



Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane Australia

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted/accepted for publication in the following source:

[Bradley, Lisa](#) & [Clark, Lynette](#) (2004) Employability and job status as moderators of the effects of job insecurity on work outcomes. In Elkin, G (Ed.) *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management (ANZAM 2004). People First Serving Our Stakeholders.*, 8-11 December 2004, Dunedin, New Zealand.

This file was downloaded from: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/24014/>

Notice: *Changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published source:*

Employability and Job Status as Moderators of the Effects of Job Insecurity on Work Outcomes

Authors:

Lynette J Clark

Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane

Email: lj.clark@qut.edu.au

Dr Lisa M Bradley

Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane

Email: lm.bradley@qut.edu.au

Stream Q

Employability and Job Status as Moderators of the Effects of Job Insecurity on Work Outcomes

Abstract

Despite greater use of temporary employment contracts, little is known about how employees react to job length uncertainty. Individual careers within the safety of one or two primary organisations are no longer the norm. This study investigates the effects of job insecurity and employment status (temporary/permanent) on work outcomes. Three hundred and ninety-one employees (122 temporary and 269 permanent) in low to medium level non-academic positions from two Australian universities completed a survey. The results

show that a belief that comparable employment is easily available did not alleviate the negative effects of job insecurity. Work attitudes for temporaries and permanents though were differentially influenced by employee perceptions of their own employability.

Keywords: job insecurity, employability, moderators, job status, temporary employees

Introduction

The purpose of the present study is to extend the literature on job insecurity and job status by examining what part perceived employability plays in determining the work attitudes of both permanent and temporary employees. We begin with a discussion of what role job insecurity and job status has on work outcomes for employees. We then introduce the concept of employability as a likely moderator of these effects.

Job insecurity and job status

Three views exist on the extent of temporary workers' job insecurity. First, since temporary workers have neither explicit nor implicit contracts for ongoing employment (Nollen & Axel, 1996), some observers argue that job insecurity is particularly strong for temporary employees (Beard & Edwards, 1995) as the likelihood of job loss or contract non-renewal is very high (Aronsson, 1999). Second, other researchers claim temporary workers expect job insecurity (Bishop, Goldsby, & Neck, 2002; Jacobson & Hartley, 1991; Pearce, 1998). Job insecurity, unavoidably, is an integral part of being a contingent worker – by definition job assignments are temporary. Polivka (1996, p. 10) even defines temporary workers as those “who did not expect their jobs to last.” As such, it is expected that the difference between the anticipated level of job security and that perceived is less overwhelming for temporaries, thereby producing less strong reactions than those experienced by permanent employees (Klein Hesselink & Van Vuuren, 1999).

Alternately, others suggest that having multiple contracts with different organisations might be far safer than having a single “contract” with one organisation (Harris & Greising, 1998). The lack of formal job security with any one organisation might not be an automatic indication of job instability. Perhaps, job security for temporaries is not about keeping a job, but how effortlessly another job can be found (Kunda, Barley, & Evans, 2002). Thus whether job insecurity is more, less, or of equal importance to temporary workers as it is to permanent organisational members is both theoretically and empirically unclear. Nonetheless it appears there is consistent evidence that job insecurity does correspond with less than favourable outcomes for both permanent and temporary workers alike (De Witte & Näswall, 2003). It is the contention of the current authors though that employability will moderate these direct effects. This concept is now discussed.

Employability

People who perceive they have limited occupational mobility (or employment security) are likely to have more severe reactions to a job loss threat than those who believe they are more mobile (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984). The perceived lack of control over a job future increases the sense of vulnerability (Greenhalgh & Sutton, 1991). A person's ability to choose alternative employment can significantly influence their attitudes and behaviour (Cappelli & Sherer, 1991). A number of studies, with samples of permanent employees, suggest that an individual's perceived prospects in the labour market, their “employability”, effect their reactions to their job insecurity. For instance, “alternatives in the labour market” alleviated strains (Büssing, 1999) and psychosomatic complaints (Mohr, 2000). Kuhnert and Vance (1992) also demonstrate the moderating effects of employment security, such that the job-insecure reported more psychological adjustment problems, particularly if they also reported employment insecurity.

Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) proposed that occupational mobility might moderate the negative effects of job insecurity. Accordingly, if individuals believe that they can find another, equally good, job then they are likely to be more relaxed about their job insecurity than those with fewer job alternatives (Frese, 1989). Similarly, the extent of your marketable skills, your occupational mobility, and your assessment of economic instability in the job market all influence the perceived intensity of a job threat (Bargal, Back & Ariav, 1992). Thus the risk of job loss is believed to be more threatening where the jobholder feels less able to find a comparable job (Burchell, 1994). Collectively then, these studies tend to suggest an individual's perceived prospects in the labour market, their “employability”, affect their reactions to their job insecurity.

Hypotheses

Job insecurity

Job insecurity is consistently associated with reduced levels of psychological well-being (Kuhnert & Palmer, 1991). Specific psychological reactions to job insecurity include anxiety, psychological distress, and depression (Mohr, 2000). Psychological mood also is positively associated with self-reported job insecurity (Barling & Kelloway, 1996). The impact of job insecurity is not limited to psychological well-being, though. Significant negative correlations between job insecurity and job satisfaction are documented in a number of studies (e.g., Ashford, Lee, & Bobko, 1989; Davy, Kinicki & Scheck, 1997; O'Quin & LoTempio, 1998).

Further, there is extensive empirical support for the view that feelings of job insecurity are negatively related to organisational commitment (e.g., Ashford et al., 1989; Blau, 1994; Hui & Lee, 2000). As for any stressor, job insecurity can induce a withdrawal response – a way to avoid the stress altogether (Ashford et al., 1989). Therefore, it is not surprising that perceived job insecurity is consistently found to be positively associated with employee turnover intentions (Ashford et al., 1989; O'Quin & LoTempio, 1998) and actual turnover (Blau, 1994). However, the present study suggests that employability, as discussed above, will moderate the effects of job insecurity on the outcome measures. Thus, it is hypothesized that:

H1: The effect of job insecurity on employee's psychological well-being (**1a**); job satisfaction (**1b**); affective commitment (**1c**); continuance commitment (**1d**) and intention to quit (**1e**) will be moderated by the employee's perception of their own employability. Having higher employability will reduce the negative effects of higher levels of job insecurity.

Job Status

Some researchers (Jacobson & Hartley, 1991; Pearce, 1998) suggest that job insecurity is an anticipated characteristic of temporary work. Being "let go", while problematical, is part of a temporary worker's expectations (Bishop et al., 2002); therefore job insecurity should be less harmful for temporary workers. Yet there is some evidence that job insecurity is a concern for temporary workers. Both Kinnunen and Nätti (1994) and Forde (2001) show that temporary work affords little job security. Comparison studies show that temporaries are significantly less satisfied with their job security than permanents (Allan & Sienko, 1997) and more concerned with their job security (Klein Hesselink & Van Vuuren, 1999). Felstead, Krahn and Powell (1999) also report that temporary employees feel less secure than their full-time and permanent colleagues.

Further support for the suggestion that temporary workers experience concern about their job continuity comes from job loss studies. Job loss is said to sensitize workers to job threats and results in high job insecurity (Kinnunen & Nätti, 1994). For example, amongst the long-term unemployed that find jobs, Halvorsen (1998) shows that two-thirds of those finding temporary work regard their jobs as insecure, whereas less than one-fifth of those who find permanent jobs feel insecure. Individuals who experience job loss tend to believe that subsequent employment opportunities are less secure (Cavanaugh & Noe, 1999). Given that job losers are more likely than non-losers to be in temporary jobs (Farber, 1999), job insecurity and instability are likely to be recurring problems for those in temporary work. Irrespective of whether it is temporaries or permanents that feel the most vulnerable to job loss, feeling that there are many alternate job opportunities available might be of more comfort to temporaries than permanents, given the likely nature of their less stable pattern of employment. Consequently, it is hypothesized that:

H2: The effect of job status on employee's psychological well-being (**2a**); job satisfaction (**2b**); affective commitment (**2c**); continuance commitment (**2d**) and intention to quit (**2e**) will be moderated by the employee's perception of their own employability. Having higher employability will reduce the negative effects of the job instability of being a temporary employee.

Method

Sample Background

To minimize the potential confounding effects of contextual differences and to enable comparisons of work attitudes across work status groups, data were collected within a single industry. Data were collected from general (non-academic) employees at two Australian universities. Respondents are employed at Higher Education Worker (HEW) Levels 3 and 4, receiving annual salaries ranging from \$AUS29,729 to \$AUS35, 982 respectively. A representative HEW 3 role is that of a security and traffic officer. A typical HEW 4 position is a School's administrative officer.

Procedure and Sample

Survey packets were distributed by the each organisation's internal mailing system to all eligible employees. Participation was voluntary and responses kept anonymous with completed questionnaires returned to a university address in the postage-paid envelopes. The

response rate at University One was 38%, 177 questionnaires. Completed surveys from University Two numbered 214, representing a response rate of 29%. At each university 87% of the respondents were female. Of the total 391 participants, 122 worked on a temporary basis with ages ranging from 20 to 62 years ($M = 35.5$, $SD = 10.8$). Job tenure for the temporaries ranged from 3 weeks to 22 years ($M = 2.3$, $SD = 3.3$). The remaining 269 employees worked on an on-going (permanent) basis with ages ranging from 18 to 65 years ($M = 40.8$, $SD = 11.2$). Job tenure for the permanents ranged from 1 month to 29 years ($M = 6.3$, $SD = 5.6$).

Measures

The questionnaire measured demographic characteristics of the respondents as well as each of the variables of interest described below. A variety of single-item measures were used to assess participants' age, gender, and organisational tenure, which were used as control measures in the analyses.

Job insecurity: Consistent with previous research (e.g., De Witt, 1999) perceived job insecurity was conceptualized as employees' belief of the likelihood of job loss. A 6-item scale assessed this variable, including two items adapted from Borg and Elizur's (1992) measure and three additional items were developed specially for the study. As well, respondents indicated the probability (on a scale of 0-100%) of retaining their job with their employer for as long as they desired. All items were reverse coded. For the other items a 7-point Likert scale, anchored from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), was used. To calculate job insecurity perceptions, all scale items were standardized to equalize the differing means and variances caused by the different widths of response formats. A high score on the scale indicates higher perceived job insecurity. Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.86.

Job Status: Job status was operationalized by having respondents indicate their employment status as either on-going or temporary.

Employability: Based on previous empirical work (viz., Kuhnert & Vance, 1992; Vance & Kuhnert, 1988), employability was conceptualized as employees' belief as to their ease of finding comparable employment in the event of job loss. Respondents indicated the probability (on a scale of 0-100%) of their finding a comparable job within 1 month of active job-seeking. Two items from the 'value of work alternatives' scale (Rusbult & Farrell, 1983), together with three items developed for this study assessed employability perceptions. Again, a 7-point Likert scale was used and the scale items standardized, prior to calculations. An internal reliability coefficient of 0.76 was obtained.

Psychological well-being: Perceptions of psychological well-being were assessed with the 12-item version of the general health questionnaire (GHQ-12) (Goldberg, 1972). The scale has proven useful as an indicator of mental health in occupational studies (Banks, Clegg, Jackson, Kemp, Stafford & Wall, 1980) and is also used in studies of job insecurity (e.g., Hellgren, Sverke, & Isaksson, 1999). Items were reverse scored so that high scores reflect better mental health. Internal consistency reliability for the scale was 0.89.

Job satisfaction: Facet-free job satisfaction was assessed using four items from Quinn and Staines' (1979, cited in Price, 1997) 5-item measure. As the response formats varied in length, responses to the scale items were standardized before a composite score was calculated. A Cronbach alpha of 0.78 was attained for this variable.

Organisation commitment: Two dimensions of organisational commitment were assessed: affective commitment (identification with, involvement in, and emotional attachment to an organisation) and continuance commitment (recognition of the costs associated with leaving an organisation) (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Based on Culpepper's (2000) recommendations, only 13 items from the original 16-item scale (Allen & Meyer, 1990) were utilized. Respondents indicated the extent of their commitment on a 7-point scale and Cronbach alphas obtained were 0.81 for affective commitment and 0.79 for continuance commitment.

Intention to turnover: Six items were used to assess respondents' intentions to resign during the next three months. Items were adapted from Hom, Griffeth, and Sellaro's (1984) test of Mobley's (1977) Model of Employee Turnover. Participants responded on a 5-point scale and a Cronbach alpha of 0.93 was obtained.

Control Variables

To rule out alternative explanations for variation in job insecurity and the outcome variables, both locus of control and negative affectivity, two characteristics previously demonstrated to influence perceived job insecurity were assessed and controlled for (Brief, Burke, George, Robinson, & Webster, 1988; Mak & Mueller, 2001).

Locus of control: Locus of control was measured with a sixteen-item scale developed specifically for use in work settings (Spector, 1988). Users of the measure are recommended to compute separate subscales for the dimensions of internality and externality (Macan, Trusty & Trimble, 1996). Equal numbers of internally and externally worded items comprise the scale. Respondents made ratings on a 7-point scale with Cronbach alphas of 0.86 for external locus of control and 0.64 for internal locus of control obtained.

Negative affect: Negative affect is a general dimension of distress and unpleasurable engagement (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). It was measured using the 13-item version Strain-Free Negative Affectivity (SFNA) scale (Fortunato & Stone-Romero, 1999). Participants responded to each item on a 6-point continuum that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.81 in the current study.

Analyses

The hypotheses were tested by hierarchical moderated regression analyses (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). The detection of moderator effects requires the use of interaction terms (the product of the independent and moderator variables) and such product terms are generally collinear with their component terms. To reduce the risk of such multicollinearity, all continuous predictor variables were mean-centred in accordance with the procedures outlined by Aiken and West (1991). To aid interpretation of the interactions, the regression results were used to plot a series of points ranging from one standard deviation below the mean to one standard deviation above the mean on the independent variables. The simple slopes generated were then tested to ascertain which, if any, were significantly different from zero. The sign of the regression coefficients for the product term indicates which job status group gave a higher score on the dependent variable. Based upon the dummy coding method used (temporaries = 0; permanents = 1), a positive coefficient means that permanents had a higher expected score on the criterion than temporaries.

Results

Table 1 summarizes the means, standard deviation, and intercorrelations of the study variables. Job status and job insecurity are unrelated ($r = -.04$, NS) consistent with the findings of De Witte and Näswall (2003). On average, temporary employees reported job insecurity at 1.41 ($SD = 0.79$) whereas the mean for permanents was 1.35 ($SD = 0.75$). This difference between the job status groups, however, was not statistically significant ($t = 0.74$, $p < .46$).

Table 1. Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of study variables

	M		SD		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	P	T	P	T												
1. Age	490	426	134	130	1	.41**	-.06	-	-.10	.17	-	-.04	.04	.08	.13	-.16
2. Tenure	76	28	67	40	.51**	1	.22*	-.17	-.10	-.02	-.34**	.05	.27**	.07	.17	-.10
3. External LOC	3.57	3.57	1.08	.98	.03	-.01	1	-.16	.15	.13	-.20*	-.18	-.08	-.12	.23*	.22*
4. Internal LOC	5.12	5.19	.73	.79	-.07	-.04	-.13*	1	-.22*	-	.29**	.46**	.32**	.34**	-.13	-
5. Negative affect	3.69	3.61	.74	.70	-.13*	-.01	.11	-.09	1	.18	-	-	-.15	-.07	.16	.14
6. Job insecurity	1.35	1.41	.75	.79	.13*	-.06	.04	-	.03	1	-.08	-	-	-	-.23*	.45**
7. Employability	2.28	2.25	.66	.67	-	-.19**	-	.24**	-.09	-	1	.14	-	-.16	-	.18
8. Psy. Well-being	3.11	3.16	.39	.42	.26**	.27**	.31**	.26**	-	.06	.08	1	.35**	.18	-.20*	-
9. Job satisfaction	2.79	2.74	.68	.72	.15*	.11	-	.38**	-.12	-	.13*	.36**	1	.53**	.23*	-
10. Affective commitment	4.63	4.33	1.12	1.16	.15*	.11	-	.42**	.01	-	.17**	.012**	.54**	1	.18	-
11. Continuance commitment	4.67	4.05	1.19	1.33	.14*	.19**	.30**	-.06	.19**	.13*	-	-.11	-.07	.04	1	-
12. Turnover intentions	1.74	2.39	.93	1.17	-	-.21**	.19**	-	.17**	.11	.07	-	-	-	-.14*	1

Note. Correlations below the diagonal are for permanent employees (P). Correlations for temporaries are above the diagonal (T).

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

For temporaries, job insecurity was significantly negatively related to psychological well-being, job satisfaction, and affective commitment; and significantly positively related to turnover intentions consistent with previous research in samples of permanent employees (Hui & Lee, 2000; O'Quin & LoTempio, 1998). For permanents, job insecurity was significantly negatively related to job satisfaction and affective commitment and significantly positively related to continuance commitment. Correlations for temporaries though were higher than those between the variables among the permanents which runs counter to the claim that the job security produces weaker reactions for temporaries than it does for permanents (Klein Hesselink & Van Vuuren, 1999).

Hypothesis 1 predicted that employability would moderate the job insecurity and work outcomes relationships. Hierarchical moderated regression analyses found that employability did not moderate these relationships in the sample. Unlike previous empirical work, (viz., Kuhnert & Vance, 1992; Vance & Kuhnert, 1988), the belief that comparable employment was easily available did not alleviate the negative effects of job insecurity.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that the relationship between job status and the work outcomes would be moderated by employability. Hierarchical moderated regression analyses found that employability did not act as a moderator in the prediction of psychological well-being, continuance commitment, or turnover intentions. For job satisfaction and affective commitment however, significant 2-way interactions were found.

Job status and employability were found to interact significantly in the prediction of job satisfaction. The overall model was significant (R^2 adj = 22.4%, $F(1, 330) = 14.17, p < .01$). Of the control variables tested in the model, three achieved significance: tenure ($\beta = .13, p < .05$), external locus of control ($\beta = -.15, p < .01$) and internal locus of control ($\beta = .39, p < .001$). Significant main effects were found for employability ($\beta = -.37, p < .001$). Results of the moderated regression analyses presented in Table 2 show that relations between employability and job satisfaction are altered depending on the respondent's job status.

Simple slope analysis indicated that when employability is high, job status influences the level of job satisfaction, such that permanents have higher job satisfaction than temporaries ($\beta = .19, t = 2.71, p < .01$), contrary to prediction. The relationship at low levels of employability shows the reverse pattern. Figure 1 shows that when employability is low, temporaries report significantly higher job satisfaction than permanents ($\beta = -.18, t = 2.45, p < .05$).

Table 2. Moderated regression analysis results predicting job satisfaction and affective commitment

Predictors	Job Satisfaction				Affective Commitment			
	β	R^2	? R^2	F change	β	R^2	? R^2	F change
Step 1 (control variables)								
Age	.07				.15*			
Tenure	.13*				.07			
External locus of control	-.15**				-.11*			
Internal locus of control	.39***				.40***			
Negative affect	-.09	.18	.18	16.77***	.04	.19	.19	16.91***
Step 2 (linear effects)								
Job Status (JS)	.01				.08			
Employability (EMP)	-.37***	.19	.01	1.87	-.25**	.19	.00	1.18
Step 3 (interaction effects)								
Job Status X EMP	-.32***	.22	.03	14.17***	.27**	.21	.02	10.58**

N = 333 * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Fig. 1

Relationship between job status and job satisfaction as a function of employability.

From the plot lines note that, of those respondents that strongly believed they could easily find comparable work (i.e., high employability), it was permanents, rather than temporaries, that were most satisfied with their jobs. Correspondingly, of those that were least confident about obtaining alternate work, it was temporaries, rather than permanents, that were most satisfied with their jobs. The graph also shows that, for permanents, employability appears to have minimal effect in how they evaluate their job satisfaction, an interpretation also supported by correlational analysis ($r = .13, p < .05$). Yet for temporaries employability did have a significant influence on their job satisfaction. Unlike permanents, temporaries' employability was *negatively* associated with job satisfaction ($r = -.26, p < .01$).

The other significant 2-way interaction ($F(1, 333) = 10.58, p < .01$) detected was in the prediction of affective commitment. The control variables accounted for 19% (adjusted) of the variance in affective commitment ($R^2 = .19, F(5, 335) = 16.91, p < .001$). Just as with the estimation for job satisfaction, the regression coefficients for external locus of control ($\beta = -.11, p < .05$) and internal locus of control ($\beta = .40, p < .001$) were significant. Age ($\beta = .15, p < .05$) also reached significance. Significant main effects were found for employability ($\beta = -.25, p < .01$). Next the two-way interactions term was added to the predictors, and the job status by employability term reached significance ($\beta = .27, p < .001$), with the full model accounting for 21.3% (adjusted) of variance in affective commitment. Table 2 presents these regression results.

Graphical representation of the interaction is shown in Figure 2. The regression lines indicate that when employability is high, permanents report higher affective commitment than temporaries ($\beta = .24, t = 3.35, p < .001$). Just as with the prediction of job satisfaction, the relationship at low levels of employability shows the reverse pattern. When employability is low, this time however, differences between the levels of affective commitment reported by temporaries and permanents are not significantly different ($\beta = -.08, NS$).

Note that the plot lines in Figure 2 bear a strong resemblance in form to those in Figure 1. So, just as highly employable permanents were more satisfied with their jobs than temporaries, so too were highly employable permanents more affectively committed than temporaries, contrary to prediction. As well, employability again correlated with affective commitment in opposite directions for permanents ($r = .17, p < .01$) and temporaries ($r = -.16, NS$). The affective commitment of temporaries and permanents not confident of alternate job opportunities though were similar.

Fig. 2

Relationship between job status and affective commitment as a function of employability.

Discussion

The current study sets out to develop a better understanding of how employability affects employee reactions to job insecurity for permanent and temporary employees. Overall, the results of this study show that temporaries and permanents experience similar levels of job insecurity. The data though suggest that threats to job security are more complex for temporaries. Temporaries were shown to differentiate between job security and employment security, whereas it appears that permanents do not.

The negative effects of job insecurity such as low job satisfaction and psychological well-being are repeatedly documented and our results do not dispel these findings (e.g., Ashford, et al., 1989; Van Vuuren, Klandermans, Jacobson & Hartley, 1991). We do however

add support to the view that job insecurity is a concern for temporaries. While our results show that the job insecurity of temporaries and permanents were similar, based on our correlational analyses temporaries were shown to have more adverse reactions to job insecurity than permanents. Our findings suggest that temporaries are not as unperturbed by job insecurity as some observers might claim (e.g., Bishop et al., 2002; Pearce, 1998). Job insecurity might be an *expected* part of temporary work (Jacobson & Hartley, 1991) but our data suggest that job insecurity is not an *accepted* part of temporary work.

Not all individuals perceive the same situation as equally threatening or challenging (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). For some employees the threat of job loss may be an acceptable risk in particular if comparable work can be found easily. Thus we argued that a belief in one's capacity to easily find alternate work would lessen the negative effects of job insecurity. Surprisingly our results did not support this argument.

We predicted that employability would moderate the negative effects of job insecurity for permanents and temporaries alike. Our data do not show such effects. One possible explanation is that job status effects confounded these relationships. Indeed the correlations between job insecurity and employability were dissimilar for temporaries ($r = -.08$, NS) and permanents ($r = -.44$, $p < .01$). Such differences suggest that permanents link high job insecurity with low employability, whereas for temporaries no such connection in made. In other words, temporaries can recognize that job security and employment security are separate concerns.

We also predicted that employability would moderate the negative effects of the job instability of being in temporary work in the prediction of work outcomes. The results show that employability had no effect on how permanents evaluate their job satisfaction or the extent of their organizational attachment. For temporaries though, employability did have a significant influence on these two outcomes. Our results suggest that temporaries less sure of their success in finding alternate employment might value their current job more highly than permanents do, since job status mobility is perceived to be more difficult for temporaries (Faber, 1999). Perhaps then, for temporaries not confident of easily finding alternate employment their current job is more "precious" to them, thereby enabling them to be more readily satisfied than dissatisfied with their current job.

Correspondingly, the results also suggest that highly employable temporaries, in contrast, are more difficult to please, since with many job alternatives their current position is less "valuable" to them. As such, these highly marketable temporaries can afford to be more discerning when evaluating how satisfied they are with their jobs. The findings also suggest that highly employable temporaries might invest less of themselves in developing an emotional attachment to their organisation, compared to equally employable permanents.

Limitations, Conclusions and Implications

The study's external validity is limited to similar organisational structures as the selected sample organisations. Further, the employment market and industrial relations context in Australia at the time the data were collected also limits the study's generalizability. In conclusion, the career context, nature of work, and employment relationship is changing for many employees. The results from this study indicate that while in many ways permanent and temporary employees experience their job similarly; there are also some differences which need consideration. For those people in temporary employment, the perception of one's own ability to find alternative employment impacted on some work attitudes. There are therefore implications for both individual and organisational career management strategies.

With the traditional expectation of a 'job for life' in decline (Allen & Henry, 1997; Kalleberg, 2000), making yourself more employable is increasingly important for individuals. Rather than accepting the anxiety of job insecurity, employees need encouragement to be proactive in managing their careers seeking employment security in preference to job security (Adkins, Werbel, & Farh, 2001; Mirvis & Hall, 1996). Workers therefore need to pursue multiple employer experiences to develop skills and marketability (Marler, Barringer, & Milkovich, 2002). Thus, future research needs to investigate what aspects contribute to feelings of employability, and how this may develop over the course of a career.

References

- Adkins, C. L., Werbel, J. D., & Farh, J.-L. (2001). A field study of job insecurity during a financial crisis. *Group & Organization Management*, 26(4), 463-483.
- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple Regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, NJ: Sage Publications.
- Allan, P., & Sienko, S. (1997). A comparison of contingent and core workers' perceptions of their jobs' characteristics and motivational properties. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, 62(3), 4-9.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.
- Aronsson, G. (1999). Contingent workers and health and safety. *Work, Employment and Society*, 13(3), 439-459.
- Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, causes, and consequences of job insecurity: a theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(4), 803-829.
- Banks, M. H., Clegg, C. W., Jackson, P. R., Kemp, N. J., Stafford, E. M., & Wall, T. D. (1980). The use of the General Health Questionnaire as an indicator of mental health in occupational studies. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53, 187-194.
- Bargal, D., Back, A., & Ariav, P. (1992). Occupational social work and prolonged job insecurity in a declining organization. *Administration in Social Work*, 16(1), 55-67.
- Barling, J., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Job insecurity and health: The moderating role of workplace control. *Stress Medicine*, 12(4), 253-259.
- Beard, K. M., & Edwards, J. R. (1995). Employees at risk: Contingent work and the psychological experience of contingent workers. In C. L. Cooper & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 2, pp. 109-126). Brisbane: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Bishop, J. W., Goldsby, M. G., & Neck, C. P. (2002). Who goes? Who cares? Who stays? Who wants to? The role of contingent workers and corporate layoff practices. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(4), 298-315.
- Blau, G. (1994). Testing a two-dimensional measure of job search behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 59(2), 288-312.
- Borg, I., & Elizur, D. (1992). Job insecurity: Correlates, moderators and measurement. *International Journal of Manpower*, 13(2), 13-26.
- Brief, A. P., Burke, M. J., George, J. M., Robinson, B. S., & Webster, J. (1988). Should negative affectivity remain an unmeasured variable in the study of job stress? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(2), 193-198.
- Burchell, B. J. (1994). The effects of labour market position, job insecurity, and unemployment on psychological health. In D. Gallie, C. March & C. Vogler (Eds.), *Social Change and the Experience of Unemployment* (pp. 188-212). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Büssing, A. (1999). Can control at work and social support moderate psychological consequences of job insecurity? Results from a quasi-experimental study in the steel industry. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(2), 219-242.
- Cappelli, P., & Sherer, P. D. (1991). The missing role of context in OB: The need for a meso-level approach. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 13, pp. 55-110). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Cavanaugh, M. A., & Noe, R. A. (1999). Antecedents and consequences of relational components of the new psychological contract. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 323-340.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioural sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Culpepper, R. A. (2000). A test of revised scales for the Meyer and Allen (1991) three-component commitment construct. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(4), 604-616.
- Davy, J. A., Kinicki, A. J., & Scheck, C. L. (1997). A test of job security's direct and mediated effects on withdrawal cognitions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(4), 323-349.
- De Witte, H. (1999). Job insecurity and psychological well-being: Review of the literature and exploration of some unresolved issues. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(2), 155-177.
- De Witte, H., & Näswall, K. (2003). 'Objective' vs 'subjective' job insecurity: Consequences of temporary work for job satisfaction and organizational commitment in four European countries. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 24(2), 149-188.
- Farber, H. S. (1999). Alternative and part-time employment arrangements as a response to job loss. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 17(4), S142-S169.
- Felstead, A., Krahn, H., & Powell, M. (1999). Young and old at risk: Comparative trends in "non-standard" patterns of employment in Canada and the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(5), 277-296.
- Forde, C. (2001). Temporary arrangements: The activities of employment agencies in the UK. *Work, Employment and Society*, 15(3), 631-644.
- Fortunato, V. J., & Stone-Romero, E. F. (1999). Taking the strain out of negative affectivity: Development and initial validation of scores on a strain-free measure of negative affectivity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 59(1), 77-97.
- Frese, M. (1989). Theoretical models of control and health. In S. L. Sauter, J. J. Hurrell Jr. & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Job Control and Worker Health* (pp. 107-128). Brisbane, QLD: John Wiley & Sons.
- Goldberg, D. (1972). *The detection of psychiatric illness by questionnaire*. London, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Greenhalgh, L., & Rosenblatt, Z. (1984). Job insecurity: Toward conceptual clarity. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(3), 438-448.
- Greenhalgh, L., & Sutton, R. I. (1991). Organizational effectiveness and job insecurity. In J. Hartley, D. Jacobson, B. Klandermans & T. Van Vuuren (Eds.), *Job Insecurity: Coping with jobs at risk* (pp. 151-171). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Halvorsen, K. (1998). Impact of re-employment on psychological distress among long-term unemployed. *Acta Sociologica*, 41(3), 227-242.

- Harris, M. M., & Greising, L. A. (1998). Contract employment as a full-time career: Implications for HRM/OB constructs. In M. A. Rahim & R. T. Golembiewski (Eds.), *Current Topics in Management* (Vol. 3, pp. 269-281). Stamford, CT: JAI Press Inc.
- Hellgren, J., Sverke, M., & Isaksson, K. (1999). A two-dimensional approach to job insecurity: Consequences for employee attitudes and well-being. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(2), 179-195.
- Hom, P. W., Griffeth, R. W., & Sellaro, C. L. (1984). The validity of Mobley's 1977 model of employee turnover. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34, 141-174.
- Hui, C., & Lee, C. (2000). Moderating effects of organization-based self-esteem on organizational uncertainty: Employee response relationships. *Journal of Management*, 26(2), 215-232.
- Jacobson, D., & Hartley, J. (1991). Mapping the context. In J. Hartley, D. Jacobson, B. Klandermans & T. Van Vuuren (Eds.), *Job Insecurity: Coping with jobs at risk* (pp. 1-22). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Kalleberg, A. L. (2000). Nonstandard employment relations: Part-time, temporary and contract work. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 341-365.
- Kinnunen, U., & Nätti, J. (1994). Job insecurity in Finland: Antecedents and consequences. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, 4(3), 297-321.
- Klein Hesselink, D. J., & Van Vuuren, T. (1999). Job flexibility and job insecurity: The Dutch case. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(2), 273-293.
- Kuhnert, K. W., & Palmer, D. R. (1991). Job security, health, and the intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics of work. *Group & Organization Studies*, 16(2), 178-192.
- Kuhnert, K. W., & Vance, R. J. (1992). Job insecurity and moderators of the relation between job insecurity and employee adjustment. In J. C. Quick, L. R. Murphy & J. J. Hurrell Jr. (Eds.), *Stress & well-being at work: Assessments and interventions for occupational mental health* (pp. 48-63). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kunda, G., Barley, S. R., & Evans, J. (2002). Why do contractors contract? The experience of highly skilled technical professionals in a contingent labor market. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 55(2), 234-261.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Macan, T. H., Trusty, M. L., & Trimble, S. K. (1996). Spector's Work Locus of Control Scale: Dimensionality and validity evidence. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56(2), 349-357.
- Mak, A. S., & Mueller, J. (2001). Negative affectivity, perceived occupational stress, and health during organisational restructuring: A follow-up study. *Psychology and Health*, 16, 125-137.
- Marler, J. H., Barringer, M. W., & Milkovich, G. T. (2002). Boundaryless and traditional contingent employees: Worlds apart. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(4), 425-453.
- Mirvis, P. H., & Hall, D. T. (1996). New organizational forms and the new career. In D. T. Hall & Associates (Eds.), *The Career is dead - Long live the career: A relational approach to careers* (pp. 72-101). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, 237-240.
- Mohr, G. B. (2000). The changing significance of different stressors after the announcement of bankruptcy: A longitudinal investigation with special emphasis on job insecurity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(3), 337-359.
- Nollen, S. D., & Axel, H. (1996). *Managing Contingent Workers: How to reap the benefits and reduce the risks*. New York, NY: Amacom.
- O'Quin, K., & LoTempio, S. (1998). Job satisfaction and intentions to turnover in human services agencies perceived as stable or nonstable. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 86, 339-344.
- Pearce, J. L. (1998). Job insecurity is important, but not for the reasons you might think: The example of contingent workers. In C. L. Cooper & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 5, pp. 31-46). Brisbane: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Polivka, A. E. (1996). A profile of contingent workers. *Monthly Labor Review*, 119(10), 10-21.
- Price, J. L. (1997). Handbook of organizational measurement. *International Journal of Manpower*, 18(4/5/6), 305-558.
- Rusbult, C. E., & Farrell, D. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The impact on job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover of variations in rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(3), 429-438.
- Spector, P. E. (1988). Development of the work locus of control scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61, 335-340.
- Van Vuuren, T., Klandermans, B., Jacobson, D., & Hartley, J. (1991). Employees' reactions to job insecurity. In J. Hartley, D. Jacobson, B. Klandermans & T. Van Vuuren (Eds.), *Job insecurity: Coping with jobs at risk* (pp. 79-103). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Vance, R. J., & Kuhnert, K. W. (1988, August). *Job insecurity and employee health*. Paper presented at the Well-being at work: Profits, programs, and prevention, Atlanta, GA.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063-1070.