



Emerald

Evidence-based HRM:  
a global forum for  
empirical scholarship

**An exploratory study of job insecurity in relation to household registration, employment contract, and job satisfaction in Chinese state-owned enterprises**

Journal:	<i>Evidence-based HRM: a global forum for empirical scholarship</i>
Manuscript ID	EBHRM-09-2015-0039.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Job Insecurity, Job Satisfaction, Household Registration, Employment Contract, Social Safety Net, Social Welfare, China, State-owned Enterprise, Institutions, Equality

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Evidence-based HRM

# An exploratory study of job insecurity in relation to household registration, employment contract, and job satisfaction in Chinese state-owned enterprises

## Abstract

**Purpose** - The paper examines the influence of the household registration and of employment contract on employee job insecurity in Chinese state-owned enterprises. The relationships between job satisfaction and the two components of job insecurity are also analysed.

**Design/methodology/approach** – The research uses original data collected through a questionnaire survey in six Chinese state-owned enterprises. 309 samples are analysed mainly using hierarchical regression analysis.

**Findings** - The research finds household registration is a predictor of job insecurity while employment contract is not. Job satisfaction is found to be positively related to one of the components of job insecurity: the perceived severity of job loss.

**Social implications** - To improve job security of the employees who are in vulnerable positions, improving the equality of social safety net is significant. In China, household registration causes unequal access to social welfare and employment opportunities; improving the equality may be more significant than seeking for permanent employment.

**Originality/value** – The research suggests two levels of factors influencing job insecurity: the macro level factors include the institutional configurations of social safety net; the micro level factors include employment contract. The macro level factors have fundamental influence while the micro level factors are more apparent. The micro level factors may manifest their influence only when the macro level factors equally cover all the employees. The macro level factors may also intermediate the relationship between job insecurity and satisfaction.

**Keywords** Job insecurity, Job satisfaction, Household registration, Employment contract, Social safety net, Social welfare, China, State-owned enterprise, Institutions, Equality

**Paper type** Research paper

## 1. Introduction

Job insecurity is defined as an employee's perception of threat and powerlessness in relation to the employee's present job (Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt, 1984). It can be summarized to have two components: the perceived likelihood of job loss and the perceived severity of the loss (Ashford *et al.*, 1989; Jacobson, 1991; Klandermans *et al.*, 2010). Job insecurity leads to negative attitudinal reactions such as reduced organizational commitment and trust (Ashford *et al.*, 1989; Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler 2000; De Witte *et al.*, 2010). It can also cause poor job performance and increased job withdrawal (Sverker *et al.*, 2002; Cheng and Chan, 2008), though maybe arguably to different extent between temporary and permanent employees (De Cuyper and De Witte, 2007; Klandermans *et al.*, 2010; Klein Hesselink and Van Vuuren, 1999). **It may affect employee health and have spillover effects on marital relationships (Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt 2010).** Hence, job insecurity can be harmful and costly at both organizational and individual levels (Sverke *et al.*, 2002). Therefore, it is significant to study job insecurity.

**The antecedents of job insecurity have been studied on two levels: the macro level mainly includes institutional configurations of societal support; the micro level includes employment contract types, trust between employees and employers.**

1  
2  
3  
4 On the macro level, analyses of job insecurity need to take social safety net into  
5  
6  
7 account in terms of its strength and equality. Social safety net can be described as a  
8  
9  
10 country's institutional configurations including the construction of social welfare, the  
11  
12 regulation of the labour market, and other societal supports (Blank, 1994; Debus *et al.*,  
13  
14 2012). Previous research mainly studied the social-safety-net effect from the perspective  
15  
16 of strength at the cross-country level: people are less concerned about losing their jobs  
17  
18 if there are high levels of societal support for people without jobs in that country (Debus  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 *et al.*, 2012; König *et al.*, 2011). However, this group of research ignored the equality of  
25  
26  
27 the safety net in terms of coverage and access: its underlying assumption was that all  
28  
29  
30 citizens in each country are equally covered by the safety net, and the citizens get equal  
31  
32  
33 access to the safety net. But, in China that is not the case: generally speaking, people  
34  
35 with urban household registration are fully covered whereas people with rural  
36  
37 household registration are not. Thus, at the intra-country level, the unequal coverage  
38  
39 and its influence on employee job insecurity need to be studied. However, the literature  
40  
41 from the equality perspective is limited. Using empirical data from the Chinese state-  
42  
43  
44 owned enterprises (SOEs), this research aims to contribute to the literature.  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 On the micro level, the employment contract has been considered to have  
51  
52 possible impact on job insecurity. During the last three decades, employment types in  
53  
54  
55 the Chinese SOEs have been undergoing significant changes. Before the economic  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 reform in the 1980s, permanent employment was the majority and was protected. Since  
5  
6  
7 then, temporary employment and redundancy have been greatly increased. Probst and  
8  
9  
10 Lawler (2006) noted that job insecurity becomes a growing concern for most employees  
11  
12 in the SOEs. It could be assumed that temporary employment might cause higher level  
13  
14 of job insecurity because temporary employees are more likely to be laid off.  
15  
16  
17 Nevertheless, there has been a debate about this assumption. Findings by Klein  
18  
19  
20 Hesselink and Van Vuuren (1999) and Parker *et al.* (2002) support the assumption.  
21  
22  
23 However, Jacobson (1991) and Klandermans *et al.* (1991, 2010) argued that the above  
24  
25  
26 research only measured one component of job insecurity—the perceived likelihood of  
27  
28  
29 job loss and ignored the other component—the perceived severity of job loss. They  
30  
31  
32 therefore argued that, for temporary employees, the perceived severity of job loss is  
33  
34  
35 often low as they expect their jobs will be terminated and are used to the kind of  
36  
37  
38 working and living style. Thus, temporary employees would not suffer stronger job  
39  
40  
41 insecurity. Following this argument, this research aims to examine the relationship  
42  
43  
44 between employment contract types and job insecurity in the Chinese SOEs.  
45

46  
47 One of the consequences of job insecurity is **low job satisfaction** (Coyle-Shapiro  
48  
49 and Kessler, 2000; De Witte *et al.*, 2010). Job satisfaction was found to be negatively  
50  
51  
52 related to job insecurity (Ashford *et al.*, 1989; Sverke *et al.*, 2002; Reisel *et al.*, 2010).  
53  
54

55  
56 **Nevertheless, job insecurity has two components: the perceived likelihood of job loss**  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 and the perceived severity of the loss, and there is little research into which component  
5  
6 is, and how it is, related to job satisfaction. The research also aims to contribute to this  
7  
8 unknown area.  
9  
10

11  
12 Further, previous research into the micro level antecedents and consequences of  
13  
14 job insecurity ignored the possible impact from the macro level, in particular, social  
15  
16 safety net. For instance, Wong, *et al.* (2005) studied Chinese workers' responses to job  
17  
18 insecurity in joint ventures and SOEs without considering the influence of the unequal  
19  
20 social-safety-net configurations, not distinguishing rural and urban household registered  
21  
22 employees. This exploratory research therefore aims to explore the relationship between  
23  
24 job insecurity and employment contract and job satisfaction under the macro level  
25  
26 context—Chinese social safety net. Thus, the research generates initial insights into this  
27  
28 unknown area and may lead to extensive studies.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 Focusing on employees in the Chinese SOEs, this exploratory research is three-  
40  
41 fold. First, it analyses how the unequal configurations of social safety net influence job  
42  
43 insecurity, extending our understanding of social-safety-net effect from the strength  
44  
45 perspective to equality perspective. Second, under the condition of unequal social-  
46  
47 safety-net configurations, the research examines the relationship between employment  
48  
49 contract types and job insecurity, contributing to the debate about whether temporary  
50  
51 employment causes higher job insecurity. Third, under the same condition, the research  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 specifically studies how each component of job insecurity is related to job satisfaction,  
4  
5  
6 deepening our understanding of the relationship between the two subjects.  
7  
8  
9

## 10 11 **2. Background**

12  
13  
14 The research is based on the fact that the Chinese social safety net has never been equal  
15  
16  
17 to the residents. The social safety net is fundamentally operated through the highly  
18  
19  
20 institutionalized Household Registration System (*'hukou'* in Chinese). The system  
21  
22  
23 classifies the residents into two groups, namely urban and rural registered residents  
24  
25  
26 (Liu, 2005; Solinger, 1999; Wang, 2004). There are insurmountable differences  
27  
28  
29 between the two groups in terms of access to social welfare and SOE employment.  
30

31  
32 China's social welfare system has never covered all the residents equally. Before  
33  
34 the 1990s, the system only covered urban registered residents and could only be  
35  
36  
37 accessed through permanent employment in the SOEs, government, and other state or  
38  
39  
40 public owned organizations (Chan *et al.*, 1992; Walder, 1995). In the 1990s reforms, the  
41  
42  
43 government tried to set up a separate rural welfare system, but failed to construct an  
44  
45  
46 effective one (Zheng and Sun, 2008). Recent reforms such as the new national health  
47  
48  
49 care and pension schemes still provide very limited support to rural registered residents.  
50  
51  
52 In contrast, urban registered residents are provided with heavily subsidized social  
53  
54  
55 welfare: education, health care, and a broad range of benefits (Liu, 2005; Wang, 2004;  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Whyte, 2010). In addition, most of the educational and health care resources are located  
5  
6  
7 in the urban areas, whereby rural residents' access to these welfare is very difficult.  
8

9  
10 Another major benefit for urban registered residents is their prior access to  
11  
12 permanent jobs in SOEs. The SOEs provide their own workplace welfare and workplace  
13  
14 benefits which are supplement to China's weak social welfare system. However, the  
15  
16 workplace welfare and benefits tend to favour permanent employees (today, all  
17  
18 "permanent contracts" have been transferred to long-term contracts which are reviewed  
19  
20 about every five years and normally are on-going. For easy understanding and  
21  
22 consistency, the research still uses the term "permanent contract"). Under China's  
23  
24 Labour Law, the workplace welfare should cover both permanent and temporary  
25  
26 employees and consists of five separate funds: pension, industrial accident, housing,  
27  
28 unemployment, and medical insurance. Both employers and employees contribute to  
29  
30 these funds based on employees' wage levels. As temporary employees get the lowest  
31  
32 wage, they therefore get the lowest welfare. The workplace benefits, mainly including  
33  
34 additional housing and healthcare, are based on an employee's contract type and work  
35  
36 position. A permanent contract and higher position can lead to greater benefits.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50 Temporary employees are generally excluded from the formal structure of these  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
benefits. As a result, permanent employees are the beneficiaries (Chan *et al.*, 1992;



1  
2  
3  
4 Walder, 1995); whilst temporary employees not only get the lowest workplace welfare  
5  
6  
7 and hardly any workplace benefits, but are also at the highest risk of redundancy.  
8

9  
10 A permanent employment contract in the SOEs can lead to greater welfare and  
11  
12 benefits. However, the opportunity to get the contract has never been equal between the  
13  
14 rural and urban registered residents. Before the 1980s, urban registered residents were  
15  
16 officially given priority to work in the industrial sector, especially in SOEs; rural  
17  
18 registered residents were only entitled to work in the agricultural sector (Chan *et al.*,  
19  
20  
21 1992; Whyte, 2010). Since then, new regulations have been issued to make rural  
22  
23 registered people's access to industrial employment easier, largely in non-SOEs  
24  
25 (Frenkel, 2001; Solinger, 2006). However, recruitment policies in the SOEs still favour  
26  
27 urban residents, restricting rural residents' access to permanent employment. Thus, the  
28  
29 employment and benefit inequalities between rural and urban registered residents  
30  
31 remain considerable.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Further, unlike in the West, change of household registration is not based on  
42  
43 where a resident lives. The two types of registration were originally decided by whether  
44  
45 the people were distributed to work in the agricultural or industrial sector by the state in  
46  
47 the 1950s. Since then, people generally inherit the registration from their parents.  
48  
49  
50 Because urban registration can lead to greater benefits, change from rural to urban  
51  
52 registration has been tightly restricted, mainly by setting quotas (Bian, 2002; Chan *et*  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 *al.*, 1992; Li, 2001). For instance, ever since 1980, the quota has been set at 0.2 to 0.5 %  
5  
6  
7 of the total rural registered population (Wang, 2004), though there has been a much  
8  
9  
10 larger proportion of rural registered population working in the urban areas (mainly in  
11  
12 non-SOEs). As a result, the major beneficiaries of the Chinese social safety net are  
13  
14 urban registered residents, especially those holding permanent contracts in the SOEs.  
15  
16

17  
18 This unequal social safety net might be expected to have a substantial influence  
19  
20 on job insecurity.  
21  
22

### 23 24 25 **3. Hypotheses development** 26 27

#### 28 29 ***3.1 Social safety net and job insecurity*** 30 31

32  
33 At the macro level, a country's institutional configurations have been considered to  
34  
35 affect job insecurity. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) pointed out that individuals are  
36  
37 embedded in higher level societal systems, it therefore can be assumed that factors from  
38  
39 the country context affect an individual's appraisal of job insecurity. Societal support,  
40  
41 as a part of national institutions, "*increases the individual's ability to cope with stressful*  
42  
43 *organizational situations by buffering the individual's life outside the organization*  
44  
45 (Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt 1984, p. 445)". In line with this assumption, Borg and  
46  
47 Elizur (1992)'s empirical findings in Germany showed that providing more support  
48  
49 contributes to reducing job insecurity. König *et al.* (2011), in their study of working  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 students, found more negative reactions to job insecurity in the United States of  
5  
6  
7 America (USA), a country with a relatively weak social safety net, compared with  
8  
9  
10 Switzerland, a country with a relatively strong social safety net. Debus *et al.* (2012),  
11  
12 using representative samples drawn from 24 countries (but not including China), found  
13  
14 that employees in countries with stronger social safety nets had fewer negative reactions  
15  
16 to job insecurity. These findings highlight the negative relationship between social  
17  
18 safety net and job insecurity at the cross-country level.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 At the intra-country level, based on the inequality that an urban household  
25  
26 registration represents greater societal support in China, Shi (2015) found that  
27  
28 temporary employees with rural registrations have higher job insecurity than those with  
29  
30 urban registrations in the SOEs. However, permanent employees were not studied.  
31  
32  
33 Covering both permanent and temporary employees, considering the negative  
34  
35 relationship between social safety net and job insecurity, and considering the two  
36  
37 components of job insecurity, the following hypotheses were proposed.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 *H1a. In the Chinese SOEs, rural registered employees have higher levels of*  
45  
46 *concern on the perceived likelihood of job loss than urban registered employees.*  
47  
48

49  
50 *H1b. In the Chinese SOEs, rural registered employees have higher levels of*  
51  
52 *concern on the perceived severity of job loss than urban registered employees.*  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### 3.2 *Employment contract and job insecurity*

Unsurprisingly, researchers such like Klein Hesselink and Van Vuuren (1999), and Parker *et al.* (2002) found temporary employees display more job insecurity than permanent ones. They considered the major reason is that temporary contracts are far more likely to lead to job loss. However, there have been arguments against this simplistic conclusion.

Klandermans *et al.* (1991, 2010) argued that job insecurity not only consists of the perceived probability of job loss, but also the perceived severity of the loss. For temporary employees, the former is often high, but the latter often low as they expect their jobs will be terminated and are used to this working and living style. Jacobson (1991, p. 33) explained it as: “*I can only be worried about losing my job if I think it is likely that I will lose it. But, if I do not care about my job, the likelihood of losing my job is of little concern to me*”. On the contrary, permanent employees estimate the probability of losing their job as low, but the severity as high. Therefore, these researchers predicted that temporary workers would not suffer stronger job insecurity. Some recent studies support this opinion (Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt, 2010).

Klandermans *et al.* (1991, 2010) and Jacobson (1991)’s arguments are on the basis of the western social safety net which equally covers both temporary and permanent employees and provides them with sufficient living support. Temporary

1  
2  
3  
4 employees do not have to worry about their living after losing their jobs. But, in China  
5  
6  
7 it is different: jobless people can only get very limited societal support and their living  
8  
9  
10 is a concern. Hence, to the Chinese temporary employees, both the likelihood of losing  
11  
12  
13 jobs and the severity of the loss are supposed to be high. Hence, they are assumed to  
14  
15  
16 suffer higher job insecurity.

17  
18 However, another influence from the Chinese social safety net should not be  
19  
20  
21 ignored: urban registered residents have more chance to work in the SOEs, including  
22  
23  
24 being temporary employees. As a result, most of temporary employees are urban  
25  
26  
27 registered residents. This might counteract the possible higher job insecurity from those  
28  
29  
30 with rural household registrations. Therefore, the temporary and permanent employees  
31  
32  
33 might not have different level of job insecurity. Thus, the research proposed the  
34  
35  
36 following hypotheses.

37  
38  
39 *H2a. In the Chinese SOEs, temporary employees do not have higher level of*  
40  
41  
42 *concern on the perceived likelihood of job loss than permanent employees.*

43  
44  
45 *H2a. In the Chinese SOEs, temporary employees do not have higher level of*  
46  
47  
48 *concern on the perceived severity of job loss than permanent employees.*

### 51 **3.3 Job insecurity and satisfaction**

52  
53  
54 Job satisfaction is considered to be one of the consequences of job insecurity (Ashford  
55  
56  
57 *et al.*, 1989; Sverke *et al.*, 2002). Ashford *et al.*'s survey in the northern USA and Reisel  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 *et al.* (2010)'s survey of the part-time MBAs in the Southwest and West coast of USA  
5  
6  
7 found that job satisfaction is negatively related to job insecurity: the higher the  
8  
9  
10 insecurity, the lower the satisfaction. In line with these findings, the following  
11  
12 hypotheses were proposed.

13  
14  
15 ***H3a.*** *Job satisfaction is negatively related to the perceived likelihood of job*  
16  
17  
18 *loss in the Chinese SOEs.*

19  
20  
21 ***H3b.*** *Job satisfaction is negatively related to the perceived severity of job loss in*  
22  
23  
24 *the Chinese SOEs.*

## 25 26 27 28 **4. Data collection and processing**

29  
30  
31  
32 Data used in this research were from a work attitude questionnaire survey conducted by  
33  
34  
35 the author in 2007. The survey was conducted in six SOEs across four provinces in the  
36  
37  
38 East and Northeast of China, covering banking, construction, property, hotel, and power  
39  
40  
41 generating industries.

### 42 43 44 **4.1 Measurement and data processing**

45  
46  
47 There are broadly two methods measuring job insecurity: the global method measures  
48  
49  
50 job insecurity in its entirety, measuring the overall insecurity; the multi-dimensional  
51  
52  
53 method measures different facets or components of job insecurity (Sverker, et al. 2002;  
54  
55  
56 Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt 2010). The latter method normally uses a questionnaire  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 including lengthy indicators. For instance, Ashford, *et al.* (1989) designed a 57-  
4  
5  
6 indicator measuring 5 facets of job insecurity. Lee, *et al.* (2008) simplified it to a bare-  
7  
8  
9 bones method which still contains 14 items. This research only used two self-designed  
10  
11  
12 indicators respectively measuring two facets of job insecurity. The main reasons were as  
13  
14 following: first, this was an exploratory research, only generating initial insights for  
15  
16 extensive studies; second, this was a part of a work attitudes survey which limited the  
17  
18 space for job insecurity study; third, if all the indicators were translated to Chinese  
19  
20 language, the differences of context and wording between the indicators would be  
21  
22 difficult to be distinguished by the respondents. This could confuse the respondents and  
23  
24 cause inaccuracy of the measurement.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 To measure the perceived likelihood of job loss, the respondents were asked to  
34  
35 evaluate the statement that “I always worry about losing my job”. A 5-point Likert scale  
36  
37 was employed: from -2 to 2 representing “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. To  
38  
39 evaluate the perceived severity of job loss, the respondents were asked to evaluate the  
40  
41 importance of job security. The importance was assumed to positively reflect the  
42  
43 perceived severity. Again, a 5-point Likert scale was employed: from -2 to 2  
44  
45 representing “not important at all” to “very important”.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 Besides the above self-designed questions, a set of four questions from the 1998  
54  
55 Workplace Employee Relations Survey (cited from Cully and Woodland, 1998) were  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 adopted to measure job satisfaction. The four questions respectively asked the  
5  
6  
7 respondents to evaluate their satisfaction with the amount of their influence, pay, scope  
8  
9  
10 of achievement, and the respect they get in the workplace. A 5-point Likert scale was  
11  
12 employed from -2 to 2 representing “very dissatisfied” to “very satisfied”. Means of the  
13  
14  
15 four items were used to represent the overall job satisfaction for further regression  
16  
17  
18 analysis.

19  
20  
21 To test the relationships between household registration, employment contract,  
22  
23  
24 and job insecurity, hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used. The two  
25  
26  
27 components of job insecurity were treated as the dependent factors in two separate  
28  
29  
30 analyses, while household registration and employment contract were treated as the  
31  
32  
33 independent factors. In each analysis, in the first step, gender, age, working years,  
34  
35  
36 marital status, parental status, and union membership status were entered as control  
37  
38  
39 factors; in the second step, household registration was entered; in the third step,  
40  
41  
42 employment contract was entered. The reason for entering household registration prior  
43  
44  
45 to employment contract is that household registration is a fundamental social identity  
46  
47  
48 prior to employment and it is a qualification for the SOE employment.

49  
50  
51 There was an additional self-evaluation question exploring the reasons for job  
52  
53  
54 insecurity. It was considered to be complementary to the hierarchical multiple  
55  
56  
57 regression analysis: employee’s self-evaluation could help to find out the apparent  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 reasons for job insecurity whilst the hierarchical multiple regression analysis could find  
4  
5  
6 out the fundamental reasons. The respondents were asked to rank their top three reasons  
7  
8  
9 from a list of 10 given factors using value 1, 2, and 3 (unranked factors were equally  
10  
11 treated as value 4). The given factors included household registration, employment  
12  
13 contract, education, title of post, practical skills, work experience, personal reasons,  
14  
15 labour market, economy, and the industrial situation. The top three reasons between  
16  
17 rural and urban registered employees and between permanent and temporary employees  
18  
19 were compared. Chi-square test was used.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used again to analyse the  
28  
29 relationships between the two components of job insecurity and job satisfaction. In the  
30  
31 first step, the same control factors used in the previous regression analysis were entered;  
32  
33 in the second step, household registration and employment contract were entered as  
34  
35 these were supposed to be the antecedents of job insecurity; in the third step, the two  
36  
37 components of job insecurity were entered. Means of the four aspects of job satisfaction  
38  
39 was used as the independent factor.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

#### 48 ***4.2 Survey and fieldwork***

49

50  
51 Because the survey was conducted in the Chinese language, the back translation  
52  
53 methodology (Brislin, 1980) was used between two bilingual Chinese postgraduate  
54  
55 students and the author. The rectified Chinese version was then used in a pilot. Staff  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 from the HRM departments of two SOEs participated in pilot runs and small  
5  
6  
7 modifications were made as a result. The data from these pilots were excluded from the  
8  
9  
10 final data.

11  
12 The volunteer respondents were employees who had no managerial work titles.  
13  
14 The author was present at each survey site where the questionnaires were given to all  
15  
16  
17 qualified volunteers together in a meeting. After the author simultaneously explained  
18  
19  
20 each question, the volunteers were asked to take the questionnaires away and then to  
21  
22  
23 return the completed questionnaires to a sealed box anonymously within the next three  
24  
25  
26 days. It gave the respondents more time to think through the questions, encouraging  
27  
28  
29 them to express their genuine attitudes. In addition, the interaction between the author,  
30  
31  
32 HRM managers and the respondents also provided an in-depth insight into the subject.  
33  
34

35  
36 All the participated SOEs and employees have agreed that their data can be used  
37  
38  
39 for research purpose and are of course guaranteed anonymity.  
40  
41

## 42 43 **5. Findings**

### 44 45 46 *5.1 Sample characteristics*

47  
48  
49 309 valid samples were analysed. The samples consisted of 87% urban registered  
50  
51  
52 employees, being the majorities in both the temporary and permanent employee groups.  
53  
54  
55 This reflected urban registered people's priority of access to SOE employment. Being  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 the minority, over half of the rural registered employees (60%) were temporary  
5  
6  
7 employees.

8  
9  
10 There were more permanent employees (69%) than temporary ones. The  
11  
12 temporary employees were much younger: 51% of temporary employees compared to  
13  
14 fewer than 10% of permanent employees were under 25-year-old; 55% of temporary  
15  
16 employees compared to fewer than 15% of permanent employees had working  
17  
18 experience of less than 5 years. As permanent employees were older, it was not  
19  
20 surprising to see that over 80% of them, compared to 47% of temporary employees,  
21  
22 were married or had partners, and over 70% of them compared to 30% temporary  
23  
24 employees were parents. Pearson correlation analysis also showed (see Table I) that  
25  
26 temporary employees were significantly correlated with less work experience, younger  
27  
28 age, and less marital and parental status. It also showed that less rural registered  
29  
30 employees and temporary employees had trade union memberships than their  
31  
32 counterparts. The samples contained 51% females who were almost evenly distributed  
33  
34 across the studied employee groups.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 << **Table I. Pearson correlations between selected factors in relation to job**  
48  
49 **insecurity and satisfaction about here**>>  
50  
51

## 52 53 54 ***5.2 Household registration, employment contract, and job insecurity*** 55

56  
57 Table II shows the results of the hierarchical regression analysis of the relationship  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 between household registration, employment contract, and job insecurity.  
5

6  
7 << Table II. Hierarchical regression analysis of job insecurity about here >>  
8

9  
10 Regarding the worry about losing job, in step 1, after entering all the control factors, the  
11  
12 model is significant [F (6,278) =4.672,  $\rho < 0.001$ ]. In step 2, after entering household  
13  
14 registration, the model is still significant [F (7,277) =9.518,  $\rho < 0.001$ ]. It explained  
15  
16 additional 10.2% of variation and this change is significant ( $\rho < 0.001$ ). Of the three  
17  
18 significant predictors (household registration, gender, and marital status), household  
19  
20 registration is the most important predictor in this step ( $\beta = -0.328$ ,  $\rho < 0.001$ ). In the  
21  
22 third step, after entering employment contract, the model is still significant [F (8,276)  
23  
24 =8.563,  $\rho < 0.001$ ]; but, the change is not ( $\Delta R^2 = 0.7\%$ ,  $\rho > 0.05$ ). Of the three significant  
25  
26 predictors (household registration, gender, marital status), household registration, again,  
27  
28 was the most important predictor ( $\beta = -0.309$ ,  $\rho < 0.001$ ); employment contract was not  
29  
30 significant ( $\beta = -0.097$ ,  $\rho > 0.05$ ). The results indicated that household registration was  
31  
32 negatively related to the perceived likelihood of job loss: rural registered employees had  
33  
34 higher concerns on the possibility of job loss. Employment contract was not a predictor  
35  
36 of this component of job insecurity. Thus, H1a and H2a were accepted.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Regarding the importance of job security, in step 1, after entering all the control  
51  
52 factors, the model was not significant [F (6,277) =2.067,  $\rho > 0.05$ ]. In the second step,  
53  
54 after entering household registration, the model was significant [F (7,276) =2.351,  $\rho$   
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 <0.05). It explained additional 1.3% of variance and the change is significant ( $\rho < 0.05$ ).  
5  
6  
7 Household registration was the most important and the only predictor ( $\beta = -0.119$ ,  
8  
9  
10  $\rho < 0.05$ ) in this step. In the third step, after entering employment contract, the model was  
11  
12 still significant [ $F(8, 275) = 2.053$ ,  $\rho < 0.05$ ]. But, no significant change happened ( $\Delta R^2$   
13  
14  $= 0$ ,  $\rho > 0.05$ ). Both household registration and employment contract were not significant  
15  
16 in this step. Thus, household registration was found to be negatively related to the  
17  
18 importance of job security in the second model, while employment contract was not  
19  
20 found to be related in the analysis. Therefore, H1b and H2b were true.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 These results showed that rural registered employees had higher levels of  
28  
29 concern on the two components of job insecurity than the urban registered ones, while  
30  
31 temporary employees had the same level of concern as the permanent ones.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 **5.3 Reasons for job insecurity**

38  
39 The analysis of the reasons for job insecurity showed some interesting results.  
40  
41

42 In employee's self-evaluation, employment contract was ranked in the top three  
43  
44 reasons for job insecurity by both rural and temporary employee groups (see Table III).  
45  
46  
47 Chi-square test found that the consideration of employment contract was significantly  
48  
49 different between the rural and urban groups [ $\chi^2(3, N = 267) = 12.17$ ,  $\rho < 0.05$ ] and  
50  
51 between the temporary and permanent employee groups [ $\chi^2(3, N = 207) = 110.58$ ,  $\rho$   
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 <0.05]. It appeared that employees felt temporary contract impact their job insecurity,  
5  
6  
7 which seemed to be contradictive to previous hierarchical regression analysis.  
8

9  
10 << Table III. Self-evaluation of the top three reasons for job insecurity

11  
12 about here >>

#### 13 14 15 16 17 *5.4 Job insecurity and satisfaction*

18  
19 The Cronbach's Alpha for the 4-item measure of job satisfaction was 0.72, above the  
20  
21 acceptable level 0.70. To analyse the relationship between job insecurity and  
22  
23 satisfaction, in the first step of the hierarchical regression analysis (see Table IV), after  
24  
25 entering all the control factors, the model was not significant [F (6,277) =2.009,  $\rho$   
26  
27 >0.05]. In the second step, after entering household registration and employment  
28  
29 contract, the model was significant [F (8,275) =1.998,  $\rho$  <0.05]. R-square increased  
30  
31 1.3%; however the change was not significant. The most important predictor here was  
32  
33 marital status ( $\beta$  =0.218,  $\rho$  <0.05). In the third step, after entering the two components  
34  
35 of job insecurity, the model was significant [F (10,273) =3.139,  $\rho$  <0.01]. R-square  
36  
37 increased 4.8% and this change was significant ( $\rho$  <0.01). The most important predictor  
38  
39 was "importance of job security" ( $\beta$  =0.221,  $\rho$  <0.001); the second important one was  
40  
41 marital status ( $\beta$  =0.222,  $\rho$  <0.05). "Worry about losing job" was not a predictor of job  
42  
43 satisfaction. Thus, H3a was rejected. Opposite to H3b, the finding showed that the  
44  
45 perceived severity of job loss (indicated by the "importance of job security") was  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 positively linked to job satisfaction, thus H3b was also rejected. The findings also  
5  
6  
7 showed that marriage increased job satisfaction.  
8

9  
10 << Table IV. Hierarchical regression analysis of job insecurity about  
11  
12 here>>  
13

## 14 15 16 17 **6. Discussion and contributions** 18

19  
20 The exploratory research contributes to our understanding of job insecurity in the  
21  
22 Chinese institutional context and, by extension, may have implications for the studies  
23  
24 elsewhere.  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 First, from the equality perspective of social safety net, the research extends our  
30  
31 understanding of the relationship between job insecurity and the safety net from cross-  
32  
33 country to intra-country level.  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 In the West, the cross-country findings by Borg and Elizur (1992), König *et al.*  
39  
40 (2011), and Debus *et al.* (2012) attributed higher job insecurity to the weaker social  
41  
42 safety net of that country. On the intra-country level, only focusing on temporary  
43  
44 employment in the Chinese SOEs, Shi (2015) tested and confirmed this negative  
45  
46 relationship. This research, covering both permanent and temporary employees, found  
47  
48 that the rural registered employees provided with less support from the social safety net  
49  
50 had higher job insecurity. This is in line with the previous findings. In China, resting on  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 the household registration system, the social safety net impacts rural registered  
5  
6  
7 employees mainly through two unequal configurations: one is limiting their access to  
8  
9  
10 SOE permanent employment; the other is providing them with weaker social welfare. In  
11  
12 the former situation, rural registered employees are most likely being temporary  
13  
14 employees who are at the higher risk of redundancy, they would perceive their  
15  
16 likelihood of job loss is high. In the latter situation, with weaker support from social  
17  
18 welfare and benefits, rural registered employees have less ability to cope with their  
19  
20 possible job loss, they would perceive the loss is severe. As a result, rural registered  
21  
22 employees suffer higher job insecurity than the urban registered ones.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 Second, the research contributes to the study into the relationship between job  
31  
32 insecurity and employment contract. There are two major categories of literature in this  
33  
34 area. Klein Hesselink and Van Vuuren, (1999) and Parker *et al.* (2002) found that  
35  
36 temporary employment leads to higher job insecurity because of the higher likelihood of  
37  
38 redundancy. On the contrary, Klandermans *et al.* (1991, 2010) and Jacobson (1991)  
39  
40 argued that, for temporary employees, the perceived possibility of job loss is high, while  
41  
42 the perceived severity of the loss is low because they are expecting their contract will be  
43  
44 terminated and are used to this kind of working and living style. Thus, they argued  
45  
46 temporary employees' overall job insecurity is no higher than permanent employees'.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55  
56 At the beginning, the analysis of this research found that employment contract is not a  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 predictor of job insecurity, which seems to be in line with the latter authors. However,  
5  
6  
7 the analysis of employees' self-evaluation found their concern on employment contract  
8  
9  
10 significantly impact their job insecurity. Considering the unequal configurations of the  
11  
12 Chinese social safety net, this research has different explanations to the seemingly  
13  
14 **contradictory findings** from any of the two categories of literature.  
15  
16

17  
18 The research firstly suggests two levels of influential factors upon job insecurity:  
19  
20  
21 the macro level factors including the institutional configurations of social safety net, and  
22  
23  
24 the micro level factors including employment contract, and working and living style.  
25  
26  
27 The research secondly considers that the influence from the macro level factors is  
28  
29  
30 fundamental while the influence from the micro level is comparatively apparent.  
31  
32  
33 Thirdly, when the macro level factors equally cover all the employees, the micro level  
34  
35  
36 factors may manifest significant influence on employees' job insecurity.  
37

38  
39 In the first category of the literature, the findings by Klein Hesselink and Van  
40  
41  
42 Vuuren (1999) and Parker *et al.* (2002) were respectively based on the Netherlands and  
43  
44  
45 the United Kingdom. Compared to China, at the macro level, these two countries'  
46  
47  
48 institutional configurations of social safety net do not cause much inequality between  
49  
50  
51 temporary and permanent employees. On that equal basis, employment contract at the  
52  
53  
54 micro level may manifest a significant impact on job insecurity. That might be why they  
55  
56  
57 found temporary employees had higher job insecurity. However, at the macro level in  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 China, the institutional configurations of household registration in relation to social  
5  
6  
7 safety net cause remarkable inequality between the employees; hence, the impact from  
8  
9  
10 the macro level is dominant. This might be why the rural registered employees were  
11  
12  
13 found to have higher job insecurity. Under this situation, employment contract, as a  
14  
15  
16 micro level factor, its influence on job insecurity does not show up. This might be why  
17  
18  
19 the regression analysis at the beginning of the analysis could not find significant  
20  
21  
22 influence from employment contract. Although no significant influence was found, the  
23  
24  
25 connection between employment contract and job insecurity still existed. That might be  
26  
27  
28 why in employees' self-evaluation the analysis found employees' concern on  
29  
30  
31 employment contract significantly impacting their worry about losing job. That might  
32  
33  
34 be also why the descriptive analysis found employment contract, rather than household  
35  
36  
37 registration, was ranked in the top three reasons for job insecurity by both rural and  
38  
39  
40 temporary employee groups. It may indicate that, compared to macro level factors such  
41  
42  
43 as household registration, micro level factors such like employment contract are more  
44  
45  
46 apparent.

47  
48       Regarding the second category of the literature, Klandermans, *et al.* (1991,  
49  
50 2010) and Jacobson (1991) considered employee's working and living style might cause  
51  
52  
53 temporary and permanent employees have the similar level of job insecurity. If taking  
54  
55  
56 employee's working and living style as one of the micro level factors, it will be in  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 consistent with the findings of this research. Working and living style, similar to  
5  
6  
7 employment contract, is one of the micro level factors, might influence job insecurity  
8  
9  
10 significantly. However, as this research suggested, if the macro level institutional  
11  
12 inequality exists, the macro level factors will dominant the impact, therefore, the micro  
13  
14 level factors may not show significant influence. This could explain why household  
15  
16 registration showed its impact in the research while working and living style showed its  
17  
18 influence in the findings by Klandermans, *et al.* and Jacobson. Certainly, at the micro  
19  
20 level, there is a range of factors such as employment contract, working and living style,  
21  
22 gender, and marital status. Further studies are required about how, and in what situation,  
23  
24 these factors significantly influence job insecurity. Hence, from the perspectives of  
25  
26 macro and micro levels, this research deepens the understanding of the influence from  
27  
28 institutional configurations and employment contract upon job insecurity.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 As far as the relationship between job insecurity and satisfaction is concerned,  
39  
40 the uniqueness of this research is that it separates the two components of job insecurity  
41  
42 and then respectively studies their links to job satisfaction. Of the two components of  
43  
44 job insecurity, the perceived severity of job loss (indicated by the importance of job  
45  
46 security) was found to be positively linked to job satisfaction: the higher the  
47  
48 consideration of the perceived severity, the higher the satisfaction. This is opposite to  
49  
50 the findings by Ashford *et al.* (1989) and Reisel *et al.* (2010).  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 The research firstly argues that the influences from the macro level factors such  
5  
6 as social safety net and labour market must be considered. Secondly, under the macro  
7  
8 level influences, the outcomes of job such as financial income and professional  
9  
10 development should be considered. China has been experiencing great economic  
11  
12 changes and its labour market becomes very competitive. In addition, China's social  
13  
14 safety net is weak. In this macro environment, a job in relation to its financial outcome  
15  
16 would be important to the employee, and the perceived loss of the job would be severe.  
17  
18 Hence the employee might appreciate the present job and keep a high level of  
19  
20 satisfaction—it explains the finding. From this perspective, it could also explain the  
21  
22 finding that married (including partnership) employees had higher job satisfaction than  
23  
24 their counterparts: to maintain their families, for the same reason, they might highly  
25  
26 appreciate their jobs and get higher satisfaction. Thus, the research contributes to the  
27  
28 understanding of the relationship between job insecurity and satisfaction under the  
29  
30 macro level situations.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 45 **7. Conclusion, implication, limitation and future study**

46  
47  
48 In conclusion, the exploratory research suggests that there are two levels of factors  
49  
50 influencing job insecurity: at the macro level, the factors include the institutional  
51  
52 configurations of social safety net; at the micro level, the factors include employment  
53  
54 contract, and working and living style. The macro level factors have fundamental  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 influence on job insecurity, which is shown in the relationship between the household  
5  
6 registration and job insecurity in the Chinese SOEs. The micro level factors are more  
7  
8 apparent than the macro level factors. When the macro level factors equally cover all  
9  
10 employees, the micro level factors such as employment contract and working and living  
11  
12 style may decide the levels of job insecurity.  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 Of the two components of job insecurity, the perceived severity of job loss is  
19  
20 found to be positively linked to job satisfaction. The research argues that, under a weak  
21  
22 social safety net in a competitive labour market, the perceived severity may cause the  
23  
24 employees to appreciate their present jobs and then to maintain a high level of  
25  
26 satisfaction.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 The findings of the research provide a meaning to a country's effort to eliminate  
34  
35 its social inequality: improving the equality of social safety net may also improve the  
36  
37 job security of vulnerable employees. The world economy is in a period of volatility.  
38  
39 Increasing redundancy and temporary employment make job insecurity a concern. To  
40  
41 minimize the negative influence of job insecurity, improving the equal coverage and  
42  
43 good quality of the social safety net may be a solution. As far as China's reform is  
44  
45 concerned, household registration is a basis to access social safety net. This unequal  
46  
47 institutional configuration should be taken into account to improve employees' job  
48  
49 security.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 One limitation of the research is the measurement of job insecurity due to the  
5  
6 exploratory nature of the study. This research uses single indicator respectively  
7  
8 measuring two facets of job insecurity. Though researchers accept using single indicator,  
9  
10 some argue that multi-indicator measurement typically has the better internal  
11  
12 consistency (Sverke *et al.*, 2002). Thus, extensive research using mature multi-indicator  
13  
14 to measure multi-facet of job insecurity is required. Another limitation is in relation to  
15  
16 the size and coverage of sampling. As China is such a big country, there are  
17  
18 considerable differences between its regions. Nevertheless, the limited samples were  
19  
20 only collected in the east and northeast of China. Hence they might not fully represent  
21  
22 the overall Chinese SOEs. The research did not find any job insecurity difference  
23  
24 between the five selected industries. It might be because the data were collected during  
25  
26 a period of fast economic growth, in which employment situation was similar and good  
27  
28 in all these industries. A longitude research in the future may overcome the limitation.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 In the last decade, China has been modifying its social safety net, improving  
42  
43 equality between different social and working groups. Thus, longitude comparison for  
44  
45 future research is recommended. It would be interesting to see if the insecurity  
46  
47 difference between rural and urban registered employees is decreasing and if it is  
48  
49 increasing between temporary and permanent employees. It would also be interesting to  
50  
51 study the subject in non-state owned organizations. The research suggests that  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 employment contract and working and living style are micro level influential factors; at  
5  
6  
7 this level, how the two factors intermediate and influence job insecurity would be a  
8  
9  
10 subject for future study. The research finds a positive influence from one of the two  
11  
12 components of job insecurity upon job satisfaction in a specific macro level situation.  
13  
14  
15 The future research could study how this influence varies under different macro level  
16  
17  
18 situations.  
19

### 20 21 22 **Acknowledgement:**

23  
24  
25 I want to thank Professor [name will be given as soon as the paper is accepted] for his  
26  
27  
28 guidance on this research, especially in the early stages, and for his help with academic  
29  
30  
31 writing.  
32

### 33 34 35 **References:**

- 36  
37  
38 Ashford, S.J., Lee, C. and Bobko, P. (1989), "Content, Causes, and Consequences of  
39  
40 Job Insecurity: A Theory-based Measure and Substantive Test", *Academy of*  
41  
42 *Management Journal*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 803-829.
- 43  
44  
45 Bian, Y. (2002), "Chinese Social Stratification and Social Mobility", *Annual Review of*  
46  
47 *Sociology*, pp. 26-91.
- 48  
49  
50 Blank, R. M. (1994), *Social Protection Versus Economic Flexibility: Is There a Trade-*  
51  
52 *off?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 53  
54  
55 Borg, I. and Elizur, D. (1992), "Job Insecurity: Correlates, Moderators and  
56  
57 Measurement", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 13 No.2, pp. 13-26.  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Brislin, R. (1980), "Translation and Content Analysis of Oral and Written Material," in:  
Triandis, H. C. and Berry, J. W. (eds.), *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology*,  
Vol. 2, pp. 389–444. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Chan, A.; Madsen, R. and Unger, J. (1992), *Chen Village under Mao and Deng*,  
Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cheng, G. and Chan, D. (2008), "Who Suffers More from Job Insecurity? A Meta-  
analytic Review", *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. Vol. 57, No. 2,  
pp. 272–303.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A.-M., & Kessler, I. (2000), "Consequences of the Psychological  
Contract for the Employment Relationship: A Large Scale Survey", *Journal of  
Management Studies*, Vol. 37, pp. 903–930.
- Cully, M. and Woodland, S. (1999), *Britain at Work: as Depicted by 1998 Workplace  
Employee Relations Survey*. London: Routledge.
- Debus, M.E., Probst, T.M., König, C.J. and Kleinmann, M. (2012), "Catch Me If I Fall!  
Enacted Uncertainty Avoidance and the Social Safety Net as Country-Level  
Moderators in the Job Insecurity–Job Attitudes Link", *Journal of Applied  
Psychology*, Vol. 97, No. 3, pp. 690–698.
- De Cuyper, N. and De Witte, H. (2007), "Job Insecurity in Temporary versus  
Permanent Workers: Associations with Attitudes, Well-being, and Behaviour",  
*Work and Stress*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 65-84
- De Witte, H., De Cuyper, N., Handaja, Y., Sverke, M., Näswall, K. and Hellgren, J.  
(2010), "Associations between Quantitative and Qualitative Job Insecurity and  
Well-being: A Test in Belgian Banks", *International Studies of Management  
and Organization*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 40–56.



- 1  
2  
3  
4 Frenkel, S. J. (2001), “Globalization, Athletic Footwear Commodity Chains and  
5  
6 Employment Relations in China”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 531-  
7  
8 562.  
9
- 10 Greenhalgh, L. and Rosenblatt, Z. (1984), “Job Insecurity: Toward Conceptual Clarity”,  
11  
12 *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 3, pp. 438–448.  
13
- 14 Greenhalgh, L., & Rosenblatt, Z. (2010), “Evolution of Research on Job Insecurity”,  
15  
16 *International Studies of Management and Organization*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 6–  
17  
18 19.  
19
- 20 Jacobson, D. (1991), “The Conceptual Approach to Job Insecurity”, in: Hartley, J.,  
21  
22 Jacobson, D., Klandermans, B., and Van Vuuren, T. (eds) *Job Insecurity:*  
23  
24 *Coping with Jobs at Risk*. London: Sage, pp. 23–39.  
25  
26
- 27 Klandermans, B., Van Vuuren, T., and Jacobson, D. (1991), “Employees and Job  
28  
29 Insecurity”, in: Hartley, J., Jacobson, D., Klandermans, B., and Van Vuuren, T.  
30  
31 (eds) *Job Insecurity: Coping with Jobs at Risk*. London: Sage, pp. 40–64.  
32  
33
- 34 Klandermans, B., Hesselink, J.K. and Van Vuuren, T. (2010), “Employment Status and  
35  
36 Job Insecurity: On the Subjective Appraisal of an Objective Status”, *Economic*  
37  
38 *and Industrial Democracy*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 557-577.  
39
- 40 Klein Hesselink, D.J. and Van Vuuren, T. (1999), “Job Flexibility and Job Insecurity:  
41  
42 The Dutch Case”, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*,  
43  
44 Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 273–294.  
45  
46
- 47 König, C. J., Probst, T. M., Staffen, S., and Graso, M. (2011), “A Swiss–U.S.  
48  
49 Comparison of the Correlates of Job Insecurity”, *Applied Psychology*, Vol. 60,  
50  
51 pp. 141–159.  
52
- 53 Lazarus, R. S. and Folkman, S. (1984), *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping*. New York, NY:  
54  
55 Springer.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Lee, C., Bobko, P., Ashford, S., Chen, Z.X. and Ren, X. (2008), "Cross - cultural development of an abridged job insecurity measure", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp.373-390.
- Li, Q. (2001), "Market Transition and the Intergenerational Transformation of Middle Classes," in: Bian, Y., Tu, E. and So, A. (eds.), *Survey Research in Chinese Societies*, pp. 141-164. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Liu, Z. (2005), "Institution and Inequality: the Hukou System in China", *Journal of Comparative Economics*, Vol. 33, pp. 133–157.
- Parker, S.K., Griffin, M.A., Sprigg, C.A. and Wall, T.A. (2002), "Effect of Temporary Contracts on Perceived Work Characteristics and Job Strain: A Longitudinal Study", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 55 No. 3, pp. 689–717.
- Probst, T.M. (2003), "Development and Validation of the Job Security Index and the Job Security Satisfaction Scale: A Classical Test Theory and IRT Approach", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 76, pp. 451–467.
- Shi, Bing (2015), "Insecure, but Satisfied and Committed: the Influence of Household Registration upon Temporary Employees in Chinese State-owned Enterprises", *The International Journal of Management and Business*, Vol.6 No.1, pp. 84-100.
- Solinger, D. J. (1999), "Demolishing Partitions: Back to Beginnings in the Cities?" *China Quarterly*, Vol. 159, pp. 629-639.
- Solinger, D. J. (2006), "The Creation of a New Underclass in China and its Implications", *Environment and Urbanization*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 177-193.
- Sverke, M., Hellgren, J., & Näswall, K. (2002), "No Security: A Meta-analysis and Review of Job Insecurity and Its Consequences", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 7, pp. 242–264.

- 1  
2  
3 Walder, A. G. (1995), "Career Mobility and the Communist Political Order", *American*  
4  
5 *Sociology Review*, Vol. 60, pp. 309-328.  
6  
7  
8 Wang Fei-Ling (2004), "Hukou Systems and Migration Control", in: Chen, A., Liu, G.  
9  
10 G. and Zhung, K. H. (eds.), *Urban Transformation in China*. Surrey: Ashgate  
11  
12 Publishing Limited.  
13  
14 Whyte, M. K. (2010), "The Paradoxes of Rural-Urban Inequality in Contemporary  
15  
16 China", in: Whyte, M. K. (ed.), *One Country, Two Societies: Rural-Urban*  
17  
18 *Inequality in Contemporary China (Harvard Contemporary China Series 16)*.  
19  
20 Cambridge: Harvard University Press.  
21  
22  
23 Wong, Y.T., Wong, C.S., Ngo, H.Y. and Lui, H.K. (2005), "Different responses to job  
24  
25 insecurity of Chinese workers in joint ventures and state-owned enterprises",  
26  
27 *Human Relations*, Vol. 58, No.11, pp.1391-1418.  
28  
29  
30 Zheng, B. and Sun, S. (2008), "30 Years Institutional Reform of China's Social  
31  
32 Security", in: Zou, D. and Ouyang, R. (eds.) *China: 30 Years of Reform and*  
33  
34 *Opening-up (1978-2008)*. Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

**Table I.** Pearson correlations between selected factors in relation to job insecurity and satisfaction

	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1. Worry about losing job</b>	.06	1.020	309	1	.239**	-0.37	-.288**	-.010	-.141*	.188**	.237**	.077	.189**	.097
<b>2. Importance of job security</b>	1.17	.770	308		1	.198**	-.127*	.038	-.032	.103	.187**	.074	.148**	.085
<b>3. Job satisfaction</b>	.102	.703	308			1	-.082	.115*	.005	.129*	.155**	.209**	.160**	.127*
<b>4. Household registration</b>	.87	.336	309				1	.239**	-.085	.265**	-.025	.082	.023	.134*
<b>5. Employment contract</b>	.69	.465	305					1	-.012	.160**	.433**	.381**	.416**	.432**
<b>6. Gender</b>	.47	.500	294						1	-.026	.017	-.120*	-.017	.087
<b>7. Age</b>	2.28	.919	309							1	.826**	.575**	.685**	.399**
<b>8. Working years</b>	2.45	1.129	309								1	.623**	.751**	.468**
<b>9. Marital status</b>	.72	.449	308									1	.727**	.415**
<b>10. Parental status</b>	.60	.490	306										1	.499**
<b>11. Trade union member</b>	.52	.500	303											1

**Notes:** household registration: 0=rural registration, 1=urban registration; employment contract: 0=temporary contract, 1=permanent contract; gender: 0=female, 1=male; age: 1=25 and below, 2=26-35, 3=36-45, 4=46-55, 5=56-65, 6=66 and above; working years: 1=5 years and below, 2=6-10 years, 3=11-20 years, 4=21-30 years, 5=31-40 years, 6=41 years and above; marital status: 0=single/separate/widower/divorced, 1=married / in partnership; parental status: 0=no, 1=yes; trade union member: 0=no, 1=yes; statistical significance: \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01.

**Table II.** Hierarchical regression analysis of job insecurity, household registration, and employment contract

Independent variables	Worry about losing job			Importance of job security		
	$\beta$	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$
<b>Step 1</b>		.092	.092***		.043	.043
Gender	-.162**			-.047		
Age	-.042			-.132		
Working Year	.267*			.231		
Marital status	-.204*			-.111		
Parental status	.160			.139		
Trade union membership	.005			.023		
<b>Step 2</b>		.194	.102***		.056	.013*
Gender	-.194**			-.059		
Age	.025			-.108		
Working Year	.179			.199		
Marital status	-.173*			-.100		
Parental status	.128			.127		
Trade union membership	.064			.045		
Household registration	-.328***			-.119*		
<b>Step 3</b>		.201	.007		.056	.000
Gender	-.195***			-.059		
Age	.040			-.106		
Working Year	.190			.200		
Marital status	-.167*			-.100		
Parental status	.135			.128		
Trade union membership	.084			.047		
Household registration	-.309***			-.117		
Employment contract	-.097			-.010		

**Notes:** unstandardized betas at the final step are reported; N=283; statistical significance: \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001.

**Table III.** Self-evaluation of the top three reasons for job insecurity

<b>Rural registered employees</b>		<b>Urban registered employees</b>	
1. Education	52.5	1. Industrial situation	52.6
2. Industrial situation	45.0	2. Education	40.9
3. Employment contract	42.5	3. Economy	35.4
<b>Temporary employees</b>		<b>Permanent employees</b>	
1. Employment contract	61.5	1. Industrial situation	62.5
2. Education	45.8	2. Education	41.8
3. Practical skill	37.6	3. Economy	41.8

**Notes:** the number beside each factor is the total percentage of rank 1, 2 and 3 from that group.

Evidence-Based HRM

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table IV.** Hierarchical regression analysis of job satisfaction

Independent variables	Step 1			Step 2			Step 3		
	$\beta$	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$R^2$	$\Delta R^2$
		.042	.042		.055	.013		.103	.048**
Gender	.007			-.002			-.009		
Age	.007			.019			.046		
Working Year	.064			.029			.005		
Marital status	.212*			.218*			.222*		
Parental status	-.089			-.103			-.118		
Trade union membership	.014			.020			.019		
Household registration				-.117			-.124		
Employment contract				.063			.055		
Worry about losing job							-.103		
Importance of job security							.221***		

**Notes:** unstandardized betas at the final step are reported; N=284; statistical significance: \*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001.

e-Based HRM