>.
- Preacher, K. J., & Leonardelli, G. J. (2001, March). Calculation for the Sobel test: An interactive calculation tool for mediation tests [Computer software]. Retrieved July 14, 2005, from <http://www.unc.edu/preacher/sobel/sobel.htm>
- Raja, U., Johns, G., & Ntalianis, F. (2004). The impact of personality on psychological contracts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 350–367. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/20159586>
- Reilly, N. P., & Orsak, C. L. (1991). A career stage analysis of career and organizational commitment in nursing. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 39(3), 311–330. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(91\)90041-J](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(91)90041-J)
- Restubog, S. L. D., Bordia, P., Tang, R. L., & Krebs, S. A. (2010). Investigating the moderating effects of leader–member exchange in the psychological contract breach–employee performance relationships: A test of two competing hypotheses. *British Journal of Management*, 21, 422–437. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2009.00673.x>
- Richard, T. (2009). Qualitative versus quantitative methods: Understanding why qualitative methods are superior for criminology and criminal justice. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Criminology*, 1 (1). Retrieved from: http://jtpcrim.org/January_Articles/Qualitative_Vs_Quantitative_Richard_Tewksbury.pdf.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555–572. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256693>
- Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. W. (2000). The development of psychological contract 21, 525–546. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379\(200008\)21:5%3C525::AIDJOB40%3E3.0.CO;2-T](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379(200008)21:5%3C525::AIDJOB40%3E3.0.CO;2-T)

- Rousseau, D. M. (1995) *Psychological Contracts in Organizations: Understanding Written and Unwritten Agreements*. Sage
- Solinger, O.N., Hofmans, J., Bal, P.M., & Jansen, P.G. (2015). Bouncing back from psychological contract breach: How commitment recovers over time. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(4), 494-525. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2047>
- Sulea, C., Maricutoiu, L., Dumitru, C. Z., and Pitariu, H. D. (2015). Predicting counterproductive work behaviors: a meta-analysis of their relationship with individual and situational factors. *Psihol. Resurs. Umane*, 8, 66–81. [https://doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01273](https://doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01273)
- Turnley, W. H., Bolino, M. C., Lester, S. W., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2003). The impact of psychological contract fulfillment on the performance of in-role and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 29(2), 187 - 206. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630302900204>
- 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, 647–680.