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ABSTRACT

This article examines a model of the domestic economy of subjective job insecurity in Uganda. Based on data on people’s knowledge, attitudes and perception toward their job security collected in schools, hospitals and organizations in Kampala central, it shows that most of the workers are aware of job insecurity and they agree that job insecurity is an undesirable feeling in any given company. Workers also agree that job insecurity is a very undesirable feeling in the working environment. Thus this shows that they have a negative attitude towards job insecurity. People's knowledge, attitudes and perception have a significant impact on job security. The article’s findings suggest the need to decompose the different components of employment insecurity as well as disaggregate national systems of social protection when examining the impact of knowledge, attitude and perception on job insecurity. Employee uncertainty over potential job loss has often been assumed to have negative effects. From an individual perspective, it is the health and well-being of employees that may be negatively affected, while, from an organizational perspective, work behaviors and attitudes may be affected negatively. Since planning for the future might not be possible when experiencing job insecurity and life outside work may be influenced negatively as well, job insecurity can have effects on a larger societal level.

One reason for the need for research on job insecurity concerns the changes that have occurred in the labor market, which have brought more uncertainty into the workforce environment. Due to the major changes in working life, certain stressors have become more prominent, with one of the most common ones concerning the uncertainty experienced over the future of one’s job, job insecurity.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Working life in Kampala has been subject to dramatic changes over the past decades as a result of economic recessions, new information technology, industrial restructuring and accelerated global competition. As a consequence, organizations in Kampala Central have been forced to engage in various adaptive strategies in order to tackle new demands and remain vigorous in this unpredictable environment. Organizations in such environments often have two options to become more profitable; they can either increase their gains or decrease their costs, often by reducing the number of employees (Burke & Cooper, 2000); (Tetrick & Quick, 2003). These organizational options often surface in actions like outsourcing and privatizations, often in combination with personnel reductions through layoffs, offers of early retirement and increased utilization of sub-contracted workers (Burke & Cooper, 2000); (Tetrick & Quick, 2003). These changes have impacted tremendously on organizational structures in Kampala and have created continuous need for organizational changes in terms of retrenchments, rightsizing, mergers and acquisitions and downsizing. As a result of these changes, job insecurity has emerged as one of the most important issues in working life in Kampala Central and has brought the issue of insecure working conditions to the forefront (Sverke & Hellen, 2002).

Job security is necessary for the proper functioning and development of economic activities for a country like Uganda. There is an ongoing concern about the rise in job insecurity despite continued efforts to prevent it. A condition where employees lack the assurance that their jobs will remain stable from day to day, week to week, or year to year, is generally undesirable in a growing economy as Uganda. Such insecurities reduce effectiveness among employees and reduces their productivity, this is because Performance and life of workers /employees is generally depending upon the working environment. The strength and performance of workers is dependent on their ability to respond to such pressures.

Ideally, employees should not be subject to work related stress due job insecurity. However, the current state of the practice in Uganda typically results in the underdevelopment of human resources due to great fear of making mistakes while trying out a risky idea in management.
A challenge is that methods used to reduce this problem are much less inferior and less active. The situation becomes even more complex when one considers how these jobs are obtained and how easy they can change hands to other individuals.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

During the last two decades organizations increasingly used downsizing as a way to handle the intense competition caused by globalization (Cartwright & Holmes, 2006); (Sverke & Hellen, 2002). On top of that, the current financial crisis in Uganda forces organizations in Kampala Central to reduce their headcount in order to save costs. For numerous employees these recent developments cause feelings of insecurity concerning the future existence of their jobs (Sverke & Hellen, 2002). Growing perceptions of job insecurity in Kampala Central have consequences for employee attitudes and perceptions, such as employee engagement. It is therefore necessary for the urban population of Kampala Central to have broad knowledge about job insecurity. This will determine the attitudes and perceptions of the people towards the working environment in Uganda.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1.3.1 Main Objectives

The main objective of the study is to assess the knowledge, attitude, and perceptions of people towards the increase of job insecurity in Uganda.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

a) To assess the Knowledge of people about job insecurity and thereby determine the impact of their knowledge on the job insecurity.

b) To find out the attitudes of people towards job insecurity and to determine the relationship between people’s attitudes and job insecurity.

c) To find out the perceptions of people towards job insecurity and thereby determine the impact of their perceptions on job insecurity.

d) To find out which age group and gender of workers is subject to more threats of losing jobs.
1.4 RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

There is no association between peoples knowledge and job insecurity.

Knowledge does not have an impact on job insecurity

There is no relationship between peoples attitude and job insecurity

Attitude has no impact on job insecurity

There is no relationship between people’s perception and job insecurity

Perception has no impact on job insecurity

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This research is expected to bring about the following positive benefit.

- This study will provide information about the knowledge, attitudes and perception of people towards the increase in job insecurity in Uganda thus adding to the existing body of knowledge.
- The study will provide a basis for policy makers to develop policies to minimize the effects of job insecurity
- Through this study, we shall become aware of the level and the impacts of job insecurity on the wellbeing of people in Uganda.
- This study will also help us to analyze the major causes of job insecurity.
- This study will encourage the government to take on its duties of ensuring a stable working environment of reduced job insecurity.
1.6 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Figure 1.1 Conceptual framework

Independent Variables

**Knowledge**
- Awareness of job insecurity (Prevalence, Sources and Causes)
- Safety Knowledge at work place

**Attitude**
- Affective Component (feelings/ emotions)
- Behavioural components (Past behaviours or Experiences)
- Cognitive component (Belief, thoughts and attributes)

**Perceptions**
- The perceiver (the person who becomes aware of job insecurity)
- The target (the person who they perceive or judge)
- Situation (The circumstance under which job insecurity occurs).

Dependent Variables

**Job Insecurity**
- Threat to job features (Payments, promotions and status).
- Threat to the Job itself (being fired or laid off)

*Source: Author (2018)*
The figure shows the figurative illustration of the relationship between the dependent and the independent variables;

The awareness of people about job insecurity describes the facts and information that people have acquired about the prevalence of job insecurity and its causes. Awareness also describes the sources of the information about job insecurity. Safety knowledge is characterized by an employee's understanding of safe operating procedures and adequate safety training and instruction.

The affective component of attitude describes the feelings or emotions that are linked to job insecurity. For example, many people are afraid/scared of losing their jobs. So this negative affective response is likely to cause an individual to have a negative attitude towards job insecurity. The behavioral component of attitude describes the past behaviors or experiences regarding job insecurity. It explains the idea that people might infer their attitudes from job insecurity. The cognitive component of attitude describes the beliefs, thoughts and attributes that people will associate with job insecurity. Many times a person’s attitude towards job insecurity might be based on the negative and positive attributes they associate with job insecurity.

The perceiver is that person who becomes aware and comes to find understanding about job insecurity. There are three factors that can influence his or her perception about job insecurity: Experience, motivational state and emotional state. In different motivational and emotional states, the perceiver will react to or perceive job insecurity in different ways. Also in different situations, he or she might employ a perceptual defence where they tend to see what they want to see. The target is that person who is being perceived or judged in relation to job insecurity. Ambiguity or lack of information about a target leads to greater interpretation and additions about job insecurity. The situation under which job insecurity occurs also greatly influences perception toward job insecurity because different situations may for additional information about the target.
1.7 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

1.7.1 Geographical Scope

The study will target workers who are employed in formal jobs in Kampala Central. The employees will be selected randomly from their places of work using simple random sampling as the sampling technique.

1.7.2 Content Scope

Information about the biographical features including age, gender, race, religion, and number of years on current job of the respondent will be sought during this study, and the relationship between these biographical features and job insecurity will be examined. This study will also seek information on the knowledge, attitudes and perception of people towards the increase in job insecurity in Uganda.

1.7.3 Time Scope

A cross sectional study based on self-reported data by workers in Kampala Central will be carried out. The data will be collected once from the field and there after conclusions shall be deduced from the data. No frequent visits will be made to the field of study by the researcher. This process of data collection and data analysis will take three month. This is because this space of time gives the researcher enough time to study and report the findings about job insecurity of workers in Uganda.

1.8 POLICY ABOUT JOB INSECURITY

The job policy in Uganda states that employers can only terminate employment by issuing a notice two to three month in advance (depending on the duration of employment). Employees are entitled to wages if they are terminated without notice. Ugandan law only differentiates between termination with notice (or payment in lieu of notice) and summary dismissal (termination without notice). Summary dismissal applies when the employee fundamentally violates his/her terms of employment. Uganda does not provide unemployment insurance or any other social safety net programs for terminated works. The employment Act, 2006, does not allow waivers of labor laws for foreign investors. In 2014, the government of Uganda created industrial court(IC)
to arbitrate labor disputes that could not be resolved by district labor officers and the commissioner of labor. The IC has the jurisdiction of the High Court and each case is heard by two high courts judges and three panelists, including one representative of the employers, one of the employees and an individual third party.

Article 40 clause 2 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 2005 as amended stipulates that, “Every person in Uganda has the right to practice his or her profession and to carry on any lawful occupation, trade or business”. The Constitution also guarantees decent work under the following articles: Articles 25(1) on slavery and servitude; Article 25(2) on forced labor; Article 29(1) on right to freedom of association; Article 34(4) on protection of children from economic exploitation and hazardous work, Article 39 on right to a clean and healthy environment, Article 40 (1) right to work under satisfactory, safe and healthy conditions; equal pay for equal work without discrimination, rest and reasonable working hours and periods of holidays with pay and remuneration for public holidays; Articles 40(3) right to form and join trade union and Article 40(4) on protection of women during pregnancy and after birth, in accordance with the law. To operationalise the above provisions of the Constitution, a number of laws have been enacted. These include; The Employment Act No. 6 of 2006; the Labor Unions Act No. 7 of 2006; the Labor Disputes (Arbitration and Settlement) No. 8 of 2006; the Occupational Safety and Health Act No. 9 of 2006; the National Social Security Act, Cap 220, and the Statutory Instrument No. 62, Employment (Recruitment of Ugandan Migrant Workers Abroad) Regulations (2005). In addition, there are other relevant laws, such as, the Local Governments Act Cap 243, Laws of Uganda (2000); the Public Service Act (2008); the Education Act (2008); the Uganda Citizenship and Immigration Act (1999); the Prevention of Trafficking in Persons Act (2008; the Public Service (Negotiating, Consultative and Disputes) Settlement Machinery Act (2008), National Disability Act (2006) and the Equal Opportunities Commission Act (2007). The above laws are in conformity with the Regional and International Treaties that Uganda has signed and ratified. These include; the East African Community Treaty (2000), which provides for integrated approach to employment strategies (Article 104), the East African Common Market Protocol and the Free Movement of Persons Regulations, the Ouagadougou Declaration and Plan of Action on Employment and Poverty Alleviation in Africa (2004); ILO Convention No. 122 on
Employment Policy (1964); as well as the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (1998).

1.9 DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

1.9.1 Knowledge

Knowledge refers to a detailed familiarity, awareness or understanding of someone or something such as facts, information, description or skills, which is acquired through experience or education by perceiving, discovering or learning. Knowledge can refer to a theoretical or practical understanding of a subject. It can be implicit (as with practical skill or expertise) or explicit (as with the theoretical understanding of a subject). It can be more or less formal or systematic. In philosophy, the study of knowledge is called epistemology; the philosopher Plato famously defined knowledge as justified true belief, though this definition is now thought by some analytic philosophers to be problematic because of the Gettier problem while others defend the platonic definition. However, several definitions of knowledge and theories to explain it exist.

1.9.2 Attitude

An attitude is an evaluation of an attitude object, ranging from extremely negative to extremely positive. Most perspectives on attitudes also permit that people can also be conflicted or ambivalent toward the same object. This has led to some discussions of whether individuals can hold multiple attitudes towards the same object.

An attitude can be a positive or negative evaluation of people, events, activities, and ideas. It could be concrete, abstract or just about anything in your environment, but there is a debate about precise definitions. Early and Chaiken, for example define an attitude as a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor. Though it is sometimes common to define an attitude as affect toward an object, affect (i.e. discrete emotions or overall arousal) is generally understood as an evaluative structure used to form an attitude object. Attitude may influence the attention to attitude objects, the use of categories for encoding information and the interpretation, judgment and recall of attitude-relevant information. These influences tend to be more powerful for strong attitudes which are
accessible and based on elaborate supportive knowledge structure. The durability and impactfulness of influence depends upon the strength formed from consistency of heuristics. Attitudes can guide encoding information, attention and behaviors, even if the individual is pursuing unrelated goals.

1.9.3 Perception

Perception refers to the organization, identification and interpretation of sensory information in order to represent and understand the presented information, or the environment. All perception involves signals that go through the nervous system, which in-turn result from physical or chemical stimulation of the sensory system.

Perception can be split into two processes

1. Processing the sensory input which transforms this low level information to higher level information. (e.g. extract shapes for object recognition)
2. Processing which is connected with a person’s concepts and expectations (or knowledge), restorative and systematic mechanisms(such as attention) that influence perception.

Perception depends on the complex functions of the nervous system, but subjectively seems mostly effortless because this processing happens outside conscious awareness.

1.9.4 Job Insecurity

Although there is not one generally accepted definition of job insecurity, many researchers use the definition of Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt. (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984) define job insecurity as ‘perceived powerlessness to maintain desired continuity in a threatened job situation’. Like many other researchers, (Davy, Kinicki, & Scheck, 1997) state that this definition goes beyond the concern over continuation of employment, and includes concern over desirable job characteristics, like promotion opportunities and current work conditions.

In turn (Hui & Lee, 2000) conclude that job insecurity derives from uncertainty in someone’s job situation as well as from a lack of control over the destiny of one’s job situation.
According to Dewitte, ‘The topic of job insecurity is situated between employment and unemployment, because it refers to employed employees who feel threatened by unemployment’. Since job insecurity does not necessarily lead to unemployment, the amount of employees experiencing feelings of job insecurity is believed to be considerably larger than the number of employees who actually lose their job.

Research on job insecurity does not focus on employees that deliberately choose an uncertain job status. Since job insecurity implies feelings of powerlessness to preserve the desired job continuation, insecure employees experience a discrepancy between the preferred and perceived level of job insecurity (DeWitte, Job insecurity: Review of international literature on definitions, prevalence, antecedents and consequences. Journal of industrial management, 2005).

Job insecurity can be equated with the feeling of being threatened by unemployment (Mohr, 2000) and may be defined as a concern about the continued existence of a current job (Van, 1990). Job insecurity is a subjective perception. The same objective situation may be interpreted somewhat differently by various employees. Some employees fear dismissal, whereas there is no reason to fear from an ‘objective’ point of view. Others feel confident about their job, while there is a strong possibility that they will be dismissed. In general, however, the subjective perception of job insecurity corresponds well with the objective possibility of job loss (see further down). Job insecurity concerns insecurity about the future: one does not know whether one will retain or lose the current job. As such, insecure employees do not know whether they have to take action or not. This is in contrast with certainty about dismissal. The employee who is dismissed is certain that the job is lost and can prepare for the future (e.g., by applying for a job). Definitions of job insecurity also contain references to the unwanted nature of job insecurity (Sverke & Hellen, 2002). Job insecurity implies a discrepancy between what workers wish for (security about the future of their present employment) and what they ‘get’ (the perception that the present job is insecure).
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter contains a review of related literature on job insecurity and peoples knowledge, attitude and perception towards job insecurity. This chapter also reviews evidence of what has been said in respect to job insecurity.

2.2 Job Insecurity

In the last two decades many employees have experienced feelings of job insecurity due to a significant increase in mergers and acquisitions along with the downsizing and delayering of many organizations (Cartwright & Holmes, 2006). As a result a large amount of literature about job insecurity and its consequences has been developed (Sora, Caballer, Peiro, & DeWitte, 2009).

Some authors distinguish between the (cognitive) possibility of job loss (‘probability’; ‘I think that I will become unemployed’), and the affective experience thereof (‘I am afraid that I will become unemployed’) (Borg, 1992). Research shows that both aspects correlate strongly, resulting in homogeneous scales with cognitive as well as affective items (De Witte, 2000a); (Vander, DeWitte, & Cuyper, 2010). Other scholars distinguish between quantitative and qualitative job insecurity (Hellgren, Sverke, & Isackson, A two dimensional approach to job insecurity: consequences for employees attitudes and well being. European journal of work and organizational psychology, 1999). Quantitative job insecurity concerns keeping or losing the job as such: people are unsure whether they will be able to keep their job or instead will become unemployed. Qualitative job insecurity refers to insecurity about preserving valued job aspects. These employees are not afraid of losing their job. They do, however, feel insecure about the future quality of their job, regarding valued job characteristics such as their colleagues, supervisor, working hours, wage or location of employment. Job insecurity is situated between employment and unemployment because it refers to employed people who feel threatened by unemployment (Hartley et al., 1991). Job insecurity has been conceptualized from two points of view, that is, as a multi-dimensional concept or as a global concept. In terms of the former,
(Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984) define job insecurity as a “sense of powerlessness to maintain desired continuity in a threatened job situation”. In terms of the latter viewpoint, job insecurity signifies the threat of job loss and job discontinuity (De witte, 1995). Hence, job insecurity is said to be an individual’s expectations about continuity in a job situation (Davy, Kinicki, & Scheck, 1997); the perception of a potential threat to continuity in his or her current job (Hearny, Isreal, & House, 1994) This definition has been applied in the context of organizational crisis or change in which job insecurity is considered as a first phase of the process of job loss (Ferrie, 1997). Researchers who adopt a multi-dimensional definition of job insecurity argue that job insecurity refers not only to the degree of uncertainty, but also to the components of job insecurity, namely:

- The severity of the threat concerning job continuity or aspects of the job;
- The importance of the job feature to the individual;
- The perceived threat of the occurrence of a total negative effect on the job situation;
- The total importance of the changes;
- Powerlessness and inability of the individuals to control the above mentioned factors.

Job insecurity is more than the perceived threat of job loss but also includes thoughts about losing valued job features such as pay, status, opportunity for promotion and access to resources. Very often individuals further characterize the threats to the entire job as more severe than the threats to the job features, because one can lose one’s job features but still maintain organizational membership. However, loss of the entire job entails potential job loss or loss of career advancement (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984). Likewise, Hellgren et al. (1999) differentiate between two different forms of job insecurity: quantitative job insecurity, that is, worrying about losing the job itself, and qualitative job insecurity, that is, worrying about losing important job features. Whilst quantitative job insecurity is related to the general, comprehensive operationalization of the construct. Qualitative job insecurity refers to feelings of potential loss in the quality of the organizational position, such as, worsening of working conditions, lack of career opportunities and decreasing salary development (Sverke & Hellen, 2002). The underlying theme behind the various definitions is that job insecurity is a subjective phenomenon, that is, it is based on the individual’s perceptions and interpretations of the immediate work environment (Hartley et al., 1991). Job insecurity refers to the anticipation of
this stressful event in such a way that the nature and continued existence of one’s job are perceived to be at risk, thereby implying that the feeling of job insecurity only occurs in the case of involuntary job loss. Two main themes identified within job insecurity are differentiated by (Borg & Elizur, 1992) as being:

1. Cognitive job insecurity, which refers to the likelihood of job loss.
2. Affective job insecurity, which refers to the fear of job loss.

In this study it is believed that in order for qualitative job insecurity to take place, individuals must attach importance to the job features and they must regard the existing job features as being salient. Therefore, the dimensions of job insecurity include:

- The salience of job features such as pay, status, opportunity for promotion, access to resources, career opportunities, and position within the organization.
- The existence of job features: This determines the extent to which salient job features exist in the organization.
- Perceived threats to job features: This refers to the estimated likelihood of losing salient job features and feelings that important job features are being threatened.
- Importance of the total job: This determines how salient the total job is to the individual. Perceived threats to total job: This refers to the estimated likelihood of one’s job itself being at risk or perceptions of losing one’s job.
- Feelings of powerlessness/powerlessness: For example, during a process of transformation individuals do not know how to protect themselves and this sense of powerlessness of being unable to secure their futures intensifies the insecurity that they experience.

Job insecurity was associated with feelings of dissatisfaction, social deprivation and fear about losing one’s current social position, which in turn translated into typical determinants for extreme-right wing voting behavior, such as a negative attitude towards migrants. Thus, job insecurity also seems to play a role in the political climate and in the choice of political parties.

2.3 Knowledge and Job Insecurity

Research suggests that safety knowledge and safety motivation are important factors in predicting safety compliance (Hofmann, Jacobs, & Landy, 1995; Neal, Griffin, & Hart, 2000).
Safety knowledge is characterized by an employee's understanding of safe operating procedures and adequate safety training and instruction (Hofmann et al., 1995). An employee who is knowledgeable of safety rules may not always be motivated to comply. Likewise, an employee who does not understand all of the safety rules may be motivated, but this motivation may or may not translate into actual compliance because of the lack of proper knowledge or skill. Safety knowledge is expected to be adversely affected when an individual perceives that his or her job security is threatened and is dissatisfied by that perception. In particular, job dissatisfaction is predicted to be related to lower levels of safety knowledge and safety motivation.

In this study, we similarly define safety motivation as an employee's degree of incentive to adhere to their organization's safety regulations, as they understand them to be. In other words, we were interested in extrinsic safety motivation. Safety motivation was operationalized using an expectancy-valence motivational approach. According to valence-instrumentality-expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), individuals will expend effort on activities that lead to desired rewards. Therefore, if an individual is rewarded for adhering to safety policies, one would expect that person's motivational force to be high for those behaviors. If the reward structure is such that individuals are "rewarded" for noncompliance, then one would expect their motivational force to comply with safety policies to be low (Hofmann et al., 1995)

2.4 Attitude and Job Insecurity

Job insecurity has not been extensively researched as an independent variable. Nevertheless, even with the use of fairly crude job insecurity scales, relationships have been documented between job insecurity and reduced work effort, propensity to leave, and resistance to change. The findings involving propensity to leave and resistance to change are consistent across studies. Further research is needed to identify the conditions under which work effort is reduced as a result of felt job insecurity. These empirical findings are both interesting and important. The negative correlation found in some studies between job insecurity and work effort is interesting because it contradicts expectations. First, there is a widely held assumption that security and complacency are related. Second, it would be rational for employees who feel insecure to exert more effort in order to become more valuable to the organization and thereby reduce their objective job insecurity. The positive correlation between job insecurity and resistance to change also is of interest because it, too, appears to contradict rational behavior. Specifically, one would
expect insecure employees to welcome adaptive change because it should make their jobs more secure by counteracting organizational decline (Greenhalgh, 1983). Three investigators have conducted empirical research that helps explain the mechanism the association of anxiety with non-rational behavior and focus on psychological withdrawal reactions to loss. Katcher (1978) found similar reactions to leaving a job, divorce, termination from psychotherapy, and terminal illness. His study did not differentiate voluntary and involuntary job leavers. Strange (1977) studied involuntary job loss resulting from a plant shutdown in a company town and reported that reactions to job loss were similar to reactions to death and dismemberment. Greenhalgh (1979) studied workers who had kept their jobs in a declining and shrinking organization in which others had been laid off. The anticipation of job loss produced the same reaction as an anticipated death. Workers begin the grieving process in anticipation of the loss and psychologically withdraw from the to be lost object, in this case the job. The unconscious tendencies of anticipatory grieving may operate in conjunction with or instead of conscious rational tendencies that might explain the same behavior. The March and Simon (1958) framework, for instance, would categorize job insecurity as a reduced organizational inducement. Under their schema decreased effort and increased resistance to change would be categorized as reduced employee contributions.

2.5 Perception and Job Insecurity
Quantitative job insecurity implies the perception that employees may lose their current job. It is not surprising that this perception is experienced in a negative way. In most contemporary societies, a job holds the key to social integration, social participation and recognition. This notion is at the core of Jahoda’s latent deprivation model (Jahoda, 1982). In this model, Jahoda documents the needs which can be satisfied by employment, such as earning an income, having social contacts outside the family, being able to structure one’s time and to develop individually and socially.

2.6 Theories of Job Insecurity
Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) critiqued prior empirical research on job insecurity for its lack of conceptual development and clarity and offered a theoretical model of the job insecurity process, within which they defined job insecurity as "powerlessness to maintain desired
continuity in a threatened job situation” (1984: 438). In their model, the job insecurity construct is multidimensional, consisting of five components. The first four make up what (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984) labeled "the severity of threat" (1984: 440), or the degree of perceived threat to continuity in a job situation. This threat may pertain to various features of a job or to the entire job. Thus, the first component of the job insecurity construct is perceived threat to various job features such as opportunities for promotion and freedom to schedule work. The more features that an individual perceives to be threatened, the greater the job insecurity. However, as in expectancy valence formulations (Vroom, 1964), in Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt’s model the perceived importance of each feature to an individual the second component of the insecurity construct-weights the first dimension. To achieve this weighting, researchers would multiply the perceived threat to each feature by its importance and then sum the scores for each feature to obtain an overall severity rating. This operation relies on the assumption that a threat to an important job feature will contribute more to job insecurity reactions than will a threat to a minor feature (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984).

The construct's third component is the perceived threat of the occurrence of various events that would negatively affect an individual's total job; being fired or laid off for a short while are examples. The fourth component is the importance attached to each of those potentialities. These two components would also combine multiplicatively and, when summed, yield a weighted rating of the severity of the threat to a total job. The fifth component of the job insecurity construct is powerlessness. Although Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt did not explicitly define powerlessness, it seems to encompass an individual's ability to counteract the threats identified in the first four components. Thus, even if they perceive a threat to their jobs or job features, people who have the power to counteract threats-those who are low in powerlessness-should not experience much job insecurity. According to Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt's theoretical formulation, an investigator would multiply powerlessness scores by the perceived severity of a threat to generate a measure of overall perceptions of job insecurity. In sum, in Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt's model the job insecurity components just described should combine as follows: job insecurity = [(E importance of job feature x likelihood of losing job feature) + (E importance of job loss x likelihood of job loss)] x perceived powerlessness to resist threat. (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984) argued quite strongly that job insecurity is a complex phenomenon and that
existing scales, such as those developed by Caplan, Cobb, French, Van Harrison, and Pinneau (1975) and by Johnson, Messe, and Crano (1984), are limited in that they tap simple, global constructs rather than the multifaceted reality of job insecurity. We tested the validity of this argument by examining the relationships of (1) a multidimensional measure based on Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt's theoretical arguments and (2) two existing global job insecurity measures to a variety of related constructs. We sought to provide evidence for the construct validity of the new measure. The first objective of this research was to test the proposition that a theory-based multidimensional measure of job insecurity would show adequate convergent validity with, and superior predictive validity to, previous measures of job insecurity. Finding support for this proposition would provide a firm basis for the central purposes of this research: the development of a job insecurity measure and the testing of substantive predictions regarding the theoretical relations between job insecurity and other organizational constructs that Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt and others have posited. We now present the basis for these predictions. Antecedents of Job Insecurity Previous research has suggested that employees and organizations enter into a psychological contract in which it is clear what each will give and receive (Schein, 1980). Such contracts give individuals a sense of mastery—a sense that they can reasonably control (or failing that, at least predict) events in their personal worlds. Given the importance of a sense of control or predictability in people's lives (cf. Staw, 1977; Sutton & Kahn, 1986), organizational, job, or personal characteristics that threaten such control should induce strong reactions, one of which will be feelings of insecurity. This study considered four factors that affect an individual's sense of mastery and thus should be related to perceptions of job insecurity. One frequently named threat to employees' sense of control is major organizational change. Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt mentioned changes such as mergers, downsizings, reorganizations, new technologies, and new physical dangers as sources of threat (1984: 442). (Brockner, 1988) highlighted layoffs as direct causes of job insecurity among employees surviving staff cuts, and (Schweiger & Ivancevich, 1985) argued that mergers negatively affect individuals by creating uncertainty and insecurity. Changes of this magnitude abrogate employees' psychological contracts with a firm, causing them to experience lack of control and attendant anxiety (Tagiuri, 1979). Changes sometimes threaten such contracts because jobs will, in fact, be either dramatically altered or eliminated. However, even when top managers are not contemplating such actions, rumors abound in change
situations. To the extent that individuals use this often inaccurate and frequently inconsistent information source to anticipate the personal consequences of organizational changes.

2.7 Empirical Evidence

In order to further understand the phenomenon of job insecurity, it is fruitful to take into consideration studies investigating potential antecedents of job insecurity. Job insecurity experiences, regardless of whether they are qualitative or quantitative, arise from an interaction between situational characteristics and characteristics of the individual that influence the interpretation the individual makes of environmental factors. Age is one demographic factor that may affect the interpretation of cues in the environment as posing a threat of job loss. People in their 30s and 40s, for example, are in an age-bracket whose members are likely to be responsible for raising children and may, in connection with such circumstances, tend to experience the possibility of job loss more negatively than persons who are only responsible for their own sustenance (Dewitte, 1999). As the responsibility for others diminishes, the vulnerability to job loss may also decrease, and result in lower levels of job insecurity, particularly, amongst older employees. However, studies have also reported evidence that older employees may experience higher levels of job insecurity (e.g., Mohr, 2000; Näswall & De Witte, 2003; Hartley et al., 1991). This has been attributed to the fact that it may be more difficult for older employees to find new employment, which would leave them more vulnerable to job loss (Hartley et al., 1991).

Gender may play a role in how a person prepares for different occurrences throughout life. Some of the few studies focusing on how gender influences perceptions of job insecurity have found that men tend report higher levels of job insecurity than women (e.g., Kinnunen et al., 1999; Rosenblatt, Talmud, & Ruvio, 1999). This has been explained by the suggestion that traditional values may prompt men to experience higher levels of job insecurity than women, since this role traditionally requires the man to be the breadwinner of the family. Men would then tend to be more vulnerable to the threat of job loss, as it would not only threaten their source of income, but also their identity, to a higher degree than it would for women. However, what complicates over generalizing about the influence of gender is that, according to this argument, a woman who was the main breadwinner for her family could similarly be expected to experience greater job insecurity than a man would who did not have this responsibility to the same extent (De Witte, 1999). Some studies also provide empirical evidence that women report higher levels of job
insecurity than men (Näswall & De Witte, 2003). The issue of how gender influences job insecurity perceptions is, however, not yet settled. A small number of studies have investigated whether certain personality dispositions are related to experiences of job insecurity. The results from a few of these studies suggest that persons with a predominantly external locus of control are more likely to report higher levels of job insecurity (Ashford et al., 1989; Kinnunen et al., 1999; Sverke et al., 2004). In contrast, higher levels of self-esteem have been related to lower levels of job insecurity (Hartley et al., 1991). There is also some evidence that negative affectivity increases the likelihood of job insecurity perceptions (Sverke et al., 2004). Socio-economic status may influence an individual’s experiencing of a situation and result in the interpretation that the job is being threatened. Status may also affect how important a job is considered to be, in that it affects an individual’s dependence on the present employment. Related to socioeconomic status are type of work (manual vs. non-manual) and the level of education the individual has. Persons who have low-status (often manual) jobs and low income are often more dependent on their income and are therefore generally thought to be more vulnerable to the threat of job loss (Frese, 1985; Kinnunen et al., 1999). An individual with low income is usually not able to save money, which would make a loss of income more severe. Low-status jobs are often also associated with lower levels of education, resulting in fewer coping resources and strategies. Studies have also shown that blue-collar workers report higher levels of job insecurity than other worker categories (Naswall & DeWitte, 2003). Lower education and skill level also contribute to employees having fewer options of alternative employment in the labor market, or the individual’s sense of employability (cf. Fugate, Kinicki, & Ashforth, 2004), which may increase their degree of dependence on the present job, and make the threat of unemployment more severe (Gallie et al., 1998; Schaufeli, 1992; Sverke et al, 2004). Holding a certain type of employment contract can also influence perceptions of job insecurity. Employees who are hired on full time or permanent contracts may experience less job insecurity. These employees may have a greater sense of being an integral part of the organization than part-time or temporary employees would (Barling & Gallagher, 1996; Sverke et al., 2000). Should the organization have to reduce their staff, those employees who are not considered core workers may be the first to have to leave the organization. However, the nature of the formal contracts of the temporary workers can actually prepare them for instability, in that any uncertainty that might arise over the future of their employment may not be something
unexpected. Moreover, employees with temporary contracts are generally aware that there is a time limit to their employment since this is something known upon entering into the employment relationship (Gallagher & McLean Parks, 2001). Employees who are less formally attached to the organization may be less committed to keeping their job and less likely to experience job insecurity than permanent workers. Studies investigating job insecurity experiences among temporary workers typically find that employees holding contracts with a time limit experience more job insecurity than permanent or full-time employees (Näswall & De Witte, 2003; Sverke et al., 2000). However, the relation between part-time work and job insecurity is less clear, as some studies (e.g., Still, 1983) show that part-time workers report more job insecurity than full-time. Others find mixed results, such that some groups of part-time workers are more insecure than full-time, but other groups of part-time workers are less insecure than full-time workers (Naswall & DeWitte, 2003).

Social support has been named as a possible coping resource for reducing the perceptions of stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Those who are able to utilize support from others have been found to reported lower levels of job insecurity (Armtrong-Stassen, 1993). Social support may originate from a variety of sources. Family-based support, such as having the presence of a partner, has been found to act as a buffer against some of the negative consequences of job insecurity (Lim, 1996). It is possible that living with a partner may remove some of the pressure of having to bring in an income, but very few studies have investigated how family status affects the level of job insecurity experienced (e.g., Sverke et al., 2004), and the results are inconclusive, indicating that more research with more adequate measures is needed. Another source of social support is union membership (Armstrong-Stassen, 1993; Dekker & Schaufelli, 1995). Being a member of a union may serve to protect against actions by management that would harm the employee. The sense of powerlessness often associated with job insecurity may decrease since unions often have a strong collective voice and may be able to affect management policies in favor of the employees (Barling, Fullagar, & Kelloway, 1992; Hellgren & Chirumbolo, 2003; Johnson, Bobko, & Hartenian, 1992; Sverke & Hellgren, 2001). Results from research on union membership and job insecurity indicate that union members report lower levels of job insecurity than nonmembers (Sverke et al., 2004). However, since only a few studies support this result, it is difficult to draw conclusions regarding
the role of the union. There are even suggestions that union members might report higher levels of job insecurity, since workers are more likely to join a union when their employment is less secure (e.g., Bender & Sloane, 1999; Näswall & De Witte, 2003). At present, the impact of support from the family as well as the union on experiences of job

2.8 Summary of Literature Review

Downsizing and other forms of organizational change involving layoffs (e.g., mergers, acquisitions, outsourcing, organizational restructuring) will continue as production and overhead costs remain noncompetitive (Burke & Nelson, 1998) and thus render job insecurity a lasting characteristic of working life. Its negative reactions, combined with the facts that uncertain job situations tend to increase change resistance (Noer, 1993), that the most valuable individuals are more inclined to seek other job alternatives (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984), and that the survivors have to do more with fewer resources (Burke & Nelson, 1998), suggest that job insecurity is of vital concern for both employees and their organizations. Our goal with the present review has been to contribute to the understanding of job insecurity by addressing theoretical as well as methodological issues and highlighting areas where further research is warranted. We summarize our conclusions from this literature review in an integrated model of job insecurity.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION
The section gives a profound description of the methods that will be applied during the process of collecting the data.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN.
This design will take the form of a cross sectional study based on self-reported data because cross sectional study will capture data on knowledge, attitude and perception from the workers at that moment of time thus saving time during the data collection process. The data will be collected once from the field and there after conclusions shall be deduced from the data. No frequent visits will be made to the field of study.

3.3 STUDY POPULATION.
A study population is one from which data about the subject matter of study is collected and conclusions are drawn based on the information gathered. Samples of the workers in Kampala Central will be interviewed and data will be collected from the sample. Sampling technique will be used so as to save time and to minimize errors involved in bulky study.

3.3. SAMPLE SIZE AND DESIGN

3.3.1. Design
A sampling design is a scientific approach for determining the sample from the entire population of study. We shall use simple random sampling to obtain the samples from the population of interest because it is the most convenient sampling design for this study. Unlike other designs, simple random sampling also saves time because it is easy to administer. Since data will be collected from workers in organizations, schools and hospitals in Kampala Central, they will be reached at their places of work. A sample of organizations, schools and hospitals will be selected from the total number of organizations in Kampala Central.
3.3.2. Size

The size of the sample will be determined using Cochran method for determining the sample size. This is because the size of the population is not known. The Cochran formula is shown below;

\[ n = \frac{Z^2 P(1-P)}{e^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.1)

Where \( n \) is sample size, \( Z \) is the level of confidence interval measure, \( P \) is the degree of reliability and \( e \) is margin of error.

The study anticipates a 95 percent confidence interval and the margin of error at 3.6 percent. The \( Z \) value =1.96, \( e=0.036 \) and \( P=0.09 \). Therefore;

\[ n = \frac{(1.96)^2 0.09(1-0.09)}{0.036^2} = 97 \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2)

The researcher will interview 97 respondents.

**Table 3.1. Sample size per category of respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of respondent</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Sampling Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Simple random sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health workers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Simple random sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Simple random sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Author (2018)*

The sampling frame will consist of teachers, health workers and social workers in organizations within Kampala Central. A simple random sample will be taken in order to determine the sample of hospitals, schools, and organizations from which a sample of workers who are going to be interviewed will be selected. Simple random sampling will be used because it the most convenient method for sampling and it saves a lot of time as compared to other methods of sampling.
3.4 DATA COLLECTION METHODS AND TOOLS

3.4.1 Methods

3.4.1.1 Personal Interview.

This is a method of data collection in which the researcher gets in direct contact with the respondent and thereby asks questions in relation with the subject matter. In this study, the researcher will use interview method because it will provide first-hand information hence making the results accurate and dependable.

3.4.1.2 Focus Group Discussion.

A focus group is a group people usually of about 6 to 15 people who are carefully selected with the help of a moderator to discuss about a subject matter and conclusions are drawn from their ideas. It usually comprises people who have prior or more knowledge about a given subject matter. Focus groups of teachers, health workers and organization workers in Kampala Central will be interviewed during this study because they will provide detailed information about the knowledge, attitude and perception of people towards increase in job insecurity in Uganda.

3.4.2 Tools

3.4.2.1 The questionnaire

A questionnaire is a data collecting tool that is often written to the respondents and its used for capturing data from the respondents about a given subject of study. Questionnaires containing open ended questions and closed ended questions will be the major tool of data collection in the study. This is because questionnaires are the most convenient for workers who are busy at work thus the workers can fill in the questionnaires at their free time. Further still using will save a lot of time since the questionnaires will be distributed to the workers who will fill them at almost the same time thus the researcher may not really interact with the workers for a long time. The questions that will be contained in the questionnaire will be concise but carrying a lot of meaning.
3.5 Validity and Reliability

The data will be collected mostly from the workers in schools, hospitals and organizations because workers in such competitive labor markets may be in position to provide the valid information about the prevalence of job insecurity in Uganda. This data may also be used to infer to the general workforce of Uganda. The information provided by workers in schools, hospitals and organizations can be depended upon for study purposes and for formation of policies about job insecurity in Uganda.

3.6 DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis will be made using SPSS at three levels of analysis (Univariate, Bivariate and Multivariate). A descriptive summary of age, sex, religion and highest education achievement will be presented using frequency distribution and summary statistics.

3.6.1 Univariate Analysis

Differentials in knowledge, attitude and perception and job insecurity will be made using Pearson correlation coefficient. This analysis will be computed to find insights of the variables.

\[ r_{xy} = \frac{n\sum X_i Y_i - \sum X_i \sum Y_i}{\sqrt{(\sum X_i^2 - (\sum X_i)^2)} \sqrt{(\sum Y_i^2 - (\sum Y_i)^2)}} \]  

(3.3)

Where:

\( r_{xy} \) is the Pearson correlation coefficient of \( X \) (independent) and \( Y \) (dependent) variable

\( X_i \) is the value of \( X \) independent variable corresponding to the \( i^{th} \) observation

\( Y_i \) is the value of the dependent variable corresponding to the \( i^{th} \) observation.

3.6.2 Bivariate Analysis

The differentials in job insecurity by knowledge, attitude and perception were examined using ANOVA with the help of the F-statistic
\[ F = \frac{\sum n_i (X_i - \overline{X})^2 (K-1)}{\sum \sum (X - \overline{X})^2 / (N-K)} \] (3.4)

Where;

\( n_i \) is the sample size of the \( i^{th} \) group

\( X_i \) is the mean of the \( i^{th} \) group

\( \overline{X} \) is the overall mean, \( X \) is the individual units, \( K \) is the number of groups of study and \( N \) is the total number of the sample.

### 3.6.3 Multivariate Analysis

Finally, a multivariate analysis will be performed using a multiple linear regression model relating job insecurity with independent variables which include knowledge, attitude and perception of people. The analysis will be done to find out the impact of the outcome variable on the dependent variable. The model will be based on the formula

\[ Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \cdots + \beta_m X_m \] (3.5)

Where

\( Y \) is the dependent variable

\( X_1, X_2, X_3, \) are independent variables used in the study

\( \alpha \) is a constant and \( \beta \) is the coefficient of the \( i^{th} \) variable.

\( m \) is the number of independent variables.

The T-Statistic will be used to establish the overall significance of the factors influencing job insecurity and the coefficient of determination between the dependent and the independent variables will be determined using the formula below:

\[ R^2_{xy} = 1 - \left( \frac{\sum e_i^2}{\sum (Y_i - \bar{Y})^2} \right) \] (3.6)

Where;
e_i is the error in the i^{th} observation (e_i = Y_i - \hat{Y})

Y_i is the i^{th} observation (true value),

\hat{Y} is the estimated value of Y

R^2_{xy} is the coefficient of determination.

3.7. Ethical Considerations

For ethical consideration, each respondent to the study will be informed about the purpose and the objective of the study. After explaining the objective of the study, respondents will then be assured of confidentiality before the questionnaires are administered to them. This is meant to reduce the adverse reactions of some respondents during the course of data collection.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS OF FINDINGS

4.0 Introduction

Research findings and analysis are a very important part of a research report. Saunders et al. (2009) emphasizes the importance of research findings and the vital role they play in representing primary data collected/gathered during the research process for the purpose of presenting a sound report. Therefore, the crux of this chapter details, the results of data collected from the field in accordance to the research objectives, design and methodology laid out in the previous chapter. This study commenced with an introductory perspective, then was the reviewing of relevant literature, and description of the research methodology, the focus of this chapter is to introduce the data analysis and discussions of results. The analysis of demographic data used in this study is conducted using descriptive statistics.

4.1 Analysis of background information

This section presents an analysis of data on the sex, age, education and marital status among others of the respondents as summarized in the Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1 Demographic profile of Respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Respondent</td>
<td>Less than 20 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 – 29 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 – 39 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 years and above</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working experience</td>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 – 10 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 – 15 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1 shows the demographic characteristics of the respondents that participated in the survey. Out of the 97 questionnaires that were distributed, only 72 questionnaires representing 74.2% were completed and retrieved. These 72 questionnaires therefore formed the basis of the whole research findings used in the analysis. However, there were missing values in some completed questionnaires. The relatively high response rate of 74.2% is because of personal distribution and the method used in distributing the questionnaire. Most of the respondents were implored to fill the questionnaire immediately they were given. In this study, the demographic characteristics of respondents that were considered included; gender, age, marital status, job status, employment contract, working experience and education background.

### 4.1.1. Gender

From the table above, a majority (54.2%) of the respondents that were interviewed were male and 45.8% were females. The males represented the largest percentage of the sample unlike the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Education Achievement</th>
<th>Bachelors’ Degree</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>59.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters’ Degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>66.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Status</th>
<th>Junior Staff</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>47.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Contract</th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>23.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Author, (2018).*
female thus the results of the survey where biased towards the male gender. It can therefore be deduced from the result that the views expressed in the study are representative of both male and female respondents with the male respondents in majority.

4.1.2. Age-group

The table above shows that, most (38.9%) of the respondents fell in the age group of 30 – 39 years of age, followed by 33.3% who were in the age group of 20 – 29 years of age. 15.6% of the respondents were in the age group of 40 years and above, and lastly 12.9% of the respondents were in the age group of 19 years and below. The ages of the respondents are in the range of 19-55. This dominant age grade is plausible for this study because it is perceived that most respondents are workers whose ages fall within this range of ages.

4.1.3. Marital Status

From table 4.1, a majority (66.7%) of the respondents were single, this represented the highest population. The married people who responded represented 30.5% of the total respondents and 2.8% of the respondents represented those in other categories, which is the lowest percentage. Thus the study had more single respondents than the married and other respondents.

4.1.4. Job Status

Respondents were also categorized based on job status. 47.2% of the respondents were junior staff, 36.1% were senior staff, and 16.7% were management staff; this signified that the study cut across all staff categories with the junior level managers in simple majority. It appears that the study also cut across all departmental units of the organizations.

4.1.5. Highest Education Achievement

Table 4.1 above shows that a majority (59.7%) of the respondents had achieved a bachelor’s degree as their highest education achievement. 25% of the respondents had achieved a diploma, 11.1% of the respondents had achieved a master’s degree and 2.8% had achieved a certificate as their highest education achievement.
4.1.6 Working Experience

Table 4.1 also shows that a majority (40.3%) of the workers who were interviewed had a working experience of 6 to 10 years, 36.1% of the respondents had a working experience of 1 to 5 years, 19.4% had a working experience of 11 to 15 years and only 4.2% of the respondents had a working experience that is more than 16 years.

4.1.7 Employment Contract

From table 4.1 most (76.4%) of the respondents had a temporary employment contract while only 23.6% of the respondents had a permanent employment contract. Thus it can be concluded that most of the workers are employed in temporary employment contracts.

Research consistently shows that job insecurity correlates with specific background characteristics (or ‘positional’ variables) which indicate a vulnerable labor market position. Research (e.g. Näswall & De Witte, 2003) shows that blue collar-workers, low skilled individuals, employees in the industrial sector and those with a temporary job contract, more often perceive themselves as job-insecure. These associations are no coincidence. These categories of employees indeed have a higher probability of being dismissed. This suggests that job insecurity is a good reflection of an individual’s real (or ‘objective’) chances and position on the labor market, despite its subjective nature.

4.2. Knowledge, attitude and perceptions toward job insecurity

4.2.1. Knowledge about job insecurity

Nine items measured the degree to which employees were knowledgeable about job insecurity and their organization's safety policies. Respondents indicated on a scale from 1 to 5 the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements, "Job insecurity is a situation where there is a threat to job features (payment, promotion, status) and the job itself (being fired or laid off) ", "Job insecurity is prevalent in schools, hospitals and organizations", "The major causes of job insecurity are high competition in the jobs market and lack of organization safety knowledge", "A set of safety rules must always be provided to workers as a means of minimizing job insecurity, "I will be able to keep my present job as long as i wish", "My job will be there as long as i want", "The most effective means of increasing awareness of job insecurity is through
the media”, "I know who to ask if I am not sure about the safe way to complete a task” and "I feel free to request additional safety training if I think it is needed.”. Table 4.3 shows the responses, means, Standard Deviation and t-test of the construct questions. All results obtained were statistically significant. All responses were rated using the five-point Likert scale: SA – strongly agree=5, A – agree=4, N – neutral=3, D – disagree=2, SD – strongly disagree=1.

Table 4.2: Awareness of job insecurity and safety knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-statistic</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job insecurity is a situation where there is a threat to job features (payment, promotion, status) and the job itself (being fired or laid off)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>51.624</td>
<td>0.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Job insecurity is prevalent in schools, hospitals and organizations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>47.174</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The major causes of job insecurity are high competition in the jobs market and lack of organization safety knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>36.974</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A set of safety rules must always be provided to workers as a means of minimising job insecurity.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.561</td>
<td>1.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I know who to ask if I am not sure about the safe way to complete a task</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>18.235</td>
<td>1.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I feel free to request additional safety training if it is necessary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>29.816</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I will be able to keep my present job as long as I wish</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>19.327</td>
<td>1.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>My job will be there as long as I want</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>15.765</td>
<td>1.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The most effective means of increasing awareness of job insecurity is through the media.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>26.843</td>
<td>1.256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of critical t value at df = 55 and significant level 0.05

*Note: SD represents the Standard Deviation.*

*Source: Author, (2018).*
Table 4.2 reveals that the employees in the schools, hospitals and organization that were sampled were aware about the prevalence, causes and sources of job insecurity in Uganda. The knowledge of job insecurity was ranging between moderate to high (Mean = 3.00-5.00). Respondents showed a high degree of awareness of job insecurity and safety knowledge (Mean 4.00-5.00) by the following statements; "Job insecurity is a situation where there as a threat to job features (payment, promotion, status) and the job itself (being fired or laid off) ", (Mean = 4.43, SD = 0.728), "Job insecurity is prevalent in schools, hospitals and organizations" (Mean = 4.47, SD = 0.804) and "The major causes of job insecurity are high competition in the jobs market and lack of organization safety knowledge " (Mean =4.29 ,SD = 0.986). This thereby implies that the employees who were interviewed were aware and familiar with the definition of the job insecurity. Moderate awareness (Mean 3.00 – 3.99) was recorded by the following statements: A set of safety rules must always be provided to workers as a means of minimizing job insecurity(Mean = 3.00, SD = 1.636),I know who to ask if I am not sure of a safe way to complete a task (Mean = 3.46, SD = 1.609), I feel free to request additional safety training if it is necessary(Mean = 3.81, SD = 1.083) and the most effective means of increasing awareness of job insecurity is through the media. (Mean = 3.97, SD = 1.256).

A relatively low awareness was recorded by the statements: I will be able to keep my present job as long as I wish(Mean = 2.75, SD = 1.207) and My job will be there as long as I want(Mean = 2.51, SD = 1.353)

One sample T-test was used to test if the opinion of the respondents in the content of the sentences are positive (p values less than 0.05), or the opinion of the respondent in the content of the sentences are neutral (p value is greater than 0.5).

Research suggests that safety knowledge and safety motivation are important factors in predicting safety compliance (Hofmann, Jacobs, & Landy, 1995), (Neal, Griffin, & Hart, 2000). Both safety motivation and safety knowledge are expected to be adversely affected when an individual perceives that his or her job security is threatened and is dissatisfied by that perception. In particular, job dissatisfaction is predicted to be related to lower levels of safety knowledge. This prediction is generated from a cognitive resources framework (Kanfer & Ackerman, 1989) and from (Eysenck & Calvo, 1992)model of anxiety and performance.
4.2.1 Attitudes towards job insecurity

The attitudes of the workers were measured by seven items. Respondents again indicated on a scale from 1 to 5 the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements, Job insecurity is a very undesirable experience at work, The government should strengthen the policies about job insecurity, The best way to minimize job insecurity is by providing organization safety knowledge, Over 50% of employees feel insecure in their jobs, Job insecurity is the major cause of stress at my work place, I rather work in a company where my job is secure with little pay than that with much pay but insecure, I rather stay jobless than to work in a company which has a high job insecurity. All responses were rated using the five-point Likert scale; SA – strongly agree=5, A – agree=4, N – neutral=3, D – disagree=2, SD – strongly disagree=1.

Table 4.3 Attitude of employees toward job insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-statistic</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Job insecurity is a very undesirable experience at work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>24.981</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>The government should strengthen the policies about job insecurity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>26.978</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>The best way to minimise job insecurity is by providing organisation safety knowledge</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>19.582</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Over 50% of employees feel insecure in their jobs.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>16.820</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Job insecurity is the major cause of stress at my work place</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>21.766</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>I rather work in a company where my job is secure with little pay than that with much pay but insecure.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>14.882</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>I rather stay jobless than to work in a company which has a high job insecurity</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>11.539</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of critical t value at df = 55 and significant level 0.05

*Source: Author (2018)*
Table 4.3 shows that most of the workers have a fair attitude toward job insecurity. The attitudes of workers were ranked on a three scale rank, (Mean < 2.99 = bad attitude, Mean 3.00 – 3.99 = fair attitude, Mean > 4 = Good attitude). Employees showed a good attitude towards job insecurity in only one statement; the government should strengthen the policies about job insecurity, (Mean = 4.03, SD = 1.267). Employees showed a fair attitude towards the following statements; Job insecurity is a very undesirable experience at work (Mean = 3.53, SD = 1.198), The best way to minimize job insecurity is by providing organization safety knowledge (Mean = 3.36, SD = 1.456), Over 50% of employees feel insecure in their jobs (Mean = 3.02, SD = 1.574) and Job insecurity is the major cause of stress at my work place (Mean = 3.69, SD = 1.440). Employees showed a bad attitude towards job insecurity in the following statements; I rather work in a company where my job is secure with little pay than that with much pay but insecure (Mean = 2.79, SD = 1.592), I rather stay jobless than to work in a company which has a high job insecurity (Mean = 2.11, SD = 1.552). Thus table 4.3 above shows that most of the employees have a fair attitude toward job insecurity.

According to stress theories, not knowing how to counteract a threat to something valued will lead to stress experiences (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Indeed, one of the most prominent features of job insecurity is the aspect of uncertainty and ambiguity. The experience of uncertainty concerning the future of employment prohibits the individual to cope with the threat adequately and diminishes the opportunities for reducing the level of stress experienced. In line with this reasoning, research suggests that perceived threats concerning the nature and continued existence of a job may have as detrimental consequences as job loss itself (Dekker & Schaufeli, 1995), (Latack & Diozier, 1986). This is consistent with the central proposition of stress research, that anticipation of a stressful event represents an equally important, or perhaps even greater, source of anxiety than the actual event (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Stress experiences are accompanied by stress reactions, which may be described as somatic, psychological, and behavioral (Jex & Beehr, 1991), (Spector, 2000).

4.2.3. Perception towards job insecurity

Six items were used to measure the perceptions of people towards job insecurity on a scale 1 to 5 which indicated the degree with which the workers agreed or disagreed with the following
statements; My company does not lay off workers often, Perceived risk of being laid off in the next 12 month, Perceived possibilities of finding another job with some other employer, Worried about losing my job soon and My job is almost guaranteed. All responses were rated using the five point Likert scale; SA – strongly agree=5, A – agree=4, N – neutral=3, D – disagree=2, SD – strongly disagree=1.

Table 4.4 Perception of people towards job insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-statistic</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>My company does not lay off workers often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>33.767</td>
<td>1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Perceived risk of being laid off in the next 12 month</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>18.901</td>
<td>1.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Perceived possibilities of finding another job with some other employer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>23.054</td>
<td>1.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Worried about losing my job soon.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>15.567</td>
<td>1.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Perceived satisfaction with my job</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>13.583</td>
<td>1.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>My job is almost guaranteed</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td>13.129</td>
<td>1.284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of critical t value at df = 55 and significant level 0.05

Note: SD represents the Standard Deviation.

Source: Author 2018

Table 4.4 Shows that most of the employees have a bad perception about job insecurity. The perceptions of workers were ranked on a three scale rank, (Mean<2.99 = bad perception, Mean 3.00 – 3.99 = fair perception, Mean > 4 = Good perception). Employees had a good perception about job insecurity in only one statement; My company does not lay off workers often (Mean = 4.15, SD = 1.044). Employees had a fair perception about job insecurity in the following statements; Perceived risk of being laid off in the next 12 month (Mean = 3.44, SD = 1.546), and Perceived possibilities of finding another job with some other employer (Mean = 3.69, SD = 1.360). Employees also had a bad perception toward job insecurity in these statements; My job is
almost guaranteed (Mean = 1.284, SD = 1.284), Perceived satisfaction with my job (Mean = 2.31, SD = 1.440) and Worried about losing my job soon (Mean = 2.67, SD = 1.454), Thus most of the employees who were interviewed had a bad perception towards job insecurity.

A recent analysis of various Finnish databanks between 1997 and 2003 revealed a clear correlation between the subjective perception of job insecurity and the national percentage of unemployment at a given time (Nätti, Happonen, Kinnunen & Mauno, 2005). Research in which various European countries were compared also suggests job insecurity to reflect the national level of unemployment and economic situation (De Weerdt et al., 2004).

### 4.4 Job insecurity

Four items were used to measure job insecurity on a scale 1 to 5 which indicated the degree with which the workers agreed or disagreed with the following statements; There is high job insecurity in our company, Job insecurity is the major cause of employee turnover, There is high job insecurity in private companies as opposed to government parastatal, Job insecurity is as a result of people’s perceptions. All responses were rated using the five point Likert scale; **SA** – strongly agree=5, **A** – agree=4, **N** – neutral=3, **D** – disagree=2, **SD** – strongly disagree=1.

**Table 4.5 Job insecurity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-statistic</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>There is high job insecurity in our company</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.437</td>
<td>19.743</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Job insecurity is the major cause of employee turnover</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.369</td>
<td>17.778</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>There is high job insecurity in private companies as opposed to government parastatal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.359</td>
<td>19.560</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Job insecurity is as a result of people’s perceptions</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.441</td>
<td>15.073</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of critical t value at df = 55 and significant level 0.05

*Source: Author (2018)*
Job insecurity of workers was ranked on a three scale rank, (Mean<2.99 = low job security, Mean 3.00 – 3.99 = moderate job security, Mean > 4 = low job insecurity). This study found out that most of the employees were employed in insecure jobs or were experiencing job insecurity or threats to the job features and to the job itself because all the statements that were used to measure job security had a mean less than 2.

4.3. Relationship between knowledge, attitude, perception and job insecurity

The table below shows the bivariate analysis between the variables that are under study, that is knowledge, attitude, perception and job insecurity.

Table 4.5 Relationship between knowledge, attitude and perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>JOBINSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.974**</td>
<td>.984**</td>
<td>.975**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.974**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.987**</td>
<td>.985**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.984**</td>
<td>.987**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.989**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.975**</td>
<td>.985**</td>
<td>.989**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Author (2018)

From table 4.5, there is a significant relationship between knowledge and attitude because the p value (p = 0.000) is less than 0.05. There is also a very strong positive relationship between knowledge and attitude (r = 0.974). Therefore, we conclude that there is a very high positive relationship between knowledge and attitude. We also conclude that knowledge has a significant impact on attitude.
The table also shows that there is a significant relationship between knowledge and perception because the p value 0.00 is less than 0.05. There is also a very strong positive relationship between knowledge and perception (r = 0.984). Therefore, we conclude that there is a very high positive relationship between knowledge and perception. We also conclude that knowledge has a significant impact on perception.

There exists a significant relationship between knowledge and job insecurity (p = 0.000 < 0.05). There is also a very strong positive relationship between knowledge and job insecurity (r = 0.975). Therefore, we conclude that there is a very strong positive relationship between knowledge and job insecurity and that knowledge has an impact on job insecurity.

There is a significant relationship between attitude and perception because the p value (0.000) which is less than 0.05. There is also a very strong positive relationship between attitude and perception (r = 0.987). Therefore, we conclude that there is a very strong positive relationship between attitude and perception. We also say that attitude has a significant impact on perception.

There is a significant relationship between attitude and job insecurity (p = 0.000 < 0.05). There is also a strong positive relationship between attitude and job insecurity (r = 0.985). Therefore, we conclude that there is a very strong positive relationship between attitude and job insecurity and that attitude has an impact on job insecurity.

The table also shows that there is a significant relationship between perception and job insecurity (p = 0.000 < 0.05). There is also a strong positive relationship between perception and job insecurity (r = 0.989). Therefore, we conclude that there is a very strong positive relationship between perception and job insecurity and that people’s perception has a significant impact on job insecurity.
4.4.4. Knowledge, Attitude, Perception and Job Insecurity

Table 4.7 Knowledge, Attitude, perception and job insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: JOBINSC

Source: Author (2018)

The table above reveals that there is a significant relationship between knowledge and job insecurity. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis of no relationship and conclude that there is a relationship between knowledge and job insecurity. We also reject the null hypothesis of no impact and conclude that people’s knowledge has a significant impact on job insecurity.

There is a significant relationship between attitude and job insecurity (p = 0.003 < 0.05). Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis of no relationship and conclude that there is a relationship between attitude and job insecurity. We also reject the null hypothesis of no impact and conclude that people’s attitude have a significant impact on job insecurity.

There is also a significant relationship between perception and job insecurity (p = 0.000 < 0.05). Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis of no relationship and conclude that there is a relationship between perception and job insecurity. We also reject the null hypothesis of no impact and conclude that people’s perception have a significant impact on job insecurity.
Table 4.8. Summary of regression analysis between knowledge, attitude, perception and job insecurity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta estimate</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
<th>T statistic</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>-0.810</td>
<td>0.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>3.034</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>5.056</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1197.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P represents the p-value, R represents the Coefficient of correlation, R² represents the Coefficient of Determination.


The results in Table 4.8 reveal that the overall coefficient of correlation is 0.991 and the coefficient of determination is 0.981. The coefficient of correlation shows that there is a very strong positive relationship between the independent variables (knowledge, attitude and perception) and the dependent variable (job insecurity). The coefficient of determination implies that about 98.1% of the variation in job insecurity is explained by changes in knowledge, attitude and perception. 1.9% of job insecurity cannot be explained which means that the unexplained variation may be related to other variables which are not captured by regression model. However, the overall fit of the regression equation is moderate given an F-statistic of 1197.193.
At 0.05 level of significance, the overall equation is significant at 0.05 probability level since the probability value ($p = 0.00 < 0.05$). Thus, in this context, we can conclude that knowledge, attitude and perceptions of people greatly affect job insecurity.

These findings are consistent with the following authors. Job insecurity is also associated with decreased safety, motivation (Borg & Dov, 1992), (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984) and compliance, increasing the risks of workplace injuries and accidents (Probst & Brubaker, 2001). Evidently, job insecurity is consistently associated with lower levels of relevant job attitudes and behaviors. Furthermore, job insecurity is also associated with higher levels of burnout, anxiety and depression and psychosomatic complaints (De Witte, 1999; Hartley et al., 1991). Several research studies have suggested that job insecurity should be related to different negative outcomes which may be roughly categorized as attitudinal, health related and behavioral (Dekker & Schaufeli, 1995), (Sverke & Hellen, 2002), (Probst, 2003; Sverke et al., 2002). Prolonged job insecurity is more detrimental and acts as a chronic stressor whose negative effects become more potent as time goes by (Dekker & Schaufeli, 1995), thereby emphasizing the importance of early identification of its occurrence.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

In the mid-1980s, research in this area began to more systematically focus on job insecurity and along with this came a change in the construct’s meaning; it went from being seen as a motivator to being defined as a stressor. In connection with this, a more systematic approach to this research began to take shape, regarding, primarily, empirical results and, to a certain degree, theory development. Among the first to place job insecurity in a larger theoretical context was Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) who, with their theoretical model, summed up the definitions of job insecurity and elaborated on the potential causes, effects, and organizational consequences of the phenomenon. Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt defined job insecurity as a “perceived powerlessness to maintain desired continuity in a threatened job situation” (1984, p. 438). They further maintained that job insecurity is based on the individual’s perceptions and interpretations of the immediate work environment. This implies that subjectively experienced threats are derived from objective threats by means of the individual’s perceptual and cognitive processes.

This study sought to establish the knowledge, attitude and perception of employees towards job insecurity in Uganda. The previous chapters presented have explained the theoretical, fictitious, procedural, and practical methods for handling this research. This research ends here as this chapter summarizes the issues raised in the study. In addition, the means by which the main objectives are achieved are outlined and explained; subsequent to this the main conclusions of this study are enumerated. Finally, the chapter ends with recommendations for further research that can be undertaken due to the conclusions arrived at and limitations identified in the study.

5.2 Summary of the findings

This summary of findings was developed based on the research objectives. The major objective of this study was to determine the knowledge, attitude and perception of people towards job insecurity in Uganda.
5.2.1 Knowledge and job insecurity

This study revealed that there is a significant relationship between knowledge and job insecurity. It also showed that there is a very strong positive correlation between knowledge and job insecurity. This therefore means that people’s awareness about the causes, sources, and prevalence of job insecurity in Uganda will directly affect the level of threat to the job features such as payment, promotion opportunity and status at work place. The findings further prove that the degree of awareness of organizations safety rules and regulations by workers will affect the degree of threat to the job features and to the job itself (being laid off or fired). Therefore we summarize that of job insecurity by employees has a great impact on the level of job insecurity.

5.2.2 Attitude and job insecurity

This study shows that there exists a significant relationship between peoples attitude and job insecurity. There is also a very strong positive relationship between attitude and job insecurity. Therefore we conclude that people’s feelings or emotions greatly affect the degree of threat to the job features such as payment, promotions and status. Other components such as past behaviors or experiences, beliefs, thoughts and attributes of the employees about the job also affect the level of threat to job features and to the job itself (being fired or laid off). Therefore people’s attitude has an impact on job insecurity.

5.2.3 Perception and job insecurity

This research shows that there is a very strong positive significant relationship between people’s perceptions and job insecurity. The person who becomes aware of job insecurity (the perceiver) may be interested in understanding more about job insecurity. The target who is being judged or perceived could be a victim of job insecurity due to the threat to job features or to the job itself. The situation of our study is a feeling of being laid off from the current job. This is of vital importance in relation to our research. Therefore, we conclude that people’s perceptions about job insecurity greatly affect the level of job insecurity.
5.3 Conclusions

Employees awareness of job insecurity and organization safety rules and regulations, the feelings or emotions, past behaviors or experiences about job insecurity, beliefs, thoughts, and attributes that workers hold are major determinants of job insecurity in Uganda.

5.4 Limitations of the research

While looking at these aforementioned findings and implications, one should always be aware of limitations considering this research. These will be discussed in the following section.

The first look at the dataset shows that in total, 97 respondents were supposed to participated in this survey, but 25 of them did not complete the whole survey. This is a high dropout rate for a questionnaire survey. The sample size perhaps is not that large as the number of staff employed by the schools, hospitals and organizations in Kampala central. Furthermore, it seems that job security is a sensitive topic among employees. The researcher was often asked if the answers are really anonymous, even if this information was already provided in the informed consent. So one can conclude that maybe some participants gave socially desirable answers because they fear that they could suffer from consequences if they answer honestly.

Also, it is worse mentioning that the participants originated from different working sectors. So there were no differences between different groups examined. This was not possible because there was no representative amount of participants of each working sector meaning that they could not be compared. For a future research it would be interesting to know if there are the same results for e.g. employees from the marketing sector compared to employees from the finance sector. Then the results would be more specific.

5.5 Recommendation for future research

The recommendations for future research will be discussed in the following discussion.

To find out some general background information about the answers given, it is recommended for future research to conduct follow-up interviews to get a more in-depth view on the results.
A recommendation for future research should be to maybe make the survey more supportive for the participant by for instance providing information about the duration for the survey like: “Only 10 more questions to go”. This is important regarding the fact that a lot of respondents stopped to fill in the survey when it came to the last 5 items. Also offering a reward for the participation could be a good manner to ensure that people complete the survey, because this improves the intrinsic motivation to fulfill the task (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999).

In general future research with the same or a comparable topic is recommended because this research actually shows that all the observed constructs are related to each other in some way.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1.1 QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear sir/ Madam,

My name is Esabu Moses from the institute of Statistics and applied Economics (ISAE), Makerere University. I am conducting an academic research on “The Knowledge, Attitude and Perceptions of people towards the increase in job insecurity in Uganda.” Your participation will be voluntary in nature. The term “job insecurity” is defined as perceived powerlessness to maintain desired continuity in a threatened job situation. I therefore request you to kindly spare a few minutes of your valuable time to fill up the questionnaire. Your responses would be used only for research purposes and all the information you will give will be treated with utmost confidentiality. By completing the survey, you indicate that you voluntarily participated in this research. Thank you.
SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION.

Please tick the boxes and fill in the blanks if you select others


A2. Age of the respondent?
   a. Below 20 years. [ ] b. 20 – 29 years. [ ]
   c. 30 – 39 years. [ ] d. 40 years and above. [ ]

A3. What is your marital status?
   a. Married. [ ] b. Single. [ ]
   c. Others please specify …………..

A4. What is your highest education achievement?
   a. Bachelors Degree [ ] b. Diploma [ ]
   c. Masters Degree [ ] e. Others Please Specify………………

A5. What is your position in the organization?
   a. Junior Staff [ ] b. Senior Staff [ ]
   c. Management Staff [ ]

A6. How long have you worked in the company?
   a. 1 – 5 years. [ ] b. 6 - 10 years [ ]
   c. 10- 15 years. [ ] d. 16 years and above. [ ]

A7. What your employment contract?
   a. Permanent [ ] b. Temporary [ ]
SECTION B: KNOWLEDGE ABOUT JOB INSECURITY

Which of the following statements best defines your opinion about job insecurity (Please indicate how you agree or disagree using the five-point Likert scale; SA – strongly agree=5, A – agree=4, N – neutral=3, D – disagree=2, SD – strongly disagree=1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Job insecurity is a situation where there as a threat to job features (payment, promotion, status) and the job itself (being fired or laid off)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Job insecurity is prevalent in schools, hospitals and organizations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>The major causes of job insecurity are high competition in the jobs market and lack of organization safety knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>A set of safety rules must always be provided to workers as a means of minimizing job insecurity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>I know who to ask if i am not sure of a safe way to complete a task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>I feel free to request additional safety training if it is necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>I will be able to keep my present job as long as i wish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>My job will be there as long as i want</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>The most effective means of increasing awareness of job insecurity is through the media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: PERCEPTION TOWARD JOB INSECURITY

Kindly indicate your level of agreement on your perception of job insecurity (Please indicate how you agree or disagree using the five-point Likert scale; SA – strongly agree=5, A – agree=4, N – neutral=3, D – disagree=2, SD – strongly disagree=1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Job insecurity is a very undesirable experience at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>The government should strengthen the policies about job insecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>The best way to minimize job insecurity is by providing organization safety knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Over 50% of employees feel insecure in their jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Job insecurity is the major cause of stress at my work place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>I rather work in a company where my job is secure with little pay than that with much pay but insecure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>I rather stay jobless than to work in a company which has a high job insecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION D: ATTITUDE TOWARDS JOB INSECURITY**

Which of the following statements best defines your opinion about job insecurity (Please indicate how you agree or disagree using the five-point Likert scale; **SA** – strongly agree=5, **A** – agree=4, **N** – neutral=3, **D** – disagree=2, **SD** – strongly disagree=1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Job insecurity is a very undesirable experience at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>The government should strengthen the policies about job insecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>The best way to minimize job insecurity is by providing organization safety knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Over 50% of employees feel insecure in their jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Job insecurity is the major cause of stress at my work place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>I rather work in a company where my job is secure with little pay than that with much pay but insecure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>I rather stay jobless than to work in a company which has a high job insecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION E: JOB INSECURITY

Which of the following statements best describes job insecurity (Please indicate how you agree or disagree using the five-point Likert scale; SA – strongly agree=5, A – agree=4, N – neutral=3, D – disagree=2, SD – strongly disagree=1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>There is high job insecurity in our company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Job insecurity is the major cause of employee turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>There is high job insecurity in private companies as opposed to government parastatals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Job insecurity is as a result of people’s perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you so much for your time and cooperation.
TO THE DIRECTOR,
KAMPALA, UGANDA.

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: REQUISITION FOR INFORMATION ON JOB INSECURITY FROM YOUR ORGANISATION.

I hereby submit this letter to your office requesting for information on job insecurity from your organization. I am a third year student of Makerere University currently pursuing a Bachelor of Science in Quantitative Economics at the School of Statistics and Applied planning.

As part of our final year examinations, each student is expected to write a dissertation on a topical issue. My dissertation topic is, “Knowledge, attitude and perception of people towards the increase in job insecurity in Uganda,” and I chose your organization as my case study. The information I will obtain from your organization, will strictly be used for education purposes only and it will help me prepare the necessary findings required for me to complete my research work on my dissertation topic.

I will be grateful if my request is put into consideration.

Thank you very much

Yours faithfully

Esabu Moses