

Influence Of Marital Status On Psychological Contract Breach And Employee Outcomes: A Study On IT Sector Employees

Dr Paresh R. Lingadkar¹

Abstract

The study tried to examine the moderating role of marital status in the relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Job outcomes. Using Hierarchical Multiple Regression, the study examined the effect of marital status on Job satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Perceives Organizational Support, Turnover Intention. The result indicated that there is a significant effect of marital status on Psychological Contract Breach and all the above employee outcomes. However, Marital Status did not moderate the relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and employee outcomes.

Keywords: Marital Status, Job satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Perceives Organizational Support, Turnover Intention, Hierarchical Multiple Regression, IT employees Psychological Contract Breach.

Introduction

The employment relationship has undergone several significant changes in recent years. This change has been brought about by the increase in globalization of business, by the dramatic rise in the number of mergers, restructurings, and layoffs, and by the increasing rate of change that permeates all of organizational life today (Kissler 1994; Parks & Kidder 1994). As a result of these events, Psychological Contracts have become increasingly important in helping to define the contemporary employment relationship.

The term Psychological Contract is found as a concept in psychological literature almost fifty years ago, as a footnote in understanding Organizational Behavior (Argyris, 1960). Psychological Contract is an extremely wide thought that is open for huge series of explanation and theoretical studies. Above all, Psychological Contract refers to the association connecting organization and its employee and concerned with shared prospect. It has been used by many researchers as a tool to describe the employment relationship.

Researchers have referred to the Psychological Contract as an unwritten contract and have identified two major types of Psychological Contract (Robinson 1996; Rousseau 1989; Tijoriwala & Rousseau, 1997). These two types of Psychological Contract are Transactional and Relational Psychological Contract.

Transactional Psychological Contract are characterized by pay and career progression in exchange for hard work. Relational Psychological Contract are characterized by Job security in exchange for loyalty.

A very interesting observation has been made by Levinson et al., (1962), that Psychological Contract emphasizes more on intrinsic, recessive, never expressive expectations that are present in the employment relationship. Some of these expectations could be specific, and some are vague. Therefore, it is a very wide concept, surrounding the beliefs about unwritten, unspoken terms, and

¹Assistant Professor of Commerce (Management), Government College of Arts Science and Commerce, Khandola Marcela Goa, India, Email: pareshlingadkar@gmail.com, Contact no: 8329739488

written in unambiguous terms incorporated into a legal contract. Rousseau argued that the Psychological Contract is an individual level build, and one may dispute whether it applies to the organizational level. Individuals have Psychological Contract, but organizations do not (Rousseau, 1989). The organization provides an environment where the Psychological Contract is constructed, shaped, and operated.

The Transactional Psychological Contract is considered to be based on a very precise exchange that exists over a limited period. Employee prefers to seek employment somewhere else when the employer fails to fulfill their expectations. Similarly, the employer also likely to terminate a Transactional Psychological Contract that fails to meet their needs. Transactional Psychological Contract shifts the risk associated with the economic uncertainties from employer to employee. Workers will contribute to the organization in line with the contributions they receive from the organization. Transactional Psychological Contract is less functional when they are a by-product of a relationship. This means they are not recognized and managed properly. In such cases, the workers either leave the organization or indulge in anti-organizational behavior. Transactional Psychological Contract remains unchanged and focuses on short term relationships in which the result is more essential rather than the continuation of the relation (Tsui et al., 1997). According to Rousseau, Transactional Psychological Contract has less personal involvement and low emotional investment (Rousseau, 1995). The Transactional Psychological Contract is mainly limited to the exchange of economic resources (Eisenberger & Aselage, 2003). Lewis & Smithson (2000) proposed that the younger employees, as compared to older employees, focus more on Transactional Psychological Contract i.e., short term monetary-non monetary arrangements rather than having a long term relationship with their employer.

Employees with Relational Psychological Contracts are more willing to work overtime, whether paid or not. They are ready to help their colleagues on the job and ready to support organizational changes that are beneficial. They get upset, especially when the reciprocal arrangements from the side of the organization do not come. This even leads to frustration, job dissatisfaction, and further erosion of employment relationships. In Relational Psychological Contract, the relationship between employee and employer is more important than anything else, which are based on collective interest of both (Parks & Kidder, 1994) and are linked to the societal exchange (Millward & Brewerton 1999; Brewerton, 2000) concerning socio-emotional assets (Eisenberger & Aselage, 2003), presenting the conventional employment relationship in which both acknowledge each others' interest (Brewerton 2000).

Guzzo et al., (1994), claimed that the Psychological Contract is for the future, will undergo changes, and undergo nonstop amendment because the expectations are not rigid, they change from time to time. It is also not possible for an individual to form these expectations in advance. Hence, Psychological Contract is inexhaustible, is never complete (Yan et al., 2002) and flexible (Wright et al., 1996).

Psychological Contract Breach

The attitude of many employees, such as commitment, trust, and passion, in addition to happiness, depends a lot on a reasonable and unbiased Psychological Contract. If the employees perceive that their Psychological Contract has not been fulfilled, then employee attitudes toward superior organizational presentation fade away rapidly. On the other hand, wherever the Psychological Contract is fair and right, these positive ingredients remain. The perception that one's Psychological Contract has been breached is a subjective experience. Sometimes it happens in reality and sometimes it's the perception of the breach. This phenomenon makes the study of the Psychological Contract more difficult and challenging.

Literature support

The literature available on the Psychological Contract brings out very important observations about the outcomes. One has to note whether these outcomes are influenced, or they are the result of either

fulfillment or breach of the Psychological Contract. For understanding this, one has to examine the inter-relationship amongst these outcomes in light of the Psychological Contract.

Perceived Organizational Support positively affects Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and does influence the job performance of hotel employees (Chun-Fang & Tsung-Sheng, 2012). Tumwesigye (2010) concluded that Perceived Organizational Support is negatively associated with Turnover Intentions. Yui-Tim et al. (2012), highlighted that Perceived Organizational Support has a significant positive effect on employee Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.

Dennis and Shaffer (2005), found that a good interpersonal relationship between the superior and subordinate is a must for employees to be engaged in higher Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. Trust in the employment relationship has a direct effect on employee Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.

In a study by Sabine et al., (1998), amongst mental health care professionals on Burnout and Intention to leave, concluded that employees who are under the perception of inequity have a significant effect on Turnover intention and emotional exhaustion. In a similar study conducted by Raybould & Walters (2007), of the Hospitality sector on Burnout and Perceived Organizational Support. The study finds that there is an important relationship between Perceived Organizational Support and each of the three burnout dimensions, i.e., Exhaustion, cynicism, and personal efficacy.

Kim (2006), examined whether job satisfaction and organizational commitment predict Organizational Citizenship Behaviour in Korean civil servants. The result confirmed that there is a positive relationship between Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. However, the findings could not establish a direct relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.

Podsakoff et al. (2009) examined Organizational Citizenship Behaviour and individual and organizational level consequences. The study confirmed that Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is related to many organizations as well as individual-level outcomes and are distinguishable from each other. The study further states that Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is strongly correlated to job performance, reward allocation, and negatively related to Turnover intention, actual turnover, and absenteeism.

Djurkovic et al., (2008), examined the moderating effect of Perceived Organizational Support on Workplace bullying and intention to leave amongst school teachers in Australia. The study revealed that Perceived Organizational Support moderates the effects of bullying on the intention to leave. Further, it was also concluded that the effects of bullying on the intention to leave were significant for employees with lower levels of Perceived Organizational Support but were non-significant with higher levels of Perceived Organizational Support.

Organ & Ryan (1995), undertook a review of fifty-five quantitative studies conducted on Organizational Citizenship behavior and Job satisfaction. The studies conducted supported the argument that Job satisfaction is a major predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. The association between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour is much stronger amongst non-professional and non-managerial employees, than that of between job satisfaction and any other variable.

Chang (1999) examined career commitment as a Moderator of Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention. Career commitment was considered to be the strongest predictor of Turnover Intention. Further, the employees who are committed to the organization are less willing to leave the organization and relatively high for those employees who are highly committed to their jobs.

Marital Status and Psychological Contract

Marriage is regarded to be one of the most prominent and most significant social institutions of all institutions in human society (Nambi, 2005). In Shastras, marriage has been considered a sacred relationship between Husband and Wife. It is one of the dominant predictors of the psychological well being of an individual. Past research shows that it is the quality of a marriage and not marriage per se that links marriage to positive mental health (Gove et al., 1983), which in turn affects

employee earnings (Thrane, 2008). Married men and women are usually happy and less stressed than unmarried (Coombs, 1991). The National Longitudinal Mortality Study, conducted by Johnson et al., (2000), found that non-married categories show elevated Relative Risk of death compared to married persons. Single women have higher scores on personality characteristics associated with better psychological well being (Marks, 1996). On the positive side, Marriage enhances perceptions of well-being for both men and women (Mookherjee, 1997; Waldron et al., 1996), and does not depend on the individual identity (Thoits, 1992). Also, married women expressed more job satisfaction than men did (Mookherjee, 1997; Wood et al., 1989). On the other hand, married employees have more stress than single ones (Kessler, 1979). A study by O'Neill & Kelly (2011), found that there were no significant differences in Marital Status and employee stress. Challenges in the job, accountability, and authority contribute to employee satisfaction more in the case of married employees in the Indian IT sector (Sengupta, 2011). Kennington & Fetsch (1997) found a significant relationship between marital status and job satisfaction. They found both divorced and married employees to be more satisfied with their jobs than those who were never married, remarried, or widowed. Wickramasinghe & Kumara (2010) found that marital status to have a significant effect on working hours and thus employee attitude. However, Scott et al. (2005) found no meaningful relationships between marital status and job satisfaction constructs. We expect marital status to moderate the effects of Psychological Contract Breach with employee outcomes. Given the above literature, it is hypothesized as:

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between employees' Marital Status and their opinion concerning the Type of Psychological Contract Breach and employee outcomes.

Hypothesis 2: Marital status moderates the relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Employee outcomes.

Hypothesis 2 i: Marital status moderates the relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Job Satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2 ii: Marital status moderates the relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.

Hypothesis 2 iii: Marital status moderates the relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Perceived Organizational Support.

Hypothesis 2 iv: Marital status moderates the relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Turnover Intention.

Research Methodology

The current research has employed a descriptive methodology. The study tries to describe the influence of marital status on the relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and work outcomes in the IT sector in India. The instrument developed to measure the Psychological Contract by Aggrawal (2012) has been used to measure the Psychological Contract of employees. Relational Psychological Contract is measured using 23 statements. The scale reliability is 0.728. Transactional Psychological Contract measured using 16 items; the scale reliability is 0.771.

Job Satisfaction (JS)

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967), the short version is used to measure Employees Job Satisfaction. The instrument comprises 19 statements and uses the five-point Likert scale to capture the Job Satisfaction of employees. The scale reliability is 0.959.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

A 16 item OCB scale developed by Smith et al., (1983) is used to capture the OCB of the employees. The scale reliability is 0.928.

Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

Perceived organizational support is measured using a 17-item short version scale from Eisenberger et al., (1986). The scale reliability is 0.863.

Turnover Intentions (TI)

Turnover intentions measured on three items, adopted from Meyer et al., (1993). The scale reliability is 0.750.

A major source of data was primary data collected from the IT professionals working in IT firms with more than one year of work experience. A total of 206 respondents were surveyed and analysed out of which 135 were men and 71 were women. The survey was conducted in Goa, Pune, and Bangalore. The period of data collection was from October 2018 to December 2019. The instrument used a five-point Likert Scale to capture the pre-arrival expectations and met or unmet expectations. All the items then were reverse coded to represent the Psychological Contract Breach rather than fulfillment (Ballou N S., 2013). The score ranges from 1 to 5.

The role played by the Demographic variables in the Psychological contract of employees, is examined through an independent sample t-test. Hierarchical Multiple Regression with Andrew Hayes's process was conducted to check the moderating effect of marital status on the relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and work outcomes. To avoid high multicollinearity, the variables were centered and an interaction term between Psychological Contract Breach and marital status was created to interpret the output easily (Aiken & West, 1991).

In testing moderation, we particularly look for the interaction effect between Predictor variable and Moderating variable and whether or not such effect is significant in predicting the outcome variable.

Data Analysis and its Interpretation

Table no 1: T-test analysis of Marital status, Type of Psychological Contract Breach (PCB) and Employee outcomes

Type of PCB and Outcomes	Marital Status				t value	p-value
	Single		Married			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
RPCB	3.82	1.49	3.92	1.46	- 2.09	0.03**
TPCB	3.66	1.48	3.76	1.44	- 2.16	0.03**
JS	2.89	0.73	2.84	0.79	0.72	0.47
OCB	3.40	1.59	3.36	1.75	0.55	0.58
POS	2.93	1.57	3.04	1.61	- 1.75	0.04**
TI	3.52	0.99	3.43	1.06	0.86	0.39

Source: Primary Survey

**** Denotes significance at 5 % level**

As noted from table no 1, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the mean difference between the Single and married employees about the Relational Psychological Contract Breach. The result of the t-test is significant, $t(404) = - 2.09, p = 0.03, p < 0.05$, two-tailed with single employees (Mean = 3.82, SD = 1.49), scoring lower than the married employees (Mean = 3.92, SD = 1.46). The magnitude of the Mean difference is small (- 0.10, 95% CI: - 0.19 to - 0.01). Hence, we can conclude that there is a significant difference between Single and Married employees about their Relational Psychological Contract Breach.

With regard to test the mean difference between the employees marital status and Transactional Psychological Contract Breach, t-test shows that the result is significant, $t(404) = - 2.16, p = 0.03, p < 0.05$, two-tailed with Single employees (Mean = 3.66, SD = 1.48) scoring slightly lower than the Married employees (Mean = 3.76, SD = 1.44). The magnitude of the Mean difference is small (-

0.10, 95% CI: - 0.19 to - 0.01). Therefore, the researcher concludes that employees who are single and married differ significantly in their Transactional Psychological Contract Breach.

With regard to the mean difference between the employees who are single and married and their Job Satisfaction, the result shows that the t-test is not significant, $t(404) = 0.72, p = 0.47, p > 0.05$, two-tailed with single employees (Mean = 2.89, SD = 0.73) scoring slightly higher than the Female employees (Mean = 2.84, SD = 0.79). The magnitude of the Mean difference is small (0.05, 95% CI: - 0.10 to 0.21). Hence, it is right to conclude that there is no significant difference between married and single employees concerning their Job Satisfaction in the IT sector.

With regard to marital status and OCB, the result shows that the t-test is not significant, $t(404) = -0.55, p = 0.58, p > 0.05$, two-tailed with single employees (Mean = 3.40, SD = 1.59) scoring slightly higher than the married employees (Mean = 3.36, SD = 1.75). The magnitude of the Mean difference is small (0.04, 95% CI: - 0.10 to 0.17). Hence, it is concluded that there is no notable difference between married and unmarried employees concerning OCB.

With regard to testing the mean difference between employees' marital status and the Perceived Organizational Support, a t-test was conducted. The result shows that the t-test is significant, $t(404) = -1.75, p = 0.04, p < 0.05$, two-tailed with Unmarried/Single employees (Mean = 2.93, SD = 1.57), scoring slightly lower than the Married employees (Mean = 3.04, SD = 1.61). The magnitude of the Mean difference is small (0.11, 95% CI: - 0.22 to 0.01). Therefore, the researcher concludes that single and married employees in the Indian IT industry differ significantly concerning POS.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the mean difference between the Married and Unmarried employees concerning their Turnover Intention. The result shows that the t-test is not significant, $t(404) = 0.86, p = 0.39, p > 0.05$, two-tailed with Single employees (Mean = 3.52, SD = 0.99) scoring slightly higher than the married employees (Mean = 3.43, SD = 1.06). The magnitude of the Mean difference is small (0.09, 95% CI: - 0.16 to 0.30). Hence one can conclude that there is no meaningful difference between married and unmarried employees concerning Turnover Intention.

The overall conclusion for hypothesis 1 is that there exists a significant difference between RPCB, TPCB, and POS, resulting in partial support for hypothesis 1. No significant difference has been observed concerning JS, OCB, and TI.

The moderating effect of the marital status on the relationship between the Psychological Contract Breach and work outcomes has been examined by conducting Hierarchical Multiple Regression. The results are as follows:

Table no 2: Hierarchical Multiple Regression with Hayes process of Marital status, PCB and Job Satisfaction

```

***** PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Version 3.2.01 *****
Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D. www.afhayes.com
Documentation available in Hayes (2018). www.guilford.com/p/hayes3
*****
Model : 1
  Y : Job_Sati
  X : PCB
  W : M_S
Sample Size: 406
*****
OUTCOME VARIABLE: Job_Sati
Model Summary
  R   R-sq   MSE    F   df1   df2   p
.6908 .4772  .3087 122.3316 3.0000 402.0000 .0000
Model
      coeff   se    t    p   LLCI   ULCI
constant 2.8596 .0276 103.6208 .0000 2.8053 2.9138
PCB       .5280 .0276 19.1053 .0000 .4737 .5823
M_S      -.0188 .0276 - .6815 .4960 -.0732 .0355
    
```

```

Int_1 .0130 .0283 .4616 .6446 -.0425 .0686
Product terms key:
Int_1 : PCB x M_S
Test(s) of highest order unconditional interaction(s):
R2-chng F df1 df2 p
X*W .0003 .2130 1.0000 402.0000 .6446
-----
Data for visualizing the conditional effect of the focal predictor:
Paste text below into a SPSS syntax window and execute to produce plot.
DATA LIST FREE/
PCB M_S Job_Sati.
BEGIN DATA.
-1.0000 -1.0000 2.3635
.0000 -1.0000 2.8784
1.0000 -1.0000 3.3934
-1.0000 .0000 2.3316
.0000 .0000 2.8596
1.0000 .0000 3.3876
-1.0000 1.0000 2.2997
.0000 1.0000 2.8408
1.0000 1.0000 3.3818 END DATA.
GRAPH/SCATTERPLOT= PCB WITH Job_Sati BY M_S.
***** ANALYSIS NOTES AND ERRORS *****
Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.0000
NOTE: The following variables were mean-centered prior to analysis:
M_S PCB
----- END MATRIX -----

```

Source: Andrew Hayes process

As noted from table no 2, the first model comprises two variables PCB and Marital status. It can be observed from the above table that these variables estimated for a major amount of difference in Employees Job Satisfaction, $R^2 = 0.477$, $F(3,402) = 122.331$, $p < 0.05$, which is a significant model. Further, to check the moderating effect, the interaction variable was included in the second Regression model. The result did not show a significant variance $\Delta R^2 = 0.000$, $F(1, 402) = 0.213$, $p = 0.644$, $b = 0.013$, $t(402) = 0.461$, $p > 0.05$. On this basis, the researcher rejects hypothesis no 2 i, which assumes that marital status moderates the relationship between PCB and Employees Job Satisfaction.

Table no 3: Hierarchical Multiple Regression with Hayes process of Marital status, PCB and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour

```

***** PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Version 3.2.01 *****
Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D. www.afhayes.com
Documentation available in Hayes (2018). www.guilford.com/p/hayes3
*****
Model : 1
Y : OCB
X : PCB
W : M_S
Sample Size: 406
*****
OUTCOME VARIABLE: OCB
Model Summary
R R-sq MSE F df1 df2 p
.4701 .2210 .3738 38.0180 3.0000 402.0000 .0000
Model
coeff se t p LLCI ULCI

```

```
constant 3.3752 .0304 111.1532 .0000 3.3155 3.4349
PCB .3239 .0304 10.6523 .0000 .2641 .3837
M_S -.0019 .0304 -.0626 .9501 -.0617 .0579
Int_1 .0261 .0311 .8393 .4018 -.0350 .0873
```

Product terms key:

Int_1 : PCB x M_S

Test(s) of highest order unconditional interaction(s):

	R2-chng	F	df1	df2	p
X*W	.0014	.7045	1.0000	402.0000	.4018

Data for visualizing the conditional effect of the focal predictor:

Paste text below into a SPSS syntax window and execute to produce plot.

DATA LIST FREE/

PCB M_S OCB.

BEGIN DATA.

```
-1.0000 -1.0000 3.0793
.0000 -1.0000 3.3771
1.0000 -1.0000 3.6749
-1.0000 .0000 3.0513
.0000 .0000 3.3752
1.0000 .0000 3.6992
-1.0000 1.0000 3.0233
.0000 1.0000 3.3733
1.0000 1.0000 3.7234
```

END DATA.

GRAPH/SCATTERPLOT = PCB WITH OCB BY M_S.

***** ANALYSIS NOTES AND ERRORS *****

Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.0000

NOTE: The following variables were mean-centered prior to analysis:

M_S PCB

----- END MATRIX -----

Source: Andrew Hayes process

As seen in table no 3, the first model comprises two variables PCB and Marital status. It can be observed that these variables accounted for a noteworthy quantity of variance in OCB, $R^2 = 0.221$, $F(3, 402) = 38.018$, $p < 0.05$, which is a significant model.

Further, to check the moderating effect, the interaction variable was included into Regression model. The result did not show a significant variance, $\Delta R^2 = 0.001$, $F(1, 402) = 0.704$, $p = 0.401$, $b = 0.026$, $t(402) = 0.839$, $p > 0.05$. Therefore, the researcher rejects the hypothesis no 2 ii, that marital status moderates relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and OCB.

Table no 4: Hierarchical Multiple Regression with Andrew Hayes process of Marital status, PCB and Perceived Organizational Support

***** PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Version 3.2.01 *****

Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D. www.afhayes.com

Documentation available in Hayes (2018). www.guilford.com/p/hayes3

Model : 1

Y : POS

X : PCB

W : M_S

Sample Size: 406

OUTCOME VARIABLE: POS

Model Summary

R	R-sq	MSE	F	df1	df2	p
.5454	.2974	.2496	56.7337	3.0000	402.0000	.0000


```

Model
      coeff   se    t    p   LLCI   ULCI
constant 2.9938  .0248 120.6608 .0000 2.9450 3.0425
PCB       .3172  .0248 12.7665 .0000 .2684 .3661
M_S      .0588  .0248 2.3653 .0185 .0099 .1076
Int_1    -.0423  .0254 -1.6624 .0972 -.0922 .0077
Product terms key:
Int_1 :   PCB   x   M_S
Test(s) of highest order unconditional interaction(s):
      R2-chng    F    df1    df2    p
X*W   .0048    2.7634  1.0000 402.0000 .0972
-----
Data for visualizing the conditional effect of the focal predictor:
Paste text below into a SPSS syntax window and execute to produce plot.
DATA LIST FREE/
      PCB    M_S POS.
BEGIN DATA.
-1.0000 -1.0000 2.5755
.0000 -1.0000 2.9350
1.0000 -1.0000 3.2945
-1.0000 .0000 2.6765
.0000 .0000 2.9938
1.0000 .0000 3.3110
-1.0000 1.0000 2.7776
.0000 1.0000 3.0525
1.0000 1.0000 3.3275 END DATA.
GRAPH/SCATTERPLOT= PCB WITH POS BY M_S.
***** ANALYSIS NOTES AND ERRORS *****
Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.0000
NOTE: The following variables were mean-centered prior to analysis:
      M_S PCB
----- END MATRIX -----

```

Source: Andrew Hayes process

The first model has two variables PCB and marital status, as can be noted from table no 4. These variables accounted for a significant amount of variance on employees POS, $R^2 = 0.297$, $F(3, 402) = 56.733$ $p < 0.05$. The model is significant.

Further, to check the moderating effect, the interaction variable was included in the second regression model, which did not account for a significant variance, $\Delta R^2 = 0.004$, $F(1, 402) = 2.763$, $p = 0.097$, $b = -0.0423$, $t(402) = -1.662$, $p > 0.05$. Hence, the Hypothesis 2 iii, is to be rejected, that marital status moderates the relationship between PCB and POS.

Table no 5: Hierarchical Multiple Regression with Andrew Hayes process of Marital status, PCB and Turnover Intention

```

***** PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Version 3.2.01 *****
Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D. www.afhayes.com
Documentation available in Hayes (2018). www.guilford.com/p/hayes3
*****
Model : 1
      Y : TI
      X : PCB
      W : M_S
Sample Size: 406
*****
OUTCOME VARIABLE: TI

```

```

Model Summary
  R    R-sq    MSE    F    df1    df2    p
.2414 .0583    1.0135  8.2923  3.0000  402.0000 .0000
Model
      coeff    se    t    p    LLCI    ULCI
constant 3.4706 .0500 69.4096 .0000 3.3724 3.5689
PCB      -.2424 .0501 -4.8411 .0000 -.3409 -.1440
M_S      -.0388 .0501 -.7753 .4386 -.1372 .0596
Int_1    .0485 .0512 .9458 .3448 -.0523 .1492
Product terms key:
Int_1 :   PCB   x   M_S
Test(s) of highest order unconditional interaction(s):
      R2-chng    F    df1    df2    p
X*W    .0021    .8946    1.0000  402.0000    .3448
-----
Data for visualizing the conditional effect of the focal predictor:
Paste text below into a SPSS syntax window and execute to produce plot.
DATA LIST FREE/
  PCB    M_S    TI.
BEGIN DATA.
-1.0000 -1.0000  3.8003
 .0000 -1.0000  3.5095
 1.0000 -1.0000  3.2186
-1.0000  .0000  3.7131
 .0000  .0000  3.4706
 1.0000  .0000  3.2282
-1.0000  1.0000  3.6258
 .0000  1.0000  3.4318
 1.0000  1.0000  3.2379 END DATA.
GRAPH/SCATTERPLOT= PCB WITH TI BY M_S.
***** ANALYSIS NOTES AND ERRORS *****
Level of confidence for all confidence intervals in output: 95.0000
NOTE: The following variables were mean-centered prior to analysis:
      M_S    PCB
----- END MATRIX -----

```

Source: Andrew Hayes process

As observed from table no 5, Psychological Contract Breach, Marital status, and Turnover Intention were included in the first model. These variables accounted for a significant amount of variance on employees Turnover Intention, $R^2 = 0.058$, $F(3, 402) = 8.292$, $p < 0.05$. The model is significant.

Further, to check the moderating effect, the interaction variable was included in the regression model, which did not account for a significant variance, $\Delta R^2 = 0.002$, $F(1, 402) = 0.894$, $p = 0.344$, $b = 0.046$, $t(402) = 0.945$, $p > 0.05$. Therefore, it is preferred to reject Hypothesis no 2 iv, that marital status moderates the relationship between PCB and employees TI.

Findings and Discussions

The result of the t-test shows that there is no difference between the married and unmarried employees about their Relational Psychological Contract Breach. Similarly, no difference between the married and unmarried employees about Transactional Psychological Contract was observed. These findings are in line with Engellandt et al. (2003). Further, employees working in IT companies in India do not differ significantly regarding their opinion on Job Satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, and Turnover Intentions. Interestingly Marital status influences employee view on Perceived Organizational Support. Marital status did not moderate any of the relationships between the Psychological Contract Breach and employee outcomes.

The IT Companies portrays themselves as "Work as Fun" and as "Workplace is yet another campus," are possibly the potential attraction to the young educated youngsters, in addition to the more prominent representation of work, excellent ambiance of the building with sweeping glass, concrete buildings, smart and trendy colleagues and indoor facilities like internet, cafeteria, recreation center, kiosk, clinic, gym, and so on. The distinctive form for work and work organization in this field includes a lot of insecurities to the workforce, including high attrition rates, higher stress levels, and low collectivity amongst the employees.

The marital status of the employees accounted for significant variance in Perceived Organizational Support. However, it did not account for a substantial variation for the types of employees Psychological Contract Breach, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, and Turnover Intentions. Marital Status moderates the relationship between Psychological Contract Breach and Perceived Organizational Support. The irregular working hours in the IT industry has made regular socialization difficult, resulting in isolation and identity crisis. Unconventional working hours tend to be inauspicious to employees who are married or have families. Though there are many firms which provide transport facilities to such unusual working hours, still married employees prefer to work as per traditional working hours. Nowadays, the IT companies have offered married employees, especially women employees having children, to work from their homes.

Future research propositions

The findings point out the desirable Psychological Contract by employees that may differ based on the group membership of employees. The organizations have to be sensitive to the employees' work approach that is subjective to the group to which the employee belongs. The finding provides support to the existing theory on the subjectivity of the Psychological Contract in addition to its practical significance. Knowing employee priorities and perspectives on the Psychological Contract can help the organization in the Recruitment and Selection process as there is every possibility of creating a fit between organization requirements and prospective employee capabilities.

References:

- Aggarwal. (2012). Psychological contract and Organizational Effectiveness.
- Aiken, & West. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Argyris. (1960). Understanding organizational behavior. *Oxford, England: Dorsey, American Psychological Association*.
- Ballou, N. (2013). The effects of psychological contract breach on job outcomes. *San Jose State University ProQuest Dissertations Publishing*.
- Brewerton. (2000). Psychological contracts: Employee relations for the twenty-first century? *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*.
- Chang. (1999). Career Commitment as a Complex Moderator of Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention. *Human Relations, Vol. 52, No. 10, 1257-1278*.
- Chun-Fang, & Tsung-Sheng. (2012). The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: The mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, Vol 31, 180-190*.
- Coombs. (1991). Marital Status and Personal Well-Being: A Literature Review. *Family Relations, Vol. 40, No. 1, 97-102*.
- Dennis, & Shaffer. (2005). Equity and relationship quality influences on organizational citizenship behaviors: The mediating role of trust in the supervisor and empowerment. *Personnel Review, Vol. 34 No. 4, 406-422*.

- Djurkovic, McCormack, & Casimir. (2008). Workplace bullying and intention to leave: the moderating effect of perceived organisational support. *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol 18, no 4, 405-422.
- Eisenberger, & Aselage. (2003). Perceived organizational support and psychological contracts: a theoretical integration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* vol 24, 491–509.
- Eisenberger, Hutchicson, & Sowa. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 71, No 3, 500-507.
- Gove, Hughes, & Briggs. (1983). Does Marriage Have Positive Effects on the Psychological Well-Being of the Individual? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, Vol. 24, No. 2, 122-131.
- Guzzo, Richard, Noonan, Katherine, Elron, & Efra. (1994). Expatriate managers and the psychological contract. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 79(4), 617-626.
- Johnson, Backlund, Sorlie, & Loveless. (2000). Marital Status and Mortality: The National Longitudinal Mortality Study. *AEP Vol. 10, No. 4*, 224-238.
- Kennington, & Fetsch. (1997). Balancing Work and Family in Cooperative Extension: History, Effective Programs, and Future Directions. *Journal of Extension*, Vol 35 (1).
- Kessler. (1979). Stress, Social Status, and Psychological Distress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, Vol. 20, 259-272.
- Kim. (2006). Public service motivation and organizational citizenship behavior in Korea. *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 27 No. 8, 722-740.
- Kissler. (1994). The New Employment Contract. *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 33, Number 3,, 335-352.
- Levinson, Price, Munden, Mandl, & Solley. (1962). Men, management, and mental health. *Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, US*.
- Lewis, & Smithson. (2000). Is job insecurity changing the psychological contract?". *Personnel Review*, Vol. 29 Iss 6, 680 - 702.
- Marks. (1996). Flying Solo at Midlife: Gender, Marital Status, and Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 58, No. 4, 917-932.
- Meyer, Allen, & Smith, &. (1993). Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-Component Conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol 78, 538-551.
- Millward, & Brewerton. (1999). Contractors and their Psychological Contracts. *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 10, 253–274.
- Mookherjee. (1997). Marital Status, Gender, and Perception of Weil-Being. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol 137:1, 95-105.
- Nambi. (2005). Marriage, mental health and the Indian legislation. *Indian J Psychiatry*, Vol 47(1), 3-14.
- O'Neill, & Kelly. (2011). Work stress and well-being in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol 30, 385-390.
- Organ, & Ryan. (1995). A meta-Analytic review of Attitudinal and Dispositional predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, Vol 48, 775-802.
- Parks, & Kidder. (1994). "Till Death Us Do Part..." Changing Work Relationships in the 1990s. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
- Podsakoff, Blume, Podsakoff, & Whiting. (2009). Individual- and Organizational-Level Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 94, No. 1, 122-141.
- Raybould, & Walters. (2007). Burnout and Perceived Organisational Support. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, Vol 14, No 2, 144-156.
- Robinson. (1996). Trust and Breach of the Psychological Contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 41, No. 4, 574-599.
- Rousseau. (1989). Psychological and Implied Contracts in Organisations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol 2, No 2, 121-139.
- Rousseau. (1995). *Psychological Contract in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, Sage.

- Sabine, Schaufeli, & Jonge. (1998). Burnout and Intention to Leave among Mental Health care Professionals: A Social Psychological approach. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, Vol 17, No 3*, 341-362.
- Scott, Swortzel, & Taylor. (2005). The Relationships between Selected Demographic Factors and the Level of Job Satisfaction of Extension Agents. *Journal of Southern Agricultural Education Research, Volume 55, Number 1*, 102-115.
- Sengupta. (2011). An exploratory study on job and demographic attributes affecting employee satisfaction in the Indian BPO industry. *Strategic Outsourcing: An International Journal, Vol. 4 Iss 3*, 248-273.
- Smith, Organ, & Near. (1983). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 68, No 4*, 653-663.
- Thrane. (2008). Earnings differentiation in the tourism industry: Gender, human capital and socio-demographic effects. *Tourism Management, Vol 29*, 514-524.
- Tijoriwala, & Rousseau. (1997). Assessing psychological contracts: issues, alternatives and measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19(1)*, 679-695.
- Tsui, Pearce, Porter, & Tripoli. (1997). Alternative Approaches to the Employee-Organization Relationship: Does Investment in Employees Pay Off? *Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 40, No. 5*.
- Tumwesigye. (2010). The relationship between perceived organisational support and turnover intentions in a developing country: The mediating role of organisational commitment . *African Journal of Business Management Vol. 4(6)*, 942-952.
- Waldron, Hughes, & Brooks. (1996). Marriage Protection and Marriage Selection: Prospective Evidence for Reciprocal effects of Marital Status on Health. *Soc. Sci. Med. Vol. 43, No. 1*, 113-123.
- Weiss, Dawis, & England. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*.
- Wickramasinghe, & Kumara. (2010). Work-related attitudes of employees in the emerging ITES-BPO sector of Sri Lanka. *Strategic Outsourcing: An International Journal, vol 3 (1)*, 20-32.
- Wood, Rhodes, & Whelan. (1989). Sex Differences in Positive Well-Being: A Consideration of Emotional Style and Marital Status. *Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 106, No.2*, 249-264.
- Wright, Larwood, & Doherty. (1996). Use and Misuse of the Psychological Contract: Reflections on an Academic case. *Journal of Management Inquiry, Vol 5, No 3*, 216-220.
- Yan, Zhu, & Hall. (2002). International Assignments for career Building: A model of Agency Relationships and Psychological Contracts. *Academy of Management Review, Vol. 27, No. 3*, 373-391.
- Yui-Tim, Chi-Sum, & Hang-Yue. (2012). The effects of trust in organisation and perceived organisational support on organisational citizenship behaviour: a test of three competing models. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, vol 23:2*, 278-293.