
The Aftermath of Employees' Psychological Contract Breach with The Moderation of Proactive Personality

MUHAMMAD BILAL KAYANI^{1*}, IMRAN IBRAHIM ALASAN², SABA IDREES³, RABIA SARWAT⁴, MARYAM ALI⁵

¹Limkokwing University of Creative Technology, Malaysia

²Limkokwing University of Creative Technology, Cyberjaya, Malaysia

³National University of Modern Languages (NUML) Rawalpindi, Pakistan

⁴National University of Modern Languages (NUML) Rawalpindi, Pakistan

⁵National University of Modern Languages (NUML) Rawalpindi, Pakistan

*Corresponding Author

Email: mbkiani@gmail.com¹, imran.ibrahim@limkokwing.edu.my², saba.idrees@numl.edu.pk³,
rabia.sarwat@numl.edu.pk⁴, marriamali1999@gmail.com⁵

Abstract: This article aims at investigating the moderating role of proactive personality in the relationship between psychological breach of contract and workers' outcomes which include counterproductive work behavior. Using social exchange theory, it was found that when employees face violation of their psychological contract, they may retaliate the same negative emotion in the form of counterproductive work behavior. A survey was conducted among the major cities of five provinces of Pakistan to investigate the model under investigation. The sample population were the public sector nurses of Pakistan. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) technique was used to test and verify the hypothesis under investigation. The results didn't support the mediating role of proactive personalities in the relationship of psychological breach of contract and counterproductive work behavior. The study attempts to fill up the gap between the psychological aspects of employees with their outcomes at the workplace.

Keywords: Psychological Contract Breach, Counterproductive Work Behavior, Proactive Personalities

1. INTRODUCTION

Human psychology has always been an interesting topic for researchers due to its impacts specifically when it comes to the corporate world. Human resource is an important aspect of corporate success. Both the brains are directing the business and the on running of its daily operations. For the success of organizational outcomes, employees' productive performance have vital significance that can be maximized if their psychology is catered skillfully.. One such psychological aspect has been examined by the current research paper. This paper aims at addressing how employees react if their psychological contract with the employer is breached and the role of proactive personalities has also been undertaken in this regard. Further, this paper aims to address the behaviors like counterproductive ones that are caused in reaction to psychological contract breach.

The idea of the psychological contract alludes to workers' convictions about common commitments among them and their firms as described by Rousseau (1995). These can be clarified, hypothetically, by the theory of social exchange and rule of reciprocation explained by Blau (1964b) and Gouldner (1960). In a business relationship, workers trade exertion or dependability for professional stability conceded by firm according to De Cuyper and De Witte (2006), De Witte et al. (2012). Subsequently, workers seeing an undeniable degree of occupation instability may think that organizational commitments and guarantees are not satisfied (Piccoli and De Witte, 2015), that is equivalent to breach of the psychological contract. Breach of psychological contract is characterized as a worker's discernment concerning how much the firm has neglected to satisfy its guarantees or commitments (Morrison and Robinson, 1997). For instance, if employees face dark personalities at work, they are less likely to have work meaningfulness (Kayani et al., 2019) leading to psychological contract breach. At the point when workers experience violation of psychological contract, they are probably going to fight back against their firm by participating in destructive practices described by Chiu and Peng (2008) and Costa and Neves (2017) like counterproductive work behavior.

As indicated by Robinson and Bennett (1995), counterproductive work behavior refers to "intentional conduct that abuses huge hierarchical standards and, in this manner, compromises the prosperity of a firm, its individuals, or both". Counterproductive work behavior can be coordinated to the firm or to people. The first is introduced as hierarchical counterproductive work environment conduct (CWB-O), the last as relational counterproductive work environment conduct (CWB-I) presented by Bennett and Robinson (2000). In spite of

the fact that it is evident that the impact of occupation weakness on CWB has some proof as is said by Reisel et al. (2010) and Tian et al. (2014), little is thought towards the components is in question. In the previous few years, specialists have analyzed counterproductive work practices (CWBs). These practices have been marked diversely in various examinations, like authoritative misconduct (Vardi and Wiener, 1996), work environment aberrance (Morrison and Robinson, 1997), work environment animosity (Neuman and Baron, 2005), and withdrawn conduct (Robinson and O'Leary-Kelly, 1998). These practices were characterized in an unexpected way, yet they share the normal subject of being willful demonstrations hurting or proposing to hurt firms and their workers (Giacalone and Greenberg, 1997, Spector and Fox, 2005). Accordingly, these definitions fall into the class of counterproductive work behaviors (Sulea et al., 2015). All of these can be characterized as practices that intentionally break the standards of a firm, and negate the authentic interests of a firm or its workers (Sackett and DeVore, 2002).

As per and Robinson and Bennett (1995), counterproductive work behaviors can be isolated into two kinds as indicated by their objective: One is the place where the counterproductive work behavior is focused on singular individuals from the firm (CWB-I); the other is the place where the counterproductive work behavior is focused on the actual firm (CWB-O). The previous is relationally arranged and may include terrible practices toward firms, e.g., hostility, irritating somebody, being rude and retaining critical data. The last is arranged toward the firm and includes practices like burglary, damage, truancy, and security strategy infringement (Spector and Fox, 2005, Bennett and Robinson, 2000, Hystad et al., 2014, Cohen et al., 2016).

Counterproductive work conduct has a critical reason for failure and can make gigantic monetary misfortunes undertakings (Tian et al., 2014). For instance, in the United States, almost from 33 to 75% of workers take part in various types of counterproductive work behavior (Harper, 1990), that results in misfortunes of 1 trillion dollars every year. These practices incorporate robbery (120 billion dollars), working environment savagery (4.2 billion dollars), and deceitful exercises (in excess of 900 billion dollars; Banks et al., 2012). Obviously thinking about these significant expenses, analysts have performed numerous investigations on counterproductive work behaviors from various viewpoints. For instance, from the viewpoint of value and equity hypotheses, the investigation of Aquino et al. (1999) affirmed that interactional equity negatively affected CWB-O and this interactional and distributive equity had consequences for CWB-I. Likewise, analyzing the wellbeing disability measure corresponding to the Job Demand-Resources (JD-R) model system. Ceschi et al. (2016) tracked down that the connection between work requests and counterproductive work behavior was intervened by burnout as well as directed by character specification (i.e., coarseness and genuineness modesty).

From a social trade point of view, Colbert (2004) tracked down that the impression of a steady workplace was contrarily identified with counterproductive work behavior. Notwithstanding, barely any experimental examinations are done according to the viewpoint of the relationship at work. As a structure for understanding the business relationship, the idea of the psychological contract has acquired consideration by Conway and Briner (2009) and by Cassar and Briner (2011). The psychological contract was characterized as the terms and states of the corresponding trade connection between a worker and firm, and common assumptions that is associated with those (Kotter, 1973, Rousseau and Tijoriwala, 1998). On the off chance that one gathering sees what another gathering has neglected to satisfy its commitments or guarantees. At that point psychological contract breach (PCB) happens in view of Robinson and Rousseau (1994) and the Morrison and Robinson (1997) considering that the business holds more force (e.g., dynamic) than basic workers, the individual can set standards to drive workers to satisfy their commitments or guarantees; henceforth, the business scarcely sees psychological contract breach. Subsequently, we just focus on the impacts of psychological contract breach saw by the workers. With hierarchical changes, for example, delaying, cutting back and repetition, workers may more effectively see psychological contract breach than any time in recent memory (Sturges et al., 2005).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Psychological Breach of Contract and Counterproductive Work Behavior

Psychological contract is a mutual agreement by both the employer and employee ((Robinson and Rousseau, 1994). According to Affective Events Theory when employees experience any sort of negative event (Fisher and Ashkanasy, 2000, Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996) generated from employer end, they experience negative emotion (Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996) which is a violation or breach of their psychological contract in the current case. Towards employer then employee tends to retaliate the same negative response which is counterproductive work behavior (Law and Zhou, 2014) supported by two-way process of social exchange theory (Blau, 1964b).

Quratulain et al. (2018) state that understanding the negative effects of psychological contract breach reciprocity theory and social exchange theory, is the most critical theoretical study and understanding. Mutual standards relate to people's expectations or patterns related to the exchange relationship between employers and employees. Whereas, Social communication theory argues that psychological contract breach's harm various essential work attitudes and employee behaviors because it lead to the employment relationships based on common negative standards (rather than generalized or balanced). Zhao et al. (2007) concluded that there was a

negative link between job satisfaction and the psychological contract. In this case, the principle of emotional events would be clarified for future clarification, i.e., the incident (violation) has an important connection with the emotional reaction decreasing the attitude to work in the workplace.

Workplaces and people stop working when they face such violation of their psychological contract (Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996). The theory of emotions shows that people are angry because organizations violate their expectations and that anger is related to the tendency to act. The idea of social interaction can support this hypothesis. The concept of a psychological contract breach triggers negative emotions about missed expectations related to certain obligations and does not respect and appreciate other general emotions about the relationship between employers and employees before using the organization (Coyle-Shapiro and Conway, 2005). It can be concluded that uncommitted employees can adversely explain the organization to third parties or third parties, which hinders the organization's ability to hire highly qualified employees (Mowday et al., 2013).

Based on the theory of social exchange as explained by Blau (1964a), workers may react to psychological contract breach with a negative attitude towards job, and that may lead to a greater chance of engaging in counterproductive work behaviors as told by Law and Zhou (2014), such as non-attendance as per Daouk-Öyry et al. (2014), behavior of withdrawal that is given by Hanisch and Hulin (1990), and divergent behavior at work as explained by Bordia et al. (2008). On the other hand, earlier research has proved that psychological contract breach may result in unrestricted absence as mentioned by Deery et al. (2006) and also a behavior against good citizenship (Kickul and Lester, 2001). In Pakistani scenario, 300 nurses and doctors were also analyzed by Ahmed et al. (2013) which concluded that psychological contract breach had a very noteworthy positive effect on the nurses and doctors' counterproductive work behaviors. When noticing psychological contract breach, most of the time workers employees may get angry and dissatisfied (Eckerd et al., 2013). Damaging emotions like these can cause employees' counterproductive work behavior (Penney and Spector, 2005, Spector and Fox, 2005). Moreover, psychological contract breach means that workers may find it difficult to accept between what was promised by the organization and what they are receiving. Hence, they try to overcome this by reducing their efforts. In the end, this leads to counterproductive work behavior (Mount et al., 2006, Jensen et al., 2010). This leads to the first hypothesis:

H₁: Psychological Breach of Contract have a significant positive impact on Counterproductive Work Behavior.

2.2 Moderating Role of Proactive Personality

There is an optimistic influence of individual traits on job participation. Persistence in this situation (Chan, 2006, Erdogan and Bauer, 2005, Fuller Jr et al., 2010, Li et al., 2010) and group resources (Loi et al., 2016) can hinder or enhance the expression of a positive personality. Research in this direction is beneficial because understanding the context can enable companies to take advantage of volatility and reduce inactivity in some cases. Especially if the goal is to maximize employee engagement, even if the quality is not high, we must consider the potential impact on the company.

A supportive organizational environment provides the opportunity to create a happy and productive workforce, as departments can raise employee expectations and make them aware that they provide sufficient labor resources—*Journal of Professional Behavior* 101 (2017) 90-103 95. As a result, it becomes a vital work resource, and POS has a positive connection with employees' professional commitment (Eisenberger and Stinglhamber, 2011) and brings additional personal resources such as efficiency, optimism, self-assessment, notable at work. Companies can benefit from the direct support of employee involvement, and they can also benefit from interactions with personal resources related to employees' tasks. In this sense, energetic personality on job commitments can be suppressed due to the higher VDP. All employees (including those with lower initiative) can be engaged in a very favorable organizational atmosphere with their remaining smaller space and display a positive personality who is involved in work and has a significant impact on work engagement. In contrast, in an unsupported organization, aggressive employees may be more involved in creative, motivated, and participatory work environments than less motivated employees (Akgunduz and Gürel, 2019).

Aggressive people are not limited to the division of the situation, but they do affect the environment. People with a positive personality are more active, adapt to circumstances as compared to the other personality traits. Whereas, aggressive people will seize the opportunity to lead and persevere until a change is announced. Aggressive people will find opportunities and try to use them until they change. People with lower prevention levels become inactive and inactive, tending to familiarize themselves with the situation or change it (Crant and Bateman, 2000).

The hypothesis is also supported by the Psychological Theory of Work Adjustment (TWA) (Lofquist and Dawis, 1978). It defines the connection of the person to his/her job atmosphere. When employees perceive an imbalance in the atmosphere of job, they tend to balance it by proactivity. Proactive are civil rights protectors, active and honest civil rights holders, real people's rights to honest people, real and permanent rights to real property. Signing a contract means that the individual who is signing the contract is independent, and the individual withdraws the merged contract. With lo tanto, unorganized organizations can enable employees to get

benefit from managers and take responsibilities to do meaningful work to maintain and improve their performance. In such a conditional situation organizations can understand personality and behavior truly (Meyer and Maltin, 2010) that can cause resistance to illegal acts and personal behavior like behaving counterproductively. Proactive personalities have a greater conscientiousness and agreeableness in them. Jafri (2014) in his research illustrated while studying Big Five Trait Model that proactive employees are less likely to react negatively with the perceived breach of psychological contract. Furthermore, Zhao et al. (2013) founded in their research that ostracism at work leads to counterproductive behavior at work while proactive personalities were found to be moderating the relationship. Psychological contract breach and ostracism at work are positively correlated (Choi, 2019). This concludes that psychological contract breach has a positive impact on counterproductive behavior with moderation of proactive personalities. This leads to second hypothesis: H₂: Proactive Personality moderates the relationship between Psychological Breach of Contract and Counterproductive Work Behavior.

3. METHODOLOGY

A total of 386 nurses from public sector hospitals of Pakistan were taken as sample. Both the descriptive and statistical analyses were conducted on the hypothesized model. Software that was used to test the model was Sem-PLS. Sem-PLS is the best software with respects to its user responsive interface and its extraordinary systematic and graphic ability (Davari and Rezazadeh, 2013). The sample data was collected quantitatively. Studying quantitatively is a useful tool in research studies as it provides comprehensive and complete data that enhances debates/arguments and invokes flexibility (Global Web Index). A five-point Likert scale was developed to evaluate the hypothetical model. The scale has the range from 1= Strongly Disagree to 5= Strongly Agree with Neutrality at its central point 3 and was utilized to offer respondents an even and well-adjusted way to reply to the questionnaires (Joshi et al., 2015).

Psychological Contract Breach is assessed on 5-item scale as established by Morrison and Robinson (2008) with reliability $\alpha=0.92$ out which 2-items that were deleted to adjust the convergent validity (AVE). The sample items are "I have not received everything promised to me in exchange for my contributions." and "My employer has broken many of its promises to me even though I've upheld my end of the deal". Counterproductive Work Behavior is assessed on 10-item scale established by Spector et al. (2010) with reliability $\alpha=0.78$ out which 6-items were deleted to adjust the convergent validity (AVE). The sample items are "Purposely wasted your employer's materials/supplies" and "Came to work late without permission". Proactive Personality is assessed on 10-item scale established by Seibert et al. (1999) with reliability $\alpha=0.86$ out which 5-items were deleted to adjust the convergent validity (AVE). The sample items are "Wherever I have been, I have been a powerful force for constructive change" and "If I see something I don't like, I fix it."

4. RESULTS

Partial Least Squares (PLS) was utilized to test the hypothesis. Smart PLS 3.0 version of software was specifically utilized. This is the program committed to predictive applications and contextualization as among the trends we study, are the trends being studied new or rapidly changing (Sanchez-Franco and Rowland, 2012). Non-segmented PLS method is recommended in conceptual model as it is very complex and contains many indicators and long-term variables (Chen and Li, 2010, Hair et al., 2011).

4.1 Descriptive Stats

A total of 386 nurses were taken as sample to evaluate and test the model. Out which 96 were males (24.8%) and 290 females (75.1%). Married sample population accounted for only 36.2% percent of the population (140) and unmarried accounted to a total for 63.7% (246). However, people were a total of 187 between age 20-29 (48.4%), 115 between 30-39 (29.7%), 62 between 40-49 (16.06%) and 22 from 50 years and above (5.6%). Out of sample population 6 fall in first (below 30k) income group, 64 in second (31k-40k), 140 in third (41k-50k), 105 in fourth (51k-60k) and 71 in fifth (60k and above). Most of the sample population had bachelor's degree in nursing (45.0%). 28.2% had done diploma. Master's degree holders were only 23.3% and lastly 3.1% had a degree of M.phil or other. Majority had the experience of 1-5 years (33.8%), then second majority had experience of 6-10 year (27.3%), third majority had experience of 16-20 years then are people with experience of less than a year (7.6%) and lastly least had the experience of 20 years and above (3.9%).

4.2 Correlation

	CWB	PCB	PP
CWB	1	0.93	0.42
PCB	0.93	1	0.41
PP	0.42	0.41	1

The table mentioned above is showing the results for correlation analysis. All variables are showing a positive correlation with each other. Some variables are showing strong, and some are showing weak correlations to each other.

4.3 Measurement Model

	Cronbach's Alpha	rho_A	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted
CWB	0.853	0.862	0.901	0.696
PCB	0.811	0.819	0.889	0.728
PP	0.864	0.877	0.9	0.644

All the constructs have an alpha value more than 0.7 which means all constructs have a consistent internal reliability. Simultaneously, all constructs have convergent validity greater than 0.5 reflecting constructs as valid. Alpha value for counterproductive work behavior (CWB) is 0.853 and composite reliability 0.901 which means the construct is reliable measure. Convergent validity (AVE) for counterproductive work behavior (CWB) is 0.696 which is greater than 0.5 and reflects that the construct is valid. Alpha value for psychological contract breach (PCB) is 0.811 and composite reliability is 0.819 which means that the construct is a reliable measure. Convergent validity (AVE) for psychological contract breach (PCB) is 0.728 which is greater than 0.5 and reflects that the construct is valid. Alpha value for proactive personality (PP) is 0.864 and composite reliability 0.877 which means the construct is a reliable measure. Convergent validity (AVE) for proactive personality (PP) is 0.644 which is greater than 0.5 and reflects that the construct is valid.

4.4 Discriminant Validity

	CWB	PCB	PP
CWB	0.834		
PCB	0.93	0.853	
PP	0.42	0.41	0.802

Moreover, the cross-loading for each variable is showing the discriminant validity. Only one out of the whole structure of study shows a little lack discriminant validity i.e., CWB -> PCB. According to M R Ab Hamid et al (2017) a deficiency of discriminant validity could be due to overlying items of variables from the individual's insight. All others have adequate discriminant validity as Gold et al. (2001) reasoned 0.9 as the verge for an adequate discriminant validity.

4.5 Structural Model

	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values
Moderating Effect 1 -> CWB	0.022	0.022	0.017	1.256	0.21
PCB -> CWB	0.906	0.905	0.032	28.359	0

4.6 Goodness to Fit Model

The above-mentioned table elaborates the results of the hypothesized model. Psychological Contract Breach (PCB) was found to have a positive significant impact on Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB). It accepts our first hypothesis. However, moderating role of proactive personality (PP) was founded to be insignificant rejecting the second hypothesis.

	R Square	R Square Adjusted
CWB	0.868	0.867

The above-mentioned results are screening the values of R-square and Adjusted R-Square. R-square shows the instructive influence of the model. Current research model shows the impact of Psychological Contract Breach

(PCB) on Counterproductive Behavior (CWB). So, in the case of Counterproductive Behavior (CWB), the explanatory power is 86.8%. According to Hair et al. (2013) in researches of management sciences and social sciences, the behavior of humans can't be predicted so a value of 60% and above is acceptable for R square.

DISCUSSION

The first hypothesis is also supported by current results. As per social exchange theory of Blau (1964a) employee and employer share a social exchange relationship. It's a two-way process. When due to any negative event triggered by organization employee perceive psychological contract breach from employer end and try and retaliate the same negative response to the organization in the form of counterproductive work behavior (Law and Zhou, 2014). According to the theory of social exchange by Blau (1964b), workers can respond to psychological contract breach with negative job attitudes, that may result as more involvement in counterproductive work behaviors (Frost et al., 2007), like as absentees (Daouk-Öyry et al., 2014), behavior of withdrawal (Hanisch and Hulin, 1990), and divergent behavior at work (Bordia et al., 2008). Preceding research has also proved that psychological contract breach can initiate discretionary nonattendance (Deery et al., 2006) and anti-citizenship behavior (Kickul and Lester, 2001).

However, the results for second hypothesis aren't supportive. Psychological contract breach is usually held when an event triggering negative emotions within employee occurs. That event might be triggered by the organization itself or its employees themselves start acting as a supervisors for other employees. According to Cognitive Theory of Events, a negative event triggers a negative emotion (PCB) within an employee and in return negative response (CWB) is generated. Proactivity might not support or help employee in coping with this negative event. This might have due reasons as stated by Belschak and Hartog (2010) in their article which states proactivity may always not result in coping with threats and challenges but it may sometimes have negative effects on employees. They stated that employees due to an increases in proactive trait of their personalities encounter more stress in order to be proactive. An employee must be evaluate the rewards and the potential cost associated to its proactivity. This literature supports that being proactive personality is not sufficient to reduce stress to eliminate counterproductive work behaviors in response to psychological contract breach.

Theoretical Implications

This examination has some fundamental hypothetical implications. By drawing on social exchange theory, we gave solid observational proof to help our comprehension of the basic system of the PCB-CWB relationship. At the point when workers see that the trade relationship with their association is disturbed, they show more negative results (Chao et al., 2011). In this light, the discoveries of the current investigation recommended that PCB was essentially identified with CWB, which is as per past research (Özdemir and Demircioglu, 2015, Griep and Vantilborgh, 2018). The current study adds on to the literature of three studied constructs of the model i.e., Psychological Contract Breach, Counterproductive Work Behavior and Proactive Personality. Further this study elaborates that employees experiencing psychological breach of contract have lower job satisfaction with elevated feeling of retaliation. Further, this study adds on to the literature that how employees psychological contract violation leads to this disengagement and lower productivity while intentionally not working to the marked potential. Moreover, this study fills up the gap illustrated by McCormick et al. (2019) in their research that proactive personalities depict proactive behavior with stability even if an adverse situation to their behavior is experienced. This study incorporates the solution to this gap that proactive personalities when bear adverse situation like psychological contract breach they do not show proactive behavior.

Practical Implications

Results of the study are of greater significance for the health sector in Pakistan as it indicates the importance of controlling the counterproductive work behavior in the nursing profession. Nursing is considered as the country's health sector and their work behavior is of prime importance as it has significant impact on overall health level of a society. A slight negligence in this sector can have a very negative impact on the lives of members of society. Organizations should invest in the factors diminishing psychological contract breach in order to maintain the long-term productivity of their employees. As psychological contract breach greatly influences employees' performance. Realistic expectations must be set while forming psychological contract by both the employee and the employer in order to avoid violation of the contract. Normally organizations try to make the promises that they can fulfill during recruitment but under certain situations it becomes impossible for them to fulfill the promises. In this type of situation normally organizations rely on their proactive employees as they consider them to be less effective for psychological contract breach. However, results of the study are indicating that even the proactive employees may not show up with their proactivity. As per contingency theory, situations that trigger psychological contract violation must be avoided by the organization.

Organizations must provide trainings to its workers to handle a situation like psychological contract breach then reacting to it negatively. Organizational achievement, be that as it may, doesn't simply appear on the grounds

that proactive individuals have been utilized, however additionally there must be a strong climate to empower them to thrive. For instance, if there is no work self-governance, proactive workers will be too obliged to even consider while performing their ideal. Thus, an empowering environment must be made which will give workers the space and opportunity to perform with their most extreme. The current model was studied in the public sector which have rigid rules and instructions have little room for proactive personalities to outperform their innovative ideas. Compensating proactive more is not an investment but an expense as the results shows. Lastly, the research adds in to the insights of the organizational managers that hiring a proactive personality isn't useful. The study sheds light on the contextual behavior shown by both proactive and reactive employees. Hence, making the managers to understand the significance of winning the confidence of employees through explaining the situation in case of psychological contract breach and compensating the employees by the managers in such a situation as much as they can. Healthy workplace environment in all situations is not achievable by hiring some proactive workforce but it requires the fulfilling of the promises made to them for productive and optimistic outcomes.

Future Research and Limitations

This study has been conducted in healthcare sector of public hospitals of Pakistan. Future researchers can test the same model in other sectors as well. In Pakistan, as well as, other countries private sector is also having a major role in providing healthcare facilities but there is a great difference between the whole organizational setup of public and private sector so for the generalization purpose there is need to study the same in the private sector too. Furthermore, this study was tested in service sector so future researchers can study the same model in manufacturing sector. Organizational size and structure may also affect the counterproductive work behavior. On the other hand, a proactive employee may or may not show the same level of counter productiveness as that of a reactive employee that's why study must be conducted to find the extent of effect of breach on the performance of the employees. Another aspect that may be taken in account by future researchers is the social comparison process by which some individuals consider themselves to be less effective of the psychological contract breach in comparison to their peer. Intensity may differ as per the social comparison between the peers. There may be the impact of ratio of proactive employees to that of reactive employees in an organization on the counter productive work behavior due to breach of psychological contract. Future researchers can look for this gap too. This research only encompasses one outcome of psychological breach of contract that is counterproductive work behavior. Future researchers can look for other outcomes like workplace deviance, Interpersonal deviance, Silence, Coworker backstabbing, Production deviance etc. This research undertakes only one independent variable that is psychological breach of contract. Forthcoming researchers can look for other variables such as Workplace Burnout, Stress, and Exhaustion etc. This study incorporates only one moderator whereas new researchers can look for other moderators such as Reactive Personalities, Negotiators etc. Moreover, the same study can be conducted in other countries as well.

CONCLUSION

The current model with three of its constructs was put under test on the nursing population of public sector of Pakistan. The results clearly indicated that psychological breach have a significant positive impact on counterproductive work behavior. However, moderating effect of proactive personalities in this regard was found to be insignificant. Employees due to occurrence of any negative event in the organization perceive a negative response as per theory of affective events explains. In return employees generate the same negativity in the form of their negative response in this situation which is counterproductive work behavior. As employees tend to retaliate the same behavior they receive as per social exchange theory. This study has both theoretical and practical limitations with few limitations as well.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmed, W., Kiyani, A. & Hashmi, S. H. 2013. The Study On Organizational Cynicism, Organizational Injustice & Breach Of Psychological Contract As The Determinants Of Deviant Work Behavior. *Actual Problems Of Economics*.
2. Akgunduz, Y. & Gürel, D. A. 2019. Role Stress And Turnover Intention In Hotels: The Mediating Role Of Organizational Enthusiasm And Unstimulating Work. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 67, 222-238.
3. Aquino, K., Lewis, M. U. & Bradfield, M. 1999. Justice Constructs, Negative Affectivity, And Employee Deviance: A Proposed Model And Empirical Test. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 1073-1091.
4. Belschak, F. & Hartog, D. D. 2010. Being Proactive At Work—Blessing Or Bane? *The Psychologist*.
5. Bennett, R. J. & Robinson, S. L. 2000. Development Of A Measure Of Workplace Deviance. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349.
6. Blau, P. M. 1964a. Justice In Social Exchange. *Sociological Inquiry*, 34, 193-206.
7. Blau, P. M. 1964b. Social Exchange Theory. Retrieved September, 3, 62.

8. 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, 1104.
9. Cassar, V. & Briner, R. B. 2011. The Relationship Between Psychological Contract Breach And Organizational Commitment: Exchange Imbalance As A Moderator Of The Mediating Role Of Violation. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior*, 78, 283-289.
10. Ceschi, A., Sartori, R., Dickert, S. & Costantini, A. 2016. Grit Or Honesty-Humility? New Insights Into The Moderating Role Of Personality Between The Health Impairment Process And Counterproductive Work Behavior. *Frontiers In Psychology*, 7, 1799.
11. Chan, D. 2006. Interactive Effects Of Situational Judgment Effectiveness And Proactive Personality On Work Perceptions And Work Outcomes. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 91, 475.
12. Chao, J. M., Cheung, F. Y. & Wu, A. M. 2011. Psychological Contract Breach And Counterproductive Workplace Behaviors: Testing Moderating Effect Of Attribution Style And Power Distance. *The International Journal Of Human Resource Management*, 22, 763-777.
13. Chen, I.-C. & Li, H.-H. 2010. Measuring Patient Safety Culture In Taiwan Using The Hospital Survey On Patient Safety Culture (Hsopsc). *Bmc Health Services Research*, 10, 1-10.
14. Chiu, S.-F. & Peng, J.-C. 2008. The Relationship Between Psychological Contract Breach And Employee Deviance: The Moderating Role Of Hostile Attributional Style. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior*, 73, 426-433.
15. Choi, Y. 2019. The Moderating Effect Of Leader Member Exchange On The Relationship Between Workplace Ostracism And Psychological Distress. *Asia-Pacific Journal Of Business Administration*.
16. Cohen, J. A., Mannarino, A. P. & Deblinger, E. 2016. *Treating Trauma And Traumatic Grief In Children And Adolescents*, Guilford Publications.
17. Colbert, B. A. 2004. The Complex Resource-Based View: Implications For Theory And Practice In Strategic Human Resource Management. *Academy Of Management Review*, 29, 341-358.
18. Conway, N. & Briner, R. B. 2009. Fifty Years Of Psychological Contract Research: What Do We Know And What Are The Main Challenges. *International Review Of Industrial And Organizational Psychology*, 24, 71-131.
19. Costa, S. & Neves, P. 2017. Job Insecurity And Work Outcomes: The Role Of Psychological Contract Breach And Positive Psychological Capital. *Work & Stress*, 31, 375-394.
20. Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. & Conway, N. 2005. Exchange Relationships: Examining Psychological Contracts And Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 90, 774.
21. Crant, J. M. & Bateman, T. S. 2000. Charismatic Leadership Viewed From Above: The Impact Of Proactive Personality. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 63-75.
22. Daouk-Öyry, L., Anouze, A.-L., Otaki, F., Dumit, N. Y. & Osman, I. 2014. The Joint Model Of Nurse Absenteeism And Turnover: A Systematic Review. *International Journal Of Nursing Studies*, 51, 93-110.
23. Davari, A. & Rezazadeh, A. 2013. *Structural Equation Modeling With Pls*. Tehran: Jahad University, 215, 224.
24. De Cuyper, N. & De Witte, H. 2006. The Impact Of Job Insecurity And Contract Type On Attitudes, Well-Being And Behavioural Reports: A Psychological Contract Perspective. *Journal Of Occupational And Organizational Psychology*, 79, 395-409.
25. De Witte, H., De Cuyper, N., Vander Elst, T., Vanbelle, E. & Niesen, W. 2012. Job Insecurity: Review Of The Literature And A Summary Of Recent Studies From Belgium. *Romanian Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 14, 11-17.
26. 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, 166.
27. Eckerd, S., Hill, J., Boyer, K. K., Donohue, K. & Ward, P. T. 2013. The Relative Impact Of Attribute, Severity, And Timing Of Psychological Contract Breach On Behavioral And Attitudinal Outcomes. *Journal Of Operations Management*, 31, 567-578.
28. Eisenberger, R. & Stinglhamber, F. 2011. *Perceived Organizational Support: Fostering Enthusiastic And Productive Employees*, American Psychological Association.
29. Erdogan, B. & Bauer, T. N. 2005. Enhancing Career Benefits Of Employee Proactive Personality: The Role Of Fit With Jobs And Organizations. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 859-891.
30. Fisher, C. D. & Ashkanasy, N. M. 2000. *The Emerging Role Of Emotions In Work Life: An Introduction*. Wiley Online Library.
31. Frost, B. C., Ko, C.-H. E. & James, L. R. 2007. Implicit And Explicit Personality: A Test Of A Channeling Hypothesis For Aggressive Behavior. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1299.
32. Fuller Jr, J. B., Hester, K. & Cox, S. S. 2010. Proactive Personality And Job Performance: Exploring Job Autonomy As A Moderator. *Journal Of Managerial Issues*, 35-51.
33. Giacalone, R. A. & Greenberg, J. 1997. *Antisocial Behavior In Organizations*, Sage.

34. Gold, A. H., Malhotra, A. & Segars, A. H. 2001. Knowledge Management: An Organizational Capabilities Perspective. *Journal Of Management Information Systems*, 18, 185-214.
35. Gouldner, A. W. 1960. The Norm Of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. *American Sociological Review*, 161-178.
36. Griep, Y. & Vantilborgh, T. 2018. Reciprocal Effects Of Psychological Contract Breach On Counterproductive And Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: The Role Of Time. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior*, 104, 141-153.
37. Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M. & Sarstedt, M. 2011. Pls-Sem: Indeed A Silver Bullet. *Journal Of Marketing Theory And Practice*, 19, 139-152.
38. Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M. & Sarstedt, M. 2013. Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling: Rigorous Applications, Better Results And Higher Acceptance. *Long Range Planning*, 46, 1-12.
39. Hanisch, K. A. & Hulin, C. L. 1990. Job Attitudes And Organizational Withdrawal: An Examination Of Retirement And Other Voluntary Withdrawal Behaviors. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior*, 37, 60-78.
40. Harper, D. 1990. Spotlight Abuse-Save Profits. *Industrial Distribution*, 79, 47-51.
41. Hystad, S. W., Mearns, K. J. & Eid, J. 2014. Moral Disengagement As A Mechanism Between Perceptions Of Organisational Injustice And Deviant Work Behaviours. *Safety Science*, 68, 138-145.
42. Jafri, H. 2014. Influence Of Personality On Perception Of Psychological Contract Breach.
43. Jensen, J. M., Opland, R. A. & Ryan, A. M. 2010. Psychological Contracts And Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Employee Responses To Transactional And Relational Breach. *Journal Of Business And Psychology*, 25, 555-568.
44. Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S. & Pal, D. K. 2015. Likert Scale: Explored And Explained. *Current Journal Of Applied Science And Technology*, 396-403.
45. Kayani, M. B., Zafar, A., Aksar, M. & Hassan, S. 2019. Impacts Of Despotic Leadership And Dark Personality Triad On Follower's Sense Of Meaningful Work: Moderating Influence Of Organizational Justice.
46. Kickul, J. & Lester, S. W. 2001. Broken Promises: Equity Sensitivity As A Moderator Between Psychological Contract Breach And Employee Attitudes And Behavior. *Journal Of Business And Psychology*, 16, 191-217.
47. Kotter, J. P. 1973. The Psychological Contract: Managing The Joining-Up Process. *California Management Review*, 15, 91-99.
48. Law, K. S. & Zhou, Y. 2014. On The Relationship Between Implicit Attitudes And Counterproductive Work Behaviors. *Asia Pacific Journal Of Management*, 31, 643-659.
49. Li, N., Liang, J. & Crant, J. M. 2010. The Role Of Proactive Personality In Job Satisfaction And Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Relational Perspective. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 95, 395.
50. Lofquist, L. H. & Dawis, R. 1978. Values As Second-Order Needs In The Theory Of Work Adjustment. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior*, 12, 12-19.
51. Loi, R., Liu, Y., Lam, L. W. & Xu, A. J. 2016. Buffering Emotional Job Demands: The Interplay Between Proactive Personality And Team Potency. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior*, 95, 128-137.
52. Mccormick, B. W., Guay, R. P., Colbert, A. E. & Stewart, G. L. 2019. Proactive Personality And Proactive Behaviour: Perspectives On Person-Situation Interactions. *Journal Of Occupational And Organizational Psychology*, 92, 30-51.
53. Meyer, J. P. & Maltin, E. R. 2010. Employee Commitment And Well-Being: A Critical Review, Theoretical Framework And Research Agenda. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior*, 77, 323-337.
54. Morrison, E. W. & Robinson, S. L. 1997. When Employees Feel Betrayed: A Model Of How Psychological Contract Violation Develops. *Academy Of Management Review*, 22, 226-256.
55. Mount, M., Ilies, R. & Johnson, E. 2006. Relationship Of Personality Traits And Counterproductive Work Behaviors: The Mediating Effects Of Job Satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 591-622.
56. Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W. & Steers, R. M. 2013. Employee—Organization Linkages: The Psychology Of Commitment, Absenteeism, And Turnover, Academic Press.
57. Neuman, J. H. & Baron, R. A. 2005. Aggression In The Workplace: A Social-Psychological Perspective.
58. Özdemir, M. & Demircioglu, E. 2015. The Relationship Between Counterproductive Work Behaviours And Psychological Contracts In Public High Schools. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 44, 41-59.
59. Penney, L. M. & Spector, P. E. 2005. Job Stress, Incivility, And Counterproductive Work Behavior (Cwb): The Moderating Role Of Negative Affectivity. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal Of Industrial, Occupational And Organizational Psychology And Behavior*, 26, 777-796.
60. Piccoli, B. & De Witte, H. 2015. Job Insecurity And Emotional Exhaustion: Testing Psychological Contract Breach Versus Distributive Injustice As Indicators Of Lack Of Reciprocity. *Work & Stress*, 29, 246-263.
61. Quratulain, S., Khan, A. K., Crawshaw, J. R., Arain, G. A. & Hameed, I. 2018. A Study Of Employee Affective Organizational Commitment And Retention In Pakistan: The Roles Of Psychological Contract

- Breach And Norms Of Reciprocity. *The International Journal Of Human Resource Management*, 29, 2552-2579.
62. Reisel, W. D., Probst, T. M., Chia, S.-L., Maloles, C. M. & König, C. J. 2010. The Effects Of Job Insecurity On Job Satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Deviant Behavior, And Negative Emotions Of Employees. *International Studies Of Management & Organization*, 40, 74-91.
 63. Robinson, S. L. & Bennett, R. J. 1995. A Typology Of Deviant Workplace Behaviors: A Multidimensional Scaling Study. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 38, 555-572.
 64. Robinson, S. L. & O'leary-Kelly, A. M. 1998. Monkey See, Monkey Do: The Influence Of Work Groups On The Antisocial Behavior Of Employees. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 41, 658-672.
 65. Robinson, S. L. & Rousseau, D. M. 1994. Violating The Psychological Contract: Not The Exception But The Norm. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 245-259.
 66. Rousseau, D. 1995. *Psychological Contracts In Organizations: Understanding Written And Unwritten Agreements*, Sage Publications.
 67. Rousseau, D. M. & Tijoriwala, S. A. 1998. Assessing Psychological Contracts: Issues, Alternatives And Measures. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal Of Industrial, Occupational And Organizational Psychology And Behavior*, 19, 679-695.
 68. Sackett, P. R. & Devore, C. J. 2002. *Counterproductive Behaviors At Work*.
 69. Seibert, S. E., Crant, J. M. & Kraimer, M. L. 1999. Proactive Personality And Career Success. *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 84, 416.
 70. Spector, P. E., Bauer, J. A. & Fox, S. 2010. Measurement Artifacts In The Assessment Of Counterproductive Work Behavior And Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Do We Know What We Think We Know? *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 95, 781.
 71. Spector, P. E. & Fox, S. 2005. The Stressor-Emotion Model Of Counterproductive Work Behavior.
 72. Sturges, J., Conway, N., Guest, D. & Liefoghe, A. 2005. Managing The Career Deal: The Psychological Contract As A Framework For Understanding Career Management, Organizational Commitment And Work Behavior. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal Of Industrial, Occupational And Organizational Psychology And Behavior*, 26, 821-838.
 73. Sulea, C., Van Beek, I., Sarbescu, P., Virga, D. & Schaufeli, W. B. 2015. Engagement, Boredom, And Burnout Among Students: Basic Need Satisfaction Matters More Than Personality Traits. *Learning And Individual Differences*, 42, 132-138.
 74. Tian, Q., Zhang, L. & Zou, W. 2014. Job Insecurity And Counterproductive Behavior Of Casino Dealers—The Mediating Role Of Affective Commitment And Moderating Role Of Supervisor Support. *International Journal Of Hospitality Management*, 40, 29-36.
 75. Vardi, Y. & Wiener, Y. 1996. Misbehavior In Organizations: A Motivational Framework. *Organization Science*, 7, 151-165.
 76. Weiss, H. M. & Cropanzano, R. 1996. Affective Events Theory: A Theoretical Discussion Of The Structure, Causes And Consequences Of Affective Experiences At Work.
 77. Zhao, H., Peng, Z. & Sheard, G. 2013. Workplace Ostracism And Hospitality Employees' Counterproductive Work Behaviors: The Joint Moderating Effects Of Proactive Personality And Political Skill. *International Journal Of Hospitality Management*, 33, 219-227.
 78. 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.