

DECISION SCIENCES INSTITUTE
Inclusion and Employer Obligation- The Indian Scenario

ABSTRACT

Employee and employer relationship and the changing scenario of employment gives rise to various issues which affect the motivation and responses of individuals at workplace. The aim of this paper is to examine the relationship of Inclusion and Employer Obligation at the workplace. The research design method used for compilation of data 191 employees from power sector in India. The results helped in gaining insight with the help of correlation and regression analysis.

KEYWORDS: Inclusion, Employer Obligation, psychological contract, employer-employee relationship, workplace exchange.

INTRODUCTION

Inclusion and Diversity differentiates an organization in the marketplace and contributes to a culture of inclusion in the workplace. It drives the capacity to recognize and build up the best ability, create a committed and engaged workforce and upgrade Quality of Life for the customers, clients, and groups that they serve. Thus, commitment to inclusion and diversity promotes growth and cultivates external partnerships (Sodexo).

Human resource is the life-line of any organization and therefore the relationship between the employees and employer is of highest significance (Ravanda, 2014). In order to be successful in the social environment, an individual needs to interact effectively and feel included. The relationships between the employee and employer are however characterised by the rights and obligations of reciprocity (International Labour Organization). Also, the relationships at workplace are highly pervasive in nature considering that the relationships whether personal or professional involves higher stakes (UNISON Pharmaceuticals). Every organization cautiously decides the nature of rights and obligations an employer has towards the employees. Though, both the employee and employer have their self- guided interests but their choices should be driven by the principles of care, honesty and respect (Josephson, 2016). Employment contracts have constantly been regarded as safety nets in case the relationship of employee and employer comes to an end (Tauber et al., 2002). From past few years the conceptualizations of psychological contracts have got much attention, thus adding to the relationship between employers and employees. Over the past few years, the concept of psychological contracts has got much attention, thus adding to the literature of relationship between employers and employees (Thomas et al., 2003). Further, Farmer & Fedor (1999) empirically revealed that the associations between employee participation and fulfilment of perceived contract and the context of non- profit association. "The psychological contract processes seem to work in a wide variety of contexts, people and work relationships, and the basic discussion processes are similar" is emphasized by the authors.

Owing to a lot of competition due to globalization, the business environment puts a lot of pressure on how well the organizations structure and what practices they follow to motivate and retain their employees (Hitt, 1998; Cappelli, 1999). With the advents of new market, competition and technological advancements it has become the employer's obligation to include and engage employees at all work levels (Neilson et al., 2000). At present Employees are frequently employed for certain skills and abilities that can assist the organization in accomplishing exclusive standards of performance. As rivalry increases gaining a better comprehension of what individuals want for their employment relationship are basic to the success of these endeavours.

In 1989, Rousseau emphasised that Psychological contract is a moral binding rather than a legal one. Promise acts as the adhesive which binds different parties to fulfill the

considerations and exchanges which are mutually beneficial. Additionally, Rousseau (1990) mentioned that employment contract does not contain items found in PC which is subjective and moral in nature (Rousseau, 1990) and hence cannot be established inherently and therefore cannot be established as a binding on either of the parties (Rousseau, 1995, 1998).

This study examines relationship of inclusion and the employer obligation in Indian Power sector. The study tries to investigate how perceived differences which exist between the importance and fulfilment of psychological contract obligations affect the employee's reaction at work.

INDIAN POWER SECTOR

The survival and expansion of infrastructure is very essential for the sustained growth of any economy. Power being one of the most crucial constituents of infrastructure is critical for the growth and welfare of the nations. Being a developing nation, the power sector of India is considered as one of the most diversified sectors in the world. The demand for Power in the country has increased exponentially and is expected to escalate further in the near future. In order to fulfil the increasing demand of Power supply in the country, a huge installed generation capacity is needed.

Past studies and reports have already described the principal driving forces behind Power sector reforms (Bacon, 1995; Patterson, 1999; World Energy Council, 1998; International Energy Agency, 1999). As per EY's Renewable Energy Country Attractiveness Index, India has been ranked third among 40 nations, considering the fact that the government is focussing on promoting renewable energy and implementation of projects in a lesser period of time.

It is the endeavour of the Government to ensure that industry, agriculture and commercial establishments and all the households receive incessant supply of power at reasonable prices. The Ministry of Power envisions consistent, reasonable and quality supply for all users. In the prevailing situation, this might appear to be an ambitious goal. Over a period of time, the priorities of both employer and employee have considerably changed in India, especially the Power sector owing to the reforms brought in by the government. Also, there is a limited research in Indian context (Blancero et al., 2007) and by and large borrowed from the west. Additionally, the influence of cultural differences on perception of psychological contract has been largely ignored (Zhao and Chen, 2008). Although, various studies have been conducted investigating the consequences of an individual's psychological contract on his or her commitment to the organization and organizational behavior in a public sector (Crewson 1997; Young et al., 1998). Thus, there is a need to study the inclusion and obligation relationship in Indian Power sector. Further, the coming sections would present the literature, methods, hypothesis statements, sample profile, and statistical methods used.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Psychological contract

Since the 90's of 20th century, Psychological contract has been a broiling area of OB and HR management research. Argyris (1960) coined the term Psychological contract (PC) and studied it in the context of leadership style used by the superior. The term 'psychological work contract' emphasized the implicit relationship between the leader and the subordinates as a repercussion of the leadership style used by the leaders in an organization. In 1970, Schein added that employees and employers have multiple expectations from each other. Additionally, Kotter (1973) specified the expectation of both employee and employer and examined the scope of incongruence between employee and employer expectation.

Rousseau (1995) added that PC refers to 'beliefs of an individual which are being shaped by the organization considering the terms of an exchange between employee and the employer. According to the literature psychological contracts are divided into two parts namely transactional PC and relational PC. In 1994, Robinson et al., defined that a transactional contract is established in short-term monetary interaction such as merit pay and requires the involvement of the employer and employee to a limited extent. In contrast, a relational contract is based upon comprehensive, long-term interchange and reflects socio-emotional essentials such as trust, commitment and loyalty (Cavanaugh & Noe, 1999). Both, transactional and relational types of contracts are the opposite ends of a continuum (Rousseau & Parks, 1993; Rousseau, 1990; Shore & Tetrick, 1994) or an employee can be high or low on both the relational and transactional dimension (Shore et al., 2006).

Another study by Shore & Tetrick (1994) suggested that the concept of the PC is aimed to capture the beliefs of employees regarding the mutual obligations that exist in the context of the employer and employee association. While operationalizing an obligation of transactional nature in the realm of a PC, the following aspects have been encompassed namely merit pay, rapid advancement and high pay (MacNeil's, 1985; Robinson et al., 1994). Whereas the obligations of relational nature deals with the long-lasting need to belong, support with personal problems, job security, training & development opportunities, career development and (Robinson et al., 1994). Further, Rousseau (1990) proposed that obligations of relational and transactional nature denote the opposite ends of a continuum which demonstrate the social and economic exchange. Whereas few studies suggested that the contract terms cannot be consistently characterized as either relational or transactional (Rousseau & Tijoriwala, 1998) and that employee- employer relationships may contain both the elements (Arnold, 1996).

Albeit, the understanding of PC has climbed multiple ladders since the idea's first conception (Roehling, 1996), still the fundamentals remain unaltered. The component of reciprocity is fundamental crux of PC which requires responses from employees in order to get a favourable treatment from the employer (Rousseau & Parks, 1993). Further, Gouldner (1960) suggested that reciprocity is collective in its demands meaning that individuals should support and not harm those individuals who have helped them. According to the social exchange theory, individuals have a tendency to return the employer treatment by enhancing their supportive behaviour, helping them in adjusting to the new environment, engaging in organizationally or both (Eisenberger & colleagues; 1986). They operationalized and defined Perceived Support as employee beliefs about "the degree to which an organization look out for the well-being of its employees by giving consideration to their contributions ". High levels of organizational support fulfilled the socio-emotional needs of employees (Maslow, 1943) and create an obligation to repay the organization. Empirical evidence suggested that the fulfillment of needs of social nature created an obligation to reciprocate and that exchange leads to organizational commitment (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Guzzo et al., 1994) and organizational citizenship behavior (Wayne et al., 1997; Moorman et al., 1998). Also, Tornikoski (2012) suggested the mediating role of the employee's perceptions to fulfil the employer obligations. Further, research (Tekleab, 2005; Robinson, 1996; Dulac et al., 2008) inclined that an employee's rational assessment of what they got as compared to what they have been guaranteed shapes their attitudes and behaviours towards their employers. Additionally, Mathijs (2010) suggested that social exchanges between the employee and employer affect the psychological contract in an organization.

Rousseau (2000) measured PC using content, feature and evaluation based measures which came to be known as elements. Few studies supported that there is an element of variability indicating the effect of culture (Herriot et al., 1997; Rousseau & Schalk, 2000). Further, the literature intensely argues in favour of the need for a new psychological contract (Petersitzke, 2009) in Indian context. Considering the strong linkage between PC and critical

organizational outcomes (Vos & Meganck, 2009; Deery et al., 2006), organization commitment, organizational citizenship behaviour, in-role performance (Zhao et al., 2007) and its idiosyncratic nature (Rousseau, 2000). It is imperative to have clarity about explicit obligations which constitutes PC. Furthermore, the incapability of organizations to deliver its obligations is also complemented by a reduction in level of commitment and job satisfaction to the organization.

Various theories like Social exchange theory have provided a descriptive framework of the processes that lead employees to notice a negative event and, hence, Breach of Psychological Contract (PCB). Further, Zhao et al. (2007) studied affective events theory in order to explain the relationship between PC, attitudes and behaviors in a meta-analytical research on the relationship between PCB and results/ consequences. Additionally, the theory of Social exchange supported that individuals engage in interactions or interpersonal relations with other people because they are inspired by the anticipation of getting enticements in exchange from the other party (Gouldner, 1960; Blau, 1964). Taylor & Tekleab (2004), argued that social exchanges and the element of reciprocity play the most crucial role in the PC because mutual obligations, as social exchanges, is the foundation of a psychological contract.

Table 1: Definitions of Psychological contract

Year	Authors	Definition
1980	Schein	Organization is the threads which bind managers and workers. In this mutual coexistence there are certain unrecorded standard operating procedure between the employer and employee.
1989	Rousseau	Psychological contract is a moral binding rather than a legal one. Promise acts as the adhesive which binds different parties to fulfill the considerations and exchanges which are mutually beneficial.
1994	Spindler,	Human behaviour is a complex and versatile interface which leads to multiple unfulfilled expectations.
1997	Herriot & Pemberton	Employment relationship is all about the relationship between perception and binding on each party.
1973; 1998	Kotter,; Rousseau and Tijoriwala,	Contemporary human resource creates a space for mutual expectations which includes terms and conditions of beneficial alliance among the employer and employee.

INCLUSION

Workplace **comprises** of individuals who all have their own perspectives of the world **Effective relationships and good practice in the workplace ensures the success of organisations and henceforth the growth of economy.** Organisations represent their members at two levels Employers' and employees' respectively and they have their own assignment to be taken care of by each other.

Nicholas Carr (2010), in his book The Shallows, conceptualised that in this industrial era the human brain have been mechanised irrespective of being socially wired. Shawn Hunter (2014) supported that the sense or feeling of not belonging to a place or a culture can have implications at workplace leading to no clear sense of role clarity, commitment to any task

and collaborative effectiveness in a team. The work should be considered as an agreement between the employer and employee regarding rendering of certain duties for a pre-determined compensation. Despite the fact of greater advances in modern day medico-technical- managerial domains, the very basic premise of duty and compensation still finds a relevant place. The significant transformation in human behaviour especially in developed nation still finds relevance in business activities along with socio- economic dispensations.

Judith Schulevitz (2012) described that the mechanism of neurobiology drives the need to exist, suggested that “Natural selection favoured people who needed people. Human are vastly more social than other mammals, even most primates, and to develop what neuroscientists call our social brain, we had to be good at cooperating.” The irony is that workplace now-a-days end up in creating social isolation.

Owing to the complex nature of the constructs, researchers have used need for belongingness and inclusion interchangeably because of the reason that individuals seek inclusion in the light of belongingness. The reason for employee’s connection to work and the workplace is due to a sense of belonging. Dr. Abraham Maslow, a pioneering social psychologist, ranks “belonging” as 3rd and significant component in his Hierarchy of Needs for human satisfaction and fulfilment placing it above physiological and security needs. Individuals feel that they fit in. On one level they fit because the work is interesting while on another they feel connected to their co-workers. In 1995, Baumeister and Leary proposed the “hypothesis of belongingness”, which proposed that human beings have consistently maintained a nominal percentage of enduring, significant interpersonal relationships.

In 2003, Sack added that when things of disagreement are done with good intent they lead to beneficial enrichment on each side. Additionally, Geoff MacDonald and Mark R. Leary at argued that positive emotions are likely to be experienced considering an individual feels loved, feels a sense of belongingness, reason being these feelings contribute to happiness, calmness and satisfaction. The process that states the significance of individual, what he deserves and desires for which includes to be loved and accepted, is Inclusion. In 1999, Sapon-Shevin added that “Inclusion means we all belong”. Additionally, Adler (1930) and Ferguson, (1989) cited regarding the fundamental need of human belongingness. Further, Baumeister and Leary (1995) presented a pool of evidence which supported their argument of belongingness being fundamental to human need. Since then, empirical research on the need to belong and inclusion has expanded rapidly. Various studies have cited that being left alone at workplace could further lead to harmful and less helpful behaviors resulting in decreased productivity, as rated by supervisors (Thau et al., 2007). Inclusion of any individual is something that should be a compulsory act; no one regardless of any status has the right to deny or decline any individual or group of individual from being part of something (Cureton, 2014). Contemporary learning has mentioned certain threats to social needs. Lieberman & Eisenberger (2008) Anxiety, avoidance of tasks and uncooperative or even undermining behavior can all result when the environment indicates threats to social needs.

Will Schultz (1958) developed FIRO-B which regulates an individual's need for inclusion, control and affection, (I, C, and A) and splits the results into two categories: 'expressed' behaviour (how much we express behaviour, or signal it, to the outside world) and 'wanted' behaviour (how much we actually want it for ourselves). The need for Inclusion or belongingness refers to the degree to which individuals require to have social interactions and relations with others (Hammer & Schnell, 2000). Further, the need of inclusion is divided into two parts namely the Expressed need for inclusion (an individual expresses his needs) and the Wanted need for inclusion (an individual waits so that others can initiate the process of belongingness or inclusion) which have been studied in the current study. The need for social interaction or the individual level of social-interaction with others and association among others clearly states the need for inclusion. In multiple studies FIRO-B has been

used as an instrument to measure the extent by which each of these interpersonal needs is expressed or wanted (Schnell & Hammer, 1993). Expressed needs refer to behaviors individuals demonstrate toward others, whereas wanted needs refer to behaviors individuals prefer to have exhibited toward them by others (Schutz, 1958). The current study examines the need for inclusion out of the three dimensions.

HYPOTHESES/ MODEL

According to Lam & Hui (1999), all values (socially approved goals) derive from three universal requirements of human existence: biological needs, requisites of coordinated social interaction, and the demands of group functioning. Groups and individuals represent these requirements cognitively as necessary, trans-situational goals, having variable importance, that function as the regulatory principles in the lives (Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995) of people in turn reflecting the terms of values. Further, Schwartz and Sagiv (1995) emphasized upon treating and accepting others as equals along with the concern for their welfare (benevolence and universalism). Earlier researches by Bentein et al., (2005) and Dulac et al. (2008) confirm the strong psychometric properties of revised measure which are: "I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization", "I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization" (R), (R) and "I do not feel a strong sense of 'belonging' to my organization" (R). There are only few studies in the literature of PC which address the formation of PC empirically (Robinson et al., 1994; Thomas & Anderson, 1998). Thomas and Anderson (1998) explained changes in the PC through socialization. Though, the researchers have established and well supported the need of Inclusion but there is hardly any literature available on Expressed Inclusion and Wanted Inclusion in relation to Employer Obligation. Thus there is a dearth of literature in this field and this study would provide researchers some understanding of the concerned theme. Following the above mentioned literature the hypothesis has been formulated as under:

H1: Expressed Inclusion is positively related to Employer Obligation.

H2: Wanted Inclusion is positively related to Employer Obligation.



Fig 1: Hypothesised Model

METHODS

Participants and Procedures

Sample statistics of the respondents includes the respondent statistics on the basis of the type of organization and the level of employees (middle-level employees). A cross-sectional survey-based research design was taken for the purpose of data collection. Specifically, respondent employees were surveyed via convenience sampling method (Suen et al., 2014). The data were collected by researchers by conducting personal visits and through training programs from the Public sector. Of the 221 survey questionnaires that were distributed, nearly 205 survey questionnaires were returned from the respondents. After preliminary screening and subsequent processing of the missing data, 14 survey forms were discarded, thereby resulting in overall 191 usable responses.

Respondents consisted of 87.6 percent males and 12.4 percent female middle-level employees from public sector organizations in North India. The respondents were in four age brackets namely 51- 60 years, 41–50 years, 31–40 years, 21–30 years for the current study.

Measures

Inclusion

The Inclusion was assessed by using a 19 item scale for Expressed Inclusion and Wanted Inclusion (9 items each) adopted form scale developed by Schutz (1958), readily available for use from NCSU (www4.ncsu.edu). To confirm for the contextual usefulness of the FIRO-B scale in the Indian context, we conducted a pilot study on managers from multiple organizations (n=35). The pilot testing was found to be reliable for the variables (Cronbach's $\alpha > .7$) (Nunnally, 1978). The responses of the participants were taken on a seven-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from 7 (Never) to 1 (Usually). The coefficient α value of the factors of Inclusion i.e. Expressed Inclusion and Wanted Inclusion were found as 0.758, 0.913 and 0.712 as shown in Table 2.

Employer Obligation

Employer Obligations were assessed by asking the respondents to which they believed that employer was obligated to provide the required items. This was measured by using 12 item scale Rousseau's Personal Inventory items (2000), subjected to modification to fit the organizational context. The responses on the scale items were tapped using the seven-point Likert Scale that ranging from 7 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). The reliability of Employer obligation on our study sample was found to be 0.71 (Table 2), parallel to the internal coefficients for studies (Rousseau, 2000; Agarwal, 2015).

Table2: Descriptive statistics of measures along with the items used in the study

No. of Items	Item Content	Mean	SD
EXPRESS INCLUSION			
1	I try to be with people.	2.26	1.090
2	I join social groups.	3.45	1.747
3	I tend to join social organizations when I have an opportunity.	3.12	2.030
4	I try to be included in informal social activities.	3.28	1.448
5	I try to include other people in my plans.	3.36	1.887
6	I try to have people around me.	3.16	1.424
7	When people are doing things together, I tend to join them.	3.02	1.600
8	I try to avoid being alone.	3.11	1.543
9	I try to participate in group activities	3.09	1.648
WANTED INCLUSION			
10	I like people to invite me to things	2.70	1.349
12	I like people to invite me to join in their activities.	2.78	1.266
13	I like people to include me in their activities.	3.07	1.667
14	I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.	3.29	1.665
15	I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.	2.82	1.359
16	I like people to invite me to things.	2.72	1.389
17	I like people to invite me to join in their activities.	2.94	1.812
18	I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.	2.97	1.605
EMPLOYER OBLIGATION			
19	Concern for my personal welfare	5.42	.984
20	Be responsive to employee concerns	5.06	.998

21	Make decisions with my involvement	4.17	1.398
22	Concern for my long-term well-being	5.33	.662
23	Limited involvement in the organization	3.62	1.673
24	Training me only for management	3.61	2.075
25	Support me in meeting higher goals	4.04	1.577
26	Developmental opportunities within this firm	5.14	1.271
27	Advancement within the firm	5.17	.783
28	Opportunities for promotion	5.44	.498
29	Help me develop extremely marketable skills	4.10	1.191
30	Contracts that create employment opportunities elsewhere	3.04	1.489

Source: Developed by the author.

Table 3 shows the items along with the independent mean and standard deviations, which have been used for the study in Indian context.

RESULTS

Collected data were tabulated and essential statistical measures were calculated like mean, standard deviation etc. In order to perform quantitative analysis SPSS statistical software (Version 23.0) was used. To examine the relationship between the independent and the dependent variable, coefficient of correlation and regression were calculated and the outcomes were as follows:

Table 3 represents the results of descriptive statistics, mean, Standard Deviation, and correlations among the study variables. It can be seen that both the categories of Expressed Inclusion had positive correlations with Employer obligation. Also, Cronbach’s α of the all the study variables were found to be more than 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978).

Table3: Descriptive statistics Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation

	Mean	Std. Dev.	1	2	3	4
1. EI(Expressed Inclusion)	3.09	.947	[.758]			
2. WI(Wanted Inclusion)	2.87	1.16	.644**	[.913]		
3. EO(Employer Obligation)	4.51	.492	.225**	.068	[.712]	

Notes: n= 150. The reliabilities of the study variables is presented along the diagonal.
*p<0.05; **p< 0.01

Hypothesis 1: The data analysis resulted in a coefficient of correlation equivalent to .725 showing a highly significant value (p<.01). This highly significant and positive value of the correlation coefficient signifies that Expressed Inclusion and Employer Obligation are highly related. Thus, the first hypothesis is accepted. Specifically, the result (R2 = .725; p<.01) suggests that 49.1 % Employer should include the employees as perceived by the employees in organisation (see Table 3). Under such circumstances, individuals will show higher enthusiasm, creativity and interest, and will thus feel a part of the organisation.

Table3: Correlation Expressed Inclusion and Employer Obligation

Model	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	Std. Err of Estimate
1	.725 ^a	.489	.491	5.48108

Source: Developed by the author.

Hypothesis 2: After testing the second hypothesis the data analysis resulted in a coefficient of correlation equivalent to .068 showing a highly significant value ($p < .01$). This negative value of the correlation coefficient denotes that there exists a negative relationship between Wanted Inclusion and Employer Obligation, specifically, the result was ($R^2 = .068$; $p < .01$) (see Table 4). This indicates that there were some other factors which might have affected the wanted inclusion needs of employees in the organisation. Under such circumstances, they might not involve with their colleagues who would affect the productivity and performance of the employees.

Table 4 : Correlation Wanted Inclusion and Employer Obligation

Model	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	Std. Err of the Estimate
1	.068 ^a	.005	-.002	.49263

Source: Developed by the author.



Fig. 2 Relationship of Inclusion and Employer Obligation

Figure 2 depicts the conceptual framework Expressed Inclusion, Wanted Inclusion and Employer Obligation and provides an overall summary of the relationship between Inclusion and Employer Obligation.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The current research provides an insight into the relationship of the Factors of Inclusion and Employer Obligation in the Indian Power Organisation context. Our study findings highlighted the crucial role of perceived role of Employer obligation in employee’s inclusion at the middle level management in Indian Context. These results support the previous studies reflecting the reciprocity norm indicating that Inclusion or Need to Belong leads to an unwritten agreement between the donor and suppliers, in this case the employer and employee (Foa & Foa, 1974; Gouldner, 1960). And, eventually the positive effect of their relationship leads to a better outcome, favourable for the organization fits (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1974). As Indian public sector organizations offer more benefits and a steady work environment, highly included individuals opt for employment in public sector. Besides this, public sector employees carry tendencies of inclusion, belongingness and socialisation in work environment (Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995). Also, the fulfillment of needs that are social in nature (Maslow, 1943) created an obligation to reciprocate and that exchange leads to organizational commitment (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Guzzo et al., 1994). By investigating the PC and the behavioural outcomes as a result of unfulfilled promises, a clear picture can be drawn. Also, the Researchers should be able to lay a better understanding of the perceptual agreements such that a better employer and relationship can be maintained for effective working of an organization.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The study has some limitations. First, it did not take into consideration the prevailing effects of the variables that could have influenced the linkage between Inclusion and Employer

Obligation relationships. Future studies are, thus, suggested to consider the variables such as different cultural factors and the type of family structure as potential moderators for understanding the relationship of Inclusion and Employer Obligation. This study was conducted by adopting a cross-sectional survey-based research design. In order to overcome the above mentioned limitation, a longitudinal based research design should be used in the future course of research. In absence of mediating/ moderating variable this study may be subjected to criticism. Regardless of the certain limitations as mentioned above, this research paper will contribute in filling the gaps with respect to management as well as organizational literature in the context of Indian Power sector.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, P. (2015). State of Psychological Contract in India: Managing the 'New Deal'. *Global Business Review*, 16(4), 623-631.
- Arnold, J. (1996). The psychological contract: a concept in need of closer scrutiny?. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(4), 511-520.
- Bacon, R. W. (1995). Privatization and reform in the global electricity supply industry. *Annual review of energy and the environment*, 20(1), 119-143.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological bulletin*, 117(3), 497.
- Bentein, K., Vandenberghe, C., Vandenberg, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2005). The role of change in the relationship between commitment and turnover: a latent growth modeling approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 468.
- Berkman, E. T., Cunningham, W. A., Lieberman, M. D., Berkman, E., Reis, H. T., & Judd, C. M. DO NOT CIRCULATE OR CITE WITHOUT PERMISSION.
- Blancero, D. M., DelCampo, R. G., & Marron, G. F. (2007). Perception of fairness in psychological contracts by hispanic business professionals: an empirical study in the United States. *International Journal of Management*, 24(2), 364.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Transaction Publishers.
- Brynjolfsson, E., & Hitt, L. M. (1998). Beyond the productivity paradox. *Communications of the ACM*, 41(8), 49-55.
- Cappelli, P. (1999). *The new deal at work: Managing the market-driven workforce*. Harvard Business Press.
- Carr, N. (2010). *The shallows: How the internet is changing the way we think, read and remember*. Atlantic Books Ltd.
- Cavanaugh, M. A., & Noe, R. A. (1999). Antecedents and consequences of relational components of the new psychological contract. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 323-340.
- Crewson, P. E. (1997). Public-service motivation: Building empirical evidence of incidence and effect. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 7(4), 499-518.
- Cureton, D. (2016). The secret of student success. *Student Attainment in Higher Education: Issues, Controversies and Debates*, 67.
- De Vos, A., De Stobbeleir, K., & Meganck, A. (2009). The relationship between career-related antecedents and graduates' anticipatory psychological contracts. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24(3), 289-298.
- Deery, S. J., Iverson, R. D., & Walsh, J. T. (2006). Toward a better understanding of psychological contract breach: a study of customer service employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 166.
- Dulac, T., Coyle-Shapiro, J. A., Henderson, D. J., & Wayne, S. J. (2008). Not all responses to breach are the same: The interconnection of social exchange and psychological contract processes in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(6), 1079-1098.

- Dulac, T., Coyle-Shapiro, J. A., Henderson, D. J., & Wayne, S. J. (2008). Not all responses to breach are the same: The interconnection of social exchange and psychological contract processes in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(6), 1079-1098.
- Eisenberg, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(1), 51-59.
- Farmer, S. M., & Fedor, D. B. (1999). Volunteer participation and withdrawal. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 9(4), 349-368.
- Ferguson, E. D. (1989). Adler's motivational theory: An historical perspective on belonging and the fundamental human striving. *Individual Psychology*, 45(3), 354.
- Gere, J., & MacDonald, G. (2010). An update of the empirical case for the need to belong. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 66(1), 93-115.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American sociological review*, 161-178.
- Gouldner, H. P. (1960). Dimensions of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 468-490.
- Grasse, W., Tyner, C. E., & Steinfeld, A. (1999). International R & D collaboration in developing solar thermal technologies for electric power and solar chemistry: The solarPACES program of the International Energy Agency (IEA). *Le Journal de Physique IV*, 9(PR3), Pr3-9.
- Guest, D. E. (1998). On meaning, metaphor and the psychological contract: a response to Rousseau (1998). *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 673-677.
- Guzzo, R. A., Noonan, K. A., & Elron, E. (1994). Expatriate managers and the psychological contract. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 79(4), 617.
- <http://josephsononbusinessethics.com/2010/12/responsibilities-employer-employee-relationship/> [15/8/2017 8:00 Pm]
- <http://switchandshift.com/why-belonging-is-key-in-todays-workplace> [13/5/2017, 9:00 AM]
- <http://www.dianechinn.com/2015/02/09/why-is-a-sense-of-belonging-at-work-important/> [13/5/2017, 8:00 AM]
- <http://www.penguinearlylearning.co.nz/inclusion-and-a-sense-of-belonging/> [12/5/2017, 9:20 PM]
- <https://intentionalworkplace.com/2015/03/13/we-need-to-belong/> [11/5/2017, 8:00 PM]
- <https://newrepublic.com/article/107327/even-scientists-dream-time-travel> [12/5/2017, 6:20 PM]
- <https://www.av.se/en/work-environment-work-and-inspections/foreign-labour-in-sweden/employers-and-employees-organisations/> [12/5/2017, 5:50 PM]
- <https://www.ibef.org/industry/power-sector-india.aspx> [13/5/2017, 1:00 PM]
- <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/20140822123153-3122920-you-don-t-have-to-be-lonely-at-work> [16/8/2017 6:00 Pm]
- Lam, S. S., Hui, C., & Law, K. S. (1999). Organizational citizenship behavior: Comparing perspectives of supervisors and subordinates across four international samples. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(4), 594.
- Longstaff, F. A., & Schwartz, E. S. (1992). A two-factor interest rate model and contingent claims valuation. *The Journal of Fixed Income*, 2(3), 16-23.
- Moorman, C., & Miner, A. S. (1998). Organizational improvisation and organizational memory. *Academy of management Review*, 23(4), 698-723.
- Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior?. *Academy of Management journal*, 41(3), 351-357.

- Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior?. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(3), 351-357.
- Nakicenovic, N., Grubler, A., & McDonald, A. (1998). Global energy perspectives: International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis/World Energy Council.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). Psychometric methods.
- Petersitzke, M. (2009). Supervisor psychological contract management. In *Supervisor Psychological Contract Management* (pp. 131-142). Gabler.
- Robinson, S. L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative science quarterly*, 574-599.
- Robinson, S. L., Kraatz, M. S., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Changing obligations and the psychological contract: A longitudinal study. *Academy of management Journal*, 37(1), 137-152.
- Robinson, S. L., Kraatz, M. S., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Changing obligations and the psychological contract: A longitudinal study. *Academy of management Journal*, 37(1), 137-152.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee responsibilities and rights journal*, 2(2), 121-139.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1990). Normative beliefs in fund-raising organizations linking culture to organizational performance and individual responses. *Group & Organization Management*, 15(4), 448-460.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1990). Normative beliefs in fund-raising organizations linking culture to organizational performance and individual responses. *Group & Organization Management*, 15(4), 448-460.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1998). The 'problem' of the psychological contract considered. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 665-671.
- Rousseau, D. M., & McLean Parks, J. (1993). The contracts of individuals and organizations. *Research in organizational behavior*, 15, 1-1.
- Rousseau, D. M., & Tijoriwala, S. A. (1998). Assessing psychological contracts: Issues, alternatives and measures. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 679-695.
- Rousseau, D., & Schalk, R. (2000). *Psychological contracts in employment: Cross-national perspectives*. Sage.
- Sacks J (2003) *The Dignity of Difference*. Continuum Books, London and New York
- Sapon-Shevin M (1999) *Because We Can Change the World. A Practical Guide to Building Co-operative, Inclusive Classroom Communities*. Allyn and Beacon
- Sapon-Shevin, M. (2003). Inclusion: A matter of social justice. *Educational Leadership*, 61(2), 25-29.
- Schimel, D., Melillo, J., Tian, H., McGuire, A. D., Kicklighter, D., Kittel, T., ... & Parton, W. (2000). Contribution of increasing CO₂ and climate to carbon storage by ecosystems in the United States. *Science*, 287(5460), 2004-2006.
- Schnell, E. R. (2000). *FIRO-B: technical guide*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Schutz, W. C. (1958). FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Sagiv, L. (1995). Identifying culture-specifics in the content and structure of values. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 26(1), 92-116.
- Sharma, N., & Patterson, P. G. (1999). The impact of communication effectiveness and service quality on relationship commitment in consumer, professional services. *Journal of services marketing*, 13(2), 151-170.
- Shore, L. M., & Tetrick, L. E. (1994). The psychological contract as an explanatory framework in the employment relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (1986-1998), 91.

- Shore, L. M., Tetrick, L. E., Lynch, P., & Barksdale, K. (2006). Social and economic exchange: Construct development and validation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*(4), 837-867.
- Suen, H. K., & Ary, D. (2014). *Analyzing quantitative behavioral observation data*. Psychology Press.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2000). Psychological contract inventory technical report. *Pittsburgh: Carnegie Mellon University*.
- Tauber, Y. D., & Silverman, C. S. (2002). Employment contracts get employers in the game.
- Tekleab, A. G., Takeuchi, R., & Taylor, M. S. (2005). Extending the chain of relationships among organizational justice, social exchange, and employee reactions: The role of contract violations. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(1), 146-157.
- Tekleab, A. G., Takeuchi, R., & Taylor, M. S. (2005). Extending the chain of relationships among organizational justice, social exchange, and employee reactions: The role of contract violations. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(1), 146-157.
- Thau, S., Aquino, K., & Poortvliet, P. M. (2007). Self-defeating behaviors in organizations: The relationship between thwarted belonging and interpersonal work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(3), 840.
- Thomas, H. D., & Anderson, N. (1998). Changes in newcomers' psychological contracts during organizational socialization: A study of recruits entering the British Army. *Journal of Organizational behavior, 745-767*.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management journal, 40*(1), 82-111.
- Young, B. S., Worchel, S., & Woehr, D. J. (1998). Organizational commitment among public service employees. *Public Personnel Management, 27*(3), 339-348.
- Zhao, H. A. O., Wayne, S. J., Glibkowski, B. C., & Bravo, J. (2007). The impact of psychological contract breach on work-related outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Personnel psychology, 60*(3), 647-680.
- Zhao, J., & Chen, L. (2008). Individualism, collectivism, selected personality traits, and psychological contract in employment: A comparative study. *Management Research News, 31*(4), 289-304.