

Research Article

Cite this article: Demirkol, M., & Ceylan, E. (2025). Examining the Relationship Between Psychological Resilience and Psychological Contract Breach in Educational Organizations Through Teachers' Views. *Üniversitepark Bülten*, 14(2): 7-21.
<https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2025.14.2.1>

Received May 09, 2025

Accepted September 27, 2025

Keywords:

Psychological resilience, psychological contract breach, teachers.

Author for correspondence:

Murat Demirkol

✉ mdemirkol@firat.edu.tr

✉ Firat University Kovancilar Vocational School, Computer Programming Program, 23100, Kovancilar, Türkiye.

**OPEN ACCESS**

© The Author(s), 2025. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

Examining the Relationship Between Psychological Resilience and Psychological Contract Breach in Educational Organizations Through Teachers' Views

Murat Demirkol , Esengul Ceylan

Abstract

Background/purpose. This study examines the relationship between middle and high school teachers' perceptions of psychological contract violation and their levels of psychological resilience, and evaluates differences across demographic characteristics.

Materials/methods. Using a quantitative, cross-sectional correlational design, the study collected data from 349 teachers in Elazığ Province during the 2024–2025 academic year using the Psychological Contract Violation Form and the Brief Psychological Resilience Scale. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, independent-samples t-test, ANOVA, Pearson correlation, and simple linear regression.

Results. The results showed that the mean psychological contract violation score for teachers was 3.061, while the mean psychological resilience score was 3.541. A negative, moderate, and statistically significant relationship was found between psychological contract violation and psychological resilience ($r = -0.319$; $p < 0.001$). Simple linear regression indicated that psychological contract violation scores explained 10.2% of the variance in psychological resilience scores ($R^2 = 0.102$). In comparisons of demographic variables, it was determined that psychological contract violation showed significant differences based on marital status and the school level at which teachers work, while psychological resilience showed significant differences based on gender and marital status; neither variable showed significant differences based on years of professional experience.

Conclusion. The findings show that higher perceptions of psychological contract violation are associated with lower psychological resilience among teachers, emphasizing the need to consider organizational factors alongside personal resilience. Because the design is cross-sectional, the results do not establish causality.

1. Introduction

Teaching is not merely a profession based on classroom instruction; it is also carried out in a work environment characterized by intense interpersonal interactions, changing organizational expectations, administrative practices, and emotional demands. Therefore, when explaining teachers' professional functioning, it is necessary to consider not only individual competencies but also organizational experiences such as support, trust, and reciprocity within the school environment. It has been noted that teachers' capacity to adapt to challenges and recover from them is shaped by the interaction between individual resources and relational and environmental resources (Beltman et al., 2011; Mansfield et al., 2016).

Within this framework, psychological resilience is a key individual resource that enables teachers to recover and maintain their functioning after professional difficulties and stressful experiences. Psychological resilience is viewed not merely as a fixed personality trait but as a dynamic structure related to adaptation and recovery processes that emerge from the interaction of risk and protective factors (Kararmak, 2006; Gizir, 2007). However, teachers' individual resources cannot be considered independently of the organizational environment in which they operate. The nature of relationships with school administration, the clarity of mutual expectations, and teachers' assessments of whether the institution fulfills its obligations to them are also key components of work experience (Rousseau, 1989; Demirkasımoğlu, 2014).

Perceptions of mutual obligations that go beyond the written employment contract between the organization and the employee are explained by the concept of the psychological contract (Rousseau, 1989). An employee's perception that the organization is failing to meet the obligations they believe it owes them is associated with a psychological contract breach. In some cases, this perception may be accompanied by emotional reactions such as disappointment, anger, or a sense of being betrayed (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). In educational organizations, the psychological contract provides an important framework for understanding reciprocity, fairness, support, and trust in teachers' relationships with school administration and the institution (Oğul Selekler, 2007; Demirkasımoğlu, 2014; Argon & Ekinci, 2017).

Examining psychological resilience and psychological contract breach together allows for an assessment of the relationship between teachers' individual resilience and their organizational experiences. Resource Conservation Theory posits that the loss or perceived threat to valued resources in organizational relationships—such as trust, support, justice, and reciprocity—may be associated with stress processes (Hobfoll, 1989). However, since resource loss and related processes were not directly measured in this study, the relationship between psychological contract violation and psychological resilience is addressed within a correlational rather than a causal framework.

This study examines the relationship between middle school and high school teachers' levels of psychological resilience and their perceptions of psychological contract violation. It determines whether these variables differ by certain demographic characteristics. Although psychological resilience and psychological contract violation have been examined alongside various organizational and individual variables, studies that directly examine teachers' general levels of psychological resilience alongside their perceptions of psychological contract violation are limited, particularly in the context of educational organizations in Turkey. Accordingly, this study examined the descriptive characteristics of both variables, the differences they exhibit based on selected demographic variables, and the direction and strength of the relationship between psychological contract violation and psychological resilience. The study is expected to contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between teachers' organizational experiences and their individual psychological resources, as well as to the relevant literature in educational administration.

2. Literature

2.1. *Psychological Resilience*

Psychological resilience is a multidimensional concept used to explain how individuals adapt to adverse experiences and difficulties, maintain functioning, and recover. While early studies on psychological resilience focused on the characteristics of individuals who adapted positively despite adverse conditions, later approaches increasingly examined resilience within the interaction between individual characteristics and environmental conditions (Karairmak, 2006; Gizir, 2007). Accordingly, psychological resilience is viewed not merely as a fixed individual trait, but as a dynamic process that can emerge from the interaction between risk and protective factors.

When assessing psychological resilience, it is important to define which dimension of the concept is being addressed clearly. The Brief Psychological Resilience Scale, developed by Smith et al. (2008), measures an individual's capacity to recover after stressful and challenging experiences. It has been noted that the Turkish adaptation of the scale also supports the structure that assesses individuals' capacity to recover after stress and difficulties (Doğan, 2015). In this study, psychological resilience is limited to teachers' self-assessments of their general capacity to recover following challenging experiences. Therefore, the psychological resilience addressed in this study differs from more specific concepts such as career resilience, professional resilience, or organizational resilience.

In the context of teaching, psychological resilience is associated not only with individual coping capacity but also with professional relationships, school climate, administrative support, and working conditions. Beltman et al. (2011) emphasize that teachers' psychological resilience should be evaluated within the framework of the mutual interaction between personal and contextual protective resources. Mansfield et al. (2016), by contrast, treat relationships, well-being, motivation, and emotions as interconnected domains within the framework of psychological resilience in teacher education. This approach supports the view that teachers' psychological resilience should be evaluated not merely as an individual trait but as a capacity that develops through interaction with the organizational environment.

Studies conducted with teacher samples in Turkey also demonstrate that psychological resilience is examined in conjunction with various individual and professional variables. In their study of middle school teachers, Altuntaş and Genç (2020) identified a positive relationship between psychological resilience and happiness. Şen and Köse (2024), on the other hand, found that psychological resilience levels among preschool and classroom teachers varied by certain educational and professional characteristics but did not differ significantly by gender, marital status, age, or years of professional experience. These findings from various studies indicate that demographic comparisons regarding teachers' levels of psychological resilience must be evaluated by taking into account sample characteristics, school type, and working conditions.

2.2. *Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach*

The psychological contract describes the aspect of the relationship between an employee and an organization that is not explicitly stated in the formal employment contract but is shaped by beliefs and expectations regarding mutual obligations. According to Rousseau (1989), the psychological contract is based on an individual's subjective beliefs that mutual obligations exist between the individual and the organization. Consequently, the psychological contract encompasses not only what employees expect from the organization but also their individual perceptions regarding the organization's obligation to behave in certain ways. In the Turkish literature as well, the psychological contract is associated with perceptions of reciprocity, trust, and obligation that go beyond formal working conditions (Topaloğlu & Arastaman, 2016).

In educational organizations, the psychological contract is used to understand elements that go beyond formal job descriptions in teachers' relationships with school administration and the institution. Demirkasımoğlu (2014) examined teachers' perceptions of the psychological contract alongside person-environment fit and highlighted the importance of relational psychological contracts in educational organizations. Oğul Selekler (2007), on the other hand, evaluated teachers' perceptions of psychological contract violations within an administration- and organization-focused framework. These studies show that teachers' assessments of the fulfillment of administrative support, reciprocity, justice, and organizational obligations matter for the relationships they build with their institutions.

When conceptualizing situations where a psychological contract is perceived as unfulfilled, it is important to distinguish between cognitive evaluation and emotional response. Morrison and Robinson (1997) define a "breach" of the psychological contract as a cognitive evaluation that the organization has failed to fulfill its obligations, while they associate the concept of "violation" with emotional reactions—such as anger, disappointment, or a sense of being deceived—that may follow this evaluation. Since not every assessment of a psychological contract breach is expected to elicit an emotional response of the same intensity, this distinction provides conceptual clarity in psychological contract research. The items in the Turkish-language version used in this study include not only cognitive evaluations regarding unfulfilled obligations but also certain negative emotional responses. Therefore, this theoretical distinction is considered when interpreting scale scores (Oğul Selekler, 2007).

The relationships between psychological contract breach and organizational attitudes and behaviors have been investigated in various work settings. Argon and Ekinici (2017) identified a negative relationship between organizational support and psychological contract violation in their study of teachers. Systematic reviews also show that psychological contract breach is associated with numerous outcome variables related to employees' attitudes and behaviors. However, researchers must consider differences in research designs and measurement approaches when interpreting the results (Topa et al., 2022).

2.3. The Relationship Between Psychological Resilience and Psychological Contract Breach

Examining psychological resilience and psychological contract breach within the same research framework allows for an assessment of the relationship between individuals' capacity to recover from difficulties and the negative experiences they encounter in their organizational relationships. While a breach of the psychological contract reflects an assessment that the expected reciprocity within the organization has been disrupted, psychological resilience focuses on the capacity to recover following stressful and challenging experiences. Therefore, theoretically, a relationship can be expected between an increase in psychological contract breach and a decrease in psychological resilience. However, the direction and magnitude of this relationship may vary by context, measurement tools, and sample characteristics.

Studies examining these variables conceptualize psychological resilience differently. For instance, Ryu and Yoo (2015) examined psychological resilience alongside role stress, organizational commitment, and psychological contract breach. However, specific dimensions like career resilience differ conceptually from the general recovery capacity defined by Smith et al. (2008). Therefore, findings across studies cannot be directly equated, and the operational definition and measurement of resilience must be carefully considered.

Examining this relationship from teachers' perspective is particularly important. This is because the school environment is an organizational structure where intense social interactions and administrative decisions directly influence daily work experiences. Obligations perceived as

unfulfilled by administration or the institution may be negatively associated with relational resources such as trust, support, and belonging. Psychological resilience, by contrast, relates to teachers' ability to maintain functioning and recover in the face of challenging experiences. However, the present study does not test a causal mechanism between these processes; rather, it examines the co-variation between psychological contract violation and psychological resilience scores derived from teachers' self-reports.

The limited number of studies in Turkey that directly examine the relationship between teachers' general levels of psychological resilience and their perceptions of psychological contract violations underscores the importance of investigating this relationship in educational organizations. This study is expected to contribute to the relevant literature by examining the organizational experiences of middle school and high school teachers alongside their general capacity for resilience within the same research framework.

2.4. Theoretical Framework and Research Questions

The Resource Conservation Theory provides a theoretical framework that can be used to explain the relationship between psychological contract breach and psychological resilience. According to Hobfoll (1989), individuals strive to acquire, protect, and maintain valued resources. Resource loss, the emergence of a threat of loss, or failure to obtain expected resources plays a significant role in the stress process. In educational organizations, supportive relationships, trust, fair treatment, and reciprocity can be considered relational and organizational resources that teachers value. From this perspective, the failure to fulfill obligations believed to be undertaken by the school can be interpreted as a loss of resources or a threat of resource loss for teachers. However, since resource loss was not directly measured in this study, this explanation is addressed at a theoretical level.

In line with this theoretical framework, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the descriptive characteristics of teachers' psychological contract violation and psychological resilience scores?
2. Do teachers' psychological contract violation and psychological resilience scores show significant differences based on gender, marital status, school level where they work, and years of professional experience?
3. Is there a significant relationship between teachers' psychological contract breach and their levels of psychological resilience?
4. To what extent do psychological contract breach scores explain the variation in teachers' psychological resilience scores?

3. Research

3.1. Research Design

This study was conducted using a cross-sectional correlational design within the framework of a quantitative research approach. Correlational studies allow examination of the direction and degree of the relationship between two or more variables without experimental intervention. In cross-sectional studies, researchers collect data from participants at a specific point in time (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). This study examined the descriptive characteristics of teachers' psychological contract breach and psychological resilience scores, whether these scores differed according to certain demographic variables, and the relationship between psychological contract breach and psychological resilience. Because the study is non-experimental and cross-sectional, the findings do not indicate causal relationships.

3.2. Study Group

The study sample consists of a total of 349 teachers who were employed at middle schools and high schools in the central district of Elazığ Province during the 2024–2025 academic year and who voluntarily participated in the study. Of the participants, 145 (41.5%) were employed at middle schools, while 204 (58.5%) were employed at high schools. Participants were recruited based on accessibility and voluntary participation. Therefore, the study used a convenience sampling method (Etikan et al., 2016).

Of the teachers in the study group, 158 (45.3%) are female, and 191 (54.7%) are male. Of the participants, 277 (79.4%) are married, and 72 (20.6%) are single. In terms of years of professional experience, 30 teachers had 0–5 years, 77 had 6–10 years, 61 had 11–15 years, 54 had 16–20 years, and 127 had 21 years or more. Information regarding the participants' age, educational level, and other demographic characteristics is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the participants

Demographic Characteristics	Category	n	%
Gender	Female	158	45.3
	Male	191	54.7
Marital status	Single	72	20.6
	Married	277	79.4
Age	21–25	3	0.9
	26–30	31	8.9
	31–35	66	18.9
	36–40	64	18.3
	41–45	78	22.3
	46 years and over	107	30.7
Professional seniority	0–5 years	30	8.6
	6–10 years	77	22.1
	11–15 years	61	17.5
	16–20 years	54	15.5
	21 years and over	127	36.4
Educational level	Bachelor's degree	229	65.6
	Master's degree	113	32.4
	Doctorate	7	2.0
School level	Middle school	145	41.5
	High school	204	58.5

N = 349. Due to rounding, percentages for some variables may not total exactly 100%.

3.3. Data Collection Instruments

This study used the Personal Information Form, the Psychological Contract Breach Form, and the Brief Psychological Resilience Scale to collect data. Personal Information Form. The researcher-prepared personal information form included questions about teachers' gender, marital status, age, years of professional experience, educational level, and the school level at which they work.

Psychological Contract Breach Form. The nine-item Psychological Contract Breach Form, originally used by Oğul Selekler (2007) with a sample of Turkish teachers, was used to assess teachers' perceptions of obligations they believed their schools and institutions failed to fulfill. In Oğul Selekler's (2007) study, psychological contract violation was assessed using the nine-item measurement tool developed by Robinson and Morrison, as cited by Oğul Selekler (2007), and the items were administered using a seven-point Likert-type response scale. In the original study, the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient for the scale was calculated as .80; in the factor analysis conducted to assess construct validity, it was determined that the items loaded onto the expected factors in two dimensions: breach against management and breach against the organization (Oğul Selekler, 2007, pp. 69, 77). In this study, the questionnaire was administered using a seven-point Likert scale, and the items were scored on a scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (7). Items 1, 2, and 7 were reverse-scored. After recoding the reverse-scored items, the psychological contract violation score was calculated as the arithmetic mean of responses to the items. Higher scores indicate a stronger perception of psychological contract violation. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient for the questionnaire was calculated as .882. While Oğul Selekler's (2007) study analyzed the questionnaire items under two factors—management and organization—this study used the overall psychological contract violation score based on nine items, in accordance with the research questions.

Short Psychological Resilience Scale. The Short Psychological Resilience Scale, developed by Smith et al. (2008) to determine teachers' capacity to recover after stressful and challenging experiences and adapted into Turkish by Doğan (2015), was used. The scale is a five-point Likert-type self-report instrument consisting of six items. In Doğan's (2015) Turkish adaptation study, exploratory factor analysis revealed a single-factor structure explaining 54.66% of the total variance. It was determined that the item factor loadings ranged from .63 to .79. Confirmatory factor analysis results also revealed that the single-factor structure demonstrated an acceptable level of fit ($\chi^2/df = 1.83$; CFI = .99; RMSEA = .05; SRMR = .03). The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient for the Turkish version was calculated as .83. Items 2, 4, and 6 on the scale are reverse-scored. After the reverse-scored items were recoded, the psychological resilience score was calculated by taking the arithmetic mean of the responses to the six items. High scores indicate a high level of psychological resilience. In this study, the scale's Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient was .852.

3.4. Data Collection and Analysis

The research data were collected during the spring semester of the 2024–2025 academic year from teachers working at middle schools and high schools in the central district of Elazığ Province. During the data collection process, schools were visited, and data collection instruments were administered to teachers who voluntarily agreed to participate in the study. The data obtained from the participants were used solely for scientific research purposes.

Before proceeding with the analyses, the dataset was examined for missing and erroneous data. The responses of the 349 participating teachers to the nine psychological contract violation items and the six psychological resilience items were checked, and no missing data were found in the items used in the analyses. It was confirmed that responses to the Psychological Contract Violation Form ranged from 1 to 7, while responses to the Brief Psychological Resilience Scale ranged from 1 to 5. After reverse-scored items were recoded, the participants' mean scale scores were calculated for both measurement instruments.

We examined skewness and kurtosis values to assess the data's suitability for parametric analyses. Skewness and kurtosis values falling within the ± 1.5 range were considered acceptable for a normal distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Descriptive statistics for the research variables included the arithmetic mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis.

An independent-samples t-test was used to determine whether teachers' scores on psychological contract violation and psychological resilience differed significantly by gender, marital status, and school level. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine differences by professional seniority.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the direction and strength of the relationship between psychological contract violation and psychological resilience. Additionally, simple linear regression was used to determine the extent to which psychological contract violation scores explained variation in psychological resilience scores. In the regression analysis, psychological contract breach was included as the independent variable, and psychological resilience as the dependent variable. We used a significance level of $p < .05$ for all statistical analyses.

4. Results

In this section, the findings obtained within the scope of the research are presented in order. First, descriptive statistics for teachers' scores on psychological contract violation and psychological resilience are presented; next, the study examines whether these variables differ by gender, marital status, school level, and years of professional experience. Finally, the relationship between psychological contract breach and psychological resilience was examined, and the extent to which psychological contract breach scores explain changes in psychological resilience scores was evaluated.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Psychological Contract Breach and Resilience Scores

Scale	n	$\bar{X}$	SS	Skewness	Kurtosis
Psychological Contract Breach	349	3,061	1,304	0,548	0,058
Psychological Resilience	349	3,541	0,862	-0,040	-0,457

Table 2 shows that the average score for teachers' psychological contract violation was 3.061 (SD = 1.304), while the average score for psychological resilience was 3.541 (SD = 0.862). It was determined that the skewness and kurtosis values for both scales fell within the ± 1.5 range. These values indicate that the score distributions are within acceptable limits for parametric analyses.

Table 3. t-Test Results for Psychological Contract Breach and Resilience by Gender

Scale	Gender	n	$\bar{X}$	SS	t	sd	p
Psychological Contract Breach	Man	191	2,969	1,233	-1,451	347	0,148
	Woman	158	3,172	1,380			
Psychological Resilience	Man	191	3,639	0,832	2,353	347	0,019
	Woman	158	3,422	0,885			

Table 3 showed no significant difference in teachers' psychological contract violation scores by gender ($t(347) = -1.451$; $p = 0.148$). Male teachers had a mean psychological contract violation score of 2.969, while female teachers had 3.172.

Psychological resilience scores, however, differed significantly by gender ($t(347) = 2.353$; $p = 0.019$). It was observed that the mean psychological resilience score for male teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.639$) was higher than that of female teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.422$).

Table 4. t-Test Results for Psychological Contract Violations and Resilience by Marital Status

Scale	Marital Status	n	$\bar{X}$	SS	t	sd	p
Psychological Contract Breach	Married	277	2,950	1,295	-3,155	347	0,002
	Single	72	3,488	1,257			
Psychological Resilience	Married	277	3,624	0,853	3,603	347	<0,001
	Single	72	3,220	0,825			

According to Table 4, teachers' psychological contract violation scores show a significant difference based on the marital status variable ($t(347) = -3.155$; $p = 0.002$). It was found that the mean psychological contract violation score for single teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.488$) was higher than that of married teachers ($\bar{X} = 2.950$).

Psychological resilience scores also differed significantly by marital status ($t(347) = 3.603$; $p < 0.001$). It was observed that the mean psychological resilience score for married teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.624$) was higher than that of single teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.220$).

Table 5. t-Test Results for Psychological Contract Violations and Resilience by School Level

Scale	School Level	n	$\bar{X}$	SS	t	sd	p
Psychological Contract Breach	Middle School	145	2,852	1,333	-2,545	347	0,011
	High School	204	3,210	1,265			
Psychological Resilience	Middle School	145	3,605	0,897	1,170	347	0,243
	High School	204	3,495	0,836			

Table 5 shows that teachers' psychological contract violation scores differed significantly by school level ($t(347) = -2.545$; $p = 0.011$). It was observed that the mean psychological contract violation score for teachers working in high schools ($\bar{X} = 3.210$) was higher than that of teachers working in middle schools ($\bar{X} = 2.852$).

It was determined that psychological resilience scores did not show a significant difference based on the school level where teachers work ($t(347) = 1.170$; $p = 0.243$). The mean psychological resilience score for middle school teachers was $\bar{X} = 3.605$, while the mean score for high school teachers was $\bar{X} = 3.495$.

Table 6. ANOVA Results for Psychological Contract Breach and Resilience Scores by Years of Service

Variable	Tenure	n	$\bar{X}$	Sd	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Psychological Contract Breach	0–5 years	30	2,937	1,304	Between groups	9,052	4	2,263	1,336	0,256
	6–10 years	77	3,356	1,327	Within-groups	582,582	344	1,694		
	11–15 years	61	3,051	1,495	Total	591,634	348			
	16–20 years	54	2,959	1,347						
	21 years and older	127	2,960	1,159						
	Total	349	3,061	1,304						
Psychological Resilience	0–5 years	30	3,450	0,880	Between groups	4,775	4	1,194	1,617	0,170
	6–10 year	77	3,348	0,857	Within-groups	253,956	344	0,738		

Variable	Tenure	n	$\bar{X}$	Sd	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
	11–15 years	61	3,683	0,875	Total	258,730	348			
	16–20 years	54	3,605	0,901						
	21 years and older	127	3,583	0,830						
	Total	349	3,541	0,862						

Table 6 showed that teachers' psychological contract breach scores did not differ significantly by years of professional experience ($F(4,344)=1.336$; $p=0.256$). Similarly, psychological resilience scores were also found to show no significant differences based on years of service ($F(4,344)=1.617$; $p=0.170$). Because the general analysis of variance was not significant for either variable, no post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted among the seniority groups.

Table 7. Correlation between psychological contract breach and psychological resilience

Variables	Psychological Contract Breach	Psychological Resilience
Psychological Contract Breach	1	-0,319
Psychological Resilience	-0,319	1

$p<0,001$.

The Pearson correlation analysis, conducted to determine the relationship between psychological contract violation and psychological resilience, revealed a negative, moderate, and statistically significant relationship between the two variables ($r = -0.319$; $p < 0.001$). Accordingly, it was observed that as teachers' psychological contract violation scores increased, their psychological resilience scores tended to decrease.

Table 8. Simple Linear Regression Results for Psychological Contract Violation and Resilience

Independent Variable	B	SH	β	t	p	R	R ²	F	DW
Constant	4,187	0,112	—	37,416	<0,001	0,319	0,102	39,417	2,014
Breach of the Psychological Contract	-0,211	0,034	-0,319	-6,278	<0,001				

Table 8 shows that the simple linear regression model examining the relationship between psychological contract violation scores and psychological resilience scores is statistically significant: $F(1,347) = 39.417$, $p < 0.001$. In the model, $R = 0.319$ and $R^2 = 0.102$. Accordingly, psychological contract violation scores account for approximately 10.2% of the total variance in psychological resilience scores.

The regression coefficients show that psychological contract breach scores are negatively and statistically significantly correlated with psychological resilience scores ($B = -0.211$; $\beta = -0.319$; $t = -6.278$; $p < 0.001$). A one-unit increase in the psychological contract violation score is associated with an approximate 0.211-unit decrease in the psychological resilience score. The Durbin-Watson value of 2.014 indicates no significant autocorrelation in the model residuals.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

In this study, the relationship between middle school and high school teachers' perceptions of psychological contract violations and their psychological resilience scores in the central district of Elazığ Province was examined; furthermore, the study investigated whether these variables differed according to gender, marital status, the school level at which they taught, and years of professional experience. The results showed that teachers' mean psychological contract violation score was 3.061, while the mean psychological resilience score was 3.541. Furthermore, a negative, moderate, and

statistically significant relationship was observed between psychological contract violation and psychological resilience.

Psychological resilience relates to individuals' capacity to recover and maintain functioning after stressful and challenging experiences. Smith et al. (2008) define psychological resilience as an individual's capacity to recover from stressful experiences. Similarly, Doğan's (2015) Turkish adaptation study focused on individuals' capacity to readjust and recover after facing difficulties. Given the nature of the teaching profession—which involves intense interpersonal relationships, changing administrative expectations, and various professional challenges—teachers' psychological resilience should not be assessed solely in isolation from individual characteristics. The approaches outlined by Beltman et al. (2011) and Mansfield et al. (2016) also demonstrate that teachers' psychological resilience is shaped by the interplay of individual and contextual factors.

Upon examining the findings related to the gender variable, it was determined that teachers' psychological contract violation scores did not show significant differences based on gender; however, psychological resilience scores did differ significantly by gender. It was observed that male teachers' average psychological resilience scores were higher than those of female teachers. However, findings on the relationship between gender and psychological resilience vary across the literature. Indeed, Şen and Köse (2024), in their study of preschool and classroom teachers, found no significant gender difference in psychological resilience. This discrepancy may be related to the groups of teachers involved in the studies, working conditions, school types, and sample characteristics. Therefore, rather than explaining the gender finding solely through the gender variable, it would be more appropriate to evaluate it alongside personal and organizational conditions.

Significant differences were identified in both psychological contract violation and psychological resilience scores with respect to marital status. It was observed that single teachers had higher average psychological contract violation scores than married teachers, while their average psychological resilience scores were lower. This finding suggests that marital status may be related to teachers' organizational experiences and their capacity to recover from stressful life events. However, it would be incorrect to interpret marital status as the sole determining factor. Other variables, such as social support, age, professional experience, family structure, working conditions, and individual characteristics, may also relate to these results. Şen and Köse's (2024) finding that psychological resilience did not differ by marital status also suggests that findings on demographic characteristics may vary by sample and context.

In comparisons based on the school level where teachers work, it was determined that high school teachers' average psychological contract breach scores were higher than those of middle school teachers. In contrast, psychological resilience scores did not differ significantly by school level. Because psychological contract breach relates to employees' assessments of how fully the organization fulfills its obligations to them (Rousseau, 1989), differences in working conditions, managerial expectations, task structure, and organizational practices between middle and high schools may explain this result. However, organizational variables that could directly explain the differences between school levels were not measured in the present study. Therefore, this finding should be interpreted cautiously and within the scope of the study's sample.

With regard to the variable of professional seniority, no significant difference was found in teachers' scores for either psychological contract breach or psychological resilience. This result suggests that time spent in the profession alone is not sufficient to explain teachers' assessments of organizational obligations or their capacity to recover after stressful experiences. Studies emphasizing that psychological resilience is shaped by the interaction of numerous personal, relational, and organizational factors also support this assessment (Beltman et al., 2011; Mansfield

et al., 2016). The findings of Şen and Köse (2024), which show that psychological resilience does not differ significantly by professional seniority, are also consistent with this study's results.

The main finding is a negative, moderate, and significant relationship between psychological contract violation and psychological resilience ($r = -0.319$; $p < 0.001$). Accordingly, it is observed that as teachers' psychological contract violation scores increase, their psychological resilience scores tend to decrease. Psychological contract breach reflects an employee's assessment that the organization is not adequately fulfilling its obligations toward them (Rousseau, 1989; Morrison & Robinson, 1997). Because these assessments are linked to key elements of the work environment—such as trust, reciprocity, and organizational support—the emergence of a negative relationship between psychological contract violation and psychological resilience appears theoretically meaningful.

This finding is generally consistent with research showing that psychological contract breach is negatively associated with various organizational attitudes and employee experiences. Argon and Ekinci (2017) found a negative relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational support and psychological contract violation. A systematic review conducted by Topa et al. (2022) also demonstrates that psychological contract violation is associated with numerous negative outcomes related to employees' organizational attitudes and behaviors. The study by Ryu and Yoo (2015), which examines psychological resilience and psychological contract violation within the same research framework, also highlights the importance of jointly assessing organizational experiences and individuals' resilience-related resources. However, it should be noted that psychological resilience is conceptualized in different ways in these studies, and the results should not be considered directly equivalent.

The negative relationship between psychological contract violation and psychological resilience can also be evaluated within the framework of Resource Protection Theory. According to Hobfoll (1989), individuals strive to protect and sustain the resources they possess and value; the loss of resources or the threat of such loss is associated with stress processes. In educational organizations, trust, support, fair treatment, reciprocity, and positive professional relationships can be considered important organizational and relational resources for teachers. Perceptions that the institution or school administration has failed to fulfill its assumed obligations may be linked to teachers' perceptions of these resources. However, since resource loss was not directly measured in this study, this explanation should be considered solely as a theoretical interpretation.

The simple linear regression results indicated that psychological contract violation scores explained approximately 10.2% of the total variance in psychological resilience scores ($R^2 = 0.102$). This percentage suggests that while psychological contract violation is one variable associated with teachers' psychological resilience, resilience must be considered within a much broader set of variables. Teachers' psychological resilience may be related to numerous individual and organizational factors, such as personal characteristics, social support, peer relationships, school climate, managerial support, workload, working conditions, and similar factors. Therefore, a breach of the psychological contract should be evaluated not as a factor that explains psychological resilience on its own, but as one of the organizational variables associated with it.

This study has some limitations. First, since the study was conducted using a cross-sectional and correlational design, it does not allow for the establishment of a causal relationship between the variables. Second, participants were selected using convenience sampling, and the study was limited to middle and high school teachers in the central district of Elazığ Province. This limits the generalizability of the findings to broader groups of teachers. Furthermore, since the data were collected through self-report scales, the study carries the inherent limitations of measurements based on participants' perceptions and evaluations. In addition, because school codes identifying the

schools where the teachers worked were not used in the study, potential effects arising from the clustering of teachers within the same school could not be examined.

In conclusion, this study found a significant negative relationship between teachers' perceptions of psychological contract violations and their psychological resilience scores. It was observed that as teachers' perceptions that their institutions were not adequately fulfilling their obligations toward them increased, their psychological resilience scores tended to decrease. The study also revealed that psychological contract breach scores differed significantly according to marital status and the level of the school where teachers worked. In contrast, psychological resilience scores differed significantly according to gender and marital status. No significant difference was found in either variable based on years of professional experience. These results highlight the importance of considering not only individual characteristics but also work and relational experiences within educational institutions when understanding teachers' psychological resilience. However, because the study is cross-sectional and correlational, it cannot be concluded that psychological contract violation directly affects psychological resilience.

6. Suggestions

Since the study found a negative and significant relationship between psychological contract breach and psychological resilience, it is recommended that educational administrators prioritize managing mutual expectations between teachers and the institution clearly and realistically. Clearly articulating expectations about duties, responsibilities, career development, managerial support, working conditions, and institutional resources can help maintain a healthier psychological contract. School administrations should share the reasons behind unmet obligations with teachers in a timely and transparent manner.

It is recommended that school administrators develop relationships with teachers based on trust, fairness, and open communication. Considering teachers' views in decision-making, providing administrative support when they face professional challenges, and establishing appropriate communication channels for them to express themselves can help shape teachers' organizational experiences more positively. However, because the present study is cross-sectional and correlational, it should not be claimed that these practices directly increase psychological resilience or reduce psychological contract violations.

The study found that psychological contract violation scores explained approximately 10.2% of the variance in psychological resilience scores. This result indicates that psychological contract violation alone cannot explain psychological resilience. Therefore, it is recommended that schools also consider variables such as social support, collegial solidarity, school climate, administrative support, organizational trust, perceived justice, workload, and working conditions, which may relate to teachers' psychological resilience.

Differences related to gender, marital status, and the school level at which teachers work indicate that supportive interventions for teachers should not be planned in a one-size-fits-all manner. In particular, future studies could examine in greater detail why high school teachers' psychological contract breach scores were higher than those of middle school teachers, including school-level-specific administrative practices, workload, job expectations, and working conditions. Similarly, variables such as social support, age, living conditions, and professional experience—which may underlie the differences observed based on gender and marital status—could also be included in future research.

In future studies, it may be helpful to consider variables such as organizational support, organizational trust, organizational justice, leadership behaviors, school climate, social support, job stress, burnout, and job commitment collectively to provide a more comprehensive explanation of

the relationship between psychological contract violation and psychological resilience. Furthermore, longitudinal studies could be used to examine in greater detail how these variables change over time and the direction of the relationships between them.

Given that this study was conducted exclusively with middle and high school teachers working in the central district of Elazığ Province, it is recommended that similar studies be conducted in different provinces, regions, and educational levels. Studies with broader, more diverse samples could facilitate comparisons across educational contexts. Furthermore, supplementing quantitative findings with qualitative methods—such as interviews and focus groups—could contribute to a more detailed understanding of teachers' experiences with psychological contract violations and their coping processes.

DECLARATIONS

Author Contributions. All authors contributed to the literature review, conceptualization, methodology, data analysis, review-editing and writing, and original manuscript preparation. All authors have read and approved the published final version of the article.

Conflicts of Interest. All authors declared no potential conflicts of interest.

Funding. The authors received no financial assistance in preparing this article.

Ethical Approval. Ethics committee approval was obtained before the commencement of the study.

REFERENCES

- Altuntaş, S., & Genç, H. (2020). Mutluluğun yordayıcısı olarak psikolojik sağlık: Öğretmen örnekleminin incelenmesi. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 35(4), 936–948. <https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2018046021>.
- Argon, T., & Ekinci, S. (2017). Teacher views on organizational support and psychological contract violation. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(2), 44–55.
- Beltman, S., Mansfield, C., & Price, A. (2011). Thriving not just surviving: A review of research on teacher resilience. *Educational Research Review*, 6(3), 185–207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2011.09.001>.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE.
- Demirkasımoğlu, N. (2014). Teachers' psychological contract perceptions and person-environment fit levels. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 56, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2014.56.1>.
- Doğan, T. (2015). Kısa Psikolojik Sağlık Ölçeği'nin Türkçe uyarlaması: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being*, 3(1), 93–102.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>.
- Gizir, C. A. (2007). Psikolojik sağlık, risk faktörleri ve koruyucu faktörler üzerine bir derleme çalışması. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 3(28), 113–128.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>.
- Kararımak, Ö. (2006). Psikolojik sağlık, risk faktörleri ve koruyucu faktörler. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 3(26), 129–142.
- Mansfield, C. F., Beltman, S., Broadley, T., & Weatherby-Fell, N. (2016). Building resilience in teacher education: An evidence-informed framework. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 54, 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.11.016>.

- Morrison, E. W., & Robinson, S. L. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 226–256. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1997.9707180265>.
- Oğul Selekler, Z. (2007). *Öğretmenlerde örgütsel adalet ve psikolojik sözleşme ihlal algısı* [Yüksek lisans tezi, Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü].
- Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2, 121–139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01384942>.
- Ryu, S., & Yoo, T. (2015). The effect of role stress on organizational commitment: The mediating effect of psychological contract breach and moderating effect of resilience. *Korean Journal of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 28(4), 723–747. <https://doi.org/10.24230/ksiop.28.4.201511.723>.
- Şen, R., & Köse, A. (2024). Okul öncesi ve sınıf öğretmenlerinin psikolojik sağlık düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 11(21), 80–101. <https://doi.org/10.29129/inujse.1404131>.
- Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The brief resilience scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 15(3), 194–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705500802222972>.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Topa, G., Aranda-Carmena, M., & De-Maria, B. (2022). Psychological contract breach and outcomes: A systematic review of reviews. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(23), 15527. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192315527>.
- Topaloğlu, H., & Arastaman, G. (2016). Örgütlerde psikolojik sözleşme üzerine kuramsal bir değerlendirme. *Ihlara Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(2), 25–36.

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

Murat Demirkol (PhD) is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Computer Technologies, Kovancilar Vocational School, Fırat University, Elazığ, TR.

Email: mdemirkol@firat.edu.tr

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3108-3219>

Esengül Ceylan, Fırat University, Elazığ, TR.

Email: eceylan23@outlook.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1310-9507>

Publisher's Note: Universitepark Limited remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.
