

CHAPTER TEN

**OBJECTIVE 3: TO DETERMINE THE AFFECT OF
PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT AND PSYCHOLOGICAL
CONTRACT BREACH ON EMPLOYEES OF PUBLIC
AND PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES OF ASSAM**

OBJECTIVE 3: To determine the affect of Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach on employees of Public and Private Universities of Assam

For our first objective, we found out the effect of Psychological Breach on employees' Employment Relationship and Organizational Support. For the second objective, we found out the effect of Psychological Breach on employees' Organizational Trust, Job Satisfaction and Recognition. For our third and final objective, we have tried to find out the combined effect of both Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach on employees of Public and Private Universities of Assam.

For the impact on employees, we have determined two factors based on literature review along with focus group discussion and pilot survey. The factors which will determine the effect on employees are- Employee Engagement and Employee Commitment.

For our third objective, we need to check the degree of significance between Psychological Contract and its Breach on the variables. For the same, multiple regression is undertaken.

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

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

Assumption 2: No multicollinearity 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 linear regression, multiple linear regression is computed for the data.

The influence of Psychological Contract Breach and Psychological Contract on Employee Engagement and Employee Commitment is measured.

Central University Employees data:

Employee Engagement

We shall be performing multiple linear regression to determine the relationship between Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach on Employee Engagement.

Therefore the hypotheses for the same are-

H_0 = “There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employee Engagement among Central University employees”

H_1 = “There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employee Engagement among Central University employees”

H_0 = “There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Engagement among Central University employees”

H_1 = “There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Engagement among Central University employees”

Following the regression analysis, it is seen that the adjusted R square is 0.493 which is interpreted as 49.3% variance in Employee Engagement is explained by Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach.

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 PC and PCB. “For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis”. PC has a significant value of 0.000 and therefore we can interpret that Psychological Contract has a statistically significant relationship with Psychological Contract Breach. Similarly, Psychological Contract Breach has a significant value of 0.000009 and hence we can conclude that there is significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Engagement.

For the regression equation we have the beta values for PC and PCB as 0.509 and 0.395 which implies that- for every unit of change in Psychological Contract, there is a change of 0.509 times in Employee Engagement and for every unit of change in Psychological Contract Breach, there is a change of 0.395 times in Employee Engagement.

More the fulfilment of Psychological Contract, more is the Employee Engagement. Less the Psychological Contract Breach, more is the Employee Engagement.

Table 8.33: Table showing the model summary results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (Central Universities) – Employee Engagement

R value	R Square value	R Square (Adjusted) value	Standard Error of Estimate
.706	.498	.493	.72537

Table 8.34: Table showing the ANOVA results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (Central Universities) – Employee Engagement

	Sum of Squares	Mean Square value	F value	Significant value
Regression	95.034	47.517	90.308	.000
Residual	95.762	.526		
Total	190.796			

Table 8.35: Table showing the Coefficients results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (Central Universities) – Employee Engagement

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients values		Standardized Coefficients value	Significant value
	B	Standard Error	Beta value	
(Constant)	.709	.373		.059
1 PC_2	.509	.081	.446	.000
PCB_1	.395	.087	.324	.000

Employee Commitment

We shall be performing multiple linear regression to determine the relationship between Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach on Employee Commitment. Therefore the hypotheses for the same are-

H_0 = “There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employee Commitment among Central University employees”

H_1 = “There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employee Commitment among Central University employees”

H_0 = “There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Commitment among Central University employees”

H_1 = “There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Commitment among Central University employees”

Following the regression analysis, it is seen that the adjusted R square is 0.668 which is interpreted as 66.8% variance in Employee Commitment is explained by Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach.

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 PC and PCB. “For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis”. PC has a significant value of 0.000 and therefore we can interpret that there is significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employee Commitment. Similarly, Psychological Contract Breach has a significant value of 0.000 and hence we can conclude that Psychological Contract Breach has a statistically significant relationship with Employee Commitment.

For the regression equation we have the beta values for PC and PCB as 0.681 and 0.400 which implies that- for every unit of change in Psychological Contract, there is a change of 0.681 times in Employee Commitment and for every unit of change in Psychological Contract Breach, there is a change of 0.400 times in Employee Commitment.

More the fulfilment of Psychological Contract, more is the Employee Commitment.

Less the Psychological Contract Breach, more is the Employee Engagement.

Table 8.35: Table showing the model summary results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (Central Universities) – Employee Commitment

R value	R Square value	R Square (Adjusted) value	Standard Error of Estimate
.820	.672	.668	.60974

Table 8.36: Table showing the ANOVA results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (Central Universities) – Employee Commitment

	Sum of Squares	Mean Square value	F value	Significant value
Regression	138.591	69.295	186.385	.000
Residual	67.665	.372		
Total	206.256			

Table 8.37: Table showing the Coefficients results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (Central Universities) – Employee Commitment

	Unstandardized Coefficients values		Standardized Coefficients value	Significant value
	B	Standard Error	Beta value	
(Constant)	-.419	.314		.183
PC_2	.681	.068	.574	.000
PCB_1	.400	.073	.315	.000

Private University Employees:

Employee Engagement

We shall be performing multiple linear regression to determine the relationship between Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach on Employee Engagement. Therefore the hypotheses for the same are-

H_0 = “There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employee Engagement among Private University employees”

H_1 = “There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employee Engagement among Private University employees”

H_0 = “There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Engagement among Private University employees”

H_1 = “There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Engagement among Private University employees”

Following the regression analysis, it is seen that the adjusted R square is 0.637 which is interpreted as 63.7% variance in Employee Engagement is explained by Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach.

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 PC and PCB. “For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis”. PC has a significant value of 0.000 and therefore we can interpret that Psychological Contract has a statistically significant relationship with Psychological Contract Breach. Similarly, Psychological Contract Breach has a significant value of 0.0034 and hence we can conclude that there is significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Engagement.

For the regression equation we have the beta values for PC and PCB as 0.734 and 0.301 which implies that- for every unit of change in Psychological Contract, there is a change of 0.734 times in Employee Engagement and for every unit of change in Psychological Contract Breach, there is a change of 0.301 times in Employee Engagement.

More the fulfilment of Psychological Contract, more is the Employee Engagement.

Less the Psychological Contract Breach, more is the Employee Engagement.

Table 8.38: Table showing the model summary results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (Private Universities) – Employee Engagement

R value	R Square value	R Square (Adjusted) value	Standard Error of Estimate
.802	.643	.637	.59668

Table 8.39: Table showing the ANOVA results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (Private Universities) – Employee Engagement

	Sum of Squares	Mean Square value	F value	Significant value
Regression	74.340	37.170	104.402	.000
Residual	41.299	.356		
Total	115.638			

Table 8.40: Table showing the Coefficients results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (Private Universities) – Employee Engagement

	Unstandardized Coefficients values		Standardized Coefficients value	Significant value
	B	Standard Error	Beta value	
(Constant)	.259	.394		.512
PC_2	.734	.116	.572	.000
PCB_1	.301	.101	.270	.003

Employee Commitment

We have performed multiple linear regression to determine the relationship between Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach on Employee Commitment. Therefore the hypotheses for the same are-

H_0 = “There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employee Commitment among Private University employees”

H_1 = “There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employee Commitment among Private University employees”

H_0 = “There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Commitment among Private University employees”

H_1 = “There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Commitment among Private University employees”

Following the regression analysis, it is seen that the adjusted R square is 0.684 which is interpreted as 68.4% variance in Employee Commitment is explained by Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach.

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 PC and PCB. “For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis” PC has a significant value of 0.000 and hence we can interpret that Psychological Contract has a significant relationship with Employee Commitment. Similarly, Psychological Contract Breach has a significant value of 0.000032 and therefore we can conclude that there is significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Commitment.

For the regression equation we have the beta values for PC and PCB as 0.802 and 0.497 which implies that- for every unit of change in Psychological Contract, there is a change of 0.802 times in Employee Commitment and for every unit of change in Psychological Contract Breach, there is a change of 0.497 times in Employee Commitment.

More the fulfilment of Psychological Contract, more is the Employee Commitment.

Less the Psychological Contract Breach, more is the Employee Commitment.

Table 8.41: Table showing the model summary results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (Private Universities) – Employee Commitment

R value	R Square value	R Square (Adjusted) value	Standard Error of Estimate
.830	.689	.684	.68001

Table 8.42: Table showing the ANOVA results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (Private Universities) – Employee Commitment

	Sum of Squares	Mean Square value	F value	Significant value
Regression	118.849	59.424	128.509	.000
Residual	53.640	.462		
Total	172.489			

Table 8.43: Table showing the Coefficients results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (Private Universities) – Employee Commitment

	Unstandardized Coefficients values		Standardized Coefficients value	Significant value
	B	Standard Error	Beta value	
(Constant)	-1.701	.449		.000
PC_2	.802	.132	.512	.000
PCB_1	.497	.115	.365	.000

State University Employees:

Employee Engagement

We shall be performing multiple linear regression to determine the relationship between Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach on Employee Engagement. Therefore the hypotheses for the same are-

H_0 = “There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employee Engagement among State University employees”

H_1 = “There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employee Engagement among State University employees”

H_0 = “There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Engagement among State University employees”

H_1 = “There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Engagement among State University employees”

Following the regression analysis, it is seen that the adjusted R square is 0.430 which is interpreted as 43% variance in Employee Engagement is explained by Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach.

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 PC and PCB. “For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis”. PC has a significant value of 0.000 and therefore we can interpret that there is significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employee Engagement. Similarly, Psychological Contract Breach has a significant value of 0.000166 and hence we can conclude that Psychological Contract Breach has a statistically significant relationship with Employee Engagement.

For the regression equation we have the beta values for PC and PCB as 0.588 and 0.225 which implies that- for every unit of change in Psychological Contract, there is a change of 0.588 times in Employee Engagement and for every unit of change in Psychological Contract Breach, there is a change of 0.225 times in Employee Engagement.

More the fulfilment of Psychological Contract, more is the Employee Engagement.

Less the Psychological Contract Breach, more is the Employee Engagement.

Table 8.44: Table showing the model summary results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (State Universities) – Employee Engagement

R value	R Square value	R Square (Adjusted) value	Standard Error of Estimate
.830	.689	.684	.68001

Table 8.45: Table showing the ANOVA results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (State Universities) – Employee Engagement

	Sum of Squares	Mean Square value	F value	Significant value
Regression	118.849	59.424	128.509	.000
Residual	53.640	.462		
Total	172.489			

Table 8.46: Table showing the Coefficients results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (State Universities) – Employee Engagement

	Unstandardized Coefficients values		Standardized Coefficients value	Significant value
	B	Standard Error	Beta value	
(Constant)	-1.701	.449		.000
PC_2	.802	.132	.512	.000
PCB_1	.497	.115	.365	.000

Employee Commitment

We have performed multiple linear regression to determine the relationship between Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach on Employee Commitment. Therefore the hypotheses for the same are-

H_0 = “There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employee Commitment among State University employees”

H_1 = “There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract and Employee Commitment among State University employees”

H_0 = “There is no significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Commitment among State University employees”

H_1 = “There is significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Commitment among State University employees”

Following the regression analysis, it is seen that the adjusted R square is 0.454 which is interpreted as 45.4% variance in Employee Commitment is explained by Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach.

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 PC and PCB. “For values less than the p-value (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis”. PC has a significant value of 0.000 and therefore we can interpret that Psychological Contract has a statistically significant relationship with Employee Commitment. Similarly, Psychological Contract Breach has a significant value of 0.0067 and therefore we can conclude that there is significant relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee Commitment.

For the regression equation we have the beta values for PC and PCB as 0.788 and 0.182 which implies that- for every unit of change in Psychological Contract, there is a change of 0.788 times in Employee Commitment and for every unit of change in Psychological Contract Breach, there is a change of 0.182 times in Employee Commitment.

More the fulfilment of Psychological Contract, more is the Employee Commitment.

Less the Psychological Contract Breach, more is the Employee Commitment.

Table 8.47: Table showing the model summary results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (State Universities) – Employee Commitment

R value	R Square value	R Square (Adjusted) value	Standard Error of Estimate
.676	.458	.454	.79799

Table 8.48: Table showing the ANOVA results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (State Universities) – Employee Commitment

	Sum of Squares	Mean Square value	F value	Significant value
Regression	167.548	83.774	131.558	.000
Residual	198.676	.637		
Total	366.224			

Table 8.49: Table showing the Coefficients results for regression analysis of Objective 3 (State Universities) – Employee Commitment

	Unstandardized Coefficients values		Standardized Coefficients value	Significant value
	B	Standard Error	Beta value	
(Constant)	.288	.327		.379
PC_2	.788	.080	.560	.000
PCB_1	.182	.067	.156	.007

Table 8.50: Consolidated table depicting the values from the three categories of universities for Objective 2

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT						
	ADJUSTED R SQUARE	SIGNIFICANT VALUES		BETA VALUES		REGRESSION EQUATION
		PC	PCB	PC	PCB	
CENTRAL UNIVERSITIES	0.493	0.00	0.00009	0.509	0.395	EE predicted = 0.709 + 0.509PC + 0.395PCB
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES	0.637	0.00	0.0034	0.734	0.301	EE predicted = 0.259 + 0.734PC + 0.301PCB
STATE UNIVERSITIES	0.430	0.00	0.000166	0.588	0.225	EE predicted = 1.448 + 0.588PC + 0.225PCB
EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT						
	ADJUSTED R SQUARE	SIGNIFICANT VALUES		BETA VALUES		REGRESSION EQUATION
		PC	PCB	PC	PCB	
CENTRAL UNIVERSITIES	0.668	0.00	0.00	0.681	0.400	EC predicted = -0.419 + 0.681PC + 0.400PCB
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES	0.684	0.00	0.000032	0.802	0.497	EC predicted = -1.701 + 0.802PC + 0.497PCB
STATE UNIVERSITIES	0.454	0.00	0.0067	0.788	0.182	EC predicted = 0.288 + 0.788PC + 0.182PCB

Discussion: For our third objective, we have seen that for the three different types of universities, the effect of Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach varies. Although in varying degrees, the combined impact of PC and PCB definitely has an effect on employees. Considering Employee Engagement and Employee Commitment as factors of employees and their association with the organization, we can see that PC and PCB impacts both the factors individually. Therefore to understand the impact of Psychological Contract and its breach on employees, we have to understand employees' engagement and commitment towards their respective organizations. This leads us to the fulfillment of our third objective in determining the effect of Psychological Contract and Psychological Contract Breach on employees of Public and Private Universities of Assam.

Research work in any field should contribute to the betterment of society and individuals. Any work done on the existing critical issues of our civilization should bear the responsibility of providing solutions for the same. The work was taken in hand, to analyse the present education scenario in the state of Assam with respect to the psychology of their employees. Our work has managed to discover novel findings of the same. Statistical analyses has proven the presence of Psychological Contract, and on its basis, we have provided few suggestions.

A Focus Group Discussion was arranged to examine the present scenario of employees in education institutes of Assam. The discussion helped us pave the way for further research. Valuable inputs from stakeholders helped us determine our variables, importance of our concept and its use in the practical world.