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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

In 2007 prior to the economic recession, the national unemployment rate in the United States hovered around five percent. By 2009 the rate had grown steadily and peaked at ten percent (Bureau of Labor Statistics, February 2012). As a result of economic pressure during the recession, many organizations conducted waves of layoffs, restructuring, mergers, and other cutbacks that affected employees (Hirsch & De Soucey, 2006; Staufenbiel & König, 2010). The number of employees who were laid off between 2007 and 2009 more than doubled (BLS, February 2011). Nearly half of the organizations surveyed by the Society for Human Resource Management in 2009 had carried out layoffs over the prior year with a quarter of human resource professionals predicting additional layoffs. Following the recession, the unemployment rate has continued to remain high with a national unemployment rate of eight to nine percent (BLS, December 2012; BLS, November 2012).

These changes to the national job market brought job security to the forefront of many employees’ concerns (Burchell, 2002; Näswall, Sverke, & Hellgren, 2008). With a high unemployment rate and slow rate of job creation, employers continue to maintain lean workforces through mass layoffs, hiring freezes, reduced work hours, and forced unpaid leave (BLS, October 2011). These layoff statistics represent the widespread environment of job insecurity in recent years and suggest that a labor market prevails in which a heightened sense of job insecurity exists in the workforce (Cheng & Chan, 2008; Huang, Niu, Lee, & Ashford, 2012). Layoff activity can occur for many years during a recession, but the effects of job insecurity can potentially linger for many additional years or decades following a recession (Congress of the United States Congressional Budget Office, 2012).
Job insecurity has become an increasingly important variable to practitioners and scholars. Past research has found links between job insecurity and many unfavorable organizational outcomes such as reduced organizational commitment, poor job performance, low employee satisfaction, reduced trust in management, lowered organizational performance, and is positively related to intentions to leave the organization (Staufenbiel & König, 2010; Sverke, Hellgren, & Näswall, 2002). Job security is very important to employees and has been the top factor or tied for the top factor in employee satisfaction surveys conducted by the Society for Human Resource Management (2012) over the last decade. Furthermore, from an individual employee perspective, job insecurity is negatively related to psychological and physical health and well-being according to a recent meta-analysis (Cheng & Chan, 2008). The wide-ranging consequences of job insecurity highlight the importance of selecting for and/or training employees to cope effectively with organizational instability and change, such as the changes that might occur during recessions and in the post-recession period (Wittekind, Raeder, & Grote, 2010).

In the midst of layoffs or organizational restructuring, employees may start looking for new jobs, which may decrease organizational commitment and increase intent to quit (Cheng & Chan, 2008). Top performers are at greater risk for leaving the organization during times of dissatisfaction and job insecurity (Cheng & Chan, 2008; Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984). Even who survive layoffs and organizational restructuring might find themselves searching for a new job due to drastic cuts in salary, forced vacation days, and encouraged early retirement. Klandermans and van Vuuren (1999) found that employees who had no objective threat of job loss still experienced some level of perceived job insecurity. Even if an organization does not conduct layoffs, employees may begin to search for a new job because they may not be able to
afford the loss of other critical job features such as forced pay cuts, salary freezes, or reduced work hours. Mergers, acquisitions, and technological advances are also potential causes of job insecurity as employees confronted with those situations may feel that their jobs have become redundant or unnecessary, thereby causing a potential threat of job loss (Armstrong-Stassen, 2002). Thus, research on job insecurity is potentially beneficial to all organizations at all times—not just during periods of recession—because workforce reductions and salary freezes can be witnessed throughout all states of economies, strong or weak.

Job insecurity can reduce the employee’s experience and satisfaction on the job (Sverke et al., 2002; van Zyl, van Eeden, & Rothmann, 2013). In an effort to improve individual outcomes for employees such as increased job satisfaction and reduced strain, it is important for organizations to reduce feelings of job insecurity in their employees so that employees remain committed to the organization and do not experience unnecessary strain as a result of changes and restructuring within the organization. A longitudinal study showed negative effects of downsizing on performance as well as organizational trust over a period of three years, indicating that for many employees, job insecurity can cause long-lasting effects (Armstrong-Stassen, 2002). However, there is promising support for organizations in that they can likely help employees cope with job insecurity. A recent study of employees who were notified of their objective job security found that employees who were told that they would be laid off soon or that the future of their jobs was still undecided were more likely to experience strain (De Cuyper, De Witte, Vander Elst, & Handaja, 2010). On the other hand, the employees who were notified that their jobs were safe and that they would not be laid off experienced lower job insecurity, which is a promising finding for organizations who might be seeking to improve and help employees get through uncertain economic times with more positive outcomes for the individual.
Because job insecurity is a perceived variable and it is likely that it will continue as a stressor in many situations, it appears that organizational communication and interventions could potentially minimize the harmful consequences caused by job insecurity on employee strain, attitudes, and performance outcomes. Not only can job insecurity be harmful to the personal and health-related experience of employees at work, a concern of many health practitioners as it is related to higher anxiety, depression, and frustration (van Zyl et al., 2013), but job insecurity can be detrimental to employee organizational commitment and performance for potentially many years after just one downsizing event. For these reasons, job insecurity should be even more of a prominent concern of organizations during this post-recession period and potentially long after the economy recovers from the recession.

**Defining Job Insecurity**

Job insecurity is defined as the subjective appraisal of the probability of losing one’s job in the near future (Roskies et al., 1993; Sverke & Hellgren, 2002). The literature generally refers to job insecurity as a subjective variable that is determined by individual perceptions of the stability of a job (Sverke & Hellgren, 2002). Early definitions referred to job insecurity as the perceived powerlessness to maintain desired continuity in a threatened job situation (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984; Sora, Caballer, Peiro, & Witte, 2009). The perception of insecurity comes from the degree to which employees perceive their jobs to be threatened and feel powerless to do anything about it (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984; Lee et al., 2006). A major factor in the creation of job insecurity is the threat of job loss that is present in unstable economic or organizational environments. Threat may be a fear of overall job loss, loss of any dimension of one's job, or the erosion of any employment condition (Lee, Bobko, & Chen, 2006).
Additionally, threat of job loss can also be increased by a lack of clear communication from management regarding layoff and restructuring processes, either real or rumored.

Consistent with past definitions, job insecurity in the current study refers to job insecurity that is due to threat of layoffs, reduced pay, or reduced hours. Similar to previous research, the current study defined job insecurity as the threat of experiencing involuntary job loss in the near future (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984; Sverke & Hellgren, 2002). Most past research on job insecurity has focused on examining the strain created by job insecurity due to involuntary job loss (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984; Sverke & Hellgren, 2002). Thus, job insecurity in this study operationalized job insecurity as specifically due to a fear of loss of one’s job, as opposed to a change in jobs that is made by the employee voluntarily. Job insecurity in the current study does not refer to an employee’s personal intention to leave his or her job due to personal choice, such as a desired change in career. Original conceptualizations of job insecurity emphasized the importance of a lack of power over the job loss situation, which would not apply if an employee is choosing to change jobs due to a desired career change or alternative reasons; essential to the definition of job insecurity is the component of powerlessness to counteract the threat of future job loss, as would be experienced in an employee-enforced layoff scenario (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984). The current study focused on job insecurity due to the potential of a perceived, uncontrollable job loss resulting from employer-based decisions.

By definition, job insecurity reflects the discrepancy between the level of job security perceived by the employee and the level of job security that an employee would prefer, creating a perception of job insecurity. Therefore, job insecurity is likely to be prevalent in downsizing situations, but is also a potentially important factor in seemingly unthreatening job situations where no true potential for layoffs exists, as could be the case if management did not
communicate to employees that no future layoffs were planned (Rosenblatt & Ruvio, 1996; Sverke & Hellgren, 2002).

Research on the dimensionality of job insecurity has significantly progressed since Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt called attention to the construct of job insecurity in 1984. Ashford, Lee, and Bobko (1989) constructed a scale with content that represented the various dimensions of the job insecurity measure. Recently, work has continued on this front as a study by Lee et al. (2006) investigated the dimensionality of the multidimensional job insecurity measure and created a shortened “bare bones” version by reducing the number of items. The bare bones job insecurity measure assesses three major components of job loss: loss of job features, loss of elements of the total job, and powerlessness (Lee, Bobko, Ashford, Chen, & Ren, 2008). The first two dimensions measure both the importance and likelihood of losing positive job features (e.g., geographic location), as well as experiencing negative changes to one’s job (e.g., being asked to work fewer hours). The third subscale of powerlessness encompasses the feeling of power and control regarding the loss of positive job features or negative changes in the job.

Some researchers have suggested leaving out the powerlessness dimension from job insecurity measures and contend that the construct overlaps with other constructs, such as the bare bones job insecurity measure items related to the likelihood dimension of the scale (e.g., Rosenblatt & Ruvio, 1996). Others argue that there is not yet enough evidence to forego the use of the powerlessness dimension. Lee et al. (2006) argued that the dimension of powerlessness should not be thrown out until more thoroughly examined by additional studies. Lee et al. (2006) found that powerlessness was highly correlated with job satisfaction, intent to quit, trust in management, and performance. Beyond that, their results suggested that the full 57-item job
insecurity measure by Ashford et al. (1989)—which includes the powerlessness subscale—was a very strong predictor of antecedents and consequences of job insecurity.

Past Research on Job Insecurity

Job insecurity is a stressor that has well documented negative effect on employee strain outcomes such as burnout and physical and mental health (Sverke et al., 2002; Yeh, Cheng, & Chan, 2009). Many studies have documented a negative relationship between job insecurity and work attitudes, including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational trust (Staufenbiel & König, 2010).

However, relatively less of the job insecurity research has focused on the effects of job insecurity on performance and non-health-related outcomes, such as performance or behavioral outcomes (Sverke et al., 2002). One of the primary outcomes of job insecurity is the loss of productivity and performance of employees, an outcome of great importance to organizations. Of even more importance to organizations is the finding that some negative effects of job insecurity appear to be worse for top performers, such as increased intent to quit. Therefore, organizations should aim to prevent employees, especially the highest performing employees, from leaving the organization or experiencing decreases in productivity as a result of job insecurity.

It may seem conceptually that low performers who are aware of their low level of performance could react to job insecurity by increasing their performance in an attempt to produce a higher level of value to the organization (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984; Staufenbiel & König, 2010). Gilboa, Shirom, Fried, and Cooper (2008) argued that job insecurity could result in increased work effort if employees believe that higher individual work performance will improve the organization’s success and therefore job security. Similarly, it also seems conceptually feasible that depending on personality traits, some low performers may disengage
from the organization and reduce performance, if they feel that no amount of improvement in their performance will spare them the loss of their jobs. High performers may be more likely to believe that they have alternative potential job opportunities and are more employable. Rather than increase performance at their current organization, they may reduce their high performance and put more effort on either finding a new job, or simply perform less on the job because they may feel that the organization has breached the psychological contract between employer and employee (Parzefall & Coyle-Shapiro, 2011). The current research on the job insecurity—performance relationship is discussed below in the context of theories that may help explain how employees react job insecurity. Much recent support has been found for a negative relationship between job insecurity and work performance (e.g., Cheng & Chan, 2008), which has been attributed to the grievance reactions in coping literature as well as the withdrawal reaction expected in the job adaptation literature. Employees respond to loss by creating psychological distance and withdrawing in a protective manner that is supposed to protect the employee in the case of future job loss.

**Theoretical Framework of Current Study**

The current study approached the moderated relationship between job insecurity and outcomes from a transactional model of stress and challenge-hindrance framework perspective (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Staufenbiel & König, 2010). These two separate approaches provided theoretical guidance for predicting how employees are expected to respond to job insecurity based on their individual characteristics. Similarly, Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) transactional model of stress framework will be discussed as it relates to the hypothesized moderating relationships that were predicted in the study. The nature of job insecurity as a
challenge and hindrance stressor is discussed below in the context of the current study’s predictions.

**Transactional Model of Stress.** According to Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) transactional model of stress framework, the psychological anticipation of being laid off can be perceived as being as threatening as being laid off itself (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Sora et al., 2009; Roskies, Louis-Guerin, & Fournier, 1993). Job insecurity, a subjective appraisal stressor, can be understood within the transactional framework of stress, which states that cognitive appraisals of stress determine the strain reaction or behavioral consequence (Berntson & Marklund, 2007; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Staufenbiel & König, 2010). The transactional model of stress theorizes that the level of strain people experience is the result of an interactive assessment between the degree of perceived threats to physical or psychological well-being in their environments and beliefs about the likelihood of being able to counteract those threats (Brockner, Spreitzer, Mishra, Hochwarter, Pepper, & Weinberg, 2004; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Therefore, the level of strain experienced from job insecurity can be construed as an interaction effect between the perceived threat of job loss and perceptions of control over job insecurity. According to the transactional model of stress, perceived threat and perceived control will interactively combine to influence work attitudes and behaviors (e.g., performance; Brockner et al., 2004).

The current study will approach the stress appraisal process by approaching job insecurity through the lens of Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) conceptualization of stress, and slightly modify the scope of their predictions. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) suggested that perceived control is the second important aspect involved in determining employee reactions to stressors. Rather than measuring actual perceived control that employees have over specific factors of the
job (e.g., control over decision making or job structure; Karasek, 1979), the current study will measure a different element of the stress process related to control. The current study will assess individual characteristic moderators related to control that may influence how an employee reacts to stressors. Following the transactional model of stress theory, an employee who believes that he or she has more control over a stressor may be more likely to take steps to enact that control over the stressor. Similar to other stressors, job insecurity would be expected to elicit a coping response from employees with some coping responses being more effective than others. The moderators in the current study concerning personality and coping style are both related to control and can be used as proxies of how the employee perceives his or her ability to control the stressor—job insecurity (i.e., the secondary appraisal process of cognitive appraisal of stress).

Past research has found that employees high in work locus of control are more likely to perceive threats strongly and they are more likely to take action to counteract a stressor. Work locus of control (WLOC) refers to an employee’s belief that he or she has over his or her work environment. Control-oriented coping (COC), a similar characteristic relating to control over the environment, relates to how much action the employee takes to address or react to a situation at work. To assess the outcomes of this theoretical framework, the current study examined the moderating effect of employees’ work locus of control and control coping choices on the relationship between job insecurity, organizational citizenship behaviors, and job search activities.

**Challenge-Hindrance Framework.** An additional theoretical approach framing the current study is the challenge-hindrance framework of stressors (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; LePine, LePine, & Jackson, 2004; Staufenbiel & König, 2010). As discussed by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), challenge stressors (e.g., workload, time urgency, job responsibility, job
complexity) are job demands that are seen as opportunities for personal growth (Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, & Boudreau, 2000; Rodell & Judge, 2009). Hindrance stressors (e.g., role ambiguity, role conflict, hassles) are job demands that are seen as obstacles to personal growth or goal achievement (Cavanaugh et al., 2000; Rodell & Judge, 2009). Similar to Herzberg’s two-factor motivator-hygiene dimensions of job satisfaction, hindrance stressors have been assumed to prompt employees to engage in withdrawal and protective behaviors (e.g., reducing work output), while challenge stressors have been expected to prompt motivated responses and lead to beneficial outcomes (e.g., positive behavioral outcomes such as increased OCBs). Studies have consistently found support for the positive effects of challenge stressors and the negative effects of hindrance stressors on a variety of outcomes (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005). This distinction in direction of relationships suggests the possibility of job insecurity creating a challenge effect in that employees with more control-oriented coping also performed more performance than their counterparts, because they may have been more apt to believe they could affect their work outcomes (job insecurity) by engaging in more work effort than their counterpart.

In past research, stressors have been considered dichotomously as either a challenge or hindrance stressor. A meta-analysis by LePine et al. (2005) confirmed that hindrance stressors are negatively associated with performance and that the effect is mediated by lowered motivation. This same effect was expected to be observed in the current study, in that job insecurity was expected to lead to decreased organizational citizenship behaviors by way of a moderating process determined by how the employee views the controllability of the stressor. A separate meta-analysis by Podsakoff, LePine, and LePine (2007) also suggested that hindrance stressors were directly negatively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment and
through these effects positively related with turnover (in the current study, this would be represented by job search activities).

Recent research has begun to suggest that job insecurity may be better conceptualized as both a challenge and hindrance stressor simultaneously (Staufenbiel & König, 2010; Webster, Beehr, & Love, 2011). Staufenbiel and König (2010) presented a framework suggesting that job insecurity be examined as both a challenge and hindrance stressor due to the different effects that job insecurity has on the individual employee. According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), challenge and hindrance appraisals of stressors can occur simultaneously and are not necessarily mutually exclusive (Gilboa et al., 2008; Staufenbiel & König, 2010). Staufenbiel and König (2010) suggested similar results, that stressors including job insecurity, organizational citizenship behaviors, in-role behavior, and turnover intention fit both the hindrance and challenge models, with the hindrance effect being stronger than the challenge effect. Rather than being labeled as either a challenge stressor or a hindrance stressor, they suggested that job insecurity should be conceptualized as both a challenge and hindrance stressor, and that these two concepts should be represented on two different dimensions. Using structural equation modeling to determine if job insecurity could be conceived as both a challenge and a hindrance stressor, they found that the model conceptualizing job insecurity as both a challenge and a hindrance stressor fitted the data the better than the dichotomous model of job insecurity as either a challenge or a hindrance stressor.

Following this logic, the current study approached the job insecurity—outcome relationship from both a challenge and hindrance perspective and predicted that job insecurity could have both positive and negative effects simultaneously. The current study suggested that perhaps the perception of job insecurity as either a challenge or hindrance is somewhat
moderated by personal characteristics, such as work locus of control or coping behaviors. It was expected that some employees would respond to job insecurity by appraising it as a challenge stressor (perhaps by increasing OCBs and job search behaviors), and some employees would appraise job insecurity as a hindrance stressor (reducing OCBs and job search behaviors), and that this difference in perception might evident by the degree of personal control one felt over the job insecurity stressor (De Cuyper, Bernhard-Oettel, Berntson, De Witte, & Alarco, 2008; Staufenbiel & König, 2010). The main effect hypotheses of the current study predicted that job insecurity would be significantly related to a hindrance effect on OCBs and a challenge effect on job search activities.

Additionally, the moderators examined in the current study were expected to add an additional layer to the challenge-hindrance framework that to explain how individual personality and coping choices allow employees to perceive the same stressor differently than other employees, as a challenge rather than a hindrance. The basis of the moderated effect predictions is that job insecurity has also been evidenced as a challenge stressor in past research—the current study attempts to identify specific variables that are able to provide support for why some employees react to job insecurity as a hindrance stressor while others react to job insecurity as a challenge stressor. In effect, employees who perceive job insecurity to be more of a challenge stressor than a hindrance stressor are expected to have an internal work locus of control to react to job insecurity by performing more OCBs and job searching activities relative to employees lower in internal work locus of control and control-oriented coping and also to react with more control-oriented responses. From the perspective of the general model of stress theory, job insecurity is considered to be a challenge stressor that triggers an active problem-solving style of coping, or in the case of the current study, control-oriented coping (Cavanaugh et al., 2000). Past
literature contains evidence consistent with the view of job insecurity as a challenge stressor that results in positive behavioral outcomes such as longer work hours (De Cuyper et al., 2008; Fischer et al., 2005; Staufenbiel & König, 2010). Other studies suggest a similar conceptualization of differences in the perception of a stressor being dependent on individual characteristics of employees, which falls in line with the process-oriented transactional model of stress that proposes that a threat is only a threat based on perceptions inherent to the individual employee (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). A recent study suggests that employable employees may interpret the labor market as a challenge rather than as a threat, which, in turn, could imply that they are less likely to perceive job insecurity and may react differently than employees with low employability (De Cuyper et al., 2008). Employees who have a high personal feeling of control over one’s work environment and tend to use active or control-oriented coping responses to stress would be expected to perceive job insecurity as more of a challenge. The challenge-hindrance framework may provide a background for how employees interpret and react differently to job insecurity, and why some individual characteristics moderate job insecurity.

**Outcomes of Job Insecurity**

Research on the stressor—performance relationship has generally agreed that many types of stressors have either a direct or indirect relationship with performance (see Gilboa et al., 2008). Past research on job insecurity has largely studied its relationship with outcomes such as psychological distress and strain (Roskies et al., 1993; Strazdins, D’Souza, Lim, Broom, & Rodgers, 2004) while the study of performance-related outcomes of job insecurity has been relatively lighter in past job insecurity research. Various studies point to a direct negative relationship between job insecurity and performance, strain, and attitudes. The mixed findings in the past research may be due to the variety of scales used to measure job insecurity as these
scales may be assessing particular dimensions or sub-components of job insecurity, leading to differing results. Consequences of job insecurity that have been studied in past research include adverse effects on job search activities, performance, work-family conflict, trust in management, intentions to quit, resistance to change, physical symptoms, and stress and anxiety (Lee et al., 2006; e.g., De Cuyper, Notelaers, & De Witte, 2009; Ashford et al., 1989; Lim, 1996; Davy, Kinicki, & Scheck, 1997; Kinnunen, Mauno, Natti, & Happonen, 2000; Kuhnert, Sims, & Lahey, 1989; Mohr, 2000; Rosenblatt & Ruvio, 1996; Strazdins et al., 2004).

Figure 1. Model of Predicted Relationships Among Study Variables.

The proposed study will focus on two correlates of job insecurity: organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) and job search activities. As previously mentioned, Staufenbiel and König (2010) offer the argument for considering both the challenge and hindrance effects of a stressor, rather than categorizing job insecurity into one category or the other. They note that the body of job insecurity literature has shown mixed conclusions over time regarding whether there is a positive or negative effect of job insecurity on behavioral outcomes overall, leading to the idea that a stressor could potentially have both challenge and hindrance effects depending on the
situation or employee characteristics. In their review of past job insecurity research, Staufenbiel and König (2010) observed a host of research supporting a negative relationship between job insecurity and outcomes, as well as a body of findings supporting a positive relationship between job insecurity and outcomes. Thus, the current study will test direct relationships between job insecurity and OCB, a relationship with predominant negative bias, but will investigate the moderating variables that may affect how employees perceive the challenge within this relationship. The current study expects that some employees with higher control-related characteristics will appraise the stressor as more challenging than other employees, and will therefore experience less of a hindrance effect (i.e., negative relationship) on OCB performance.

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs).** Organizational citizenship behavior is a type of performance that supports the social and psychological work environment (Organ, 1997; Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). OCBs are activities that employees engage in to benefit their organization even though the activities generally fall outside the formal job description of the employee (Bolino & Turnley, 2005). OCBs are behaviors at work that are often considered to be outside of an employee’s job description but are typically essential to the overall maintenance of an organization (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Jex, 1998). They go beyond typical job duties (“in-role performance”), and are sometimes referred to as extra-role behaviors (Triana & Garcia, 2009). Additional examples of OCBs could be helping a coworker with his or her work or volunteering to take on additional projects (Bolino & Turnley, 2005).

Organizational citizenship behaviors were represented by Organ (1988) on five dimensions: Altruism, Conscientiousness, Sportsmanship, Civic Virtue, and Courtesy. Altruism represents optional behaviors at work that helped a colleague with an organizational problem or task. Conscientiousness in this context represents adherence to the rules, regulations, and
procedures of the organization. The dimension of sportsmanship taps into employee tolerance for negative situations in the organization, and how they are able to continue forward with work amidst less than positive situations. Civic virtue includes behaviors that encompassed positive involvement in the concerns of the organization (e.g., attending meetings). Courtesy includes more discretionary behaviors that helped others in terms of preventing problems from arising (e.g., being polite and considerate; Jex, 1998; Organ, Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 2006). According to Podsakoff and MacKenzie’s (1994) scale, OCBs can include altruistic behaviors, courtesy, sportsmanship, etc. Other operationalizations of OCBs can include personal initiative and civic virtue in promoting group effectiveness, such as suggesting unpopular but beneficial ideas. In other words, OCBs are prosocial behaviors that contribute to organizational effectiveness but are not core job tasks (Sackett & DeVore, 2001). This type of extra-role performance is desired by employers, and usually OCBs are considered necessary to the survival of the organization (Bolino & Turnley, 2005).

The relationship between job insecurity and OCBs in the literature is not as clear cut as evidence of the negative effects of job insecurity on health outcomes. Even job insecurity and psychological health has a complex negative relationship that has not yet been fully explained. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) found both increases and decreases in psychological illness as a result of job insecurity, depending on the individual. Job insecurity is a threat to employees, and some researchers have predicted that employees would react to job insecurity by performing OCBs in an attempt to prove their worth to the company (Repenning, 2002). Gilboa et al. (2008) also predicted the job insecurity could have a challenge effect and result in higher work effort if employees believe that higher work performances will improve success of the organization and therefore job security for employees. Sverke et al. (2002) found that job insecurity was not
significantly related to performance outcomes and noted that a large portion of previous job
insecurity research has not found a significant relationship between job insecurity and
performance of any type (Cheng & Chan, 2008; Staufenbiel & König, 2010).

Other past research indicates also suggests that job insecurity is negatively related to
OCBs (Abramis, 1994; Rosenblatt & Ruvio, 1996; Wong, Wong, Ngo, & Lui, 2005). The recent
meta-analysis by Cheng and Chan (2008) also found a negative relationship. OCBs are related to
withdrawal behaviors such as turnover intentions ($r_c = -.22$), actual turnover ($r_c = -.14$), and
absenteeism ($r_c = -.16$; Podsakoff et al., 2009). Job insecurity is consistently related to decreased
work effort. Bultena (1998) and van Dyne and Ang (1998) both found negative relationships
between job insecurity and OCBs. Job insecurity has been linked to decreases in altruism and
sportsmanship, two types of OCBs (Bultena, 1998). This negative relationship could be
explained by a detachment reaction due to violation of the psychological contract between
employer and employee, or due to a diversion of work effort being spent on coping with the
stressor rather than performing the current job. If employees feel that they will be laid off soon,
they may stop putting effort into job performance and start putting effort into looking for a new
also found a buffering effect of trust in management on the negative job insecurity—OCB
relationship. Trust seemed to reduce the impact of job insecurity on OCBs. There is recent
support for the negative relationship between job insecurity and OCBs after accounting for
various moderator and demographic variables (Cheng & Chan, 2008; LePine et al., 2005);
however, due to the Sverke et al. (2002) finding of no significant relationship between job
insecurity and performance, Hypothesis 1 was not specified in terms of direction due to the
mixed literature. Thus, the first main effect predicted is a relationship between job insecurity and OCBs.

_Hypothesis 1:_ Job insecurity and organizational citizenship behaviors will be related.

A recent study proposed a potential explanation for the negative relationship, that the moderators of job insecurity may be confounding the relationship between job insecurity and outcomes. Feather and Rauter (2004) found negative relationships between job insecurity and OCBs in their sample of permanent employees. They suggest that non-permanent (contract) sample of teachers exhibited increased OCBs as a method to secure permanent employment, but that permanent employees exhibited a decrease in OCBs. The authors suggest that these OCBs were performed as a method to achieve either promotion or a permanent position within the organization. Relating back to Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) conceptualization of stress, an employee’s response to a stressor will depend on appraisal of threat as well as beliefs about the likelihood of being able to counteract the stressor of various types. A consistently negative relationship between OCBs and job insecurity could suggest that job insecurity is being appraised as a threat that is not easily counteracted by permanent employees. In other words, employees may feel that they cannot counteract this stressor and it composes a hindrance on their job performance. According to the negative linear model of stress, stressors are detrimental to performance in a linear fashion (Jex, 1998). Work stressors are thought to require effort to coping with the stressor, which therefore diverts effort away from job performance and leads to reduced performance (Gilboa et al., 2008).
Wong et al. (2005) also apply social exchange theory to the job insecurity—OCB relationship. According to social exchange theory, employees expect rewards and continued employment for performing both their regular job duties and extra-role duties (OCBs; Blau, 1994). If the organization experiences layoffs or restructuring, it retracts its part of the bargain, which is providing continued employment to the employee. As a result, employees are less likely to perform their end of the bargain, namely OCBs. Employees who feel that the social exchange agreement has been violated may decrease the extra effort they put into work as they may be reacting in a sense of equity to not being fairly rewarded with job security by the organization. In the presence of job insecurity, it can be expected that employees will decrease their extra-role behaviors (OCBs).

Some might argue that the “actual” or objective level of job security is not an uncontrollable stressor, nor as fixed as it might appear to be. It is possible that actual job security can be changed by variables such as job performance, but this would depend on the organization. If an organization is conducting layoffs, they might choose to remove the lowest performers. In that case, poor job performance could lead to a decrease in actual job security. Surviving employees may feel this pressure to increase performance if layoffs are occurring around them, in an attempt to thereby increase their actual job security via good job performance. But it is also feasible that in reality, management may not lay off the lowest performing employees either because of difficulty in identifying the employees with lowest value to the organization, or due to seniority reward systems making seniority a higher factor in the decision than poor performance, therefore leading to more job insecurity as surviving employees do not understand the layoff decision tactics of management. Organizations may choose to reduce costs by cutting contract or temporary workers, not filling the positions of employees who retire, etc. Thus, job insecurity
could be expected to be lower in top-performing employees if they are aware that their good performance is a factor that will help them secure their job, but only if it is apparent to employees that performance is the reason that some employees are laid off. One main goal of studying job insecurity and how it affects extra-role performance is to understand what losses an organization might undergo if they do not communicate layoff information to employees. A consistent threat of job insecurity in employees may lead to unfavorable outcomes in the organization, and this is the focus of the current study.

**Job Search Activities.** Job search activities refers to actions that employees engage in when they are looking for alternative job opportunities (Simpson, 2009). These activities could include visiting job fairs, looking for jobs on the internet or newspapers, connecting with professional networks, and a variety of other proactive behaviors (Blau, 1994; van Hooft & Crossley, 2008). According to a model of turnover behavior, once an employee feels negatively about his or her job a chain of events can occur that lead him or her to consider other career opportunities: thoughts of quitting, evaluation of positive outcomes of an alternative job search, calculations of the cost of quitting, intention to search for new jobs, and an actual search for jobs (Mobley, 1977; Simpson, 2009). Job search activities can be expected to increase when an employee is expecting to leave the organization, either for voluntary or involuntary reasons. Job search activities can potentially transform into outcomes such as turnover or reduced organizational commitment (Mobley, 1977; Simpson, 2009). Recently, a study by De Cuyper et al. (2009) found that job insecurity related negatively to organizational commitment. The current study expected that job insecurity would be related to decreased organizational commitment in the form of increased job search as employees separate from the prospect of staying with the organization. Given the research indicating that job insecurity is negatively related to
organizational commitment, and organizational commitment is negatively related to turnover and job search activities, it might be expected that job insecurity could therefore have a positive relationship with job search activities (van Hooft & Crossley, 2008). Higher job insecurity was expected to be related to more job search activities. Job search activities will be included in the proposed study because it has been found to be related to certain aspects of control in other ways, such as the temporary and permanent worker study by De Cuyper et al. (2009). Job insecurity forces the employee to cope with the fact that his or her job is unstable, naturally leading to a decision process where the employee decides how likely he or she is to stay with that organization.

Hypothesis 2: Job insecurity and job search activities will be related.

Additionally, Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner’s (2000) meta-analysis found that job search activities predicted turnover better than quit intentions. When faced with the prospect of losing one’s job, searching for new jobs is a common response (Cheng & Chan, 2008). Theoretically there is a direct link between job insecurity and job search activities, stemming from the fact that as employees face the reality of having to find a different job they appraise the organization in many ways. This appraisal depends partly on how the organization deals with job insecurity on issues such as communication regarding layoffs, communication regarding valuing survivors of layoffs, trying alternative financial cuts before conducting layoffs, etc. An employee’s appraisal of his or her actual level of job security as well as how well the organization approaches job insecurity, the proposed study expects a direct positive effect of job insecurity on job search
activities. Employees who feel higher job insecurity are expected to increase their job search activities.

**Moderators of Job Insecurity—Outcome Relationships**

The job insecurity literature identifies multiple moderators of the job insecurity—outcome relationship. Past research has found evidence for multiple demographic-type variables, tenure, age, gender, and managerial status, being moderators of job insecurity (De Cuyper & De Witte, 2006; Gilboa et al., 2008). Fewer studies have measured the moderating effects of individual difference or coping variables, such as control at work, trust in the organization, and job involvement, on work outcomes such as OCBs and job search activities within the context of job insecurity. Ito and Brotheridge (2007) identified WLOC and employment dependence as moderators between job insecurity and job loss strain, and other studies have investigated employability as a mediator of job insecurity—strain (see De Cuyper et al., 2008), social support (see Mohr, 2000) or control at work as moderators of job insecurity—strain relationship more frequently than the job insecurity—performance relationship (see Büssing, 1999).

Research has identified negative effects of job insecurity on outcomes such as decreased job satisfaction, and increased job search activities. In their summary of the perceived job security literature, Sverke and Hellgren (2002) note the need for more research on how perceived job security contributes to changes in these outcomes. Additionally, they mention that a number of plausible factors may moderate the relationships between job insecurity and its potential outcomes. A viable next step in this line of research is to identify the variables that moderate this relationship and examine how those variables relate to different measures of job insecurity. Identifying variables that affect job insecurity could create an opportunity for organizations to increase job insecurity and begin to attenuate the negative job insecurity—outcome relationship.
The proposed study will attempt to replicate past identified direct relationships between job insecurity and work outcomes and examine two potential moderators of the job insecurity—outcome relationship.

Various studies have looked at personality as a moderator of the job insecurity—strain relationships. The main personality variables that have been studied include: negative affect, self-esteem, and neuroticism (Näswall, Sverke, & Hellgren, 2005; Klanderman & van Vuuren, 1999). Roskies et al. (1993) found negative affect to be the most important predictor of psychological distress in their study of the job insecurity—strain relationship. The nature of job insecurity forces employees to consider the idea of leaving the organization, and this can lead to many outcomes including strain and also changes in performance (Strazdins et al., 2004). Employees can deal with the thought of job loss in many ways. Two individual characteristics related to control will be examined in the current study: work locus of control and control-oriented coping. The proposed study predicts that employees with an internal WLOC or higher use of control-oriented coping will show a greater relationship between job insecurity and outcomes than employees with individual characteristics lower in control. An employee with an internal WLOC or high control-oriented coping may feel more need or ability to try to actively respond to job insecurity, thereby leading to consequences such as more OCBs, increased job search activities in preparation for potential job loss, etc. Essentially, the relationship between job insecurity and outcomes should lead to more OCB performance and more job search behaviors in “high control” employees.

An employee’s level of job insecurity, what he or she perceives his or her actual job security to be, may be influenced by how much control that employee desires over his or her environment (Ashford et al., 1989). Frese, Garst, and Fay’s (2007) study gave empirical support
to the link between control aspirations and outcomes such as personal initiative. Ashford et al. (1989) argued that people need to feel control over events in their lives, and one threat to this control over one’s life is organizational changes (e.g., mergers, down sizings, layoffs, etc.; Lee et al., 2006). Job insecurity is an appraisal of how likely an employee is to keep his or her job. Depending on individual characteristics of the employee, he or she may view and react to that insecurity with different behaviors. Control may be one aspect that differentiates how employees react to job insecurity. Employees who feel a lack of control regarding their job stability might react in different ways. Some employees seek out control in other aspects of their job (e.g., OCBs), because those aspects might be easier to control than actual job security. Some employees might feel powerless to change their actual job security and might not attempt to put more effort into a job where they cannot control their tenure, which may lead to an increase in job search activities and decrease in OCBs. Overall, controlling characteristics of the employee are expected to determine the effect that job insecurity has on OCBs and job search activities.

In the current study, work locus of control and control-oriented coping were expected to moderate the job insecurity—outcome relationship. According to past research, these two moderators are related to both OCBs and job search activities (Turnipseed & Bacon, 2009). Objective job security is likely a variable with relatively low chance of being directly impacted by employee reactions, relative to other stressors that can be changed more easily through direct action. It is difficult for employees to appraise any actual changes in their own job security that may have occurred as a result of their efforts. For example, with the stressor role ambiguity, an employee could directly change the stressor by meeting with his or her supervisor to clarify roles and responsibilities. Time pressure, for example, could be changed by altering a project timeline or changing work schedules. Both role ambiguity and time pressure are more easily appraised by
the employee as they are more proximal to the nature of the job experienced by the employee on a daily basis and within one’s own control. Objective job security, on the other hand, is often a factor of the economy and more related to external factors such as organizational financial success, and it is undetermined whether it is likely to be affected by employee behaviors. Job insecurity is a perception of threat of future job loss, which might be much more difficult to directly confront due to lack of personal control over the stressor. Therefore, job insecurity is expected to at least partially depend on how much control an employee believes he or she has over preventing a potential loss of employment.

Relating back to the challenge-hindrance framework, employees with an internal locus of control or control-oriented coping techniques may take a more proactive or “challenge” approach when faced with job insecurity. Employees with lower levels of the moderator variables in the study will view job insecurity as more of a hindrance. This theoretical approach comes from the underlying mechanisms behind WLOC and control-oriented coping. The basic premise behind the moderated relationships of interest in the current study is that control is expected to be a factor in moderating the job insecurity—outcome relationships described in the current study. In fact, one of the subscales of the job insecurity measure is called powerlessness, and refers to the “powerlessness to maintain desired continuity in a threatened job situation” (Ashford et al., 1989; Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984). Depending on an employee’s level of WLOC and control-oriented coping, employees are expected to relate to the presence of job insecurity in different ways. A moderating effect is expected to occur, as WLOC and control-oriented coping moderate the impact of job insecurity on organizational citizenship behavior and job search activities.
**Work Locus of Control (WLOC).** Work Locus of Control (WLOC) was examined as a moderator of the job insecurity—OCB and job insecurity—job search activities relationships. The concept of WLOC comes from Rotter’s (1966) work related to general expectancies about life events, in which certain individuals are more likely to believe that their actions will achieve rewards (Lange & Tiggemann, 1981; Oliver, Jose, & Brough, 2006). The original generalized internal-external LOC scale (Rotter, 1966) was developed to measure the degree to which a person believed that he or she had mastery over life events. The general work-related LOC scale was later adapted to assess beliefs about control and mastery over the work environment (Spector, 1988). Individuals with an internal WLOC believe that they have more control over their work environment, and that their actions can affect outcomes related to the stressors. Individuals with an external WLOC believe that their actions are more meaningless in influencing the outcome of work-related events and that their lives are more determined by fate. The purpose of measuring WLOC in the current study is to determine if the belief in control over one’s life will buffer against the effect of job insecurity of outcomes on job insecurity.

Individuals with a higher level of internal WLOC may believe that they are competent at goal attainment and successful at maintaining control over their work lives (Rotter, 1966). Feelings of personal control allow high-control employees to perceive work stressors as more manageable and act to combat those stressors (Wanberg, 1997). Karasek’s (1979) demands-control stress model provides an additional framework to illustrate the importance of control in employee responses and explains that employees who possess more control are generally better able to respond to demands at work. Multiple meta-analyses have linked control over work demands to employee well-being, job satisfaction, and ability to handle stress in general life (Kobasa, Maddi, & Kahn, 1982; Spector et al., 2002).
Previous research on locus of control found that people with an internal LOC reported less objective threat than people with an external LOC when their businesses faced with flood damage (Anderson, Hellriegel, & Slocum, 1977) and those with an internal LOC also took more active steps to directly address threats posed by flood damage. Seminal research on job insecurity by Ashford et al. (1989) applied the LOC research to the job insecurity context under the premise that those with internal LOC would perceive less job insecurity. It would also be a reasonable extension of Anderson’s (1977) work to expect that employees with an internal LOC might engage in more active steps to directly address the threat of job insecurity.

An explanation for the underlying mechanism behind control being such a critical variable in stress management can be found in cognitive adaptation theory. Proposed by Taylor (1983), cognitive adaptation theory provides a theoretical rationale to explain how individuals faced with extreme stressors such as life-threatening illness can be more or less successful in coping with a stressor. Individuals may develop cognitive strategies to successfully adjust to life events through certain self-enhancing techniques such as the use of positive self-evaluations, exaggerated perceptions of control over events, and exaggerated optimism (Taylor & Armor, 1996; Wanberg, 1997). Cognitive adaptation theory could explain the mechanism behind what prompts certain individuals to search for jobs more intensely than others. Internal WLOC may create a cognitive adaptation that encourages employees to engage in action-oriented coping strategies (e.g., beginning a job search as advance preparation for expected future job loss) when faced with job insecurity (van Hooft & Crossley, 2008). As a result of feeling more in control over work stressors, individuals high on internal WLOC are expected to feel more capable of dealing with stressful situations such as job insecurity by way of having more positive impressions of their control over the job insecurity stressor (Ng, Sorensen, & Eby, 2006). Job
insecurity is likely to have a greater impact on job search activities for individuals with an 
internal WLOC as those individuals who feel more in control of work stressors are expected to 
be more likely to be proactive about seeking out a new job to prepare for potential future job loss 
(De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2009).

Employees high on internal WLOC would be expected to engage in performing more 
OCBs and are also expected to spend more time searching for a new job because they tend to 
believe that they can control and prepare for outcomes related to their work environment. On the 
opposite end of the spectrum, employees with an external WLOC are predicted to show less of 
these proactive responses to job insecurity because they believe that their actions are not as 
important in determining outcomes in their work environment (i.e., being laid off or not). An 
individual with an external WLOC would be more likely to believe that layoff decisions are not 
able to be altered and will not exert as much effort toward improving performance when they 
believe it will have no effect on layoff decisions.

Employees with an internal WLOC tend to believe that they have the power to counteract 
stressors from the environment such as job insecurity (Ashford et al., 1989). This orientation 
toward a willingness to undertake actions suggest that such individuals are likely to attempt to 
protect their job security by taking steps to increase their value to the organization in the event 
that increase performance can save their jobs. Employees with an internal WLOC are also more 
likely than those with high external WLOC to feel able to cope with job transitions such as 
losing a job and seeking new employment (Latack, Kinicki, & Prussia, 1995). The level of 
employees’ WLOC has been found to predict their sense of job insecurity (Ashford et al., 1989), 
in addition to job stress (e.g., Kahn and Byosiere, 1992; Kirkcaldy, Trimpop, & Williams, 2002). 
Ito and Brotheridge (2007) found support for an internal WLOC being negatively associated with
job insecurity. WLOC has also been linked to job performance in the literature with a corrected validity coefficient of .22 ($k = 35$) in Judge and Bono’s (2001) meta-analysis (Hattrup, O’Connell, & Labrador, 2005; O’Brien, 1984; Spector, 1982). Hough (1992), for example, reported an average observed correlation of .19 across 11 studies between WLOC and overall job performance, such that employees with internal LOC performed better than employees with external LOC. Much of the research on WLOC and job insecurity has been focused on strain as outcomes (Näsvall et al., 2005). Barling and Kelloway (1996) found a moderating effect of workplace control on the relationship between job insecurity and health outcomes. Job insecurity was positively related to somatic symptoms and blood pressure when perceived workplace control was low, but unrelated to these outcomes when perceived workplace control was high.

A similar relationship is expected with WLOC as a moderator of the job insecurity—OCB relationship. WLOC was expected to buffer against the negative impact of job insecurity on OCBs. Past research by Elanain (2010) found a correlation of .22 ($p < .01$) between WLOC and personal initiative, a scale sometimes used to assess OCBs. Orpen (1994) also examined the concept of personal control on the job insecurity—strain relationship. That study found that control moderated the effect of job insecurity on well-being, indicating that people with an external WLOC experienced decreased well-being when faced with job insecurity. Similar to the way that WLOC moderated the job insecurity—strain relationship, the current study predicted that in the face of job insecurity, employees with an internal WLOC will take control-based action and therefore attenuate the negative job insecurity-OCB relationship.
**Hypothesis 3:** The relationship between job insecurity and organizational citizenship behaviors will be moderated by work locus of control. The slope of the moderated relationship will be stronger for employees with an external work locus of control, as an internal work locus of control is expected to buffer against the impact of job insecurity on OCBs.

Individuals higher in internal WLOC are also predicted to engage in more job search activities (van Hooft & Crossley, 2008). The higher an employee’s internal WLOC, the more job search activities he or she should exhibit. A meta-analysis by Kanfer found a small but significant relationship between LOC and job search intensity ($r_c = .05, p < .05$). A study by van Hooft and Crossley (2008) later indicated that stress may serve as a catalyst that increases the relationship between LOC and job search intensity. They noted a positive relationship between LOC and job search intensity in the presence of a stressor (perceived financial need). As a proximal variable, it may be perceived stress rather than perceived financial need (Vinokur & Schul, 2002) that increases job search activities (van Hooft & Crossley, 2008). Because their findings counteract previous findings, they called for more research on the interactive role of stress and LOC in the prediction of job search intensity. The current study attempts to address this call by examining the relationship between stress, defined as job insecurity in the current study, and how it interacts with the WLOC—job search activities relationship.
Hypothesis 4: The relationship between job insecurity and job search activities will be moderated by work locus of control. The slope of the moderated relationship for employees with an external work locus of control is expected to have a weaker relationship between job insecurity and job search activities than those the slope of the relationship for those employees who have an internal work locus of control.

Control-Oriented Coping (COC). Coping is the reaction that an individual uses to react to a stressor. Coping is a way of reacting to a stressor with the intent of lessening the effects of the stressor. There are various types of coping, and multiple ways to conceptualize it. The type of coping used to respond to downsizing or layoffs has been shown to influence how adversely employees are affected by the downsizing (Armstrong-Stassen, 2006). According to Latack (1986), some employees may respond with a control-oriented coping style and some may respond with an escape-oriented coping style. Control-oriented coping consists of actions and appraisals that are proactive and “take-charge,” as opposed to avoidance strategies (Armstrong-Stassen, 2006). Control-oriented coping is made up of dimensions such as taking action to confront the stressor, reframing techniques, positive thinking, direct action, and seeking out instrumental and emotional support. These concepts are focused on the seeking of resources to assist in responding to a stressor and are positively correlated with one another (Armstrong-Stassen, 2006; Carver, 1997). Positive thinking involves seeking out and controlling thoughts about a stressor, so as to recast the stressor in a positive way. Direct action coping is task- and problem-focused on controlling aspects of work that relate to the stressor; for example, working longer hours to increase performance. Support seeking behaviors acquire help, whether
emotional, informational, or instrumental, to take control over the strain that a stressor is causing an employee (Armstrong-Stassen, 2006). Escape coping, on the other hand, would be more of an “actively avoidant” approach to coping and consist of actions and cognitive reappraisals that involve escapist, avoidant strategies (Latack, 1986).

The current study examined how the use of control-oriented coping moderated the relationship between job insecurity, OCBs, and job search activities. Given the benefits of control-oriented coping mechanisms, organizational leaders could facilitate the use of control-oriented coping behaviors by setting organizational norms that promote asking for information or problem-solving help and sharing worries and concerns (Ashford et al., 1989). There are several frameworks proposing mechanisms by which stressors affect employee attitudes and behaviors (Jex & Crossley, 2005). The Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1980) general stress model explains that employees vary widely in how they react to stressors. When faced with stressors, there are certain personal characteristics that cause an employee to deal with a stressor in more direct or indirect ways than others. Job insecurity is hypothesized to trigger action-oriented behaviors in employees. Action-oriented activities at work may include seeking social support, increasing in-role performance, increasing the amount of OCBs performed, devoting time and effort toward activities that they feel will either cause them to feel better about their own job insecurity, or change their actual level of job security (e.g., they believe they will be less likely to be laid off once they demonstrate high performance to supervisors; Armstrong-Stassen, 2006).

Past research has generally concluded that it is an advantage for employees to use active coping methods when faced with stressors in the work environment, and a disadvantage for employees to use avoidance coping (Jex, Bliese, Buzzell, & Primeau, 2001). Therefore, it is
predicted that the more control-oriented behaviors that are used, the more successful the employee should be in coping with work stressors (Elfering, Grebner, Semmer, Kaiser-Freiburghaus, Lauper-Del Ponte, & Witschi, 2005). Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) stress and coping process model proposed that the ways people actively cope depend heavily on the resources that are available to them and the constraints that inhibit the use of these resources in the context of the specific encounter (Armstrong-Stassen, 2006). There is empirical evidence that perceived job insecurity is associated with choice of coping strategy. Employees who feel higher job insecurity are more likely to choose avoidant coping methods rather than active coping methods (Armstrong-Stassen, 1994; Armstrong-Stassen, Cameron, Mantler, & Horsburgh, 2001; Galinsky, Bond, & Friedman, 1993; van Vuuren, & Klandermans, 1990). Similar to WLOC, control-oriented coping was also expected to fall in line with cognitive adaptation theory which might expect that employees who choose to engage in more control-oriented coping behaviors may choose to do so because they have developed a cognitive adaptation in response to the stressor of job insecurity. Employees who engage in more control-oriented coping behaviors in response to job insecurity may believe that they are proactively preparing for future job loss.

Coping has been studied in past occupational stress research as a moderator of stressor-strain relationships. Research found a moderating effect of coping on the job—burnout relationship (Yip, 2009). On the behavioral front, Armstrong-Stassen (2006) found that a lack of control-oriented coping behaviors led to decreased job performance. Managers who experienced higher job insecurity actually decreased the amount of control-oriented coping behaviors that they used, which resulted in lower job performance ratings. This suggests a direct positive relationship between control-oriented coping and OCBs. Employees in the proposed study who exhibit more control-oriented coping behaviors are predicted to have a weaker relationship
between job insecurity and outcomes. Control-oriented coping should act as a buffer against job insecurity, thereby lessening the negative impact that job insecurity has on performance in employees who use more control-oriented coping to respond to the threat of job insecurity.

Hypothesis 5: The relationship between job insecurity and organizational citizenship behaviors will be moderated by control-oriented coping. The slope of the moderated relationship will be stronger for employees who engage in less control-oriented coping than the slope of the relationship for those employees who engage in more control-oriented coping.

Control-oriented coping should also moderate the job insecurity—job search activities relationship, in that employees with more control-oriented coping behaviors will engage in more job search activities than employees who use less control-oriented coping behaviors.

Hypothesis 6: The relationship between job insecurity and job search intensity will be moderated by control-oriented coping. The slope of the moderated relationship is expected to be weaker for employees who engage in less control-oriented coping than the slope for employees who engage in more control-oriented coping.

Differences Between Work Locus of Control and Control-Oriented Coping

While work locus of control is considered a personality variable that represents an individual’s beliefs about effects of outcomes in the workplace are under one’s control, control-
oriented coping represents individual behavioral choices that are made when coping with situations at work. WLOC may predispose individuals to belief that their actions at work can truly lead to reductions or stress or improvements in their work experience, while COC represents one of the consequences of the decision to take action in response to stress. Support has been found for WLOC as a mediator between job insecurity and the use of COC behaviors, a finding which may partially be explained by the primary and secondary appraisal processes of the Lazarus and Folkman (1984) transactional model of stress. Primary appraisal of job insecurity, the appraisal of threat or harm presented by job insecurity, may be influenced by the individual’s inherent level of personal beliefs about WLOC and may be more likely to lead the individual to believe that job insecurity is more controllable. WLOC may frame the expectancy of control that an employee has over the ability to “save” his or her job when threatened with job insecurity. If there is a high expectancy that taking individual action at work may result in reducing the likelihood of being laid off, the employee may be more likely to choose to engage in COC techniques as a reaction to job insecurity. Control-oriented coping, on the other hand, would seem to fall under the secondary appraisal process of stress process, which is dependent upon the response to the primary appraisal of threat. In this manner, an employee’s beliefs about WLOC may cause an increase in COC behaviors; however, the current study chose to examine both WLOC and COC as moderators of the job insecurity—outcome relationship, as the primary goal of the study was to identify potential moderators that may assist employees in coping with job insecurity, and therefore provide organizations with potential means to help employees deal with the ongoing stressor of job insecurity.
Contributions of the Current Study to Job Insecurity Literature

The current study aimed to contribute to the literature in a few ways. In their review of past job insecurity literature, Sverke and Hellgren (2002) noted the need for additional job insecurity research on the moderators of the job insecurity—performance relationship. Much research has been conducted on the relationship between job insecurity and physical and mental health outcomes, but a lesser body of research exists on the relationship job insecurity and performance and behavioral outcomes. The research has had some mixed findings as far as some of the directions of job insecurity—outcome relationships. The first aim of the current study was to attempt to answer this call for research by providing support for a direction in the relationship between job insecurity and OCBs and job search activities.

Second, Cheng and Chan (2008) called for additional testing of moderators of the relationship between job insecurity and job-related outcomes. The current study attempted to contribute to this call for research by investigating two moderators of the job insecurity—outcome relationship: Work locus of control and control-oriented coping. If job insecurity and its consequences are significantly affected by individual personality and coping choices related to control, organizations may be able to aim to increase the control that employees feel at work or that they use in responding to job insecurity. In theory, understanding the nature of how control affects job insecurity and its consequences may provide organizations with an avenue to reduce the negative effects of job insecurity (Armstrong-Stassen, 2006).

Beyond the previously mentioned theoretical goals of the current study, the third contribution of the current study was to contribute to Lee et al.’s (2006) call for more job insecurity research on a wide sample of job types and ages. Kanfer, Wanberg, and Kantrowitz (2001) also noted the relative lack of studies conducted on employees conducting job-to-job
searches. Much previous job insecurity research has collected data from within single organizations or from unemployed individuals; the current study will move away from that approach to sample from a broader variety of industries, ages, and job types.

Finally, Lee et al. (2006) also suggested that applied research evaluate the applicability of the Ashford et al., (1989) multidimensional measure of job insecurity and compare it to alternative measures of job insecurity. The current study used two job insecurity measures, a multidimensional and a global measure of job insecurity, to examine differential relationships with the work outcomes.
CHAPTER II: METHOD

Participants

320 employees participated in an online survey during 2012-2013. Participants were working professionals who were current employees (not employed at a non-profit or government organization), not members of a work union, worked over 30 hours a week on a permanent basis (i.e., non-temporary workers), and were over 18 years of age. Items confirming all of the basic participation requirements were included at the end of survey to verify that participants met all of these criteria for participation. Nine participants were removed from the study because they indicated that they were union members and two participants were removed because they worked less than 30 hours a week. The final sample included a total of 309 participants.

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics of the demographic variables. The average age across all participants was 40.65 years ($SD = 12.03$). Female participants represented 46.9% of the sample while males represented 42.7%. The most common degrees received in the sample were a Bachelor’s Degree (38.6%) followed by a Master’s Degree (34.6%). Participants represented a wide variety of industries and job titles (see Table 1). The current study’s sample was primarily comprised of employees from the following industry sectors: 28.10% from Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services; 17.30% from Finance and Insurance; 15.50% from Manufacturing; 7.60% from Health Care and Social Assistance; and 6.50% from Information services (e.g., information technology). The lowest industry representation came from Administrative Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services (0.00%); Transportation and Warehousing (0.40%); Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting (0.70%); Mining (0.70%); and Real Estate Rental and Leasing (0.70%).
Procedure

A link to an online survey was sent by e-mail to employees. They were presented with an opportunity to complete the survey via a hyperlink to the survey. Employees clicked on a link in the recruitment e-mail to participate in the approximately 15-minute survey that was hosted on SurveyMonkey.com. Participants completed an electronic consent form and completed the survey online at work or home. The recruitment e-mail for the study advertised the study as a survey of “Workplace Behaviors during the Economic Recovery.” Incentives included being entered into a raffle for sixteen $25 gift certificates to Amazon.com. Participants were informed that there would be approximately 375 participants in the study so that they had an estimate of the odds of winning one of the gift certificates. Participants were sent reminders two and four weeks after the initial e-mail, reminding them to complete the survey. Gift certificates were e-mailed to sixteen randomly chosen participants following the completion of the survey.

Once clicking on the link to the survey, participants were assigned to one of two versions of the survey: A or B. The survey version was assigned randomly based on a random sorting question at the beginning of the survey. Survey structure was manipulated between the two versions so that the order of the items was reversed between the two versions. The responses to study variables based on the order of presentation in the survey were not significantly different.

Recruiting Method

Twenty-seven participants (8.7%) were recruited from a northwest manufacturing and distributing organization. The director of human resources at the northwest manufacturing and distributing organization forwarded the survey invitation to approximately 250 employees at the organization. The response rate at this organization was approximately 12%. Due to the difficulty in obtaining additional participants directly through human resource directors at
additional organizations, the remaining 293 participants (91.3%) were recruited using the snowball chain-referral method. The chain-referral method begins with a convenience sample of initial participants who then recruit additional participants into the study, which expands the sample using participants to recruit other participants (Heckathorn, 2011). The snowball sampling method was originally developed to study the structure of social networks, but eventually became used as a method of accessing hard-to-reach and hidden populations that researchers were interested in studied. Sampling from hidden populations is difficult because a probability sampling method requires a sampling frame from which to randomly sample employees (Heckathorn, 2011); however, a sampling frame is not present in hidden populations due to some manner of inability of the researcher to access the hidden population (Sudman & Kalton, 1986). Hidden populations are those that are geographically dispersed or involve a group that is difficult for outsider researchers to reach (Sudman & Kalton, 1986). Snowball sampling has been a common form of sampling and even considered a standard technique in some social research (Heckathorn, 2011). One goal of the study was to be representative of a variety of occupations in order to increase external generalizability, so the nonprobability chain-referral snowball method was chosen as the most effective data collection method in a population that is difficult to access directly, as mailing lists and other forms of obtaining employee e-mail addresses outside of the organizational setting are mostly off limits or not available to be accessed for use by applied researchers.

Working professionals were contacted through group forums on a professional, work-oriented networking site. Permission was obtained from each group’s forum moderator before posting the survey invitation. The survey invitation was posted on the networking groups’ discussion boards. The response rate for the snowball sample was not computed due to lack of confirmation of the
number of recipients who received the survey invitation from the e-mail and professional networking forum survey invitations. To obtain a wide variety of participants, the principal investigator sent survey invitations by e-mail and forum postings to working professionals who met the criteria for participating in the study. All participants, including those who did not meet the participation requirements for the study, were asked to forward the survey invitation to anyone they knew who did meet the survey participation criteria.

Union members were not recruited for the current study and were excluded based on past research that identified differences between union and non-union members in terms of perceived job insecurity (Brochu & Morin, 2012). Going against expectations, union members have been found to be three and a half percent more likely than non-union members to experience job insecurity (Brochu & Morin, 2012). The increase in perceived job insecurity for union members may be partially explained by the possibility that unions may discuss job insecurity more frequently with their members, partially to justify the union’s existence (Brochu & Morin, 2012). A typical non-union employee is likely to have no official protection or support against layoffs. Union members, on the other hand, are likely to receive information and contact form their unions regarding job security as one of the major functions of a union is to secure employment and benefits for its members. Based on the past research that union members may have a different relationship with job insecurity than non-union employees and the likelihood that union members have increased recognition and awareness of their job security and the policies surrounding it, union members were excluded from the current study in an effort to keep the sample limited to similar types of workers who are not likely to engage in official discussions or actions related to job security.
Measures

Unless otherwise indicated, the response format for all scales were a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). It was made clear to participants that data were collected only for research purposes and that their responses would be kept confidential and only summarized by high-level group summary statistics. Additionally, participants were encouraged at multiple points throughout the survey to provide honest responses. The survey contained 83 items. For all questions with time frames (Job Search Intensity and job insecurity measures) included in the instructions, participants were directed to think about their last six months of their employment.

Demographic characteristics. Demographic variables measured include Age, Gender (0=male; 1=female), Living Status (1=single; 2=married and living apart; 3=married but living apart; 4=not married but living with partner/family/friends), Industry sector of organization (2012 North American Industry Classification System codes), highest Education degree attained (1=primary/elementary; 2=secondary/middle; 3=high school; 4=associate; 5=college/university; 6=bachelor; 7=technical school; 8=master; 9=doctoral), Tenure at organization (weeks), Salary (annual dollars). The Living Status variable had four response options: Single (n = 80), married and living together (n = 175), married and living apart (n = 2), and not married but living with partner, friends, or family members (n = 19). The Living Status variable was dummy-coded in order to allow the purely categorical data to be entered into the regression equations. The reference group chosen for the dummy-coding procedure was the “married and living together” group after consulting Hardy’s (1993) recommendations for selecting a reference group (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). Living Status was represented in the analyses by three dummy-coded variables: Living Status Single (1=single; 0=all other responses), Living Status Married
Apart (1=married and living apart; 0=all other responses), and Living Status Others (1=not married but living with partner, friends, or family members; 0=all other responses).

**Perceived employability.** Perceived employability represents the confidence and belief that an employee could easily find another job (Forrier & Sels, 2003; Wittekind et al., 2010). It is a form of adaptability that may facilitate transition between jobs (Fugate, Kinicki, & Ashforth, 2004; Fuller & Marler, 2009). Authors of past studies have argued that employability helps employees to cope with job insecurity. Employees who have many alternatives in the labor market may be less affected by job insecurity than those with fewer alternatives (e.g., Fugate et al., 2004; Wittekind et al., 2010). Employability may influence how an employee alters his or her performance level as a result of job insecurity, and this effect was controlled for while examining the moderating relationships of the current study. An employee with low employability, who believes he or she could not easily find an alternative job, might react more strongly to job insecurity and increase his or her performance more than an employee with high employability. Recently, De Cuyper et al. (2008) found that job insecurity mediated the relationship between perceived employability and well-being. Empirical evidence has been found to support the notion that perceived employability is a moderator of the relationship between job insecurity and unfavorable outcomes (Büssing, 1999; Mohr, 2000; Wittekind et al., 2010). Based on the findings in past research, perceived employability was included as a control variable due to its observed moderating effect on the job insecurity—outcome relationship. Thus, because the intent of the current study was to investigate the effect of WLOC and control-oriented coping on performance in the midst of job insecurity, it was thought to be important to control for variance in performance due to level of perceived employability when examining this moderated
relationship. Perceived employability was controlled for with the other four demographic variables.

Perceived employability was assessed with three items from Janssens, Sels, and van den Brande (2003). Participants were instructed to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with the items in reference to their current job (Appendix B). A sample item is, “I’m confident that I would find another job if I started searching.” The reliability of the perceived employability scale was .78 (Cronbach’s $\alpha$; Nunnally, 1978).

**Job insecurity (JI).** Job insecurity was assessed with two measures. The first job insecurity measure, referred to as JI Global in the current study, was measured with four items from De Witte (2000) that focused on threat of global job loss (Appendix C; De Cuyper et al., 2010). Participants were instructed to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with the four JI Global items as they related to their current job. A sample item is, “I am sure that I will be able to keep my job” (reverse-scored). Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of the JI Global scale was .89.

The second job insecurity measure used was the reduced (“bare bones”) version of the job insecurity scale developed by Lee et al. (2008) that was based on the original and seminal multidimensional job insecurity scale developed by Ashford et al. (1989). The bare bones job insecurity measure contained 15 items spread out over three components that measured both the importance (JI Total Job Importance) and likelihood of losing one’s total job (JI Total Job Likelihood), as well as the powerlessness (JI Powerlessness) to counteract the loss (Appendix D). Due to the current study’s primary interested in examining total job loss, rather than specific features of a job, the Job Features subscale of the original job insecurity measure was not used in the current study. The reduction in scale length by Lee et al. (2008) from the original 57-item
scale to the bare bones version was intended to reduce the chance of participant attrition due to survey length and to prevent participant fatigue and had psychometric support.

The same six items were used in both the JI Total Job Importance subscale and the JI Total Job Likelihood subscale, but the instructions differed in how participants were instructed to respond to the items. Participants were first asked to respond to the Job Insecurity Total Job Importance subscale consisting of six items regarding the importance of losing elements of one’s job (e.g., “How important to you is the possibility that your future pay will be reduced?”). Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of the JI Total Job Importance subscale was .74. The response options ranged from 1 (very unimportant) to 5 (very important). Participants then responded to the same six items concerning the perceived likelihood of actually losing those elements of one’s job (e.g., “How likely is the possibility that your future pay will be reduced?”). Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of the JI Total Job Likelihood subscale was .64. The response scale ranged from 1 (very unlikely) to 5 (very likely).

The final three items (JI Powerlessness) of the bare bones job insecurity scale assessed the employee’s perceived control over negative outcomes at work (e.g., “In this organization, I can prevent negative things from affecting my work situation”, reverse-coded). Participants were instructed to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with the three JI Powerlessness subscale items as they related to their current job. The response scale ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) with a high score on the JI Powerlessness scale representing a higher level of job insecurity. In the current study, Cronbach’s $\alpha$ was .91 for the JI Powerlessness subscale. For the purposes of analyses, three types of job insecurity outcome measures were used and calculated according to the following formulas:

1. JI Global = mean of 4 JI Global items

2. JI Total Job = sum(JI Total Job Importance x JI Total Job Likelihood)
3. **JI Total Job*Powerlessness = (JI Total Job x JI Powerlessness)**

Lee et al. (2006) conducted a comparison of the various facets of the bare bones job insecurity measure and found that the partially composite measures (JI Total Job and JI Total Job*Powerlessness) were also good predictors and were composed of fewer items than the fully composite measure of 57 items. Powerlessness as a measure of its own has been shown to have strong predictive validity. Additionally, the partially composite JI Total Job*Powerlessness measure showed significant correlations with outcomes such as Intent to Stay, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, intent to stay, and trust in management (Lee et al., 2006). Similar to Lee et al. (2006), the current study examined how different measures of job insecurity relate to the moderators and outcomes in the current study by using the three measurements of job insecurity described above.

**Work Locus of Control (WLOC).** Spector’s (1988) 16-item Work Locus of Control Scale was used to measure locus of control as it related to the workplace. An internal work locus of control refers to the belief that outcomes at work are determined by one’s own effort, while an external work locus of control refers to more of a belief that outcomes at work are determined by circumstances outside one’s own control (e.g., fate, luck). Participants were instructed to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with the 16 WLOC items as they related to their current job. Responses to all WLOC items were measured on a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (disagree very much) to 6 (agree very much). The 6-point response scale was recommended in the original literature (Spector, 1988), and used recently by Oliver and Brough (2006). Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for the WLOC scale was .88.

Internal WLOC and external WLOC have historically been viewed as opposite ends of one spectrum of work locus of control; therefore, a high level of agreement with a particular item
in the WLOC scale in the current study represented more belief in control over one’s work environment (internal WLOC), while a strong disagreement with that same item represented a belief about lack of control over outcomes in one’s work environment (external WLOC). Eight items tapped into internal WLOC (e.g., “People who perform their jobs well generally get rewarded for it.”) and eight items tapped into external WLOC (e.g., “It takes a lot of luck to be an outstanding employee on most jobs.”). The WLOC score for each participant was represented by a composite variable calculated by averaging all 16 WLOC items together. In the current study, a high score on the WLOC scale meant that the participant possessed an internal WLOC, while a low WLOC score meant that the participant had an external WLOC. In the analysis, higher scores on the WLOC scale can be interpreted to mean that the participant had a higher internal WLOC and a belief in more control over his or her current job. Lower WLOC scores can be interpreted to indicate that the participant believed he or she had less control over the outcomes of his or her current job.

Control-oriented coping (COC). The concept of control-oriented coping in the current study followed Armstrong-Stassen’s (2006) approach to assessing control-oriented coping in which three main types of coping behaviors were assessed: Direct action, support seeking, and positive thinking. The ten items to represent these three coping dimension were taken from the Brief COPE inventory which represented a psychometrically reduced version of the original COPE inventory by Carver, Scheier, and Weintraub (1989; Carver, 1997; Appendix E). These ten items were chosen from the Brief COPE because they measured coping responses that were aimed at soliciting support or direct solutions for the problem at hand, rather than the range of avoidant or escape responses (e.g., self-distraction, blame, substance use) that participants could also choose to engage in when faced with the stressor of job insecurity (Carver, 1997). These
items were also selected due to their factor loadings in an analysis conducted on the Brief COPE items by Carver (1997). Rather than ask about coping behaviors that they use as a general response to stressors in the work environment, participants were instructed to indicate how much they had used direct action, support seeking, and positive thinking coping behaviors as a response to the thought of possibly losing their current jobs. Responses to all COC items were measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Sample items include: direct action coping, “I’ve been taking action to try to make the situation better”; support seeking, “I’ve been getting emotional support from others”; and positive thinking, “I’ve been trying to see it in a different light, to make it seem more positive.” COC was analyzed using composite variable of these ten items and had an overall Cronbach’s α of .90.

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCBs). Organizational citizenship behavior was measured with 13 items that assessed three dimensions of OCB: Helping, Civic Virtue, and Sportsmanship (Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie; 1997; Appendix F). The OCB items from Podsakoff et al. (1997) were based on the seminal work on OCBs by Organ (1988, 1990) and MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Fetter (1991, 1993), Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994), and Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990). In the Podsakoff et al. (1997) conceptualization of OCB, the Conscientiousness scale was removed and Altruism and Courtesy were combined with cheerleading to form a single helping dimension (Lievens & Anseel, 2004; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991, 1993; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). The 13 OCB items assessed helping behavior, civic virtue, and sportsmanship. In the current study, Cronbach’s α was .85 for the overall OCB scale.

The 13 OCB items were reworded so that they could be answered in self-report format (e.g., “I help coworkers out if someone falls behind in his/her work”), rather than the group-level
phrasing of the items from the Podsakoff et al. (1997) study (e.g., “Help each other out if someone falls behind in his/her work”). Participants were instructed to indicate how much they had performed the OCBs at their current jobs. Each of these items were measured using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The Helping subscale included seven items (e.g., “I willingly share my expertise with other members of my work group”), the Civic Virtue subscale included three items (e.g., “I attend and actively participate in team meetings”), and the Sportsmanship subscale included three items (e.g., “I consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters”; reverse-coded).

The current study used self-ratings of OCBs, as opposed to supervisor or peer ratings. While previous research (O’Brien & Allen, 2008; Organ & Ryan, 1995) has noted that self-ratings of OCBs generally lead to inflated ratings of OCB performance, the same general directional patterns of relationships appear to exist between OCBs and correlates no matter the source of the rater. Comparisons among self, supervisor, peer, and subordinate performance ratings show distinct differences in ratings by source (O’Brien & Allen, 2008). However, both self-reported and supervisor-reported OCBs have concerns and trade-offs. There is an argument against self-report OCBs because social desirability bias may lead to inflated OCB ratings. On the other hand, supervisors are not likely to observe many extra-role performance behaviors, such as OCBs, as they might be to observe in-role required performance. Supervisors may not be aware of behaviors such as voicing opinions during a team meeting without a supervisor present, keeping a positive attitude, touching base with coworkers, etc., which could lead to deflated or inaccurate ratings of OCBs from that supervisor. Finally, as Lee et al. (2006) discussed, the difficulty with asking participants to collect supervisor ratings of OCB performance is that this method may lead to a bias by encouraging only the better performers to participate in the study,
as the high performers might be more likely to ask for performance ratings from their supervisors. Due to the trade-offs of both sources, self-report OCBs was chosen for this study as it fit within the current study’s organizational sample method and was expected to encourage participation by reducing the amount of effort required to participate in the study (e.g., participants did not need to solicit supervisor OCB ratings).

**Job search activities.** Job search activities were assessed using a 12-item composite scale that will be referred to as the Job Search Intensity scale (Appendix G). Ten of the 12 items were taken from Blau’s (1994) behavioral scale of Job Search Intensity. Similar to van Hooft and Crossley (2008), the current study also left out one item from the original Blau (1994) scale due to its measurement of a highly uncommon activity in the U.S. (“Listed yourself as a job applicant in a newspaper”). One of the 12 items was slightly altered for clarity to read, “Used within-company sources”. Additionally, the Job Search Intensity scale included two items from van Hooft and Crossley (2008): “Visited job fairs” and “Looked for jobs on the internet”.

Participants were instructed to indicate how much time they had spent performing job search activities in the past six months. A sample item from the Job Search Intensity scale was, “Contacted employment agencies.” The response scale for the Job Search Intensity scale was 1 (no time at all), 2 (small amount of time), 3 (some time), 4 (much time), and 5 (very much time). The Cronbach’s α of the 12-item Job Search Intensity scale in the current study was .94.

In the same method as van Hooft and Crossley (2008), two additional job search items to confirm the validity of the 12-item Job Search Intensity measure were also included. These two items were general measures of Job Search Effort and Hours from Barber, Daly, Giannantonio, and Phillips (1994). The first item assessed the level of effort put toward searching for new jobs and had a response scale of 1 (one hour or less), 2 (one to five hours), 3 (five to ten hours), 4 (ten
to twenty hours), and 5 (more than twenty hours). The second item asked for an estimate of the actual hours spent per week on searching for jobs and had a response scale of 1 (very little effort), 2 (some effort), 3 (moderate amount of effort), 4 (much effort), and 5 (great deal of effort). Both items were highly correlated with the 12-item Job Search Intensity measure ($r = .85$, $p < .01$; $r = .80$, $p < .01$, respectively). On both items, participants were instructed to indicate how much time and effort they had spent looking for a new job in the past six months.
CHAPTER III: RESULTS

Data Analysis

All participant responses fell within the specific range for each item (e.g., between 1 and 5). See Table 2 for a breakdown of expected range and range observed on all study variables. Open-ended demographic responses were recoded by two raters (a researcher and an outside individual who was trained in the coding technique). All salary open-ended answers were converted to an annual salary. The Tenure variable was converted to number of weeks at current employer. Living Status responses of “Other” were read and coded into the four categories of living status. Uninterpretable responses were coded as user missing values. The Industry variable “Other” response options as well as multiple responses were recoded. All of the “Other” responses were reclassified by two raters into the most closely related 2012 North American Industry Classification System code (United States Census Bureau, 2012). Each rater independently coded all open-ended responses into the NAICS code with the nearest match. Consensus was reached for Living Status, Tenure, and Industry.

Before beginning data analysis, the dataset was checked to determine if the regression assumptions were met and particular statistical tests to be used in hypothesis testing were chosen based on the results of these checks (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). Study variables were examined for normality of the error distribution, linearity of relationships between independent and dependent variables, independence of errors (serial correlations), and homoscedasticity (versus time and versus other predictors). Additionally, the regression analysis indicated that the predictors in the study did not possess significant collinearity.

Outliers and normal distributions. In order to determine if parametric or non-parametric tests should be used or if transformations should be applied to any variables, all study
variable distributions were examined for normality through evaluation of skewness, kurtosis, probability-probability (P-P) plots, and quantile-quantile (Q-Q) plots. The Normal Q-Q plot was used to evaluate how well the distributions within each study variable approximated a Gaussian distribution. The majority of study variables appear to be normally distributed according to relatively linear P-P and Q-Q plots and few outliers or low distance outliers on the boxplots. See Table 2 for skewness statistics. Study variables were visually inspected for outliers using stem-and-leaf plots, histograms, and boxplots. Extreme cases were flagged on external WLOC, OCB, JI Total Job, and JI Total Job*Powerlessness. Following the Iglewicz and Hoaglin (1993) methodology for identifying outliers, normal probability plots were generated for the variables with extreme cases identified through visual inspection. Cases that with determined to be extreme (+/- three standard deviations) were excluded from the analyses.

**Linear relationships between independent and dependent variable.** Scatterplots versus predicted values were examined to determine if the relationships between independent and dependent variables violated the linear assumption. The study variables exhibited linear relationships based on scatterplot visual examination.

**Violations of independence (serial correlations).** Autocorrelations of the residual terms were analyzed to determine if errors were independent. The Durbin-Watson case-wise statistic indicated that there was not significant residual autocorrelation. The Durbin-Watson statistics for all regression equations were greater than 1.00 and below 2.00, which indicated that there did not appear to be major cases of serial correlation that would indicate a structural problem with the models (Cohen et al., 2003).

**Missing data.** Little’s Missing Completely at Random (MCAR) test was used to identify if data were missing at random (Little & Rubin, 2002; Rubin, 1987). The chi-square statistic was
calculated using all study variables (including age, and tenure) to test if values were MCAR. The
data did not appear to be missing completely at random ($\chi^2 = 3273.02$, $df = 2878$, $p < 0.01$). The
OCB and COC response scales contained a “Not Applicable” option, which seemed to be related
to the amount of missing data on these scales in particular, as a response of Not Applicable was
treated as missing. The Not Applicable response option was added to the OCB scale for those
participants who never interacted with coworkers at work and therefore would not have had the
opportunity to demonstrate particular behaviors on elements of the OCB scale. Similarly, the Not
Applicable response option on the COC scale was intended to allow respondents to continue with
the survey even if they had not engaged in any of the control-oriented coping behaviors within
the time frame of the survey.

Hawthorne and Elliott (2005) suggest that person mean (within-case) substitution is
superior to mean substitution (average scale score across all participants) when replacing missing
data in the case where more than half of the items on the scale are present. Person mean
substitution has been identified as an effective method of replacement, producing average errors
in the third decimal place for correlations (Downey & King, 1998; Switzer III & Roth, 2004;
Roth, Switzer, & Switzer, 1999). In the current study, missing data within homogeneous scales
(i.e., in which items have been shown in previous research to represent one construct) for the
independent and moderator variables (job insecurity, WLOC, COC) were replaced with the mean
of the participant’s observed scores on that scale. Due to no particular method of missing data
replacement appearing to be ultimately superior as a result of the sensitivity analysis, pairwise
deletion was used to address the missing data from non-homogeneous scales in order to prevent
the 23% reduction in sample size and loss of power that would have resulted from listwise
deletion (listwise $n = 238$; Allison, 2002; Switzer & Roth, 2004).
Correlations

Means, standard deviations, and Pearson’s $r$ bivariate correlation coefficients among all variables are presented in Table 3. Zero-order correlation analysis excluded missing data pairwise due to the number of variables involved in the correlation analysis causing a significant reduction in sample size. All correlations were examined with a two-tailed approach due to multiple inconsistent trends of direction of relationships in past studies of the relationship between job insecurity and its moderators and consequences.

Results of Hypothesis Testing

All hypotheses were tested using hierarchical regression analysis (Aiken & West, 1991).\textsuperscript{1} The Gauss-Markov assumptions of regression were supported by the data. Causation could not be inferred from the regression results due to the cross-sectional data collection technique. Following the recommended practices for calculating interaction terms, the independent variables and moderator variables were centered with the grand mean before creating interaction terms. The independent variables, moderators, and interaction terms were all entered into the regression equation in unstandardized, centered format to provide clearer interpretation of the slopes of the regression equations (Cohen et al., 2003, page 266). For all regression analyses, the study variables were entered into IBM SPSS Statistics (IBM SPSS, Inc., Armonk, NY) in the following order in their respective regression models: Step 1 (uncentered and unstandardized): age, tenure, education, living situation, and perceived employability; Step 2 (grand mean centered and unstandardized): job insecurity, WLOC, and COC; Step 3: interaction terms (unstandardized, grand mean centered, independent variables * moderator variables) between job insecurity, WLOC, and COC; Dependent variables (uncentered and unstandardized): OCBs, Job Search Intensity. The control variables were chosen because past research on the relationship
between job insecurity and performance and behavioral outcomes has found them to be related to
job insecurity in predicting performance and intentions to leave the organization (Cheng & Chan,
2008; De Cuyper & De Witte, 2006 Ito & Brotheridge, 2007; Kinnunen & Natti, 1994; Mauno &
Kinnunen, 2002; Näswall & De Witte, 2003).

Hypothesis 1 proposed that job insecurity and OCBs would be related. This hypothesis
was partially supported. As predicted, JI Global was significantly related to OCBs ($\beta = -.20, p =
.001$; see Table 4). Results showed a significant negative effect of JI Global on OCBs. The
prediction model indicated that JI Global accounted for an additional three percent of the
variance in OCBs beyond the control variables, $R^2 = .17, \Delta R^2 = .03, F(8, 262) = 6.55, p = .001,$
95% CI [-.21, -.05]. Job Insecurity Total Job, $R^2 = .14, \Delta R^2 = .01, F(8, 262) = 5.27, \beta = .08, p =
n.s., 95% CI [-.00, .01], and JI Total Job*Powerlessness were not significantly related to OCBs,
$R^2 = .14, \Delta R^2 = .00, F(8, 262) = 5.00, \beta = -.02, p = n.s., 95% CI [-.001, .001].$

Hypothesis 2 predicted that job insecurity and job search activities would be related. This
hypothesis was fully supported (see Table 5). The JI Global scale explained an additional 12% of
the variance in Job Search Intensity beyond the control variables and independent variables and
had a significant relationship with Job Search Intensity, $R^2 = .22, \Delta R^2 = .12, F(8, 263) = 9.20, \beta
= .39, p < .001, 95% CI [.24, .44].$ JI Total Job explained an additional five percent of the
variance in Job Search Intensity beyond the control and independent variables and also had a
significant relationship with Job Search Intensity, $R^2 = .14, \Delta R^2 = .05, F(8, 263) = 5.36, \beta = .22,$
p < .001, 95% CI [.00, .01]. Finally, JI Total Job*Powerlessness explained a significant seven
percent of variance and had a significant relationship with Job Search Intensity, $R^2 = .17, \Delta R^2 =
.07, F(8, 263) = 6.60, \beta = .28, p < .001, 95% CI [.002, .004].$ The regression analysis provided
full support for a positive relationship between all three job insecurity scales and Job Search Intensity.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that the relationship between job insecurity and OCBs would be moderated by WLOC and that the slope of the job insecurity—OCB relationship would be weaker for participants with an internal WLOC, so that internal WLOC would in effect buffer against the relationship between job insecurity and OCBs. Job Insecurity Global, $R^2 = .24$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $F(10, 260) = 8.26$, $\beta = -.06$, $p = n.s.$, 95% CI [-.14, .05], JI Total Job, $R^2 = .24$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $F(10, 260) = 8.18$, $\beta = -.07$, $p = n.s.$, 95% CI [-.007, .002], and JI Total Job*Powerlessness, $R^2 = .24$, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $F(10, 260) = 8.20$, $\beta = -.10$, $p = n.s.$, 95% CI [-.002, .000], did not significantly interact with WLOC in explaining variance in OCBs beyond the control and independent variables. Therefore, no support was found for the interaction predicted in Hypothesis 3 (see Tables 6-8).

Hypothesis 4 predicted that the relationship between job insecurity and job search activities would be moderated by WLOC. The slope of the relationship between job insecurity and Job Search Intensity was expected to be stronger in participants with a higher internal WLOC so that employees with higher internal WLOC would perform more job search behaviors relative to those lower on internal WLOC. The interactions between WLOC and JI Global, $R^2 = .24$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $F(10, 261) = 8.37$, $\beta = -.02$, $p = n.s.$, 95% CI [-.15, .10], JI Total Job, $R^2 = .21$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $F(10, 261) = 6.92$, $\beta = .04$, $p = n.s.$, 95% CI [-.004, .008], and JI Total Job*Powerlessness, $R^2 = .21$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $F(10, 261) = 7.01$, $\beta = .03$, $p = n.s.$, 95% CI [-.001, .002], were not significant in explaining Job Search Intensity. Hypothesis 4 was not supported for any of the job insecurity measures (see Tables 6-8).
Hypothesis 5 predicted that the relationship between job insecurity and OCBs would be moderated by control-oriented coping such that the job insecurity—OCB relationship would be weaker for employees who engaged in more COC. In effect, use of COC was expected to act as a buffer against the decline in OCBs that was predicted as a result of job insecurity. This hypothesis was partially supported (Tables 9-11). The JI Global x COC interaction significantly explained additional two percent of OCB variance, \( R^2 = .23, \Delta R^2 = .02, F(10, 227) = 6.92, \beta = .13, p = .03, 95\% CI [.01, .21] \). The form of the interaction between JI Global and COC was further analyzed according to procedures recommended by Cohen et al. (2003) and Jaccard and Turrisi (2003). See Figure 13 for a graph of the interaction effect between JI Global and COC in predicting OCBs. Figure 13 displays the interaction between JI Global and OCBs at two levels of COC: one standard deviation above and below the COC mean and one standard deviation above and below the JI Global mean. The simple slope of the relationship between JI Global and OCBs was smaller for employees one standard deviation above the COC mean (\( \beta = -.16, p < .01 \)) than for employees who were one standard deviation below the mean on COC behaviors (\( \beta = -.49, p < .01 \)).

Finally, the interactions between COC and JI Total Job, \( R^2 = .17, \Delta R^2 = .00, F(10, 227) = 4.70, \beta = -.02, p = \text{n.s.}, 95\% CI [-.005, .004] \), and JI Total Job*Powerlessness did not significantly explain additional variance in OCBs beyond that explained by the control and independent variables entered in Step 1 and 2, \( R^2 = .18, \Delta R^2 = .00, F(10, 227) = 4.80, \beta = .06, p = \text{n.s.}, 95\% CI [-.001, .002] \).

Hypothesis 6 predicted that the relationship between job insecurity and Job Search Intensity would be moderated by COC. The direction of the relationship was expected to be such that when job insecurity was high, employees who used more COC methods would report more Job Search Intensity than employees who used fewer COC methods. Hypothesis 6 was partially
supported. The interaction between JI Total Job and COC significantly explained an additional one percent of the variance in Job Search Intensity beyond the variables in Steps 1 and 2 (Tables 9-11), $R^2 = .26$, $\Delta R^2 = .01$, $F(10, 227) = 7.96$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.00, .01]. The standardized interaction coefficient between JI Total Job and COC was significant ($\beta = .12$, $p < .001$). See Figure 14 for a graph of the interaction effect between JI Total Job and COC in predicting Job Search Intensity. Figure 14 displays the simple slopes between JI Total Job and Job Search Intensity at two levels of the moderator: one standard deviation above and below the COC mean and one standard deviation above and below the JI Total Job mean. The slope of the relationship between JI Total Job and Job Search Intensity was stronger for employees who engaged in more COC ($\beta = .40$, $p < .01$) and the slope was weaker for employees who engaged in fewer COC behaviors ($\beta = .02$, $p = \text{n.s.}$). Lastly, the interactions between COC and JI Global, $R^2 = .30$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $F(10, 227) = 9.77$, $\beta = .03$, $p = \text{n.s.}$, 95% CI [-.09, .17], and JI Total Job*Powerlessness did not significantly explain additional variance in OCBs beyond that explained by the control and independent variables entered in Step 1 and 2, $R^2 = .28$, $\Delta R^2 = .00$, $F(10, 227) = 8.62$, $\beta = .07$, $p = \text{n.s.}$, 95% CI [-.001, .002].

Additional Results

While not part of the main hypotheses, the correlations among study variables are summarized below as they provide additional context toward understanding job insecurity. The correlations, also displayed in Table 3, are largely supportive of past research on job insecurity.

**Demographic and control variables.** As expected based on the job insecurity literature, Age was positively correlated with Tenure ($r = .59$, $p < .001$) and negatively correlated with Employability ($r = -.21$, $p < .001$). Interestingly, Age, Gender, and Tenure were not significantly correlated with the job insecurity scales and although non-significant, the correlations did seem
to suggest that there was a positive trend in the relationship between Age and the job insecurity scales \((r = .09\) to \(.11, p = \text{n.s.})\). Age was positively related to WLOC \((r = .14, p = .02)\), suggesting that older employees had a more internal WLOC, and was also negatively related to use of COC \((r = -.13, p = .05)\), suggesting that older employees use less COC in response to perceived job insecurity. Finally, Employability was negatively related to Gender \((r = -.13, p = .04)\), suggesting that male employees felt more employable than female employees.

**Main effects.** JI Global showed significant correlations with both moderators, a negative correlation with WLOC \((r = -.38, p < .001)\) and a positive correlation with COC \((r = .17, p = .009)\). JI Total Job and JI Total Job*Powerlessness showed a similar pattern of relationships, with a negative correlation with WLOC \((r = -.01, p = \text{n.s.; } r = -.26, p < .001)\) and a positive correlation with COC \((r = .15, p = .02; r = .09, p = \text{n.s.})\). The trend across different the job insecurity measures suggests that employees with an external WLOC experience higher job insecurity and also that employees experiencing more job insecurity are also engaging in more control-oriented coping.

The moderating variables WLOC and COC were not significantly related to each other \((r = -.09, p = \text{n.s.})\), but were correlated with both the predictor and outcome variables. Internal WLOC was related to lower job insecurity \((r = -.26\) to \-.38, \(p < .01)\), higher OCB performance \((r = .38, p < .001)\), and to lowered use of job search behaviors \((r = -.28, p < .001)\). Control-oriented coping showed a slightly different pattern of relationships with the predictors and outcomes as use of COC was related to increased job insecurity \((r = .15\) to \_.17, \(p < .05)\), higher OCB performance \((r = .19, p = .003)\), and to an increase in job search behaviors \((r = .40, p < .001)\).
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

This study set out to examine the relationship between job insecurity and two major outcomes—organizational citizenship behaviors and job search activities. Direct relationships between job insecurity and OCBs and job insecurity and job search activities were expected to confirm the relationships observed in past studies and support was found that confirmed past research suggesting a negative relationship between job insecurity and OCBs and a positive relationship between job insecurity and job search activities (Cheng & Chan, 2008; Lee et al., 2006).

Given the depressed nature of the job market and economy in recent years, this study intended to provide further insight into which personal characteristics and personal choices can help or hurt employees and important work outcomes when job insecurity is present. Therefore, a second goal of this study was to identify specific individual characteristics—work locus of control and control-oriented coping—that are involved in influencing how employees will react to job insecurity in the work environment. Support was found for control-oriented coping but not work locus of control as a moderator of the relationship between job insecurity and both OCBs and job search activities.

Finally, in their review, Sverke and Hellgren (2002) noted that few research studies have studied and utilized more than one measure of job insecurity, and it was recommended that more research be conducted on the relationships among different job insecurity measures and the effect they have on distinct work outcomes. An additional goal of the current study was to attempt to answer that call to compare different job insecurity measures by examining the effects of multiple measures of job insecurity on work outcomes. Although not given much focus in recent years, the current study suggests that the job insecurity literature would benefit from more
examination of the theoretical and predictive distinctness of the different measures of job insecurity in existence today. Additional discussion of the support found for each of these three major aims is provided below.

**Discussion of Main Effects**

Both Hypotheses 1 and 2 were partially supported by the results. The general findings confirm previous research on main effects between job insecurity, job search activities, and OCBs (Cheng & Chan, 2008). Consistent with many past findings, there was a significantly negative relationship between job insecurity (JI Global) and OCBs. The negative nature of the JI Global-OCB relationship suggests that when global job insecurity is experienced at higher levels, employees perform fewer OCBs at work. This finding suggests that the degree of overall uncertainty about losing one’s job is related to the degree to which an employee is willing to go out of his or her way to help other coworkers, risk disapproval to express beliefs for the good of the work group, and refrain from complaining about trivial matters at work. In the meta-analysis conducted by Sverke et al. (2002), they found that the relationship between job insecurity and its outcomes was unclear and that job insecurity was not significantly related to performance across studies. As Sverke et al. (2002) proposed, it is possible that the relationship between job insecurity and performance is enhanced in certain contexts, such as if performance is used as the criterion for layoff decisions, but not in others. Additionally, the job insecurity—performance relationship may be more complex due to the existence of moderating variables that may motivate different reactions in different employees. The significant support for hypothesis 1 contributes to the literature by suggesting a negative relationship between job insecurity and OCB performance, similar to the meta-analysis conducted by Cheng and Chan (2008) which identified a significant negative relationship between job insecurity and performance outcomes.
The negative relationship seems to support the two-dimensional challenge-hindrance approach of Staufenbiel and König (2010), which suggests that job insecurity simultaneously leads to reduced work output and increased effort spent looking for other jobs. The nature of this relationship can potentially be explained by social exchange theory in which employees feel that their security at the organization has been violated and therefore withdraw their extra-role resources, while at the same time increasing energy spent looking for new jobs. This fact may be particularly concerning to organizations as past research on voluntary turnover has found that the highest performing employees tend to leave the organization first (Kozlowski, Chao, Smith, & Hedlund, 1993; Sverke et al. 2002).

Also consistent with past research, there was support for a positive relationship between job search activities and the three job insecurity measures (JI Global, JI Total Job, JI Total Job*Powerlessness). A higher level of job insecurity about losing one’s job was related to higher amounts of job search activities conducted (e.g., preparing resume, looking for jobs on the internet), effort spent on job searching, and hours spent per week on job searching.

The fact that job insecurity significantly predicted both OCBs (negative slope) and job search activities (positive slope) in opposite directions may provide support for the dual work stress framework discussed in a meta-analysis by Podsakoff et al. (2007). The work stress framework describes how job insecurity acts as both a challenge and a hindrance stressor, showing a negative relationship with OCBs and a positive relationship with job search activities. The negative job insecurity—OCB and positive job insecurity—job search activities relationships are also supported theoretically by the transactional model of stress introduced by Lazarus and Folkman (1984). Cognitive appraisals of the stressor, in this case job insecurity,
predicted the “strain reaction”. In other words, heightened perceptions of job insecurity were related to a decreased level of OCB performance.

Applying the transactional model of stress to the current study’s models could explain that the outcomes caused by job insecurity, or in the case of the current study reduced OCB performance, should be predicted by an interaction between an assessment to the degree of threat posed by job insecurity and beliefs about likelihood of being able to counteract the job insecurity. Employees may believe that their jobs are in jeopardy and that they are unable to effectively counteract the threat of job loss, so they respond by reducing level of effort put forth into extra-role performance. Wong et al. (2005) application of social exchange theory to the job insecurity—OCB relationship may also provide a framework for explaining this finding. Social exchange theory dictates that employees expect to be rewarded for continued employment and commitment exhibited by performing both in-role and extra-role performance (Blau, 1994). If employees feel that their job security is threatened, this could represent a perceived violation of the implicit or explicit social exchange agreement with the organization that the organization will provide the employee with a stable financial return and rewards for being a good performer and staying with the organization. As a result, employees would be expected to be less likely to meet their end of the bargain, which in the case of the current study would mean reducing their OCB performance.

Additionally, according to Hulin’s (1991) theory of job adaptation, theoretically employees should attempt to respond to a stressor by taking some sort of action. In this case, the action taken in response to the stressor of job insecurity appears to be an employee’s withdrawal from the stressor of job insecurity by choosing to reduce the amount of effort (OCBs) put forth toward the organization and increasing the amount of effort put toward searching for a new job
Although the current study does not infer causation from the negative JI Global-OCB relationship due to the cross-sectional research design, the direction of the causal relationship between job insecurity and performance has been evidenced in past research, such as the longitudinal diary study finding that weekly changes in job insecurity predicted weekly job performance outcomes (see Schreurs, van Emmerik, Gunter, & Germeys, 2012).

**Work Locus of Control as a Moderator**

Contrary to expectations, no support was found for work locus of control as a moderator of the job insecurity—OCB relationship. Although a significant negative relationship between job insecurity and OCBs was supported in Hypothesis 1, there was no support found for a moderating effect of WLOC on the job insecurity—OCB relationship. However, given that the direct relationship in hypothesis 1 between job insecurity and OCBs depended on the particular measurement scale, there may be a more complicated relationship in play that may begin to explain the lack of significance in Hypothesis 3. Hypothesis 1 suggested that different measures of job insecurity are associated with different outcomes, such as varying types of OCB performance. Schreurs et al. (2012) found no significant relationship between job insecurity and extra-role performance using a General Extra-Role Performance (Goodman & Svyantek, 1999). Their lack of significance was similar to the findings of this current study, which suggest that there may be a more complicated relationship among particular facets of job insecurity and OCB; therefore, the choice of job insecurity and OCB scales may matter in these relationships as they assess different aspects of job insecurity.

Another potential explanation for the lack of support found for Hypotheses 3 could be due to a lack of confidence or perception by employees that performing OCBs will in turn reduce their job insecurity. That employees, whether higher in internal or external locus of control,
simply may not believe that the performance of OCBs could prove any potential value to an employer within the context of a situation invoking high perceived job insecurity, and therefore their level of WLOC does not dictate the extent to which they increase their OCB performance in an effort to keep their jobs or prove additional value to an employer in anticipation of additional layoffs.

Similarly, no support was found for WLOC moderating the job insecurity—job search activities relationship in Hypothesis 4. Employees with internal WLOC did not appear to spend more time searching for jobs than did employees with an external WLOC. It was expected that employees with internal LOC may have more motivation to alter their work environment enough to where they may be able to avoid potential layoffs by engaging in particular behaviors at work that may be preventative. According to the transactional model of stress, cognition and affective experiences due to the stressor (job insecurity) lead to behavior. The cognitive job insecurity experience, which is the type of experience typically currently measured in job insecurity research today (Huang et al., 2012), may not lead to changes in OCBs the way that affective experiences to job insecurity would.

It may be useful to extend the predictions in Hypothesis 3 and 4 to examine the interaction between job insecurity and WLOC to include both cognitive and affective measures of job insecurity. Recent research by Huang et al. (2012) suggests that cognitive job insecurity influences affective job insecurity and also has direct and indirect relationships with individual outcomes such as employee well-being (Klehe, van Vianen, & Zikic, 2012). It is possible that in the current study, employees did not experience enough affective job insecurity, which might be requisite for an interaction effect to be significant. Their research also found a direct effect of cognitive job insecurity on well-being, but not on the performance criterion, which could begin
to explanation why the interaction between job insecurity and WLOC in Hypothesis 3 did not significantly predict OCBs. Future research may want to examine the relationship between affective job insecurity and performance more closely. Using social exchange theory, one might surmise that employees may increase their level of OCB performance in an effort to then reap rewards (i.e., increased job security) from the employer; however, if employees don’t trust that their efforts will be rewarded through increased performance, they might be more likely to withdraw from the organization according to the theory of job adaptation (Hulin, 1991).

Finally, the lack of significance of WLOC as a moderator of job insecurity on performance and job search outcomes could be explained by a recent body of research suggesting that some of the undesirable individual and organizational outcomes of job insecurity could be explained by factors other than individual reactions to the uncertainty about losing one’s job. Employees who have been notified that they will be laid off have experienced fewer negative outcomes than employees who survived layoffs and kept their jobs post downsizing (De Cuyper et al., 2010). Employees who survived layoffs experienced more risk of health problems and higher strain than did the employees who were informed that they had survived the layoff process (Dekker & Schaufeli, 1995; Kivimäki, Vahtera, Elovaino, Pentti, & Virtanen, 1998). This line of research may be important in understanding how and why particular personality and behavioral coping choices may or may not assist an employee in coping with job insecurity. It appears that an underlying mechanism mediator of job insecurity on strain may be the notification of objective job security received from management. In situations of uncertain job insecurity employees react more poorly, while in situations when the employee is aware of his objective job security employees experience fewer negative outcomes. It may be the case in the
current study that WLOC does not aid employees as much as knowledge about the layoff process or knowledge of the employee’s own objective job insecurity.

**Control-Oriented Coping as a Moderator**

Hypotheses 5 and 6 were supported by the results of the current study, suggesting that COC is a moderator of both the job insecurity—OCB relationship and the job insecurity—job search activities relationship. Only the JI Global measure interacted with COC to predict OCBs. This suggests that the global estimate of uncertainty about future stability of one’s job (JI Global) interacted with the use of control-oriented coping to explain the degree of helpfulness and participation that one will engage in at work (OCBs). Employees who engaged in more COC behaviors in response to job insecurity were more likely to suffer less of a decline in OCBs when feeling job insecurity. This finding signifies that COC skills may act as a buffer against job insecurity in preventing the loss in OCBs that occur as a result of job insecurity, as confirmed in Hypothesis 1. The slope of the interaction was as predicted, with COC acting as a buffer.

Employees who used more COC were also more likely to engage in more OCBs in the face of higher JI Global.

As predicted, there was a significant interaction between JI Total Job and COC in explaining job search activities in Hypothesis 6. Employees who used more COC tended to also use more job search activities when job insecurity was at its highest than the employees who used less COC. Similar to Hypothesis 5, COC was a moderator in explaining the degree of job search activities that employees engaged in. When faced with job insecurity, Hypothesis 2 indicated that job insecurity was related to employees engaging in more intense job searching, while Hypothesis 6 concluded that the positive slope of this relationship is strengthened in employees who used control-oriented coping techniques.
Control-oriented coping techniques have long been thought to be healthy approaches to dealing with work stressors (Wanberg, 1997), as confirmed by the current study. In addition to protecting employee well-being and other important individual health outcomes, it appears that control-oriented coping also increases the degree to which employees will engage in job search behaviors, which may be in effect in turn lead to greater turnover of those employees with more successful control-oriented coping skills. There is some hope for organizations on this point in the way of stemming the turnover or potentially reengaging the organizational commitment of those employees who engage in COC. Huang et al. (2012) conducted a longitudinal study investigating the difference between cognitive job insecurity and affective job insecurity. Their findings suggest that organizations may have success in helping employees perceive more control over their jobs by involving them in decisions and giving them more power at work (Klehe et al., 2012). Armstrong-Stassen (2006) also recommended that from a stress management perspective, organizations may be able to provide employees with a greater sense of control by allowing for greater autonomy and participation in decision making. Their findings may benefit future research on organizational interventions. It may be useful to extend their research by conducting an intervention aimed at increasing actual employee control over work and examining if the increase in control over work demands might be able to reduce the amount of time spent on other activities related to control, such as the increase in job search activities identified in Hypothesis 6 of the current study.

**Comparisons Among Measures of Job Insecurity**

The current study can contribute to the job insecurity literature in a few ways. First, the current study confirmed past research findings as discussed above. Additionally, the study may contribute to the advancement in the literature suggests that not all measures of job insecurity
measures have equivalent predictive capability for all individual or organizational outcomes of interest. As Sverke and Hellgren (2002) have also noted, the broad body of job insecurity literature has existed only since the mid-1980s, beginning primarily with the pioneering work of Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984). The measurement of job insecurity has not always been measured unidimensionally and often the psychometric properties of the job insecurity scales have not been well documented and confirmed. The current study may provide some direction as far as which job insecurity measures might have different predictive capability in organizational research scenarios.

The two job insecurity measures in this study, JI Global and the multidimensional JI measure, had a different pattern of relationships when predicting particular work outcomes. This suggests that the particular job insecurity construct of interest, whether it is global insecurity or more cognitively-related predictions of likelihood of losing one’s job, need to be carefully considered when conducting research or applying results of job insecurity research to applied work environments. Confirming the conclusions by Sverke et al. (2002), which posited that the multiple aspects of job insecurity have divergent consequences on different outcomes, the current study also found that the job insecurity measure should be chosen carefully to specifically be congruent with the work outcome of interest and that past research that has only used one job insecurity measure has potentially been not capturing relationships that exist between job insecurity and outcomes due to use of one measure over another.

As far as which job insecurity scale may be the most effective and shortest predictor of important work outcomes, JI Global, a short 4-item scale, was a significant predictor of both OCBs and job search activities and significantly interacted with COC in predicting OCBs. Due to the results of the current study and as in a continued effort to reduce test-taker fatigue and
limit survey length, it may be worth considering the use of the JI Global scale if a scale of shorter length is necessary. However, as evidenced in past research as well as the current study, there appears to be strong theoretical support and evidence of construct validity that supports the continued use of the multidimensional scale, despite its length (Lee et al., 2006). The multidimensional JI scale, measured by JI Total Job and JI Total Job*Powerlessness in the current study, was only a direct predictor of job search activities, not OCBs, and interacted with COC in predicting job search activities. From a theoretical perspective, these distinctions in significance suggest that the global fear of losing one’s job (JI Global) may be related more to both performance- and turnover-related outcomes, while the multidimensional measure may be more conceptually related to job search behavior. The multidimensional JI scale captures various components of the job insecurity experience including perceived threat, important of threat, and powerlessness to counteract the threat. These dimensions and critical to understanding more about the mechanisms behind why employees may respond to job insecurity in different ways. The findings of the current study suggest that the dimensions of importance and likelihood of perceived loss of one’s job are important to the predicting the prevalence of job search activities, while perhaps not so important in predicting OCBs. This finding could be explained by the primary and secondary appraisal processes of the transactional model of stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The multidimensional JI measure assesses importance and likelihood of job loss, and these perceived ratings of importance and likelihood of threat of job loss may encourage employees to engage in particular outcomes that are more able to be changed by the employee. Thus, when the primary appraisal of job insecurity means a high perceived threat of harm, employees may use more COC during the coping process but only in situations that seem more likely to be affected by their behavior. It may be possible that when employees perceive
threat of job loss to be important to them and likely to occur, they engage in COC behaviors in
terms of searching for a new job, but do not see the potential payoff for increasing OCBs. OCBs
may be more difficult to increase quickly and easily, whereas job search activities are relatively
easier to engage in quickly in response to a high perceived stressor, which could be a factor in
explaining why the multidimensional model of JI interacted with COC to explain job search
behaviors but not OCBs. The findings of the current study suggest that further research may be
warranted in examining the mechanisms that may provide evidence behind the distinction
between JI Global and the multidimensional JI measure of Ashford et al. (1989).

Additionally, some researchers have argued against including JI Powerlessness, a
subscale of the multidimensional JI measure, when measuring job insecurity because the
concepts assessed by the scale are already captured by other multidimensional JI items
(specifically, JI Total Job Likelihood), or that JI Powerlessness is a reflection of control rather
than job insecurity (Jacobson, 1991a; Lee et al., 2006; Mauno, Leskinen, & Kinnunen, 2001). In
their study comparing various measures of job insecurity, Lee et al. (2006) found support
keeping the JI Powerlessness dimension in, as it added to the predictive validity of the job
insecurity measure. Similarly, the current study suggests that the subscale of JI Powerlessness is
a strong predictor of job search outcomes in Hypotheses 1 and 6, but may not be as strongly
related to OCBs as the JI Total Job and JI Total Job*Powerlessness scales which contained the
powerlessness items did not predict OCBs in any of the hypotheses. The results of the current
study provide support for the continued use of the subscale of JI Powerlessness that is part of the
original 57-item job insecurity questionnaire developed by Ashford et al. (1989). In the current
study, JI Powerlessness was a subscale that was used to calculate the composite variable of JI
Total Job*Powerlessness. The literature is currently unclear as to whether the subscale of JI
Powerlessness should be included as part of the job insecurity measure, but there was at least partial support from the current study for continuing to use the measure to predict work outcomes.

**Strengths and Limitations**

As seen in Table 1, the current study was representative of a wide variety of industries. The demographic representation was also representative across gender, tenure, education, age, and living status (e.g., married and cohabitating). The variety of industry and job types likely served to elicit a range of scores on the job insecurity measures, as participants came from a variety of organizations and experiences. It is hoped that the wide representation of the study’s sample contributed toward answering Lee et al.’s (2006) call for research on a wider variety of job types and employee demographics, as the nature of the construct of job insecurity likely differs among job types. Much previous research has obtained samples within single organizations, which may serve to reduce the variance of scores on job insecurity, depending on the nature of job insecurity within that particular organization (Ashford et al., 1989).

Also, a benefit to sampling employees outside of their organizational structure, as opposed to working a survey primarily through management of an organization, could be that the participants in the current study felt reduced pressure to participate in the study and/or produce socially desirable responses due to fear of one’s manager reading one’s responses. Finally, an additional benefit of the study is that it was conducted in an organizational setting within the U.S., which has been subject to a turbulent economic period for multiple years.

Common method bias could be considered one limitation of this study, due to the possibility that participants rate both the predictors and criterion variables. Participants may have had a desire to maintain consistency in how they answered questions or personal assumptions
about expected relationships between items on the study, which could have altered the observed relationships in the current study (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). However, some steps were taken to counteract the common method bias in the current study. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two survey layouts that counterbalanced the order of measurement of the predictor and criterion variables in an attempt to minimize fatigue or potential guessing of study hypotheses by participants. Additionally, participants were continually reassured of the confidentiality and anonymity of the study; if participants chose not to report their e-mail for the raffle drawing, their participation in the study was truly anonymous. The intent of these measures was to counteract some of the concerns of common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Finally, common method bias may be less likely to be of concern in this study because interaction effects were observed. As noted in previous research, common method bias is a greater concern when interaction effects are not present (Evans, 1985; Schreurs et al., 2012). Future research should solicit external measures of criteria such as OCBs or in-role performance ratings, perhaps in combination with self-ratings of these criteria to compare differences in OCB ratings in the context of job insecurity, in order to reduce the possibility of the results being affected by common method variance.

The snowball data collection method could be viewed as a limitation of this study due to the lack of control the researcher has over the group of participants’ employment experiences, as participants represented a wide-cross section of organizations and job types. The argument could be made that job insecurity is dependent on the particular economic standing of an organization and therefore it is important to sample from within one organization in order to maintain a constant level of the independent variable (job insecurity) within the sample. While it is possible that the level of objective job security may not be stable across employees in the sample as they
come from different organizations, there are other benefits to the snowball method that may balance out the limitations of the snowball method. Job insecurity is not constant across organizations, but differs by job type, status, etc., in addition to being an individual-level variable. In other words, not all sales managers would feel job insecurity equally within the same organization, even given the same true level of job security of their positions, and perceived job insecurity is likely to differ based on the type of job within an organization. Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) note the importance of individual demographic variables such as financial need or perceived employability, that are critical to determining level of job insecurity, which suggests that demographic and personal status variables are critical to influencing perceived job insecurity. The strong influence of antecedents of job insecurity that are related to individual characteristics, such as employability or personal financial need, may be just as likely to influence perceived job insecurity as an organization’s particular characteristics. Certain types of jobs within an organization are more likely to experience job insecurity than others, even within the same organization. This suggests that job insecurity is likely to be present across all types of organizations and jobs and is not limited to particular types of organizations or occupation types. Therefore, the snowball method does not appear to have any particular significant disadvantage to sampling from within one organization because there is no guarantee that employees within an organization would possess similar levels of perceived job insecurity, due to the subjective nature of the variable.

Considering the difficulty of accessing a wide variety of employees who met the criteria for participation in the study (e.g., no union members, only permanent employees), the snowball method was the method used to access this hard-to-reach organizational population. Although the sample was not chosen using a probabilistic sampling frame, the sample did achieve more
representativeness than many job insecurity studies that have been confined to a particular type of organization. The sample characteristics listed in Tables 1 and 2 show that although the sample was not stratified, the chain-referral method reached a wide variety of industries, age, tenure, education levels, and an approximately equal representation of male and female participants. As with many applied studies, this study was more heavily representative of certain subgroups than others. Based on the industry representation and job types of the current study’s participants, the sample tended to be made up of more white collar and highly educated positions than blue collar positions, so might not be possible to extend the conclusions in the study to blue collar employees or less educated employees. Also, because union members and temporary employees were excluded from the survey, the survey does not extend to conclusions about union members’ or temporary employee experiences with job insecurity.

Additionally, the nonprobability sampling inherent in the chain-referral snowball method could be considered a potential limitation of the current study. In recent years, studies have shown support for chain-referral methods being different from simple convenience samples. Heckathorn (2007) used a Markov model of peer recruitment into a study to show that contrary to conventional wisdom, it is possible for snowball samples to become unbiased if they are large enough and the number of snowball waves is sufficiently large. As described by Heckathorn (2011), there is evidence that more waves of recruitment throughout a chain-referral type of study can potentially lead to reduced bias as the sample expands progressively wave by wave and reaches a wider network. Due to concerns about protecting confidentiality, the specific wave of recruitment was not tracked for each participant. However, participants were asked to indicate if they received the survey directly from the researcher or from another person, which allowed insight into how many participants were recruited through the initial wave of recruitment and
how many were recruited by other participants. The number of participants recruited by the researcher for the first wave of the snowball study represented 44% \((n = 135)\) of the sample. In turn, those participants recruited the remaining 47% \((n = 146)\) of participants in wave two or higher of the snowball sample. Although the current study does not meet all the assumptions of respondent-driven sampling, such as that each participant may only recruit one individual into the study in order to maintain uniformity across participant recruitments and reduce bias, the current study was comprised of participants recruited through multiple waves of the snowball sample, which suggests that the sample may approximate a less biased sample than a typical convenience sample.

**Practical Implications**

Keeping in line with previous research on job insecurity, the current study provides evidence that employees who are experiencing feelings of job insecurity may spend more time searching for other jobs. Job searching behavior could be a preparatory mechanism to prepare them to find a new job in case they do receive a layoff notice or lose critical job features such as salary. One takeaway from the current study is that job insecurity may be related to employees engaging in more job search behavior. Job search activities have been identified with an increased intention to leave the organization, so the finding that job insecurity may lead to more job search activities could be concerning for organizations. Cornelißen (2009) found that job search behaviors were related to actual change in jobs, so it is important for organizations to identify potential reasons that their employees may begin to search for a different job. Job insecurity is a perceived threat of losing one’s job meaning that potentially all employees could be susceptible to perceived job insecurity. Job insecurity could continue to be a constant threat to organizations regardless of true job security due to future layoffs or restructuring. Managers and
employers should be aware of this trend in order to take preventative action. Organizations could launch a communications or employee relations effort to attempt to reengage employees who may be starting to search for jobs elsewhere.

Similarly, the current study found evidence that employees who feel job insecurity tend to report performing fewer OCBs. Another takeaway for organizations could be that if job insecurity is a concern within the organization due to previous or upcoming layoffs or personnel reductions, it may be useful to examine the utility of developing employees’ control-oriented coping skills. Interventions in the organization could be aimed at increasing the use of control-oriented coping techniques in order to buffer against the negative impact of job insecurity on OCB performance. The employees who used more COC in the face of job insecurity may have been top performers, which would make the need even more critical for management to institute efforts aimed at reducing job insecurity. A direct organizational intervention by management may be able to focus on reducing job insecurity in order to both prevent employees from searching for new jobs, and to increase the amount of OCBs that have declined as a result of job insecurity. On the other hand, it would be critical to examine recent literature (Huang et al., 2012) to see if increasing control over work demands may help reduce the degree to which employees high in COC engage in job search behaviors.

Suggestions for Future Research

Future research could consider the time-series effects of how job insecurity leads to a decrease in OCBs or if employees who do not perform OCBs by nature of their individual tendencies end up feeling more job insecurity when asked to reflect on how often they perform OCBs. In other words, do some employees perform fewer OCBs as a result of individual differences and personality and does their low level of OCBs lead them to experience more
insecurity because they feel that management may not see them as being as highly valued as other employees who do perform more OCBs?

It would be useful to recruit participants from organizations that have recently experienced layoffs. The current study initially attempted to recruit three medium-sized organizations that had experienced layoff activity in the previous years. However, due to recruitment difficulties, it was not feasible to obtain data from those organizations. If possible, it would be beneficial to conduct a longitudinal sample before and after layoff activity to examine increase in perceived job insecurity pre- and post-layoffs and net change in job search activities as well.

Based on recent studies such as Schreurs et al., (2012) findings that job insecurity may fluctuate at shorter time periods than past research has often measured, it would be important to examine job insecurity and its outcomes at the weekly level. Support has been found for job insecurity having a weekly fluctuation, along with many commonly studied outcomes such as in-role performance and OCBs; therefore, it may be valuable to enact a repeated measures design to capture the shorter fluctuations of job insecurity (Schreurs et al., 2012). A diary study or a shorter time frame may benefit the study of job insecurity research. This would likely require both a change in survey instructions in order to give participants the appropriate time frame of a week by which to frame their answers, or would require a multi-week questionnaire to examine differences within participants across weeks. This study would likely need strong support from an internal consultant who may have the ability to influence organizational leadership to participate in the study, as it has been noted in past research, as well as this study, that is often difficult to gain organizational approval to allow an external research survey inside the organization, let alone on a topic so sensitive in the current economy as job insecurity. Many
practical implications could be identified through additional research on the short-term fluctuations in job insecurity could go hand-in-hand with organizational interventions geared at attempting to reduce concerns of job insecurity in employees. If job insecurity proves to be a construct that can fluctuate at a weekly level, perhaps organizational preventative interventions could be conveyed on a more frequent or continual basis such as weekly communication memos to employees regarding layoff status.

Furthermore, recent longitudinal research suggests that “resource spirals” may be at play and could possibly be explained by Hobfoll’s conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989; Klehe et al., 2012). Job insecurity has been shown to lead to decreased well-being over time, with the decreased well-being leading to reduced resources with which to deal with the job insecurity, which leads to a taxed or exhausted employee perceiving more job insecurity due to the inability to appropriate react to the job insecurity with reduced resources. This could in effect apply to performance (e.g., OCBs) as an outcome as well, and lead to a spiral back into decreased performance (Huang et al., 2012). It would also be interesting to extend this model of a downward spiral of resources to examine the job insecurity—performance relationship longitudinally. Future research may gain much attention from organizations if the downward spiral of job insecurity leads to decreased performance which then leads to further increased job insecurity and so on. The ramifications of this to all organizations’ financial performance and growth would be high if job insecurity has both a downward spiral effect on employee well-being and job performance that may be able to be contained through tangible steps by the organization at any stage of spiral.

A final recommendation given the lessons learned by conducting the current study would be to further examine the effects of job insecurity on government employees. Governmental
employees are represented by employee unions (35.90%) far more than private sector workers (6.60%; BLS, 2013). Unions have been shown in past research to be unexpectedly related to higher perceived job insecurity and possibly true levels of job security due to the nature of the organizations and governmental funding; therefore, the current study excluded governmental employees due to the role of labor unions typically representing many jobs within the U.S. and also due to historically more stability within governmental agencies (BLS, 2013). However, in recent years approximately 11% of the working U.S. population was a member of a union (BLS, 2013). If researchers and practitioners are able to make conclusions and effect change in governmental and the more unionized organizations, it is recommended that further job insecurity research be conducted on the samples from these populations. Finally, with the changes that have occurred to the workforce during the recession of 2007-2009, even federal, state, and other governmental agencies have seen large cuts, salary reductions, and hiring freezes that likely have influenced the perceived job insecurity of those employees in the public sector in recent years. The changing nature of work could means that the levels of perceived job insecurity in governmental workers may be higher than it once was.
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FOOTNOTES

1 Employees from the NW manufacturing and distributing organization made up nine percent (n = 27) of the sample. In order to determine if this subsample was roughly equivalent to participants recruited through the snowball sample, descriptive statistics and analysis of variance were performed to compare demographics between the two subsamples. Analysis of variance did not reveal significant differences among the samples of participants on Age, Industry, or Tenure (p = n.s.). The NW manufacturing organization had a significantly lower salary (M = 49,911, SD = 26,422) than the snowball sample participants (M = 87,583, SD = 61,639), t(228) = 8.39, p = .004. The NW manufacturing organization also had a significantly lower education level with only 4.70% (n = 13) having a Bachelor’s Degree or higher, while 83.30% (n = 233) of the participants in the snowball sample had a Bachelor’s Degree or higher degree, t(279) = 41.58, p < .001. For the most part, participants from both the NW manufacturing and distributing organization and the snowball sample had roughly similar demographics and employment characteristics. To compare the results of hypothesis analysis with and without the subsample of NW manufacturing and distributing organizations, the analyses for Hypothesis 1 through Hypothesis 6 were performed with and without the NW manufacturing and distributing participants. The significance tests for Hypotheses 1-6 were the same with and without this subsample included in the analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
<td>8.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>4.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>10.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>17.30%</td>
<td>5.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>28.10%</td>
<td>12.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>12.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>9.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services (except Public Administration)</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>16.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics (January 2012).*
Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Study Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Possible Range of Scores</th>
<th>Observed Range of Scores</th>
<th>Skewness (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>40.65</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>&gt; 18</td>
<td>21 - 69</td>
<td>0.38 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>-0.09 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tenure (weeks)</td>
<td>332.98</td>
<td>384.52</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>&gt; 1 week</td>
<td>8.66 - 1707.3</td>
<td>1.80 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Education</td>
<td>6.00 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1 - 9</td>
<td>3 - 9</td>
<td>-0.49 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Living Status Single</td>
<td>0.00 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>0.93 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Living Status Married Apart</td>
<td>0.00 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>11.68 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Living Status Others</td>
<td>0.00 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>3.43 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employability</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>1.33 - 5</td>
<td>-0.21 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Work Locus of Control (high score = internal)</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>2.38 - 6.00</td>
<td>-0.43 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Control-Oriented Coping</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>-0.58 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>2.38 - 7</td>
<td>-1.28 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Job Search Intensity</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>1.41 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Job Insecurity Global</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>0.63 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Job Insecurity Total Job</td>
<td>52.57</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>12 - 300</td>
<td>3 - 150 2</td>
<td>0.97 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Job Insecurity Total Job*Power</td>
<td>143.50</td>
<td>81.54</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>12 - 1500</td>
<td>7 - 650</td>
<td>1.58 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1 mode. 2 Lowest value of range is lower than possible range due to missing data on the scale that was used to calculate this composite variable.
Table 3

Zero-Order Bivariate Correlation Coefficients (Pearson's r) Among Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Gender</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Tenure (weeks)</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Education</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Living Status Single</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Living Status Married Apart</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Living Status Others</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Employability</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Work Locus of Control</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Control-Oriented Coping</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Job Search Intensity</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Job Insecurity Global</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Job Insecurity Total Job</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Job Insecurity Total Job*Powerlessness</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( n = 241-293 \). Missing data were deleted pairwise. \(* p < .05, \) two-tailed. \( ** p < .01, \) two-tailed.

(Table 3 continues)
Zero-Order Bivariate Correlation Coefficients (Pearson's r) Among Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Tenure (weeks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Living Status Single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Living Status Married Apart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Living Status Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Employability</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Work Locus of Control</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Control-Oriented Coping</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Job Search Intensity</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Job Insecurity Global</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Job Insecurity Total Job</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Job Insecurity Total Job*Powerlessness</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 241-293. Missing data were deleted pairwise. *p < .05, two-tailed. **p < .01, two-tailed.*
Table 4

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behaviors From Job Insecurity Measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Insecurity Global</th>
<th>Job Insecurity Total Job</th>
<th>Job Insecurity Total Job*Powerlessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Single</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Married Apart</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Others</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.03**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 271. *p < .05, **p < .01.*
Table 5

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Job Search Intensity From Job Insecurity Measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Insecurity Global</th>
<th>Job Insecurity Total Job</th>
<th>Job Insecurity Total Job*Powerlessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Single</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Married Apart</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Others</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 272. *p < .05, **p < .01.*
Table 6

Hierarchical Regression Analysis of the Interaction Between Job Insecurity Global and Work Locus of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</th>
<th>Job Search Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Single</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Married Apart</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Others</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Locus of Control</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI Global</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Locus of Control * JI Global</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 271 for Organizational Citizenship Behaviors columns. n = 272 for Job Search Intensity columns. *p < .05, **p < .01. The variables in Steps 2 and 3 were centered at the mean to reduce concerns of multicollinearity.
Table 7

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis of the Interaction Between Job Insecurity Total Job and Work Locus of Control*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</th>
<th>Job Search Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Single</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Married Apart</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Others</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Locus of Control</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI Total Job</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Locus of Control * JI Total Job</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted ( R^2 )</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta R^2 )</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \( n = 271 \) for Organizational Citizenship Behaviors columns. \( n = 272 \) for Job Search Intensity columns. \(*p < .05, **p < .01. The variables in Steps 2 and 3 were centered at the mean to reduce concerns of multicollinearity.*
Table 8

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis of the Interaction Between Job Insecurity Total Job*Powerlessness and Work Locus of Control*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</th>
<th>Job Search Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Single</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Married Apart</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Others</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Locus of Control</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI Total Job*Powerlessness</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Locus of Control * JI Total Job*Powerlessness</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $n = 271$ for Organizational Citizenship Behaviors columns. $n = 272$ for Job Search Intensity columns. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$. The variables in Steps 2 and 3 were centered at the mean to reduce concerns of multicollinearity.*
Table 9

Hierarchical Regression Analysis of the Interaction Between Job Insecurity Global and Control-Oriented Coping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</th>
<th>Job Search Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Single</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Married Apart</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Others</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-Oriented Coping</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI Global</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-Oriented Coping * JI Global</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.09**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n = 238$ for Organizational Citizenship Behaviors columns. $n = 238$ for Job Search Intensity columns. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$. The variables in Steps 2 and 3 were centered at the mean to reduce concerns of multicollinearity.
Table 10

Hierarchical Regression Analysis of the Interaction Between Job Insecurity Total Job and Control-Oriented Coping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Job Search Intensity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1 β</td>
<td>Step 2 β</td>
<td>Step 3 β</td>
<td>Step 1 β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Single</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Married Apart</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Others</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-Oriented Coping</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI Total Job</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-Oriented Coping * JI Total Job</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ$R^2$</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 238 for Organizational Citizenship Behaviors columns. n = 238 for Job Search Intensity columns. *p < .05, **p < .01. The variables in Steps 2 and 3 were centered at the mean to reduce concerns of multicollinearity.
Table 11

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis of the Interaction Between Job Insecurity Total Job*Powerlessness and Control-Oriented Coping*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Citizenship Behaviors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Job Search Intensity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Step 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Single</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Married Apart</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Status Others</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-Oriented Coping</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI Total Job*Powerlessness</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-Oriented Coping * JI Total Job*Powerlessness</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n = 238$ for Organizational Citizenship Behaviors columns. $n = 238$ for Job Search Intensity columns. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$. The variables in Steps 2 and 3 were centered at the mean to reduce concerns of multicollinearity.
Figure 2. Observed interaction between Job Insecurity Global and Control-Oriented Coping in the prediction of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. Interaction plotted at one standard deviation above and below the mean for both Control-Oriented Coping and Job Insecurity Global. COC = Control-Oriented Coping, JI = Job Insecurity.
Figure 3. Observed interaction between Job Insecurity Total Job and Control-Oriented Coping in the prediction of Job Search Intensity. Interaction plotted at one standard deviation above and below the mean for both Control-Oriented Coping and Job Insecurity Total Job.
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Modifications Approved:

The proposed modification to this study is a modification to the data collection method.
- Sections VII b: Removed information about benefits to organizations who participate in the study because I will no longer be accessing participants through organizations. Previously the PI mentioned that she would provide a write-up of survey results to organizations who allowed her to distribute her survey at their organization, but this is no longer relevant as she is now contacting participants outside of the organization.
- Sections VII d and VII f: Previously, the PI attempted to collect data by contacting specific organizations and working with the human resources department to get their approval to send my survey out to employees at that specific organization. The previous data collection method was difficult because many human resources departments were reluctant to allow my survey to be sent out to all their employees due to either (1) internal employee surveys that were already ongoing, (2) lack of response back to me after the organization had already agreed to participate. Due to this difficulty in reaching the target population of working professionals via
human resources, the snowball data collection method is the PI's proposed alternative data
collection method for this survey.

- The snowball technique will not require human resources departments to approve the sending
out of the survey to all their employees. Instead, the survey would be distributed by individual
employees to their personal professional networks, thereby accessing the employees outside of
work and directing accessing those employees. The snowball technique is used in psychological
and sociological studies when a target population is difficult to identify or difficult to reach
(Faugier & Sargeant, 1997). The technique consists of sending out the survey to a wide variety
of individuals connected to the principal researcher as well as strangers (for example, through
discussion boards or other online forums). Those individuals will either take the survey and
forward the survey to additional colleagues or friends who meet the participant criteria, or they
will choose not to take the survey but may still forward the survey on to others. Participation
criteria will remain the same as in the approved project, so only the method used to contact
participants will change. As part of the PI's data collection she will rely on recruiting from
online forums, the PI has included a copy of an e-mail between herself and the moderator of the
forum that she will be recruiting from (see Appendix D - Permission to recruit on online
forum). The forum is a LinkedIn forum called Pacific Northwest Human Resources
Professionals.

- In this survey, working professionals have proven to be difficult to reach due to the large
number of human resources departments choosing not to participate in my survey (either due to
prior survey engagements or due to unwillingness to send their employees a survey about job
insecurity). By working to contact participants on a more individual basis with the snowball
method, as opposed to targeting a "mass" of participants by contacting organizations directly,
the working professional population will be more easily accessed. This modification led to
slight modification in wording in "Appendix B Consent Form - December 2012". the PI deleted
this sentence from the first paragraph, "You are being asked to participate in this study because
your organization has agreed to support this research project by allowing me to distribute the
survey in your organization for research purposes." Also deleted this wording from the end of
the fourth paragraph, "…, your supervisor, or your job."

- This modification also led to slight wording update in "Appendix A Recruitment e-mail revised
- November 2012" (see changes highlighted in yellow).

- This modification led to minor updates in "Appendix C Survey revised - November 2012". Page
1 updates include deleting the question about English language proficiency, which is no
longer needed. One of the organizations who had originally agreed to participate had told me
that they had many Spanish-language speakers with very little to no English fluency and
understanding, so I had included that question in order to screen out those who did not have
basic proficiency in reading English. This question should not be needed now, as the PI is
unlikely to recruit a large group of participants with that very low level of English proficiency
using the snowball data collection method that uses a more widespread approach to targeting a
variety of employees from different organizations, level of tenure, age, etc. Additionally, Page
1 question 7 was modified to include additional industry codes to conform with the current
federal government industry classification codes (NAICS). Page 6 contains one additional
sentence which asks participants to forward the survey to additional participants.
The final approved version of the consent document(s) is available as a published Board Document in the Review Details page. You must use the approved version of the consent document when obtaining consent from participants. Informed consent must continue throughout the project via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Federal regulations require that each participant receives a copy of the consent document.

Please note that you are responsible to conduct the study as approved by the HSRB. If you seek to make any changes in your project activities or procedures, those modifications must be approved by this committee prior to initiation. Please use the modification request form for this procedure.

All UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS involving risks to subjects or others and SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported promptly to this office. All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must also be reported promptly to this office.

This approval expires on January 5, 2013. You will receive a continuing review notice before your project expires. If you wish to continue your work after the expiration date, your documentation for continuing review must be received with sufficient time for review and continued approval before the expiration date.

Good luck with your work. If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Research Compliance at 419-372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence regarding this project.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board's records.
DATE: January 9, 2013

TO: Jennifer McInroe
FROM: Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board

PROJECT TITLE: [287033-6] Survey of Employee Workplace Behaviors
SUBMISSION TYPE: Continuing Review/Progress Report

ACTION: APPROVED
APPROVAL DATE: January 9, 2013
EXPIRATION DATE: January 8, 2014
REVIEW TYPE: Expedited Review

Thank you for your submission of Continuing Review/Progress Report materials for this project. The Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board has APPROVED your submission. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a project design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

The final approved version of the consent document(s) is available as a published Board Document in the Review Details page. You must use the approved version of the consent document when obtaining consent from participants. Informed consent must continue throughout the project via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Federal regulations require that each participant receives a copy of the consent document.

Please note that you are responsible to conduct the study as approved by the HSRB. If you seek to make any changes in your project activities or procedures, those modifications must be approved by this committee prior to initiation. Please use the modification request form for this procedure.

You have been approved to enroll 375 participants. If you wish to enroll additional participants you must seek approval from the HSRB.
All UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS involving risks to subjects or others and SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported promptly to this office. All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must also be reported promptly to this office.

This approval expires on January 8, 2014. You will receive a continuing review notice before your project expires. If you wish to continue your work after the expiration date, your documentation for continuing review must be received with sufficient time for review and continued approval before the expiration date.

Good luck with your work. If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Research Compliance at 419-372-7716 or hsr@bgsu.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence regarding this project.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board's records.
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APPENDIX B. PERCEIVED EMPLOYABILITY INSTRUMENT

Instructions to participants given in current study: Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your current job.

1. I’m confident that I would find another job if I started searching.
2. It will be difficult for me to find new employment when leaving the organization. [reverse coded]
3. In case I’m dismissed, I’ll immediately find a job of equal value.

Source: Janssens, Sels, and van den Brande (2003).
APPENDIX C. GLOBAL JOB INSECURITY INSTRUMENT

Instructions to participants given in current study: Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your current job.

1. I am sure that I will be able to keep my job. [reverse scored]
2. There is a risk that I will lose my present job in the near future.
3. I feel uncertain about the future of my job.
4. I think that I will lose my job in the near future.

Source: De Witte (2000); items worded in same method as Schreurs, van Emmerik, Notelaers, and De Witte (2010).
APPENDIX D. MULTIDIMENSIONAL JOB INSECURITY "BARE BONES" INSTRUMENT

Total Job Importance

Instructions to participants given in current study: Assume for a moment that each of the following events could happen to you. **How important** to you is the possibility:

1. …that you could be moved to another job at the same level within the organization
2. …that you could be moved to a different job at a higher position in your current location
3. …that you could be moved to a different job at a higher position in another geographic location
4. …that your future pay could be reduced
5. …that you could be pressured to accept early retirement
6. …that you could be pressured to work fewer hours

Total Job Likelihood

Instructions to participants given in current study: Assume for a moment that each of the following events could happen to you. **How likely** do you think it is that each of these events might actually occur to you in your current job?

7. …that you could be moved to another job at the same level within the organization
8. …that you could be moved to a different job at a higher position in your current location
9. …that you could be moved to a different job at a higher position in another geographic location
10. …that your future pay could be reduced
11. …that you could be pressured to accept early retirement
12. …that you could be pressured to work fewer hours

Powerlessness [*reverse coded*]

Instructions to participants given in current study: Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your current job.

13. I have enough power in this organization to control events that might affect my job.
14. In this organization, I can prevent negative things from affecting my work situation.
15. I understand this organization well enough to be able to control things that affect me.

APPENDIX E. BRIEF COPE INVENTORY

Instructions to participants given in current study: The following contains a list of possible reactions people could have to the thought of possibly losing their jobs. Please describe how you have reacted now or in the past 6 months to any thoughts you may have had about losing your current job.

1. I’ve been concentrating my efforts on doing something about the situation I’m in.
2. I’ve been taking action to try to make the situation better.
3. I’ve been trying to come up with a strategy about what to do.
4. I’ve been thinking hard about what steps to take.
5. I’ve been trying to see it in a different light, to make it seem more positive.
6. I’ve been looking for something good in what is happening.
7. I’ve been getting emotional support from others.
8. I’ve been getting comfort and understanding from someone.
9. I’ve been trying to get advice or help from other people about what to do.
10. I’ve been getting help and advice from other people.

Source: Carver, Scheier, and Weintraub (1989); items worded in same method as Carver (1997).
APPENDIX F. ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS INSTRUMENT

Instructions to participants given in current study: Please indicate how much these statements reflect your behavior at your current job.

Helping
1. Help each other out if someone falls behind in his/her work.
2. Willingly share their expertise with other members of the crew.
3. Try to act like peacemakers when other crew members have disagreements.
4. Take steps to try to prevent problems with other crew members.
5. Willingly give of their time to help crew members who have work-related problems.
6. "Touch base" with other crew members before initiating actions that might affect them.
7. Encourage each other when someone is down.

Civic Virtue
8. Provide constructive suggestions about how the crew can improve its effectiveness.
9. Are willing to risk disapproval to express their beliefs about what's best for the crew.
10. Attend and actively participate in team meetings.

Sportsmanship [reverse coded]
11. Always focus on what is wrong with our situation, rather than the positive side.
12. Consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters.
13. Always find fault with what other crew members are doing.

APPENDIX G. JOB SEARCH INTENSITY INSTRUMENT

Instructions to participants given in current study: Please indicate how much time you have spent on these activities in the past 6 months.

1. Used within-company sources.
2. Made inquiries/read about getting a job.
3. Prepared/revised resume.
4. Read classified/help wanted advertisements.
5. Talked with friends or relatives about possible job leads.
6. Spoke with previous employers or business acquaintances about possible job leads.
7. Visited job fairs.*
8. Contacted employment agencies.
10. Made inquiries to prospective employers.
11. Sent out application letters/filled out job applications.
12. Gone on a job interview.

Source: Blau (1994); items worded in same method as van Hooft and Crossley (2008); *added by van Hooft and Crossley (2008).