Examining the Impact of Job Security, Organizational Climate and Engagement on Motivation Level of Employees at IMC PVT LTD

Lubna Rizvi D/O Dr Javed[1*] Khawaja Atif Siddiqui
1. College of Business Administration, King Saud University. Riyadh, KSA
2. King Saud University. Riyadh, KSA
* E-mail of the corresponding author: lubna.javed@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to find out the relationship of Motivation with organization climate, engagement, and job security in a service organization, where the company is going through rightsizing. Moreover the company is also utilizing temp staff. This study finds out as to how employees working in the organization perceive it and how much they feel connected to it. Is there any variation on their Motivation regarding job security keeping in view the economic crises in the Country.

1.0.0   Research Objectives
- The main objective is to find out whether the employees working at IMC are motivated to work
- What do they feel about job security
- How is the use of temps working in the organization effecting their job security
- What are the effect of climate to the motivation of employees
- And Do they feel engaged with the organization

1.1.0   Background
The level of competition in the media industry has intensified in recent years, driven by several factors such as the decline in household wealth, rising unemployment, rapid globalization, unclear economic picture. Viewers have also become extremely conscious, especially as other channels have come in the market with lot of good programming. In this scenario the aim of the organization is simply to grab as much market share as possible and that can only be done by giving attractive programming to viewers. Target will be achieved if the employees working in the organization are productive which can only be achieved if they are motivated. The focus of this study is to examine the employee Motivation in relation to employee commitment, culture and job security.

1.2.0   Problem Statement
The Motivation of employees in IMC seems to be effected, In the economic downturn and shut down of the channel twice now employees engagement, perception of job security, and the organization climate will be examined keeping focus to find a relationship of these with employees Motivation Level

1.3.0   Research Question
The main research question of this study is:

How does Job security, organizational climate and employee engagement influence employee Motivation at IMC Pvt Ltd (Geo Tv Network

1.4.0   Hypothesis
The hypotheses indicated below is tested and discussed in this whole study accordingly:**H1a: Job security, Engagement, and Organizational climate factors, effect the Motivation of the employee.**

1.5.0   Research Design
For the current study I have used the quantitative approach.
- The primary data – questionnaire
- The secondary data -past literature reviews and relevant articles.
- Sample method- Random-convenient sampling
- Sample size- 500 employees

European Journal of Business and Management
www.iiste.org
ISSN 2222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839 (Online)
Vol 4, No.9, 2012

1.5.1 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE FACTORS MEASURED

Variables	measurement Source	Number of items	Type of Variable
MOTIVATION	EFPPA	04	Independent
EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT	Mowday et al. (1979)	04	Independent
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE	letwin & stringer (1968)	04	Independent
JOB SECURITY	G. R. Oldham,C. T. Kulik, L. P. Stepina, and M. L. Ambrose, 1986,	03	Independent

Literature Review

In this chapter all the variables have been discussed in depth. There are four independent and one dependent variable. The independent variables are employee engagement, job security and organizational climate. The dependent variable is Employee Motivation.

Literature of Variables

JOB SECURITY

As stated by the theorist Pearce (1998) that perceived job security is a mind state in which employee sees his job stability with the firm in near future. Davy, Kinicki, & Scheck (1991) ; Geary (1992) ; Roskies & Louis-Guerin (1990) ; Tsui, Pearce, Porter, & Tripoli (1997) added that it is the result of the firm's own practices and policies with the employees which makes them more secure or insecure towards a job.

They says that the temporary workers perform well then the permanent workers

Rousseau and Tijoriwala (1998) argued that worker now don't expect categorical job security since the competition in the volatile market is maximum which in turn has placed the security outside management control. However the worker of the current era expects the managements to apply employee involvement programs in good faith efforts which in turn will lead to job security or we can also say that workers may now expect only that management will engage in good faith efforts to secure jobs. The repercussion of this view is that, when the worker will develop a trust for management to be making such efforts he will willingly participate in the employee involvement programs, which may have the positive results even in the downsizing or restructuring of the organization**.**

Ashford, Lee and Bobko (1989); Steers (1977); Forbes (1985); Oldham et al (1986). have also found a negative inverse relationship between perceived job insecurity and both employee satisfaction and commitment. The negative result of insecurity while we talk about EI programs is vital because insecurity may demoralize the possibility of Employee involvement programs. Therefore few theorists like Levine 1995 suggests that prescribed security assurances are important to minimize the employee uncertainties that their involvement in the programs will lead to their own layoffs. However if on the other hand the firm market share is not increased Employee involvement programs will indeed lead to declining workforce. Osterman (2000)) discussed the same. He argued that recent findings are evident that high performance work organizations practices is linked with greater occurrence of layoffs. It is therefore recommended for a firm to have long term employee relationships by which they can support their EI programs. EATON(1990)) while discussing the same endorsed this that because of this very reason in past generations wokers and their unions use to ask for absolute job security before they participated in any such programs.

In 2001 it is estimated by the bureau of labour that contingent workforce was approximately 9.4% of the total workforce. Therefore with the growing numbers of these temporary workers the research and studies on them

can be found growing with the same pace for instance. Beard & Edwards,(1995) Davis-Blake & Uzzi,(1993); Hulin & Glomb,(1999); Pearce (1993), Usually the focus of these research is on the attitudes and behaviours differences between the Employees that means the permanent workers and the Temporary workers like studies of e.g., Bishop & Goldsby,(2000); Broschak & Davis-Blake,(1999); Van Dyne & Ang,(1998). Moreover Ellingson, Gruys, & Sackett,(1998) Feldman, Doerpinghaus, & Turnley, (1995) has also done lot of work on the predictors of both the behaviors and attitudes of these contingent or temporary workers.

The organizational engagement or psychological commitment of the permanent employee can be affected if the firm is using the contingent workforce as argued by Davis-Blake et al Geary,(2003) ; McLean Parks, Kidder, & Gallagher,(1998) Rousseau,(1989) Moreover few more theorists like Guest,(1998); Robinson, Kratz, & Rousseau,(1994); Rousseau,(1994); Rousseau & McLean Parks,(1993); Smithson & Lewis,(2000) also believe that type of that psychological engagement with firm to some degree is confined by the employee perceived job security.

However the other angle of it is that employees may also feel that temporary workers are not only threat but are benefit to the firm. Like theorists Davis-Blake & Uzzi,(1993); Matusik & Hill,(1998); Pfeffer & Baron(1988), said that Temporary workers are hired during the high need times and then are released . in this case not only that employee is not feeling insecure but also feels that he is being helped by these contingent workers in peak seasons. Sometimes these full time employees also sees these contingent workers being used as a weapon to restructure in a firm. As argued by Davis-Blake & Uzzi(1993), employees may see these temporary workers as a preface to outsourcing of any function

Barnett & Miner (1992),Believed that when employees started believing that these part time temporaries can be hired as full timers or are being trained and tested for the full time permanent positions then these temporary workers automatically becomes rivals for the full timers who desire future promotions.

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

A theorist Kahn 1990 also defined engagement as a system which Closely tie together members of the organization with their JOB roles. He further added that employees are connected to their work, physically, mentally, perception ally and emotionally.Moreover one of theorist Csikszentmihaly (1975,1990) gave another concept regarding employee engagement as a "holistic sensation" which means that employees are when engaged with their firm then they act, and think totally for the betterment of the firm. They are in a flow and rarely feel any difference between self and the surroundings. When Kahn (1990) defined the concept about employee engagement he felt the importance of all three dimensions that includes physical, emotional and cognitive. Whereas in Job satisfaction importance was given to only cognitive side. Most of the Human resource Gurus think that employee engagement is all about what are the feeling of an employee towards his organization value system, how much he feels attached to the firm and the way he is treated in the firm as well. . It has a lot to do with emotions which are fundamentally related to drive bottom line success in a company. On the other hand there will always be some employees who will never give their best no matter how and what HR and other managers try to bring that drive and sense of engagement in them. In a nutshell we will observe that usually employee will get connected and engaged with the firm because doing this he satisfies a powerful and a basic need in connect with and contribute to something significant.

Categories of Employee Engagement

According to GALLUP(n.d.) the employees in an organization can be divided into 3 major categories

1) Engaged: they are the building blocks for their firm, the are keen to know the goals, objectives of the firm and what is expected of them. Their performance level usually exceeded the expectations. Every day they are showing their high level energies , skills and abilities. They have a buring desire and passion for innovation and learning which becomes a ladder to success for them.

2) Not engaged—these kinds of employees are concerned about what is to be accomplished that is task oriented only, and not concerned about the goals /objectives expected of that task. They feel that their accomplishments or achievements are being out looked by the management and that there potential is not fully utilized. One of the reasons to feel this way could be of unproductive relationship with the line manager or colleagues.

3) Actively Disengaged—they are like "cave inhabitant" you will find them as a NO MAN who are almost against everything, and usually on a complaining mode all the time. And since they are not a team players so because of this organization suffers the most because of actively disengaged employees

Aktouf (1992) while addressing to the issue of employee engagement argued that cultivating engagement in a firm is vital for every manager since without it there will be affect on the motivation and commitment levels in the workers. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) also commented that insignificant and worthless work by the employee is most of the time linked and connected with laziness, lack of interest and impassiveness from one works. It means that if an employee is disengaged he is certainly de-motivated and dissatisfied. Seeman,(1972)

said that if this is the case then employee will be separated from their own selves. However we have found a lot of researchers like Harter, Schnidt & Hayes (2002), who have worked on employee engagement with reference to other variable which are symptoms of less engaged and unhappy employee like employee turnover, customer satisfaction – loyalty, safety , productivity and profitability criteria

WORKING CLIMATE

Litwin and Stringer (1968) has defined the organization in a broader perspective . As stated they have described climate as an apparent characteristics and working of sub-system way in which the organization deals with its people and their problems. Moreover they have given a structure which is based on six pillars of drive that are applicable for firms climate or an atmosphere

Achievement- The person will compete to achieve the target which is either set by him or given by others, all what he wants to attain is perfection or excellence in it. While setting up these objectives he must be well aware of the hindrances that might come in his way and should have a backup plan as well to reach his target.

Influence This is the second drive as mentioned by Litwin & Stringer, (1968), here an individual will try to impress others and wishes to impact other actions like the way he wants. This drive also deals with an obsession to make a difference and grow people.

Control This drives deals with regulations, here an individual wants to be in loop in all the activities in an organization. He wants to get tight control over things deals the mishaps if occur there and then. He wants to use his authority.**Extension** This drive is illustrated as when an individual is worried about others. He believes in team work and is interested in his sub ordinate objectives. He wants to be useful member of a group.

Dependency An individual's desire to develop his own self by being affiliated with the people of wisdom, class, status and authority therefore the individual will want to have ties with these people on their consent .**Affiliation** An individual motive to have strong bondage, ties and focus on friendship with others, where he can share his inner feelings.

Schneider and Barlett (1968) has defined organizational climate as person's trait or characteristics as well as individual's perceptional image. The climate is how an employee perceives his firm's environment. Moos in 1994 also came up with a work environment scale in which he included few of these characteristics like Involvement, Co-worker, Cohesion, Supervisor Support, Autonomy, Task Orientation, Work Pressure, Clarity, Managerial Control, Innovation, Physical Comfort and others Schneider and Barlett**.** Many vital components of job surroundings are put together to define the word organizational climate. Climate has been considered by Schneider;(1990) Ashkenasy *et al*(2000) as the way people think about their firm's procedures, guidelines and actions.Culture has been studied by many researchers like . Reichers and Schneider (1990); Payne(2000) with the help of questionnaires which are also used in climate studies. Dension (1996) argued that culture is in depth framework of the firm whereas climate is what the employees think, knows or suppose of the firms environment.Bartram *et al*(2002) argued that there are 4 performance recommendations and that are Economic, social, technological and commercial.The concept of the culture is a broader one , Gugvenc (2005) argued that culture refers to the development or progression of group or groups of people living together. Whereas tezcan (n.d) while adding to the same suggested that culture is the life pattern of the society and recognized human conduct. Akdemir (2001) described it as a development of a civilization. However few theorists have described the culture in a restricted manner like Celik who has reviewed that organization culture is composed of the emotions, norms, interactions, activities, expectations, hypothesizes, beliefs, attitudes and values shared its members

In organization its culture is affected by the external environmental culture and the way the organization behave with that, along with It each of the organization has its own value system which comprises its culture. Ozden (n.d) argued that this value system is what triggers every member of the organization. The customs traditions and the climate of the organization influences its value system. The climate of the organization is the nucleus of it, which comprises of culture ecology, individuals and social system. The organization has a blanket over it which is its climate which exhibits employees positive goals and faithfulness, dedication of organization in return.

Celep (2000) while studying the teachers behavior argued that inspiring organizational climate will lead to honesty and dedication in employees. Organization climates give an identity to the employee. Aydin n.d says that organization grows with employees, if the employee is developing himself automatically the firm will develop and grow, Therefore it is needed nowadays to provide employees with a climate that enhances and provokes the creativity and innovations in the individual thus by converting these into firms culture.

EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION

Motivation is a mental progression or a procedure. According to Mine,Ebrahimi, and Wachtel,(1995) after studying and analyzing it seems that mostly absence of keenness in employee is because of dissatisfaction or de-motivation. Beside all the other personality traits motivation is vital part of the human behavior. Now It does not

mean that motivation merely makes what we call a behavior but it works with other cognitive processes. like as described by Luthans(1998) that motivation is a process which affects people behaviors based on what drives people to do something..Moreover motivation as described by Wallace and szilag (1982) as whatever a person does in awareness somewhere between two limits that can be unconscious or conscious for instance Impulse action such as a sneeze cultured behavior or a way of life such as washing your face. Luthans (1998) emphasizes that a course that arouse or stimulate the behavior in a human being, which means that it burns a desire to achieve something(goal or objective) in that person is called motivation. Therefore the best way for organization to have more engaged and happy workers is to make best use of motivation by providing it at the work place. It is not only the cash that can be used to provoke that drive in people instead there can be other perks which can be of help to work as motivators or provokers. In the major fields of management like OB and HR the focus is on employee behaviors in relation to job satisfaction and their engagement with the organization. Employee attitude is directly proportional to job satisfaction however the employee engagement focus more on employee attitude for all organization. We can find a very strong bond between job satisfaction and commitment but recent work on the same argues that commitment causes satisfaction. Motivation is an emotional stage, or It is a zest and determination with a kind of excitement that leads one to persevere to reach greater heights. It can be very vital for considering human behavior however Luthan (1998) emphasized that this tool should not be treated to explain what behavior is? Infact it should be used with other tools and environment. Luthan (1998) further affirms that similar to other rational and thinking process, motivation can't be seen as well. All what can be felt, observed and seen by naked eyes is human behavior. Motivation has a pivotal role when we talk about human behavior adding to this statement EVANS 1986 states that many theorists now find it vital to re-focus behavior in the filed of OB. We can find thousands of definitions of motivations however one key word we will find in all of them mostly will be desire", "want", "wishes","aim","goals", "needs", and" incentives". Luthan (1998) while describing motivation explains it as a systematic procedure that begins with lack of something which in turn triggers the desire or provoke the drive that is intended or targeted at a purpose. Keywords for motivation like drive, desire, wishes, aim etc gives us the clear understanding of what exactly the word motivation revolves around. In addition to this Minner, Ebrahimi, and Watchel(1995) stated that motivation revolves around three things needs, drives and incentives.

Information Availability and Communication: Olajide (2000) argued that by sharing information in the organization manager can also motivate the employees. Employees no matter where they work , really appreciate proper communication channels, cooperation between teams and collaboration. Sharing and bearing information will provoke competition between employees or their teams and thus they seek to thrive for the best and are motivated to compete.

The focus of most of the motivational studies has been on the initiators , influencers and modifiers of behaviors in human. Theories of the past have made a lot of effort on the core of motivation that is "drive" for instance instinctual drives (e.g., Freud, 1923/1962), physiological drives (e.g., Hull, **1943).**
These theories still holds a lot of weight however because of some limitations like humans are submissive to situation according to their environment, surrounding, functioning or structure, these studies were criticized by many theorists.

1.6.0   Evaluating the model:
Multiple regression was conducted to determine the best linear combination of Organizational climate, job security and employee engagement for predicting Employee motivation. Assumptions of linearity, normally distributed error and un- correlated errors were checked and met.

The summarized results are presented Below:

Model Summary of impact of all 4 variables on productivity TABLE				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.664[a]	.441	.404	.37380666
a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Security, Commitment, Climate				

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5.066	3	1.689	12.085	.000[a]
	Residual	6.428	46	.140		
	Total	11.494	49			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Security, Commitment, Climate

b. Dependent Variable: Motivation

Coefficients

Model		Un standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.080	.657		-.122	.903
	Commitment	.302	.178	.239	1.703	.095
	Climate	.224	.207	.164	1.085	.284
	Job_Security	.512	.167	.401	3.059	.004
a. Dependent Variable: Motivation						

This combination of variables significantly predicted motivation level.

$F(3,44)=11.949$, $P = < .05$ with all three variable significantly contributing to the prediction. The adjusted R Square was .404. This indicates that 40% of the variance in motivation level was explained by the model. According to Cohen (1988) this is a large effect. It was found that job security significantly predicted motivation ($\beta = .401$, $P < .05$) as did, Commitment ($\beta = .239$, $P < .10$). However there was insignificant relationship of climate with the motivation ($\beta = .164$, $P > .05$)

1.7.0 : Discussion and Analysis of the Results:

Our findings suggest that there is a significant relationship between employee commitment and motivation. Comparatively the findings of Strokes, Riger and Sullivans (1995) also substantiate the research findings that there is a relationship between employee commitment and motivation. Similarly another study also support the findings that there is a positive relationship between commitment and motivation (Brown and Shepherd) 1997. Moreover study of Bredell (2000:85) also endorsed the same result, which says that higher will be the commitment higher will be the motivation.

The findings in the context of Organizational Climate and Motivation was that there is no relationship between the two variables. Comparatively the findings of Parker et al (2003) was that there is a relationship between the two variables. The reason of contradiction from the findings of Parker et al(2003) could be that IMC Pvt Ltd was at the stage of rightsizing at the time data was collected therefore the factor superseded the relationship of climate with motivation of Employees.

Discussing the findings of the current study it is evident that there is a strong relationship between motivation and job security. The study by Harpaz (1990 also endorsed the same where he ranked different motivational factors according to their importance which are (a) interesting work, (b) good wages, and (c) job security.

Wrapping Up the study:

The main objective is to find out whether the employees working at IMC are motivated to work

By preliminary analysis it was evident that the employees are still motivated to work

- What do they feel about job security

They don't feel any threat and feel secure, even when the organization is hiring Temps

- What are the effect of climate to the motivation of employees

The climate has no significant impact on the motivation

- Do they feel engaged with the organization

Employees feel engaged not only with the organization but with the supervisor, then to department going on to the organization

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. A.Engellandt and R.T. Riphahn 2005. Temporary contracts and employee effort. Labour Economics, 12(3):281–299.

2. A.Ichino and R.T. Riphahn 2005. The effect of employment protection on worker effort: Absenteeism during and after probation. Journal of the European Economic Association,3(1):120–143,

3. Aktouf, O. 1992. Management and theories of organizations in the 1990s: Toward a critical radical humanism. Academy of Management Review, 17, 407–431.).

4. Akdemir, A., 2001. 1sletme Bilimine Giris. Kavramlar, 1slevler ve Tartismalar. [Introduction to Management, Concepts, Functions and Discussions] Eskisehir: Birlik Ofset Yayincilik.

5. Akinboye, J.O. 2001. *Executive behavior battery*. Ibadan: Stirling-Horden Publishers.

6. Allmon, E; Hass, C; Borcherding, J; Goodrum, P. 2000 U.S Construction Labor Productivity Trends, 1970 – 1998. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 126(2), 97-104

7. Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. 1989. Content, causes, and consequences of job insecurity: A theory-based measure and substantive test. Academy of Management Journal, 32, 803–829

8. ASHFORD, Susan J., Cynthia LEE and Philip BOBKO. 1989. "Content, Causes, and Consequences of Job Insecurity: A Theory-Based Measure and Substantive Test."

9. Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 32, No. 4, 803–829.

10. Ashkenasy, N. M., Wilderom, C. P. M. and Peterson, M. F. (eds.) 2000, Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate, London: Sage.

11. Barnett, W. P., & Miner, A. S. 1992. Standing on the shoulders of others: Career interdependence in job mobility. Administrative Science Quarterly,37, 262–281

12. Bartram, D., Robertson, I. T., & Callinan, M. 2002. Introduction: A Framework for Examining Organizational Effectiveness. In I.T Robertson,

13. Bauer, T. N., & Truxillo, D. M. 2000. Temp-to-permanent employees: A longitudinal study of stress and selection success. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5, 337–346.

14. Beard, K. M., & Edwards, J. R. 1995. Employees at risk: Contingent work and the psychological experience of contingent workers. Trends in Organizational Behavior, 2, 109–126. Bishop,

15. Borcherding, J.D. Garner, D. F., 1986"Work Force Motivation and Productivity on Large Jobs," ASCE Construction Journal Vol. 107, pp. CO3, September 1981; Vol 112 No 1 pp 137151 7

16. Bredell, D. 2000. An industrial psychological study establishing the relationship

17. between career self-management and job performance. Thesis presented in partial

18. fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts at the University of Stellenbosch.

19. Broschak, J. P., & Davis-Blake, A. 1999, August. Is temporary employment an effective selection tool? The relationship between temporary employment and job performance. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.

20. Brown, J. & Sheppard, B. (1997). Teacher librarians in learning organizations. Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the International Association of School Librarianship, Canada.August 25-30.

21. Carnevale, D.G., 1992,Physical Settings of Work. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 15,4,423-436.

22. Celep, C., 2000. Egitimde Orgutsel Adanma ve Ogretmenler. [Organizational Sacrifice in Education and the Teachers]Ankara: Ani Yayincilik

23. Celik, V., 2000 a. Okul Kulturu ve Yonetimi. 2. Baski. [School Culture and Its Management] Ankara: Pegem A Yayinevi Tic. Ltd. Sti.

24. Cherniss, C., and Kane, J. "Public Sector Professionals: Job characteristics, satisfaction, and aspiration for intrinsic fulfillment through work." Human Relations, 40 (3), 125-136.

25. Csikszentmihalyi 1975, M. Beyond Boredom and Anxiety Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA,.

26. Csikszentmihalyi, 1990 M. Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience Harpers Perennial, New York,

27. Davy, J. A., Kinicki, A. J., & Scheck, C. L. 1991. Developing and testing a model of survivor responses to layoffs. Journal of Vocational Behavior,38, 302–317

28. Davis-Blake, A.&Uzzi,B.1993. Determinants of employment externalization: A study of temporary workers and independent contractors. Administrative Science Quarterly, 38, 195–223.

29. Denison, D. R. 1996, 'What is the Difference between Organizational Culture and Organizational Climate? A Native's Point of View on a Decade of Paradigm Wars', Academy of Management Review, 21, pp. 619-654.

30. EATON, A. E. 1990. "The Extent and Determinants of Local Union Control of Participative Programs." Industrial and Labor Relations

Review, Vol. 43,No. 5, 604–621.

31. Ellingson, J. E., Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. 1998. Factors related to satisfaction and performance of temporary employees. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83, 913–921.

32. Evans, M.G. 1986. Organizational behavior: The central role of motivation. *Journal of Management 12 (2)*, 203.

33. Feldman, D. C., Doerpinghaus, H. I., & Turnley, W. H. 1995. Employee reactions to temporary jobs. Journal of Managerial Issues, 7, 127–141.

34. FORBES, D. 1985. "The No-Layoff Payoff." Dun's Business Month, Vol. 126, No. 1, 64–66.

35. Geary, J. F. 1992. Employment flexibility and human resource management: The case of three American electronic plants. Work, Employment, & Society, 6, 251–270.

36. Goodrum, P. and Haas, C. 2000-2001. "Factors Affecting Innovation Performance in the U.S. Construction Industry," for the ASCE Construction Congress VI Proceedings.

37. Greenhalgh, L., & Rosenblatt, Z. 1984. Job insecurity: Toward a conceptual clarity. Academy of Management Review, 9, 438–448.

38. Guvenc, B., 1991. 1nsan ve Kultur. [Man and The Culture] 5. Baski. 1stanbul: Remzi Kitabevi A.S.

39. Güvenç, Bozkurt 2005, *İnsan ve Kültür – Human and Culture*, Remzi Kitabevi,İstanbul.

40. Harpaz, I. (1990). The importance of work goals: an international perspective. Journal of International Business Studies, 21. 75-93.

41. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. 2002. Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 268-279

42. Huges, J. 2007, July. Office design is pivotal to employee productivity. *Sandiego source the daily transcript.***http://www.nios.ac.in/srsec328newE/328EL9.pdf** 4th August 4, 2010, 7.19 pm

43. Hyde, Albert C. Hyde Autumn, 1992 Public Productivity & Management Review, Vol. 16, No. 1.*http://www.nios.ac.in/srsec328newE/328EL9.pdf 4th August 4, 2010, 7.19 pm*

44. John D. Borcherding, A.M. ASCE, and Clarkson H. Oglesby, F. ASCE Sept. 1974, Journal of the Construction Division,

45. J.W., & Goldsby, M. G. 2000, August. Layoff practices, perceived organizational support, employee commitment, and intention to quit: The role of contingent workers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

46. Kanungo, R. 1982. Work Alienation: An Integrative Approach. New York Praeger,

47. Kline, T. (2005) B, SULSKY, LM & REVER MORIYAMA, COMMON MEHTOD VAIRANCE SPECIFICATION ERRORS: A PRACTICAL APPROACH TO DETECTION. Journal of psychology, 134, 401-421

48. Lawler, E., & Hall, D. 1970. Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 54, 305–312.

49. LEVINE, David I. 1995. Reinventing the Workplace: How Business and Employees Can Both Win. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

50. Luthans, F. 1998. Organisational Behavior. 8th ed. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

51. Litwin, G., & Stringer, R. 1968 Motivation and organizational climate. Boston: Harvard University Press,

52. **Maloney**, W F and **McFillen**,1987 J M 'Influence of foreman on performance' J. Construct. Eng. Manage. Vol 113 No 3

53. Matusik, S. F., & Hill, C. W. L. 1998. The utilization of contingent work, knowledge creation, and competitive advantage. Academy of Management Review, 23, 680–697.

54. McLean Parks, J., Kidder, D. L., & Gallagher, D. G. 1998. Fitting square pegs into round holes: Mapping the domain of contingent work arrangements onto the psychological contract. Journal of Organizational Behavior,19, 697–730.

55. Moos, R. H. 1994. Work environment scale manual: Development, applications, research (Third ed.). Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

56. M. Callinan, & D. Bartram (Eds.),N.D. Organizational Effectiveness: The Role of Psychology (p. 1-12). Chichester, UK: Wiley

57. Miner, J.B., Ebrahimi, B., & Wachtel, J.M. 1995. How deficiency in management contributes to the United States' competitiveness problem and what can be done about it? *Human Resource Management*. Fall, p. 363.

58. OLDHAM, G. R., C. T. JULIK, M. L. AMBROSE, L. P. STEPINE and J. F. BRAND 1986. "Relations between Job Facet Comparisons and Employee Relations." Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Vol. 38, 28–47.

59. OSTERMAN, Paul. 2000. "Work Reorganization in an Era of Restructuring: Trends in Diffusion and Effects on Employee Welfare." Industrial and Labor Relations Review, Vol. 53, No. 2, 179–196.

60. Pearce, J. L. 1998. Job insecurity is important, but not for the reasons you 396 RESEARCH REPORTS might think: The example of contingent workers. Trends in Organizational Behavior, 5, 31–46

61. Perry Rector, Brian H. Kleiner, 2002 "Creating productivity in public institutions", Management Research News, Vol. 25 Iss: 3, pp.43 -50

62. Peter F Kaming 1997 International Journal of Project Management, Volume 15, Issue 1, February 1997, Pages 21-30,

63. Pfeffer, J., & Baron, J. N. 1988. Taking the workers back out: Recent trends in the structuring of employment. Research in Organizational Behavior, 10, 257–303.

64. Roskies, E., & Louis-Guerin, C. 1990. Job insecurity in managers: Antecedents and consequences. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11,345–359.

65. ROUSSEAU, Denise M., and Snehal A. TIJORIWALA. 1998. "Assessing Psychological Contracts: Issues, Alternatives and

Measures." Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol. 19, 679–695.

66. Rousseau, D. M. 1989. Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 2, 121–139.

67. Rousseau, D. M. 1990. New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: A study of psychological contracts. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11, 389–400

68. Rousseau, D. M. 1995. Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements. Newbury Park, CA:Sage.

69. Rousseau, D. M., & McLean Parks, J. 1993. The contracts of individuals and organizations. Research in Organizational Behavior, 15, 1–43.

70. Reichers, A. E. and Schneider, B. 1990, 'Climate and Culture: An Evolution of Constructs',

71. STEERS, R. 1977. "Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Commitment." Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 22, 46–56

72. Steer, R.M., Mooday, R.T., & Porter, L.W. 1982. *Employee organization linkages*. New York: Academic Press.

73. Steers, J. and L. Porter, 2000. Factors affecting the context for motivation in public organizations. Acad. Manage. Rev., 7: 89-98.

74. Seeman, M. 1972. Alienation and engagement. In Campbell, A., & Converce, P. E. (eds).The Human Meaning of Social Change, 467-527. New York: Russell Sage Foundation

75. Schneider, B. (ed.) 1990, Organizational Climate and Culture, San Franc isco: Jossey-Bass.

76. Schneider (ed.), Organizational Climate and Culture, pp. 5-39. San Franc isco: Jossey-Bass.N.D

77. Schneider, B., & Bartlett, C. J. 1968 Individual differences and organizational climate I: The research plan and questionnaire development. Personnel Ps cholo, , 21, 323-333.

78. Sundstrom, E., Town, J.P., Rice, R.W., Osborn, D.P. and Brill, M. 1994, Office noise, satisfaction, and performance, Environment and Behavior, 26(2), pp. 195-222.

79. Tsui, A. S., Pearce, J. L., Porter, L. W., & Tripoli, A. M. 1997. Alternative approaches to the employee–organization relationship: Does investment in employees pay-off? Academy of Management Journal, 40, 1089–1121.

80. Thomas, K.W., & Velthouse, B.A. 1990. Cognitive elements of empowerment: An 'interpretive' model of intrinsic task motivation. Academy of Management Review, 15, 666–681.

81. Tezcan, M., 1987. Kultur ve Kisilik (Psikolojik antropoloji). [Culture and Personality (Psychological Antropology)] Ankara: Bilim Yayinlari.

82. Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. 1998. Organizational citizenship behaviors of contingent workers in Singapore. Academy of Management Journal, 41, 692–703.

83. William A. KAHN 1990, physchological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of management journal 33, 694-724

Lubna Rizvi D/O Dr Javed Ahmed, Lecturer, Department of Management Sciences, College of Business Administration, KSA
Khawaja Atif Siddiqui, King Saud University

This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage: http://www.iiste.org

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** http://www.iiste.org/Journals/

The IISTE editorial team promises to the review and publish all the qualified submissions in a fast manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digtial Library , NewJour, Google Scholar