The Effects of Job Insecurity on Job Satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Deviant Behavior, and Negative Emotions of Employees

Abstract: This research examines the effects of job insecurity on three outcomes: job attitudes (satisfaction), work behaviors (organizational citizenship behavior and deviant behavior), and negative emotions (anxiety, anger, and burnout). A total of 320 U.S. managers responded to a self-report electronic survey. Additionally, two independent referees have analyzed and rated a subset of the sample of managers’ (N = 97) comments over an electronic discussion group about their job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and deviant behavior. Analyses of both sets of data show that job insecurity is negatively related to satisfaction and that job insecurity has both direct and indirect effects on work behaviors and emotions. We address these results in the context of growing pressures on business to improve efficiencies through human capital reductions bearing in mind the trade-offs.
that businesses must anticipate as employees respond to job insecurity in ways that are counterproductive to organizational purpose.

The perception of having a job but not knowing whether it is secure has been classified as one of the more stressful burdens that an employee can shoulder (Hartley et al. 1991; Ironson 1992). Yet competitive pressure on businesses to rationalize their procedures and personnel is making job insecurity increasingly common. Each year, over 1 million U.S. workers are eliminated from positions during mass layoffs that help firms become more efficient by reducing payroll costs (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2008). In this research, we examine how job insecurity influences employee job attitudes, the enactment of positive and negative work behaviors, and negative emotions.

The aims here are threefold. First, we provide empirical evidence showing how job insecurity affects organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and deviant behavior—a link that has received limited examination in the past. By simultaneously testing OCB and deviant behavior, we can arrive at a fuller picture of the degree to which the direction of reactions to job insecurity is consistent.

Second, we utilize multiple methods of data collection to mitigate problems associated with response biases that are common to perceptual data research. Last, we suggest practical implications about employing managers who are experiencing job insecurity. Our expectation is that an employee performing more of the positive sorts of behavior such as OCB would also perform less of the deviant behavior.

**Concept of job insecurity**

Job insecurity has been conceptualized and defined in a number of ways. Some view it as a function of objective circumstances such as contract work that carries a specified term of service (Bordia et al. 2004; Pearce 1998). Still many others regard job insecurity as a perceptual phenomenon that varies in intensity even when employees are confronted by identical job threats (Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt 1984, Hartley et al. 1991). The scope and dimensions of job insecurity have also been debated, some viewing it as a threat to a range of job features such as freedom to schedule work or access to job resources (Ashford, Lee, and Bobko 1989; Blau et al. 2004; Lee, Bobko, and Chen 2006), while others have constrained the meaning of job insecurity to the job itself (Caplan et al. 1975).

In line with general conceptualizations, Ransome (1998, 47) suggests that job insecurity draws its meaning from the importance of work in contemporary society given that it is fundamentally linked to material and psychological
Consequences of job insecurity

We draw on a recent meta-analysis of more than 70 published job insecurity studies including over 38,000 respondents that found that job insecurity is significantly and negatively related to job and organizational attitudes, to mental and physical health, and has a negative effect on work performance (Sverke, Hellgren, and Näswall 2002). For example, the corrected correlation between job insecurity and job satisfaction was $r = -.41$. In addition, the same meta-analysis observed negative relationships between job insecurity and job involvement ($r = -.37$, $k = 4$), organizational commitment ($r = -.41$, $k = 30$), trust ($r = -.50$, $k = 8$), mental health ($r = -.24$, $k = 37$), and performance ($r = -.20$, $k = 12$), and a positive relationship with turnover intentions ($r = .28$, $k = 26$).

While several of our hypotheses have been tested in prior research, the current research adds to the literature in at least two unique ways. First, the relationship between job insecurity and OCB and deviant behavior has not been thoroughly examined, and results thus far have been inconsistent. For example, Feather and Rauter (2004) found that job insecurity was related to higher levels of OCB, whereas Bultena (1998) found the opposite to be true. Our research adds to that growing body of literature by testing a more complex model of the relationships between job insecurity and these outcome variables. Rather than simply investigating correlates of job insecurity, we test both direct and mediating effects of job insecurity on these variables. As a result, our data may shed some light on why earlier research found apparently contradictory results.

A second advantage of the current research is gained through the use of both self-report and independent assessments of employee levels of job satisfaction, OCB, and deviant behavior. The variables included in our study and the relationships among them are presented in Figure 1.

Job satisfaction is one of the most commonly researched attitudinal outcomes of job insecurity (Sverke, Hellgren, and Näswall 2006). Job satisfaction is an emotional state resulting from the evaluation or appraisal of one’s job experiences (Locke 1976). The relationship between job insecurity and job satisfaction is understandable because jobs provide numerous sources of satisfaction. We suggest that the job as a unit of analysis best expresses the notion of fulfilling survival needs via the income that a job generates, whereas insecurity over loss of valued job features is more akin to fulfilling human wants. Thus, we regard job insecurity as an individual-level perception specific to job loss and define it as the perceived stability and continuance of one’s employment with an organization (Probst 2003).
satisfaction such as economic stability, social contacts, and self-efficacy (De Witte 1999). Prior research has already shown that job insecurity is directly related to lower job satisfaction (Ashford, Lee, and Bobko 1989). Job insecurity is the general perception of job continuation; job satisfaction is the general favorable view of the overall job. We expect the same pattern of evidence in this research. Thus, we hypothesize that:

**Hypothesis 1: Job insecurity is negatively related to job satisfaction.**

Although we are not providing a test of causal relationships, we reason that job insecurity will primarily influence employee attitudes about their jobs (e.g., job satisfaction), whereas behaviors and certain affective responses occur as a consequence of job satisfaction. We base this assumption on Sverke, Hellgren, and Näswall (2002), who conjecture that the effects of job insecurity may be categorized as immediate and long-term. Job attitudes, such as job satisfaction are short-term consequences, whereas behavioral responses are long-term effects. Researchers have shown that job insecurity should arouse stronger emotional and physiological effects the longer it endures (De Witte 1999; Ferrie et al. 1998). Given the timing of effects described in theory and

---

**Figure 1.** Proposed model of the effects of job insecurity on satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, deviant behavior, and emotions ($N = 320$)
demonstrated in evidence, we expect that the influence of job insecurity will be manifested first on job satisfaction, which will then act as a mediator of subsequent long-term effects. Therefore, our second hypothesis is:

**Hypothesis 2: Job satisfaction mediates the effect of job insecurity on organizational citizenship behavior.**

Our third and fourth hypotheses predict that the indirect negative effects of job insecurity should decrease the performance of behaviors valued by the organization and increase behaviors that are counterproductive to the organization. Our rationale for this expectation is grounded in exchange theories, which hold that employees who experience job satisfaction are likely to reciprocate through behaviors that contribute to the organization (Barnard 1938; Mount, Illies, and Johnson 2006; Rousseau 1995), and by contrast, perform behaviors that detract from the organization when they are dissatisfied (Dalal 2005). We selected OCB as an example of valued behaviors, which is defined as individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ 1988). Examples include sharing ideas with coworkers or belonging to outside groups to benefit the organization (Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch 1994).

Few studies have linked job insecurity to OCB. Recent evidence suggests that OCB may increase in response to job insecurity and that this may be particularly true if employees have a contingent (e.g., contract) employment relationship with their organization. Reducing discretionary inputs such as OCB is a form of behavioral withdrawal over which employees have control and face limited accountability. The same is less true of task behaviors for which there are stated goals and performance metrics. The notion of withholding inputs such as OCB is consistent with the inducements-contributions principle of March and Simon’s work (1958) as well as reactions to inequity (Adams 1965). Thus, we hypothesize that job insecurity will have an indirect negative affect on OCB via a decrease in job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 3: Lower levels of job satisfaction are related to decreased enactment of organizational citizenship behaviors.**

We also investigated deviant behavior, which is defined as voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and, in doing so, threatens the well-being of the organization or its members, or both (Bennett and Robinson 2000). To the best of our knowledge, there has been no examination of the relationship between job insecurity and deviant behavior using job satisfaction as a mediating variable. Evidence from an earlier study found a positive correlation of .34 between job insecurity and deviant behavior (Lim 1996).
Recently, Robinson and Bennett (1995) distinguished between deviant behaviors that are organization-directed (e.g., stealing money from a cash register) versus those that are individual directed (e.g., stealing money from a coworker). In this article, we focus on deviant behavior that affects the organization as opposed to individuals. Deviant behavior is discretionary and counterproductive and is thought to be a reaction to employee perceptions of injustice and/or dissatisfactions as well as other factors (Bennett and Robinson 2000). Employees who perform deviant behavior are retaliating “against dissatisfying conditions and unjust workplaces by engaging in behavior that harms the organization and/or other employees” (Dalal 2005, 1243). Accordingly, our fourth hypothesis follows:

**Hypothesis 4:** Job dissatisfaction is positively related to deviant behavior.

Our final hypotheses examine affective responses to job insecurity. As noted recently, “most studies that have examined the effects of self-reported job insecurity on health have documented consistent adverse effects on measures of psychological morbidity” (Ferrie et al. 2005, 1593). In this study, we expect that satisfaction will also mediate the effect of job insecurity on anxiety, anger, and burnout.

As mentioned earlier, job insecurity is an added cognitive burden for employees. They have yet to be let go but are thinking about it while still being required to do their jobs. It is this enduring and uncertain set of conditions that may tend to heighten stress and susceptibility to negative emotions (Roskies and Louis-Guerin 1990; Strazdins et al. 2004). Therefore, our fifth hypothesis is:

**Hypothesis 5:** Job satisfaction mediates the effect of job insecurity on anxiety, such that dissatisfaction resulting from insecurity results in higher anxiety levels.

Job insecurity is threatening to individuals because it is the anticipation of an involuntary job change. Whether severance results or not, the employee is likely to feel angry about the change as has been suggested in the literature addressing psychological contract violations (Rousseau 1995). Our expectation of anger reactions is further grounded in empirical evidence that negatively associates job satisfaction and anger (Chen and Spector 1991). Thus, our sixth hypothesis states that:

**Hypothesis 6:** Job satisfaction mediates the effect of job insecurity on anger, such that dissatisfaction resulting from insecurity results in higher anger levels.

Our final hypothesis looks at burnout, which is defined as the feeling of
being extended beyond one’s resources (Maslach and Jackson 1986). Burnout represents a state of emotional exhaustion toward work comprising negative feelings that generalize to the organization, its members, and to the tasks for which one is responsible. In the context of job insecurity research, burnout has been found to be a consequence of long-term uncertainties associated with job insecurity (Dekker and Schaufeli 1995). As already indicated, the negative influence of job insecurity appears to intensify over time. This means that individuals who are confronted by job insecurity experience stress that has the effect of wearing them down, eventually draining them of energy. Consequently, our final hypothesis is:

_Hypothesis 7: Job satisfaction mediates the effect of job insecurity on burnout, such that dissatisfaction resulting from insecurity results in higher burnout levels._

**Methods**

**Participants and procedure**

Data collection was conducted in the spring of 2006 as part of a program of study for part-time MBAs attending graduate schools in the Southwest and West Coast of the United States. All respondents \((N = 320)\) were assured of confidentiality, could skip survey items or sections if uncomfortable, and received course credit for participating. We chose part-time MBAs because they work during the day and attend school at night.

The participants were working professionals averaging 35.7 years old. Sixty-six percent of the respondents were male (210) and 34 percent were female (110). On average, the participants worked 43.5 hours per week and had been employed by their present firm for an average of 4.28 years.

**Self-report measures**

Participants completed an electronic self-report questionnaire that included the main variables in the research along with demographic information. All items were presented using a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” Item responses were coded such that higher numbers reflect higher levels of the variables described below.

*Job insecurity.* Job insecurity was measured with five items from a global measure of job insecurity developed by Francis and Barling (2005). The
coefficient alpha reliability in the current research was .80. A sample item is “I am afraid I may lose my current job.”

**Job satisfaction.** Four items were drawn from Judge, Scott, and Ilies (2006) performance in the market scale. The reliability as measured by coefficient alpha in the current research was .92. A sample item is “I am enthusiastic about my work.”

**Organizational citizenship behavior.** Three items from the OCB scale developed by Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994) were used. A sample item is “I share ideas for new projects or improvements widely.” The reliability as measured by coefficient alpha in the current research was .69.

**Deviant behavior.** The four items used for this variable originated with Bennett and Robinson (2000). A sample item is “I come in late to work without permission if I feel like it.” The reliability as measured by coefficient alpha in the current research was .80.

**Anxiety, anger, and burnout.** Emotional reactions were measured by single items (Caplan et al. 1975). Subjects were prompted to rate three emotions (anxious, angry, and burned out by work) with the statement: “At work these days more than in the past, I have felt . . .”

**Independent measures**

This study is unique in that it employs both self-reported and independent measures of the outcomes. This reduces the potential effects of common method variance, which has been a frequent problem with earlier studies of outcomes of job insecurity (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Podsakoff 2003). Of the 320 students, 97 participated in electronic discussion groups as part of a required class project. The other 223 students did not attend this specific course that utilized e-discussion groups and therefore did not provide relevant data for these subsequent analyses.

**Analyses**

Two analyses were conducted to test the study’s hypotheses. The first analyzed all 320 participants using structural equation. Using AMOS 6.0 (Arbuckle 2005), we followed the two-step data analyzes process recommended by Anderson and Gerbing (1988) in which the measurement model was first fit to the data followed by the structural model developed from the study’s hypotheses shown in Figure 1. Additionally, to test the extent to which the effects of job
insecurity were fully mediated by job satisfaction, two additional alternative models were tested: the first (Alternate Model 1) allowed for only direct effects of job insecurity on the outcome variables (i.e., nonmediation model), whereas the second (Alternate Model 2) allowed both indirect (i.e., mediated) effects as well as direct effects of job insecurity on the outcomes. Because models with more freed paths would have better fit statistics, a sequential chi-square was computed to assess whether any improvement in fit was statistically significant (i.e., not merely due to additional freed paths).

In the second analysis, we performed a content analysis of a subset ($N = 97$) of the participants ratings of job satisfaction, OCBs, and deviant behavior. Each rater independently assessed a total of 910 participant comments on each of the four dimensions (relevance, job satisfaction, OCBs, and deviant behavior). In other words, each rater independently made 3,640 ratings (i.e., 910 comments $\times$ 4 dimensions).

Results indicate that the raters exhibited a high degree of agreement with respect to whether particular participant’s comments were relevant to the study (percent agreement = .96). The percent agreement for job satisfaction ratings was .68. Finally, the percent agreements for OCBs and for deviant behavior were .67 and .97, respectively. In the third set of analyses, regression was used to determine the extent to which the self-reported measure of job insecurity predicted the independently rated measure of job satisfaction and the extent to which job satisfaction in turn predicted OCBs and deviant behavior. It should also be noted that due to the small sample size for which ratings were available, as a result, we primarily relied upon measures of effect size rather than $p$-values when interpreting the regression results.

**Results**

Table 1 provides the zero-order correlations among the self-reported measures, along with descriptive statistics and scale alpha coefficients. As expected, job insecurity was negatively related to job satisfaction, and job satisfaction was positively related to OCBs, but negatively related to deviant behavior and anxiety, anger, and burnout.

**Structural equation modeling results**

Table 2 presents the fit statistics for the measurement, structural, and two alternate models. As can be seen, the fit statistics from the test of the measurement model indicate a very good fit and provide support for the construct validity of the instruments used in the study. Given these results, we next turned to the proposed and alternate structural models.
Table 1  
**Descriptive statistics, scale reliabilities, and inter-item correlations between job insecurity and variables in the study (N = 320)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job insecurity</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>−.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OCB</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>−.25**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Deviant behavior</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>−.18**</td>
<td>−.21**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Anxiety</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>−.31**</td>
<td>−.18**</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Anger</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>−.54**</td>
<td>−.26**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Burnout</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>−.43**</td>
<td>−.12*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01.
As shown in Table 2, while the fit of all the structural models was quite good, Alternate Model 2 offered the best fit compared to both the Proposed Model ($\chi^2_{\text{seq}}(5) = 23.10, p < .01$) and Alternate Model 1 ($\chi^2_{\text{seq}}(1) = 17.80, p < .01$). This suggests that the best model is the one that allows for both direct and mediated effects of job insecurity on our outcomes of interest. Therefore, the results of our original hypotheses are later discussed in light of these findings. Path coefficients from Alternate Model 2 can be seen in Figure 2.

As predicted by H1, job insecurity was negatively related to job satisfaction (path coefficient = −.25). H2 through H7 predicted that the effects of job insecurity on organizational outcomes would be fully mediated by job satisfaction. However, because Alternate Model 2 (which also allowed direct effects of job insecurity on the outcomes) was shown to have statistically improved fit over the fully mediated model, it appears that job satisfaction only partially mediated the effects of job insecurity and that direct effects must be taken into account as well. Specifically, both job satisfaction (.42)

**Figure 2.** An alternate model: direct and mediated effects of job insecurity on satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, deviant behavior, and emotions ($N = 320$)

Standardized solution (maximum likelihood estimates) for the mediated affects of job insecurity on outcomes ($N = 320$)

Paths indicate standardized betas
Betas of .11 or higher are significant at $p < .01$
Fit indices are: $\chi^2 = 162.4, p = .01; \text{NFI} = .94; \text{CFI} = .97; \text{RMSEA} = .05$
and job insecurity (−.15) were significant predictors of OCBs. In addition, job insecurity and job satisfaction both predicted anxiety (.18 and −.28, respectively), anger (.16 and −.51, respectively), and deviant organizational behaviors (.11 and −.26, respectively). However, only job satisfaction predicted burnout (−.43).

**Regression analysis results**

The regression analysis indicated that self-report job insecurity perceptions were negatively related to independent ratings of job satisfaction ($\beta = −.11$) accounting for 1.3 percent of the variance in job satisfaction ratings. Independent ratings of job satisfaction were positively associated with OCBs ($\beta = .34$) accounting for 12 percent of the variance and negatively related to deviant behavior ($\beta = −.17$) accounting for 3 percent of the variance. Notably, these beta-weights are consistent in size and direction with the path coefficients from the initial SEM analyses that relied solely on self-report measures.

**Discussion**

This article tested a model of the effects of job insecurity on job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, deviant behavior, anxiety, anger, and burnout. We hypothesized that the effects of job insecurity on the outcomes would be mediated by job satisfaction. The model tests largely supported the hypotheses in the study. We found that job insecurity is negatively related to job satisfaction and that job satisfaction partially mediates the effects of job insecurity on the outcomes we investigated. However, our alternative model that also fitted direct paths from job insecurity to the dependent variables better fit the data than our original hypothesized structural model (see Table 2). This suggests that there are important direct effects of job insecurity on the outcome variables, in addition to those effects mediated by job satisfaction.
Theoretical implications

The model we tested replicated known relationships between job insecurity and job satisfaction (Sverke, Hellgren, and Näswall 2002) and between job insecurity and negative emotions: anger, anxiety, and burnout (Dekker and Schaufeli 1995; Roskies and Louis-Guerin 1990; Rousseau 1995; Strazdins et al. 2004). We also simultaneously examined two related but distinct sets of withdrawal behaviors: organizational citizenship behavior and deviant behavior.

Beginning with the unique contribution of this research, we found that job insecurity was viewed by our sample of managers as a source of dissatisfaction, and this was associated with deviant behaviors such as less effort on the job, working more slowly, taking longer breaks than permitted, and coming in later than allowed. As pointed out by Dalal (2005) and Harrison, Newman, and Roth (2006), deviant behavior signals a progression of attitudinal withdrawal that becomes behaviorally manifest as employees cut back on discretionary inputs into the organization. This result is a central theme of equity theory, which emphasizes the human motivation to achieve fairness in exchange (Adams 1965).

We speculate that employees perform deviant behavior as an equity adjustment because the costs to them are violation of organizational norms, which are, by definition, less formal than rules. Consequently, the deviant behaviors we examined are largely discretionary outcomes as opposed to behaviors on tasks or goals for which formal scrutiny increases the cost to employees who willfully underperform.

We also hypothesized and found support for the negative relationship between job insecurity and organizational citizenship behavior. This effect is both direct and indirect through job satisfaction and is consistent with earlier findings of research conducted with contract and permanent teachers (Feather and Rauter 2004). Like permanent teachers who reduced their OCBs when faced with job insecurity, our managers (also permanent employees), reduced their OCBs as their job insecurity increased. They are not required to perform OCBs so these behaviors appear to diminish in the presence of job insecurity perceptions.

These results fit a pattern of evidence from research conducted recently in China that compared employee responses to job insecurity in state-owned enterprises and private joint ventures (Wong et al. 2005). In that study, job insecurity was found to be negatively associated with OCBs in the private joint ventures and positively associated with OCBs in the state-owned enterprises (SOEs). The authors interpreted this apparently mixed set of findings via an integration of rational choice theory and social exchange theory. Job context,
they reasoned, determines the explanatory strength of the theory. In the private joint ventures, they argued that employees were guided by relational attachments to their employers and job insecurity perceptions represent a violation of trust, which prefigures a reduction in OCBs.

However, in the SOEs, employees were guided by rational choices because job insecurity was not provided. SOE employee behavior was predicted by the transactional benefits they received. These economic exchanges served as the driver of employee attachment, and they were sufficient to increase OCBs even when their employment situation was insecure. One must take into account how job insecurity affects the employee’s job satisfaction and whether the enactment of OCBs or deviant behavior will serve to potentially adapt to the original stressor (i.e., job insecurity) or not. Taken in full, the significance of our evidence supports a consistent view of discretionary behavioral reactions to job insecurity. Our managers reported doing more of the things that detract from organizational purpose (deviant behavior) and less of the things that positively support organizational purpose (OCBs). This was consistent across behaviors and affective responses, anxiety and anger. The fact that we found a nonsignificant effect on burnout may be attributable to the research design, which was cross-sectional and thereby limited our ability to understand the actual extent of burnout, which occurs after an extensive period of strain. Model 2 brings together the effects of job insecurity in both mediating and direct fashion demonstrating the impact upon job satisfaction as well as direct affects on our outcomes.

**Limitations and future research**

Because this research relies on cross-sectional data, conclusions are not possible regarding the causal nature of our research model. Future researchers should consider longitudinal research designs to address this shortcoming. Such an approach would greatly aid our understanding of the job insecurity process, particularly in light of the fact that behavioral reactions to job insecurity are likely to unfold over time as employees gauge and react to their job threat.

Further, this research makes a fairly general statement about outcomes of job insecurity as the sample comprised subjects from many different firms. It would be useful to offer greater contextual understanding of the job insecurity-outcomes process. For example, we may suspect that managers with strong leadership skills who are included in high-level managerial networks are going to see more of what is happening and be well-positioned to avoid job threats (Rosenblatt and Schaeffer 2001). Thus, the effects we observed in this study may not apply to all managers.
The practical implication of this research is that job insecurity acts as a clear source of job dissatisfaction and negative emotions, and is associated with a pattern of discretionary withdrawal behaviors that is evident in reduced positive inputs (OCB) and increased negative inputs (deviant behavior). Because this research is the first to measure OCB and deviant behavior simultaneously, it is not established what may act to moderate the effects. We can speculate on the basis of information-seeking research (see Brockner et al. 1990) that managers will react poorly to uncertainty given job threats and that it is advisable to mitigate negative reactions by offering clear statements from the senior most officers of the firm about what is to be expected. Short of this, the current research serves notice that job insecurity perceptions continue to have strong negative associations with outcomes that are counterproductive to organizational purpose.
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