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Job insecurity is a particularly relevant topic given the current economic climate. Over the past two years the unemployment rate in the United States has been at its highest since the recession of the early 1980’s. It is useful to consider the effects that the current state of job insecurity can have on performance at work. Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is of particular interest to organizations during this poor economic climate as it has been shown that OCB leads to greater organizational effectiveness. Considering the mixed results regarding the relationship between job insecurity and OCB, the present study examined the way in which an employee appraises their job insecurity as a potential moderator of this relationship. Lazarus and Folkman’s stress and coping theory suggests that the manner in which a stressor is appraised will impact the behavior of the individual. Based on this, the present study hypothesized that different appraisal types (challenge or threat) will lead to higher or lower exhibitions of OCB respectively. There was also an examination of the moderating effects of core self-evaluation (CSE) and perceived organizational support on the relationship between job insecurity and appraisal type. The personality characteristics comprising CSE have been shown to be related to stress appraisal types. Furthermore, Social Exchange Theory suggests that perceived organizational support can be utilized as a resource to combat workplace stress. Participants were collected through a survey web link provided to undergraduate students at San Diego State University. The link was also posted to social networking sites and the online worker pool MTurk. Hierarchical multiple regression and correlations were used to test these hypotheses. No support was found for the moderating effects of stress appraisal types on the relationship between job insecurity and OCB. Support was found for CSE as a moderator of the relationship between job insecurity and both threat and challenge appraisals. Support was also found for perceived organizational support as a moderator of the relationships between job insecurity and both threat and challenge appraisals. These results suggest that both individual and organizational factors have an impact on the way employees perceive stress in the workplace.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

If employees feel as though their jobs, and therefore livelihood, are at risk, how will this affect their desire to perform extra-role behaviors? Job insecurity is a particularly relevant topic given the current economic climate. Over the past two years the unemployment rate in the United States has been at its highest since the recession of the early 1980’s. It is useful to consider the effects that the current state of job insecurity can have on performance at work. I am interested in the way job security relates to organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB). OCB is a topic that has received a great deal of attention in the organizational science literature since it first showed up in the 1980’s (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). These behaviors may be of particular interest to organizations during this poor economic climate as it has been shown that OCB leads to greater organizational effectiveness and provides a competitive advantage (Bolino & Turnley, 2005; Bolino, Turnley, & Bloodgood, 2002).

OCBs are characterized as beneficial behaviors in the workplace that are not explicitly assigned or rewarded. It is typically described as “going the extra mile” to help coworkers and the organization as a whole. Smith et al. (1983) found two independent factors of OCB: altruism and generalized compliance. Altruism refers to behaviors that are specifically intended to help another person in the workplace. An example of altruism would be helping a coworker who has a heavy workload. Generalized compliance is positive behavior in the workplace that is not aimed at one specific person. Workers showing generalized compliance would show up to work on time and not take extra breaks.

Interestingly, the research that has examined the effects that job insecurity has on OCB has shown mixed results. Considering these mixed results, there are likely to be some moderators at work in this relationship. The present study will, in part, replicate the model used in Staufenbiel and König (2010) and investigate potential moderators of this relationship. Specifically, because job insecurity is a well-established work stressor, I will look at the way an employee appraises his/her job insecurity as a moderator of the
relationship between job insecurity and OCB. I will also extend Staufenbiel and König’s (2010) model to include an examination of what factors may serve as predictors of appraisal type. The particular variables of interest in this case are core self-evaluation and perceived organizational support.

The goal of this study is to look at stress appraisal types to better understand the mixed results of the relationship between job insecurity as a stressor and an employee’s level of OCB. Below is a review of the literature involving an examination of the mixed results regarding the relationship between job insecurity and OCB. This will be followed by an overview of the role that stress appraisals may play in moderating the relationship between job insecurity and OCB. Finally core self-evaluation and perceived organizational support will be proposed as potential moderators of the relationship between job insecurity and appraisal type.

STRESS APPRAISALS

Given that job insecurity is a well-established workplace stressor (Ashford, Lee, & Bobko, 1989; Hellgren, Sverke, & Isaksson, 1999; Staufenbiel & König, 2010), it is important for researchers and organizations to understand outcomes and moderators of this particular stressor, especially in the current economic climate. Most of the job insecurity and OCB literature is either focused on stress theory (e.g., König, Debus, Häusler, Lendenmann, & Kleinmann, 2010; Staufenbiel & König, 2010) or social exchange theory (e.g., Bultena, 1998; Gong & Chang, 2008; Wong, Wong, Ngo, & Lui, 2005). The present study will incorporate both of these theories by focusing on stress appraisals of job insecurity as discussed by Lazarus and Folkman (1984) as well as the impact that social exchange theory can have on the type of appraisal made.

The Lazarus and Folkman stress theory (1984) focuses on the demands placed on individuals as a result of a stressor and the resources they possess to cope with that stress. The theory proposes there are three types of primary appraisals of any potential stressor: irrelevant, benign-positive and stressful. When an individual is faced with insecure employment, he/she is unlikely to appraise that situation as irrelevant. Even if the individual is considering the possibility of a layoff as a push into a new, and possibly better, job/career, the change associated with such a move is stressful regardless. As a result, it is also unlikely
that an individual would appraise job insecurity as benign-positive. Even Lazarus and
Folkman state that totally “benign-positive appraisals without some degree of apprehension
may be rare” (p. 32). Therefore, I will be exclusively concerned with primary appraisals of
job insecurity as stressful.

If the situation has had a primary appraisal as being stressful, then there are three
types of secondary stress appraisals that can occur: threat, challenge, and harm-loss. A threat
appraisal occurs when there is low confidence in overcoming the stressor and can lead to
withdrawal behaviors in the workplace (Sverke, Hellgren, & Näswall, 2002). A challenge is
when the stressor is seen as an obstacle to overcome and causes the person to work harder to
overcome that obstacle. This appraisal would occur when the individual has confidence in
their ability to handle the stressful events. Harm-loss appraisals reflect the reaction to having
already lost someone or something important to the individual as a result of the stressor. This
type of appraisal tends to be associated with some of life’s most challenging experiences,
such as the death of a spouse.

The harm-loss appraisal type will be left out of the model because it is used to
measure reactions to events that have already occurred as a result of the stressor, whereas
threat and challenge measure an appraisal of anticipated stressful situations. Insecure
employment is not an outcome of a stressful situation: it is a continual stressor that is more in
line with an appraisal of anticipated stress. If the participant feels as though they have
adequate resources to deal with the stress caused by job insecurity it will be appraised as a
challenge. If the participant feels as though they have inadequate resources to overcome their
job insecurity they will appraise it as a threat.

Workplace stressors can lead to both positive and negative outcomes. The manner in
which a person appraises a stressor has an impact on whether they experience negative or
positive outcomes. Lazarus (1974) divides stress into distress, which has negative
consequences, and eustress, which results in more positive outcomes. Given the different
appraisals that one may make of a stressor, it is not surprising that research on the
relationship between job insecurity and OCB has shown mixed results.
JOB INSECURITY AND OCB

There have been several studies looking at the relationship between job insecurity and OCB (Eatough, Chang, Miloslavic, & Johnson, 2010; Feather & Rauter, 2004; Gong and Chang, 2008; König et al., 2010; Reisel, Probst, Chia, Maloles, & König, 2010; Staufenbiel & König 2010; and Wong et al., 2005). Most of the time it is found that job insecurity, as one may expect, results in negative outcomes. These outcomes could affect physical or mental-health (DeWitte, 1999; Kopp, Stauder, Purebl, Janszky, & Skrabski, 2007; László et al., 2010) or job attitudes, such as reduced job satisfaction and lowered organizational commitment (Ashford et al., 1989). One may assume that because job insecurity is generally seen as a negative demand, it will lead to purely negative outcomes. This assumption has received substantial support in the literature (e.g., Bultena, 1998; De Witte, 1999; Reisel et al., 2010; Wong et al., 2005).

However, there have been exceptions. Feather and Rauter (2004) found that job insecurity led to higher exhibitions of organizational citizenship behaviors in Australian teachers. Adding to the confusion, Gong and Chang (2008) found no significant relationship at all between OCB and employment security. Meta analyses have also mentioned the mixed findings regarding the relationship between role stressors such as job insecurity and OCB (Eatough et al., 2010). Aside from the practical value of a better understanding of the relationship between job insecurity and extra role behavior, it is also important to clarifying literature on the effects that stress can have on performance outcomes. In light of these mixed results, the literature has called for an investigation of potential moderators of this relationship. The role that stress appraisals play in this relationship has not been examined. The manner in which a person perceives stress will impact whether they respond positively or negatively. Appraisal types can help explain why individuals may react positively or negatively to stress caused by job insecurity. The following section will discuss stress appraisal types in more detail.

Staufenbiel and König (2010) created a framework, based on the Lazarus and Folkman (1984) stress theory, in which job insecurity can be simultaneously a hindrance and challenge stressor. Hindrance and challenge are not two ends on a continuum. An event can be viewed with varying degrees of both hindrance and challenge appraisal. Staufenbiel and König studied employees in a medium-sized German electronics wholesaler and found
support that hindrance (or threat) stressor appraisals lead to lower OCB and challenge stress appraisals lead to the opposite outcome. As a result, they argue it is not appropriate to say the relationship between job insecurity and OCB is entirely negative or entirely positive. I propose a model that will replicate these findings and show that a threat appraisal will lead to lower exhibition of OCB, and the opposite will be true for a challenge appraisal.

Threat appraisals lead to less proactive reactions to stress. If employees do not have access to resources that will help them overcome a stressor then a threat appraisal will occur. In the face of job insecurity, a person making a threat appraisal would see their insecure employment as out of their hands. If the employee makes a threat appraisal of the job insecurity they may withdraw from the situation, unable to take action to overcome their stress. Thus the individual would be less likely to take proactive measures to improve their job security, such as exhibit OCB.

_Hypothesis (1) The negative relationship between job insecurity and OCB will be moderated by threat appraisal, such that when threat appraisal is high, the relationship between job insecurity and OCB is more negative._

If an employee feels as though their employment is at risk and they feel as though they have the resources to overcome the stressful situation, they would appraise this situation as a challenge. This challenge would result in a proactive reaction to the stressful situation. The person would be more likely to exert extra effort at work and go “above and beyond.” In other words they would be more likely to perform OCB in the face of the stressful situation in an attempt to keep their present job. Therefore I hypothesize:

_Hypothesis (2) The negative relationship between job insecurity and OCB will be moderated by challenge appraisal, such that when challenge appraisal is high, the relationship between job insecurity and OCB will become positive._

**WHAT MODERATES THE JOB INSECURITY-APPRAISAL RELATIONSHIP?**

In addition to looking at appraisal types as potential moderators of the job insecurity and OCB relationship, I extend the Staufenbiel and König (2010) model to examine what might be impacting the relationship between job insecurity and these appraisal types. The personality construct of core self-evaluation is expected to moderate the manner in which an employee will appraise the stress caused by their job insecurity. In line with Social Exchange...
Theory (SET), perceived organizational support is also expected to moderate appraisal types. Each of these potential moderators will be discussed in turn below.

**Core Self-Evaluation and Appraisals**

Core self-evaluation (CSE) is a relatively new measure of personality that has been included in other work stress studies, but has not been used in very many job insecurity studies. CSE assesses a person’s overall inventory of their worth and capabilities in a general sense through measures of locus of control, neuroticism, self-esteem, and generalized self-efficacy (Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2003). Rather than measuring the overall positive and or negative outlook one may have, core self-evaluation measures “the fundamental appraisal of one's worthiness, effectiveness, and capability as a person” (Judge et al., 2003, p. 304). Although there has been little research done on specific measures of CSE and how they relate to appraisals and coping strategies, there has been some research on the individual factors of CSE (i.e., locus of control, neuroticism, self-esteem, and generalized self-efficacy) and how they each relate to stressor appraisals.

First of all, *locus of control* is specifically discussed as a key component in the appraisal process (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The perceived control that a person has over a stressful situation will be affected by their locus of control. For example, people with a high level of internal locus of control will feel as though they are better equipped to handle stressful events and perceive them as a challenge rather than a threat.

The impact that *neuroticism* has on appraisals has been well-documented in the literature, mostly due to its inclusion in the Big Five personality characteristics. Research has routinely found that neuroticism leads to more strain at work (Deary et al., 1996). Neuroticism is also related to more negative appraisals of stressful situations (Deary et al., 1996; Lee-Flynn, Pomaki, DeLongis, Biesanz, & Puterman, 2011), as well as maladaptive coping behaviors (McCrae & Costa, 1986).

Rector and Roger (1997) suggested that higher *self-esteem* leads to a challenge oriented view of a stressor. If a person thinks highly of themselves they are more likely to see stress as a challenge or opportunity for growth. More recently, Lee-Flynn et al. (2011) found high self-esteem to buffer negative (i.e. threatening, uncontrollable) appraisals of stressors.
Generalized self-efficacy has been found to serve as a buffer against job strain, the negative physical or psychological outcomes of stressors, in low-control situations (Nauta, Liu, & Li, 2010). Nauta and colleagues studied the differences in the relationship between generalized self-efficacy and job strains for US and Chinese workers. The study found generalized self-efficacy to serve as a buffer against psychological strains in the sample of US workers. Karademas and Kalantzzi-Azizi (2004), and Luszczynska, Mohamed, and Shwarzer (2005) found general self-efficacy to be positively correlated with challenge appraisals.

CSE has received support as a suitable construct for stress studies (Best, Stapleton, & Downey, 2005; Luria & Torjman, 2009) because of the effect that the individual components have on the interpretation of events and appraisal of potentially stressful situations. Based on support from previous studies, as well as the findings of Judge (2009), I expect to find that individuals scoring high in CSE (and thereby high in locus of control, emotional stability, self-esteem, and generalized self-efficacy) will be more likely to have a challenge-oriented appraisal of stress in the workplace. A high core self-evaluation will potentially act as a personal resource, as described in Lazarus and Folkman (1984), which an individual can draw upon to limit the impact of a stressor. Resources are broadly referred to as anything that may have its own inherent value or something that may be used to achieve a goal (Hobfoll, 2002). Potential resources can include personality traits, social support and even money. The traits encapsulated in CSE are expected to provide the individual with a resource to draw upon in the face of stress. This will help individuals guard themselves from experiencing negative outcomes from workplace stressors like job insecurity, thereby promoting positive outcomes (such as higher OCBs).

CSE is an appropriate dimension of personality to use for the current study because the main point of the construct is to measure the way someone perceives their own worth and abilities. This is especially relevant to situations involving stress appraisals. Are they going to give up in an attempt to avoid the threatening circumstances or are they going to feel prepared to face the perceived challenge ahead of them? Those low in CSE may not feel as though they have the ability or power to keep their job in the face of insecure employment. When job insecurity increases, employees reporting lower CSE are expected report higher threat appraisals. Participants high in CSE will likely feel that they are able to keep their job
when faced with insecure employment. When job insecurity increases, employees who report higher CSE will be more likely to report challenge appraisals of this stressful situation. Therefore, I hypothesize:

Hypothesis (3a) CSE will moderate the positive relationship between job insecurity and threat appraisal, such that high CSE will result in lower threat appraisal in instances of high job insecurity.

Hypothesis (3b) CSE will moderate the negative relationship between job insecurity and challenge appraisal, such that respondents high in CSE will result in higher challenge appraisal in instances of high job insecurity.

Perceived Organizational Support and Appraisals

Social exchange theory (SET) arose from the field of economics and was subsequently applied to psychology and sociology research in the 1960’s. It is based around the concept of human behavior as a cost-benefit analysis. In the context of the workplace, this cost-benefit analysis refers to the benefits the employee is getting from the organization in return for their efforts (costs). In other words, SET proposes that employees operate under a quid pro quo principle in which employees feel obligated to reciprocate in kind for benefits received from the organization (or retaliate for harm). Because of this, SET is often used as a basis for workplace stress studies, including those investigating job insecurity (e.g., Bultena, 1998; Wong et al., 2005; Gong & Chang, 2008).

Drawing from social exchange theory, I am looking at perceived organizational support (POS) as a potential moderator of the relationship between appraisals and job insecurity. POS is a construct that is closely tied to SET. In situations where participants report high POS, they believe that the organization is committed to them, so they are in turn committed to the organization (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). This construct has not been used in very many stressor appraisal studies.

More specifically, I expect POS to act as a resource offered by the organization which the employee can draw upon to overcome the stressor. Haar (2006) found that POS was positively related to challenge stressors and negatively related to hindrance (threat) stressors. If an employee’s job is in danger, he/she will naturally feel some stress from that situation. If the employee feels as though the organization is supportive of him/her, there may be a more positive appraisal of that stressor resulting from that resource available to the employee.
Lazarus and Folkman’s stress theory (1984) proposes that the availability of resources to assist an individual in overcoming a stressor will contribute to a challenge appraisal.

*Hypothesis (4a)* Perceived organizational support will moderate the positive relationship between job insecurity and threat appraisal, such that respondents high in POS will be less likely to indicate a threat appraisal when job insecurity is high.

*Hypothesis (4b)* Perceived organizational support will moderate the negative relationship between job insecurity and challenge appraisal, such that respondents high in POS will be more likely to indicate a challenge appraisal when job insecurity is high.
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

SAMPLE AND PROCEDURE

Participants were invited to participate in a larger online survey on worker well-being through an undergraduate student sample at San Diego State University, Facebook and the Amazon Mechanical Turk service (MTurk). The qualifications for participation were that the respondent be over 18 years of age and currently employed. This ensured that a measure of job insecurity would be relevant to the respondent. In addition to the items measuring the constructs of interest, items assessing age, gender, marital and familial status, employment status, and level of education were also administered and reported.

The sample was obtained electronically via a web survey link which was offered to undergraduate psychology students, posted to social networking cites (such as Facebook and LinkedIn) and posted to the Amazon Mechanical Turk service. The students were offered course credit in exchange for their participation in the survey. The Facebook sample was collected using a snowball sampling technique: the research team posted a link to the survey as a status update and prompted participants to share the link with their eligible friends. MTurk is a worker pool hosted by Amazon.com that offers small monetary compensation in exchange for various tasks such as picture sorting, transcribing an audio recording or survey participation. This service has been found to offer comparable, if not better, data quality than traditional collection methods like a student sample or other online methods (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). For the present study, participants on MTurk received $0.50 for completing the survey. Anonymity was ensured for all three samples, as no names or other identifying information was collected at any point during the process. All three samples will be combined into a single sample. The student sample showed many significant demographic differences from the MTurk and Facebook samples. Students were significantly lower than Facebook and MTurk in age, organizational tenure, organizational level, hours worked per week and self-employment. All three samples were significantly different on education level with Facebook being the highest educated sample followed by MTurk and then students.
MTurk also had significantly more male respondents than both Facebook and the student sample. However, there were minimal significant differences found between the three samples on the study variables (see Table 1). This drove the decision to integrate them into one sample.

Table 1. Comparing Sample Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>MTurk</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. OCB</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Insecurity</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Threat Appraisal</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Challenge Appraisal</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Core Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Age</td>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>33.14</td>
<td>21.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gender</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Education Level</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Organizational Tenure</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Organizational Level</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Hours Worked Per Week</td>
<td>38.60</td>
<td>39.45</td>
<td>20.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Self-Employment</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Shared superscripts indicate no significant mean differences at the .05 level.

d Coded 1=Female 2=Male

e Coded 1= Some High School 2= High School 3= Associate’s 4= Bachelor’s 5 = Master’s 6= Ph.D.

f Measured in years

g Coded 1=Non-managerial 2=Managerial 3=Executive

h Coded 1=Self-employed 2=Not self-employed
Initially there were 625 participants (221 from Facebook, 183 from MTurk, and 221 students. Participants were removed from the final sample if they incorrectly answered all three of the quality control items, or if they reported 0 work hours per week. After data cleaning the final sample consisted of 510 participants overall, (213 from Facebook, 143 from MTurk, and 154 students). The average age of the sample was 28.74 ($SD = 10.186$), with a minimum of 18 and maximum of 79. Sixty-two percent of the sample was female and 38% was male. Seven percent of the sample was self-employed. Thirty-eight percent of the sample had a high school diploma, 14% had an associate’s degree, 32% had a Bachelor’s degree, and 15% had an advanced degree. Average hours worked per week was 33.24, and average tenure with current organizations was 3.81 years.

**Measures**

Except where noted below, each scale was assessed using a 5-point Likert scale where 1 is strongly disagree and 5 is strongly agree. For each scale a higher score means a higher level of the construct is present in that individual. The scales for job insecurity, OCB, and CSE contain reverse scored items which were adjusted accordingly, and each participant’s responses for each scale were averaged to create a scale score. To help guard against potential priming effects, items were strategically ordered in the survey. For example, outcome variables were placed before predictors to prevent unintended priming effects. All of the items are provided in the appendix. Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of all the variables used in this study are provided in Table 2.

Job insecurity relates to the concern one has for the future continuity of their current employment (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984). This was measured using the 5-item job insecurity scale from Francis and Barling (2005). It is a concise and reliable scale that measures perceived job insecurity (Francis & Barling, 2005). A sample item is “I am not really sure how long my present job will last.” The reliability of this scale in this sample was .81.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is behavior in the workplace that is “…discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988). This was measured with the Williams and Anderson (1991) measure of OCB. It is a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job Insecurity</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.253*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Threat Appraisal</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-.171*</td>
<td>.653*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Challenge Appraisal</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.254*</td>
<td>-.281*</td>
<td>-.286*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Core Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.245*</td>
<td>-.330*</td>
<td>-.368*</td>
<td>.364*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.251*</td>
<td>-.240*</td>
<td>-.281*</td>
<td>.447*</td>
<td>.342*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note. $N = 421$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Correlation is significant at the .01 level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21-item scale measuring OCB across three categories. Because the focus of the current study does not include different predictions for different types of OCB, the items will be averaged to create a single OCB score. Sample items from the scale include: “I help others who have been absent,” and “I give advance notice when unable to come to work.” The items were adjusted from their original third-person voice to reflect the self-report nature of the rest of the survey. The reliability for this scale in this sample was .79.

Appraisals refer to the perception of control one has in regards to a stressful event. The measure comes from Folkman and Lazarus (1985). It consists of 15 items total, but I will only be using the 6 that correspond with threat and challenge appraisals (three items each). Each item assesses the extent to which a particular emotion is associated with the stressor (job insecurity). The emotions are rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 0 (Not at all), to 4 (A great deal). The emotions will be preceded by the phrase “Indicate the extent to which these emotions relate to your employment security.” To measure threat appraisals the emotions listed are: worried, fearful, and anxious. The emotions listed for a challenge appraisal are: confident, hopeful, and eager. The reliabilities for threat and challenge appraisals in this sample were .93 and .83 respectively.

Core self-evaluation “…is a basic, fundamental appraisal of one's worthiness, effectiveness, and capability as a person” (Judge et al., 2003, p. 304). The four dimensions of core self-evaluation – general generalized self-efficacy, neuroticism, locus of control and self-esteem – are to be assessed with a 12-item scale developed by Judge and colleagues (2003). A sample item is “Overall, I am satisfied with myself.” The reliability for this scale in this sample was .85.

POS measures the extent to which an employee feels their employer is concerned with their well being and values their contributions (Eisenberger et al., 1986). One of the most popular measures of POS is Eisenberger and colleagues’ (1986) Scale of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS). Three of the highest loading items from this scale were selected to measure POS in this study. These are the same three selected in Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, and Rhoades (2002) in their perceived supervisor support (PSS) scale. An example item is “My company shows a lot of concern for me.” The reliability for this scale in this sample was .93.
**ANALYSES**

The properties of the measures (e.g., reliability and validity) were examined. Three items were removed from the study based on their alpha if item deleted values. Deleting the item “Help is available from my company when I have a problem,” from the POS scale increased the alpha from .896 to .928. Deleting “This job has retirement security” from the job insecurity scale increased the alpha from .734 to .809. Deleting the item “Confident” from the Challenge emotion scale increased the alpha from .804 to .825. Missing data were removed by list-wise deletion. Data for participants that do not meet the minimum requirement of being currently employed were excluded from analyses. Quality control items were also placed in the survey to guard against insufficient effort responding. There were a total of three quality control items throughout the survey, and respondents that answered all 3 incorrectly were also excluded from analyses. All hypotheses were tested using hierarchical multiple regression. For Hypothesis 1 and 2, job insecurity was entered in the first block, along with threat appraisal for Hypothesis 1 and challenge appraisal for Hypothesis 2. The second block contained the interaction term between job insecurity and the respective appraisal type. For Hypotheses 3a and 3b, job insecurity and CSE were entered in the first block. The second block contained the interaction term between job insecurity and CSE. Threat appraisal was entered as the dependent variable for 3a, and challenge appraisal was entered as the dependent variable for 3b. To test Hypotheses 4a, and 4b, job insecurity was entered in the first block with POS, and the interaction between job insecurity and POS was entered in the second block. Threat appraisal was entered as the dependent variable for 4a, and challenge appraisal was entered as the dependent variable for 4b. Predictors were centered as recommended by Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2003).
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

INITIAL ANALYSES

Before hypotheses were tested, initial correlations were run to analyze any potentially interesting relationships between study variables (see Table 2). As expected, OCB showed a significant negative correlation with job insecurity ($r = -.253$, $p < .001$). In addition to a significant negative correlation with OCB, job insecurity was also significantly negatively correlated with challenge appraisal ($r = -.281$, $p < .001$) and positively correlated with threat appraisal ($r = .653$, $p < .001$). That is, as job insecurity increased, respondents reported more threat appraisal and less challenge appraisal.

A one-way ANOVA across the three samples was run to determine if there were any significant mean differences among the variables of interest for each sample. Significant differences were found between the samples in OCB ($F(2, 483) = 10.929$, $p < .001$), job insecurity ($F(2, 437) = 3.553$, $p = .029$) and threat appraisal ($F(2, 437) = 8.679$, $p < .001$). A Scheffé post hoc analysis was conducted to find the specific scale mean differences between samples (see Table 1). Facebook and MTurk samples showed significant differences in OCB. The Facebook sample was also significantly different from the student sample in threat appraisal. MTurk and the student samples were significantly different for both threat appraisal and OCB. The majority of the constructs were not significantly different between samples, so the decision was made to combine all three samples into one. The samples were also combined to gain greater statistical power to detect moderation effects.

TESTS OF HYPOTHESES

Hierarchical multiple regressions were used to test the moderation hypotheses. All significant moderations were graphed with the low condition of the predictor represented as the minimum value reported, and the high condition as the maximum value reported. The low value for the predictors will be negative because centered variables were used to construct these graphs and these values represent the distance from the mean. For the three levels of
the moderator, low is one standard deviation below the mean, medium is the mean value, and high is one standard deviation above the mean.

Hypotheses 1 and 2, which proposed a moderating effect of threat and challenge appraisal on the relationship between job insecurity and OCB, were both not supported by the analyses (see Tables 3 and 4). For the test of Hypothesis 1 there was a significant moderation found, but it was contrary to the hypothesized effect (see Figure 1). Support was found for Hypothesis 3a and 3b as CSE was shown to be a significant moderator of the relationship between job insecurity and threat appraisal (see Table 5; Figure 2) as well as challenge appraisal (see Table 6; Figure 3). These results indicate that in instances of greater job insecurity, employees reporting higher CSE were less likely to make a threat appraisal and more likely to make a challenge appraisal than respondents with low CSE.

### Table 3. Summary of Hypothesis 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: Organizational Citizenship Behavior</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.062**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td>-.240</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat Appraisal</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity X Threat Appraisal</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level  
** Significant at the .01 level

### Table 4. Summary of Hypothesis 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: Organizational Citizenship Behavior</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.099**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge Appraisal</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity X Challenge Appraisal</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level  
** Significant at the .01 level
Figure 1. Two-way interaction between threat appraisal and job insecurity on organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 5. Summary of Hypothesis 3a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>DV: Threat Appraisal</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Self-Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity X Core Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* . Significant at the .05 level
**. Significant at the .01 level

Support was also found for Hypotheses 4a and 4b. POS was shown to be a significant moderator of the relationship between job insecurity and threat appraisal (β = -.153, p < .001) (see Table 7; Figure 4) as well as job insecurity and challenge appraisal (β = .116, p < .05) (see Table 8; Figure 5). These results indicate that respondents who reported higher POS were less likely to make a threat appraisal in the face of higher job insecurity than respondents reporting lower POS. Respondents reporting higher POS were also more likely to make a challenge appraisal as reports of job insecurity were higher.
Figure 2. Two-way interaction between core self-evaluation and job insecurity on threat appraisal.

Table 6. Summary of Hypothesis 3b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>DV: Challenge Appraisal</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Step 2                     |                          |      |       |       |
| Job Insecurity X Core Self-Evaluation | .089 | .032 |       |

*. Significant at the .05 level  
**. Significant at the .01 level
Figure 3. Two-way interaction between core self-evaluation and job insecurity on challenge appraisal.

Table 7. Summary of Hypothesis 4a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>DV: Threat Appraisal</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived Organization Support</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.013**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level
Table 8. Summary of Hypothesis 4b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>DV: Challenge Appraisal</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.333</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Insecurity X Perceived Organizational Support</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Significant at the .05 level  
**. Significant at the .01 level
Figure 5. Two-way interaction between perceived organizational support and job insecurity on challenge appraisal.
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The goal of the present study was to better understand the relationship between job insecurity and OCB through an examination of stress appraisals as potential moderators. Moreover, potential moderators of the relationship between job insecurity and stress appraisals were also proposed. Using the Lazarus and Folkman (1984) stress theory as a foundation, stress appraisals were expected to moderate the relationship between job insecurity and OCB. Higher reports of threat appraisal were predicted to result in fewer OCBs and higher reports of challenge appraisal were predicted to result in more OCBs. CSE was expected to moderate the relationship between job insecurity and stress appraisals. Employees high in CSE were expected to have a challenge appraisal in cases of high job insecurity, and those low in CSE would be more likely to appraise high job insecurity as a threat. Social exchange theory was used as a basis for POS acting as a moderator of the job insecurity-stress appraisal relationship. POS was expected to serve as a resource that employees could draw upon, which would encourage a challenge appraisal of their insecure employment.

HYPOTHESIS FINDINGS

The analyses showed no support for Hypotheses 1 or 2. Even though the test for Hypothesis 1 showed a significant moderation, it was the opposite of what was expected. In instances of higher job insecurity, higher levels of threat emotions were shown to be related to an increase in reported OCBs more reported OCBs. An explanation for this unexpected relationship may be that the employees who have adverse reactions to threat appraisals may already be gone, either because they were fired or because they voluntarily removed themselves from their stressful jobs. The employees left in organizations may be better equipped to respond to a threat appraisal and thereby perform more OCBs. Threat appraisals and challenge appraisals are also not necessarily mutually exclusive. Respondents could still feel threatened by the loss of their job even if they felt confident in their ability to keep it if
they put forth extra effort. However, that seems unlikely considering the strong negative correlation between threat and challenge appraisals ($r = -.286, p < .001$)

Perhaps a study done closer to the beginning of the economic downturn would have yielded the hypothesized results. At this point most of the downsizing and streamlining that is going to happen may have already happened. Organizations may have already made the necessary changes in order to deal with the rough economy. Employees may have experienced job insecurity in recent years but don’t feel it quite as much now as a result. This may also leave organizations with employees who are better equipped to deal with stress in the workplace. Perhaps their ability to deal with stress has been an asset that kept them employed through the recession. In addition, they may just be better employees and feel confident that their jobs are not in danger. The data showed a large mean difference between threat ($M = 2.01$) and challenge ($M = 3.45$), which indicates that challenge appraisals were endorsed much more strongly than threat appraisals in this sample. Thus, range restriction on appraisal types could have been a factor in Hypotheses 1 and 2 not being supported. If this sample was compared to a sample of people at the beginning of the current recession, perhaps we would see greater variance in their mean scores for threat and challenge appraisals related to job insecurity. The relatively low mean age for the sample (28.74) could have also affected the results for Hypotheses 1 and 2. Perhaps the high number of student respondents in the study (with a mean age of 21.38) were not in a position at work to feel strongly one way or another by potential job insecurity.

When looking at CSE and POS as moderators of the job insecurity-stress appraisal relationship, support was found for 3 of the 4 hypotheses. CSE was a significant moderator of job insecurity and threat appraisal (see Figure 1), as well as challenge appraisal (see Figure 2). In instances of high job insecurity, employees low in CSE experienced more threat emotions than those high in CSE. The opposite was true regarding challenge emotions. Those high in CSE when faced with high job insecurity were more likely to experience challenge emotions than those low in CSE. Almost identical results were found for POS as a moderator of job insecurity and threat appraisals. Employees experiencing higher job insecurity reported higher threat appraisals if they also perceived less organizational support. Similar to the CSE hypotheses, the opposite was true for the moderating effect of POS on job insecurity and challenge appraisal. The overall relationship between job insecurity and
challenge appraisal was negative, but made less negative for those who perceived more organizational support.

**IMPLICATIONS**

The subject of job insecurity is very salient in the current economic climate. Organizations can benefit from knowing how insecure employment can affect their employees at work. It is important to know what characteristics may be present in those employees to mitigate the negative consequences that can occur from the stress of job insecurity. The results of the current study suggest that employees high in CSE will be less likely to have a threat appraisal of insecure employment. It appears that organizations that have high job insecurity may benefit from having employees high in CSE. Having workers that are less likely to make threat appraisals could result in more positive outcomes for organizations. Thus incorporating a measure of CSE into selection procedures could provide a set of employees with relevant attributes for struggling companies.

POS was shown to be a significant moderator of the relationship between job insecurity and appraisal types. This supports the social exchange view that higher POS would result in stronger commitment to the organization and thereby lead to a challenge-oriented appraisal of stress. Organizations that provide support to their employees will help them have a more positive outlook on stressors. Instead of being threatened by such events they will feel supported and have confidence in their ability to overcome work stress. Providing support for employees is one way for organizations to help their employees handle stress in the workplace.

Organizations can limit the level of threat appraisals in employees by providing support structures for employees, even in times of security. This can be done by limiting uncertainty through better communication. There are many things an organization can do to increase POS in their employees. Simply noticing and rewarding good performance will let employees know their work is being evaluated and appreciated. Providing opportunities for advancement and making sure all employees are aware of these opportunities can also be beneficial. Employees also feel more POS when their organization is flexible around an extended absence for illness (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Anecdotally, employees may even experience job insecurity when there is no objective threat to their employment. It is
important for organizations to let their employees know their status to help limit the amount of undue stress that the employees may experience. Implementing training also has the potential to increase an employee’s perception that their organization cares about their production and well-being. Employees that feel as though their organization cares about them are more likely to report POS (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

These results show that individual as well as organizational variables can impact appraisals of stress. If an organization is in a high stress industry, it could help them to have a workforce high in CSE. These workers will be more likely to have a positive response to stress. Furthermore, organizations that show they care about employees can help these employees when they are faced with stressful situations. Lowering the impact of stress on workers can help their job attitudes and job satisfaction (Ashford et al., 1989) as well as lower health risks associated with stress (Nixon, Mazzola, Bauer, Krueger, & Spector 2011).

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

One limitation is that the sample included self-employed workers. Intuitively, one may assume that feelings of job insecurity would not be as relevant to self-employed workers. However, there doesn’t appear to be any theoretical basis for filtering out self-employed workers from the sample. In fact Tremblay (2008) found that self-employed workers in Canada reported insecurity and uncertainty as the biggest disadvantage of self-employment compared to working in a traditional organization. If anything, this result indicates that the self-employed workers would report more insecurity. In the current study, there was no significant difference in reports of job insecurity between self-employed and non-self-employed workers.

Another limitation is that the design of the study makes it impossible to determine the causal direction of the relationships between constructs. The ordering of the survey items attempted to mitigate some of this uncertainty. To stay consistent with the Lazarus and Folkman (1984) model of experiencing a stressor, appraising it, and then reacting, the appraisal items were placed directly after the job insecurity items in the survey. The stem for the appraisal items was “Rate the extent to which you feel the following emotions as they relate to your job security…” This was intended to serve as a proxy for the way one may experience job insecurity and provide an appraisal of that situation. However, in a more
practical sense one may experience a stressor, appraise it, and then through that appraisal have their view of said stressor become more negative or more positive. Depending on how somebody appraises a situation could impact how they experience the stressor. So does job insecurity cause the appraisal, or does the appraisal cause the view of the stressor? Again, the direction of the relationship between job insecurity and stress appraisals is unclear. Perhaps future research could perform longitudinal studies to better understand the relationship between job insecurity, threat appraisals and OCBs.

Self-reported OCBs are often criticized for being susceptible to social desirability effects and impression management (Bolino, 1999; Schnake, 1991). Thus, another limitation of the current study is the use of self-reported OCBs, which were used mainly in the interest of time. It would not have been feasible for a project of this scope to attempt to get supervisory or peer-ratings on OCB. However, Kelloway, Loughlin, Barling, and Nault (2002) provided some support for this decision. The authors reported that even though self-report measures of OCBs are indeed affected by method variance, it is not so much as to lead to improper measurement. Future research may benefit from collecting both self-report and supervisory ratings of OCBs.

This study has the potential to be affected by common method variance because the study relied solely upon self-report data measured at a single point in time. Self-report data was necessary as the majority of the constructs dealt with an individual’s perceptions of a situation (job insecurity, stress appraisals, and POS). Even though Spector (2006) argues that the threat of common method variance is less prevalent than previously believed, it is still worth examining as a potential limitation. Although correlations between the variables of interest were all significant, many of the correlations were fairly low. OCB and threat appraisal ($r = -.171$), OCB and job insecurity ($r = -.253$), challenge appraisal and OCB ($r = .254$), CSE and OCB ($r = .245$), OCB and POS ($r = .251$), and POS and job insecurity ($r = -.240$) all showed relatively low albeit significant correlations. This suggests that common method variance most likely did not exert undue bias in results in this study. Moreover, it has been shown that significant moderations are not likely to arise solely from common method variance (Evans, 1985).

As previously mentioned, researchers should consider performing longitudinal studies to better understand the relationship between job insecurity, stress appraisals and extra-role
behaviors. Doing so will help to alleviate concerns that results may be driven by common method variance. In addition, it may be helpful to look at a specific company or industry experiencing insecure employment. With a population in an industry or organization experiencing job insecurity you could compare measures of subjective versus objective job insecurity as well. Industry-specific research could provide more useful results to industries that may be especially impacted by employment security. It could also be beneficial to look at different types of workplace stressors to see if CSE and POS show similar benefits in those situations as well.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The results of this study suggest that the manner in which employees perceive the stress from job insecurity may affect their performance at work. There were results (albeit contrary to the hypothesized effect) to suggest that threat appraisals could moderate the relationship between job insecurity and OCB such that, in instances of high job insecurity, employees experiencing high threat appraisal would perform more OCBs than those with a low threat appraisal. However, there were no results to suggest that challenge appraisals would moderate the relationship between job insecurity and OCBs. Support was found for CSE and POS as moderators of the relationship between job insecurity and stress appraisals. This study contributed to furthering the understating of the relationship between job insecurity and OCB as well as how the stress from job insecurity is appraised. Organizations should seek to increase support of their employees to protect against negative appraisals of stress. They may also select for employees high in CSE if they are in a particularly stressful industry where employment is routinely insecure. Research should continue on the relationships between insecurity, OCB, and the moderating effect of stress appraisals.
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APPENDIX

SCALES
Job Insecurity - Francis and Barling (2005)

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

5 point Likert scale, 1= strongly disagree 5= strongly agree

1. I can keep my current job for as long as I want it. (R)
2. This job has retirement security. (R)
3. I can be sure of keeping my present job as long as I do good work. (R)
4. I am not really sure how long my present job will last.
5. I am afraid of losing my present job.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) - Williams and Anderson (1991)

5 point Likert scale, 1= strongly disagree 5= strongly agree

OCBI

1. I help others who have been absent
2. I help others who have heavy work loads
3. I assist my supervisor with his/her work (when not asked)
4. I take time to listen to co-workers’ problems and worries
5. I go out of my way to help new employees
6. I take personal interest in other employees
7. I pass along information to co-workers

OCBO

1. My attendance at work is above the norm
2. I give advance notice when unable to come to work
3. I take undeserved work breaks (R)
4. I spend a great deal of time with personal phone conversations at work (R)
5. I complain about insignificant things at work (R)
6. I conserve and protect organizational property
7. I adhere to informal rules devised to maintain order
Appraisal - Folkman and Lazarus (1985)

5-point Likert scale (0 = not at all: 4 = a great deal) the extent to which they felt each of the following emotions, which are grouped here into their appraisal categories:
Rate the extent to which you feel the following emotions as they relate to your job security…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Worried</td>
<td>4. Confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fearful</td>
<td>5. Hopeful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anxious</td>
<td>6. Eager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Instructions: Below are several statements about you with which you may agree or disagree.
Using the response scale below, indicate your agreement or disagreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item.
5 point Likert scale, 1 = strongly disagree 5 = strongly agree

1. I am confident I get the success I deserve in life.
2. Sometimes I feel depressed, (r)
3. When I try, I generally succeed.
4. Sometimes when I fail I feel worthless, (r)
5. I complete tasks successfully.
6. Sometimes, I do not feel in control of my work, (r)
7. Overall, I am satisfied with myself.
8. I am filled with doubts about my competence, (r)
9. I determine what will happen in my life.
10. I do not feel in control of my success in my career, (r)
11. I am capable of coping with most of my problems.
12. There are times when things look pretty bleak and hopeless to me. (r)

r = reverse-scored

Perceived Organizational Support – Eisenberger et al. (2002)
Please indicate your agreement with the following statements about your COMPANY:

1. Help is available from my company when I have a problem
2. My company really cares about my well-being
3. My company shows a lot of concern for me