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ABSTRACT

Job insecurity is growing around the world, with employees staying at their jobs for shorter durations and part-time, contract, and even extremely short-term “gig” work becoming increasingly common. Job insecurity has been linked with several undesirable outcomes for both the individual and the organization, such as higher levels of employee burnout and increased turnover. This thesis seeks to extend the job insecurity literature by treating job insecurity as a demand within the Job Demands-Resources model, with perceived organizational support (POS) as its resource opposite. In addition, I utilized data collected in both the United States and China, providing insights into how job insecurity’s effects may differ cross-culturally. Results from this study showed that job insecurity had a direct relationship with turnover intentions in the Chinese sample and POS had a direct relationship in the American sample, suggesting cultural differences do exist regarding experiences of job insecurity. Implications for future research and practice are also discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

Job insecurity is a rising threat to worker health and well-being around the world. Exact definitions of job insecurity have differed somewhat over the past three decades of research on the topic (Shoss, 2017), ranging from powerlessness over continuing one’s job (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984) to more modern conceptualizations of perceived threats or risks to one’s job (Schreurs, Van Emmerik, Günter, & Germeys, 2012; Vander Elst, De Cuyper, Baillien, Niesen, & De Witte, 2016). Fundamentally, job insecurity is the realization that one’s job is in danger. This can further be broken down into quantitative and qualitative job insecurity, which is whether one’s job as a whole is threatened or whether certain aspects of the job are in danger, thus hampering the individual’s work quality (Shoss, 2017). However, it is entirely possible to consider both aspects of job insecurity together as a global construct (Shoss, 2017), which is the perspective I will be taking for the purposes of this proposal.

In the United States, increasingly prevalent changes to the employment relationship, such as temporary or contract work, as well as downsizing and outsourcing of jobs to other countries has led to a dramatic increase of workers experiencing job insecurity (Benach et al., 2014). In downsizing or organizational restructuring situations, which are on the rise all over the world (Datta & Basuil, 2015), survivors of layoffs experience heightened perceptions of job insecurity alongside lowered trust and organizational commitment (Ugboro, 2016). The extreme end of “precarious” employment has been characterized as the “gig economy,” in which workers engage in extremely short-term contracts with their employers, such as companies like Uber and
Taskrabbit (Sinclair, Morgan, & Johnson, Forthcoming). However, these alternative work arrangements are often entered into voluntarily due to employees desiring the increased flexibility they offer (Spreitzer, Cameron, & Garrett, 2017). As a result, employees with insecure jobs may not necessarily experience job insecurity from a psychological perspective, as their precarious employment may be a personal choice and not necessarily a source of stress or tension.

Job insecurity is a subjective experience, as it manifests as a concern over the future of one’s job (Cheng & Chan, 2008), meaning that it relies on perceptions about the future, and that two employees in the same situation may experience job insecurity quite differently. These differences can manifest either as antecedents or as moderators to job insecurity’s outcomes. These moderators can be vulnerabilities, such as income insecurity or work as a source of self-esteem, or as threats, such as perceived situational control (Shoss, 2017). The negative outcomes of job insecurity have been well documented, including worsened health/well-being, lowered job satisfaction, lowered organizational commitment, worsened job performance, and increased intent to turn over (Cheng & Chan, 2008; Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002).

In the People’s Republic of China (PRC), similar changes in the nature of work are occurring, but stemming from a dramatically different source. The PRC has been historically a centralized, planned economy, with the government acting as manager to all enterprises within the country, also guaranteeing lifetime jobs to all employees throughout the country (Child, 1994). However, in recent years, a shift has been occurring, in which enterprises are becoming more decentralized and autonomous. As a
side effect, an increasing number of Chinese workers are temporary or contract, leading to more prevalent job insecurity (Lee, Bobko, & Chen, 2006). This job insecurity may lead to worse outcomes in China compared to many western countries such as the United States, as the culture tends towards collectivism (See “Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Job Insecurity” for more on individualism/collectivism as a construct).

**Job Insecurity and the Job Demands-Resources Model**

The Job Demands-Resources model is one theoretical framework through which job insecurity has been infrequently examined (Mauno, Kinnunen, & Ruokolainen, 2007) and represents a promising framework through which to view the effects of job insecurity on individual and organizational outcomes (Schaufeli, 2016). Job demands can be conceptualized as any job aspect that requires physical or psychological effort and thus incurs certain costs, whereas job resources can be defined as any aspect of the job that help one achieve work goals, reduce demands/costs, and/or stimulate personal growth (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). In this model, the demands of a job interact with the resources available to a worker which lead to motivation and strain for/on the employee, which in turn determine various organizational outcomes, such as performance, health and well-being, or turnover (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

Although originally intended as an explanation for burnout (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), the JD-R model has since been expanded and can be used as an explanation for a wide variety of organizational phenomena. However, research has not yet fully attempted to integrate the job insecurity literature with the JD-R model. Previous research has
argued that contextual factors, such as job insecurity in the workplace could be treated as challenges for employees, similarly to a job demand, but this hypothesis has not been extensively tested (Lu, Wang, Lu, Du, & Bakker 2014). Schaufeli (2014) argues that viewing job insecurity in this way could allow for better integration of it as a job demand. Supporting this idea, research treating it as a demand has shown that burnout does mediate the effects of job insecurity on outcomes such as turnover intentions (Hu & Schaufeli, 2011). This integrative research is still in its early stages and this proposal seeks to further this line of thinking by considering the entire JD-R conceptualization instead of merely the demands-side and by including POS as a potential resource that could be used to meet job insecurity demands. A visualization of the JD-R model can be seen in Figure 1.

Treating job insecurity as a demand would make sense based on the JD-R model’s definitions, as a demand can be classified as anything that requires sustained physical/psychological effort, which in turn leads to physical/psychological costs (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). As an example, job insecurity requires effort to deal with both physically through economic insecurities and psychologically through perceived psychological contract breach (Shoss, 2017). Resources expended as a result of the effort needed to meet the demands of job insecurity can also be physical, such as supplementary income to address the economic vulnerability, or psychological, such as an employee’s perceived organizational support offsetting the decreased trust. If the demands of job insecurity are not met, the costs can be severe: such as lowered loyalty, broken trust, increased turnover intentions, and worsened performance (Schaufeli, 2014). Based on
this perspective, job insecurity, as a demand, could be dealt with using resources available to the employee.

One possible resource that could ease the negative effects of job insecurity would be perceived organizational support (POS). POS is generally defined as the degree to which an employee feels the organization values them and cares about their well-being (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), which could potentially fit the previously discussed definition for job resources, as these feelings could do things like potentially reduce the costs an employee faces. Van Woerkom, Bakker, and Nishii (2016) provided evidence for this being the case, as they showed POS (specifically strengths use support, meaning support for employees’ utilizing their specific strengths properly) can buffer the negative effects of job demands (which in their case were workload and emotional demands).

**Perceived Organizational Support**

POS and its antecedents/consequences have been researched extensively since its initial conceptualization as a type of organizational commitment (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Most recently, Kurtessis et al. (2017) conducted a meta-analysis to investigate which antecedents and consequences were most common and which had the greatest effects. They included 558 studies from the organizational support theory literature, which is a more holistic view of POS (in contrast with traditional views only considering organizational commitment) involving general feelings of support from the organization. Antecedents the authors considered include leader-member exchange, fairness, abusive supervision, and job security. Consequences
included job involvement, trust, positive and negative psychological well-being, and
counterproductive work behaviors. Overall, the relationships between the many variables
examined and POS behaved as expected, with most corrected correlations being
moderately strong. Most importantly for this review, the authors found a corrected
correlation of .42 between job security and POS, illustrating how the two can moderately
covary with each other.

POS may also be perceived differently by individuals in different cultures. For
example, Vogel et al. (2014) examined how abusive supervision is perceived in Anglo
versus Confucian cultures (the researchers used samples from the U.S. and Australia for
the former and Taiwan and Singapore for the latter). Abusive supervision has been shown
to be an antecedent and a reducer of POS, as supervisors represent the organization to
their subordinates to some degree (Kurtessis et al., 2017). Interestingly, the authors found
that abusive supervision is perceived as more normal in Confucian cultures than in in
Anglo ones. As a result, individuals in Confucian cultures experience fewer negative
effects from abusive supervision, as they view it as more normative. This could have POS
implications, as these individuals’ perceptions as to how supportive their organization is
may not be affected as strongly if they are treated poorly by their boss. One explanation
for this cultural distinction is differences in power distance.

Power distance is defined as the degree to which inequality is tolerated or even
expected within a culture (Hofstede & McCrae, 2004). In high-power distance cultures,
inequality is not necessarily imposed, but is rather endorsed by people at all levels of the
organization. This can affect tolerance for supervisor abuse, as discussed previously,
(Vogel et al., 2014) but it may also affect POS and its outcomes in other ways. Farh, Hackett, and Liang (2007) used pairs of supervisors and employees to examine whether power distance orientation at the individual level moderated the relationship between POS and its outcomes. They found that POS only significantly directly affected organizational commitment and marginally affected job performance, but power distance was a significant moderator of the former relationship.

Job insecurity and perceived organizational support have also been shown to be closely intertwined (Lee & Peccei, 2006). Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) found that job security could be considered a facet of POS, in that the employer wishes to keep an employee with the organization and not lose them to turnover. Therefore, job insecurity should have a negative relationship with POS: if an employee perceives their job as uncertain, they are likely to blame their organization, leading them to feel less supported. Overall, the relationship between POS and job insecurity has been established, but not necessarily from the perspective of the JD-R model. Examining which resources counteract job insecurity as a demand is one literature gap this research seeks to fill (Schaufeli, 2014) and POS is the optimal choice as a resource due to its established relationship with job insecurity and similarities with other establish job resources.

Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Job Insecurity

As discussed previously, job insecurity is certainly not an issue constrained to a single country but is an increasing global phenomenon. Interestingly, longitudinal studies of job insecurity have predominantly been conducted in countries with stronger social
security infrastructure, such as Scandinavia (Schaufeli, 2014). This means that countries such as the U.S. and China, which do not have such strong social safety nets in place, are not researching this topic proportionately to their comparatively higher population. However, the impact of job insecurity on individual outcomes does not appear to have any specific cross-national differences (Witte, Pienaar, & Cuyper, 2015), meaning that individual experiences of job insecurity will likely lead to the same effects across cultures. However, potential mediators or moderators involving job insecurity and its outcomes may differ cross-culturally, even if job insecurity’s effects themselves may not. This intersection between job insecurity, JD-R, and cross-cultural research is another literature gap this proposal seeks to fill: culture may not impact the base relationship between job insecurity and its consequences, but when other variables are introduced into the equation, do cultural differences affect their relationships? Cross-cultural differences may be viewed through a variety of different lenses: one of the most popular being individualism/collectivism.

Individualism/Collectivism is the degree to which individuals are integrated within groups and how strong the ties within these groups are (Hofstede & McCrae, 2001). Individualistic cultures tend to prioritize standing out and personal achievement, where collectivistic ones emphasize group achievement and maintaining harmony within the group. The U.S. is one of the highest scoring countries on individualism and China is one of the highest on collectivism, making the two polar opposites on this factor (Hofstede Insights, 2017). In collectivist countries, such as China, job security is more highly valued, as connectedness within groups is viewed as more important than
individual achievements (Triandis, 1995). As a result, workers in collectivist countries tend to react more poorly to job insecurity, since more value is placed on one’s role in the organization, so the threat of losing the ties to their organization is less desirable (Probst & Lawler, 2006). The United States and China are excellent countries for cross-cultural examinations involving individualism/collectivism due to their tendency to be the highest scoring on each cultural trait, respectively (Hofstede Insights, 2017).

Research has supported this claim, as Probst and Lawler (2006) found that Chinese employees consistently reacted more negatively to job insecurity compared to US employees, showing reduced job satisfaction, higher turnover intentions, and more work withdrawal behaviors. Given that job insecurity is globally increasing in frequency (Shoss, 2017), particular attention should be paid to countries with more collectivistic cultures, such as China, since individuals in these countries may be more susceptible to its negative effects.

Another perspective on understanding cultural differences can be through examining what they value. Schwartz (1994) hypothesized a total of ten dimensions that cultures differ with regard to what they emphasize, which can be further broken down into two continua: self-transcendence/self-enhancement and openness to change/conservatism. Based on these value types, Schwartz (1999) clustered together similar nations and where they fit on the dimensions. For example, China was placed in the far east region, which more strongly emphasizes hierarchy, mastery, and conservatism. The United States was placed in the English-speaking region, which values mastery, affective autonomy, and hierarchy, though to a lesser extent than the far east
region. Though these values may have shifted somewhat since the nearly twenty years since this study, viewing cultures through a values framework can be helpful for illustrating both similarities and differences. For example, in the workplace, work centrality is most highly related to cultures which value mastery and hierarchy. Therefore, because both countries tend to emphasize both values, we would expect both Chinese and American individuals to highly value their work as a part of their life (Shwartz, 1999).

The most recent attempt at understanding cross-cultural similarities and differences is the series of studies orchestrated by the GLOBE project. These studies have sought to examine how culture affects how leaders are expected to behave and how this impacts their effectiveness (GLOBE, 2016). An example study by Caraballo (2016) examined how organizations based in the U.S. and China differ based on the Denison Organizational Culture Survey/Model (DOCS). This model takes a different approach from many cultural perspectives by considering dimensions at the organizational level rather than the individual (i.e., measuring organizational outcomes rather than the outcomes for individual employees). Interestingly, Caraballo found that the Chinese and American organizations were roughly equivalent on the four traits measured by the DOCS, which are involvement (empowerment), consistency (agreement), adaptability (organizational learning), and mission (goals and objectives). He theorized that because China and the United States have such a global economic impact, even though measures on the four DOCS traits may be different, those behaviors will lead to the same goals and outcomes, ultimately, because all organizations desire to succeed and existing on an
international level tends to standardize the playing field. This is an important finding because so many cross-cultural studies stick to the individual level when culture may not have nearly as strong an impact at the organizational level.

Other western cultures and China have also been used to examine job insecurity cross-culturally. For example, Roll, Su, Li, and De Witte (2015) compared German and Chinese employees on how their perceived job insecurity impacted their innovativeness and safety outcomes via cognitive errors, mediated by engagement and burnout, respectively. They found that job insecurity only indirectly reduced innovativeness via engagement in the German sample but held a direct relationship in the Chinese sample (but only for quantitative job insecurity, which, again, involves actual job loss rather than loss of positive job attributes). However, their results generally helped further illustrate how damaging job insecurity can universally be, as job insecurity reduced innovativeness and increased cognitive errors in both samples.

Overall, given the general acceptance of current and continuing globalization of the world economies, research into cultural distinctions can yield valuable insights into how workers may differ, especially for companies interested in maintaining multi-nationality. One area in which culture must be heavily considered is leadership. If a company wishes to establish itself in new markets, it must understand how leaders should conduct themselves if they wish to properly motivate their employees. For example, leaders tend to be more revered if they act “macho” in countries like the U.S., France, England, and Russia, whereas a more egalitarian leader is desired in countries like New Zealand, the Netherlands, and Ireland (Dickson, Castano, Magomaeva, & Hartog, 2012).
This could have implications for job insecurity outcomes, for example, as employees may expect to be treated certain ways while navigating their instability.

If thought of in terms of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory, each leader should develop individual relationships with their subordinates, and these relationships are also affected by culture. Rockstuhl, Dulebohn, Ang, and Shore (2012) found that these individual relationships are more important and more strongly tied to individual outcomes in western cultures than in eastern ones, meaning western employees take their individual reciprocal relationship with their supervisor more seriously. This may also affect how job insecurity is experienced, as an employee in China may attribute their job insecurity to their role or organization rather than to a specific leader. It is hard to say what implications this could have for workers’ perceived organizational support, as this differing attribution may or may not impact the strength of the construct itself, but it may lead to POS manifesting differently between eastern and western cultures.

The Present Study

The present study has three broad aims. The first and second are to expand the job insecurity literature by introducing perceived organizational support as a possible resource opposite to job insecurity as a job demand and to frame this interplay through the JD-R model, respectively. Finally, the present study will examine the same model in two samples: one collected in the United States and one collected in the People’s Republic of China. Given the increasing globalization of the world economy and the downsizing/outsourcing occurring because of it, taking a global perspective on job
insecurity and its effects is increasingly important. Including these two samples will allow for cross-cultural comparisons to be made between the United States and China, illuminating whether employees’ experiences differ between the two nations.
HYPOTHESES

The Job Demands-Resources Model

As discussed previously, the fundamental idea behind the JD-R model is that employees balance the demands of their job with the resources they have available to meet them, leading to changes in burnout and engagement, and finally to various personal and organizational outcomes (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Demands can range from the obvious, such as the actual workload of employees, to the less obvious, such as their emotional load (Llorens, Bakker, Schaufeli, & Salanova, 2006). Job resources can range from how much control one has over various aspects of their job, to how much support they receive from their coworkers (Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2003). These dual antecedents lead to two different processes: one of strains/impairment and one of motivation (Llorens et al., 2006). Strains, such as burnout, occur when demands cannot be adequately met, leading to negative health, well-being, and performance outcomes (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007). Motivations, such as engagement, are a result of adequate resources and achieving goals, which leads to positive outcomes, such as improved performance and higher organizational commitment (Hakanen, Schaufeli, & Ahola, 2008). In addition, the JD-R model predicts that the demands and resources interact with each other, buffering the effects each has on strain and motivation, respectively (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006). For example, if job demands are high, the effect of job resources on motivation should be reduced as a result.
One of the intentions of the present research is to integrate conceptualizations of job insecurity and its consequences with the JD-R model, with nine hypotheses being tested that follow the framework of the JD-R model. As a brief preliminary summary, job insecurity will be treated as a job demand with perceived organizational support as its resource opposite. In addition, the effects of job insecurity and perceived organizational support on turnover intentions will be fully mediated by burnout and engagement. Finally, job insecurity and perceived organizational support will be negatively correlated with each other, while also buffering the effects of the other on burnout and engagement. For example, POS should have a negative effect on the relationship between job insecurity and burnout. The full proposed model can be seen in Figure 2.

**Job Demands Path**

Job insecurity can have serious negative consequences, both immediate and long-term. These can include lowered job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment, trust, physical/mental health, worsened performance, increased turnover intentions, and burnout. (Bosman, Rothmann, & Buittendach, 2005; Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002). Burnout, in particular, features as a core mediator within the JD-R model between job demands and their organizational outcomes (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006). According to Maslach (1981), burnout involves a sense of emotional exhaustion in which employees become cynical or unhappy with their jobs and feel “drained” at work. In contrast, according to Shirom and Melamed (2006), burnout involves physical, emotional, and cognitive exhaustion, representing more a depletion of resources than cynicism. This is the perspective I will be taking in this proposal because this idea of
resource depletion lines up perfectly with the JD-R model. Burnout can have serious consequences, especially in jobs where lives may literally be on the line, such as dangerous jobs, or in healthcare. For nurses, burnout can be directly related to patient safety outcomes (Laschinger & Leiter, 2006). For other dangerous jobs in which safety is a concern, burnout also can predict accidents and unsafe behaviors (Nahrgang, Morgeson, & Hofmann, 2010). For other jobs, even ones where safety may not be a large a concern, burnout can predict turnover intentions (Janssen, de Jonge, & Bakker, 1998; Plooy & Roodt, 2010).

Turnover intentions are defined as an employee’s intent to leave the organization and either seek employment elsewhere or exit the workforce entirely. A wide variety of antecedents of turnover intentions have been extensively examined, such as job satisfaction, burnout, stress, organizational culture/climate, and organizational commitment (Kim & Kao, 2014). Intentions themselves do not always accurately lead to certain behavior, but intent to turnover tends to predict actual turnover (Shore & Martin, 1989) and is far easier to measure, so it is often used as a stand-in for actual turnover, even though recent research has shown that the two may actually be distinct constructs. For example, youth, proportion of female employees, telecommuting prevalence, and satisfaction with performance culture/advancement opportunities predicted actual turnover, but not turnover intentions (Cohen, Blake, & Goodman, 2016). Because of this, researchers should keep in mind that intentions do not always lead to behavior with regard to turnover, though there is evidence of overlap (Shore & Martin, 1989).
Turnover is often (though not always) undesirable to both the employee and the organization. Both direct costs, such as replacing the lost employee, and indirect costs, such as the spent time and effort on replacement, can take a serious toll on organizations (Allen, 2008). Job insecurity has been shown to predict turnover intentions, both directly and indirectly. Berntson, Naswall, and Sverke (2010) found that job insecurity directly predicted turnover intentions (called “exit” through the framework they were considering) and that this relationship was moderated by how employable employees considered themselves to be. Staufenbiel and König (2010) found that job insecurity affected performance outcomes, such as turnover intentions, indirectly through work attitudes. Although burnout itself is not necessarily entirely a work attitude, one of the original conceptualizations, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) certainly include attitudinal components, such as cynicism and professional efficacy (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Therefore, burnout should similarly mediate the relationship between job insecurity and performance outcomes such as turnover intentions.

Following the JD-R framework, job insecurity will be considered a job demand, as it has been shown to take a toll on workers over time (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Job insecurity requires effort from employees to deal with, such as changing their behavior to make up for threatened job aspects, as in qualitative job insecurity, and also incurs physical and psychological costs, such as worsened health or well-being (Shoss, 2017). Furthermore, job factors, such as insecurity, have been shown to directly cause burnout, which in turn has been directly linked to turnover intentions: particularly the emotional exhaustion component (Bakker, Demerouti, & Sanz-Vergel, 2014; Dekker & Schaufeli,
In consideration of both this evidence and the JD-R model of burnout mediating the relationship between job demands and various personal outcomes, I hypothesize that burnout should fully mediate the effects of job insecurity on turnover intentions.

*Hypothesis 1:* Job insecurity will be positively related to burnout.

*Hypothesis 2:* Burnout will fully mediate the positive relationship between job insecurity and turnover intentions.

**Job Resources Path**

As discussed previously, job resources can be defined as physical, psychological, social, or organizational job aspects that help employees achieve work goals, reduce job demands/costs, and stimulate personal growth and development (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004). Examples of job resources that have been examined via the JD-R model include autonomy, colleague support, participation in decision making, opportunities for learning, and various kinds of social support (Evers, van der Heijden, Kreijins, & Vermeulen, 2016; Scheepers et al., 2017). To the best of my knowledge, perceived organizational support by itself has never been examined as a job resource, though other concepts related to POS, such as strengths use support (feeling as though the organization is sufficiently leveraging your individual strengths), have been shown to have a buffering effect between job demands and outcomes such as absenteeism, as one would expect from a job resource (van Woerkom, Bakker, & Nishii, 2016).
Perceived organizational support, as discussed previously, is the sense that the organization “has your back.” One aspect of how POS influences behavior is through reciprocity norms, in that an employee feels as though the organization has done right by them, so they feel obliged to respond favorably (Eisenberger et al., 2001). This perception of favorability leads to desirable outcomes from employees, such as increased commitment towards the organization (Rhaodes, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001). The support must be discretionary, however: meaning it must have been benevolently provided to aid the individual (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986). The effects of POS are many: it has been shown to improve job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, and performance while reducing turnover intentions and improving engagement (Kurtessis et al., 2017; Riggle, Edmondson, & Hansen, 2009; Saks, 2006).

Engagement is a state of working characterized by “vigor, dedication, and absorption” and can also be described as the antithesis of burnout (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006). As a result, engagement can show opposite effects to burnout, such as improved safety, higher job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors, higher job performance and client satisfaction for those with public-facing jobs (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008; Nahrgang, Morgeson, & Hofmann, 2010; Saks, 2006). Engagement has also been shown to reduce turnover intentions, both indirectly as a mediator and as a direct cause by itself (Bhatnagar, 2012; Saks, 2006). Following the JD-R framework, perceived organizational support will be treated as a job resource, being used to meet various job demands and reduce negative
outcomes, specifically turnover intentions indirectly by improving employee engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

_Hypothesis 3_: Perceived organizational support will be positively related to engagement.

_Hypothesis 4_: Engagement mediates the negative relationship between perceived organizational support and turnover intentions.

**Cross-Path Interactions and Moderators**

An important consideration when applying the JD-R model is that the twin processes of job demands, resources, and their outcomes do not occur entirely independent of each other. In fact, theoretically, the two should interact not only with each other, but as buffers on their relationships with burnout and engagement, respectively (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006). Following this idea, I predict that job insecurity will negatively moderate the relationship between perceived organizational support and engagement. Because of this, when an employee experiences high levels of job insecurity, their POS will not as strongly improve their engagement with work. Job insecurity has already been shown to influence the relationship between psychological empowerment (such as how meaningful or impactful one thinks their work is) and an employee’s engagement (Stander & Rothmann, 2010), so it may influence perceived organizational support and engagement as well, given both of these work attributes would fall under the category of job resources, and thus be influenced by job demands such as job insecurity.
Hypothesis 5: At high levels of job insecurity, the relationship between perceived organizational support and engagement will be weaker than when job insecurity is average.

Perceived organizational support may also serve as a moderator of the relationship between job insecurity and burnout. Previous research has shown that perceived organizational support moderated the relationship between role conflict and burnout (Jawahar, Stone, & Kisamore, 2007), and role conflict has been treated as a job demand in the past, (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004). As a result, perceived organizational support should reduce the impact job insecurity has on burnout, much like other job resources would affect the relationship between job demands and burnout.

Hypothesis 6: At high levels of perceived organizational support, the relationship between job insecurity and burnout will be weaker than when perceived organizational support is average.

In addition, I predict that job insecurity will be negatively related to perceived organizational support. This makes sense intuitively, as one likely does not feel supported by their organization when their position within it is in jeopardy. This idea has been supported by research as well, as measures of the two showed negative correlations during company downsizing (Armstrong-Stassen, 2004). This interplay between job demands and resources has been put forward theoretically, as discussed previously, but also has research support showing the two are negatively related with each other (Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2003). The mediators between job insecurity/perceived
organizational support and turnover intentions should exhibit an identical relationship, according to the JD-R model. Burnout and engagement have been argued to be opposite ends of a single continuum, with mixed results (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002), though research has shown a clear negative relationship between the two (Bakker, Demerouti, & Sanz-Vergel, 2014) and a meta-analysis on the matter showed they have high dimension-level correlations, similar correlate associations, and controlling for one reduced the effect size of the other (Cole, Walter, Bedeian, & O’Boyle, 2012). Though the evidence on whether the two are empirically distinct remains at least somewhat debatable, the negative relationship between the two has been well-established and I predict that it will materialize again in the present study.

Hypothesis 7: Job insecurity will be negatively related to perceived organizational support.

Hypothesis 8: Burnout will be negatively related to engagement.

Cross-Cultural Differences

As discussed previously, the United States and China are popular cultures to sample from when performing cross-cultural research, as they tend to exemplify polar opposites on multiple cultural dimensions (Hofstede Insights, 2017). One key difference between the U.S. and China is power distance, which is the degree to which power inequality between the leader and subordinates is accepted, or even encouraged. The U.S. tends to score much lower on power distance than China (Hofstede Insights, 2017), meaning leaders and followers in the United States are not quite as rigidly defined or
hierarchical as they are in China. With regard to perceived organizational support, power distance has been shown to moderate the relationship between it and its work outcomes (Farh, Hackett, & Liang, 2007) in such a way that the relationship is stronger in low power distance cultures. This is possibly because the leader-member exchange is less reliant on reciprocity in cultures with high power distance, since employees follow their leader based on authority instead of a sense of obligation. As a result, the job resources path involving POS and engagement could appear stronger in the U.S. sample.

Another difference between the U.S. and China is their tendency to measure as polar opposites on individualism/collectivism, as discussed previously. In China, as a collectivist culture, workers tend to react less favorably when experiencing job insecurity, as they tend to value their role in the organization more highly than workers in individualist cultures (Probst & Lawler, 2006). Because of this, participants in China may desire to leave their organization more strongly when faced with job insecurity, causing the job demands path involving job insecurity and burnout to appear stronger in the Chinese sample.

One key concern when conducting cross-cultural research is whether or not the constructs function identically across cultures. Previous research in China has used translated versions of scales developed in English without issue (Wang, Lu, & Siu, 2015), suggesting that many constructs could be universally applicable. Alternatively, researchers have used scales developed in English to inform scales developed specifically for a Chinese sample. For example, Yang et al. (2016) found the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) to be an insufficient measure of burnout on its own, so they chose to
incorporate additional items from other scales to better cover their construct as informed by focus group interviews. Building off of this idea, research on the factor structure of the MBI has proved mixed, with some research supporting the traditional three-factor structure in Chinese samples and others finding the exact opposite (Hu & Schaufeli, 2006; Schwarzer, Schmitz, & Tang, 2000). Overall, the MBI was originally intended only for nurses (Maslach & Jackson, 1981) and that level of occupational specificity may have a stronger effect in Chinese samples, for reasons unknown. But, aside from burnout, the other scales used in this study have been used in Chinese samples without issue.

Overall, it is hard to say exactly how culture will impact the proposed model. Culture is an incredibly complex phenomenon and could have effects from any number of possible angles: the two previous paragraphs are simply possibilities. As a result, I am not specifically hypothesizing any effects, but rather introducing possible cross-cultural effects as a research question.

*Research Question 1:* How will culture impact the relationships between job insecurity, POS, turnover intentions, and the mediators between them?
STUDY 1

The largest issue facing the current proposed study is that I will be comparing samples from two different countries using two different scales. This obviously creates one difficult, but not insurmountable, problem right at the outset: I require evidence that the different scales are, in fact, as close to identical as possible.

Many constructs have multiple scales used to measure them which should, in theory, yield similar information about the construct. For example, the Maslach Burnout Inventory and the Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure, which both were designed to measure burnout, have been directly compared in the past and found to have similar convergent and discriminant validity, if not the same factor structure (Shirom & Melamed, 2006). So, although they may tap into different areas of the constructs they represent, they should function similarly. However, many other scales supposedly measuring the same constructs have not been directly compared before, thus calling their equivalence into question. These could be developed by different researchers, such as the scales on job insecurity (Oldham, Kulik, Stepina, & Ambrose, 1986; Probst, 2003), or simply revisions made to existing scales, such as perceived organizational support (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Eisenberger, 2001).

In these cases, before any comparisons can be made, evidence must be provided to show that the scales are functionally equivalent, which is the purpose of this preliminary study. This was done by administering both sets of scales to a single sample to show that participants answered them in identical ways. It should be noted that this
validation was done in a U.S. context rather than a Chinese one and using the English translation of items that were originally administered in Mandarin.

**Participants, Procedures, and Measures**

Data were collected from 30 undergraduate students from a large Southeastern university. All participants were employed at the time of the study and almost all participants worked some sort of customer service-oriented job, usually working around 20 hours per week. All participants completed a survey consisting of the measures used in the American sample and the Chinese sample. The scales were paired together, meaning participants answered all questions relating to job insecurity, then perceived organizational support, etc. Participants completed the survey on their personal laptops in person with researcher supervision.

*Job security* was measured with an abridged version of the Job Security Index by Probst (2003) in the Chinese sample. An example question is “The future of my job is unpredictable.” The response options for this scale were, “yes” “?” and “no.” The “?” was coded as a 2 on the scale, as treating it as missing data did not significantly impact the results. The scale had six items, with three being reverse-coded. Many of the English translations of the items did not perfectly match the Probst scale due to being back-translated from Mandarin, though these inconsistencies were minor (for example, the Chinese scale used “the organization” instead of “my organization”). In the American sample, job security was measured with a scale by Oldham, Kulik, Stepina, and Ambrose (1986). An example item is “My job will be there as long as I want it.” The response
options for this scale were a standard 1-7 strongly disagree to strongly agree likert scale. The scale had ten items, with two being reverse-coded. Reliability values for both scales were calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which were $\alpha = .92$ and $\alpha = .93$, respectively.

Perceived organizational support was measured with a scale by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986) in the Chinese sample. An example question is “The organization really cares about my well-being.” The scale had seven items, with three being reverse-coded. In the American sample, perceived organizational support was measured with a scale by Eisenberger (2001). An example item is “My organization is willing to help me if I need a special favor.” This scale had eight items, but five were identical to the 1986 scale. These overlapping items were asked only once in Study 1, but used twice during analyses, meaning when the means for each scale were calculated, these items were used in both the 1986 and 2001 scales. The response options for both scales were a standard 1-7 strongly disagree to strongly agree likert scale. Reliability values for both scales were calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which were $\alpha = .81$ and $\alpha = .83$, respectively.

Burnout was measured with the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Maslach, 1982) in the Chinese sample. An example question is “I feel emotionally drained from my work.” The response options for this scale were a frequency 1-7 likert scale, from never to every day. In the American sample, burnout was measured with the Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure (SMBM) (Shirom & Melemed, 2006). An example item is “In the past 30 workdays, I feel I’m not focused in my thinking.” As discussed previously, the MBI and SMBM have been examined previously and shown to have
highly similar convergent and discriminant validity, if dissimilar factor structures (Shirom & Melamed, 2006). The MBI focuses on emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficacy. The SMBM uses physical fatigue and cognitive weariness as its facets. These different factors mean that the individual parts of the MBI and SMBM may not correlate perfectly with each other, but the scales as whole have been shown to do so (Shirom & Melamed, 2006). The response options for this scale were a frequency 1-7 likert scale, from never or almost never to always or almost always. Reliability values for both scales were calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which were $\alpha = .92$ and $\alpha = .96$, respectively.

Engagement was measured with the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) by Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova (2006) in the Chinese sample. An example question is “I am enthusiastic about my job.” The response options for this scale were a 1-7 frequency likert scale, from never to always. This scale had 17 items. In the American sample, engagement was measured with the nine-item short form of the same scale from the article (UWES-9). The response options for this scale were a standard 1-7 strongly disagree to strongly agree likert scale. There was obviously a great deal of overlap between the two scales, with every item in the latter appearing in the former, with the only difference being every item in the American sample UWES-9 was prefaced by “In the past 3 months…” This may have been due to the 3-month time lag between the two waves in the MTurk sample, meaning the researchers wanted participants to focus on their recent engagement following the previous survey. Reliability values for both scales were calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which were both $\alpha = .91$. 
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Turnover intentions were measured with a scale adapted from Mobley, Horner, and Hollingsworth (1978) in the Chinese sample. An example question is “The thought of quitting my job often crosses my mind.” In the American sample, the turnover intentions measure was developed by the research team that originally gathered the data, though it is similar to the Mobley scale. An example item is “I often think about quitting my job.” The response options for both scales were a standard 1-7 strongly disagree to strongly agree likert scale. Both scales were 3 items and some items had very similar wording, such as “the thought of quitting my job often crosses my mind,” versus, “I often think about quitting my job.” Reliability values for both scales were calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which were $\alpha = .84$ and $\alpha = .81$, respectively.

Results

First, responses were manually examined for evidence of careless/otherwise abnormal responding and outliers. No evidence was found to suggest that either occurred. Next, several items were reverse-coded as necessary and Cronbach’s alpha values and item-total correlations were calculated for each scale. Following the satisfactory alpha values, means and standard deviations were calculated for each scale. Finally, correlations between each of the scales were calculated. Ideally, the correlations should be as close to 1.0 as possible, indicating perfect agreement between them. However, previous scale comparison research on burnout measures showed a correlation between the two between .7 and .8 (Shirom & Melamed, 2006), so ideally these measures should correlate similarly.
Descriptive statistics and correlations appear in Table 1. Bivariate Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated in SPSS between each variable. Though the correlation table included all possible correlations, the correlations between each pair of scales are the focus of these results. For job security, the correlation between the two scales was $r = .$. For perceived organizational support, the correlation between the two scales was $r = .91$. For burnout, the correlation between the two scales was $r = .76$. For engagement, the correlation between the two scales was $r = .83$. For turnover intentions, the correlation between the two scales was $r = .79$.

**Discussion**

All correlations between each pair of scales could be considered “strong” (0.6 - 0.79) or “very strong” (0.8 - 1.0) according to the framework put forward by Evans (1996), even in the uncorrected forms. Correlations were calculated by generating the means of each of the scales, then generating a bivariate Pearson 2-tailed correlation matrix using SPSS. No scale fell below the acceptable threshold of 0.7 for Cronbach’s alpha (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), leading me to conclude the scales being used are sufficiently reliable.

The only pair of scales that correlated noticeably lower than the others were the two job security scales. However, an uncorrected correlation of 0.62 is still considered to be a strong correlation according to Evans (1996) and considering how different the response options were for the two scales, it makes sense that they would not match up perfectly with each other. Again, the issue is likely not that the two scales are empirically distinct from one another, but that the response options are so different. These response
options may have led to range restriction, in that one scale only had 3 options in comparison to the other’s 7. This could lead to the relationship being diminished simply because respondents were forced into a less varied response distribution. The response options themselves may have also played a role, as one referred to levels of agreement and the other was yes/no with a question mark answer in the middle (coded as yes=1, ?=2, no=3). This did not allow for any nuance in responses as well as the question mark being a vague answer. It could imply that the respondent does not know the answer to the question, but that does not allow for any “sometimes” level of answering between yes and no. Because of this, in the data was also analyzed with “?” responses coded as missing data, but this did not affect the correlations in any meaningful way.

Regardless, the correlation between the two scales is strong enough to be considered as highly related to each other, if not necessarily identical. In addition, both scales correlated similarly with other study variables in several cases and correlated nearly identically with both burnout measures, which is most important for the proposed model (though these correlations were mostly nonsignificant, likely due to the small sample size).

Overall, I sought to provide evidence that the different scales used in each sample are measuring the same constructs and showed that they are highly related to each other. With this evidence, Studies 2 and 3 were conducted to test the presented hypotheses in American and Chinese contexts.
Participants and Procedures

Data were collected at two different time points three months apart using Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) in the United States. Participants were required to have a primary job and not use MTurk as their primary source of income. Participants were compensated with approximately $5 for the first session and another $5 for the second. 1,073 individuals initially responded with 553 also completing the second wave. Participants were 47.6% male on average, worked an average of 39.59 hours per week at their primary job, had an average current job tenure of 5.7 years, and had an average salary of $42,758. Much like other MTurk studies, participants were widely geographically located across the United States with very high variety in occupations.

Job security was measured with a scale by Oldham, Kulik, Stepina, and Ambrose (1986). An example item is “My job will be there as long as I want it.” The response options for this scale were a standard 1-7 strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) likert scale. The scale had ten items, with two being reverse-coded. The scale was reversed into job insecurity for the purposes of this study. The reliability for the scale was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which was $\alpha = .93$.

Perceived organizational support was measured with a scale by Eisenberger (2001). An example item is “My organization is willing to help me if I need a special favor.” This scale had eight items and response options were a standard 1-7 strongly
disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) likert scale. The reliability for the scale was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which was $\alpha = .93$.

*Burnout* was measured with the Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure (SMBM) (Shirom & Melemed, 2006). An example item is “In the past 30 workdays, I feel I’m not focused in my thinking.” The response options for this scale were a frequency 1-7 likert scale, from never or almost never (1) to always or almost always (7). The reliability for the scale was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which was $\alpha = .97$.

*Engagement* was measured with the nine-item short form of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9). The response options for this scale were a standard 1-7 strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) likert scale. The reliability for the scale was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which was $\alpha = .95$.

*Turnover intentions* were measured with a scale developed by the original research team that is similar to the scale from Mobley, Horner, and Hollingsworth (1978) An example question is “I often think about quitting my job.” The scale was composed of three items and the response options for the scale were a standard 1-7 strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) likert scale. The reliability for the scale was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which was $\alpha = .93$.

**Results**

Correlations and descriptive statistics for the variables in Study 2 appear in Table 2. Correlations were calculated to provide a preliminary look at the relationships between the variables. In particular, I wanted to ensure the hypothesized relationships should
match what appears in the correlation table. Overall, all expected correlations materialized at a moderate strength and significance. This provides initial support for moving forward with more advanced analyses.

The mediation paths were analyzed via structural equation modeling (SEM) in EQS. Using SEM allowed me to better understand the complex relationships between the variables, including how well my proposed model fit the data and whether alternative models exist. These alternative models were assessed using Lagrange Multiplier (LM) and Wald tests, which examine whether paths should be added or removed to the model. Following the recommendation of Hu and Bentler (1999), I used the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) to assess model fit. Further following their recommendations, the CFI should have a value close to .95 and the RMSEA and SRMR should have values lower than .06 and .08, respectively.

SEM results for the hypothesized model, including path coefficients and fit statistics, can be seen in Figure 3. I chose to use combined scale scores in the SEM as opposed to latent variable modeling using the individual items due to time constraints. All relationships were assessed using EQS multivariate software after scale scores were created using SPSS. The paths representing Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8 (all potential mediation/cross-path hypotheses) were all significant at the \( \alpha = .05 \) level. The CFI was reported at .90, the RMSEA was reported at .19, and the SRMR was reported at .11.
The LM test suggested adding paths between POS and burnout as well as POS and turnover intentions. This model can be seen in Figure 4. All previously hypothesized paths remained significant at the α=.05 level in this new model, with the exception of the path representing hypothesis 1. The CFI was reported at .99, the RMSEA was reported at .07, and the SRMR was reported at .02.

In addition, Hypotheses 5 and 6 involving moderation within the proposed model were tested using regression and modeling of simple slopes as recommended by Edwards and Lambert (2007). If the predictors are significant and the change in $R^2$ is meaningful, the relationship between the independent and dependent variables were examined at high, medium, and low levels of the proposed moderator variable to see how it influences the relationship. This examination of simple slopes allows me to know how job insecurity and POS are affecting the other’s relationship with burnout and engagement, respectively.

Moderation effects were assessed using linear regression in SPSS. Job insecurity and POS were multiplied together into a combined variable and hierarchical linear regression was used to determine whether or not adding this variable improved the $R^2$ in the relationships between the antecedents and their relationship with their mediators. In each case, both job insecurity and POS were included as predictors of first burnout and later engagement to assess whether the moderation variable improved the $R^2$ beyond both predictors together. Even though the JD-R model shows only the opposite path antecedent as a moderator, I needed to rule out that any moderation effects are beyond
simply the predictive power of the opposite antecedent. As a result, both are included for each regression equation.

Initially, both job insecurity and POS were entered into the regression, predicting first burnout and then engagement. Next, the combined variable was introduced to see if it added to the predictive power, represented by the $R^2$. The $\Delta R^2$ was .001 when predicting burnout and .002 when predicting engagement (both were non-significant changes). The full regression results can be seen in Table 3. Based on these results, I chose not to proceed with examining simple slopes, given the negligible moderating effect found.

**Discussion**

Study 2 tested my proposed model in an American sample. In the initial model, the path coefficients are all significant and reasonably strong, despite the model fit being insufficient. The CFI and SRMR results are approaching the cutoff values, but the RMSEA was too high to be able to accept this model as sufficiently fitting. In addition, the paths from job insecurity and POS to their respective mediators of burnout and engagement are noticeably weaker than many of the other paths, raising the possibility that direct paths may be more appropriate.

The results of the LM test support this theory, as it recommended adding direct paths from POS to both burnout and turnover intentions. Doing so essentially nullified the path from job insecurity to burnout, both reducing the path strength to below .1 and removing its significance. Based on these results, it would seem job insecurity almost
seems to serve as an antecedent to POS, which fully mediates its effects on burnout, engagement, and turnover intentions. The strong relationship between the two is unsurprising, given previous research arguing job insecurity can be viewed as a strong indication of a lack of POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), and the directionality of this relationship (POS fully mediating job insecurity’s effects on all outcomes) supports this idea.

Regarding the moderation results, the moderation effect was negligible for both burnout and engagement. The moderation variable was an insignificant predictor in both cases and the $\Delta R^2$ was barely detectable. In general, POS served as a stronger predictor in the regression for both dependent variables, which matches the results of the SEM. However, these results strongly suggest that no moderation is occurring within the model.

Overall, the results suggest perhaps the JD-R model may not fully explain the relationships between these variables, as it did not account for the direct paths from POS to burnout and turnover intentions. The path from POS to turnover intentions is of particular interest, as it suggests job resources may have direct effects on outcomes as opposed to being fully mediated by motivations. Social Exchange Theory (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005) provides a possible explanation for this finding. Within this theory, exchanges between employees and their organization are considered reciprocal in nature, meaning employees expect cooperation and for the organization to respond favorably to their actions. When this exchange is taking place, belief in the organization’s supportiveness is high and turnover intentions are often lowered as a result (Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997).
Participants and Procedures

Data were collected from 426 participants in person at two different time points at a manufacturing facility in the People’s Republic of China. Participants were predominantly male (73.6%), had an average age of 30, and, on average, had been at their job for 9.2 years. In stark contrast with the MTurk sample, participants worked 70.2 hours per week on average and 95.7% earned less than 1000 ($143 in 2007, when these data were collected) yuan per month, with no participant earning more than 3000 ($429). These long hours and astonishingly low pay appear to be normal for Chinese factory workers, however, though research has shown they may suffer mental health consequences as a result, especially if they are migrant workers (Mou et al., 2011).

Unfortunately, I was unable to get in contact with the professor who supervised the original data collection to learn more about the sample, so I do not know the geographic location within China, but, based on the participants’ self-reported job titles, the employees worked at a paper manufacturing facility of some kind. Many of these translated job titles can be more accurately considered descriptions of the employee’s job tasks, such as “paper cutting,” “chemical treatment,” and “beating the paper liquid.”

Job security was measured with an abridged version of the Job Security Index by Probst (2003) in the Chinese sample. An example question is “The future of my job is unpredictable.” The response options for this scale were, “yes” (1), “?” (2), and “no” (3). The scale had six items, with three being reverse-coded. Many of the items did not
perfectly match the Probst scale, likely due to the translation process of administering them in Mandarin originally. The scale was reversed into job insecurity for the purposes of this study. The reliability for the scale was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which was $\alpha = .80$.

*Perceived organizational support* was measured with a scale by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986) in the Chinese sample. An example question is “The organization really cares about my well-being.” The scale had seven items, with three being reverse-coded. The response options for this scale were a standard 1-7 strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) likert scale. The reliability for the scale was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which was $\alpha = .76$.

*Burnout* was measured with the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Maslach, 1982) in the Chinese sample. An example question is “I feel emotionally drained from my work.” The response options for this scale were a frequency 1-7 likert scale, from never (1) to every day (7). The reliability for the scale was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which was $\alpha = .90$.

*Engagement* was measured with the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) by Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova (2006) in the Chinese sample. An example question is “I am enthusiastic about my job.” The response options for this scale were a 1-7 frequency likert scale, from never (1) to always (7). This scale had 17 items. The reliability for the scale was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which was $\alpha = .83$.
Turnover intentions were measured with a scale adapted from Mobley, Horner, and Hollingsworth (1978) in the Chinese sample. An example question is “The thought of quitting my job often crosses my mind.” The response options for this scale were a standard 1-7 strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) likert scale with three items total. An example item is “I often think about quitting my job.” The reliability for the scale was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha, which was \( \alpha = .72 \).

An important note is that the data for this sample were collected in 2007, one year before a major labor contract law was passed in China. This labor contract sought to strengthen labor protection and improve job security for Chinese workers (Akee, 2018) following the end of guaranteed employment approximately ten years prior, which led to a spike in layoffs that had only somewhat stabilized by 2007 (Feng, Hu, & Moffitt, 2017). This is an important consideration because the law was signed into effect in June of 2007, meaning the employees in this sample could have been aware of impending job protections, affecting their perceived job insecurity. Granted, the items measuring job insecurity did specify the participants’ current job and the effects would likely only boost responses to the job security items across the board, but it is something important to consider when analyzing the responses.

Results

Correlations were calculated to provide a preliminary look at the relationships between the variables, similarly to Study 2. The correlations between the variables in Study 3 appear in Table 4. Overall, the correlations were less supportive than those of
Study 2. Burnout neither strongly nor significantly correlated with any other variable and only engagement significantly correlated with turnover intentions. Strangely, POS and engagement showed a weak negative correlation, both being opposite of what should be expected. These initial results serve as a warning that further analyses may not show either significant or expected results.

Data were analyzed using the same methods (structural equations modeling and moderated regression/simple slope examination) as Study 2. SEM results for the hypothesized model, including path coefficients and fit statistics, can be seen in Figure 5. The paths representing Hypotheses 3, 4, and 7 (the paths connecting job insecurity, POS, engagement, and turnover intentions) were significant at the $\alpha=.05$ level, though Hypotheses 1, 2, and 8 (the entire job demands path and the path between burnout and engagement) were not. The CFI was reported at .91, the RMSEA was reported at .05, and the SRMR was reported at .03.

The LM test suggested adding a direct path between job insecurity and turnover intentions. This model can be seen in Figure 6. All previously significant paths remained significant at the $\alpha=.05$ level in this new model. The CFI was reported at .97, the RMSEA was reported at .04, and the SRMR was reported at .03.

In addition, Hypotheses 5 and 6 involving moderation within the proposed model were tested using the methods in Study 2. Initially, both job insecurity and POS were entered into the regression, predicting first burnout and then engagement. Next, the combined variable was introduced to see if it added to the predictive power, represented
by the $R^2$. The $\Delta R^2$ was .002 when predicting burnout and .005 when predicting engagement. The full regression results can be seen in Table 5. Based on these results, I chose not to proceed with examining simple slopes, given the negligible moderating effect found.

**Discussion**

Study 3 tested my proposed model in a Chinese sample. The job demands path in the hypothesized model for this study was entirely nonsignificant. Job insecurity showed a moderate negative relationship with POS, but it did not predict burnout significantly and burnout did not appear to significantly predict engagement or turnover intentions. The lack of a relationship between burnout and engagement is particularly surprising, given the hypothesized opposite relationship they should share (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002). The Maslach Burnout Inventory has been shown to insufficiently measure burnout for specific occupational samples in China in the past (Yang et al., 2017) and that may be what happening here. Specifically, Yang et al. found themselves requiring additions to the MBI from focus group interviews to better fit their construction-oriented sample and this sample is similarly blue-collar, suggesting it may necessitate something similar to better capture exactly how burnout manifests in this industry. Yang et al. also found that simply a translation of the MBI was insufficient and that some items needed to reworded to better fit expression in Chinese culture. However, the MBI items used in this study focused predominantly on emotional exhaustion, which was the least changed factor used by Yang et al. This suggest that the MBI used in this study may lack occupational specificity, but it should culturally translate. Removing
burnout from the model entirely did improve model fit, but not as well as the best-fitting model suggested by the LM test, discussed below. Overall, the fit statistics for this model met the suggested cutoff values, implying it did fit the data sufficiently.

The LM results suggested adding a direct path from job insecurity to turnover intentions. This addition further improved the model fit and added a new significant path to the model. It is interesting that job insecurity directly related to turnover intentions rather than indirectly through burnout, though this may be, at least partially, an effect of the measurement instrument used for burnout in this sample, as discussed previously. However, the direct path may also suggest that job insecurity does truly have a stronger direct effect on turnover intentions than POS in this sample. Potential cultural explanations for this finding are discussed in the Cross-Cultural Comparison section of the general discussion.

Regarding the moderation results, the moderation effect was negligible for both burnout and engagement. The moderation variable was an insignificant predictor in both cases and the $\Delta R^2$ was barely detectable, suggesting no moderation was occurring. The regression results were almost entirely nonsignificant, with the exception of POS negatively predicting engagement in the equation before the moderation variable is entered. Bizarrely, the beta value flipped to positive when the moderation variable was entered and job insecurity became a noticeably stronger predictor (though still nonsignificant). The best explanation for this strange finding is that suppression is occurring. Suppression is any variable with a negative relationship to the overall total effect that inflates the effects of another on the dependent variable when included in the
regression equation (Rucker, Preacher, Tormala, & Petty, 2011). The solution to suppression is to identify and include the suppressor variable, which in this case would be our moderation variable, as it helps better understand what is actually occurring. However, neither job insecurity nor the moderation variable were significant predictors, leaving the suppression effect as merely an interesting aside rather than a finding worth discussing in-depth.

Overall, similarly to Study 2, these results suggest the JD-R model may not account for direct effects from antecedents on outcomes, as evidenced by the direct path from job insecurity to turnover intentions in the best fitting model. However, only one antecedent or the other exhibited a direct relationship in each sample, suggesting there may be cultural differences in whether job insecurity or POS is more highly valued when employees consider whether to leave their job.
GENERAL DISCUSSION

Cross-Cultural Comparison

Although the results cannot be statistically compared due to the nature of the data collections using different scales and response options for the same constructs, I was able to compare the results by examining the proposed model in each sample. This was done by examining the path coefficients, chi-square/other fit statistics, and simple slopes to see if and how the model differs. Specifically, given that I could not use the various measurement invariance tests suggested by Milfort and Fischer (2010) to directly compare the samples due to using different measures in each, I compared qualitatively how the different fit and path coefficients differed between the two samples, similar to the methods used by Stephan, Diaz-Loving, and Duran (2000).

In the initial models, both the path coefficients and fit statistics were noticeably different. Every path in the U.S. sample was significant with moderately strong path coefficients universally. This was not the case in the Chinese sample, where only the job resources path was significant and nothing related to burnout in any way. Again, this may be a function of the burnout measure and how it appears to more occupation-specific than generally experienced in this particular culture. Based on the fit statistics, the model for the Chinese sample appeared to sufficiently fit the model, but the U.S. sample did not. Fortunately, the LM test had several suggestions which both improved model fit and provided a starker contrast between the two samples.
The best-fitting models for each sample are somewhat different in nature. The U.S. sample added direct paths from POS to burnout and turnover intentions and the Chinese sample added a direct path from job insecurity to turnover intentions. These differences may be due to cultural factors, such as power distance and individualism/collectivism.

Power distance can explain why POS did not directly impact turnover intentions in the Chinese sample. China tends to be a high power distance culture, meaning employees follow their supervisor out of a sense of obligation rather than reciprocity norms (Farh, Hackett, & Liang, 2007). As a result, POS may not necessarily have been important to employees as job insecurity when considering their turnover intentions. In addition, job insecurity could have been a direct predictor due to its violation of collectivist values. China tends toward collectivism, meaning employees value group ties and belonging, meaning job insecurity can be viewed as something of a betrayal by the organization, causing employees to want to leave the organization more highly.

In contrast, in the American sample, POS was a direct predictor for both burnout and turnover intentions. The U.S. is a more individualistic and lower power distance culture, meaning employees value individual achievement and reciprocity for their actions (Rockstuhl, Dulebohn, Ang, & Shore, 2012). Because of this, job insecurity is not necessarily viewed as a betrayal of group ties, as it may simply be a result of outside forces, such as economic conditions or an aspect of the job itself. POS, however, can be more highly valued by employees as it can manifest as a function of how well the organization is taking care of you. American employees prefer to feel as though their
individual achievements are being recognized and rewarded and a lack of this support may explain employees burning out and leaving the organization.

Overall, these cultural dimensions may explain why the model functioned so differently between the two samples, but occupation may also provide an explanation. The American sample was composed of a wide variety of occupations all across the United States. In contrast, the Chinese sample was composed of entirely manufacturing workers at one location. Because of this, job insecurity may not have been as dire of an outcome for many of the U.S. workers as it was for the Chinese workers. The American sample was collected through MTurk, meaning every single one of the U.S. workers was using the platform for supplemental income, so they could at least somewhat fall back on MTurk if they lost their job. This is not the case for the Chinese workers, who may have not had any other options if they found themselves unemployed. Cultural differences may explain the stark differences between the two samples, though occupational distinctions may also have played a role. In general, these differences highlight just how different applications of the same theories and models can be depending on where and to whom they are applied.

**Practical and Theoretical Significance**

Preventing undesirable turnover is a constant goal for organizations around the world. Turnover can have great costs associated with it, both direct costs of having to replace the lost employee and other costs, such as lost knowledge and experience (Staw, 1980). As a result, the present research seeks to clarify how job insecurity and perceived
organizational support influence an employee’s intentions to leave the organization. One possible benefit to this research is that an employer will gain more insight into how they can better prevent their employees from leaving the organization. For example, if the organization is undergoing restructuring or layoffs causing job insecurity, they may be able to use improved POS to offset it. Job insecurity may not be changeable, as it may be a characteristic of a job or inevitable as a result of organizational downsizing, though it may be possible to offset this insecurity by improving POS. POS can certainly be changed within the organization to help employees deal with their job insecurity (Gillet, Gagne, Sauvagere, & Fouquereau, 2012). Based on the results of this study, changing POS would be far more impactful for an American company, as it appeared to directly impact turnover intentions. In contrast, Chinese companies may have greater success in trying to improve job insecurity, as their employees would likely not react as positively to improved support from the organization.

Some jobs have an innate level of job insecurity built into them. So-called “gig economy” jobs are mostly freelancers who are a step below independent contractors in that their employment is composed of a multitude of short-term contracts (Kuhn, 2017). A common example of this type of job is the Mechanical Turk sample used in Study 2, as many MTurk employees use the platform frequently as a way to find short-term contracts as a supplement to their primary source of income (Huff & Tingley, 2015). Other examples of these types of jobs would be employees of Uber and Taskrabbit, who are loosely tied to the organization, but complete their very short-term contracts independently. In these cases, American companies could benefit from this research
because even though they may not be able to change their employees’ inherent job insecurity, perhaps these organizations could become more supportive towards their employees to compensate. This improved support could take the form of dedicated support staff for their freelance employees or increasing available benefits for their employees. This could help these companies retain their employees while simultaneously dealing with high employment uncertainty.

Theoretically, this study is an extension of the job demands-resources model. Perceived organizational support has been well-established as a job resource (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004) but job insecurity has been only rarely examined from this perspective (Mauno, Kinnunen, & Ruokolainen, 2007). One theoretical contribution is the expansion of job insecurity in the job demands-resources context and further insight into how it and perceived organizational support interact to affect turnover intentions. Overall, in both samples, the model fit best when direct paths were added from the antecedents to the outcome, a relationship that the JD-R model does not account for. Job insecurity’s direct effect on turnover intentions may be due to rationality instead of a stressed psychological state, as it makes sense for employees concerned about the future of their job to seek other employment (Ashford, Lee, & Bobko, 1989). Social Exchange Theory may explain the direct relationship between POS and turnover intentions, as reduced turnover intentions may be reciprocal response to positive actions taken by the organization as opposed to a resource-driven motivational response (Perryer, Jordan, Firns, & Travaglione, 2010). Overall, these results suggest that future JD-R research should incorporate these other explanations and consider that direct effects from demands
and resources may be occurring in addition to indirect effects, though these direct effects may differ based on sample characteristics, as shown in this study.

Regarding the interaction between job insecurity and POS, one consistency across both samples was a strong relationship between the two and lack of a relationship between job insecurity and burnout, causing POS to fully mediate the effects of job insecurity on all outcomes. This is an important finding because previous research has considered job insecurity as a marker of POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), whereas these results suggest it may actually be a determinant. A next research step would be examining whether or not job insecurity is in fact an antecedent of POS and how this relationship predicts additional outcomes beyond the ones included in this study.

From a cross-cultural perspective, this research provides further insight into how different cultures may experience these processes differently. By examining cross-cultural differences through Hofstede’s dimensions, researchers can gain further insight into which are more important for organizations wishing to reduce turnover based on their cultural context. Specifically, as discussed previously, POS appears to be a more important predictor of turnover intentions for American workers and job insecurity appears more important for Chinese workers. This is likely the most important literature contribution of this thesis, as shows that cultural factors may influence whether employee experiences of job insecurity or POS actually affect their intentions to leave the organization.


Limitations

The most obvious limitation is that I used different scales between the different samples, so it becomes somewhat more difficult to directly compare the two. As a result, this research analyzed two separate models and compared the trends qualitatively, instead of quantitatively. In theory, the different scales should be measuring the same construct, but the different measurement scales and ranges made direct comparison more difficult, though not impossible. The evidence from Study 1 shows that the scales exhibit good convergent validity, as they did correlate highly with each of the counterparts from the other sample, but future research should seek to use scales that are completely identical, so the models can be directly compared through structural equation modeling.

On the topic of Study 1, it should be noted that this validation study was conducted using a US sample and not a Chinese one. This means that although this sample considered the constructs from the different scales similarly, a sample from China may not have. As always in cross-cultural research, it is important to ensure that constructs are not just thought of in similar ways across your cultures of interest, but that the constructs are even considered to exist in both cultures. For example, the fundamental attribution error is considered a common cognitive bias in Western cultures but can be far less common in Eastern ones (Morris & Peng, 1994). This could be a potential explanation for burnout failing to relate to other variables in the Chinese sample in this study: burnout may simply be experienced differently in this particular culture in ways the Maslach Burnout Inventory is not adequately measuring.
In addition, the nature of the samples themselves may lead to differences in the proposed model beyond simply cultural differences. For example, there are substantial differences between the industries of the two samples. The Chinese sample is composed of blue-collar factory workers, whereas the American sample is predominantly white-collar and being paid substantially higher salaries. This may affect employees’ levels of burnout due to the nature of the work being so different, though it is hard to say how it would impact constructs such as job insecurity, which tend to be much more individual/situation-specific rather than industry-specific. In addition, the MBI did not appear to be a sufficient measure of burnout for this industry/culture, a similar issue that Yang et al. (2017) encountered when working with a similar sample. Future research should either expand with items from other scales, as they did, and move beyond simply back-translating items by changing items to better reflect expression in the particular culture.

The nature of the data collection may also have impacted the results. Both data collections were conducted over two waves, but unfortunately the amount of time between the waves in the Chinese sample was lost. As a result, I know the American sample was two months apart, but do not know if the Chinese sample had a comparable gap. However, the data file had the year in the title, so hopefully that means they were under one year apart.
Future Directions

Contemporary conceptualizations of the Job Demands-Resources Model propose that the causal directions may not be as concrete as previously believed. In fact, there is evidence that it is possible for outcomes to affect motivations, which in turn direct how resources are allocated: a reversal of the traditional model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). The present study argues for the more traditional causal directions through the use of multiple data collection time points, but the possibility of a reversal is still one to be considered. Turnover intentions could indirectly affect job insecurity, as a manager could potentially put an employee forward for layoffs if they know they are intending to quit anyway. Turnover intentions may also affect how supportive an employee feels their organization is, as if they are already planning on quitting their job, attempts to help them feel supported may be more likely to be ignored. These reversals of the presented model may feel less intuitive than the traditional JD-R Model, but they are possibilities that could prove supported if investigated.

In addition, current research has put forward the differentiation between personal (such as optimism and self-efficacy) and job resources, which function nearly identically in the job resources path (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Making the distinction between the two could tap into different areas of engagement, which could affect various job outcomes in different ways. For example, personal resources such as self-efficacy and optimism could buffer the effects of high emotional demands in ways that job resources, such as appreciation, may not be able to. From this perspective, POS would likely remain
a job resource, as it involves perspectives on the organization, but it may interact with other personal resources to determine outcomes such as turnover intentions.

Finally, another more recent development is gain and loss spirals, in which the motivations and strains continually feed back upon their demands and resources, either spiraling downwards or upwards, magnifying their effects over time (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). A direction for future research would be to take measures of the present model at multiple time points to examine whether these feedback loops are occurring with our application of the job demands-resources model.

**Conclusion**

Job insecurity is an aspect of employment employees all around the world are increasingly facing. This thesis sought to examine whether there were cultural distinctions in how it is experienced and whether or not POS could be used as a resource to counteract the demands it imposes. Overall, these results suggest job insecurity and perceived organizational support are in fact closely intertwined but show different effects on turnover intentions depending on whether an employee is in the United States or China. Employers benefit from these findings with the knowledge that they may be able to affect turnover by improving one of these areas, depending on their culture. Researchers benefit through the knowledge that direct relationships may need to be explained beyond the Job Demands-Resources Model and that these direct relationships may be culture-dependent. Overall, cross-cultural research is increasingly important as
the world continues to globalize and this thesis helps us understand how well different concepts and theories translate across borders.
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Table 1

Descriptive statistics and correlations for Study 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. JS - CH</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. JS - US</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. POS - CH</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. POS - US</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. BO - CH</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. BO - US</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EN - CH</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. EN - US</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. TI - CH</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>-.66**</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. TI - US</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>-.66**</td>
<td>-.67**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>(.81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Uncorrected correlations appear below the diagonal. Reliability estimates appear in parentheses on the diagonal.

* p < .05

** p < .01

### Table 2

*Descriptive statistics and correlations for Study 2.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Insecurity</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. POS</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Burnout</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>(.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engagement</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>-.54**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* Correlations appear below the diagonal. Reliability estimates appear in parentheses on the diagonal. Listwise deletion was used when calculating correlations.

**p < .01
### Table 3

*Moderated regression results for Study 2.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Total R²</th>
<th>Δ R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>JI</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout Step 2</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>JI</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JI x POS</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>JI</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement Step 2</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>JI</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JI x POS</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* Listwise deletion was used when calculating regression coefficients.

**p < .01

Abbreviations: JI: Job Insecurity, POS: Perceived Organizational Support
Table 4

*Descriptive statistics and correlations for Study 3.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Insecurity</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. POS</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.43-7</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Burnout</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engagement</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2-7</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1-6.67</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>(.72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* Correlations appear below the diagonal. Reliability estimates appear in parentheses on the diagonal. Listwise deletion was used when calculating correlations.

* *p < .05
** *p < .01
Table 5

Moderated regression results for Study 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Total R²</th>
<th>Δ R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>JI</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>JI</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JI x POS</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>JI</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>JI</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JI x POS</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Listwise deletion was used when calculating regression coefficients.

* p < .05

Abbreviations: JI: Job Insecurity, POS: Perceived Organizational Support
FIGURES

Figure 1

*The Job Demands-Resources Model.*

Figure 2

*The full proposed model.*
Figure 3

Results for the hypothesized model – Study 2.
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CFI: .898 RMSEA: .190 SRMR: .109

Figure 4

Results for the best-fitting model – Study 2.
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Figure 5

Results for the hypothesized model – Study 3.
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Figure 6

Results for the best-fitting model – Study 3.
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APPENDIX A: JOB INSECURITY MEASURE – CHINESE SAMPLE

For each of the following statements about the future of your job, select "No" if it does not describe it, "?" if you cannot decide, or "Yes" if it describes your job.

1=No

2=?

3=Yes

The future of my job is unpredictable.

The future of my job is stable. (R)

The future of my job is unknown.

The future of my job is almost guaranteed. (R)

The future of my job is uncertain.

I can depend on my job being here. (R)
APPENDIX B: JOB INSECURITY MEASURE – U.S. SAMPLE

Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

1=Strongly Disagree
2=Disagree
3=Neither Agree nor Disagree
4=Agree
5=Strongly Agree

I will be able to keep my present job as long as I wish. (R)
My current organization will not cut back on the number of hours I work each week. (R)
If my current organization were facing economic problems, my job would be the first to go.
I am confident that I will be able to work for my organization as long as I wish. (R)
My job will be there as long as I want it. (R)
If my job were eliminated, I would be offered another job in my current organization. (R)
Regardless of economic conditions, I will have a job at my current organization. (R)
I am secure in my job. (R)
My current organization would transfer me to another job if I were laid off from my present job. (R)
My job is not a secure one.
APPENDIX C: PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT MEASURE – CHINESE SAMPLE

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement by selecting one of the seven options next to each statement with regard to your current job assignment.

1=Strongly Disagree
2=Moderately Disagree
3=Slightly Disagree
4=Neutral
5=Slightly Agree
6=Moderately Agree
7=Strongly Agree

The organization really cares about my well-being.

The organization strongly considers my goals and values.

The organization would ignore any complaint from me. (R)

The organization disregards my best interests when it makes decisions that affect me. (R)

The organization shows very little concern for me. (R)

Help is available from the organization when I have a problem.

The organization cares about my opinions.
APPENDIX D: PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT – U.S. SAMPLE

Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

1=Strongly Disagree
2=Moderately Disagree
3=Slightly Disagree
4=Neutral
5=Slightly Agree
6=Moderately Agree
7=Strongly Agree

My organization really cares about my well-being
My organization strongly considers my goals and values
My organization shows little concern for me (R)
My organization cares about my opinions
My organization is willing to help me if I need a special favor
Help is available from my organization when I have a problem
My organization would forgive and honest mistake on my part
If given the opportunity, my organization would take advantage of me (R)
APPENDIX E: BURNOUT MEASURE – CHINESE SAMPLE

The following are statements of job-related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job.

1=Never
2=A few times a year or less
3=Once a month or less
4=A few times a month
5=Once a week
6=A few times a week
7=Every day

I feel emotionally drained from my work.
I feel used up at the end of the work day.
I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.
Working with people all day is really a strain for me.
I feel burned out from my work.
I feel frustrated by my job.
I feel I'm working too hard on my job.
Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.
I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.
APPENDIX F: BURNOUT MEASURE – U.S. SAMPLE

Please indicate how frequently you have experienced the following.

1=Never or almost never
2=Very infrequently
3=Quite Infrequently
4=Sometimes
5=Quite frequently
6=Very frequently
7=Always or almost always

In the past 30 workdays, I feel tired
In the past 30 workdays, I have no energy for going to work in the morning
In the past 30 workdays, I feel physically drained
In the past 30 workdays, I feel fed up
In the past 30 workdays, I feel like my “batteries” are “dead”
In the past 30 workdays, I feel burned out
In the past 30 workdays, My thinking process is slow
In the past 30 workdays, I have difficulty concentrating
In the past 30 workdays, I feel I'm not thinking clearly
In the past 30 workdays, I feel I'm not focused in my thinking
In the past 30 workdays, I have difficulty thinking about complex things
In the past 30 workdays, I feel I am unable to be sensitive to the needs of coworkers and customers
In the past 30 workdays, I feel I am not capable of investing emotionally in coworkers and customers

In the past 30 workdays, I feel I am not capable of being sympathetic to co-workers and customers
APPENDIX G: ENGAGEMENT MEASURE – CHINESE SAMPLE

The following statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job.

1=Never
2=Almost Never
3=Rarely
4=Sometimes
5=Often
6=Very Often
7=Always

At my work, I feel bursting with energy.
I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose.
Time flies when I am working.
At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.
I am enthusiastic about my job.
When I am working, I forget everything around me.
My job inspires me.
When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.
I feel happy when I am working intensely.
I am proud of the work that I do.
I am immersed in my work.
I can continue working for very long periods of time.
To me, my job is challenging.

I get carried away when I am working.

At my job, I am very resilient, mentally.

It is difficult to detach myself from my job.

At my work, I always persevere, even when things do not go well.
APPENDIX H: ENGAGEMENT MEASURE – U.S. SAMPLE

Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

1=Strongly Disagree
2=Disagree
3=Somewhat Disagree
4=Neither Agree nor Disagree
5=Somewhat Agree
6=Agree
7=Strongly Agree

In the past 3 months...At my work, I felt bursting with energy.
In the past 3 months...At my job, I felt strong and vigorous.
In the past 3 months...When I got up in the morning, I felt like going to work.
In the past 3 months...I was enthusiastic about my job.
In the past 3 months...My job inspired me.
In the past 3 months...I was proud of the work that I do.
In the past 3 months...I felt happy when I was working intensely.
In the past 3 months...I was immersed in my work.
In the past 3 months...I got carried away when I was working.
APPENDIX I: TURNOVER INTENTIONS MEASURE – CHINESE SAMPLE

Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements. There are no right or wrong answers.

1=Strongly Disagree
2=Moderately Disagree
3=Slightly Disagree
4=Neutral
5=Slightly Agree
6=Moderately Agree
7=Strongly Agree

The thought of quitting my job often crosses my mind.

I often consider finding a new job.

I often actively look for a new job.
APPENDIX J: TURNOVER INTENTIONS MEASURE – U.S. SAMPLE

Please rate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

1=Strongly Disagree
2=Moderately Disagree
3=Slightly Disagree
4=Neutral
5=Slightly Agree
6=Moderately Agree
7=Strongly Agree

I am planning to search for a new job outside my job during the next 12 months

I often think about quitting my job

If I have my own way, I will be working in some other job one year from now