

Impact of Psychological Contract on Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Employees of the Dairy Industry

Gurumoorthi V and T. Venkatesan

Department of Social Work, Madurai Institute of Social Sciences, Madurai, India

[Abstract] This research study aims to explore the impact of the psychological contract on organizational citizenship behavior. It focuses on, specifically, whether there is a relationship between psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior among employees. The transactional contract and the relational contract are considered as the measurement variables of psychological contract. Meanwhile, altruism, compliance, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue are regarded as the measurement variables of organizational citizenship behavior. As suggested by the organization, 60 out of 336 employees were selected as the sample for this study by adopting convenience sampling technique. To test the hypothesis, inferential statistical tests were performed to identify whether there is a significant difference in the psychological contract and the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) among employees based on socio-demographic factors and, also, to find the relationship between organizational variables. Findings have shown the psychological contract, and organizational citizenship behavior is varied as a low, moderate, or high level among employees. Furthermore, there is a significant positive relationship between psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior. Through regression analysis, it is found that psychological contract influences the organizational citizenship behavior and one of its dimensions: sportsmanship.

[Keywords] psychological contract, organizational citizenship behavior, variables, dimensions, impact

Introduction

Village dairy farmers who are engaged actively in dairying earn more credits through the exponential growth of the dairy industry. India is able to fulfil the dairy needs of the people throughout the year due to the high production of milk. Enhancing psychological contract of the employees is indispensable to increasing the milk productivity, which would, in turn, help employees in exhibiting organizational citizenship behavior. The psychological contract was originally developed by Denise Rousseau and refers to informal arrangements, mutual beliefs, common ground, and perceptions between two parties. In most of the organizations, psychological contract becomes an inevitable domain as it helps to get rid of a complicated relationship between employees and employers. The study on psychological contract has been gaining momentum in the last few decades and is being used extensively now to resolve many human resource (HR) related issues. The psychological contract refers to the unwritten set of expectations of the employment relationship. To put it in the nutshell, the psychological contract and the employment contract define the employer-employee relationship. Dennis Organ first introduced the concept of organizational citizenship behavior in the mid-1980s. The construct is being largely used by various stakeholders, such as academicians, researchers, and organizations in contemporary scenarios. Organizational citizenship behavior is considered to have an important impact on the effectiveness and efficiency of organizations and their work teams, and contribute to overall productivity. These two organizational variables significantly contribute to the development organization; therefore, the present study was undertaken to find its relevance in the dairy industry.

Review of Literature

Robinson and Morrison (2000) in their longitudinal study revealed that when employees feel that they are treated unfairly by their employer, it results in psychological contract breach with more intense feelings of violation. Coyle-Shapiro, Jacqueline, and Kessler (2002) found the positive relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and the dimensions of psychological contract. Bellou, (2007) found the

influence of mergers and acquisitions on the content of the psychological contract. The change was found in organizational obligations and contributions of employees after mergers or acquisitions. Chahar (2009) confirmed the significant relationship between various domains of psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior. It was further claimed that the result of the study was similar with the existing literature. Finkelstein, (2011) found the positive relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and their influence on organizational citizenship behavior of employees. Jafri (2011) reported that psychological contract breach would affect the citizenship behavior and job performance of the employees. The significance of managing the psychological contract to improve job performance of the employees and for bettering organizational citizenship behavior was further identified.

Francisco (2015) found the negative effect of the psychological contract on organizational citizenship behaviors. It explained that negative beliefs and attitudes towards supervisors and organizations result in decreased organizational citizenship behaviors. Anggraeni, Dwiatmadja, and Yuniawan, (2017) revealed that the employee citizenship behavior is influenced by the organizational commitment. Kishokumar (2018) conducted a study among employees of the banking sector in Sri Lanka to examine the impact of the psychological contract on organizational citizenship behavior. It was revealed that the psychological contract significantly influences the organizational citizenship behavior, and it was further discovered that both the organizational variables were at a high level among the employees of the banking sector. Mohapatra, Satpathy, and Patnaik (2019) found the positive correlation between various dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction. The result clearly indicates that higher job satisfaction leads to higher organizational citizenship behavior.

Though extensive studies have been carried out on the psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior, this study is intended to show the impact of the psychological contract on organizational citizenship behavior in the dairy industry. Success of any enterprise is influenced by several factors. Therefore, the study was undertaken to gauge the impact.

Methodology

The study aimed to throw light on the impact of the psychological contract on organizational citizenship behavior among employees in the dairy industry in the Madurai District. The psychological contract' is an increasingly relevant aspect of workplace relationships and wider human behavior. This leads to the question of whether and to what extent organizations can determine the behavior of employees. Satisfying those contract expectations leads employees in exhibiting organizational citizenship behavior. The study adopted "descriptive research design," as it provides the necessary scope to describe the level and impact of the psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior among employees. Employees at the manufacturing site were included. As suggested by the organization, the researcher has collected data from 60 respondents out of 336 employees by adopting the convenience sampling technique. Thus, the sample size is 60. The questionnaire method was employed to collect data. To understand and study the selected socio demographic details of the employees, a self-structured questionnaire consisting of open and closed ended questions was prepared. To understand and measure the psychological contract, a 19-item, five-point Likert type rating scale developed by Denise M. Rousseau (2008) was used. To understand and measure the organizational citizenship behavior, a scale developed by Podsakoff, et al. (1990) was used; it is a 15-item, seven-point Likert scale. The collected data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Findings Related to Socio-Demographic Data

- More than one-third of the respondents (36.7%) are Technicians.
- The majority of the respondents (83.3%) are Male.
- More than one-third of the respondents (35%) are aged above 50 years.
- Exactly one-fifth of the respondents (20%) have 16-20 years of experience.

- Nearly half of the respondents (48.3%) have completed ITI / Diploma.
- More than one-third of the respondents (38.3%) earn more than Rs.50,000 per month.
- The overwhelming majority of the respondent (95 %) are married.

Table 1

“T” -TEST Table Shows the Difference in the Psychological Contract Based on Gender

Dependent Variable	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	Df	Sig
Psychological Contract	Male	50	65.5400	9.36823	-2.591	58	.012
	Female	10	73.6000	6.46701			

The table shows the difference in the psychological contract based on gender. It is obvious that the mean value of female respondents (73.6) is higher than male respondents (65.4). Also, the significant value $p < 0.05$ ($p = .012$) clearly indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant difference in the psychological contract based on gender.

Table 2

“T” -TEST Table Shows the Difference in Organizational Citizenship Behavior Based on Gender

Dependent Variable	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	Df	Sig
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	Male	50	78.0400	7.77216	-2.064	58	.043
	Female	10	83.8000	9.44928			

The table shows the difference in organizational citizenship behavior based on gender. It is obvious that the mean value of female respondents (83.8) is higher than male respondents (78.4). Also, the significant value $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.43$) clearly indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant difference in organizational citizenship behavior based on gender.

Table 3

“T” -TEST Table Shows the Difference in Psychological Contract Based on Marital Status

Dependent Variable	Marital Status	N	Mean	SD	T	df	Sig
Psychological contract	Unmarried	3	52.3333	4.61880	-2.919	58	.004
	Married	57	67.6491	8.97117			

The table shows the difference in the psychological contract of respondents based on their marital status. It is obvious the mean value of married respondents (67.64) is higher than the unmarried respondents (52.33) and the significant value $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.04$). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant difference in the psychological contract based on marital status.

Table 4

"t" -TEST Table Shows the Difference in Organizational Citizenship Behavior Based on Marital Status

Dependent Variable	Marital Status	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig
Organizational citizenship Behavior	Unmarried	3	75.6667	2.08167	-.713	58	.479
	Married	57	79.1754	8.44758			

The table shows the difference in organizational citizenship behavior of respondents based on their marital status. It is obvious that there is no significant difference in the mean value of marital status of respondents and the significant value $p > 0.05$ ($p = 0.479$). Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted, and there is no significant difference in organizational citizenship behavior based on marital status.

Table 5

ANOVA Table Shows the Mean Difference Score of the Psychological Contract Based on Designation

Dependent Variable	Designation	N	Mean	SD	df	F	Sig
Psychological Contract	Manager	4	75.0000	5.88784	4	23.451	.001
	Deputy Manager	4	69.7500	7.13559			
	Executive	15	73.6667	5.38074			
	Technician	22	68.5909	6.91209			
	Senior Factory Assistant	15	54.6667	4.33699			
	Total	60	66.8833	9.40446			

The above table shows the test of difference, i.e. ANOVA, in the psychological contract based on designation. It is obvious that the mean value of managers (75) is higher than designated employees. Also, the significant value $p < 0.05$ ($p = .001$) clearly indicates that null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant difference in the psychological contract based on designation.

Table 6

ANOVA Table Shows the Mean Difference Score of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Based on Designation

Dependent Variable	Designation	N	Mean	SD	df	F	Sig
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	Manager	4	88.5000	4.50925	4	5.638	.001
	Deputy Manager	4	91.0000	8.75595			
	Executive	15	79.4000	11.01168			
	Technician	22	76.8636	6.15123			
	Senior Factory Assistant	15	76.0000	2.42015			
	Total	60	79.0000	8.27494			

The above table shows the test of difference, i.e. ANOVA, in organizational citizenship behavior based on designation. It is obvious that the mean value of deputy managers (91) is higher than other designated employees. Also, the significant value $p < 0.05$ ($p = .001$) clearly indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant difference in organizational citizenship behavior based on designation.

Table 7

ANOVA Table Shows the Mean Difference Score of Psychological Contract Based on Age of the Respondents

Dependent Variable	Age	N	Mean	SD	df	F	Sig
Psychological Contract	20-30	6	58.0000	9.75705	3	2.994	.038
	31-40	13	65.4615	10.06326			
	41-50	20	70.2000	8.51377			
	Above 50	21	67.1429	8.45154			
	Total	60	66.8833	9.40446			

The above table shows the test of difference, i.e. ANOVA, between the psychological contract and age. It is obvious that the mean value of the respondents in the age group between 41-50 years has higher mean value than other age groups. Also, the significant value $P < 0.05$ ($p = .038$) clearly indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Hence, there is a significant difference in psychological contract of respondents based on age.

Table 8

ANOVA Table Shows the Mean Difference Score of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Based on Age

Dependent Variable	Age	N	Mean	SD	df	F	Sig
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	20-30	6	79.1667	5.70672	3	.76	.518
	31-40	13	77.3077	7.93079			
	41-50	20	81.2000	10.29359			
	Above 50	21	77.9048	6.89133			
	Total	60	79.0000	8.27494			

The above table shows the test of difference i.e. Anova in organizational citizenship behaviour based on age of the respondents. It is obvious that the mean value of respondents at age group between 41 to 50 years (81.2) have high mean value than other age group. Also, the significant value $p > 0.05$ ($p = .518$) clearly indicates that the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is significant difference in the organizational citizenship behavior of respondents based on age.

Table 9

ANOVA Table Shows the Mean Difference Score of the Psychological Contract Based on Number of Years of Experience

Dependent Variable	Age	N	mean	SD	df	F	Sig
Psychological Contract	0-5	8	62.6250	14.19192	4	.837	.508
	6-10	11	68.9091	9.23531			
	11-15	11	66.0909	10.45423			
	16-20	12	69.6667	6.15457			
	Above 20	18	66.1667	8.21226			
	Total	60	66.8833	9.40446			

The above table shows the test of the difference, i.e. ANOVA, in the psychological contract based on the years of experience of the respondents. There is no significant difference in the mean value of experience of respondents. Also, the significant value $p > 0.05$ ($p = 0.508$) clearly indicates that the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the psychological contract of respondents based on years of experience.

Table 10

ANOVA Table Shows the Mean Difference Score of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Based on Number of Years of Experience

Dependent Variable	Age	N	mean	SD	df	F	Sig
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	0-5	8	80.6250	6.98851	4	.550	.700
	6-10	11	77.1818	12.62393			
	11-15	11	81.6364	5.48220			
	16-20	12	77.7500	6.78401			
	Above 20	18	78.6111	8.19712			
	Total	60	79.0000	8.27494			

The above table shows the test of differences, i.e. ANOVA, in organizational citizenship behavior based on the number of years of experience of the respondents. There is no significant difference in the mean value of experience of the respondents. The significant value $p > 0.05$ ($p = 0.7$) clearly indicates that the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the organizational citizenship behavior of the respondents based on years of experience.

Table 11

ANOVA Table Shows the Mean Difference Score of Psychological Contract Based on the Monthly Salary

Dependent Variable	Monthly Salary	N	Mean	SD	df	F	Sig
Psychological Contract	Upto Rs.20000	8	54.6250	4.20671	4	26.81	.001
	Rs.20001 to Rs.30000	8	54.6250	4.47014			
	Rs.30001 to Rs.40000	8	69.0000	5.85540			
	Rs.40001 to Rs.50000	13	69.4615	6.70342			
	Above Rs.50001	23	73.2174	5.74422			
	Total	60	66.8833	9.40446			

The above table shows the test of difference, i.e. ANOVA, in the psychological contract based on the monthly salary of the respondents. The mean value of the respondents' monthly salary above Rs.50,000 is high compared to other salaried respondents. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, it proves that there is significant difference in the psychological contract based on the salary component of the respondents.

Table 12

ANOVA Table Shows the Mean Difference Score of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Based on Monthly Salary

Dependent Variable	Monthly Salary	N	Mean	SD	df	F	Sig
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	Upto Rs.20000	8	75.7500	2.37547	4	2.490	.054
	Rs.20001 to Rs.30000	8	76.6250	2.61520			
	Rs.30001 to Rs.40000	8	75.6250	4.34042			
	Rs.40001 to Rs.50000	13	77.4615	7.30999			
	Above Rs.50001	23	83.0000	10.78720			
	Total	60	79.0000	8.27494			

The above table shows the test of the difference, i.e. ANOVA, in the organizational citizenship behavior based on the monthly salary of the respondents. There is no significant difference in the mean value of the monthly salary of respondents. The significant value $p > 0.05$ ($p=0.54$) clearly indicates that the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the organizational citizenship behavior of respondents based on monthly salary.

Table 13

ANOVA Table Shows the Mean Difference Score of Psychological Contract Based on the Educational Qualification

Dependent Variable	Educational Qualification	N	Mean	SD	df	F	Sig
Psychological Contract	SSLC	1	61.0000	.	4	4.109	.006
	Higher Secondary	6	55.1667	4.70815			
	ITI/Diploma	29	66.4138	9.24089			
	Under Graduate	21	70.6190	7.89605			
	Post Graduate	3	70.6667	11.59023			
	Total	60	66.8833	9.40446			

The above table shows the test of difference, i.e. ANOVA, in the psychological contract based on the educational qualification of the respondents. There is significant difference in the mean value of educational qualification of the respondents. The mean value of post-graduates is higher than other respondents. The significant value $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.06$) clearly indicates that the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant difference in the psychological contract of the respondents based on educational qualification.

Table 14

ANOVA Table Shows the Mean Difference Score of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Based on Educational Qualification

Dependent Variable	Educational qualification	N	Mean	SD	df	F	Sig
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	SSLC	1	75.0000	.	4	1.214	.315
	Higher Secondary	6	77.0000	2.68328			
	ITI/Diplomo	29	77.7586	6.31130			
	Under Graduate	21	80.2857	11.05506			
	Post Graduate	3	87.3333	7.63763			
	Total	60	79.0000	8.27494			

The above table shows the test of difference, i.e. ANOVA, in the organizational citizenship behavior based on the educational qualification of the respondents. There is no significant difference in the mean value of educational qualification of respondents. The significant value $p > 0.05$ ($p = 0.315$) clearly indicates that the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the organizational citizenship behavior of the respondents based on educational qualification.

Table 15

Karl Person's Correlation between Psychological Contract and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Variable		1	2	3	4	5	OCB	RC	TC	PC
Altruism	Pearson Correlation	1	.336**	.329*	.254*	0.095	.601**	0.134	0.182	0.189
	Sig.(2-tailed)		0.009	0.01	0.05	0.468	0.01	0.308	0.164	0.148
Courtesy	Pearson Correlation	.336**	1	.274*	0.043	0.221	.593**	0.174	0.178	0.209
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.009		0.034	0.744	0.09	0.01	0.183	0.173	0.11
Civic virtue	Pearson Correlation	.329*	.274*	1	-0.116	.281*	.647**	-0.091	-0.249	-0.209
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.01	0.034		0.378	0.029	0.01	0.489	0.055	0.109
Sportsmanship	Pearson Correlation	.254*	0.043	-0.116	1	0.139	.406**	.537**	.487**	.602**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.05	0.744	0.378		0.29	0.001	0.01	0.01	0.01
Compliance	Pearson Correlation	0.095	0.221	.281*	0.139	1	.673**	.260*	0.08	0.192
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.468	0.09	0.029	0.29		0.01	0.045	0.545	0.142
OCB	Pearson Correlation	.601**	.593**	.647**	.406**	.673**	1	.330*	0.186	.297*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.001	0		0.01	0.155	0.021
RC	Pearson Correlation	0.134	0.174	-0.091	.537**	.260*	.330*	1	.428**	.815**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.308	0.183	0.489	0.01	0.045	0.01		0.001	0
TC	Pearson Correlation	0.182	0.178	-0.249	.487**	0.08	0.186	.428**	1	.873**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.164	0.173	0.055	0	0.545	0.155	0.001		0.01
PC	Pearson Correlation	0.189	0.209	-0.209	.602**	0.192	.297*	.815**	.873**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.148	0.11	0.109	0.01	0.142	0.02	0.01	0.01	

1-Altruism, 2- Courtesy, 3- Civic Virtue, 4- Sportsmanship, 5- Compliance, OCB -Organizational Citizenship Behavior, RC- Relational Contract, TC - Transactional Contract, PC - Psychological Contract

The above table clearly shows the test of Karl person's correlation between the psychological contract and organizational citizenship behaviors, along with its dimensions. The table reveals that the correlation value for the psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior is 0.297. Therefore, it is positively correlated. Also, the significant value $p < 0.05$ ($p=0.02$) indicates strong evidence against the null

hypothesis, so the null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant positive relationship between the psychological contract and the organizational citizenship behavior. Similarly, there is a positive relationship between the psychological contract and a dimension of organizational citizenship behavior, i.e. sportsmanship. The significant value is $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.01$). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is a significant positive relationship between the psychological contract and sportsmanship.

Table 16

Regression between Psychological Contract, Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Sportsmanship

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Df	R square	Adjusted R square	t	Sig.	Beta	Anova Sig.
Organizational Citizenship Behaviour	Psychological Contract	1	.088	.073	2.371	.021	.262	.021
Sportsmanship	Psychological Contract	1	.363	.352	5.748	.001	.602	.001

A linear regression test was applied to the psychological contract on the organizational citizenship behavior. Where the psychological contract was taken as an independent variable and the organizational citizenship behavior and sportsmanship were treated as dependent variables. From the above table, it is noted that the psychological contract influences organizational citizenship behavior by only 8%, since the r square value is 0.088. Model regression analysis shows that with regard to the psychological contract and the organizational citizenship behavior, the psychological contract influences organizational citizenship behavior up to 8% only. The table shows that the psychological contract influences sportsmanship by nearly 36%, since the r square value is 0.363. It is inferred that the psychological contract has more influence on one of the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior, i.e. sportsmanship, than overall organizational citizenship behavior since the Beta value of sportsmanship (.602) is greater than the overall organizational citizenship behavior (.262). The t value also denotes that the psychological contract has more influence on sportsmanship.

Table 17

Distribution of the Respondents Based on Level of Psychological Contract

Level of Psychological Contract	No of Respondent (n)	Percentage (%)
Low Level	20	33.3
Moderate Level	23	38.3
High Level	17	28.3
Total	60	100

The level of the psychological contract of the respondents has been classified into three categories, low, moderate, and high, for analytical purpose. For 60 respondents, the total score value for each respondent was calculated. The calculated lowest and highest score value of respondent's psychological contract was 47 and 83, respectively. The score values 47-63 have been classified as low on the psychological contract. The score values 64-73 have been classified as moderate for the psychological contract. The score values greater than 74-83 have been classified as high for the psychological contract.

The table shows that more than one-third of the respondents (38.3%) have moderate a level of psychological contract, exactly one-third of the respondents (33.3%) have a low level of psychological contract, and more than one-fourth of the respondents (28.3%) have a high level of psychological contract.

Table 18

Distribution of the Respondents Based on Level of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Level of Organizational Citizenship Behavior	No of Respondents (n)	Percentage (%)
Low Level	21	35.0
Moderate Level	21	35.0
High Level	18	30.0
Total	60	100

The level of organizational citizenship behavior of the respondents was classified into three categories, low, moderate, or high, for analytical purposes. For 60 respondents, the total score value for each respondent was calculated. The calculated lowest and highest score values of the respondents' organizational citizenship behavior were 53 and 100, respectively. The score values 53-75 were classified as low-level for the organizational citizenship behavior. The score values 76-81 were classified as moderate for the organizational citizenship behavior. The score values 82-100 were classified as high for the organizational citizenship behavior. The table shows that more than one-third of the respondents (35%) have a moderate level organizational citizenship behavior, more than-one third of the respondents (35%) have a low level of organizational citizenship behavior, and 30% of the respondents have a high level of organizational citizenship behavior.

Recommendations and Conclusion

The psychological contract, one of the most important organizational variables, plays an inevitable role in the manufacturing sector for achieving targets. Based on the research findings, some recommendations were given to improve the psychological contract among employees. This study identified that there is a significant positive relationship between the psychological contract fulfillment and organizational citizenship behavior. It shows that when the psychological contract increases, organizational citizenship behavior also increases among employees, thereby contributing to the holistic development of the organization. So, all organizations, irrespective of sector, should ensure the fulfillment of the psychological contract to increase the organizational citizenship behavior of employees. Further, employers may provide long-term benefits, welfare measures for employees' families, opportunity to participate in decision making, secure and stable employment and training, recognition and promotions to the deserving employees, and so on. The results of this study show positive correlation among the various components of the psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior among employees engaged in the dairy industry of the Madurai District. This study concludes that the psychological contract is one of the organizational variables determining organizational citizenship behavior.

References

- Anggraeni, A. I., Dwiatmadja, C., & Yuniawan, A. (2017). The role of psychological contract on employee commitment and organizational citizenship behavior: A study of Indonesian young entrepreneurs in management action. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 43(0).
- Anderson, N., & Schalk, R. (1998). The psychological contract in retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(S1), 637–647.
- Bellou, V. (2006). Psychological contract assessment after a major organizational change. *Employee*

- Relations*, 29(1), 68–88.
- Blau, P.M. (1964), Justice in Social Exchange. *Sociological Inquiry*, 34, 193-206.
- Borman, Walter & Penner, Louise & Allen, Tammy & Motowidlo, Stephan. (2001). Personality Predictors of Citizenship Performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*. 9, 52 - 69.
- Cavanaugh, M.A., & Noe, R.A. (1999), Antecedents and consequences of relational components of the new psychological contract. *J. Organizational. Behavior*. 20, 323-340.
- Chahar, B. (2019). Psychological contract and organizational citizenship behavior: exploring the interrelatedness through cross validation, *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 18(1), 104-125
- Conway. N., & Briner., R. (2011). Understanding Psychological Contract at Work: A Critical Evaluation of Theory and Research. *Understanding Psychological Contracts at Work: A Critical Evaluation of Theory and Research*. 1-244.
- Coyle-Shapiro., Jacqueline, A.M. (2002). A psychological contract perspective on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(8), 927–946.
- Coyle-Shapiro., Jacqueline, A.M., & Kessler, I. (2002). Reciprocity through the lens of the psychological contract: Employee and employer perspectives. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*.
- Cullinane, N., & Dundon, T. (2006). The Psychological Contract: A Critical Review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*. 8, 113 - 129.
- Finkelstein, M. A. (2011). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and organizational citizenship behavior: A functional approach to organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture*, 2(1), 19–34.
- Francisco. (2015). Moderators of Psychological Contract Breach and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors in Private Educational Institutions, *Philippine Journal of Psychology*, 48(1), 87-114
- Guest, D.E. (2004). The Psychology of the Employment Relationship: An Analysis Based on the Psychological Contract. *Applied Psychology*, 53, 541-555.
- Jafri, M. H. (2011). Influence of Psychological Contract Breach on Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Trust. *Psychological Studies*, 57(1), 29–36.
- Kishokumar, R. (2018). The Impact of Psychological Contract on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Investigation on Banking Sector in Eastern Province, Sri Lanka. *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting*, 6(1), 1–13.
- Lepine, J., & Colquitt, J., & Erez, A. (2006). Adaptability to changing task contexts: Effects of general cognitive ability conscientiousness, and openness to experience. *Personnel Psychology*, 53, 563 - 593.
- Mohapatra, Satpathy, & Patnaik. (2019). Impact of dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Job Satisfaction in Information Technology sector. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, 25(5), 1-12.
- Millward, L. J., & Hopkins, L. J. (1998). Psychological contracts, organizational and job commitment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(16), 1530–1556.
- Morrison, E.W. (1994). Role Definitions and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Importance of the Employee's Perspective. *AMJ*, 37, 1543–1567.
- Organ, D.W. (1988) *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington Books, Lexington.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2), 262–270.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(5), 603–609.

- Robinson, S. L., Kraatz, M. S., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Changing Obligations and the Psychological Contract: A Longitudinal Study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(1), 137–152.
- Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E.W. (2000). The Development of Psychological Contract Breach and Violation: A Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 525-546.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1990). New hire perceptions of their own and their employers obligations: A study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(5), 389–400.
- Rousseau, D.M., & Parks, I.M. (1993). The Contracts of Individuals and Organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 15, 41-43.
- Rousseau, D.M., & Tijoriwala, S.A. (1998). Assessing Psychological Contracts: Issues, Alternatives and Measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 679-695.
- Redman, T., & Snape, E. (2005), Unpacking Commitment: Multiple Loyalties and Employee Behavior. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42, 301-328.
- Sandra, L. R., Matthew, S. K., & Denise, M. R. (1994). *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(1), 37-152
- Todd, J., & Vickers, K. (2003), Developing High-Tech Entrepreneurs: A Multidisciplinary Strategy. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 1, 317-320.
- Turnley, W., & Bolino, M., & Lester, S., & Bloodgood, J. (2003). The Impact of Psychological Contract Fulfillment on the Performance of In-Role and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 29, 187-206.
- Turnley, W.H., & Feldman, D.C. (2000). Re-Examining the effects of psychological contract violations: Unmet expectations and job dissatisfaction as mediators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 25-42.
- Williamson, Ó. (1979). Transaction-Cost economics: The governance of contractual relations. *Journal of Law and Economics*.
- Yen, H. R., & Niehoff, B. P. (2004). Organizational Citizenship behaviors and organizational effectiveness: Examining relationships in Taiwanese banks. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(8), 1617–1637.