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Abstract
The study aimed to measure the effect of psychological contract breach on both workplace bullying and job silence. The research also aimed to assess whether workplace bullying plays a mediating role in the relationship between psychological contract breach and job silence in tourism companies. To achieve the aims of the study; A questionnaire was designed to collect study data from a random sample of employees in tourism companies in Hurghada and Sharm El-Sheikh, where 492 questionnaires were distributed, while only 418 questionnaires were analyzed. The results of the study highlighted that psychological contract breach leads to an increase in the level of workplace bullying, and job silence. The results also showed that workplace bullying leads to job silence. Finally, the results depicted that psychological contract breach affects the job silence in tourism companies through workplace bullying as a mediating variable.
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Introduction
Organizations are experiencing many changes and developments in their internal working environment such as increasing their size, restructuring, or internal digital transformations (Imran et al., 2021). These changes and developments have affected the development and modernization of work methods and strategies in organizations, as well as changing the nature of the obligations between the organization and its employees (Kuipers et al., 2014). Since employees have become the basis of success for various organizations (Salas-Vallina et al., 2021); these organizations have sought to develop more procedures to ensure that they retain distinguished employees, and build strong relationships with them, in a way that enables them to benefit from their skills, experiences and capabilities. Among these procedures is the commitment to their promises to employees, which is known as "psychological contract fulfillment" (Wibowo, 2022; Altunoğlu et al., 2022).

The psychological contract is related to the employees’ beliefs about the extent of the organization’s commitment to its promises with them, and when these employees feel that the organization does not implement its obligations, they feel a breach of the psychological contract that results in many negative behaviors and attitudes of the employees towards the organization and their jobs (Arasli & Arici, 2020). The degree of psychological contract breach increased during the Covid-19 crisis, and it was negatively reflected on the behavior and attitudes of employees within the tourism and hospitality organizations, which led to a decrease in the level of trust between management and employees, and threatens the long-term survival of these organizations (Wu et al., 2021).
Many studies in the field of organizational behavior and human resource management have been interested in discussing some organizational behaviors and attitudes at work, as a result of the increased impact of these behaviors on the success or failure of organizations in the work environment (Luthans et al., 2021). Among these behaviors is job silence (Maqbool et al., 2019), which expresses employees withholding information related to work problems, or not sharing their ideas due to fear of negative reactions, whether from management or supervisors (Zekeriya, 2021). Increasing job silence negatively affects developing work in the organization, and hinders its ability to change, in addition to the clear impact on employee satisfaction and performance (Gencer et al., 2021; Razmjooei et al., 2018). Among the factors that lead to an increase in job silence are psychological contract breach (Bari et al., 2020) and workplace bullying (Cheong, 2020). The tourism and hospitality industry is characterized by continuous interaction between employees at work, and these interactions may result in some conflicts and problems, as well as bullying. Bullying within the tourism and hospitality organizations has become the main cause of psychological damage to employees, which is reflected in their negative behaviors at work that affect productivity and service quality. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the management of these organizations to work on addressing workplace bullying and minimizing its effects (Hsu et al., 2019).

Bullying is one of the work stresses types prevalent in the workplace, and it has many negative consequences for both the organization and the employees. It may lead to a general impact on physical, psychological and mental health (Nel & Coetzee, 2020). Bullying is a form of interpersonal misconduct in the workplace, which includes repeated humiliating or destructive behaviors toward others at work (Fernández-del-Río et al., 2021). It is also considered a pattern of behavior aimed at intimidating a specific person or group (Leach et al., 2020).

Several studies have dealt with the direct relationship between the three study variables: psychological contract breach, workplace bullying and job silence (e.g. Guo, 2017; Salin & Notelears, 2020; Rai & Agarwal, 2017, 2018; Rajalakshmi & Naresh, 2018). But - to the researchers’ knowledge - there were no previous studies that dealt with the mediating role of workplace bullying in the relationship between psychological contract breach and job silence in tourism companies. Consequently; This study seeks to measure the effect of psychological contract breach on both workplace bullying and job silence in tourism companies. The study also seeks to explore the mediating role of workplace bullying in the relationship between psychological contract breach and job silence in tourism companies in the Egyptian context. Finally, the results of the study provide some recommendations for tourism and hospitality organizations.

**Conceptual framework and hypotheses development**

**Psychological contract breach (PCB)**

Employees in tourism and hospitality organizations are aware of the psychological contract breach when the organizations fail to fulfill their promises to them. For example; Hotel employees may feel a psychological contract breach when they do not receive additional rewards after achieving their goals as agreed, or the salary is not increased after achieving the
sales goal, or the promotion after a certain period or after several years of experience (Ampofo, 2021). The psychological contract refers to the unwritten commitments and promises between the organization and its employees, which imply the existence of implicit obligations from the organization towards the employees, as well as the existence of implicit obligations from the employees towards the organization (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2016).

Wu et al. (2021) pointed out that the tourism and hospitality sector witnessed many significant organizational changes, which led to the disruption of the relationship between the employer and employees. The expected obligations of the employer and employees towards each other (the psychological contract) have changed, especially during the last period after the occurrence of the Covid 19 pandemic. The breach of the psychological contract by the management of tourism and hospitality organizations has led to an increase in psychological pressure on employees, and a decrease in their loyalty. A psychological contract breach may occur as a result of the employees’ realization that the management has violated its promises and did not abide by them, whether deliberately or due to circumstances beyond its control, or because of a conflict in the realization of the implemented promises and obligation. In this case the management believes that it has fulfilled its obligations towards the employees, but employees see that management has failed to fulfill its obligations towards them (Arasli & Arici, 2020; Erkutlu & Chafra, 2016). Management’s failure to adhere to its commitments to employees leads to a feeling of job insecurity, unwillingness to develop skills or exert more efforts, and a decrease in their loyalty (Wu & Chen, 2015).

Psychological contract breach negatively affects many organizational outcomes as well as employees' outcomes. Arasli and Arici (2020) and Bavik and Bavik (2015) explained that psychological contract breach leads to unethical behavior by employees at work. As the study by Zhao et al. (2007) stated, breaching the psychological contract leads to a negative impact on the attitudes and effectiveness of employees in organizations. Restubog et al. (2008) revealed that breaching the psychological contract leads to a decrease in the employees’ practice of organizational citizenship behaviors. Griep and Vantilborgh (2018) demonstrated that it leads to highly counterproductive behaviors within organizations. Furthermore, the results of the study of Agarwal and Bhargava (2013) confirmed that psychological contract breach decreases the employees’ emotional commitment and job engagement. Peng et al. (2016) added that breaching the psychological contract causes the employees' deviation in their jobs and within the organization.

While tracking the negative effects of psychological contract breach in the tourism and hospitality organizations; Ampofo (2021) concluded that psychological contract breach negatively affects the satisfaction of front-office employees in hotels, and their low level of job engagement. Karatepe et al. (2021) mentioned that psychological contract breach has a negative impact on the employees' participation, and their desire to stay at work inside the hotels. As well, Kaya and Karatepe (2020) found that breaching the psychological contract leads hotel employees to be late for work and lower silence behaviors. Saleem et al. (2021), Chen and Wu (2017), and Santhanam et al. (2017) illustrated that psychological contract breach increases the employees' intention to leave work in tourism and hospitality organizations. According to Yang et al. (2020), it increases bullying behaviors at
work. It also affects the decrease in organizational trust, mental and psychological exhaustion of hotel employees (Abdalla et al., 2021) and has a negative impact on the psychological well-being of workers in those hotels (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2016). Among the negative effects of psychological contract breach are the decrease in organizational identification, job performance, and emotional commitment among employees which have been confirmed by the results of study of Li et al. (2016) on psychological contract breach.

The relationship between psychological contract breach and job silence

Job silence refers to the employee’s reluctance to share and exchange important information that benefits the work or his/her unwillingness to present opinions and ideas at work, or participate in decision-making (Aboramadan et al., 2020). It also includes the employees not talking about problems and obstacles of work (Gencer et al., 2021).

The employees’ feeling of dissatisfaction within the organization as a result of the work policies, the relationship with management or the relationship with co-workers results in their feeling of unwillingness to make more efforts at work, as well as their unwillingness to present their ideas and opinions about work development, or to talk about work problems, which consequently lead to an increase in their involvement in job silence behaviors (Fard & Karimi, 2015; Demirtas, 2018). Boadi et al. (2020) found that the low emotional intelligence of the employee leads to an increase in the level of job silence in tourism and hospitality organizations. The low level of organizational justice results in a decrease in morale, and an increase in the level of job silence. This was confirmed by Tan (2014) and Erdogdu (2018), who indicated that organizational justice and fair behaviors at work affect employee job silence. The lack or low level of organizational trust increase the level of job silence among employees (Cakinberk et al., 2014).

Pozveh and Karimi (2016) explained that there is a relationship between organizational climate and job silence, as the negative organizational climate which is full of conflicts and problems, and lack of motivation makes employees unwilling to work and make efforts to accomplish their tasks, as well as their lack of keenness to achieve the company's goals, through their withholding of information that is useful for achieving goals. Similarly, Parcham and Ghasemizad (2017) and Sholekar and Shoghi (2017) indicated that a weak organizational culture negatively affects employees' engagement in job-voice behaviors, and their resort to silence at work. Moreover, nepotism and favoritism may lead to an increase in the silence of employees within the organization as a result of their feeling of lack of appreciation at work, as well as the presence of bias and favoritism for others, and this was confirmed by the study of Pelit et al. (2015).

In addition, Akçin et al. (2017) suggested that there is an effect of perceived organizational support on job silence, as the decrease in organizational support for employees is negatively reflected on their presentation of ideas and suggestions to develop work, or providing information about work problems to solve them. The results of the study by Polat et al. (2018) illustrated that family-work conflict affects the behavior of job silence. There are many negative effects of job silence in the tourism and hospitality industry, such as lower organizational trust, organizational citizenship behaviours, job alienation, and lower job performance (Gencer et al., 2021). Nikmaram et al. (2012) indicated that job silence
decreases the level of organizational commitment, as the increase in employees' tendency to silence, and not share their information about work, is reflected in decreasing their commitment to work.

As explained by Çınar et al. (2013), there is a negative relationship between job silence and organizational citizenship behaviors. Fatima et al. (2015) confirmed that job silence negatively affects organizational citizenship behaviors, as the employees' reluctance to share their information and ideas at work results in their unwillingness to practice organizational citizenship behaviors. Elçi et al. (2014) added that increasing the level of job silence within organizations leads to an increase in the intention to leave.

Among the negative effects of job silence is what was highlighted by Akin and Ulusoy (2016), who showed that job silence increases the level of job burnout among employees, due to a feeling of constant pressure at work. Sadeghi and Razavi (2020) highlighted that job silence within organizations leads to weak creative abilities of employees. Organizational performance is also affected as a result of the employees' silence, and their lack of participation, whether in solving work problems or developing work performance. Razmjooei et al. (2018) depicted that job silence negatively affects the performance of the organization and its employees.

Regarding the relationship between psychological contract breach and job silence; The study of Khan et al. (2021) found that there is an effect of breaching the psychological contract on employees’ engagement in job silence behaviors, and their unwillingness to share information and ideas at work. As pointed out by Bari et al. (2020), the organization’s failure to fulfill its commitments towards employees leads to a decrease in their confidence, feelings of frustration, and therefore their unwillingness to participate, whether in solving work problems or developing the organization. Morsch et al. (2020) added that psychological contract breach spreads job silence among employees. The results of Guo's (2017) also found the negative impact of psychological contract breach on the employees' engagement in job-voice behaviors. Accordingly; We propose the following hypothesis:

**H1: Psychological contract breach affects job silence in tourism companies.**

### The mediating role of workplace bullying

Workplace bullying is the systematic exposure of a person to aggressive behavior by one or more colleagues or superiors for an extended period (Munro & Phillips, 2020). It is also a repetitive behavior towards one or more employees that causes embarrassment and suffering, as well it may negatively affect the completion of work, and create a hostile work environment (Paul & Kee, 2020). Bullying behaviors in tourism and hospitality organizations may take a several forms such as willful neglect, accusations, threats, repeated insults, hurtful looks, and constant criticism (Spencer, 2020; Ariza-Montes et al., 2017).

Workplace bullying is prevalent in organizations where power is abused and informal organizational alliances exist (Maxwell-Wilson, 2020). There are many factors that may push employees to bully in the workplace, such as organizational justice (Mohamed et al., 2018; Dzurec, 2020), leadership style, organizational policies, organizational culture (Miller et al., 2020), and bad supervision (Medina et al., 2020). These factors also include organizational climate, conflict in the workplace, job insecurity, injustice, reward systems, and competition
(Maxwell-Wilson, 2020). Karatuna et al. (2020) divided the causes of bullying into causes related to the individual (demographic causes, causes related to personality traits), and others related to the organization (causes related to leadership, causes related to work characteristics, and causes related to organizational culture).

The increased level of workplace bullying has many negative effects on organizations and employees. Roy and Khan (2020) and Khoshkar et al. (2020) reported that bullying is one of the pressures of work, and negatively affects the employees’ satisfaction. Fernández-del-Río et al. (2021) stated that it leads to an increase in employee absenteeism and intention to leave work.

Ahmed et al. (2020) mentioned that workplace bullying reduces productivity and increases exhaustion. Silva and Senarathna (2020) added that workplace bullying leads to lower employee performance, organizational performance, and job withdrawal. The negative effects of workplace bullying also include late work, decreased organizational commitment, job anxiety, depression (Leach et al., 2020; Nielsen et al., 2020), frustration, and decreased job engagement (Gupta et al., 2020; Attia et al., 2020).

In tourism and hospitality organizations, the study of Hsu et al. (2019) and Hayat and Afshari (2020) highlighted that workplace bullying negatively affects the well-being of hotel employees. Said and Tanova (2021) and Anasori et al. (2020) clarified that it leads to emotional exhaustion for employees in tourism and hospitality organizations. Further, it negatively affects psychological adjustment at work (Jung & Yoon, 2018). Van Der Wal et al. (2021) notes that bullying within the organizations leads to a decrease in the quality of services, a loss of confidence, and a decrease in organizational effectiveness. Moreover, a person who is subjected to bullying at work is often absent from work, which negatively affects the completion of tasks within these organizations (Ariza-Montes et al., 2021).

With regard to the relationship between psychological contract breach and workplace bullying; The study of Ali et al. (2019) and Malik et al. (2018) indicated that there is a correlation between psychological breach contract and employees’ practice of bullying behaviors in the workplace. Psychological contract breach between the organization and its employees leads to employees feeling mistrust and anxiety about management decisions, and then they have negative attitudes and behaviors towards work, such as causing some problems with management or supervisors as well as their colleagues, as well as ridicule and psychological abuse of their colleagues at work (Salin & Notelaers, 2017, 2020).

Additionally, Rai and Agarwal (2017, 2018, 2019) explained that breach of psychological contract leads employees to increase their practice of some forms of bullying at work. Rajalakshmi and Naresh (2018) and Kakarika et al. (2017) revealed that adherence to the psychological contract reduces bullying behaviors in the workplace, while breaking the psychological contract leads to an increase in these behaviors among employees. Johnson and O’Leary-Kelly (2003) and Jiang et al. (2017) demonstrated that breaching the psychological contract leads to bullying behaviors at work. Breaching the psychological contract leads to some negative behaviors and practices among employees as a result of their feeling of lack of commitment by the organization towards them, and increasing bullying at work (Zagenczyk et al., 2017). So; We suggest the following hypothesis:

H2: Psychological contract breach affects workplace bullying in tourism companies.
Regarding the relationship and the impact of workplace bullying on job silence; Cheong (2020) highlighted that the increase in workplace bullying behaviors increases the level of job silence, as a result of employees' preference for silence due to fear of psychological abuse from supervisors or co-workers. The results of the Farjam et al. (2018) discussed that there is a relationship between workplace bullying and employees' engaging in job silence behaviors, where employees are afraid of being severely criticized, devalued ideas, or ignored, and therefore prefer silence and non-participation. Besides, there are many factors that affect job silence such as trust in the supervisor, workload, and bullying according to Kim et al. (2018). Hence, the following hypotheses are proposed:

**H3:** workplace bullying affects job silence in tourism companies.

**H4:** workplace bullying mediates the relationship between psychological contract breach and job silence in tourism companies.

**Methodology**

The current study employs a quantitative and deductive research technique. According to Cooper et al. (2006), the quantitative research design is the most suited strategy for investigating correlations between latent variables, testing models, and hypotheses. Quantitative research methodology is better suited for analyzing group association and minimization of relationships when evaluating hypotheses. To achieve the study objectives, the survey method used a questionnaire as the tool to gather data for statistical analysis. (Zaman et al., 2021).

**Population and sample**

This research was conducted among the employees of tourism companies – category A – in Hurghada and Sharm EL-Sheikh. The ideal research sample size, as Hair et al. (2021) suggested, can vary between 10 and 20 times the number of latent constructs. As a result, the required sample size for the study was set at 360, which appears to be more appropriate for analysis given that the three latent constructs included (psychological contract breach (5 items), workplace bullying (16 items), and job silence (15 items). A big sample size is generally ideal to eliminate the possibility of non-response bias (Schouten et al., 2009). As a result, 492 questionnaires forms were provided to the participants in order to reach the aspired sample size. Finally, for the statistical analysis, 418 completed valid questionnaires were employed. 70.6% of the respondents were male, while 29.4% were female. Those aged 35 to less than 45 years account for 39.8% of the total, followed by those aged 45 to less than 55 years (29.1%), less than 35 years (20.4%), and 55 years and over (10.7%). Bachelor's degree (73.5%), medium degree (18.7%), and postgraduate degree (7.8%) are the educational levels of the respondents. 38.3% of respondents have experience from 5 to less than 10 years, 36.2% (10 to less than 15 years), 18% (15 years and above), and 7.5% (less than 5 years) as depicted in the table (1).
Table (1): Respondents' profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 35 years</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to less than 45 years</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to less than 55 years</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 years and above</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to less than 10 years</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to less than 15 years</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years and above</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures

The scales used to evaluate all latent variables contained adapted items from previous research that had been adjusted to be more relevant for the sample (Hair et al., 2021). The Likert scale is designed to explore how strongly respondents would agree or disagree with a certain item (Croasmun & Ostrom, 2011; Joshi et al., 2015). The primary goal of a five-point Likert scale is to provide respondents with additional alternatives and to represent the increased variety in respondents' mindsets and attitudes (Chyung et al., 2017). Psychological contract breach (PCB) was assessed with a 5-item scale developed from Karatepe et al. (2021). To measure job silence (JSL) a 15-items scale by Dyne et al. (2003) was adopted. Finally, workplace bullying (WBL) was measured by a 16-items scale adopted from Jung and Yoon (2018).

Reliability and validity

The reliability of the measurement model can be determined using two values, Cronbach's alpha coefficient (0.7 and above) and composite reliability (0.7 and above) (Shrestha, 2021; Janadari et al., 2016). As indicated in Table (2), the Cronbach's alpha values ranged from 0.803 to 0.883 and .827-.897 for composite reliability that confirms that the instruments' measurements are consistent. Convergent validity may be determined by examining the factor loading values, the composite reliability, and its extracted average variance (AVE) (higher than .5) as Hair et al. (2021) suggested. The results of table (2) confirmed the reliability and validity of all variables.

Table (2): The results of reliability and validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PCB</th>
<th>JSL</th>
<th>WBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranging of item loadings</td>
<td>.758-.833</td>
<td>.804-.893</td>
<td>.767-.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's alpha</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite reliability</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Henseler et al. (2015) recommended, it is desirable to check the discriminating validity in PLS-SEM to further investigate the model's discriminating validity. This is accomplished by examining the HTMT criteria value to ensure that the items across the construct are measuring distinct constructs in the model (Ab Hamid et al., 2017; Hair et al., 2020). It is determined by observing that the positive interval value of HTMT metrics does not contain the value of 1 for a full build mixture and evaluating the value of HTMT less than 0.90 (Sarstedt et al., 2017; Henseler et al., 2015). As a result, Table (3) shows that the overall model's HTMT value is less than 0.90, indicating that the model has little discriminating validity. To verify the overall factor structure of variables, confirmatory factor analysis was undertaken. As seen in table (4), the measurement model analysis provided a satisfactory fit to the data.

### Table (3): Discriminant validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>PCB</th>
<th>JSL</th>
<th>WBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSL</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table (4): Confirmatory factor analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indices</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normed chi-square</td>
<td>3.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index (NFI)</td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Test of hypotheses

The results of the suggested model's structural equation modelling using the maximum likelihood technique are shown in table (5). The investigation of structural model relations, as shown in table (5), reveals that psychological contract breach has a considerable positive link ($\beta=.638$, $p$-value=.000) with job silence. As a result, H1 is acceptable. H2 was acceptable since there is a positive link between psychological contract breach and workplace bullying ($\beta=.489$, $p$-value =.000). Table (5) also showed that workplace bullying is positively related to job silence ($\beta=.493$, $p$-value=.000). So, H3 is accepted.

Bootstrapping is a technique that is used to examine the indirect influence of prospective variables (Biesanz et al., 2010). According to Sarstedt et al. (2014); Koopman et al. (2015) and Streukens and Leroi-Werelds (2016), bootstrapping is one of the most precise and effective techniques for investigating the mediation effect, which is gaining popularity among academics. Zeng et al. (2021) and Hair et al. (2017) added that because it may be utilized with small sample numbers, bootstrapping is most suited for agreement analysis in PLS-SEM. This research used Smart PLS 3.0 and 500-re-sample bootstrapping to examine the effect of psychological contract breach on job silence via workplace bullying, and the t-values were exhibited. Both direct and indirect effects are examined for the role of workplace...
bullying. The psychological contract breach has a considerable direct influence on job silence as β = .638 and p-value = .000. The value of β in table (6) was .287 and the p-value was .021, indicating the link between psychological contract breach and job silence remains significant, but it weakens when mediating variable (workplace bullying) is included. These findings show that workplace bullying mediates the connection between psychological contract breach and job silence in part. Therefore, H4 is accepted.

**Table (5): SEM results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: PCB – JSL</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>10.814</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: PCB – WBL</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>14.818</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: WBL – JSL</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>9.667</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table (6): Bias-Corrected Bootstrapped result**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>VAF</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H4: PCB – WBL - JSL</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>7.359</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion and recommendations**

The main objective of this research was to explore the impact of psychological contract breach on job silence through workplace bullying in tourism companies -category A - in Hurghada and Sharm EL-Sheikh. The results of the study clarified that there is a significant and positive correlation between psychological contract breach and job silence. This result was supported by the study of Morsch et al. (2020), which highlighted that there is a positive link between the breach of psychological contract and job silence. The study of Khan et al. (2021) also supported this result, as it clarified the positive effect of breaching the psychological contract on job silence. As well, the results highlighted the significant and positive link between psychological contract breach and workplace bullying. This result is consistent with the study of Salin and Notelaer (2017) and Salin and Notelaer (2019), which depicted a significant and positive relationship between psychological contract breach and workplace bullying. Also, Rai and Agarwal (2017), Jiang et al. (2017), and Zagenczyk et al. (2017) indicated that psychological contract breach leads to an increase in the practice of forms of workplace bullying. Additionally, the results depicted that there is a significant and positive relationship between workplace bullying and job silence. Cheong (2020) and Kim et al. (2018) supported this result, as the results of their study demonstrated that there is a positive effect of the prevalence of bullying behaviors in the workplace on increasing the employee's involvement in job silence behaviors. This result is in line with Farjam et al. (2018), who concluded that there is a significant and positive relationship between bullying and job silence. Finally, mediation analysis revealed that workplace bullying partially mediates the association between psychological contract breach and job silence. Based on the previous results, which highlighted the existence of an effect of psychological contract breach on workplace bullying and job silence. The management should constantly fulfill all its promises and obligations because these promises motivate employees to make more efforts to achieve what is required of them. Failure to fulfill these promises negatively affects the employees, causing them not to trust the management, and not making additional
efforts to achieve the desired goals effectively, as well as not sharing their information and ideas to solve work problems and develop the company. Therefore, all promises should be fully adhered to, and not exaggerated, so that the company can fulfill them.

To avoid the spread of bullying behavior in the company; Management should adopt some leadership styles that support positive attitudes and behaviors such as ethical leadership, charitable leadership, and authentic leadership. There is also a need to develop an ethical charter according to which all employees within companies deal, and the management is more committed to this charter in its dealings with employees, in order to set an example for all employees.

The management should also develop some punitive measures for those who transgress the right of their colleagues or deliberately harm them. Also; Fair and transparent dealing away from mediocrity and favoritism so that employees feel justice among all, and then their sense of appreciation increases, which is reflected in their increased participation in developing work and solving its problems.

Furthermore; The management should follow the open-door policy and provide a safe environment at work to encourage employees to speak without fear or concern about work problems, as well as motivate them to put forward opinions and suggestions that would solve these problems and develop work. Finally, companies should be keen on enhancing organizational trust between management and employees, and between employees, and emphasizing the principles of respect and honesty in dealings, so that a positive work climate prevails away from conflicts and problems.

Limitations and future research

While this research provides essential information to policymakers, it does have a number of limitations. This research assessed the effect of psychological contract breach on both workplace bullying and job silence. Future research is recommended to examine the impact of psychological contract breach on other organizational and employees' outcomes such as organizational sustainability, organizational agility, change management, and service quality. As well, this research investigated the mediating role of workplace bullying in the link between psychological contract breach and job silence. Future research could examine other mediator or moderator variables other than workplace bullying like leadership style, job security, well-being, compensations, and human resources management policies. Finally, we applied this research to the tourism companies in Hurghada and Sharm El-Sheikh. The future research could be comparative studies between tourism companies, hotels, and airlines in relation to these effects, and demonstrate the reasons for the difference in the results, if any.

References


• Pozveh, A. Z., & Karimi, F. (2016). The Relationship between Organizational Climate and the Organizational Silence of Administrative Staff in Education Department. International Education Studies, 9(6), 120-129.


تأثير الإخلال بالعقد النفسي على الصمت الوظيفي في شركات السياحة: التنمر في مكان العمل كمتغير وسيط
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ملخص العربي:
تهدف الدراسة إلى قياس تأثير الإخلال بالعقد النفسي على الصمت الوظيفي في مكان العمل في شركات السياحة، وتحديد هل التنمر في مكان العمل يلعب دورًا وسيطًا في العلاقة بين الإخلال بالعقد النفسي والصمت الوظيفي. تم تصميم استمارة لجمع بيانات 418 استمارة من العاملين في شركات السياحة في كل من مدينة الغردقة وشرم الشيخ، حيث تم توزيع 492 استمارة، بينما تم الاعتماد على تحليل 418 استمارة فقط. وقد أوضحت النتائج أن تنمر في مكان العمل يؤثر على الصمت الوظيفي. كما بيّنت النتائج أن الإخلال بالعقد النفسي يؤدي إلى زيادة متوسطي التنمر في مكان العمل، والصمت الوظيفي. أخيراً، بيّنت النتائج أن التنمر بالعقد النفسي يؤثر على الصمت الوظيفي في شركات السياحة من خلال التنمر في مكان العمل كمتغير وسيط.

الكلمات الدالة: العقد النفسي، الصمت الوظيفي، التنمر في العمل، شركات السياحة، الغردقة، شرم الشيخ.