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This study investigated how psychological contract violation and motivational strategies predict job performance of employees. Two hundred and thirty-two non-teaching staff (118 males and 114 females) of the University of Ibadan participated in the study. Seventy seven (33.2%) of the participants were aged between 31 and 40, 99 (42.7%) had worked for less than 5 years in the university while 83 (35.8%) of the respondents had spent 10 years or more working in the same institution. Three standardized instruments were used for data collection. Robinson & Rousseau’s (1994) psychological contract violation scale measured psychological contract violation. The scale has 12-items and an alpha reliability of 0.92. Motivational factor scale (Kovach, 1995; Wong, Siu & Tsang, 1999) measured motivational strategies. It is also 12-items. A revalidation of this scale produced an alpha reliability of 0.80. Job performance was measured using health and work performance scale developed by Attridge (2003). It is a 7-item scale with a Cronbach alpha of 0.89. Three hypotheses were tested for this research. The inter-correlations of the demographic variables showed that gender and age of the respondents were not significantly related to job performance. There was also no significant relationship between marital status and job performance. The inter-correlations of the main variables of the research showed that there was significant positive relationship between psychological contract violation and job performance ($r = 0.157; P < .05$); motivational strategies did not significantly correlate with job performance. A $2 \times 2$ ANOVA (used to test hypothesis one) revealed that psychological contract violation had significant main effect on the respondents’ job performance ($F (1,231) = 5.34; P < .05$). Findings further revealed that respondents who scored high ($X = 13.81$) on psychological contract violation put up better job performance than their counterparts that scored low ($X = 12.47$) on psychological contract violation. Results of independent t-test revealed that motivational strategies did not have significant influence on the participants’ job performance. However, independent t-test results revealed that psychological contract violation had a significant influence on the respondents’ job performance ($t (230) = 2.44; P < .05$). Furthermore, mean scores revealed that participants who scored high ($X = 14.56$) on psychological contract violation recorded better job performance than their counterparts that scored low ($X = 13.06$) on psychological contract violation. Results provided insight into the way, manner, and times that psychological contract violation and lack of motivational strategies are most experienced. Suggestions were made in line with the findings of the study while implications for future research for organisational practice were highlighted.
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Introduction

A psychological contract is defined as “an employee’s beliefs regarding mutual expectations and obligations, in the context of his relationship with the organization, which shape this relationship and govern the employee’s behaviour” (Freese, 2007: 24). This definition of psychological contract
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encompasses the expectations and obligations of the employee and the organisation from the employee’s perspective, restricting the psychological contract to an intra-individual level (Rousseau, 1990). Thus psychological contract is a subjective, individual perception of obligations of the employer towards the employee and the employee towards the organisation (Freese & Schalk, 1993). Therefore, psychological contract is analysed based on a unilateral, singular level of the individual and not from a bilateral relationship between two parties at different levels - individual and organisation (Freese, 2007).

Psychological contract is a term that is subject to a wide range of interpretations and theoretical analyses. While connoting a relationship between an employer and its employees, psychological contract borders specifically on issues of mutual expectations of inputs and outcomes. There are many ways to measure psychological contract. Rousseau and Tijoriwala (1998) reviewed the assessments used to measure psychological contract and distinguished three forms of measurement, namely, content-oriented, feature-oriented, and evaluation-oriented. Content-oriented involves analysing the content of the contract, including its terms and the connections among terms. Feature-oriented involves comparing the contract to some feature or aspect such as the degree to which the contract is implicit/explicit or stable/unstable over time. Evaluation-oriented has to do with appraising the extent of fulfillment, change or contravention experienced within the context of the contract.

Psychological contract violation is defined as a failure to honor or respect the terms of a contract (Osland, Turner, Colb & Rubin, 2007). It encompasses the emotional and affective state that may, under particular conditions, stem from the conviction that one’s organisation has failed to adequately maintain the psychological contract (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). Violation is a combination of disappointment emotions and anger emotions (Ortony, Clore & Collins, 1988). Psychological contract violations are perceived by the employee based on the expectations that they had in line with the promises that were made by the employer (Osland, Turner, Colb & Rubin, 2007).

According to Robinson, Kraatz & Rousseau (1994) and Kickul (2001), psychological contract violation can result in change in behaviour and commitment on the part of the employee. This affects the employee’s obligation toward the organisation.

Motivation refers to the inner drive that propels individuals to act or perform. It is the psychological process that brings about the arousal, direction, intensity and sustenance of behaviour (Locke & Latham, 2004; Pinder, 1998). Typically, motivation leads to behaviour. However, this process cannot be directly measured or observed. Therefore, earlier researchers on motivation identified different factors that could be helpful in measuring motivation. Notably, Herzberg (1966) empirically identified satisfaction/no-satisfaction and dissatisfaction/no-dissatisfaction (hygiene) factors as bases for staff motivation and contentment at work. Whereas satisfaction/no-satisfaction-related factors motivate and/or de-motivate workers, dissatisfaction/no-dissatisfaction (hygiene) maintenance elements could either eliminate or encourage workers’ complaints about working conditions.

Jaafar, Ramayah & Zainal (2006) maintain that hygiene factors (or issues) can minimise dissatisfaction if handled carefully and can result in dissatisfaction if they are absent. Nelson and Quick (2003) opine that motivation factors are more important than hygiene factors because they directly affect a person’s motivational drive to do a good job. However, they noted that hygienic factors only support the motivators and they (the hygienic factors) do not directly affect a person’s motivation to work; they only influence the extent of the person’s discontent.

Employees are valuable resources of an organisation. Therefore, understanding and catering for the needs of employees is as important as keeping track of and boosting the employees’ productivity. Although it appears somewhat hidden to both employees and employers, psychological contract is useful for the understanding of workers’ needs, motivations and productivity. Despite their relevance and centrality to organizations, the aforementioned issues and their relationships have not been sufficiently discussed in management and organisational literature. This
study aimed at filling this research gap. It examined psychological contract violation and motivational strategies as predictors of employees' job performance.

Motivational concept has, in recent times, been providing the necessary tools in the workplace. For instance, it helps organisations to understand human behaviour which makes performance of management tasks more effective and dependable. Most times, management is faced with the challenge of getting to cope with enormous task of coming to terms with the fulfillment and the demands of employees' needs and wants. Many organisations today are not tapping beneficially into the knowledge of motivation, due partly to lack of direction and also ignorance of how motivational knowledge would be applied. Nevertheless, an understanding and appreciation of motivational and psychological contract knowledge is a prerequisite for effective motivation. It is also a veritable instrument for effective management and leadership. This study is about psychological contract violation and motivational strategies as predictors of employees' job performance. It generated three questions for which answers were provided. These questions are:

1. Will motivational strategies improve employees' performance in the workplace?
2. Will fulfillment of psychological contract enhance the performance of the employees?
3. Will participants who score low on psychological contract violation have better job performance than their counterparts who score on psychological contract violation?

**Literature and Empirical Reviews**

A number of theories provided theoretical framework for this present study. These include social exchange theory, attachment theory, equity theory, expectancy theory, and goal setting theory. Social exchange theory is centered on the "norm of reciprocity". This means that when an organisation treats employees well, the employees will reciprocate in some way such as increase in productivity, commitment to their job, and job satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Schnake, 1991). This notion of exchange is closely linked to psychological contract theory. The latter (psychological contract theory) is also reciprocal in outlook and suggests that employees are bound by an unspoken contract to return in kind the benefits bestowed upon them by the organisation for which they work (Schein, 1965).

Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch and Rhoades (2001) found evidence in support of reciprocal exchange in employee-organisation relationships. Whether or not employer fulfills his/her promises to the employee is a matter of perception on the part of the concerned employee. Thus employees whose psychological contracts are fulfilled are more likely to believe that the organisation can be trusted - something that is central to the way an employee evaluates his employment experience (Robinson, 1996). On the other hand, violation has been found to have a negative impact on employee's attitude and behaviour (Robinson, Kraatz, Rousseau, 1994). Social exchange theory has demonstrated that employer-employee relationships may either enhance or diminish the performance of employees in the relationship.

Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980) developed and used attachment theory to explain the link between the perceptions that employees have of the fulfillment of the psychological contract and their attachment to their supervisor. Attachment suggests that social development entails the sustained construction, review, assimilation, and abstraction of mental models (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). This is akin to the notion of schema in social psychology (Fiske & Taylor, 1984) in which the relationship between an employee and an employer depends on the receipt of new information and on the interpretation of experiences.

Employees expect supervisors to be not only supportive but also sensitive, trustworthy, and responsive (Shaver & Hazan, 1994). Therefore, if employees believe that their expectations of their leaders have been met, they may feel more protected and confident in their current and future interactions with their employers. In this regard, employees that have excellent relationship with their employer will most likely be more committed to stay with the organisation. Such employees are also more motivated to
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advance the organisation. Critics of attachment theory have noted that the theory has not been able to show why some employees still leave their organisations even when such organisations were taking good care of them (employees).

The equity theory developed by Adams (Adams, 1963) proposes that people will evaluate the fairness of their situation in an organisation by comparing the ratio of their own inputs and outcomes with some referent’s ratio of inputs and outcomes. When these ratio comparisons are not equal, people are inclined to change the situation by either modifying their inputs and outcomes, changing their referent other, distorting their perceptions, or quitting.

To understand Adams’ equity theory of motivation, one needs to know the nature of individual-organisation exchange relationship. According to Carrell and Dittrich (1978), equity theory stresses three primary points. Firstly, employees perceive a fair return for the tasks they perform with respect to their job. Secondly, employees make some kind of social comparison with their colleagues regarding compensation. Thirdly, each employee that perceives him/herself to be in an inequitable situation will try to decrease this inequity.

Equity theory is based on perceived fairness of an individual. In other words, an employee reflects on how much effort he has expended and compares this to what he has got from it. This employee’s self evaluation of input-output ratio is followed by comparison of his ratio to the input-output ratios of others, especially the direct peers. If the employee views his input-output ratio to be equal to ratios of other relevant employees, a state of equity exists. The employee will have a feeling that he is treated fairly.

Equity theory has been able to show that employees are rational beings that compare their input into a job and what they get in return for their input. Nevertheless, the theory has been criticised for not addressing the individual differences in the input-output ratio, i.e. the reason why some employees will still remain on their job despite the fact that there are imbalances in their input-output ratio.

Expectancy theory is another proposition in which perception plays a key role. Developed by Vroom (1964), the theory emphasizes cognitive ability to anticipate likely consequences of behaviour (Kinicki and Kreitner, 2003). The theory has been able to show that employees can be motivated to perform optimally only to the extent that they perceive chances of getting certain outcomes which will lead to accomplishing organisational goals. Also, it can be noted that employees are only motivated to the extent that they value the outcomes received.

However, expectancy theory has been criticised for not being able to fully explain and measure perceptions about effort, performance and the value of rewards. Again, critics note that comparisons between different choices of people using the expectancy theory framework may not be accurate. Furthermore, critics argue that rewards may not necessarily be directly connected to effort and job performance as expectancy theorists suggest.

Performance is behaviour exhibited or something done by the employee (Campbell, 1990). Job performance is the behaviour that can be assessed in terms of the extent to which it contributes to organisational effectiveness (Onukwube, Iyabga and Fajana, 2010). Hillriegel, Jackson and Slocum (1999) view job performance as individual’s work achievement after having expended energy. This is what Viswesveran and Ones (2000) regard as the behaviour and outcomes that employees indulge in or bring about that are related to and contribute to organisational goals.

It is implied from the foregoing explanations that job performance is related to the degree to which an employee is able to accomplish the task assigned to him or her and how the accomplished task contributes to the realisation of the organisational goal. Performance is considered to be a function of ability and motivation. The most effective method of increasing employee performance relates to job design, which is a crucial motivational factor. When jobs are designed for employees to minimize work-related stress, it makes the employees feel more that the work they are doing is meaningful. Also, setting goals acts as a powerful motivational factor for employees and improves work performance. When employees set goals, especially goals that are challenging and very specific, they see their contributions as being more important to the company; hence
they are more likely to strive to meet those goals. According to Perry, Mesch & Paarlberg (2006), performance increases arising from goal setting are most likely to occur when attaining a goal is monetarily rewarded.

The notion of job performance is also grounded in the theory of goal-setting. While defining goal setting as what an individual attempts to accomplish (the object or aim of a certain action), Locke, Shaw, Saari & Latham (1981) submit that the basic assumption of goal-setting is that goals are immediate regulators of human action. Empirical findings from goal-setting research suggest that specific goals lead to increased performance and difficult goals, when individuals have accepted them, result in higher performance than easy goals (Kinicki & Kreitner, 2003; Locke & Latham, 2002; 2004). Challenging goals should be achievable (Locke et al., 1981) and “SMART”, which is an acronym that stands for specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time bound (Kinicki & Kreitner, 2003).

Goals are simultaneously an object or outcome to expect and a standard for satisfaction (Locke & Latham, 2002; 2004). Thus, when desiring to achieve a certain goal, an individual will not be satisfied until he reaches that goal. This means that goals serve as reference standard for satisfaction versus dissatisfaction (Mento, Locke & Klein, 1992). In the view of Locke & Latham (2002), individuals that produce the most, those with difficult goals, are harder to satisfy. In this case, individuals that set high goals produce more as they are dissatisfied with less (Locke & Latham, 2002). Owing to the fact that this specific point where they become satisfied is much higher, individuals with high, difficult goals are motivated to produce more than those individuals with lower goals (Locke & Latham, 2002).

The theory of goal-setting has demonstrated that effective feedback system is essential ingredients for performance. Therefore, workers will know where to improve when given negative feedback and will become encouraged when they receive positive feedback. Even then the goal-setting theory has been criticized for not being able to address the reason why individuals are not motivated by goals that are not challenging but time consuming. Another criticism of goal-setting theory is that it (the theory) relies on rewards in order to keep workers motivated, but rewards might not always be available to dispense.

Psychological contract violation, motivational strategies and employees’ job performance are important issues that modern organisations have to deal with. However, limited research about these issues has been conducted. The structure of contemporary organisations has also been changing with organisations having smaller pool of potential employees. Consequently, there is bound to be heightened focus on the part of organisations to find the best employees with the right skills to fulfill roles within the organisation. This makes it pertinent to understand the psychological contract that exists between employee and employer and its impact on the employee and employer relationship. A few studies have dwelt on the aforementioned subject matter.

Lester & Kickul (2001) found that when employees’ psychological contract was breached, the employees were more likely to be dissatisfied with their jobs and their intent to leave increased. This shows that lack of reward can lead to dissatisfaction with job. According to Maurer (2001), rewards and recognition are essential factors in enhancing employee job satisfaction. Previous studies on motivation and job performance among employees produced in the profit and non-profit organisations have yielded different results. For instance, a study by Eze (1995) revealed that there is remarkable difference between high-order motivators and lower-order motivators. Also, being preoccupied with the motivators in one set would inhibit the urge to satisfy the motivators in the other set (Eze, 1995).

With particular reference to the Nigerian work situation, Eze (1995) stressed that the lower-order motivators (e.g. human physiological needs such as needs for food, clean water, clothing, shelter, and sex/marriage) are basic to Nigerian workers. It was in this same regard that Gunu (2003) found that employees of the Kwara State Government, Nigeria, were dissatisfied with their physiological needs (e.g. salary).
Kinicki, McKee-Ryan, Schriesheim & Carson (2002) did a current meta-analysis on the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation. They found that job satisfaction was positively moderately correlated to motivation. On the basis of the foregoing literature and empirical reviews, this study hypothesized as follows:

1. Motivational strategies and psychological contract violation will have significant main and interaction effects on job performance.
2. Participants who score high on motivational strategies will have a significantly better job performance than their counterparts that score low on motivational strategies.
3. Participants who score low on psychological contract violation will have a significantly better job performance than those who score high on the same variable.

Also, the following three key terms were operational definition as follows:

- **Psychological contract violation**: This is the actual abrogation of the non-verbal exchange of agreement from the employer to the employee.
- **Motivational strategies**: This is the willingness to exert high levels of effort towards organisational ability to satisfy some individual needs.
- **Job performance**: It is an extremely important criterion that relates to employees’ work, organisational outcomes and success.

**Method**

**Setting**

This study’s setting was the University of Ibadan, a federal government of Nigeria-owned undergraduate and postgraduate educational institution. The university is located in Oyo State, South-West Nigeria. It has academic departments and programmes in more than ten faculties. The teaching and non-teaching staff, as well as students of the university, are from diverse ethnic, social, religious and cultural backgrounds.

**Design**

The study utilised ex post-facto research design since variables were not manipulated in the study. The independent variables were psychological contract violation and motivational strategies, while the dependent variable was job performance.

**Participants**

Two hundred and thirty-two (232) respondents were sampled from a population of about 3,222 non-teaching staff of the University of Ibadan. They consisted of 118 (50.9%) males and 114 (49.1%) females. Ages of respondents ranged from 31 to 40. While 66 (28.4%) of the participants were single, 156 (67.2%) were married. Seven of the respondents were separated, divorced or widowed. Three respondents did not indicate their marital status. In terms of education, 22 (9.5%) of the respondents acquired secondary education, 61 (26.3%) obtained National Certificate in Education (NCE) or Ordinary National Diploma (OND) qualification, 134 (57.7%) attained university education at the levels of first degree or master’s degree while 10 (4.3%) had doctorate degrees. Five (2.2%) of the respondents did not indicate their educational qualifications. With regards to length of service, 99 (42.7%) of the respondents had spent less than 5 years working in the University; 39 (16.8%) had spent less than 10 years; 83 (35.8%) had spent more than 10 years while 11 (4.7%) of the respondents did not indicate their length of service.

**Instruments**

**Psychological Contract Violation**

This was measured using Psychological Contract Violation Scale developed by Robinson (1996) and Rousseau (1989). It is a 9-item, 5-point scale for which its original developers and users reported a Cronbach alpha of 0.92. This study obtained a Cronbach alpha of 0.81 for the scale. A sample item in the scale is shown below.

> Almost all the promises made by my employer during recruitment have been kept so far.

The response pattern has “Strongly disagree” on one end and “Strongly agree” on the other. Scoring ranged from 1-5 with “1” on the side of “Strongly disagree” and “5” on the side of “Strongly agree.” The highest possible score for an individual was 45 while the least was 9. An individual who scored within or above the mean...
was considered to have been experiencing high psychological contract violation, while those who scored below the mean were regarded as having been experiencing low psychological contract violation.

**Motivational Strategies**

These were measured using Motivational Factor Scale developed by (Kovach, 1995; Wong, Siu & Tsang, 1999). It is a 12-item, 5-point scale for which its original developers and users reported a Cronbach alpha of 0.80. A sample item in the scale is shown thus “Supervisor’s help with personal problems.” The response pattern has “Very unimportant” on one end and “Very important” on the other. Scoring ranged from 1-5 with “1” on the side of “Very unimportant” and “5” on the side of “Very important.” The highest possible score for an individual was 60 while the least was 12. Respondents who scored within and above the mean were considered to be high on motivational strategies, while those who scored below the mean were considered to be low on motivational strategies.

**Job performance**

This was measured using Health and Work Performance Scale developed by Attridge (2003). It is a 7-item scale with an original Cronbach alpha of 0.89. A Cronbach alpha of 0.71 was obtained in the present study. The scale is a 5-point instrument, scored at “1” by “none of the time, and at “5” by all of the time with a highest possible total score of 35 and a lowest score of 7. A sample item in the scale is shown thus “How often was your job performance lower than most workers on your job?” A respondent who scored within or above the mean was said to have low job performance, while the one who scored below the mean was regarded high on job performance.

**Procedure**

This study adopted a multi-stage sampling technique. This means that different sampling techniques were employed at different stages of the research. Simple random sampling technique was used to select faculties, units and departments evenly. Due to the limited time available for conducting the study, convenience sampling technique was also used in selecting university non-teaching staff that participated in the study.

**Data Analysis**

The Pearson Product Moment correlation was used to establish intercorrelations among all variables of the research. Hypothesis 1 was tested using a 2 x 2 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Hypothesis 2 and 3 were tested using independent t-test. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17 was used to analyze data for the study.

**Results**

In order to know the direction of relationships among the demographic variables and the main variables of this research, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was carried out. The results are presented in Table 4.

---

**Table 4.1: Pearson Product Moment Correlation showing relationships among variables of study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.212**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar.Sta</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.C.V</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>23.36</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motiv.Str.</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>50.58</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job.Perf.</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.157*</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.05, **P<.01

**Key:**

Mar. Sta = Marital Status  
P.C.V = Psychological Contract Violation  
Motiv. Str. = Motivational Strategies  
Job. Perf. = Job Performance

---
As shown in Table 4.1, there was no significant relationship between gender and job performance. Likewise, there was no significant relationship between the age of respondents and job performance. Marital status also did not significantly relate to job performance.

Intercorrelations of the main variables showed that there was significant positive relationship between psychological contract violation and job performance ($r = 0.157; P >.05$). However, motivational strategies was not significantly related to job performance.

### Table 4.2: Summary of 2x2 ANOVA Showing Influence of Psychological Contract Violation & Motivational Strategies on Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psy. Cont. Viol.</td>
<td>115.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115.46</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mot. Stra.</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psy. Cont. Viol. * Mot. Stra.</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>4926.30</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>21.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5103.59</td>
<td>231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.05.


Hypothesis one which stated that motivational strategies and psychological contract violation will have significant main and interaction effect on job performance was not supported. This result revealed that motivational strategies and psychological contract violation did not have a significant interaction effect on the participants' job performance.

Table 4.2 showed that psychological contract violation had a significant main effect on the respondents' job performance ($F(1,231) = 5.34; P<.05$). Observation of the mean scores revealed that respondents who scored high ($\bar{X} = 13.81$) on psychological contract violation had better job performance than their counterparts that scored low ($\bar{X} = 12.47$) on psychological contract violation. Moreover, the table showed motivational strategies did not have significant main effect on job performance. Thus, hypothesis one was not fully supported.

### Table 4.3: Summary of Independent T-test Showing Influence of Motivational Strategies on Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mot. Stra.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** Mot. Stra. = Motivational Strategies

Hypothesis two stated that participants who scored high on motivational strategies will have a significantly better job performance than their counterparts that scored low on motivational strategies. The hypothesis was not confirmed ($t(230) = 1.07; P>.05$). This implies that motivational strategies did not have a significant influence on participants' job performance.

### Table 4.4: Summary of Independent T-test Showing Influence of Psychological Contract Violation on Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** Psy. Cont. Viol = Psychological Contract
Hypothesis three stated that participants who scored low on psychological contract violation will have a more significant job performance than those who scored high on the same variable. The hypothesis was confirmed \((t(230) = 2.44, P<.05)\). The results showed that psychological contract violation had a significant influence on the respondents’ job performance. Furthermore, observation of the mean scores revealed that participants who scored high \((X = 14.56)\) on psychological contract violation had better job performance than their counterparts that scored low \((X = 13.06)\) on psychological contract violation.

**Discussion**

This research examined psychological contract violation and motivational strategies as predictors of employees’ job performance. The first hypothesis stated that motivational strategies and psychological contract violation will have a significant main and interaction effects on job performance. The hypothesis was not confirmed. Hypothesis two which stated that participants who scored high on motivational strategies will have a significantly better job performance than their counterparts that scored low on motivational strategies was also not confirmed.

However, in hypothesis three, psychological contract violation had a significant main effect on job performance. Respondents that scored high on psychological contract violation had better job performance than those that scored low on psychological contract violation. The reasons for this may be that employees that are high on psychological contract violation may think that the only way to make their employers keep to the employment contract is to ensure that their performance meets the expectation of their employers. Such employees that are high on psychological contract violation will ensure that their performances are impressive. The thinking of employees that scored high on psychological contract violation seems to be that, by putting up high performances, their employers would honour their employment contract. The implication of this is that fulfillment of the psychological contract is a relevant variable for employees’ effective job performance.

From the results, it seems that employees who were low on psychological contract violation were not so keen on putting up high performance to impress their employers since they did not perceive that their employment contract was violated.

The findings of this study are in line with previous findings of Ugwu & Ogwuche (2013) who reported that, despite non-fulfillment of employers own side of the bargain; employees may still exhibit positive work behaviour and maintain their membership with the organisation. The increasing rate of unemployment of job opportunities in Nigeria may have accounted for this kind of posture. However, this study’s findings do not support the findings of Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler (1998); Shore & Barksdale (1998); Tsui, Pearce, Porter & Tripoli (1997) & Lester et al. (2002) who noted that over-fulfillment of psychological contracts can lead to increased benefits.

The present findings are also not consistent with those of Cheung & Chiu (2004) who reported that when employees receive more than they expected in terms of promises delivered, they tend to increase their task and contextual performances, experience job satisfaction, and exhibit continuous commitment to the organisation. Again, findings of this study are not consistent with those of Robinson & Morrison (1995) and Robinson (1996), which indicated that employees who believe that obligations to them are not met display negative work outcomes, such as a reduction in the level of their work performances (Robinson, 1996; Robinson & Morrison, 1995; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Turnley & Feldman, 1999; Turnley & Feldman, 2000) and less positive work attitudes; for example, less job satisfaction (Turnley & Feldman, 1998), a lower level of organisational commitment (Guzzo, Noonan & Elron, 1994), a lower level of trust in the organisation (Robinson, 1996), and a greater tendency to want to leave the organisation (Lo & Aryee, 2003).

**Conclusion**

Results of the present study have shed more light on what happens when employers violate psychological contract as well as how lack of motivational strategies on the part of the
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Employers can lead to non-performance on the part of the employees. Findings of this study provide insight into when psychological contract violation and lack of motivational strategies are most likely to be experienced. They also suggest interesting and useful implications for future research and for organisational practice.

This study has shown the importance of psychological contract violation, motivation and job performance in the work environment. Concerning the relationship of motivation and job performance in the public and the private service sector, this research has come to similar conclusions regarding what some previous studies have reported. Undoubtedly, any form of motivational strategy adopted or put in place has the possibility of enhancing or diminishing intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction.

Motivation is found to be positively related to job performance. Therefore, organisations have to be careful on how to implement reward systems for their employees. If employers decide to use rewards in order to increase performance, it is suggested, therefore, that they focus on rewards that enhance motivation, or at least do not harm motivation.

Recommendations

Based on analyses of results, interpretation, and conclusion in this study, it is recommended as follows:

1. Organisations should recognise success as critical and equally important in inspiring employees to work toward achievements. Employees will be inspired by knowing that their contributions are valued and that management is confident in their capabilities.

2. Periodically, management should determine what the employees need to maximize their innovative thinking and productivity. They should also put in place a workable feedback mechanism that will motivate employees to desired behaviour.

3. Resources that take care of employee motivation like salary, incentives, good working atmosphere, appreciation, healthy environment should be made available to employees in order to keep them motivated at work.

4. Management should therefore involve all employees in brainstorming on issues affecting the organisation so as to find a lasting solution to such problems. Once all or most employees are involved in finding a solution to a challenge, it is expected that all or most of them would be motivated and encouraged to get involved in dealing with present and future challenges. Again, dealing with challenges together engenders team spirit and leads to increased productivity.

5. Employers need to be aware of the amount of actual, rather than expected, inducements to employees because this may affect the obligations that the employees feel towards their employer.

6. Employers should be encouraged to pay more attention to work expectations of employees, such as welfare package, support in terms of resources, and work conditions (March & Simon, 1958). This is because employees may base their determination of how much they owe to their employer on whether or not the promises made to them have been fulfilled.
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