The Impact of AI Awareness on Counterproductive Work Behaviors of It Industry Workers in Colombo District: The Mediating Effect of Job Insecurity and The Moderating Role of Perceived Organizational Support

Gunasinghe MDRS, Rebecca, E

University of Kelaniya

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10100025

Received: 30 December 2025; Accepted: 05 January 2026; Published: 19 January 2026

ABSTRACT

The acceleration and spread of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology have drastically changed modern work settings, specifically in sectors with higher knowledge content, like the Information and Communications Technology (ICT) industry. On one hand, embracing AI technology can benefit work settings by bringing about higher efficiency and competitiveness; on the other hand, it poses considerable concern to workers on job sustainability and long-term career development and advancement. Particularly, employees working at a managerial level are concerned with workers' job sustainability and organizational change due to technology advances, as they have to manage and monitor employees in work settings where jobs are insecure due to technology changes. Although interest in the implications of AI on jobs and workers at the global and international levels has been rising, literature on how workers' awareness of AI affects work settings remains less explored at the international and regional developing country level, specifically in Sri Lankan work settings. This study focuses on the effect of AI awareness on counterproductive work behavior (CWB) of managerial level employees in reputable IT firms in Colombo District, Sri Lanka. As part of the organizational behavior, counterproductive work behavior is understood as the deliberate action of employees that goes against the organization's values, causing damage to the organization, its processes, or its members. Using the psychological contract theory and contract breach stress theories, the study posits job insecurity as the principal psychological mechanism employed in explaining the influence of AI awareness on behavior of employees. Job insecurity is the employees' perception of losing a job and the uncertainty that follows. Additionally, this study posits perceived organizational support (POS) to be an important boundary condition in shaping employees' attitudes and behaviors to change due to AI. POS is the employees' belief of their organization's concern and value regarding their input and the care for their psychological safety. The conceptual model crafted for carrying out this research postulates that job insecurity has both direct and indirect relationships as an intervening variable for counterproductive work behavior, which gets influenced by AI awareness. Moreover, organizational support perception has been proposed to moderate the relationship between job insecurity and organizational support. The proposed conceptual model has been able to incorporate both mediation and moderation in one model to better understand the role of technological awareness in modifying organizational behavior. Methodologically, the proposed study is quantitative in nature, specifically cross-sectional in research design. The study is based on a structured questionnaire, which is self-administered, given to the managerial employees of the IT sector in the Colombo District, which is known to have reputable IT companies. In order to measure the study variables of awareness of AI, the variables of job insecurity, CWB, and POS are known to be measured, along with advanced statistical techniques of mediation and moderation analysis in SPSS using the PROCESS macro. The importance of this study is founded in its contributions to the fields of theory as well as practice. In theory, it adds to the existing literature of AI and employee behavior as it specifically investigates the psychological mechanism underpinning employee responses to change driven by AI. In practice, the implications of this study are critical as it has the potential to provide valuable information to leaders of the organization, as well as to the human resource practitioners, regarding the importance of addressing the issue of job insecurity as well as the importance of effective support structures in the organization as it goes through technological change.

INTRODUCTION

As one of the most promising technologies, Artificial Intelligence (AI) has quickly taken one of the most prominent roles in the modern organizational environment, disrupting both the essence of work and the expectations of employees as to their job security and career advancement. In a world-wide economy, AI-driven systems allowed organizations to mechanize their work, maximize their decision-making, make it more accurate, and streamline their operations on a scale that never existed before. The IT sector in Sri Lanka has seen a spur towards AI-based process particularly fast, with local companies trying to cling to the competitive market that is becoming more digitalized. Such a quick technological change, however, has brought both psychological and behavioral issues of employees whose professional activity directly depends on new changes in automation.

The awareness of AI-the knowledge and perception of the employees concerning the capabilities, role, and future opportunities of AI-has become a key factor shaping workplace attitudes and behavior. It has been demonstrated that employees do not merely perceive AI as a technological innovation; instead, they explain it through their experiences and their understanding of their job and how the organization changes (Brougham and Haar, 2018; Teng et al., 2024). With the high number of routine or repetitive tasks in the Sri Lankan IT setting, the employees are likely to perceive AI not as a tool to enhance the work, but as a potential replacement of human labor. This perception develops greater sensitisation and emotional reactions, especially people whose everyday activity can be automated (OECD, 2023).

Among the most significant psychological implications of AI awareness, there should be the effect of job insecurity, which refers to a feeling of being at risk of losing the job or undergoing adverse changes in the working position (Sverke and Hellgren, 2002). The actual layoffs or restructuring are not always the sole determinants of job insecurity as it is often created by the employees themselves and the uncertainty of their future work expectations. Research shows that automation and AI-related transformations may worsen the experience of insecurity among workers particularly in sectors that are experiencing rapid digital transformation (Kong et al., 2021; Liang et al., 2022). The perceived risk of losing the job to AI is magnified in the Sri Lankan IT sector, in which economic changes and competition in the global market already pose a significant instability environment (Daily Mirror, 2025). Employees will be willing to be scared that their current skills will be rendered obsolete or they might witness significant changes in their role as organizations switch to smarter systems.

Job insecurity has always been correlated with various negative behavioral outcomes such as counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs)-voluntary behaviors that are against organizational norms and work towards affecting the organization or its members negatively (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). Some of the forms of CWBs are deliberately slowness, reluctance to embrace technology, unnecessary breaks or even sabotaging or inter-personal conflict (Bowling and Gruys, 2010). The cognitive theory of stress states that when employees encounter those stress characteristics of threat such as job insecurity, they can deal with it by withdrawing or engaging in deviant behavior (Lazarus, 1984). The association is empirically validated, and continues to be a powerful predictor of CWBs, particularly in those looking at technological disturbances (Shoss, 2017; Yusof et al., 2019).

Although job insecurity is the reason why employees behave negatively in the workplace via awareness of AI, not all employees react to change that is brought about by AI. One important moderating variable is Perceived organizational support (POS)- the belief by the employees that their organization appreciates their efforts and that it is concerned about their welfare (Eisenberger et al., 1986). POS is a psychological buffer that increases resilience of employees when they are faced with uncertainty. It is expected that in the times of technological change, high-POS employees will be more inclined to trust the decisions of the organization, perceive the introduction of AI positively, and be less emotionally unstable (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). The research has demonstrated that positive working environments can considerably alleviate the adverse impact of the technological change and even eliminate the chance of employees to commit to CWBs (Caesens et al., 2016; Sulea et al., 2015). Recent results also strengthen the idea that POS helps reduce the effects of anxiety caused by AI by reassuring workers that the company is still interested in their growth and retention (Marriott & Pitardi, 2025).

Sri Lankan IT industry provides a very interesting environment within which one can explore these relations. As workers are becoming more exposed to automation through AI, with their labour force being heavily contained in task-focused and deadline-driven jobs, AI awareness has a psychological impact that is both opportune and immense. However, even though researchers globally have examined the issue of job insecurity caused by AI and its associated behavioral consequences, there is scarce empirical data available in the context of developing economies, especially with regard to the effect of AI perceptions on the IT employees at the managerial level. This paucity of the research leaves a gap that is critical and this is the gap that this study intends to fill.

Through the investigation of the interaction between AI awareness, job insecurity and counterproductive work behavior and the moderating role of perceived organizational support, this study adds important knowledge on how Sri Lankan IT professionals handle technological change. These human-centered dynamics are critical to be comprehended as organizations continue to embrace AI in order to increase their productivity and competitiveness. The results highlight the importance of open communication, targeted reskilling programs, and effective organizational support mechanisms to make sure that the developments in the field of technologies do not affect the welfare of employees or performance of organizations.

HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

AI has progressively gained a new status and become a component of the working procedures in an organization, transforming the conventional employment patterns and changing the way laborers view their future jobs. With the introduction of AI-based systems to organizations to improve decision-making, task automation, and efficiency, employees are staring at the changing expectations in terms of skills, job security, and workplace demeanor. In this regard, it is necessary to comprehend the impact of AI awareness on employee psychology and behavior. Based on the existing theories and empirical findings, this section will derive hypotheses of the study by looking at how AI awareness, job insecurity, counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs), and perceived organizational support (POS) connect to one another.

Artificial Intelligence Awareness and Counterproductive Work Behaviors.

The concept of AI awareness describes the attitudes of employees regarding the impact AI technologies could have on workers or even displace human labour in the workplace (Brougham and Haar, 2018). Employees shall feel their professional identity, employment relevance and their career security are threatened by such technological developments when they realize that AI has the potential to execute certain tasks that have primarily been performed by humans. In sectors with high rates of technological adoption, like the IT sector, workers often have a lot of anxiety about the probability of their skills becoming obsolete (Teng et al., 2024).

The Cognitive Appraisal Theory of Stress is the theory where people assess events in their surroundings or changes and make a personal threat (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). AI awareness can hence be evaluated as a stress factor where the employees think that automation will take away their job activities or their work will have no value. Technological uncertainty has been shown to increase stress and thus facilitate maladaptive behaviors such as withdrawal, resistance and interpersonal conflict (Spector and Fox, 2005).

The counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) in the contexts of the stressors that threaten the stability or the fairness of the employees as a whole are common when the employees face the situation that is threatening to them in terms of their sense of stability or unjustness (Robinson and Bennett, 1995). In case employees perceive AI implementation as organizational rejection of their job descriptions or job safety, they might react by using CWBs, including decreasing effort, withholding information, slackening productivity, or rejecting new systems (Bowling and Gruys, 2010). Empirical research confirms that technological change augments such practices especially in the tech-oriented industries that are undergoing swift change (Shoss, 2017).

H1: AI awareness significantly affects to counterproductive work behaviors.

AI Awareness and job Insecurity

Job insecurity can be described as the risk of losing jobs or unwanted alterations in the terms of working conditions (Sverke and Hellgren, 2002). This has been continuously associated with technological change (primarily AI-based automation) increasing job insecurity in various sectors (Kong et al., 2021). When employees realise the potential of AI, they might expect their work to be computerised or that the knowledge they already have will become obsolete, and their employment security will look insecure.

A good lens in the understanding of this relationship is the Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory. According to COR, people attempt to conserve the resources they appreciate, including job stability, competencies, freedom, and economic wellbeing (Hobfoll, 1989). As the workers are informed about the possibilities of AI tools that can perform or be superior to their abilities, they feel the potential loss of resources, and this feeling leads to feelings of vulnerability. These resources cause job insecurity due to the fear of loss.

Empirical findings indicate that AI-related awareness is a strong predictor of job insecurity. As an illustration, Liang et al. (2022) have found out that workers who thought that AI was capable of substituting human labour were more anxious about their future work positions. On the same note, a study in the service-based sectors revealed that perceived AI replacement was a strong predictor of insecurity and stress among employees (Kwak et al., 2021). In less developed nations, where the labour market is less stable and technological change can be sudden, the impact is even greater.

H2: The awareness of AI significantly influence on job insecurity.

Job Insecurity and Counterproductive Work Behavior

Job insecurity is an established predisposing factor of negative work behaviors. When employees are threatened with the possibility of losing their jobs, they tend to resort to withdrawal, resistance, or deviant behaviors (Shoss, 2017). Psychologically, job insecurity causes emotional exhaustion and frustration and diminished commitment, and this could make the employees resort to counterproductive ways of coping.

The COR theory suggests that, in case individuals feel that there is a loss of resources including job stability, they might resort to defensive or retaliating actions to safeguard their available resources (Hobfoll, 2011). CWBs can be associated with the desire to take some power back or demonstrate discontent with the organization that is seen as the cause of the unrest (Sulea et al., 2015).

Further, the Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Behavior reveals that job insecurity is a stressor that leads to such negative emotions like anger, fear, and anxiety, which may be expressed in terms of CWBs (Spector and Fox, 2005). The meta-analytic evidence on the topic is consistent that job insecurity predicts counterproductive behavior in any organizational context (Yusof et al., 2019).

H3: Job insecurity has significant influence to counterproductive work behaviors.

Job Insecurity as a Mediator

Since AI awareness is theoretically related to job insecurity and CWBs, it can be suggested that job insecurity is a psychological process that would connect AI awareness to CWBs. The first effect that employees who feel threatened by AI can experience is the feeling of insecurity, which in turn will be reflected through behavioral responses.

This mediating role is supported in previous studies. Teng et al. (2024) noted that AI awareness boosted withdrawal behaviors at the workplace mainly by increasing job insecurity. Likewise, the studies in the manufacturing and services industries revealed that technological progress induced CWBs by exerting its influence on the perceived job insecurity (Kong et al., 2021).

H4: Job insecurity mediates between AI awareness and counterproductive work behaviors.

Perceived Organizational Support as a Moderator

Perceived organizational support (POS)—the belief that the organization values and supports its employees—plays a crucial buffering role in stressful environments (Eisenberger et al., 1986). According to COR theory, supportive workplaces offer resource reinforcement, which offsets the psychological threat generated by resource loss. High POS provides employees with emotional security, enhancing their resilience to external stressors, including AI-driven change (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Evidence suggests that when employees feel supported, they are less likely to interpret technological shifts as personal threats. For instance, Caesens et al. (2016) found that POS reduced the negative emotional effects of job insecurity, while Marriott and Pitardi (2025) reported that POS moderated AI-induced stress in digital work environments.

H5: Perceived organizational support moderates the relationship between AI awareness and job insecurity, such that the relationship is weaker when POS is high.

METHODOLOGY

Conceptual Framework

Measurement scales

The dependent variable: CWB was assessed using the measurement scale developed by (Bennett & Robinson (2000)) with 6 items. All the items are anchored on a seven-point Likert scale where 1 = Not at all and 7 = A great deal**.** No reverse-coded items are included in the scale. Sample items include: Spoke poorly about the organization to others' 'Work slower than necessary' 'Took an unnecessary break' 'Criticized organizational policies' 'Did not work to the best of my ability' 'Spent time on tasks unrelated to work'. The Cronbach's alpha value was 0.925.

The independent variable: AI Awareness was assessed using the measurement scale developed by (Bai et al. (2024) with 4 items. All the items are anchored on a five-point Likert scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree. No reverse-coded items are included in the scale. Sample items include: "I think my job could be replaced by AI." "I am personally worried that what I do now in my job will be able to be replaced by AI." "I am personally worried about my future in my organization due to AI replacing employees." "I am personally worried about my future in my industry due to AI replacing employees." The Cronbach's alpha value was 0.831.

Job insecurity was assessed through a five-item measure originally designed by De Witte (2000), which probes how workers perceive the risk of losing their position and the accompanying anxieties. The instrument combines a cognitive element—awareness of the likelihood of dismissal—with an emotional component—affective appraisal of whether one's employment will persist. Participants rated their agreement with each statement on a five-point Likert scale, from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Typical items are: "I feel insecure about the future of my job," "There is a real chance that I will lose my job in the near future," and "I am worried about the continuation of my job." The statement "I am sure I can keep my job" is scored in the opposite direction. Aggregate higher results reflect stronger job insecurity perceptions. The Cronbach's alpha value was 0.845.

Perceived Organizational Support was assessed through a eight-item measure originally designed by Eisenberg er, R., Huntingt on, R., Hutchiso n, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Participants rated their agreement with each statement on a Seven-point Likert scale, from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). The Cronbach's alpha value was 0.873.

	Items
AI awareness	1. I think my job could be replaced by AI.

(Independent Variable)	2. I am personally worried that what I do now in my job will be able to be replaced by AI. 3. I am personally worried about my future in my organization due to AI replacing employees. 4. I am personally worried about my future in my industry due to AI replacing employees.
Counterproductive Work Behaviors (Dependent variable)	1. Spoke poorly about the organization to other' 2. Worked slower than necessary 3. Took an unnecessary break 4. Criticized organizational policies 5. Did not work to the best of my ability 6. Spent time on tasks unrelated to work
Job Insecurity (Mediator)	1. I feel insecure about the future of my job. 2. I am sure I can keep my job (**reverse-scored**) 3. There is a real chance that I will lose my job in the near future. 4. I think I might lose my job in the near future. 5. I am worried about the continuation of my job.
Perceived organizational support (Moderator)	1. My organization values my contribution to its well-being. 2. My organization strongly considers my goals and values. 3. My organization shows little concern for me. (**reverse-scored**) 4. My organization cares about my opinions. 5. My organization is willing to help me if I need a special favor. 6. Help is available from my organization when I have a problem. 7. My organization really cares about my well-being. 8. Even if I did the best job possible, my organization would fail to notice. (**reverse-scored**)

RESULTS

The information employed in this research was taken due to 280 questionnaires that were administered to the employees at the managerial level in the IT industry of Colombo District. A total of 280 were sent back, and on screening accuracy and completeness, 274 responses were found valid to analysis giving a very high effective response of 100 percent. This response rate is great and gives good foundation in making stable and credible statistical conclusions.

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett Test of Sphericity were used to test the validity. The KMO scores were between 0.811 and 0.928 among the four major constructs, which is meritorious to superb

adequacy in the analysis of factors. AI Awareness showed KMO value of 0.811 with Job Insecurity and POS recording 0.862 and 0.859 respectively. The CWB scale had the highest KMO value of 0.928 which indicates statistical stability. The chi-square tests of each variable as calculated by Bartlett gave highly significant chi-square values (kh2 = 428.218 AI Awareness, kh2 = 1118.314 CWB, kh2 = 504.209 Job Insecurity, kh2 = 1359.033 POS), with all the p-values below 0.001. These findings reveal that the data proved to have adequate correlations between items to warrant the use of factor analysis.

The descriptive statistics have been obtained to identify the general trends of the metrics that have been measured. In the case of Counterproductive Work Behaviors, the average score was 3.79 and has standard deviation of 0.674, which implies that there is moderate counterproductive activity of respondents. AI Awareness and Job Insecurity were moderately high as well, meaning that though the employees were usually aware of AI progress, they did not always see it as a threat to them at that moment. The scores of Perceived Organizational Support were rather high which indicated that a big portion of employees believed that their organizations were concerned about their health and appreciated their efforts.

The demographic features of the respondents also enhanced the analysis. There was a slight majority with female respondents (55.8% of the sample) and male respondents (44.2% of the sample). The age groups showed a high number of young workforce with 72.6 percent falling under the age group of 20-29 years. There was 17.2% employees in the age group of 30-39 and a small percentage of 40-49 (6.6) and 50+ (3.6). As to work experience within the IT sector, a majority of the respondents (78.5%) had less experience within the industry, and this shows that the sample was composed of mainly young professionals. Regarding the levels of managers, middle managers represented 39.1, junior managers 38.7, senior managers 17.2 and the other 5.1 denoted other management positions. The current organization was fairly balanced as 39.8% have worked between five to ten years and closely followed by 37.2% with less than five years.

The data distributions in terms of normality and linearity were visually checked before the advanced analyses were done. The hypothesis that all variables were approximately normally distributed was verified using histograms and probability plots, whereas the hypothesis that the relationships between different key variables of interest were linear, was valid, i.e., AI Awareness and Job Insecurity, AI Awareness and CWB, and AI Awareness and POS. These observations met parametric test assumptions.

The Pearson correlation coefficient correlation analysis gave preliminary information regarding the correlation between variables. The correlation between AI Awareness and CWB was weak yet significant positive ($r = 0.155$, $p = .010$), with the higher the awareness of AI developments, the higher the tendency toward counterproductive behavior. The correlation between AI Awareness and Job Insecurity ($r = 0.418$, $p < .001$) showed to be much stronger, and thus, the higher the AI Awareness of employees was, the higher the probability that they would develop job-related anxiety. There was also a strong positive correlation between Job Insecurity and CWB ($r = 0.438$, $p < .001$), which represents that employees who experienced job insecurity were more likely to be involved in destructive work behavior. Interestingly, the correlation between AI Awareness and POS was found not significant ($r = -0.050$, $p = .414$) which implies that the extent to which organizational support was directly correlated with the perceptions of AI.

In order to test the mediating effect of Job Insecurity, PROCESS model 4 as developed by Hayes was applied. The mediation analysis demonstrated strong results. AI Awareness had a significant positive impact on Job Insecurity ($B = 0.3960$, $p < .001$), meaning that the higher AI awareness, the higher the likelihood of job insecurity. Likewise, Job Insecurity was also a big predictor of CWB ($B = 0.7726$, $p < .001$), which affirmed the fact that those employees who were insecure predisposed towards counter productivity. The overall impact of AI Awareness on CWB prior the introduction of the mediator was high ($B = 0.2499$, $p = .0104$). Nevertheless, after the addition of Job Insecurity in the model, the direct effect was no longer significant ($B = -0.0561$, $p = .5640$). The mediation pathway, which is the indirect effect, was significant (0.3059), with confidence intervals that were not inclusive of zero. These results show full mediation, i.e. AI Awareness can affect CWB completely by the effect of Job Insecurity but not directly. The moderation effect of Perceived Organizational Support was tested using PROCESS Model 1. The interaction between AI Awareness and POS on Job Insecurity was not statistically significant ($B = 0.2298$, $p = .0728$). Surprisingly, the coefficient suggested a slight strengthening effect rather than a buffering one. This indicates that higher POS did not reduce the impact of AI Awareness on

Job Insecurity; in fact, it slightly increased it, though not significantly. This finding contradicts the theoretical expectation and results in the rejection of the moderation hypothesis.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In discussion, conclusion, and recommendations that follow the findings of the research, which examined the effects of AI Awareness on Counterproductive Work Behaviors (CWB) in employees of managerial level in Colombo District IT companies. It also tested the mediating variable of Job Insecurity and moderating variable of Perceived Organizational Support (POS). This chapter combines the statistical results of the previous chapters with the theoretical understanding to offer implications that are practical, limitations and future research directions.

The chapter starts by covering the interrelationships between the key variables. The analysis of correlation showed that AI Awareness is also weakly but statistically significantly correlated with CWB ($r = .155$, $p = .010$), which can be interpreted that more AI technologies-aware employees had a little bit more propensity to engage in counterproductive behavior. This relationship is not strong but a demonstration that the awareness of AI can lead to slight changes in behavior among employees who are confronted with the technological change. More to the point, the correlation between AI Awareness and Job Insecurity ($r = .418$, $p < .001$) was significantly more valuable and strong in the sense that the more an employee was knowledgeable or exposed to information about AI, the more fear and anxiety one felt about the security of their job. The correlation analysis also indicated that there was no correlation between AI Awareness and POS ($r = -.050$, $p = .414$) which alleviates that organizational support does not affect the perceptions and interpretations of AI-related developments by the employees.

Among them, the complete mediation effect of Job Insecurity in the correlation between AI Awareness and CWB has to be deemed among the most important discoveries of this chapter. Although AI Awareness showed evidence of a high direct impact on CWB ($B = 0.2499$, $p = .0104$), this direct relationship was no longer significant ($B = -0.0561$, $p = .5640$) again after Job Insecurity was added to the model. Indirect effect was still significant (Effect = 0.3059; CI = [0.2001, 0.4250]) which is a confirmation that mediation was fully significant. This implies that the employees do not perform counterproductive behaviors just because they are aware of AI, but it is the fear of losing the job that is caused by the knowledge of AI, which is leading them to undertake the counterproductive behavior. This observation supports the centrality of Job Insecurity as the main psychological determinant between AI perceptions and behavioral consequences.

The moderation analysis examined whether POS undermines the role of AI Awareness in Job Insecurity. The findings showed that the relationship between AI Awareness and POS was not significant ($p = .0728$). Amazingly, the interaction coefficient indicated that there was a slight strengthening effect instead of buffering effect. Employees that felt more supported by the organization were sometimes pressured to do or maintain a pace with AI-induced changes, which is ironical because it intensified insecurity. The chapter also highlights that, in this context, POS did not act as a buffer despite the common assumption that it acts as a protective factor. Rather, more competent and adaptable expectations of the AI progress could have been perceived by employees who felt more supported by their organizations, causing more stress instead of relief.

The chapter then presents a number of implications to organizations. To start with, it emphasizes the value of open and active communication when it comes to the implementation of AI. Since AI Awareness is the leading contributor to Job Insecurity, it is recommended in the study that the organization makes clear explanations regarding the purpose, scope, and the effects of AI on the role of the employees. This would be useful in the reduction of the ambiguity which breeds insecurity. Second, the close relationship between Job Insecurity and CWB implies that an organization should pay close attention to the anxiety level of its employees and intervene at the initial stage by means of counseling, training, and free conversations. Third, POS did not buffer the adverse effects, however, it is crucial that the support initiatives should be explicitly linked to job security strategies. A lack of support that is not supported or reassured can inadvertently increase stress. The chapter articulates that firms ought to invest in up skilling, reskilling, and lifelong learning to enable employees to be confident to embrace AI-related changes.

There are also a number of limitations that are recognized in Chapter Five. The sample in the study was only restricted to managerial employees of well-known IT companies in Colombo District limiting the generalization of the results to other sectors, regions, or other employee levels. Since the research was based on self-reported data, the responses could have been influenced by social desirability or misconception of questions. Moreover, it considered a single mediator (Job Insecurity) and a single moderator (POS) though it is quite probable that there are many other variables; including leadership style, perceived employability, organizational culture, emotional exhaustion, or stress that can determine these relationships. The cross-sectional design was also constraining change over time.

Lastly, this study proposes the focus of further research. Researchers may use more mediators and moderators, use longitudinal research designs to observe the changes in behavior over time, or apply the study to other industries where AI adoption is most active. Qualitative methods including interviews and focus groups, can equally help to get a deeper understanding of the emotional and cognitive responses of employees to AI. Additionally, the research may consider future research to examine the usefulness of HR interventions, including AI literacy programs, leadership-oriented support systems, reskilling sessions, and communication strategies to lessen the feeling of insecurity.

Finally, AI Awareness does not directly cause counterproductive behavior to take place--Job Insecurity does. With AI transforming the workplace, organizations need to consider the psychological influence of technological change and invest in accommodating the change through supportive strategies that help organizations become adaptable, secure, and healthy.

REFERENCES

1. Bai, L., Li, H., & Zhang, Y. (2024). Artificial intelligence awareness and employee behavior in digital workplaces. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 37(2), 245–262. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/joocm.2024.37.2
2. Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(3), 349–360. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349
3. Bowling, N. A., & Gruys, M. L. (2010). Overlooked issues in the conceptualization and measurement of counterproductive work behavior. Human Resource Management Review, 20(1), 54–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.03.008
4. Brougham, D., & Haar, J. (2018). Smart technology, artificial intelligence, robotics, and algorithms (STARA): Employees' perceptions of our future workplace. Journal of Management & Organization, 24(2), 239–257. https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2016.55
5. Caesens, G., Stinglhamber, F., & Ohana, M. (2016). Perceived organizational support and employees' well-being: The mediating role of organizational dehumanization. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 25(2), 289–299. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2015.1089869
6. Daily Mirror. (2025, March 4). AI in Sri Lanka's IT industry: Disruption or opportunity? Colombo: Wijeya Newspapers Ltd.
7. De Witte, H. (2000). Work ethic and job insecurity: Measurement and consequences for well-being, satisfaction and performance. In R. Bouwen, K. De Witte, H. De Witte, & T. Taillieu (Eds.), From group to organization (pp. 325–350). Leuven University Press.
8. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(3), 500–507. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500
9. Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. American Psychologist, 44(3), 513–524. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513
10. Hobfoll, S. E. (2011). Conservation of resource caravans and engaged settings. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84(1), 116–122. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2010.02016.x
11. Kong, H., Jiang, X., Chan, W., & Zhou, X. (2021). The relationship between job insecurity and employee performance in the age of automation. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 32(4), 511–534. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21400

12. Kwak, D., Park, S., & Lim, D. H. (2021). The impact of automation anxiety on job stress and turnover intention: The mediating effect of job insecurity. The Service Industries Journal, 41(11–12), 726–744. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2019.1646189
13. Lazarus, R. S. (1984). On the primacy of cognition. American Psychologist, 39(2), 124–129. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.39.2.124
14. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. Springer.
15. Liang, J., Sun, H., & Zhang, J. (2022). Artificial intelligence and job insecurity: The moderating role of task complexity. Computers in Human Behavior, 134, 107309. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107309
16. Marriott, H., & Pitardi, V. (2025). Perceived organizational support in the age of AI: A resilience-based perspective. Journal of Business Research, 169, 114319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.114319
17. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). AI and the future of work: Risks and policy implications. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/ai-future-work-2023
18. Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), 698–714. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698
19. Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. Academy of Management Journal, 38(2), 555–572. https://doi.org/10.2307/256693
20. Shoss, M. K. (2017). Job insecurity: An integrative review and agenda for future research. Journal of Management, 43(6), 1911–1939. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317691574
21. Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). The stressor-emotion model of counterproductive work behavior. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets (pp. 151–174). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/10893-007
22. Sulea, C., Virga, D., Maricutoiu, L. P., Schaufeli, W. B., Zaborila Dumitru, C., & Sava, F. A. (2015). Work engagement as mediator between job characteristics and positive and negative extra-role behaviors. Career Development International, 20(5), 543–558. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-09-2014-0127
23. Sverke, M., & Hellgren, J. (2002). The nature of job insecurity: Understanding employment uncertainty on the brink of a new millennium. Applied Psychology, 51(1), 23–42. https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.0077
24. Teng, Y. M., Wu, K. S., & Wang, S. T. (2024). How artificial intelligence awareness influences employee turnover intention: The role of job insecurity. Computers in Human Behavior, 146, 107807. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.107807
25. Yusof, N., Jamaludin, N., & Mohamed, R. (2019). Job insecurity and counterproductive work behavior: A systematic review. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 9(6), 720–735. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v9-i6/6065