

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH OF THE PERCEPTION OF A PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT IN RESPECT OF DEGREE OF JOB PERMANENCY

Ana Milijić¹, MSc; Kristina Spasić², MSc

¹ Innovation Center, University of Nis, REPUBLIC OF SERBIA, ana.randjelovic@yahoo.com¹

² Faculty of Economics, Nis, REPUBLIC OF SERBIA, k.88.spasic@gmail.com

Abstract: Modern forms of work relations that have arisen as a consequence of economic, organisational, demographic, cultural and technological changes in the society and the increasing reliance on temporary work and significantly affect the content of the psychological contract built by employees. The research examines the influence of different employment patterns on employees' psychological contract in educational institutions in the Leskovac and Vlasotince area. Using the descriptive method, the comparison method, the sampling method, the χ^2 test, the correlation coefficient and the Mann-Whitney U test, the dependence was examined, as well as the degree of agreement between the observed phenomena. The survey contains questions that are adjustments to the questionnaire that Denise M. Rousseau used in her research. The paper defines four hypotheses, presents the research results, and the reached conclusions. Observing the relationship between job permanence and the content of a psychological contract can help increase work performance and job satisfaction. The work can be helpful to experts in the field of human resource management but also to all interested parties who want to get acquainted with this topic.

Keywords: psychological contract, job permanency, dependence, correlation, education.

1. INTRODUCTION

According to [1], a psychological contract is defined as a series of mutual expectations that regulate the mutual relationship between two parties, although the parties may not be aware of those expectations. Newel and Dopson in [2] believe that a psychological contract contains an effort that employees are willing to invest in and their contribution in exchange for something they value in their employer with expectations of reciprocity in job security, wages and benefits, or continuous training. As stated in [3], there are two different forms of the psychological contract, namely the transactional (new) psychological contract and the relational (old) psychological contract. According to [4] and [5], the fundamental distinction between these two forms of psychological contract is the duration of the employment contract (temporary or permanent), exchange of resources (tangible and intangible), degree of specificity and others. Employees who build transactions with a psychological contract conclude the organisation as a source of income. The transactional psychological contract is of short-term character, narrowly defined and quite materialistic, while the relational psychological contract is of long-term character, broader definition and implies socio-emotional exchange, a high level of mutual trust and loyalty [6].

2. JOB PERMANENCY AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT

The academic community's interest in the analysis of the impact of employment status on the content of the psychological contract has existed before. Research conducted over the years by many authors is evidence of that. Guest and Conway in [7] presented the results of their research conducted on 1000 respondents in the UK in 1997. Based on regression analysis, they identified a more significant impact of the psychological contract content on job security compared to the reversed situation. In [8], Quinlan, Mayhew and Bohle point out that there is insufficient evidence to confirm that employees under a temporary employment contract have a lower organisational commitment than permanent employees, and if this difference is identified, it can be explained by content analysis psychological contract. Despite the lack of research, there is enough evidence to support the assumption that there is some influence between the type of employment contract employees sign with the employer and the content of the psychological contract they build. The research results conducted in Europe, in several countries and sectors presented in [9], clearly indicate a relationship between the content of the psychological contract and the permanence of work, but further research is needed. Through observing the content

¹Note: The paper is the result of research based on the obligations from the Agreement on the implementation and financing of the Innovation Center of the University of Nis d.o.o. (record number 451-03-68/2020-14/200371).

of the psychological contract and the permanence of work, it can be said that full-time employees have higher expectations in terms of greater influence on decision-making within the organisation. In [10], where they presented the results of their research, Millward and Hopkins pointed out that temporary workers will more often form a transactional rather than a relational psychological contract. A multi-year study conducted by Guest and Conway is given in [11] and shows that the situation differs from year to year. In their research, they compared the content of the psychological contract of temporarily and permanently employed workers. Like the previous authors, they confirmed a connection between the employment contract and the psychological contract, as well as those temporary employees usually create a transactional psychological contract. Also, temporary employees are more sensitive to changes in the content of the psychological contract. Guest in [12] points out that temporarily employed workers create a transactional psychological contract whose content is narrower and easier to monitor than the content of a relational psychological contract.

3. OBJECTIVE, RESEARCH METHODS AND SAMPLE

3.1. Research Objective

This research aimed to examine whether the type of employment contract that determines the permanence of work affects the content of the psychological contract of employees working in primary, secondary and tertiary education institutions in Leskovac and Vlasotince area. For the purposes of the research, we defined the following hypotheses:

- Hypothesis 1: The assumption is that employees hired on the basis of temporary employment will form a transactional (new) psychological contract.
- Hypothesis 2: The assumption is that employees hired on the basis of temporary employment will form a relational (old) psychological contract.
- Hypothesis 3: The assumption is that employees hired on the basis of permanent employment will form a transactional (new) psychological contract.
- Hypothesis 4: The assumption is that employees hired on the basis of permanent employment will form a relational (old) psychological contract.

3.2. Research Method

A survey created for the purposes of empirical research in this paper was based on the survey used by Denise M. Rousseau in her research [13]. An electronic form of the survey was created in order to make it easier to survey respondents through social networks. The first part of the survey contains socio-demographic questions related to gender, age, education, family and work status, length of service and salary. The second part of the questionnaire examines the beliefs about the employer's obligations to the employee, while the third part examines the employee's beliefs about his obligations to the employer. The answers to the questions were evaluated using the Likert scale from 1 ("none") to 5 ("largely"). The evaluation criteria are defined as follows: for scores above three and more, we can say that the given statement fully characterises the respondents, for scores between two and three, we consider that the statement partially characterises them, and statements with a score less than two do not characterise the respondents at all.

The analysis of the collected data was performed by descriptive measures, χ^2 test, Pearson's correlation coefficient and Mann-Whitney U test using IBM SPSS Statistics 20. The sample was divided into two groups for the purposes of analysis: the group of full-time employees and the group of temporary employees.

The analysis procedure using the χ^2 test is shown in [14]. Each question passed the χ^2 dependency test in relation to employment status. Hypothesis H_0 contains the assumption that the answer does not depend on the work status of the respondents, while hypothesis H_1 states the opposite. The form $\chi^2_{(r-1)(s-1); \alpha}$ was used to determine the critical value of the χ^2 test, as well as the corresponding statistical table. If the value obtained by the χ^2 test is higher than the critical value, we will accept hypothesis H_1 , which states that the respondents' answers depend on their employment status and vice versa.

According to [15], Pearson's linear correlation coefficient is a number that shows the direction and strength of the statistical relationship between the two observed variables. The direction and degree of the agreement depend on the value of the correlation coefficient. In the case when the value of the coefficient is less than 0.2, there is a weak direct correlation, between 0.2 and 0.5 there is a moderate direct correlation, between 0.5 and 0.7 there is a significant direct correlation, from 0.7 to 0.9 strong direct correlation, while at values over 0.9 there is a very strong direct correlation. These rules also apply to the inverse correlation, with these values than having a minus sign [16].

The Mann-Whitney U test is an alternative to the t-test and is one of the most powerful nonparametric tests. Unlike the t-test, which compares the arithmetic means for two groups, this test compares their medians and converts the values of a continuous variable into ranks, comparing and determining whether there is a significant difference between them. Since ranks are used, the actual distribution is not important. If the existence of a statistically significant difference is identified, a mutual comparison of the medians of both observed groups is performed. The magnitude of the impact (r) is calculated according to the pattern $r = Z/\sqrt{N}$ as given in [17], while the Cohen criterion was used for decision making. According to Cohen's criterion, as stated in [18], if r has a value of 0.1, there is a small impact, 0.3 is a medium impact, and 0.5 is a large impact.

3.3. Sample

The sample for the survey contains 115 employees in primary, secondary and high schools in the Leskovac and Vlasotince area. The average age of all respondents is 44 years, with a minimum average standard deviation of 8.25 years. The percentage of women participating in this study is 55% of the average age of 42 years, with a minimum standard deviation of 8.49 years. Men make up 45% of respondents and are slightly older than average (Mean = 45 years; SD = 7.46). If we look at the sample structure according to the length of service, we can see that the average length of service is 12 years with a slight minimum standard deviation of 0.32 years. Almost half of the respondents have a work experience of more than 10 years, which also applies to females, while for men, this percentage is slightly lower and amounts up to 42%. About 72% of respondents are permanently employed, 67% full-time. 67% of women and 40% of men have a permanent employment contract. According to the level of education, the sample analysis shows that highly educated employees make up a share of 83.48%, with a higher share of females. Three quarters of the respondents are married or live with a partner in an extramarital community where the participation of both partners is equal. Through observation of employees' career development, and based on the analysis results, we notice that 35% of respondents (of which 37% are men) kept their first job.

The descriptive statistics of full-time and temporary employees are given in Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4. By observing the scores for all full-time and temporary employees, we notice that the statements concerning the old psychological contract have higher scores than the statements related to the new psychological contract. For full-time employees, the ratings of the statements that determine the old psychological contract range from 2.89 - 4.15 (2.56 - 3.93 for men and 3.16 - 4.35 for women), while the ratings of the statements of the new psychological contract are in the range of 2.15 - 3.52 (2.1 - 3.2 for men and 2.21 - 3.81 for women). Also, the assessments of the statements related to the old psychological contract, given by the temporary employees, ranging from 2.67 - 4.23 (3 - 4.6 for men and 2.5 - 4.2 for women) and they are higher than the scores that determine the new psychological contract, which ranges from 2.2 - 4.03 (2.1 - 4.5 for men and 2.25 - 4 for women). Five of the nine questions answered by permanently employed men concerning the old psychological contract have scores greater than three and less than four, while the remaining questions have scores less than three. Nine of the seventeen questions answered by permanently employed men and concerning the new psychological contract have scores slightly higher than three, up to 3.17. Based on that, we can conclude that the statements concerning the old psychological contract characterise permanently employed men more than the statements that determine the new psychological contract. Based on the previously defined criteria, the statements related to the old psychological contract are fully characterise permanently employed women because all scores are higher than three, while seven of the seventeen questions answered by permanently employed women concerning the new psychological contract have slightly higher scores of three, up to a maximum of 3.81. If we were to make a decision about what type of psychological contract is formed by employees at the level of the observed groups and based on descriptive statistics, it would be an old psychological contract. Also, the analysis of groups by gender leads to the same conclusion. Based on that, we will accept the second and fourth hypothesis according to which the employees of both groups will form the old psychological contract and reject the first and third hypothesis, which assume that the employees of both groups create a transactional psychological contract.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Permanent Employees - Old Psychological Contract

	Total Mean	Total St. Dev.	Total	M Mean	M St. Dev.	M N	F Mean	F St. Dev.	F N
Gender			85			41			44
The employer cares about my personal well-being	3,14	1,432	85	2,68	1,312	41	3,63	1,381	44
The employer takes care of my health and well-being	3,00	1,423	85	2,66	1,315	41	3,37	1,431	44
The employer makes decisions that are in my interest as well	3,22	1,383	85	2,78	1,333	41	3,70	1,264	44
The employer cares about my long-term well-being	3,07	1,412	85	2,56	1,184	41	3,60	1,417	44
The employer supports me in order to achieve a higher level of performance	3,16	1,370	85	2,66	1,217	41	3,67	1,340	44
The employer supports me in meeting higher goals	3,24	1,315	85	2,68	1,150	41	3,79	1,245	44
I see an opportunity for development within the firm	3,21	1,372	85	2,85	1,315	41	3,51	1,352	44
I see an opportunity for advancement within the firm	3,06	1,339	85	2,73	1,184	41	3,33	1,410	44
Opportunity for promotion	2,89	1,263	85	2,61	1,070	41	3,19	1,385	44
I am ready to make personal sacrifices for this organisation	3,20	1,326	85	3,24	1,261	41	3,16	1,413	44
I take the problems of the organisation personally	3,28	1,394	85	3,32	1,404	41	3,28	1,403	44
I protect the reputation of this organisation	4,15	1,160	85	3,93	1,273	41	4,35	1,021	44
I am fully committed to this organisation	4,02	1,091	85	3,73	1,119	41	4,30	1,013	44
I promote myself to be valuable to the employer	3,67	1,148	85	3,32	1,128	41	4,02	1,080	44

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Temporary Employees - Old Psychological Contract

	Total Mean	Total St. Dev.	Total	M Mean	M St. Dev.	M N	F Mean	F St. Dev.	F N
Gender			30			10			20
The employer cares about my personal well-being	3,83	1,262	30	4,10	1,524	10	3,70	1,129	20
The employer takes care of my health and well-being	3,63	1,189	30	4,30	1,160	10	3,30	1,081	20
The employer makes decisions that are in my interest as well	3,67	1,184	30	4,40	843	10	3,30	1,174	20
The employer cares about my long-term well-being	3,40	1,453	30	4,00	1,333	10	3,10	1,447	20
The employer supports me in order to achieve a higher level of performance	3,63	1,402	30	4,20	1,317	10	3,35	1,387	20
The employer supports me in meeting higher goals	3,57	1,501	30	4,00	1,414	10	3,35	1,531	20
I see an opportunity for development within the firm	3,67	1,398	30	4,10	1,449	10	3,45	1,356	20
I see an opportunity for advancement within the firm	3,47	1,408	30	3,90	1,449	10	3,25	1,372	20
Opportunity for promotion	3,13	1,332	30	3,60	1,350	10	2,90	1,294	20
I am ready to make personal sacrifices for this organisation	2,67	1,295	30	3,00	1,333	10	2,50	1,277	20
I take the problems of the organisation personally	3,10	1,213	30	3,70	1,059	10	2,80	1,196	20
I protect the reputation of this organisation	4,30	1,022	30	4,60	699	10	4,15	1,137	20
I am fully committed to this organisation	4,23	,971	30	4,50	850	10	4,10	1,021	20
I promote myself to be valuable to the employer	4,23	,935	30	4,30	823	10	4,20	1,005	20

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Permanent Employees - New Psychological Contract

	Total Mean	Total St. Dev.	Total	M Mean	M St. Dev.	M N	F Mean	F St. Dev.	F N
Gender			85			41			44
Limited engagement in the organisation	2,86	1,255	85	2,80	1,100	41	2,88	1,401	44
It provides me with training only for the existing job	2,88	1,384	85	2,49	1,287	41	3,23	1,394	44
My job is limited to specific, precisely defined responsibilities	3,16	1,396	85	2,93	1,292	41	3,42	1,468	44
The employer helps me develop marketable skills	2,72	1,315	85	2,63	1,240	41	2,81	1,402	44
I get assignments that increase my employability outside the organisation	2,35	1,241	85	2,17	1,116	41	2,56	1,333	44
I am looking for potential employment opportunities outside the organisation	2,15	1,210	85	2,10	1,068	41	2,23	1,342	44
I develop contacts that create employment opportunities elsewhere	2,34	1,220	85	2,46	1,206	41	2,21	1,245	44
I only do the necessary work	2,93	1,370	85	3,15	1,236	41	2,72	1,485	44
I only do what I get paid to do	3,05	1,388	85	3,05	1,264	41	3,02	1,520	44
I have limited liability	3,01	1,277	85	3,17	1,160	41	2,86	1,390	44
I only do the job for which I signed an employment contract	3,00	1,389	85	3,02	1,255	41	3,00	1,528	44
I have no further obligations to the employer	2,98	1,291	85	3,02	1,313	41	2,98	1,263	44
I can leave work at any time	2,94	1,499	85	3,05	1,359	41	2,88	1,621	44
I increase my visibility to potential employers outside the organisation	2,91	1,315	85	2,90	1,221	41	2,91	1,428	44
I am increasing my ability to increase my future employability	3,04	1,358	85	3,07	1,253	41	3,00	1,480	44
I find tasks that improve my employability	3,19	1,249	85	3,12	1,122	41	3,23	1,377	44
I am actively searching and finding opportunities for training and personal development	3,52	1,221	85	3,20	1,123	41	3,81	1,258	44

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Temporary Employees - New Psychological Contract

	Total Mean	Total St. Dev.	Total	M Mean	M St. Dev.	M N	F Mean	F St. Dev.	F N
Gender			30			10			20
Limited engagement in the organisation	2,73	1,258	30	2,90	1,449	10	2,65	1,182	20
It provides me with training only for the existing job	3,00	1,414	30	3,30	1,418	10	2,85	1,424	20

My job is limited to specific, precisely defined responsibilities	2,93	1,285	30	3,50	1,179	10	2,65	1,268	20
The employer helps me develop marketable skills	3,20	1,400	30	3,60	1,430	10	3,00	1,376	20
I get assignments that increase my employability outside the organisation	2,20	1,157	30	2,10	1,197	10	2,25	1,164	20
I am looking for potential employment opportunities outside the organisation	2,53	1,456	30	3,10	1,595	10	2,25	1,333	20
I develop contacts that create employment opportunities elsewhere	2,73	1,574	30	3,00	1,633	10	2,60	1,569	20
I only do the necessary work	2,43	1,547	30	2,80	1,549	10	2,25	1,552	20
I only do what I get paid to do	2,80	1,540	30	3,20	1,751	10	2,60	1,429	20
I have limited liability	3,30	1,236	30	3,70	1,059	10	3,10	1,294	20
I only do the job for which I signed an employment contract	3,13	1,502	30	3,60	1,430	10	2,90	1,518	20
I have no further obligations to the employer	3,20	1,518	30	4,30	1,337	10	2,65	1,309	20
I can leave work at any time	2,90	1,517	30	3,00	1,700	10	2,85	1,461	20
I increase my visibility to potential employers outside the organisation	2,90	1,373	30	3,20	1,619	10	2,75	1,251	20
I am increasing my ability to increase my future employability	3,93	1,202	30	3,80	1,619	10	4,00	,973	20
I find tasks that improve my employability	3,87	1,074	30	4,00	1,414	10	3,80	,894	20
I am actively searching and finding opportunities for training and personal development	4,03	1,033	30	4,50	,972	10	3,80	1,005	20

4. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of data using the χ^2 test showed that there is a relationship between the answers to the given questions and the working status of employees, in thirteen of the fourteen questions that characterise the old psychological contract and fourteen of the seventeen questions concerning the new psychological contract. The remaining questions did not identify the relationship between the given statements and the working status of employees based on the results of the χ^2 test. The values obtained by the χ^2 test are given in Tables 5 and 6. In the second phase of the analysis, the results obtained using the χ^2 test were examined using the Pearson correlation coefficient to identify the degree of agreement between the given statements. The results of this analysis are given in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 5: Data Analysis using χ^2 test and Pearson Correlation - Old Psychological Contract

	df 4 $\alpha=0,05$ $\chi^2_{(r-1)(s-1);\alpha}=2,1318$	Pearson Chi-Square Value	N of Valid Cases	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2- tailed)
The employer cares about my personal well-being		5,665	115	0,215*	0,021
The employer takes care of my health and well-being		12,163	115	0,201*	0,031
The employer makes decisions that are in my interest as well		3,563	115	0,145	0,121
The employer cares about my long-term well-being		2,804	115	0,102	0,278
The employer supports me in order to achieve a higher level of performance		3,690	115	0,149	0,112
The employer supports me in meeting higher goals		4,818	115	0,107	0,256
I see an opportunity for development within the firm		3,733	115	0,145	0,123
I see an opportunity for advancement within the firm		3,079	115	0,132	0,160
I am ready to make personal sacrifices for this organisation		4,445	115	-0,176	0,059
I take the problems of the organisation personally		2,481	115	-0,060	0,526
I protect the reputation of this organisation		2,628	115	0,058	0,540
I am fully committed to this organisation		6,915	115	0,087	0,354
I promote myself to be valuable to the employer		6,693	115	0,221*	0,017

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 6: Data Analysis using χ^2 test and Pearson Correlation - New Psychological Contract

	df 4 $\alpha=0,05$ $\chi^2_{(r-1)(s-1);\alpha}=2,1318$	Pearson Chi-Square Value	N of Valid Cases	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2- tailed)
My job is limited to specific, precisely defined responsibilities		2,276	115	-0,075	0,428

The employer helps me develop marketable skills	3,782	115	0,158	0,092
I get assignments that increase my employability outside the organisation	8,520	115	-0,055	0,556
I am looking for potential employment opportunities outside the organisation	3,232	115	0,131	0,164
I develop contacts that create employment opportunities elsewhere	9,312	115	0,130	0,165
I only do the necessary work	7,622	115	-0,153	0,102
I only do what I get paid to do	3,425	115	-0,076	0,417
I only do the job for which I signed an employment contract	2,827	115	0,042	0,659
I have no further obligations to the employer	5,584	115	0,073	0,438
I can leave work at any time	3,232	115	-0,012	0,898
I increase my visibility to potential employers outside the organisation	4,066	115	-0,002	0,983
I am increasing my ability to increase my future employability	12,423	115	0,289**	0,002
I find tasks that improve my employability	7,295	115	0,242**	0,009
I am actively searching and finding opportunities for training and personal development	5,661	115	0,191*	0,041

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The correlation coefficients' values show the weak and insignificant correlation between employment status and the given statements for both psychological contracts. In the old psychological contract, the values are lower and do not exceed 0.221, while in ten of the thirteen questions, the value is less than 0.2 and indicates a weak correlation. In the new psychological contract, two of the fourteen questions have a value greater than 0.2, while the remaining ones have a lower value so that there is a low correlation here as well. Through observation, we notice that the values of the correlation coefficients for the statements that characterise psychological contract are higher than the values of the correlation coefficients that characterise psychological contract.

We subjected these statements to another nonparametric test. With the help of the Mann-Whitney U test, we examined whether the statements concerning the old and the new psychological contract differed depending on whether temporary or permanent employees gave the answers.

Table 7: Man-Whitney U Test Results (Test Statistics (a)) - Old Psychological Contract

	The employer cares about my personal well-being	The employer takes care of my health and well-being	The employer makes decisions that are in my interest as well	The employer cares about my long-term well-being	The employer supports me in order to achieve a higher level of performance	The employer supports me in meeting higher goals
Mann-Whitney U	924,000	958,000	1050,000	1105,500	1041,000	1097,000
Wilcoxon W	4579,000	4613,000	4705,000	4760,500	4696,000	4752,000
Z	-2,291	-2,064	-1,468	-1,103	-1,542	-1,167
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0,022	0,039	0,142	0,270	0,123	0,243
$r = Z/\sqrt{N}$	0,214	0,193	0,137	0,103	0,144	0,109

a. Grouping Variable: What is your employment status?

Table 7 continued.

	I see an opportunity for development within the firm	I see an opportunity for advancement within the firm	I am ready to make personal sacrifices for this organisation	I take the problems of the organisation personally	I protect the reputation of this organisation	I am fully committed to this organisation
Mann-Whitney U	1036,000	1062,500	990,500	1168,000	1139,000	921,000
Wilcoxon W	4691,000	4717,500	1455,500	1633,000	4794,000	4576,000
Z	-1,565	-1,389	-1,854	-0,700	-0,925	-2,353
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0,118	0,165	0,064	0,484	0,355	0,019
$r = Z/\sqrt{N}$	0,146	0,129	0,1729	0,065	0,086	0,219

a. Grouping Variable: What is your employment status?

The magnitude of the impact (r) for all previously calculated statements shows a small impact, which means no statistically significant impact of employment status on the given statements has been identified.

Table 8: Man-Whitney U Test Results (Ranks) - Old Psychological Contract

	What is your employment status?	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
The employer cares about my personal well-being	Permanent employment	85	53,87	4579,00
	Temporary employment	30	69,70	2091,00
	Total	115		
The employer takes care of my health and well-being	Permanent employment	85	54,27	4613,00
	Temporary employment	30	68,57	2057,00
	Total	115		
The employer makes decisions that are in my interest as well	Permanent employment	85	55,35	4705,00
	Temporary employment	30	65,50	1965,00
	Total	115		
The employer cares about my long-term well-being	Permanent employment	85	56,01	4760,50
	Temporary employment	30	63,65	1909,50
	Total	115		
The employer supports me in order to achieve a higher level of performance	Permanent employment	85	55,25	4696,00
	Temporary employment	30	65,80	1974,00
	Total	115		
The employer supports me in meeting higher goals	Permanent employment	85	55,91	4752,00
	Temporary employment	30	63,93	1918,00
	Total	115		
I see an opportunity for development within the firm	Permanent employment	85	55,19	4691,00
	Temporary employment	30	65,97	1979,00
	Total	115		
I see an opportunity for advancement within the firm	Permanent employment	85	55,50	4717,50
	Temporary employment	30	65,08	1952,50
	Total	115		
I am ready to make personal sacrifices for this organisation	Permanent employment	85	61,35	5214,50
	Temporary employment	30	48,25	1455,50
	Total	115		
I take the problems of the organisation personally	Permanent employment	85	59,26	5037,00
	Temporary employment	30	54,43	1633,00
	Total	115		
I protect the reputation of this organisation	Permanent employment	85	56,40	4794,00
	Temporary employment	30	62,53	1876,00
	Total	115		
I promote myself to be valuable to the employer	Permanent employment	85	53,84	4576,00
	Temporary employment	30	69,80	2094,00
	Total	115		

The fourth column of Table 8 (Mean Rank) shows which variable was higher on average. Given that there were no significant differences between the observed variables in the statements concerning the old psychological contract, it is not necessary to specifically analyse the values of Table 8.

Table 9: Man-Whitney U Test Results (Test Statistics (a)) - New Psychological Contract

	My job is limited to specific, precisely defined responsibilities	The employer helps me develop marketable skills	I get assignments that increase my employability outside the organisation	I am looking for potential employment opportunities outside the organisation	I develop contacts that create employment opportunities elsewhere	I only do the necessary work	I only do what I get paid to do
Mann-Whitney U	1156,000	1023,000	1199,000	1102,000	1106,000	1020,500	1153,000
Wilcoxon W	1621,000	4678,000	1664,000	4757,000	4761,000	1485,500	1618,000

Z	-0,775	-1,641	-0,502	-1,148	-1,113	-1,676	-0,796
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0,439	0,101	0,616	0,251	0,266	0,094	0,426
$r = Z/\sqrt{N}$	0,072	0,153	0,047	0,107	0,104	0,156	0,074

a. Grouping Variable: What is your employment status?

Table 9 continues.

	I only do the job for which I signed an employment contract	I have no further obligations to the employer	I can leave work at any time	I increase my visibility to potential employers outside the organisation	I am increasing my ability to increase my future employability	I find tasks that improve my employability	I am actively searching and finding opportunities for training and personal development
Mann-Whitney U	1204,500	1156,000	1253,500	1263,500	794,500	879,000	966,500
Wilcoxon W	4859,500	4811,000	1718,500	4918,500	4449,500	4534,000	4621,500
Z	-0,460	-0,779	-0,141	-0,075	-3,156	-2,591	-2,037
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0,646	0,436	0,888	0,940	0,002	0,010	0,042
$r = Z/\sqrt{N}$	0,043	0,073	0,013	0,007	0,294	0,242	0,190

a. Grouping Variable: What is your employment status?

The magnitude of impact (r) previously calculated for almost all statements shows that a small impact is present, while a statistically significant impact was identified for the statement related to increasing one's ability to increase future employability. Employment status has a medium impact on whether employees will increase their abilities to increase future employability because the value is obtained by applying the Mann-Whitney U test $U = 4449.5$, $Z = -3.156$, $n = 115$, $r = 0.2943$ (0.3), $Md = 3.93$ in 30 temporary employees and $Md = 3.04$ in 80 full - time employees, and we conclude that there is a statistically significant difference between the observed variables.

Table 10: Man-Whitney U Test Results (Ranks) - New Psychological Contract

	What is your employment status?	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
My job is limited to specific, precisely defined responsibilities	Permanent employment	85	59,40	5049,00
	Temporary employment	30	54,03	1621,00
	Total	115		
The employer helps me develop marketable skills	Permanent employment	85	55,04	4678,00
	Temporary employment	30	66,40	1992,00
	Total	115		
I get assignments that increase my employability outside the organisation	Permanent employment	85	58,89	5006,00
	Temporary employment	30	55,47	1664,00
	Total	115		
I am looking for potential employment opportunities outside the organisation	Permanent employment	85	55,96	4757,00
	Temporary employment	30	63,77	1913,00
	Total	115		
I develop contacts that create employment opportunities elsewhere	Permanent employment	85	56,01	4761,00
	Temporary employment	30	63,63	1909,00
	Total	115		
I only do the necessary work	Permanent employment	85	60,99	5184,50
	Temporary employment	30	49,52	1485,50
	Total	115		
I only do what I get paid to do	Permanent employment	85	59,44	5052,00
	Temporary employment	30	53,93	1618,00
	Total	115		
I only do the job for which I signed an employment contract	Permanent employment	85	57,17	4859,50
	Temporary employment	30	60,35	1810,50
	Total	115		

I have no further obligations to the employer	Permanent employment	85	56,60	4811,00
	Temporary employment	30	61,97	1859,00
	Total	115		
I can leave my work at any time	Permanent employment	85	58,25	4951,50
	Temporary employment	30	57,28	1718,50
	Total	115		
I increase my visibility to potential employers outside the organisation	Permanent employment	85	57,86	4918,50
	Temporary employment	30	58,38	1751,50
	Total	115		
I am increasing my ability to increase my future employability	Permanent employment	85	52,35	4449,50
	Temporary employment	30	74,02	2220,50
	Total	115		
I find tasks that improve my employability	Permanent employment	85	53,34	4534,00
	Temporary employment	30	71,20	2136,00
	Total	115		
I am actively searching and finding opportunities for training and personal development	Permanent employment	85	54,37	4621,50
	Temporary employment	30	68,28	2048,50
	Total	115		

The fourth column of Table 10 (Mean Rank) shows which variable was higher on average. Based on the Mean Rank value for the question "I am increasing my abilities to increase my future employability", we notice that the variable temporary employment was higher on average (Mean Rank = 74.02) compared to the variable permanent employment (Mean Rank = 52.35).

Table 11: Statement: I increase my ability to increase my future employability (Mean Report)

What is your employment status?	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Permanent employment	3,04	85	1,358
Temporary employment	3,93	30	1,202
Total	3,27	115	1,372

Data on the medians of the observed groups show that the values of the average continuous variable were higher among temporary employees for the question related to the increase of their abilities for the sake of future employability (Table 11).

5. CONCLUSION

This paper analyses the existence of a relationship between the employment status of employees and the content of the psychological contract they build. The sample consists of employees in primary, secondary and higher education institutions in Leskovac and Vlasotince area. The analysis' results should provide answers to four hypotheses. First, the data analysis was performed with the help of descriptive statistics, where the results at the group level showed that employees prefer an older psychological contract. Based on the value of arithmetic means of four hypotheses, we accepted the second hypothesis, which assumes that temporary employees will form a relational (old) psychological contract and the fourth hypothesis, which defines those permanent employees will form a relational (old) psychological contract. In the second step of the analysis, the dependence between the answers to the given questions and the work status of both groups of respondents was examined by the χ^2 test. The results of the χ^2 test for the old psychological contract show that thirteen of the fourteen statements depend on the working status of the respondents, while in the new psychological contract, the ratio is slightly lower, fourteen of the seventeen questions. After that, we examined the degree of dependence on these questions by applying the correlation coefficient. Although the values of the correlation coefficients are higher for the statements concerning the old one in relation to the new psychological contract, all the obtained values show that there is a low and insignificant correlation between the employment status and the given statements for both psychological contracts. The results of the Mann-Whitney U test confirmed the previously obtained results. The calculated values of the size of the impact (r) of employment status on the statements concerning both psychological contracts, except for one statement which is characteristic of the new psychological contract and refers to the readiness to increase skills in order to ensure a more favourable future employability, show that there is little impact.

Regarding this statement, temporary employees have shown a greater tendency to increase their abilities in order to improve their future employability, which is expected because it is not certain that their contract will be renewed or changed after the expiration of the existing employment contract, but they may lose their jobs. This empirical research has certain limitations. The statistical sample itself is small, so there are small groups (permanent and temporary employees) formed for the needs of the analysis so that the obtained results cannot be generalised. One limitation also

refers to the content of the survey, which does not contain a sufficient number of statements in order to precisely determine the content of the psychological contract that most characterises a certain group of respondents. In order to overcome these limitations, it is necessary to review and modify the existing survey and increase the number of respondents who will participate in the survey.

LITERATURA

- [1] Levinson H., Price C. R., Munden K. J., Mandl H. J., Solley C. M. *Men, Management, and Mental Health*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 1962.
- [2] Newell H., Dopson S., Muddle in the middle: organisational restructuring and middle management careers, *Personnel Review*, 4(25), 1996: 4-20.
- [3] Rousseau D. *Psychological Contracts in Organisations: Understanding Written and Unwritten Agreements*, Sage: Thousand Oaks; 1995.
- [4] Lu V.N., Capezio A., Restubog S. L. D., Garcia P. R. J. M., Wang L. In pursuit of service excellence: Investigating the role of psychological contracts and organisational identification of frontline hotel employees, *Tour. Manag.* 56, 2016: 8–19.
- [5] Rousseau D. New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: a study of psychological contracts, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11, 1990: 389–400.
- [6] Millward L.J., Hopkins L.J. Psychological contracts, organisational and job commitment, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 1998: 1530–1556.
- [7] Guest D., Conway N. *Employee Motivation and the Psychological Contract*. London: CIPD; 1997.
- [8] Quinlan M., Mayhew C., Bohle P. Contingent work: Health and safety perspectives. Paper presented to the workshop on Just in Time Employment – Organizational, Psychological and Medical Perspectives", Dublin: European Foundation, 2000.
- [9] Isaksson K., Bernhard C., Claes R., De Witte H., Guest D., Krausz M., Mohr G., Peiró J., Schalk R., *Employment contracts and psychological contracts in Europe Results from a pilot study*. Stockholm: National Institute for Working Life & SALTSA; 2003.
- [10] Millward L., Hopkins L. Psychological contracts, organisational and job commitment, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 1998: 1530–1556.
- [11] Guest D., Conway N. *Fairness at Work and the Psychological Contract*. London: CIPD; 1998.
- [12] Guest D. Flexible employment contracts, the psychological contract and employee outcomes: an analysis and review of the evidence, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 5/6, 2004: 1–19.
- [13] Rousseau D. *Psychological contract inventory technical report*. Pennsylvania: Heinz School of Public Policy and Graduate School of Industrial Administration Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh; 2000.
- [14] Panik M. *Advanced statistics from an elementary point of view*. USA: Elsevier Academic Press; 2005.
- [15] Sharma K. *Business statistics*. Noida: Vikas Publishing House; 2018.
- [16] Marjanović M., Mihailović I., Spasić K. *Statistika u ekonomiji i poslovanju sa zbirkom rešenih zadataka*. Leskovac: Visoka poslovna škola strukovnih studija; 2016.
- [17] Suzić N. *Primenjena pedagoška metodologija*. Banja Luka: HBS; 2007.
- [18] Cohen J.W. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd edn)*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1988.