The perception of job security varies in degree across individuals. For a variety of reasons, some individuals perceive their jobs to be more secure than others. Perception of job security has been shown to be related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This relationship was investigated. Subjects were 97 employees from 3 organizations located in the Mid-West. Subjects completed the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, and the Job Security Scale. A 3 X 3 Analysis of Variance, job satisfaction (low, medium, high) by organizational commitment (low, medium, high), was used to understand the relationship of these variables to perception of job security.

The analysis indicated the main effect for organizational commitment was significant while the main effect for job satisfaction and the interaction between the two effects failed to reach significance. There was a
positive linear relationship between perception of job security and organizational commitment. Employees were likely to have high job satisfaction if organizational commitment was high. Implications are discussed.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

During the past few years, organizations have been in the process of downsizing, merging, and restructuring. As a result, employees are no longer certain they will have jobs in the future. One's perception of job security is how stable one believes his or her job to be. An employee's perception of job security may or may not be realistic. Various factors may affect this perception: age, job satisfaction, gender, need for achievement, self-esteem, and job commitment (Ellis & Taylor, 1983; Kinicki, 1989; Parker & Chusmir, 1991). By studying the relationships between these factors, knowledge of employees' attitudes toward their jobs can be expanded.

A lack of job security can lead employees to have serious intentions to quit, reduced organizational commitment, reduced job satisfaction, and increased anxiety and stress (Ashford, Lee, & Bobko, 1989). Research has shown that employees who expect to be displaced experience higher amounts of stress than those who do not expect dismissal (Kinicki, 1985). Consequently, employees may experience more stress-related health problems and the company will incur more costs.

Perceptions of job security should also be examined for financial reasons. Employers often must pay a large part of the health-care costs of their employees (Kuhnert & Palmer,
The perception of low job security has been linked to the psychological and physical well-being of employees (Kuhnert & Palmer, 1991). In a 1989 study by Kuhnert, Sims, and Lahey, an employee's perception of job security was found to be the only work-related variable to predict overall employee health. For these reasons, it is important to study the impact and consequences of a lack of perceived job security.

This study will examine the relationship of the perception of job security to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The relationships involved have been cited by many sources as needing further research (Ashford et al., 1989; Brockner, Davy, & Carter, 1985; Davy, Kinicki, & Scheck, 1991; Kinicki, 1989; Kuhnert & Palmer, 1991). The importance of each variable will be examined.

**Perceived Job Security**

Perceived job security has been cited in the literature as being positively related to organizational commitment (Ashford et al., 1989). Job security itself may be different from an employee's perception of job security. Actual job security is whether an employee will have a job in the future. An employee's perception of job security can be influenced by a combination of many factors including rumors, the job market, the condition of the economy and organizational downsizing. Employees perceive a psychological contract with their employers that identifies
what each will do to maintain an employee/employer relationship (Buchanan, 1974). Buchanan suggested a broken psychological contract will reduce commitment. By not upholding the psychological contract, the organization reduces an employee's feelings of trust. When the organization is perceived as untrustworthy, organizational commitment is reduced and ultimately perceived job security is threatened.

Kuhnert and Palmer (1991) found "a threat of job loss is more than a financial threat, it is a threat to their (employee's) sense of identity" (p. 187). Jahoda (1982) has agreed by stating "jobs not only define what we do, but they identify who we are and our place in society" (p. 13). Jahoda (1979) discussed key functions perceived job security may fulfill. These functions are the imposing of time structure, regularly sharing experiences and contacts with people outside the family, linking a person to goals and purposes which exceed those of his or her own, defining aspects of personal status and identity, and enforcing regular activity.

A theory of job insecurity was proposed by Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984). The components of job insecurity are perceived severity of the threat to various job features (i.e., opportunities for promotion, freedom to schedule work), expectancy of the future (how likely is the event), perceived threat of the occurrence of events that would
affect total job, importance attached to these events, and powerlessness (lack of ability to counteract threats). They indicated these variables allow one to assess the amount of perceived job insecurity.

Job Security and Organizational Commitment

The psychological contract results in a tendency for employees to develop commitment to a firm. Steers (1977) found people who perceived their organization as fulfilling their psychological contract were more committed to their organizations. The aspects of organizational commitment include a belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values, a willingness to expend extra effort for the organization, and a desire to maintain membership in the organization (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). According to Steers (1977), studying organizational commitment is important because it is a better predictor of turnover than job satisfaction and it is an indicator of organizational effectiveness. In fact, many studies have reported an inverse relationship between organizational commitment and voluntary employee turnover (Angle & Perry, 1981; Koch & Steers, 1978; Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974; Steers, 1977).

Organizational commitment has been shown to be positively related to perception of job security (Ashford et al., 1989). If an employee is committed to an organization, he or she is likely to feel more secure than a less
committed employee.

Hypothesis #1 - Perceived job security will be positively related to organizational commitment.

Job Security and Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined by Umstot (1988) as "the degree of pleasurable or unpleasurable feelings that one has toward a job, or different job aspects or experiences" (p.70). It is possible job security is positively related to job satisfaction. In general, job security is cited as a source of job satisfaction (Lindstrom, 1988). A study by Khaleque and Rahman (1987) found job security to be a stronger source of job satisfaction than of job dissatisfaction. This is in keeping with Herzberg's two-factor theory that suggests factors related to the nature of the work such as job security would be associated with job satisfaction (Peterson, 1991).

Like commitment, job satisfaction is important to study because it has been consistently linked to the propensity to remain with the organization (Porter, et al., 1974). If an employee is satisfied with his or her job, he or she is more likely to feel secure.

Hypothesis #2 - Perceived job security will be positively related to job satisfaction.

Job Security and Need for Achievement

Need for achievement is the urge to improve or a desire to excel. People with a high need for achievement tend to
have a drive to attain goals and seek challenging tasks. It is estimated only 10% percent of the population has a high need for achievement (McClelland, 1976). Although the literature examining the relationship between perceived job security and need for achievement is extremely scarce, some research suggests the need for achievement is negatively correlated to job security (Parker & Chusmir, 1991). Therefore, it is hypothesized there will be a negative relationship between perception of job security and need for achievement.

Hypothesis #3 - Perceived job security will be negatively related to need for achievement.

Job Security and Self-esteem

Self-esteem, defined by Rosenberg (1965), is a positive or negative attitude towards oneself. According to Rosenberg, a person with high self-esteem considers himself or herself adequate, but not necessarily superior. In other words, he or she is self-accepting.

Unemployment has been shown to lower a person's self-esteem (Gordus, 1986). If an employee fears unemployment or has a low perception of job security, the employee's self-esteem may decrease. Consequently, it is hypothesized job security will be positively related to self-esteem. The higher the employee's perception of job security, the higher the person's self-esteem. People with less confidence are less likely to feel secure in their job. Research regarding
this relationship has been recommended by Ashford et al. (1989).

Hypothesis #4 - Perceived job security will be positively related to self-esteem.

**Job Security and Age**

The relationship between job security and age has been hypothesized to be negative (Kinicki, 1989). In the study by Kinicki, age was found to be inversely related to one aspect of job security, the expectancy of obtaining another job. When displaced, older workers encountered more psychological deterioration and financial stress than younger workers. These results contradict the findings of Kuhnert and Palmer (1991), who found older workers were relatively unaffected by perceived job security.

Hypothesis #5 - Perceived job security will be negatively related to age.

**Job Security and Gender**

The relationship between job security and gender has not been widely studied. In a study by Hackett, Mirvis, and Sales (1991), women were found to be more pessimistic about the likely effects of new technology on their job security. This may indicate that women have a lower perception of job security.

Logically, women should perceive less job security. Women are traditionally in lower level occupations, such as clerical positions, that are the first to be cut back
(Savery, 1990). As a result, it would be logical to assume women's jobs are less secure than men's jobs. Contradicting this finding, Kuhnert and Palmer (1991) found women had a higher perception of job security than men. Yet when education level, salary, and tenure were controlled, gender did not serve as a significant predictor of perceived job security. It also has been shown women tend to desire job security more than men (Savery, 1990).

Jahoda (1982) stated unemployment hits women less hard because many women have the opportunity to return to the traditional role of housewife. Men also experience a sense of failure-as-a-man, while women do not experience failure-as-a-woman (Kelvin & Jarrett, 1985). A West German study (Abraham & Houseman, 1993) indicated women blamed themselves less often than men for unemployment. In one area, missing social contacts, Abraham and Houseman (1993) found more women than men felt a psychological burden from unemployment.

Need for achievement also has been shown to be correlated with gender (Levine, Gillman, & Reis, 1982). Women who were high in need for achievement also had high self-esteem. Self-esteem had less of an influence on men's need for achievement (Heaven, 1987).

Hypothesis #6 - Perceived job security will be higher for men than for women.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Sample

Subjects were 97 employees from 3 organizations in the Mid-West. Two of these organizations were in the public sector. Sixty percent of the subjects fell within the age range of 25-44 years old. The sample consisted of 48 men, 45 women and 4 unreported. The mean educational level (for highest year completed) was 2 years of college. On average subjects had been working for the same organization for 10 years and 5 months and in their current position for 6 years and 4 months. Thirty-five subjects were in a management position, 50 were non-management and 12 unreported.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis #1 - Perceived job security will be positively related to organizational commitment.

Hypothesis #2 - Perceived job security will be positively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis #3 - Perceived job security will be negatively related to need for achievement.

Hypothesis #4 - Perceived job security will be positively related to self-esteem.

Hypothesis #5 - Perceived job security will be negatively related to age.

Hypothesis #6 - Perceived job security will be higher for men than for women.
Instruments

The following instruments were used in this study:
Rosenberg's Self-esteem Index (Rosenberg, 1965), the Job
Security Scale (Lahey & Kuhnert, 1988), the Organizational
Commitment Scale (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979), the short
form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss,
Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967), and the Manifest Needs
Questionnaire (Steers & Braunstein, 1976). The following
information will be presented for each scale: number of
items, response range, scoring, time to complete, previous
reliabilities and coefficient alpha for the present study.

Job satisfaction was assessed with the short form of
the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). It was
composed of the 20 items (from the long form) that
correlated highest with the 20 reinforcer scales in the
original MSQ development sample. Responses range from 1 to
5 with 1 = very dissatisfied and 5 = very satisfied. All 20
items are summed for a general satisfaction score. The MSQ
takes about five minutes to complete. Internal consistency
for this scale ranged from .81 to .94, with a median of .88
(Carlson, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1962). The
coefficient alpha for the present sample was .91.

Organizational commitment was assessed with the 15 item
Organizational Commitment Scale (OCQ). Subjects responded
using a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = strongly disagree and
7 = strongly agree. Items scores are summed and the mean is
derived. This questionnaire has an internal consistency of .88. The OCQ takes approximately four minutes to complete. This scale has a median coefficient alpha of .90 (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979). The coefficient alpha for the present sample was .90 which is consistent with previous research.

Self-esteem was assessed with Rosenberg's (1965) Self-Esteem Index (RSEI). RSEI is a widely used measure of overall self-esteem. The scale consisted of 10 items with a 4-point Likert scale format where 4 = strongly agree, and 1 = strongly disagree. A high score indicated high self-esteem. Scores from individual items were summed. The RSEI took approximately two to three minutes to complete. Silber and Tippett (1965) obtained a test-retest correlation of .85. The validity of the scale was also acceptable (Silber & Tippett, 1965). The coefficient alpha for the present sample was .84.

Need for achievement was assessed with the Manifest Needs Questionnaire (MNQ). The format contained 20 items evaluated on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 = never and 7 = always. Need for achievement was determined by the sum of five of the 20 items. The scale took approximately three minutes to complete. The scale has been shown to have reasonable levels of convergent and discriminant validity (Steers & Braunstein, 1976). Steers and Braunstein also reported a coefficient alpha of .66 for the need for
achievement scale. For the present sample, coefficient alpha was .88.

Perception of job security was assessed with the Job Security Scale (JSS) (Lahey & Kuhnert, 1988). This scale consisted of 38 items which measure four subscales: company concern for the individual (employees' attitudes regarding management and company policies), job permanence (beliefs about the continuity of individuals' job within the organization), job performance (workers' perceptions of the quality of their work), and company growth and stability (the financial history and future of the organization). Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale with higher values being associated with increased security. The JSS took approximately six minutes to complete. A study by Kuhnert, et al. (1989) found the scale to be highly reliable (alpha = .88 to .91). The coefficient alpha for the present sample was .92. Age was self-reported using the following three categories: 16-24, 25-44, 45-64 years. Management was self-reported with 1 = management and 2 = non-management position. Educational level was reported as the highest number of years completed.

Procedures

Questionnaires and an informed consent document (Appendix A) were distributed to the subjects by the researcher. Questionnaires were completed during working hours. The total time required to complete the
questionnaires was 20 minutes. The entire procedure including completion of questionnaires, demographics, informed consent, and questions regarding the questionnaires averaged approximately 30 minutes. The researcher collected the questionnaires and informed consent forms after the forms were completed. The informed consent forms were separated from the questionnaires as they were returned. The results of the study were posted at the organizations for employee review.

**Design**

The results were analyzed by computing a Pearson correlation coefficient for each relationship. This analysis was followed by a 3 X 3 Analysis of Variance.
Correlations among the major variables of the study were calculated. Results indicated a positive relationship between perceptions of job security and both job satisfaction ($r = .75$, $p < .01$) and organizational commitment ($r = .75$, $p < .01$). Organizational commitment was also highly correlated with job satisfaction ($r = .70$, $p < .01$). Table 1 presents these correlations including those for other variables. Table 2 presents means and standard deviations for all variables.

The first hypothesis stated perceived job security would be positively related to organizational commitment. As a result, the first hypothesis was supported. To further investigate this relationship, subjects were categorized on the basis of trichotomizing the scores on both commitment and satisfaction.

Hypothesis two stated that perceived job security would be positively related to job satisfaction. Correlations indicated job satisfaction was positively related to perception of job security ($r = .75$, $p < .01$). The main effect for job satisfaction was not significant ($F (1,77) = 1.67$, $p > .05$), but was in the predicted direction. Therefore, hypothesis two was supported, but the differences were not large enough to result in a significant main effect. Table 3 contains the means and standard
TABLE 1

Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OCQ</th>
<th>MSQ</th>
<th>JSS</th>
<th>MNQ</th>
<th>RSEI</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>GEND</th>
<th>TENJ</th>
<th>TENC</th>
<th>EDUC</th>
<th>MGMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCQ</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSQ</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNQ</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSEI</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEND</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENJ</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENC</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05  **p < .01
OCQ = Organizational Commitment Questionnaire
MSQ = Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire
JSS = Job Security Scale
MNQ = Need for Achievement Scale (Manifest Needs Questionnaire)
RSEI = Rosenberg's Self-esteem Index
AGE = 1 = low (16-24), 2 = medium (25-44), 3 = high (45-64)
GEND = 1 (male), 2 (female)
TENJ = number of months in current position
TENC = number of months with company
EDUC = highest educational level obtained
MGMT = 1 (management), 2 (non-management)
### TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCQ</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSQ</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSEI</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNQ</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENJ</td>
<td>76.40</td>
<td>62.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENC</td>
<td>125.60</td>
<td>90.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**

SD = standard deviation  
OCQ = Organizational Commitment Questionnaire  
MSQ = Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire  
JSS = Job Security Scale  
MNQ = Need for Achievement Scale (Manifest Needs Questionnaire)  
RSEI = Rosenberg's Self-esteem Index  
AGE = 1 = low (16-24), 2 = medium (25-44), 3 = high (45-64)  
TENJ = number of months in current position  
TENC = number of months with company  
EDUC = highest educational level obtained
TABLE 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Perception of Job Security by Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cut-off Scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSQ (low = 0 - 1.99)</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSQ (medium = 2.00 - 2.70)</td>
<td>2.514</td>
<td>.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSQ (high = 2.71 - 5.00)</td>
<td>2.947</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MSQ = Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire
deviations for perception of job security by job satisfaction.

A 3 X 3 ANOVA (commitment and satisfaction) with perception of job security as the dependent measure was computed. A Cochran test of homogeneity of variance indicated the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not violated ($\chi^2(11, 7) = .26491, p = .191$).

The main effect for organizational commitment was significant in the predicted direction ($F(1, 77) = 3.67, p < .01$). Simple comparisons indicated subjects with low organizational commitment had significantly lower perceptions of job security than subjects with medium commitment, who had significantly lower perceptions of job security than subjects with high commitment. Therefore, hypothesis one was clearly supported. Table 4 contains means and standard deviations for perception of job security by organizational commitment.

The interaction between job satisfaction and organizational commitment was not significant ($F(1, 77) = .69, p > .05$) although they were highly correlated ($r = .70, p < .01$). Employees were likely to have high job satisfaction if organizational commitment were high. A summary of the ANOVA analysis is presented in Table 5.

Hypothesis three stated perception of job security would be negatively related to need for achievement. Need for achievement was negatively correlated with perception of
TABLE 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Perception of Job Security by Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cut-off Scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCQ (low = 0 - 2.33)</td>
<td>1.996</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ (medium = 2.34 - 3.67)</td>
<td>2.528</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ (high = 3.68 - 5.00)</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OCQ = Organizational Commitment Questionnaire
TABLE 5

Summary of ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.030*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSQ</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCQ X MSQ</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p < .05

OCQ = Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

MSQ = Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire
job security ($r = -.27, p < .05$), thus supporting hypothesis three.

Hypothesis four stated perception of job security would be positively related to self-esteem. Self-esteem was positively correlated with perception of job security ($r = .34, p < .01$). Hence, hypothesis four was supported. Self-esteem was also positively correlated with job satisfaction ($r = .45, p < .01$), and organizational commitment ($r = .36, p < .01$).

Hypothesis five stated perception of job security would be negatively related to age. The correlation indicated a non-significant positive relationship ($r = .10, p > .05$). Hypothesis five was not supported. However, the correlation was positive rather than negative.

Hypothesis six stated perception of job security would be higher for men than for women. The correlation signified hypothesis six was supported ($r = .14, p > .05$), but this correlation was not significant.

Tenure with the company was correlated with the following variables: organizational commitment ($r = -.28, p < .01$), job satisfaction ($r = -.27, p < .05$), age ($r = .25, p < .05$), and tenure in current position ($r = .66, p < .01$). Also, organizational commitment was negatively correlated with tenure in current position ($r = -.23, p < .05$). Men had a higher level of education than women ($r = -.35, p < .01$) and more tenure with the company ($r = -.26, p < .05$).
Older employees were with the company longer ($r = .25, \ p < .05$). Employees in management positions were less likely to be satisfied ($r = .24, \ p < .05$). They obtained a higher level of education ($r = .42, \ p < .01$) and had more tenure with the company ($r = -.26, \ p < .05$).
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

The present study was an attempt to gain an understanding of the relationship of job satisfaction and organizational commitment to perceptions of job security. Hypothesis one stated perceptions of job security would be positively related to organizational commitment. Hypothesis two stated perception of job security would be positively related to job satisfaction. The results of the study support both hypotheses.

Analysis of variance results were generally consistent with previous research. Support for hypothesis one confirms previous findings by Ashford, et al. (1989) in which job insecurity was associated with a decline in organizational commitment. Employees with low organizational commitment had significantly lower perception of job security than employees with medium commitment, who had significantly lower perception of job security than employees with high commitment.

Theoretical Implications

Ashford et al. (1989) suggested an employee's commitment may be explained by the exchange theory. According to this theory an employee decides what to give a firm, in terms of effort, by examination of the psychological contract. If this contract is not fulfilled, less effort will be exerted and attachment may decrease.
Perceived job security may diminish if this attachment is broken.

Job satisfaction has been associated with a specific job environment rather than satisfaction with the organization itself. Conversely, organizational commitment is influenced directly by feelings about the organization as a whole (Mowday, et al., 1979). For example, an employee may be satisfied with the job itself and feel little commitment toward the organization. Commitment is less influenced by everyday events than is job satisfaction. Organizational commitment is more global, reflecting a general attitude. Perception of job security is also less influenced by daily events.

Although job satisfaction and organizational commitment were significantly correlated, the fact there was no interaction between these two variables and perception of job security is not surprising. Since job satisfaction focuses on the tasks of a job and commitment and perception of job security focus on global attitudes toward the organization as a whole, job satisfaction is not measuring the same dimension. Future research might include measures of job commitment and job satisfaction.

While a review of the literature suggested some of the same factors that influence job satisfaction influence organizational commitment, perception of job security (in this study) was not an influential factor. Additional
research on possible predictors of perception of job security is necessary to help understand what might enhance an employee's perception of job security.

Hypothesis 3 stated perceived job security would be negatively related to need for achievement. The correlation indicated support for this relationship. An employee who has a high need for achievement may believe he or she has not accomplished enough to make his or her current position with the company secure.

Hypothesis 4 stated perceived job security would be positively related to self-esteem. Results indicated a positive relationship. Therefore hypothesis 4 was supported. This relationship may exist because an employee with high self-esteem may believe he or she is worthy of the position he or she holds.

Hypothesis 5 stated perceived job security would be negatively related to age. The correlation indicated a weak positive relationship. This relationship could be explained by the number of older employees with long tenure with the organization. Although age has been found to be inversely related to expectancy of finding another job (Kinicki, 1989), the older employees may have felt so secure with the organization that they were not seriously considering the prospect of finding another job. As a result, the older employees had a relatively high perceptions of job security.

Hypothesis 6 stated perceived job security would be
higher in men than for women. The correlation indicated equal job security.

Research Implications

A limitation of this study is the sample size. Suggestions for future research include using private sector employees. The majority of the sample, 85 out of 97 subjects, were taken from public sector employees. Future research could sample employees from private industry and compare the results to the public sector. At the time of the administration of questionnaires, employees in one organization (n = 26) were anticipating elections and possible restructuring. Although the public's perception is public organizations are more stable than private organizations, the upcoming election may have led to instability, and as a result, decreased perception of job security. Also, comparing union to non-union employees would be interesting. Unions also tend to give employees a sense of stability. It could be expected that union members would perceive higher job security than non-union members.

A second potential shortcoming of this research is all measures are based on employees' self-reports. In order to verify the current results, the study needs to be replicated in other settings. Also, each variable was assessed with a single measure. Multiple measures of each variable would increase the certainty in the pattern of results.
Practical Implications

Efforts to increase perceptions of job security are important because perceived job security has been linked to turnover and intentions to leave the organization (Steers, 1977; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). This study has shown support for a positive relationship between perception of job security and organizational commitment. This research helps clarify the relationship between an employee's perception of job security and organizational commitment. As Steers (1977) has suggested, increased commitment leads to a more stable workforce. If organizational commitment can be increased, so might one's perception of job security and the benefits which accompany high job security.
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Appendix A

Informed Consent Document
The Division of Psychology and Special Education at Emporia State University supports the practice of protection of human subjects participating in research and related activities. The following information is provided so that you can decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time, and that if you do withdraw from the study, you will not be subjected to reprimand or any other form of reproach. The results of the study will be kept confidential.

The present study requires subjects to complete six questionnaires. The topics covered in these questionnaires are job satisfaction, perception of job security, organizational commitment, self-esteem, and need for achievement. The subject's age, gender, number of years with company, and job level is also requested. Please direct any questions to Kimberly Gehrke at (316) 341-9851.

"I have read the above statement and have been fully advised of the procedures to be used in this project. I have been given sufficient opportunity to ask any questions I had concerning the procedures and possible risks involved. I understand the potential risks involved and I assume them voluntarily. I likewise understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time without being subjected to reproach."
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