CHAPTER EIGHT

OBJECTIVE 1: TO DETERMINE THE STATUS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT IN THE PRIVATE AND PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES OF ASSAM

OBJECTIVE 1: To determine the status of Psychological Contract in the Private and Public Universities of Assam

The first objective of our study is to check the status of Psychological Contract in the Private and Public Universities of Assam. To understand the status of a particular concept, a number of factors come into play. Since it is not feasible to include all such factors to determine the concept of Psychological Contract, some variables are identified after literature review, focus group discussion and pilot study and they are- Organizational Support and Employment Relationship.

For our first objective, we need to check the degree of significance between Psychological Contract and the variables. For the same, multiple linear regression is undertaken.

"Regression is a statistical tool which is used in predicting the value of a variable based on the value of another variable. The variable to predict is called the dependent / outcome variable and the variable used to predict the other variable's value is called the independent / predictor variable". (Statistics, 2018)

Prior to computing regression on our data, the assumptions of the same are checked.

"Assumption 1: Relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable is linear – Not Violated

Assumption 2: No multi-collinearity in the data – Not violated

Assumption 3: Values of the residuals are independent – Not violated

Assumption 4: Variance of the residuals is constant (homoscedasticity) – Not violated

Assumption 5: Values of the residuals are normally distributed – Not violated

Assumption 6: There are no influential cases biasing the model – Not violated"

After the fulfilment of all the assumptions of regression, multiple linear regression is computed for the data and the influence of Employment Relationship and Organizational Support on Psychological Contract for the three types of universities is measured.

Central University Employees:

We shall be performing multiple linear regression to determine the relationship between Organizational Support and Employment Relationship with Psychological Contract, wherein we have Psychological Contract as the Dependent Variable and Employment

Relationship and Organizational Support as Independent Variables. Therefore the hypotheses for the same are-

H_0 = "There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Organizational Support among Central University employees"

H_1 = "There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Organizational Support among Central University employees"

H_0 = "There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employment Relationship among Central University employees"

H_1 = "There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employment Relationship among Central University employees"

Following the regression analysis, it is seen that the adjusted R square is 0.484 which is interpreted as 48.4% variance in Psychological Contract is explained by Organizational Support (OS) and Employment Relationship (ER).

The significance value from the ANOVA table is 0.00 is less than 0.05, which gives us a statistically significant result.

From the coefficients table we have the significant values of OS and ER. "For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis". OS has a significant value of 0.023 and hence we can interpret that Organizational Support has a statistically significant relationship with Psychological Contract. Similarly, ER has a significant value of 0.000008 and therefore we can conclude that Employment Relationship also has a statistically significant impact on Psychological Contract.

For the regression equation we have the beta values for OS and ER as 0.197 and 0.361 which implies that- for every unit of change in Organizational Support, there is a change of 0.197 times in Psychological Contract and for every unit of change in Employment Relationship, there is a change of 0.361 times in Psychological Contract.

More the Organizational Support more is the chance of fulfilment of Psychological Contract of employees.

More the fulfilment of Employment Relationship more is the chance of fulfilment of Psychological Contract.

Table 8.1: Table showing the model summary for regression analysis of Objective 1 (Central Universities)

R value	R Square value	R Square (Adjusted) value	Standard Error of Estimate
.685	.490	.484	.70024

Table 8.2: Table showing the ANOVA results for regression analysis of Objective 1 (Central Universities)

	Sum of Squares	Mean Square value	F value	Significant value
Regression	57.136	28.568	58.262	.000
Residual	89.242	.490		
Total	146.378			

Table 8.3: Table showing the Coefficient values for regression analysis of Objective 1 (Central Universities

	Unstandardized Coefficients values		Standardized Coefficients value	Significant value
	B	Standard Error	Beta value	
(Constant)	2.418	.269		.000
OS_1	.197	.086	.217	.023
ER_1	.361	.078	.438	.000

Private University Employees:

We shall be performing multiple linear regression to determine the relationship between Organizational Support and Employment Relationship with Psychological Contract. Therefore the hypotheses for the same are-

H_0 = "There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Organizational Support among Private University employees"

H_1 = "There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Organizational Support among Private University employees"

H_0 = "There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employment Relationship among Private University employees"

H_1 = "There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employment Relationship among Private University employees"

Following the regression analysis, it is seen that the adjusted R square is 0.575 which is interpreted as 57.5% variance in Psychological Contract is explained by Organizational Support (OS) and Employment Relationship (ER).

The significance value from the ANOVA table is 0.00 which is less than 0.05, and gives us a statistically significant result.

From the coefficients table we have the significant values of OS and ER. "For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis". OS has a significant value of 0.000033 and therefore we can interpret that Organizational Support has significant relationship with Psychological Contract. Similarly, ER has a significant value of 0.000124 and therefore we can conclude that Employment Relationship has a statistically significant relationship with Psychological Contract.

For the regression equation we have the beta values for OS and ER as 0.321 and 0.297 which implies that- for every unit of change in Organizational Support, there is a change of 0.321 times in Psychological Contract and for every unit of change in Employment Relationship, there is a change of 0.297 times in Psychological Contract.

More the Organizational Support more is the chance of fulfilment of Psychological Contract of employees.

More the fulfilment of Employment Relationship more is the chance of fulfilment of Psychological Contract.

Table 8.4: Table showing the model summary for regression analysis of Objective 1 (Private Universities)

R value	R Square value	R Square (Adjusted) value	Standard Error of Estimate
.763[a]	.582	.575	.50280

Table 8.5: Table showing the ANOVA results for regression analysis of Objective 1 (Private Universities)

	Sum of Squares	Mean Square value	F value	Significant value
Regression	40.828	20.414	80.749	.000
Residual	29.326	.253		
Total	70.154			

Table 8.6: Table showing the Coefficients results for regression analysis of Objective 1 (Private Universities)

	Unstandardized Coefficients values		Standardized Coefficients value	Significant value
	B	Standard Error	Beta value	
(Constant)	1.856	.277		.000
OS_1	.321	.074	.420	.000
ER_1	.297	.075	.387	.000

State University Employees:

We shall be performing multiple linear regression to determine the relationship between Organizational Support and Employment Relationship with Psychological Contract. Therefore the hypotheses for the same are-

H_0 = "There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Organizational Support among State University employees"

H_1 = "There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Organizational Support among State University employees"

H_0 = "There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employment Relationship among State University employees"

H_1 = "There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employment Relationship among State University employees"

Following the regression analysis, it is seen that the adjusted R square is 0.485 which is interpreted as 48.5% variance in Psychological Contract is explained by Organizational Support (OS) and Employment Relationship(ER).

The significance value from the ANOVA table is 0.00 which is less than 0.05, which gives us a statistically significant result.

From the coefficients table we have the significant values of OS and ER. "For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis" OS has a significant value of 0.000160 and can therefore interpret that Organizational Support has a statistically significant relationship with Psychological Contract. Similarly, ER has a significant

value of 0.000 and hence we can conclude that Employment Relationship has a significant relationship with Psychological Contract.

For the regression equation we have the beta values for OS and ER as 0.266 and 0.392 which implies that- for every unit of change in Organizational Support, there is a change of 0. 266 times in Psychological Contract and for every unit of change in Employment Relationship, there is a change of 0. 392 times in Psychological Contract. Taking prior literature review into account, the adjusted R square in our model ranges from 0.4 – 0.6 and therefore we can say that it is a moderate-strong model. (Falk & Miller, 1992), (Cohen, 1988), (Chin, 1998), (Hair, Joseph, Ringle, Christian, & Marko, 2013)

More the Organizational Support more is the chance of fulfilment of Psychological Contract of employees.

More the fulfilment of Employment Relationship more is the chance of fulfilment of Psychological Contract.

Table 8.7: Table showing the model summary results for regression analysis of Objective 1 (State Universities)

R value	R Square value	R Square (Adjusted) value	Standard Error of Estimate
.680	.485	.481	.60424

Table 8.8: Table showing the ANOVA results for regression analysis of Objective 1 (State Universities)

	Sum of Squares	Mean Square value	F value	Significa nt value
Regression	71.265	35.632	97.595	.000
Residual	113.912	.365		
Total	185.177			

Table 8.9: Table showing the Coefficients results for regression analysis of Objective 1 (State Universities)

	Unstandardized Coefficients values		Standardized Coefficients value	Significant value
	B	Standard Error	Beta value	
(Constant)	2.913	.179		.000
OS_1	.192	.050	.266	.000
ER_1	.267	.047	.392	.000

Table 8.10: Consolidated table depicting the values from the three categories of universities for Objective 1

	ADJUSTED R SQUARE	SIGNIFICANT VALUES		BETA VALUES		REGRESSION EQUATION
		OS	ER	OS	ER	
CENTRAL UNIVERSITIES	0.484	0.023	0.000008	0.197	0.361	PC predicted = 2.418 + 0.197OS + 0.361ER
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES	0.575	0.000033	0.000124	0.321	0.297	PC predicted = 1.856 + 0.321 OS + 0.297ER
STATE UNIVERSITIES	0.481	0.000160	0.000	0.266	0.392	PC predicted = 2.913 + 0.192 OS + 0.267ER

Discussion: For our first objective, we have seen that for the three different types of universities, the status of Psychological Contract varies in accordance with its variables. For every change in the variables of Psychological Contract i.e., Organizational Support and Employment Relationship, the status of Psychological Contract changes, in different ratio. Since the factors have p-values less than 0.05, it can be determined that they are significantly related with Psychological Contract. Therefore to make changes in the status of Psychological Contract of employees, effort should be made to improve the Organizational Support and Employment Relationship in different universities. This leads us to the fulfillment of our first objective in determining the status of Psychological Contract in the Private and Public Universities of Assam

For a detailed status of Psychological Contract among employees of different universities, analyses were done with few of the *Demographic Factors* as well. These are as follows:

GENDER- To analyze the Psychological Contract of employees based on their gender, "Independent Samples T-tests" for employees' data of Central, State and Private Universities were done

Central Universities:

"Independent Samples t-test" was done to analyze the relationship between Psychological Contract (PC) mean scores and Gender mean scores. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = "The mean scores of Psychological Contract and Gender groups are not significantly different among Central University employees"

H_1 = “The mean scores of Psychological Contract and Gender groups are significantly different among Central University employees”

“For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis”. The significance value found is 0.729, and therefore we conclude that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of PC and gender for Central University employees

State Universities:

“Independent Samples t-test” was done to analyze the relationship between Psychological Contract (PC) mean scores and Gender mean scores. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = “The mean scores of Psychological Contract and Gender groups are not significantly different among State University employees”
H_1 = “The mean scores of Psychological Contract and Gender groups are significantly different among State University employees”

“For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis”. The significance value found is 0.181, and therefore we conclude that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of PC and gender for State University employees

Private Universities:

“Independent Samples t-test” was done to analyze the relationship between Psychological Contract (PC) mean scores and Gender mean scores. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = “The mean scores of Psychological Contract and Gender groups are not significantly different among Private University employees”
H_1 = “The mean scores of Psychological Contract and Gender groups are significantly different among Private University employees”

"For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis". The significance value found is 0.767, and therefore we conclude that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of PC and gender for Private University employees

Table 8.11: Table showing the significant values and analyses for the three types of universities for Objective 1 (Gender)

	GENDER	
	SIGNIFICANT VALUE	**ANALYSIS**
CENTRAL UNIVERSITIES	0.729	No significant difference between Gender and Psychological Contract among employees of Central Universities
STATE UNIVERSITIES	0.018	Significant difference between Gender and Psychological Contract among employees of State Universities
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES	0.767	No significant difference between Gender and Psychological Contract among employees of Private Universities

AWARENESS OF PC- To analyze the Psychological Contract of employees based on their awareness of PC, Independent Samples T-tests for employees' data of Central, State and Private Universities were done

Central Universities:

"Independent Samples t-test" was done to analyze the relationship between Psychological Contract (PC) mean scores and Awareness of PC mean scores. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = "The mean scores of Psychological Contract and Awareness of PC are not significantly different among Central University employees"

H_1 = "The mean scores of Psychological Contract and Awareness of PC are significantly different among Central University employees"

"For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis". The significance value found is 0.387, therefore we conclude that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of PC and awareness of PC for Central University employees

State Universities:

"Independent Samples t-test" was done to analyze the relationship between Psychological Contract (PC) mean scores and Awareness of PC mean scores. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = "The mean scores of Psychological Contract and Awareness of PC are not significantly different among State University employees"

H_1 = "The mean scores of Psychological Contract and Awareness of PC are significantly different among State University employees"

"For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis". The significance value found is 0.810, and therefore we conclude that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of PC and awareness of PC for State University employees

Private Universities:

"Independent Samples t-test" was done to analyze the relationship between Psychological Contract (PC) mean scores and Awareness of PC mean scores. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = "The mean scores of Psychological Contract and Awareness of PC are not significantly different among Private University employees"

H_1 = "The mean scores of Psychological Contract and Awareness of PC are significantly different among Private University employees"

"For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis". The significance value found is 0.915, and therefore we conclude that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of PC and awareness of PC for Private University employees

Table 8.12: Table showing the significant values and analyses for the three types of universities for Objective 1 (Awareness of the term 'Psychological Contract')

	AWARENESS OF THE TERM 'PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT'	
	SIGNIFICANT VALUE	**ANALYSIS**
CENTRAL UNIVERSITIES	0.387	No significant difference between Awareness of PC and Psychological Contract among employees of Central Universities
STATE UNIVERSITIES	0.810	No significant difference between Awareness of PC and Psychological Contract among employees of State Universities
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES	0.915	No significant difference between Awareness of PC and Psychological Contract among employees of Private Universities

To analyze the Psychological Contract of employees based on their Designation, Age, Education Level, Type of job role, their belief on the existence of PC and whether or not they are provided with legal employment contract, One-way ANOVA tests were done.

DESIGNATION- To analyze the Psychological Contract of employees based on their Designation, "One-way ANOVA" tests for employees' data of Central, State and Private Universities were done:

Central Universities:
"One-way ANOVA" test was done to analyze the relationship between average Psychological Contract (PC) scores across the Designation groups. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = "Average PC scores for all the designation groups are equal for Central University employees"
H_1 = "Average PC scores for all the designation groups are not equal for Central University employees"

"For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis". The significance value found is 0.001, and therefore we conclude that the average PC scores across all the groups of Designation are not equal for Central University employees.

State Universities:
"One-way ANOVA" test was done to analyze the relationship between average Psychological Contract (PC) scores across the Designation groups. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = "Average PC scores for all the designation groups are equal for State University employees"
H_1 = "Average PC scores for all the designation groups are not equal for State University employees"

"For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis". The significance value found is 0.733, and therefore we conclude that the average PC scores across all the groups of Designation are equal for State University employees.

Private Universities:

"One-way ANOVA" test was done to analyze the relationship between average Psychological Contract (PC) scores across the Designation groups. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = "Average PC scores for all the designation groups are equal for Private University employees"
H_1 = "Average PC scores for all the designation groups are not equal for Private University employees"

"For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis". The significance value found is 0.174, and therefore we conclude that the average PC scores across all the groups of Designation are equal for Private University employees.

Table 8.13: Table showing the significant values and analyses for the three types of universities for Objective 1 (Designation)

	EMPLOYEE DESIGNATION	
	SIGNIFICANT VALUE	**ANALYSIS**
CENTRAL UNIVERSITIES	0.001	The average PC scores across all the groups of Designation are not equal
STATE UNIVERSITIES	0.733	The average PC scores across all the groups of Designation are equal
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES	0.174	The average PC scores across all the groups of Designation are equal

AGE- To analyze the Psychological Contract of employees based on their Age, One-way ANOVA tests for employees' data of Central, State and Private Universities were done:

Central Universities:
"One-way ANOVA" test was done to analyze the relationship between average Psychological Contract (PC) scores across the Age groups. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = "Average PC scores for all the age groups are equal for Central University employees"

H_1 = “Average PC scores for all the age groups are not equal for Central University employees”

“For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis”. The significance value found is 0.0422, and therefore we conclude that the average PC scores across all the Age groups are not equal for Central University employees.

State Universities:

“One-way ANOVA” test was done to analyze the relationship between average Psychological Contract (PC) scores across the Age groups. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = “Average PC scores for all the age groups are equal for State University employees”

H_1 = “Average PC scores for all the age groups are not equal for State University employees”

“For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis”. The significance value found is 0.233, and therefore we conclude that the average PC scores across all the Age groups are equal for State University employees.

Private Universities:

“One-way ANOVA” test was done to analyze the relationship between average Psychological Contract (PC) scores across the Age groups. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = “Average PC scores for all the age groups are equal for Private University employees”

H_1 = “Average PC scores for all the age groups are not equal for Private University employees”

“For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis”. The significance value found is 0.990, and therefore we conclude that the average PC scores across all the Age groups are equal for Private University employees.

Table 8.14: Table showing the significant values and analyses for the three types of universities for Objective 1 (Age)

	AGE	
	SIGNIFICANT VALUE	**ANALYSIS**
CENTRAL UNIVERSITIES	0.0422	The average PC scores across all the age groups are not equal
STATE UNIVERSITIES	0.233	The average PC scores across all the age groups are equal
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES	0.990	The average PC scores across all the age groups are equal

EDUCATION LEVEL- To analyze the Psychological Contract of employees based on their Education level, “One-way ANOVA” tests for employees’ data of Central, State and Private Universities were done:

Central Universities:

“One-way ANOVA” test was done to analyze the relationship between average Psychological Contract (PC) scores across the Education levels. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = “Average PC scores for all the education levels are equal for Central University employees”

H_1 = “Average PC scores for all the education levels are not equal for Central University employees”

“For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis”. The significance value found is 0.336, and therefore we conclude that the average PC scores across all the Education levels are equal for Central University employees.

State Universities:

“One-way ANOVA” test was done to analyze the relationship between average Psychological Contract (PC) scores across the Education levels. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = "Average PC scores for all the education levels are equal for State University employees"

H_1 = "Average PC scores for all the education levels are not equal for State University employees"

"For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis". The significance value found is 0.019, and therefore we conclude that the average PC scores across all the Education levels are not equal for State University employees.

Private Universities:

"One-way ANOVA" test was done to analyze the relationship between average Psychological Contract (PC) scores across the Education levels. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = "Average PC scores for all the education levels are equal for Private University employees"

H_1 = "Average PC scores for all the education levels are not equal for Private University employees"

"For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis". The significance value found is 0.430, and therefore we conclude that the average PC scores across all the Education levels are equal for Private University employees.

Table 8.15: Table showing the significant values and analyses for the three types of universities for Objective 1 (Education level)

	EDUCATION LEVEL	
	SIGNIFICANT VALUE	**ANALYSIS**
CENTRAL UNIVERSITIES	0.336	The average PC scores across the education levels are equal
STATE UNIVERSITIES	0.019	The average PC scores across the education levels are not equal
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES	0.430	The average PC scores across the education levels are equal

JOB ROLE- To analyze the Psychological Contract of employees based on their Job roles, "One-way ANOVA" tests for employees' data of Central, State and Private Universities were done:

Central Universities:

"One-way ANOVA" test was done to analyze the relationship between average Psychological Contract (PC) scores across Job roles. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = "Average PC scores for the Job roles are equal for Central University employees"
H_1 = "Average PC scores for the Job roles are not equal for Central University employees"

"For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis". The significance value found is 0.181, and therefore we conclude that the average PC scores across all the Job roles are equal for Central University employees.

State Universities:

"One-way ANOVA" test was done to analyze the relationship between average Psychological Contract (PC) scores across Job roles. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = "Average PC scores for the Job roles are equal for State University employees"
H_1 = "Average PC scores for the Job roles are not equal for State University employees"

"For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis". The significance value found is 0.215, and therefore we conclude that the average PC scores across all the Job roles are equal for State University employees.

Private Universities:

"One-way ANOVA" test was done to analyze the relationship between average Psychological Contract (PC) scores across Job roles. Hypotheses for the same are as follows:

H_0 = "Average PC scores for the Job roles are equal for Private University employees"
H_1 = "Average PC scores for the Job roles are not equal for Private University employees"

“For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis”. The significance value found is 0.403, and therefore we conclude that the average PC scores across all the Job roles are equal for Private University employees.

Table 8.16: Table showing the significant values and analyses for the three types of universities for Objective 1 (Job role)

	JOB ROLE	
	SIGNIFICANT VALUE	**ANALYSIS**
CENTRAL UNIVERSITIES	0.181	The average PC scores across the Job roles are equal
STATE UNIVERSITIES	0.215	The average PC scores across the Job roles are equal
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES	0.403	The average PC scores across the Job roles are equal