

Werner Gresse, Bennie Linde, René Schalk*

Sense of deservingness: What are the entitlement beliefs of students in their anticipatory psychological contract?*

Without taking the entitlement beliefs and reasons therefore into account when examining the psychological contract of an individual, a full view on the psychological contract and its expected consequences cannot be achieved. Therefore the purpose of the paper was to explore and substantiate themes associated with perceived entitlements and utilise this information to develop a structural model of the anticipatory psychological contract. The findings suggest that there are certain factors that determine an individual's entitlement beliefs, and in turn that individual's entitlement beliefs will influence the level of expectation of that individual regarding future employment. By fully comprehending the effects of the entitlement beliefs on the anticipatory psychological contract of prospective employees the organisation may minimise the occurrence of psychological breach or violation, which may decrease new employee turnover.

Key words: **entitlement, anticipatory, psychological contract, graduates**
(JEL: J24, J28, J59, J63)

* Werner Gresse, PhD student at the Potchefstroom campus of the North-West University (South Africa), WorkWell Research Unit. North-West University, Private Bag X6001, Potchefstroom, 2520, South Africa. E-mail: 20385226@nwu.ac.za.

Dr. Bennie Linde, associate professor at the Potchefstroom campus of the North-West University (South Africa), WorkWell Research Unit. North-West University, Private Bag X6001, Potchefstroom, 2520, South Africa. E-mail: bennie.linde@nwu.ac.za.

Prof. Dr. René Schalk, Professor René Schalk, Department of Human Resource Studies, Tilburg University, PO Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg. Extraordinary Professor at WorkWell Research Unit, North-West University (South Africa).
E-mail: m.j.d.schalk@uvt.nl.

** The financial assistance of the National Research Foundation (NRF) towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at, are those of the authors and are not necessarily to be attributed to the NRF.

Article received: February 6, 2013

Revised version accepted after double blind review: November 22, 2013.