

Job insecurity and commitment to change: role of employability as a moderating variable (A review)

Gafar Olanrenwaju Yusuf¹, Olufade Ireti Olusola²

¹Small and Medium Enterprises Department Administrative Staff College of Nigeria

²Management studies Department Administrative Staff College of Nigeria

Abstract: *The present study aim to review literature on the previous study on the employability as the moderating role between job insecurity and commitment to change, With an advent of information and communication technology and globalization, there is a pressing need to develop a better understanding on employability as the moderating role on the relationship between job insecurity and commitment to change. It was discovered from the review of the literature that job insecurity was found to be in connection with commitment to change, and employees who are high in employability may have more chances for gaining control over their working life doing change.*

Previous studies on employability as the moderating role on the relationship between job insecurity and commitment are the data for this present study. The conclusion garnered from the literature showed that employability plays an effective role on the relationship between job insecurity and commitment to change.

Key word: *employability, job, employee, organization*

I. Introduction

Change as a viable solution for organizational growth, survival and success in the organizational development literature, this has been supported by many considerable amount of researcher, (Lines, 2004). Constant change is needed in the organization to be able to adapt to their environment, which is a continuous threats to the organization by outwardly stick to a systems theory view, whereby a often hostile and dynamic environment poses continuous threats to organizations (Hirsch and De Soucey, 2006). By means of holding to the competition, a knowable effort on goal of change is rising in productivity and efficiency, (Burke, 2002). Bigger organizations decided to put in real rebuilding processes, which always have a definite impact on most of their employees due to little efforts in reorganizational that are usually common environment at work (Weick and Quinn, 1999).

Literature also gives proves that changes in organization, either unplanned or planned act as a way of problems to the employees due to the source that there is no certainty of connection between them regardless of whether change in the organizational is necessary for organizational growth or not. Fear of job loss between employees may lead to uncertainty in the organizational environment (Berntson et al., 2006). Most times when employees are ready to see to the organizational situation in term of changing that occur, such changes in the organization can be welcomed (Ashford, 1988), With fewer job opportunities it may be considered a threat in economies (Armknrecht and Early, 1972), and job insecurity perception. A change in the organization is an initiative necessary for the achievement of the change and employees perception toward their feeling during the change. Common important factors necessary for support for the employee in achievement of change initiatives is commitment, Herscovitch and Meyer (2002).

The present study reviews the literature by investigating the role of employability in moderating the relationship between job insecurity and commitment to change.

II. Moderating roles of employability

Employability means a self-perceived will of looking for another job on level of his or her abilities and also one common factor that are expected to motivate employees' will in dealing with change-common with uncertainty (Berntson et al., 2006). Relationship between job insecurity with different views, for example, commitment has been argued to be moderated by employability (Sverke and Hellgren, 2002). Employable persons have life satisfaction that are better off their mates with non-employability levels when witnessing more job insecurity in employability moderated association among employees and their job satisfaction, Silla et al. (2008).

In view of the changing in labor market employability is not a new phenomenon, but it has gained renewed attention (McQuaid et al., 2005). The researches on employability among persons who are more or less build in the labor market have focus directly towards interpreting employability in the phenomenon of

organizational behavior. The persons perception of his or her abilities to gain a new job and one's concerns possibilities in the labor market is been seen as the concepts of employability, (Berntson et al., 2006).

Factor related to balancing the demands for new type of work, with its personalized responsibility and improved demands for flexibility has been viewed out as a key factor of employability, (Allvin, 2004). If employability perceptions were lower job insecurity may not be as threatening with a free environment and volatile working atmosphere, which implies control for an individual perceived him- or herself as employable, (Baruch, 2001). Meanwhile, an individual with greater freedom of action provides control of being employable. Thus, individual who have a good ways believe to find different employment could decide to leave that environment for another, if a situation is perceived more negative than more positive environment. Consequently, Employees' reactions to situational factors can be altering by employability, (Allvin, 2004).

Conditions which give employees a sense of control based on change can be mitigated by the negative impacts of commitment to change on job insecurity, (Barling and Kelloway, 1996). Desired to impact on a change, in a willingway, on the environment' at a given point in time is called control (Greenberger and Strasser, 1986). Individuals' sees ways to look for alternative employment with power over change is sees as an important factor associated with employability. The individual's self-perceives of being able to look for a new job becomes necessary during the time of organizational change; this is argued by Berntson et al. (2006). Employees feel assured about their own necessity for the organization, when they feel more committed to the change direction and they were able to feel the collective gains. Desired and Willingness of an individual to adhere to a new things in the job environment and the way to which their know-how and ability can be applied outside the organization, can be suggest as perceived employability, Kluytmans and Ott (1999).

Meanwhile, Employability as moderating the impact of stress related to job insecurity, idea has being presented by a numbers of researchers (Fugate et al., 2004). When the employees feel assured about their skills and job insecurity on affective and normative commitment to change, this can be mitigated by employability. Good reactions to change even in the face of adversity, is experience in individual with high level employability, The inconvenience impact of job insecurity during the problem or unstable economic environment can shield an employee from skill to look for a new (Baruch, 2001). Employable individuals will see themselves willing of coping with difficulties in adverse environment, are expected to show lower levels of continuance commitment to change. Silla et al. (2008) says that there is an argument that suggest that negative effect of job insecurity can be reduce by employability. Perceived employability is possible to both lead to the development of positive attitudes towards commitment to change and mitigate the negative effects of stressors like job insecurity, Silla et al. (2008).

III. Commitment to change

It has becomes compulsory to know the elements that will brings development of positive attitudes and beliefs towards commitment to change, given the essentiality of getting the employee acceptance for realization of any change initiative in the organization (Cordery et al., 1993). A force (mind-set) that connects a person to a course of action deemed it compulsory for the realization of implementing of a change initiative is simply defines as commitment to change. No matter of the focus of commitment, it should show sign of the commitment phenomenon; this concept was form based on Meyer and Herscovitch's (2001) argument. Affective, continuance and normative was three dimensional types of representation to commitment to organizations. Meanwhile, commitment to change is a good motivator of individual willingness in support of change, the outcomes of both organizational commitment and commitment to change is to make employees more determined to participate in their organization's change move, (Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002).

Moreover, readiness to give support to the change initiative is based on the knowledge of goodness of the change, this is affective commitment. When persons know the benefit and what of change, this type of commitment is likely to develop. According to Herscovitch and Meyer (2002), knowledge and educating regarding the need and reason for change and the willingness to cope with these changes depend upon the affective commitment. Behavioral and Compliance support for the change initiative is being related to this type of commitment to change.

Cost-based commitment and reflects is a realization that there are costs associated with failure to provide support for the change is seen as Continuance commitment to change, (Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002). The capital put in the organization in terms of effort and time are cost elements that rely on the lack of visible alternatives. When employees feel hold in their job works, they have no time to deal successfully with the changes, either based on lack of clear-cut education on the purpose of change and outcomes of gains or the unable feeling to cope with the new ideas and change requirements. Such individual show minimal support for change because they do not relate to the change or find it useful easily to engaged themselves to the process of change because they have to do it. Successfully carrying out the change initiative in the long run may cause problem for the employees going through change in the organization (Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002).

When employees see the organization achieving its aim and objectives or accepting the psychological agreement that occurs between them, this is a kind of change that is commitment to a sense of duties to give change a support (Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002). For a successful change process normative commitment and affective commitment to change are both compliance to a behavioural support of the change, this makes this type of commitment an important prerequisite in the organization (Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002).

IV. Job insecurity

It was widely agreed in the literature in the last decade, that different functional impacts of job insecurity on several employees and organizational perspectives are known, (Cheng and Chan, 2008). Feelings of insecurity are negatively affected by a wide range of organizational behaviors and attitudes. The association between job insecurity, organizational commitment and job satisfaction is negative; this is found through several investigations, (Ashford et al., 1989). Meanwhile, work behaviors, and withdrawal intentions such as non-compliant job behaviors and proactive job search are being perceived by workers that feel their job is at risk, task avoidance, absenteeism, and tardiness, which makes them to quit the organization intentionally, (Kinnunen et al., 2003).

Employees with higher rates of job insecurity reported to have higher rates of workplace injuries and accidents because job insecurity also seems to have expected outcomes related to safety and task performance in an organization, and affect job performance (De Witte, 2006). Meanwhile, behavior towards the trade union, like trust, satisfaction, and intention to participate in union activities affect job insecurity negatively.

Moreover, higher levels of, psychological strain, poor mental health and physical complaints are consistently found to be predicted by job insecurity (Hellgren and Sverke, 2003). Similarly, lower self-esteem is associated with higher feelings of job insecurity, ruined family relationships and lower life satisfaction (Kinnunen et al., 2003).

Job insecurity is defined by some scholars as a phenomenon subjective to an overall concern about the continued availability of the job in the future (De Witte, 2006). A multidimensional approach, differentiating between different aspects of job insecurity and was also adopted by some authors, Hellgren et al. (1999) give two differentiations of job insecurity which are qualitative job insecurity and quantitative job insecurity. From their analysis, quantitative job insecurity involves worries and concerns about the loss of essential features of job, which result in insufficient development of salary, worsening of work conditions and lack of career opportunities whereas qualitative job insecurity refers to concern and worries about losing the job itself. Meanwhile, job loss fear and the job loss probability as two distinct components, pointing to a distinction between affective (i.e. fear) and cognitive (i.e. probability) job insecurity this was regarded by other authors, (De Witte, 2006).

V. The relationship between job insecurity and commitment to change

When an organization is being under a massive pressure to make a change, in the aspects of Economic incentives, restructuring, and layoff, restructuring of the organization is being used as the strategy for the solution of the organization in the condition of under performance of the organization, Beer and Nohria (2000). However, restructuring process may adversely affect the very objectives it is meant to achieve, if there is fear of the Job insecurity among employees and the uncertainty arising out of the restructuring process may not allow the organization to achieve its aim and objectives in the process because of the fear of layoffs after restructuring. Individuals employed in the public sector have restructuring more job security and long-term job more value than a higher paying one in the private sector, and changes may be more stressful for such individual, (De Witte, 2006).

Furthermore, the employee's view and analysis of the immediate work environment and feeling of motionless to maintain desired continuity in a job threatened situation, is being defined as job insecurity by (De Witte, 2006). Viewing change prospect as a threat to their work relationship, their daily routine and their financial security makes employees to feel ill at ease in the organization (De Witte, 2006). Views on a lack of control over the stressful situation are generally negative attitudes towards change (Bordia et al., 2004).

Research has shown that performance of employees and support perceived by the organization may not only have an adverse effect on job security, but also tends to increase resistance to change in an organization. It is generally accepted that an assurance of job security, may give rise to openness to change on the other hand whereas, rise to lack of flexibility which is detrimental for the organizational change process, give insecure situation of employment. Job insecurity is likely to have deleterious effects on a factor critical for the success of a change initiative due to the stressful nature of employee commitment to change (Bordia et al., 2004).

However, commitments to change have three dimensions which may relate to job insecurity differently. Organization's change initiatives are based on sense of duty towards normative commitment, but Reflections and willingness to support change because of an understanding of its intrinsic advantages is the affective commitment to change. For different reasons the perceptions on job security is expected to be negatively in to these two types of commitment to change (Bordia et al., 2004). A lower level of this form of commitment is expected to be related to job insecurity and the clarity of a given situation largely depends on affective

commitment. A clear future perspective is often based on lack of job security, and since employee perceiving is based on the employer normative commitment to change in fulfilled its obligations, and a breach of such obligations may be perceived by job insecurity, job insecurity is expected to be negatively commitment to change. Meanwhile, higher levels of continuance commitment to change are expected to be related to job insecurity, (Beer and Nohria (2000)).

VI. Conclusion

Conclusively, this studies asreviews the contribution of different scholars and researchers towards moderating role of employability on the relationship between job insecurity and commitment to change. Review of literature indicates that the moderating roles of employability have an effect on job insecurity and employee commitment to change. It was also discovered from the literatures that an excellent and effective organization begins with employee's commitment to change.

Also, it was concluded from the review of the literature that individual with high employability skill create better chances to react and have better control over job insecurity in their working life.

References

- [1]. Armknecht PA, Early JF (1972) Quits in manufacturing: A study of their causes. *Monthly Labor Review* 95: 31–37.
- [2]. Ashford SJ (1988) Individual strategies for coping with stress during organisational transitions. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 24: 19–36.
- [3]. Ashford SJ, Lee C, and Bobko P (1989) Content, causes and consequences of job insecurity: A theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management Journal* 32: 803–829.
- [4]. Barling J, Kelloway EK (1996) Job insecurity and health: The moderating role of workplace control. *Stress Medicine* 12: 253–259.
- [5]. Baruch Y (2001) Employability: A substitute for loyalty. *Human Resource Development International* 4: 543–566.
- [6]. Beer M, Nohria N (2000) Cracking the code of change. *Harvard Business Review* 78: 133–141.
- [7]. Bertson E, Sverke M, and Marklund S (2006) Predicting perceived employability: Human capital or labour market opportunities. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 27: 223–244.
- [8]. Bordia P, Hunt E, Paulsen N, Tourish D, and DiFonzo N (2004) Uncertainty during organizational change: Is it all about control? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 13: 345–365.
- [9]. Burke WW (2002) *Organization Change: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [10]. Cheng GH-L, Chan DK-S (2008) who suffers more from job insecurity? A meta-analytic review. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 57: 272–303.
- [11]. Cordery JL, Sevastos P, Mueller W, and Parker S (1993) Correlates of employee attitudes toward functional flexibility. *Human Relations* 46(6): 705–723.
- [12]. De Witte H (2006) The impact of job insecurity and contract type on attitudes, well-being and behavioral reports: A psychological contract perspective. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 79: 395–409.
- [13]. Fugate M, Kinicki AJ, and Ashforth BE (2004) Employability: A psycho-social construct, its dimensions and applications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 65: 14–38.
- [14]. Greenberger DB, Strasser S (1986) The design and development of a model of personal control in organizations. *Academy of Management Review* 11: 164–177.
- [15]. Hellgren J, Sverke M, and 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: 179–195.
- [16]. Herscovitch L, Meyer JP (2002) Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87: 474–487.
- [17]. Hirsch PM, De Soucey M (2006) Organizational restructuring and its consequences: rhetorical and structural. *Annual Review of Sociology* 32: 171–189.
- [18]. Kluytmans F, Ott M (1999) Management of employability in the Netherlands. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 8: 261–272.
- [19]. Lines R (2004) Influence of participation in strategic change: Resistance, organizational commitment and change goal achievement. *Journal of Change Management* 4: 193–215.
- [20]. Meyer JP, Herscovitch L (2001) Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review* 11: 299–326.
- [21]. Silla I, De Cuyper N, Gracia FJ, Peiró JM, and De Witte H (2008) Job insecurity and psychological well-being: Moderation by employability. *Journal of Happiness Studies*.
- [22]. Sverke M, Hellgren J (2002) The nature of job insecurity: Understanding employment uncertainty on the brink of a new millennium. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 51: 23–42.