

Psychological Contract Breach, Work-Family Conflict and Self-Efficacy as Predictors of Pro-Social Behaviour among a Sample of Nigerian Bank Employees

Leonard I. Ugwu

(Corresponding Author)

Department of Psychology
University of Nigeria, Nsukka
ZIP/Postal code: 410001, Nigeria
E-mail: leonard.ugwu@unn.edu.ng

Ijeoma Oji

Department of Psychology
University of Nigeria, Nsukka
ZIP/Postal code: 410001, Nigeria
E-mail: jayexciteus@yahoo.com

(Received: 1-6-13 / Accepted: 23-7-13)

Abstract

The study investigated the role of psychological contract breach, self-efficacy and work-family conflict on pro-social behaviour among commercial bank employees in Nigeria. Three hypotheses were formulated and tested. The descriptive survey research design was adopted for the study. Two hundred and seventy-one bank employees (males = 120 and females = 151) with mean age of 28.54 were selected through simple random sampling technique from the four sections of the banks, namely; internal control, marketing, info-tech and operation. Four instruments were used in gathering information in this study. They are: Psychology Contract Breach Scale, Work-Family Conflict Scale, Self-Efficacy Scale and Pro-Social Behaviour Scale. A multiple linear regression analysis was used to analyze the data. Results showed that individuals high in self-efficacy demonstrated high pro-social behaviour, while employees with high work-family conflict exhibited low level of pro-social behaviour. The results suggest that individuals who believe in their ability to accomplish tasks are more likely to embark on extra-role behaviour, while reverse was the case for employees with high work-family conflict.

Keywords: Psychological contract breach, Self-efficacy, Work-family conflict, Pro-social behaviour.

Introduction

Organizations come into existence for the attainment of specific goals; and it is the collective efforts of their employees that help organizations to achieve the desired goals. In this sense, organizations can be conceived of as “association of cooperative efforts” (Vivekanand &

Pevekar, 2009). However, from the onset, reciprocal obligations guiding the relationships between employers and employees exist. The psychological contract is distinct from formal employment contracts/agreements or even implied agreements between the parties, as it is based solely on the perceptions of one party (Roehling, 1997). It has been argued that the psychological contract framework enhances our understanding of public sector employees' attitudes and behaviour (Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2003). The researchers use the psychological contract as a framework to help identify employees' perceptions that the employer has breached the contract. Roehling (1997) defined psychological contract as a set of beliefs or perceptions of what one party (the employee or the employer) expects to receive from and is obliged to provide to the other party. It can also be seen as a mental schema or a model of the employment relationship (Rousseau & Tijoriwala, 1998). A breach or violation of the contract occurs when an employee perceives that the organisation does not deliver on its obligations (Marks, 2001). Morrison and Robinson (1997) define a breach as an affective and emotional experience of disappointment, frustration, anger and resentment that may emanate from an employee's interpretation of the circumstances surrounding a perceived contravention of the contract. It is a calculative assessment of the employment relationship, whereby employees conclude that the organisation did not meet their expectations (Hallier & James, 1997). The perception of noncompliance or non-reciprocation by the other party is of crucial importance as it may adversely affect employees' exhibition of pro-social behaviour to co-workers (Hallier & James, 1997). The principle of reciprocity states that fulfilment of employee obligations is conditional on the organisation fulfilling what employees perceive the organisation to owe them (Herriot, Manning, & Kidd, 1997). The employees' perception that the organization has failed to fulfil its obligation is thought to lead to feelings of anger, betrayal, and resentment, which in turn, lead to decreased employee motivation, dissatisfaction, loss of loyalty, and exit from the organization (Rousseau, 1989; Robinson & Morrison, 1997; Turnley & Feldman, 1999). The central question is: Does an employee who believes that his or her organization has breached the contract exhibit altruistic behaviours at work?

The helping behaviour (pro-social behaviour), according to Wright and Sablinski (2008), is defined as employee's willingness to help co-workers, supervisors, and other significant power holders within the organization realise organizational goals and consequently maintain the cooperative existence of the whole system. Management practitioners have come to realize that for organizations to compete effectively in the hyper-competitive business environment of today, employees must not only carry out their prescribed roles, but must also be willing to engage themselves in pro-social behaviours that are nevertheless essential for the survival of the organization (Vivekanand & Pevekar, 2009; Dyne, Graham & Dienesch, 1994)). When employees perform extra-role tasks that help co-workers, supervisors, and managers to achieve positive results, organizations benefit in the form of increased level of productivity and high quality delivery.

Increased level of productivity is better achieved when employees are able to work in organizational climate devoid of distractions and interferences. However, this is not to be because most workers today, regardless of gender, have family responsibilities, and most married workers regardless of gender, have an employed spouse; and even at that, jobs are still designed as if workers have no family responsibilities. Today's workers are faced with conflicts emanating from work and family domains. The interface of the two domains has been the subject of study for researchers world-wide (Valk&Srnivasan, 2011). Work-family conflict is a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). A researcher (e.g., Ahmad, 2008) suggests that work-family conflict could predict job type, work time commitment, job involvement, role overload, and job flexibility, and helping behaviour.

Although division of labour prevails in all large scale organizations with employees assigned some prescribed roles, they still extend helping hands to their co-workers in order to get the work done. Helping other employees accomplish prescribed roles assigned to them is a function of the individual's capabilities as well as the individual's belief that he/she could perform the other person's job well. The individual's belief on his capabilities is what is referred to as self-efficacy. Self-efficacy refers to one's self judgments of personal capabilities to initiate and successfully perform specified tasks at designated levels (Bandura, 1986.). This perceptiveness enables one to gain a deeper understanding of the interactive relationship between self-efficacy and performance. Bandura (1977) defines the performance component of self-efficacy as "people's judgement of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required for attaining designated types of performance.

In separate studies conducted by Cantisano, Dominguez and Depolo (2008), and Cassar (2001), on the role of psychological contract breach and pro-social behaviour, their findings showed that psychological contract breach and pro-social behaviour are negatively related. Turnley, Bolino, Lester and Bloodgood (2009), Gacovic and Tetrick (2003) researched on the relationship between psychological contract fulfilment and three types of employee behaviour, namely; in-role performance, pro-social behaviour directed at the organization and pro-social behaviour directed at individuals within the organization. Result indicates that psychological contract fulfilment is more strongly related to pro-social behaviour directed at the organisation than to pro-social behaviour directed at one's colleagues. Psychological contract breach is also found to be negatively related to other related variables such as organizational citizenship behaviour (Mark & Anderson, 2008), performance (Robinson, 1996), supervisor rated in-role behaviour, and pro-social behaviour (Suazo, 2011).

Marks and Scholarios (2001) posit that the perception of good benefits such as balance between work and family was related to increased participation at work and pro-social behaviours, such as interpersonal helping. A strategy of mutuality with respect to the employer-employee relationship and flexibility with respect to work-family issues directly impacts employee attitudes positively, and if otherwise, can affect the employee attitudes and behaviours negatively (Marks & Scholarios, 2001). The result of a study conducted by Beham (2011) on the influence of work-to-family conflict (WFC) and family-to-work conflict (FWC) on pro-social behaviour among Spanish employees showed significant negative relationships between FWC and pro-social behaviour directed towards the individual and task citizenship behaviour. However, no significant relationship was found between WFC and pro-social behaviour. Research by Flap and Volker (2001) found that employees with a partner and children were less involved in social activities at work, altruistic relation at work and extra-role behaviour. Other researchers (e.g., Ilies, Schwind, Wagner, Johnson, De Rue & Ilgen, 2007; Higgins & Duxbury, 2005) reported that work-family conflict yielded inconsistent results in predicting pro-social behaviour.

Regarding the relationship between self-efficacy and pro-social behaviour, Grant and Sonnentag (2010) reported that self-efficacy is a strong predictor of pro-social behaviour. In separate studies conducted by Grant and Gino (2010), De Gail's (2003), Lee (2001), Suazo (2005), which investigated the role of self-efficacy in predicting pro-social behaviour; their individual results showed that self-efficacy significantly predicted pro-social behaviour. The results also revealed that high self-efficacy was positively related to pro-social behaviour. Einolf (2008) carried a study to test the correlation between empathic concern and 14 different pro-social behaviours, including informal help to individuals and formal helping through institutions. Statistically significant correlations were found for 10 behaviours, but substantively meaningful correlations were only found for three, all of which were spontaneous, informal helping behaviours, where the individual needing help was directly present. The findings indicate that self-efficacy is not an important motivator for planned helping decisions and decisions to help others who are not immediately present, such as volunteering, charitable giving, and blood donation. The weak correlation between self-

efficacy and most helping behaviours indicates that individual differences in self-efficacy may not play much role in helping decisions. Vittorio, and Steca (2007), Ali (2007) and Roy, Mascmpo and Dewall (2009), in their separate studies, found that self-efficacy is negatively related to pro-social behaviour.

Literature reviewed showed that there are inconsistent results regarding the role of psychological contract breach, self-efficacy and work-family conflict in predicting pro-social behaviors. The present study, therefore, seeks to investigate their role in predicting pro-social behaviour of bankers in a Nigerian sample. Specifically, the study will provide answers to the following questions: Will psychological contract breach predict employees' pro-social behaviour? Will work-family conflict predict employees' pro-social behaviour? Will self-efficacy predict employees' pro-social behaviour? In the light of the following questions, it was hypothesised that:

Psychological contract breach will not predict pro-social behaviour of employees; Work-family conflict will not predict pro-social behaviour of employees; and that Self-efficacy will not predict pro-social behaviour of bank employees.

Methods

Participants

A total of 271 bank employees participated in the study. The respondents were drawn from six (6) Nigerian banks located in Port-Harcourt, Rivers State, namely; 34 from Zenith Bank, Ecobank (40), Access Bank (60), Fidelity Bank (36), UBA (52) and Diamond Bank Plc (48). Among these participants (bankers) 205 of them were married while 66 were unmarried; 157 of them are junior staff, while 114 are senior staff; 120 of them are males while 151 are females. Their ages ranged from 25-52 years with mean age of ($M = 28.54$).

Instruments

Four instruments were used in gathering information in this study. They are: Psychology Contract Breach Scale, Work-Family Conflict Scale, Self-Efficacy Scale and Pro-Social Behaviour Scale. Psychological contract breach instrument, which was developed by Robinson and Morrison (2000) is a 5-item instrument designed to measure employees' global perception of psychological contract breach. A Likert-type scale anchored by (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) undecided, (4) agree and (5) strongly agree, was used to indicate the extent of agreement/disagreement with each item. A sample item is "I feel that my employer has come through in fulfilling the promises made to me when I was hired". A Cronbach's alpha of .89 was obtained for this measure by Robinson and Morrison (2000). The scale provides an overall measurement of the extent to which the employee's psychological contract has been fulfilled. Items, 1, 2, 3 were positively worded while items 4 and 5 were negatively worded. In order to revalidate the instrument, the researcher carried out a pilot study using 73 employees from four (4) banks in Enugu, Enugu State. Results obtained in item- total correlation of the 5-items ranged from .29 to .64, with internal consistency reliability estimate of Cronbach alpha = .82.

The second instrument used in the study was the adapted work-family conflict scale. The work-family conflict measures the work-family interference of employees. The scale is an 18-item scale developed by Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000) and is made up of six facets measuring the six dimensional perspectives of work-family conflicts. The six dimensions are: (1) time-based work interference with family, (2) time-based family interference with work; (3) strain-based work interference with family, (4) strain-based family interference with work, (5) behaviour-based work interference with family and (6) behaviour-based family

interference with work. Each dimension of work-family conflict was measured with three items ranging from items 1-3 (time-based work interference with family, to items 16-18 (behaviour-based family interference with work), respectively. The scale is designed in a 5-point Likert-type format, ranging from (1) Never, (2) Seldom, (3) Sometimes, (4) Often and (5) Very often. The internal consistency of each of the dimensions was estimated with coefficient alpha of .86, .89, and .76 for time-based, strain-based and behaviour-based WFC, respectively. Sample items are “My work keeps me from my family activities more than I would like” for time-based WFC, “When I get home from work I am often extremely tired to participate in family activities” for strain-based WFC and “The problem solving behaviours used in my job are not effective in resolving problem at home” for behaviour-based WFC. The scale was revalidated by Amazue (2010). The result of the item analysis revealed that the items have an internal consistency of alpha .87 and a Spearman correlated split-half reliability index of .56. The result of the item analysis further showed coefficient alpha of .82, .77, and .83 for time-based, strain-based and behaviour-based WFC, respectively. The factor analysis of the items confirmed the three factor structure of time-based, strain-based and behaviour-based work-family conflict (Amazue, 2010).

The third instrument used in the study was the New General Self-efficacy (NGSE) scale developed by Chen, Gully and Eden (2001). The scale contains 8-items measuring the participants' perceived level of self-efficacy. The response categories on each self-efficacy item ranged from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”, with numerical values of 1 through 5 assigned to each response. The items were reverse scored so that item numbers shaded 5,4,3,2,1 respectively are scored 1,2,3,4,5. Inter-item correlations ranged from .32 to .86 with internal consistency reliability estimate of Cronbach alpha =.91 (Chen, Gully & Eden, 2001). A pilot study was also conducted by the researcher, using the same 73 employees from Enugu, and the result obtained from item analysis showed no duplication. Item-total correlation of the 8-items ranged from .29 to .79 with reliability estimate of Cronbach alpha =.78.

The fourth instrument used in the study was the Pro-social behaviour scale developed by McNeely and Meglino (1994). The scale is a 15-item questionnaire measuring employee's pro-social behaviour in work setting. The three factors measure pro-social organizational behaviour, role prescribed behaviour and pro-social individual behaviour with 7-items, 3-items and 5-items respectively. An example of the item is “I speak favourably about the organization to outsiders”. The options ranged from (1) never to (5) always on a five point scale. The researcher obtained item-total correlations that ranged from 0.23 to 0.55 with internal consistency estimate reliability coefficient of alpha =0.78. No item was dropped.

Procedure

Three hundred (300) copies of the questionnaire containing the four instruments namely; Psychology Contract Breach Scale, Work-Family Conflict Scale, Self-Efficacy Scale and Pro-Social Behaviour Scale, were distributed to bank employees, with the help of research assistants, during their rest period that lasted for 45 minutes. The exercise took place on two working days within the week. Every available employee on rest was given a copy of the questionnaires. Two hundred and eighty (280) copies representing 93.33% were returned. Of this number, 9 copies, representing 3.21%, were discarded due to improper filling. Two hundred and seventy-one (96.79%) valid copies of the questionnaires were used for data analysis.

Design/Statistics

The researchers employed a cross-sectional survey design because more than one samples were drawn from the population at one time. A multiple linear regression analysis was used to

analyze the data since multiple regressions can accurately estimate the relationship between independent and dependent variables, especially if the relationships are linear in nature.

Results

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Inter-correlations of Psychological contract breach, Work-family conflict, self-efficacy and Pro-social behaviour

	Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4
1	Pro-social behaviour	58.77	7.21	1			
2	PCB	15.24	3.57	-.04	1		
3	WFC	42.16	9.33	-.10*	-.10	1	
4	Self-efficacy	34.57	3.57	.52**	-.10	.06	1

* $P < .05$ ** $P < .01$

The result of the study revealed that self-efficacy correlated significantly with pro-social behaviour ($r = .52$, $p < .01$), work-family conflict shows a weak negative correlation with pro-social behaviour ($r = -.10$, $p < .05$). The table also indicates that psychological contract breach did not significantly correlate with pro-social behaviour, but showed a negative relationship. This implies that employees with high self-efficacy exhibit high pro-social behaviour in their workplace. However, the result showed that work-family conflict is negatively related to pro-social behaviour. This also indicates that employees who experience work-family conflict perform less extra-role behaviour. Similarly, result showed that employees who believe that management does not meet its own-side of the contract or obligation may not indulge in work activities beyond the call of duty.

Table 2: Model summary table of Psychological Contact Breach, Work-Family Conflict and Self-Efficacy in Pro-Social Behaviour

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std error
1	.53	.28	.28	6.14

Model	R square change	F change	df1	df2	sig.
1	.28	35.10	3	267	.001

Table 2 revealed that psychological contract breach, work-family conflict and self-efficacy accounted for 28% variance in pro-social behaviour and significantly predicted pro-social behaviour (F change = 35.10, $F(3,267)$, $P < .001$). This result showed that three independent variables are jointly predictive of pro-social behaviour.

Table 3: Regression co-efficient of Psychological contract breach, Work-family conflict and Self-efficacy on Pro-social behaviour

Model	Unstandardized Co-efficient		Standardized Co-efficient		t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
Constant	26.484	4.452			5.949	.000

PCB	-.002	.106	.000	-.017	.986
WFC	-.100	.040	-.130	-2.487	.013
EFFICACY	1.057	.105	.524	10.044	.000

Dependent Variable: Pro-Social Behaviour

The regression table reveals that self-efficacy is a significant predictor of pro-social behaviour ($\beta = .52, p < .001$). This implies that self-efficacy is positively related to pro-social behaviour. Employees that manifest high self-efficacy exhibit greater pro-social behaviour at work. Similarly, the regression analysis showed that work-family conflict predicted pro-social behaviour negatively ($\beta = -.13, P < .01$). This indicates that when employees experience imbalance between their work and family duties, the tendency to engage in extra-role behaviour declines. However, Psychological contract breach was not a significant predictor of pro-social behaviour ($\beta = .001, ns$). This result showed that psychological contract breach is not a factor that influences whether employee will embark on helping behaviour in the world of work or not.

Discussion

The result of this study supports the hypothesis which states that psychological contract breach will not predict employees' helping behaviour. The result of this study is at variance with the earlier findings by Cassar (2001), Turnley et al., (2009), Mark and Anderson (2008), Robinson and Rousseau (1994), Suazo et al., (2005), Suazo (2011) and Gacovic and Tetrick (2003). The results obtained from those studies showed that employees reduce work effort and pro-social behaviour when they perceive that the organization has breached its commitment. The result of the present study counters the age-long belief among researchers and management practitioners that psychological contract breach reduces employees' helping behaviour. The present result could be explained on the premise that most African people are collective-oriented and were socialized to exhibit altruistic behaviour, especially when their colleagues are in difficulty. The helping behaviour, which has been internalized into the cognitive set of people during socialization process, continues to guide employees' behaviour, workplace inclusive. In the traditional African settings, people provide social support in the time of difficulty and/or joy. Such behaviours are carried to the workplace and could be regarded as part of social expectancies. Helping behaviour in African context may be classified as "intrinsic-reward associated behaviour," and consequently may not be motivated by organizational practices alone. This perhaps may explain the employees' exhibition of extra-role behaviours in spite of their perceived psychological contract breach. Furthermore, Nigerian workers lend helping behaviours to other colleagues even to the extent of lending money to their insolvent colleagues. For instance, rotating savings, credit associations, and mutual aid societies are under the platform, which Nigerian employees use to help their colleagues in financial distress and as well compensate for failures experienced by employees from the existing formal financial obligations of their organizations. In rotating credit and savings associations, participants periodically contribute fixed amount of money and allocate the fund on a lottery (draw) or rotational basis to its members. Therefore, pro-social behaviour could be regarded as a self-orientation behaviour that can be exhibited by employees in any circumstance, irrespective of whether employers are keeping to their own terms of the contract agreement or not. Whether the employer decides to fulfil, breach or violate the contract agreement, the employee(s) could still exhibit some helping behaviour among each other in the work setting because helping behaviour could be regarded as one of the personality dispositional characteristics that are subjective, and emanating from a sense-making process.

Another plausible reason could be anchored on the uncertainties surrounding employees in the banking industry. Job insecurity, absence of job alternatives, and unrealistic targets set by the management may predispose employees to high level of stress. As a result, employees may see themselves as “partners under threat” and could exhibit pro-social behaviour as a means of saving their colleagues from the threat and ever-impending retrenchment. This development could counter the adverse effect psychological contract breach could have on employees’ pro-social behaviour. Secondly, when employees are under constant threat, they are likely to develop stress buffer by building resilience. Their positive capacity to cope with breach may result in the individual bouncing back to a previous state of normal functioning, or using the experience of exposure to adversity to produce a “steeling effect” and functioning better than expected.

The second null hypothesis which states that work-family conflict will not predict pro-social behaviour among bank employees was rejected ($\beta = -.13, p < .01$). The findings showed that employees that experience work-family conflict exhibit less pro-social behaviour. The result corroborates with earlier findings by Mark and Scholarios (2001), Flap and Volker (2001), Ilies *et al.*, (2007), Rothbard (2001), Byrne (2000), which reported a significant negative relationship between work-family conflict and pro-social behaviour. However the result of the present study contradicts the research findings by Beham (2011), and Higgins and Duxbury (2005), which showed no significant relationship between work-family conflict and pro-social behaviour. Employees whose work intrude into family roles or otherwise will definitely experience some level of conflicts, and this will affect their willingness to extend helping behaviours to other colleagues. Therefore, an increase in work - family pressures will cause a decline in lending pro-social behaviour to others. Besides, any employee that experiences conflict between his/her work and family responsibilities is likely to be under stress, and may lack the energy and concentration to perform extra-role activities in the workplace. This explanation could be anchored on the premise that stress has been generally accepted as an agent that destabilizes the entire constellation of body functioning with the potency of beclouding intellectual reasoning. If an employee fails to balance his/her work family demands, he/she is likely to decline in pro-social behaviour. It seems that work-family conflict and pro-social behaviour are two constructs that occupy two extremes of the same continuum.

The third hypothesis which states that self-efficacy will not predict pro-social behaviour among bank employees was rejected ($\beta = .52, p < .001$). The result indicates that self-efficacy has a significant positive relationship with pro-social behaviour. The study is consistent with findings of Sonnentag and Grant (2010), Lee (2001), and Suazo (2005), which found that self-efficacy, is a significant predictor of pro-social behaviour. One could adduce from the findings of this study that belief on one’s ability is an impetus to helping behaviour. When employees believe that they have the potential ability to perform certain activities, they are more amenable to helping others. Self-efficacy has the potency of providing workers with self-confidence and the desire to achieve more so that they can prove their self-worth. Since efficacy is about ability and belief to perform a particular task, an employee’s desire to prove one’s self-worth can be evaluated in the workplace as the employee extends helping behaviour to his/her co-workers, and by so doing, demonstrate his/her expertise to people that will appreciate his/her skills. Self-evaluation promotes a positive attitude towards life in general and spurs one into performing some action, while a negative assessment of oneself deters an individual from carrying-out extra-role activities. Employees with high efficacy tend to anticipate a higher likelihood of success in life and are more likely to help others in difficulty. The present finding supports Bandura’s social exchange theory.

In conclusion, several limitations of this study must be noted. The cross sectional data presented in this study are based on subjective self-reports from the perspective of individual bank employees. Such data are susceptible to distortions from respondents so as to maintain a consistent series of answers or to present themselves in a favourable light or from other

effects of common method variance (Podaskoff & Organ, 1986). In addition, future research should involve longitudinal analyses that can more clearly establish the causal ordering among psychological contract breach, self-efficacy and work-family conflict and pro-social behaviour. It is also important to note that the analysis was limited to a single high status, professional occupation, namely bankers. Some of the findings here may be limited to this particular occupation under study. It is important to determine whether the results are generalizable to more occupationally diverse groups of workers.

References

- [1] A. Ahmad, Job, family and individual factors as predictors of work-family conflict, *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 4(2008), 57-66.
- [2] E.A. Ali, The relationship between work-family conflict and family-work conflict towards job burnout: A case at Sarawak, Economic Development Corporation, *Unpublished Master's Thesis*, (2007), University Utara, Malaysia.
- [3] L.O. Amazue, Roles of cultural variations, self-esteem and gender in work-family conflict, *An Unpublished Thesis*, (2011), Department of Psychology University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- [4] A. Bandura, *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*, (1977), New York: Freeman.
- [5] A. Bandura, *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*, (1986), Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [6] B. Beham, Work-family conflict and organizational citizenship behaviour: Empirical evidence from Spanish employees community, *Work and Family*, 14(1) (2011), 63-80.
- [7] G.T. Cantisano, F.M.J. Dominguez and M. Depolo, Psychological contract breach and outcomes: Combining meta-analysis and structural equation models, *Psicothema*, 20(3) (2008), 487-496.
- [8] D.S. Carlson, M.K. Kacmar and L.J. Williams, Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 56(2000), 249-276.
- [9] V. Cassar, Violating psychological contract terms among Maltese public service employees: Occurrence and relationships, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 16(3) (2001), 194-208.
- [10] G. Chen, S. Gully and D. Eden, Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale, *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(2001), 62-83.
- [11] J.A.M. Coyle-Shapiro and I. Kessler, Consequences of the psychological contract for the employment relationship: A large scale survey, *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(2003), 903-930.
- [12] H.D. Flap and B. Volker, Informele relaties ophet work, *Social Wetenschappann*, 44(2001), 30-47.
- [13] A. Gakovic and L.E. Tetrick, Psychological contract breach as a source of strain for employees, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(2003), 235-246.
- [14] A.M. Grant and F. Gino, A little thanks goes a long way: Explaining why gratitude expressions motivate pro-social behaviour, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(6) (2010), 946-955.
- [15] J.H. Greenhaus and N.J. Beutell, Sources of conflict between work and family roles, *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1) (1985), 76-88.
- [16] J.E. Grusec, J.J. Goodnow and L. Cohen, Household work and the development of concern for others, *Development Psychology*, 32(6) (1996), 999-1007.
- [17] P. Herriot, W.E. Manning and J.M. Kidd, The content of the psychological contract, *British Journal of Management*, 8(1997), 151-162.
- [18] C. Higgins and L. Duxbury, Report four: Who is at risk? Predictors of caregiver strain, work-life conflict and pro-social behaviour, <http://www.origin.phac-aspc.gc.ca/publicat/work-report/.php>, (2005).

- [19] R. Ilies, K.M. Schwind, D.T. Wagner, M.D. Johnson, D.S. DeRue and D.R. Ilgen, When can employees have a family life? The effects of daily work load and affect on work-family conflict and social behaviour at home, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(5) (2007), 1368-1379.
- [20] H. Lee, Willingness and capacity: The determinants of pro-social organizational behaviour among nurses in the UK, *The International Journal of Human Resources Management*, 12(6) (2001), 1029-1048.
- [21] B.L. McNeely and B.M. Meglino, Good soldiers or good duty? The role of work values and contextual antecedents in prosocial organisational behaviour, *Paper Presented at the Academy of Management*, Las Vegas, August (1994).
- [22] A. Marks, Developing multiple foci conceptualisation of the psychological contract, *Employee Relations*, 23(5) (2001), 454-469.
- [23] H. Mark and S. Anderson, A conceptual model of the effect of psychological contracts and associated fairness perceptions on customer service organizational citizenship behaviour, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 102(2008), 1511-1562.
- [24] A. Marks and D. Scholarios, Work-life integration and the psychological contract: An examination of work outcomes for software professionals, *Paper Presented at the 10th European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology Conference*, Prague, (2001).
- [25] E.W. Morrison and S.L. Robinson, When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops, *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1997), 226-256.
- [26] P.M. Podaskoff and D.W. Organ, Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects, *Journal of Management*, 12(1986), 531-544.
- [27] S.L. Robinson, Trust and breach of the psychological contract, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(1997), 574-599.
- [28] S.L. Robinson and E.W. Morrison, The development of psychological contract breach and violation: A longitudinal study, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 21(2000), 525-546.
- [29] S.L. Robinson and D.M. Rousseau, Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception, but the norm, *Journal of Organizational Behaviours*, 15(1994), 245-259.
- [30] M.V. Roehling, The origins and early development of the psychological contract construct, *Journal of Management History*, 3(2) (1997), 204-207.
- [31] N.P. Rothbard, Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(2001), 655-684.
- [32] D.M. Rousseau, Psychological and implied contracts in organization, *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journals*, 2(1989), 121-139.
- [33] D.M. Rousseau and S.A. Tijoriwala, Assessing psychological contracts: Issues, alternatives and measures, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(1998), 679-695.
- [34] S. Sonnentag and A.M. Grant, Doing good buffers against feeling bad: Pro-social impact compensates for negative task and self-evaluations, *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Process*, 111(2010), 13-22.
- [35] M.M. Suazo, Implications of the affective response to psychological contract breach, *Working Paper*, The University of Texas at San Antonio, College of Business UTSA, EDU, (2005).
- [36] M.M. Suazo, Implications of psychological contract breach: A perceived organizational support perspective, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26(5) (2011), 366-382.
- [37] W.H. Turnley, M.C. Bolino, S.W. Lester and J.M. Bloodgood, The impact of psychological contract fulfillment on the performance of in-role and organizational citizenship behaviour, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 45(2009), 78-99.
- [38] W.H. Turnley and D.C. Feldman, The impact of psychological contract violations on exit, voice, loyalty and neglect, *Human Relations*, 52(1999), 895-922.

- [39] C.W. Wright and C.J. Sablinski, Procedural justice, mood and pro-social personality influence on organizational citizenship behaviour, *American Journal of Psychology*, 10(2) (2008), 397-412.
- [40] R. Valk and V. Srinivasan, Work-family balance of Indian women software professionals: A qualitative study, *Indian Institute of Management Review*, 23(2011), 39-50.
- [41] R.J. Vallerand, Towards a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 29(1997), 271-360.
- [42] R.J. Vallerand and G. Reid, On the casual effects of perceived competence on intrinsic motivation: A test of cognitive evaluation theory, *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 6(1984), 94-102.
- [43] L. Van Dyne, J.G. Graham and R.M. Dienesch, Organizational citizenship behaviour: Construct redefinition, operationalization and validation, *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(1994), 765-802.
- [44] C. Vivekanand and S. Pevekar, *Relationship between Aspirations and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour*, (2009), The Icfai University Press.