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ABSTRACT
English abstract only consisted of one paragraph
This comprehensive study thoroughly examines the psychological contract literature by reviewing 134 papers published from 1989 to 2022. It extensively explores various aspects, including the conceptual framework, classifications, influencing factors, measurement criteria, and evolutionary trends of psychological contracts. Through a critical analysis, this paper reveals that certain areas within the realm of psychological contracts have reached a saturation point, with a wealth of existing research. It highlights the need for a paradigm shift towards studies conducted from the employer's standpoint, which can offer invaluable insights into the dynamics of psychological contracts. In essence, this review encapsulates the existing knowledge on psychological contracts and maps out a roadmap for future research, emphasizing the importance of diverse perspectives and methodological approaches.
INTRODUCTION

HR serves as a vital resource (Huy et al., 2020) and is intricately linked with psychological contracts (PC), affecting employee behavior and reactions, including PC fulfillment, breach, and violation (Roehl, 2019). HR also sets the precedent for PC complexity (Roehl, 2019). With global workforce management challenges rising due to varied attitudes, commitment levels, and compensation expectations, understanding PC becomes crucial (Ravlin et al., 2012). PC encapsulates personal beliefs regarding promised benefits and commitments between individuals and organizations (Obushenкова et al., 2017).

To grasp behaviors in exchange relationships, PC fulfillment—how well an organization keeps its promises—is key (Vantilborgh, 2015). This paper aims to map PC in organizations, serving three objectives: understanding PC academically and practically, simplifying PC comprehension, and identifying under-researched areas for future exploration.

Sections include introduction, theoretical PC-organization links, methodology, findings on concepts, classifications, factors, and PC measurement, along with social exchange theory (SET) components such as inducements, contributions, PCB, fulfillment, and reciprocity. The paper concludes with discussions, implications, and conclusions.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

The importance of psychological contracts (PC) in shaping employee-employer relationships is widely acknowledged by scholars (Niehoff & Paul, 2001; McDermott et al., 2013; McLean Parks et al., 1998; O’Neill & Adya, 2007; Westwood et al., 2001; Lee, 2001), underlining their significance in contemporary employment dynamics (Roehl, 2019). Ng & Feldman (2009) assert that PC lay the foundation for employment relationships, echoing Lee’s (2001) view. These relationships encompass both legal contracts, formalized in written agreements, and psychological contracts, manifested in behavior (O’Neill et al., 2010). PC represents cognitive schemas depicting individuals’ perceived obligations and responsibilities, influenced by various internal and external factors (Rousseau et al., 2018).

PC significantly shape employees’ future attitudes and behaviors at work (Tekleab et al., 2013), guiding their cognitive evaluations and anticipations of organizational experiences (Rogozinska-Pawelczyk, 2018). The type of PC perceived in employee-employer relationships impacts employee expectations and the organization’s ability to meet them (Lester et al., 2007). Pattnaik (2018) defines PC as individuals’ perceptions of employer promises (e.g., competitive salary, career advancement, job security) and corresponding employee contributions (loyalty, integrity, high performance), serving as a framework for managing and understanding employment relationships (Naidoo et al., 2019; Protsiuk, 2019).

Formal employment contracts reinforce the psychological agreement between employer and employee, with employers providing inducements in exchange for commitments (Rousseau, 1990). Fulfilling PC leads to dedicated and satisfied employees, strongly correlating with employee engagement (Braganza et al., 2021). Managers must ensure fair treatment to maintain positive working
relationships and foster trust, essential for employee engagement (van Niekerk et al., 2019). The level of PC elements positively associates with employees’ perceived control over their roles (Pattnaik, 2018; van Niekerk et al., 2019), helping prevent adverse outcomes linked with perceived contract breaches, such as mistrust and intentions to leave (van Niekerk et al., 2019). Concepts like inducements and expectancies aid in comprehending the components of PC (Naktiyole & Kula, 2018).

**METHODOLOGY**

The proposed review aims to comprehensively summarize existing PC research through a systematic literature review, following established procedures and criteria using PRISMA. This method ensures transparency and replicability across various databases and grey literature. A total of 134 English-language peer-reviewed academic journal articles were systematically analyzed, focusing on the PC. Databases such as ScienceDirect, EBSCOhost, JSTOR, Emerald, and Wiley Online were utilized, covering the period from 1989 to 2022. Empirical articles were hand-coded by the author to identify different PC aspects. The systematic search process is outlined in Figure 1, with initial keywords based on general readings and author expertise.

![Figure 1. Paper Selection Process](image-url)
RESULTS
For this paper, the proposed review is divided into 1) the concepts of PC, 2) classification, 3) factors, and 4) employer’s inducements and employee’s contribution. The methodology adopted in the analyzed papers referred mainly to the quantitative methods (78 papers). From the analyzed papers, the nature of the PC can be developed, as seen in Figure 2.

DISCUSSION
This part allows you to elaborate on your results findings academically. You must not put numbers related to your statistical tests here; instead, you have to explain that numbers here. You have to compile your discussion with academic supports to your study and a good explanation according to the specific area you are investigating.

Figure 2. The Nature of Psychological Contract

1. The Concept of Psychological Contract
The concept of PC was delineated by Lambert et al. (2003), who proposed two articles that delineated the traditional and extended views, which complement each other by addressing gaps in the traditional perspective.

Traditional view: Insufficiency of psychological contract fulfillment (PCF) leads to negative repercussions including distributive and procedural injustice, distrust, betrayal, and reduced contributions. Conversely, satisfaction with PC fulfillment yields positive outcomes such as feeling valued, enhanced trust, and beneficial impacts on both employees and organizations. However, factors like generational, contextual, and individual influences do not sufficiently explain variations in outcomes based on the absolute levels of promised and delivered inducements.

Extended view: The interplay between promised and provided incentives and its effect on contentment, encompassing both adherence and violation, is crucial. However, factors like individual variances, formal organizational impact, and the employment bond overlook the significance of informal social connections in shaping employees' assessment of fulfillment, including social influences.
Conversely, the extended view introduces nuanced distinctions in how inducements are administered, categorizing PC into breach/violation and fulfillment. Additionally, papers by Seeck and Parzefall (2008) and van der Smissen et al. (2013) distinguished between the traditional and contemporary views of PC:

Traditional view: Employer-employee responsibility, freedom to act under responsibility, job security, benefits and salary, work attractiveness, workplace attractiveness, social interactions at workplace.

Contemporary view: More to employer responsibility, loyal more to themselves and their individual goals, employability, flexibility.

2. Classification of Psychological Contracts

Table 1 summarises the entire classification related to psychological contracts. The scarce research that discusses the different effects of artificial intelligence (AI) adoption on psychological contracts, employers, and employees can be a direction for future research that fills the gap in the current literature.

This paper examines PC research, noting that most studies rely on content-oriented measurements, criticized for their instability and hindrance in making comparisons due to scholars' varied methods. The extended and contemporary views of psychological contracts suggest rapid changes influenced by ICT, AI adoption, and post-pandemic scenarios. Recent studies highlight employees' increasing bargaining power, prompting future research directions to investigate this phenomenon in the workplace. Feature-oriented measurement can distinguish between breaches in transactional contract inducements (socio-economics) and broken promises in relational contracts (socio-emotional). Further exploration of two PC classifications, Alienation and Covenantal Ideology Change, and their relationship with psychological contracts is warranted. Braganza et al. (2021) propose that AI adoption and algorithmic decision-making could transform HR, prompting exploration of PC measurements and their impact on social exchange theory. Various factors influence PC, including previous experiences, industry type, adaptation to new environments, skills, knowledge, and organizational and collective perspectives. Despite decades of scholarly attention to PC classification, only a few papers address specific types, warranting further exploration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifications</th>
<th>Specifications</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>Calculative relationship (individual), monetary obligation/economic content focus contract, negative (lower engagement, lower commitment), high specific performance, high level role ambiguity, limited involvement, short-term, relative stability, limited flexibility based on demand-supply market, eroding exchange relationship, narrow-range duties, high competition, and economic instability.</td>
<td>Braganza et al., (2021); O’Donahue et., (2015); Rogozińska-Pawelczyk (2018); Lester et al., (2007); Ravlin et al., (2012); Thomas et al., (2016); Protsiuk (2019); Naidoo et al., (2019); Lee et al., (2011); De Cuyper (2008); Hui et al., (2004); Pattnaik (2018); Rosseau &amp; Tijoriwala (1998); Rogozińska-Pawelczyk, 2020; Seopa et al., (2015); Shahnawaz &amp; Hassan Jafri (2011); Scheepers &amp; Shuping (2011); Chun Hui et al. (2004); Chien &amp; Lin (2013); Hamilton &amp; von Treuer (2012); Mousa (2020); Millward &amp; Hopkins (1998); Martin et al., 1999; Lee (2001); O’Donahue et al. (2007); O’Neill &amp; Adya (2006); O’Donahue &amp; Nelson (2003); Patrick (2008); Raulapati et al., (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Collective interest (normative contract, social contract), personal effect, positive (higher engagement, higher commitment), low level role ambiguity, long-term socio-emotional obligations (commitment, loyalty), socio-emotional focus, lesser requirements for immediate reciprocity, high competition and economic instability, unstructured, open-</td>
<td>Braganza et al., (2021); O’Donahue et., (2015); Tekleab et al., (2013); Rogozińska-Pawelczyk (2018); Lester et al., (2007); Thomas et al., (2016); Ravlin et al., (2012); Protsiuk (2019); Naidoo et al., (2019); Lee et al., (2011); De Cuyper (2008); Rosseau &amp; Tijoriwala (1998); Rogozińska-Pawelczyk, 2020; Seopa et al., (2015); Shahnawaz &amp; Hassan Jafri (2011); Scheepers &amp; Shuping (2011); Chun Hui et al. (2004); Chien &amp; Lin (2013); Hamilton &amp; von Treuer (2012); Mousa (2020); Millward &amp; Hopkins (1998); Martin et al., 1999; Lee (2001); O’Donahue et al. (2007); O’Neill &amp; Adya (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ended time, rely on high level of trust, economic content focus, stability.</strong> (2006); O’Donahue &amp; Nelson (2003); Patrick (2008); Raulapati et al., (2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balanced</strong></td>
<td>Open ended, relates to transactional features of well specified performed reward</td>
<td>Hui et al., (2004); Chen &amp; Lin (2013); Rosseau &amp; Tijoriwala (1998); Chun Hui et al. (2004); Chien &amp; Lin (2013); Hamilton &amp; von Treuer (2012); Mousa (2020); O’Neill &amp; Adya (2006); Patrick (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transitional</strong></td>
<td>Happen in the process of M&amp;A between two companies.</td>
<td>Hui et al., (2004); Chen &amp; Lin (2013); Rosseau &amp; Tijoriwala (1998); Chien &amp; Lin (2013); Hamilton &amp; von Treuer (2012); Mousa (2020); O’Neill &amp; Adya (2006); Patrick (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alienational</strong></td>
<td>AI adoption, ad hoc, sporadic, human capital theory, data-led decision making, interaction with algorithm.</td>
<td>Braganza et al., (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covenantal ideology change</strong></td>
<td>Society, a portion of society, or an abstract idea, ideologies; such as social and work values, show a real devotion to a worthwhile social cause, participate in the organization's mission or cause; act in a civically responsible manner.</td>
<td>O’Donahue et al., (2015); Hart &amp; Thompson (2007); O’Donahue &amp; Nelson (2003); Fischer &amp; Schultz (2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Rosseau (2000) introduced balanced and transitional contracts, with balanced contracts focusing on employability, internal advancement, and dynamic performance within the organization. However, the literature mainly discusses two types, as noted by Soares & Mosquera (2019). Additionally, Rousseau (1995) mentioned covenantal relationships, described as ideology-infused contracts with societal or abstract features, although this concept is not extensively explored in available literature. Fischer & Schultz (2017) elaborated on covenantal ideology change, highlighting its linear relationship with organizational processes and leadership. Braganza et al. (2021) introduced alienation contracts, which involve the adoption of non-human AI for employment, serving as ad-hoc but fulfilling human capital theory and data-driven decision-making.

3. Factors that Influence Psychological Contracts in The Organizations

Factors that influence PC is summarized in Table 2. PC is shaped by various factors influencing the employee's organizational experience and the employer's fulfillment of the PC. Bangerter et al. (2012) emphasize that the establishment of employees' PC heavily relies on the information source. Rogozińska-Pawelczyk (2016) highlights that both parties' willingness to articulate the PC terms provides valuable insight into their duties and expectations. Coyle-Shapiro et al. (2019) further suggest that individuals' consciousness within an organization reflects the PC's fulfillment or breach over time. Factors contributing to psychological contract breach (PCB) include external and internal environments, market competition, and integrated human resources management. Lester et al. (2007) briefly discusses the impact of the external and internal environment on PCB, particularly during layoffs, restructuring, and catastrophic events, which may lead to high environmental unpredictability. Naktiyole and Kula (2018) suggest that when individuals perceive their contributions binding the organization to reciprocate, a psychological contract form.
Table 2. Psychological Contracts Influence Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors That Influence PC in The Organizations</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of information</strong>: company’s website, organisational documents and policies, agents of the organization, interactions with friends and family</td>
<td>Huy et al., (2020); Delobbe, Cooper-Thomas, and De Hoe (2016); van Niekerk, Chrysler-Fox, and van Wyk (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbalisation and communication</strong>: Employer incentives, the attitude of line managers, and the willingness of organization members to communicate their expectations, including transparency.</td>
<td>Rogozińska-Pawelczyk (2018); Ellis (2007); O’Neill et al., (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous employment experiences</strong></td>
<td>Grant (1999); Ng and Friedman (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong>: learning process of employer and employee, understanding new working environment, employment relationship, knowledge management</td>
<td>Woodrow and Guest (2017); Delobbe, Cooper-Thomas, and De Hoe (2016); van Niekerk, Chrysler-Fox, and van Wyk (2019); Caldwell and Peters (2018); Gupta et al., (2012); O’Neill and Adya (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External and internal environments</strong></td>
<td>Lester, Kickul, and Bergmann (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization's policy</strong></td>
<td>Lub et al., (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrated Human Resource Management System</strong>: Includes the recruitment and selection subsystem, behavioral assessment, training, and compensation.</td>
<td>Rogozińska-Pawelczyk (2018); Sparrow (1998); Sims (1994); Roehl (2018); Shahnawaz and Hassan Jafri (2011); Chien and Lin (2013); Bellow (2007); Aggarwal et al. (2007); Grant (1999); Guest (1998); Guzzo and Noonan (1994); Hiltrop (1996); Muratbekova-Touron and Galindo (2018); McDermott et al. (2013); Martin et al. (1999); O’Neill et al. (2010); Roehl (2019); Westwood et al. (2001); Seeck and Parzefall (2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social accounts</td>
<td>Lester, Kickul, and Bergmann (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AI adoption and technology adoption</strong></td>
<td>Braganza et al., (2021); Obushenkova et al. (2018); Raulapati et al., (2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundaries</strong>: When certain limits are exceeded, it triggers negative reactions. Deviations beyond this limit are seen as unsuitable or unacceptable, prompting employees to engage in various corrective actions.</td>
<td>Gresse and Linde (2020); Battistì et al. (2007); Thomas et al. (2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of incongruence perception toward obligations</strong></td>
<td>Battistì et al. (2007); De Vos, Buyens, and Schalk (2003); Tekleab, Orvis, and Taylor (2013); Rogozińska-Pawelczyk (2018); Woodrow and Guest (2017); Vantilborgh (2015); van Niekerk, Chrysler-Fox, and van Wyk (2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reciprocity</strong></td>
<td>Battistì et al. (2007); De Vos, Buyens, and Schalk (2003); Vantilborgh (2015); Protsiuk (2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrealistic entitlement perceptions</strong></td>
<td>Gresse and Linde (2020); Poisat, Mey, and Sharp (2018); Huy et al. (2020); De Hauw and De Vos (2010); Sparrow (1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader-member exchange, team-member exchange, leadership</strong></td>
<td>Delobbe, Cooper-Thomas, and De Hoe (2016); Naktiyole and Kula (2018); Shih and Lin (2014); Clarke and Scurry (2020); Ali (2021); Kasekende (2017); Raulapati et al. (2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Talent management: retention</strong></td>
<td>Poisat, Mey, and Sharp (2018); Seopa et al. (2015); Deas and Coetzee (2020); De Vos and Meganck (2009); Clarke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural values: Collectivist vs individualist</td>
<td>Ravlin et al. (2012); Thomas et al. (2016); Street (2009); Sparrow (1998); Du and Vantilborough (2021); Willems et al. (2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group diversities and social interactions</td>
<td>Sia et al. (2013); Ronnie and Sears (2020); Dabos and Rosseau (2013); Ellis (2007); Lub et al. (2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee's organizational attributes (position level, department, organizational nature)</td>
<td>Duan et al., (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee's personal attributes (gender, marital status, education)</td>
<td>Duan et al. (2019); Bellow (2009); Jie Shen (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: Millennials tend to be more ambitious, which increases their likelihood of actively pursuing career opportunities within organizations.</td>
<td>De Hauw and De Vos (2010); Poisat, Mey, and Sharp (2018); Duan et al. (2019); Ng and Friedman (2009); Newton et al. (2008);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational cultures</td>
<td>Shahnawaz and Hassan Jafri (2011); Pattanayak (2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective of individual, collective, and organization</td>
<td>Randmann (2013); Cohen (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of economy</td>
<td>Metz et al., (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management</td>
<td>Özkellk and Uyargil (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Pattanayak (2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade union availability</td>
<td>Raulapati et al., (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Willems et al., (2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Employer’s Inducements and Employee’s Contribution

The psychological contract, rooted in pre-employment factors, reflects differing obligations perceived by both employers and employees. Thus, a comprehensive evaluation considers perspectives from both sides, aligning with the notion of a social exchange relationship (Battisti et al., 2007; Coyle-Shapiro, 2002). Inducements, akin to payments by organizations, signify obligations and utility for employees (De Vos et al., 2003; Lambert et al., 2003; Lee et al., 2011; Naidoo et al., 2019; Tekleab et al., 2013; Vantilborgh, 2015). Understanding inducements requires data on employer expectations, industry requirements, organization size, and the impact of AI adoption on employee demands.

Most papers focus on employee perspectives, with only a few exploring employer expectations (Naktiyole & Kula, 2018; Woodrow & Guest, 2017).

Table 3. Inducements, Contributions, and Reciprocity Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inducement/obligation of employer</th>
<th>Expectations of employer (Contribution/obligations of employee)</th>
<th>Reciprocity outcome (vice-versa, breach/fulfillment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic (tangible), socioeconomic (Coyle-Shapiro, 2002)</td>
<td>Competitive pay/wage (Battisti et al., 2007; Coyle-Shapiro, 2002; Lambert et al., 2003; Lee et al., 2011; Lester et al., 2007; Naidoo et al., 2019; Deas &amp; Coetzee, 2020; Cunningham, 2010; Guest &amp; Conway, 2006; Herriot et al., 1997; Jonsson &amp; Thorgren, 2017; O'Neill et al., 2010; Patrick, 2008; van der Smissen et al., 2013)</td>
<td>Commitment (Battisti et al., 2007; De Vos et al., 2003; Gresse &amp; Linde, 2020; McDermott et al., 2013; Rodwells &amp; Ellershaw, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefit (De Vos et al., 2003; Lee et al., 2011; Lester et al., 2007; Jie Shen, 2010)</td>
<td>Loyalty (Battisti et al., 2007; De Vos et al., 2003; Gresse &amp; Linde, 2020; O'Neill et al., 2010)</td>
<td>Turn-over intention (Huy et al., 2020; Naidoo et al., 2019; Naktiyol &amp; Kula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for career advancement (Battisti et al., 2007; De Hauw &amp; De Vos, 2016; Naidoo et al., 2019; Jonsson &amp; Thorgren, 2017; Muratbekova-Touron &amp; Galindo, 2018; Metz et al., 2012; Patrick, 2008; Ye et al., 2011; van der Smissen et al., 2013))</td>
<td>Employee performance (Battisti et al., 2007; De Vos et al., 2003; Maia &amp; Bittencourt Bastos, 2019; Metz et al., 2012; O’Neill et al., 2010; Patrick, 2008))</td>
<td>Absenteeism (Naktiyok &amp; Kula, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation (De Hauw &amp; De Vos, 2016)</td>
<td>Willing to learn, have skills (Gresse &amp; Linde, 2020)</td>
<td>Quality of organizational life (Battisti et al., 2007; Naidoo et al., 2019))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development, skill investment (De Vos et al., 2003; Delobbe et al., 2016; Lambert et al., 2003; Naidoo et al., 2019; Sia et al., 2013; Sims, 1994; Guest &amp; Conway, 2006; Herriot et al., 1997; Jie Shen, 2010; Metz et al., 2012; Scholarios et al., 2008);</td>
<td>Adaptable (Gresse &amp; Linde, 2020)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction (Battisti et al., 2007; Delobbe et al., 2016; Naidoo et al., 2019; Lambert et al., 2003; Sims, 1994; Rogozińska-Pawelczyk, 2020; Dos Santos et al., 2018; Deas &amp; Coetzee, 2020; Niehoff &amp; Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good working condition (Coyle-Shapiro, Naidoo et al., Guest &amp; Conway, Jonsson &amp; Thorgren)</td>
<td>Obedience (Gresse &amp; Linde, 2020)</td>
<td>Employee self-achievement (Battisti et al., 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic, socio-emotional (Coyle-Shapiro, 2002), Intangible (psychological state, mental health, well-being)</td>
<td>Justice (Battisti et al., Coyle-Shapiro, Huy et al., Lester et al., Naidoo et al., Scheepers &amp; Shuping, Flood et al., O'Donahue et al.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee engagement (Braganza et al., 2021)</td>
<td>Loyalty (Coyle-Shapiro, Battisti et al., De Vos et al., Lee et al., Naidoo et al., Hart &amp; Thompson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust (Braganza et al., Lester et al., Naidoo et al., Scheepers &amp; Shuping, Hassan et al., O'Neill et al.)</td>
<td>Commitment (Battisti et al., Delobbe et al., Lee et al., Naidoo et al., Street, Collins et al., Blomme et al., Behery et al., Aggarwal, Flood et al., Hassan et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Attitude and behavior</td>
<td>Work engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battisti et al., (2007); Naidoo et al., (2019); Collins et al., (2013); Grant (1999); Guest (2004a); Guest &amp; Conway (2006); Patrick (2008); Ye et al., (2011); van der Smissen et al., (2013)</td>
<td>(Coyle-Shapiro (2002); De Vos et al., 2003)</td>
<td>(Braganza et al., (2021); Naidoo et al., (2019); Soares &amp; Mosquera (2019))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational support</td>
<td>Performance (De Vos et al., 2003)</td>
<td>Trust (Braganza et al., (2021); Coyle-Shapiro (2002); Delobbe et al., (2016); Lambert et al., (2003); Naidoo et al., (2019); Seopa et al., (2015))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battisti et al., (2007); Delobbe et al., 2016</td>
<td>Extra-role behavior (De Vos et al., (2003); Lee et al., (2011); O’Neill et al., (2010); van der Smissen et al., (2013))</td>
<td>Good performance (Battisti et al., (2007); Lee et al., (2011))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of job (Coyle-Shapiro (2002); De Vos et al., (2003))</td>
<td>Flexibility (De Vos et al., (2003); van der Smissen et al., (2013))</td>
<td>Intention to leave the company (De Hauw &amp; De Vos (2016); Delobbe Cooper-Thomas &amp; De Hoe (2016); Hamilton &amp; von</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work balance (De Hauw and De Vos, 2016; Kraak et al, 2018; van der Smissen et al., 2013)</td>
<td>Honesty (Battisti et al., 2007)</td>
<td>Intention to stay (De Hauw and De Vos, 2016; Flood et al., 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (De Hauw and De Vos, 2016)</td>
<td>Have realistic expectations (Gresse and Linde, 2020; Obushenkova et al. (2018))</td>
<td>Employee self-fulfilment (Battisti et al., 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job attractiveness (Huy et al., 2020), job variety (Lamber et al., (2003); Naidoo et al., (2019); Muratbekova-Touron &amp; Galindo (2018); Lub et al., (2016)</td>
<td>In-role behavior (Lee et al., (2011); Naidoo et al., (2019); O'Neill et al., (2010); Patrick (2008); van der Smissen et al., (2013))</td>
<td>Group integration (Delobbe et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational attractiveness (Huy et al., (2020); Seeck &amp; Parzefall (2010))</td>
<td>Advance discipline (O'Neill et al., 2010)</td>
<td>Organization value understanding (Delobbe et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition, self-esteem (Lambert et al., (2003); Herriot et al., (1997); Mousa (2020))</td>
<td>Act ethically at work (O'Neill et al., 2010)</td>
<td>Betrayal (Delobbe et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational support (Lee et al., (2011); O'Donahue et al., (2007))</td>
<td>Comply with regulation (O'Neill et al., 2010; O'Neill et al., 2010)</td>
<td>Anger (Delobbe et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect to employee (self-value) (Lester et)</td>
<td>Proud of organization (Patrick, 2008)</td>
<td>Detrimental effect to relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al., (2007); Hassan et al., (2017))</td>
<td>(Delobbe et al., 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness (Sia et al., 2013; Herriot et al, 1997; Niehoff and Paul, 2001; Martin et al, 1999; Lester et al, 2001; O’Neill et al., 2010; Zhang et al., 2019; van der Smissen et al., 2013)</td>
<td>In-role performance (Delobbe et al., 2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal activities (Sia et al., 2013)</td>
<td>Withdrawal (Huy et al, 2020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability (Ali, (2019); Martin et al, (1998); O’Donahue et al., (2007); van der Smissen et al., (2013); Scholarios et al., (2008))</td>
<td>Counter-productive work-behavior (Huy et al., (2020); Naktiyok &amp; Kula (2018))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide performance management (Patrick, 2008)</td>
<td>Motivation (Naidoo et al., 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with relocation (Patrick, 2008)</td>
<td>Poor mental health (Naidoo et al., 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility (van der Smissen et al., (2013); Seeck &amp; Parzefall (2010))</td>
<td>Interpersonal organizational behavior (Naktiyok &amp; Kula, 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EVLN (O’Donohue et al., (2015); Woodrow &amp; Guest (2017); Ng &amp; Friedman (2009))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undoubtedly, psychological contracts play essential roles in the employment relationship. The theory that developed from the first time Rosseau (1989) defined psychological contracts got much-added literature with significant studies that built the psychological contracts. Although the theory has a massive amount of research, there is still much room for future research to investigate the fields that still need to get the researcher's focus as employment relationship, employee, employer, and environment also change.
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