



Perception of Labor Flexibility in an Organization in Central Mexico

Cruz García Lirios*

National Autonomous University of Mexico (ENTS-Faculty of Psychology), Mexico

*Corresponding author: García Lirios C, National Autonomous University of Mexico (ENTS-Faculty of Psychology), Mexico; Email: garcialirios [at] gmail [dot] com

Abstract

The objective of this work has been to explore the dimensions of labor flexibility to establish the dependency relationships between its indicators. An exploratory, cross-sectional and correlational study was carried out with a sample selection of 100 employees from an organization in central Mexico. The flexibility is indicated by the turnover, the wage casual and lack of benefits. Lines of research on the incidence of leadership styles on the variables in question are recommended.

Keywords: Flexibility; Climate; Leadership; Turnover; Salary

Introduction

As of this writing, the SARS CoV-2 pandemic and the Covid-19 disease have killed three million and infected about 20 million. In Mexico, about 120 thousand have lost their lives and more than 2 million have been infected (WHO, 2020) [1]. In this panorama of health and economic crisis, the policies of containment and mitigation of the pandemic have been implemented as strategies of confinement and social distancing, causing a labor crisis which is reflected in labor flexibility such as remote work (PAHO 2020) [2].

Labor flexibility is indicated by 1) legislation adjusted to unemployment, subsidies and vacancies informal; 2) precarious conditions in the matter of selection, training and education reflected in the reduction of wages; 3) unfair competition and monopoly led to an increase in demands and a decrease in the quality of processes and products; 4) export strategies sponsored by the state and specialized labor willing to work long hours with low income; 5) energy crisis and its effect on the maquiladora industry, mainly the automotive industry, which encouraged mass production without quality control; 6) the contraction of public investment and massive unemployment that meant the impoverishment of jobs; 7) the proliferation of power groups as a barrier to entrepreneurship and innovation that promoted mass

production without quality; 8) State intervention that aggravated compensation for illnesses and accidents, as well as unemployment insurance that caused the entry of unskilled labor; 9) public policies that generated poverty, pollution and agglomerations of workers in a single industrial sector; 10) negotiation, pacts and corporate, union and state agreements associated with corruption, inequality, sabotage, strikes, boycotts, confrontations [3].

Therefore, the objective of this work is to explore the structure of labor flexibility from the perception of employees who kept their jobs even when they have been confined and distanced to carry out their work. Are there significant differences between the theoretical dimensions of labor flexibility reported in the literature with respect to the observations in the present study?

The premise that answers the question lies in assuming that significant differences prevail between the structure of labor flexibility reported in the literature with respect to the structure of perceived flexibility in the surveyed sample [4]. This is so because the state of the question has been oriented towards the description and explanation of dimensions related to the work environment without considering the perception of workers regarding the same work environment, demand and resources that the organization where they work for Carreon [5].

Theory of Labor Flexibility

Received date: 28 November 2020; **Accepted date:** 07 December 2020; **Published date:** 15 December 2020

Citation: García Lirios C. Perception of Labor Flexibility in an Organization in Central Mexico. SunText Rev Neurosci Psychol 1(3): 118.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51737/2766-4503.2020.018>

Copyright: © 2020 García Lirios C. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Labor flexibility reveals a change from state management to a personalized selection of labor, the replacement of machinery operated by groups and collectives with automated technologies that not only allowed to extend the working day, but also transformed it into continuous and permanent, opening the possibility of employment of unskilled and poorly paid personnel, which is why it is subcontracted for a short period [6].

In this way, the competition between the organizations that replaced the parastatals and the emergence of companies in areas of specialization and innovation after the technological revolution, mainly informational, has generated a labor demand for jobs that is estimated at 40% not existed for five years [7].

If we consider that the occupational changes due to different dimensions, then it will be possible to see a future scenario in which occupations are presented in accordance with economic, social, labor, educational, scientific and technological structures [8].

The prospect of labor flexibility, understood as a probable scenario to produce knowledge in accordance with technological development purposes applied to the quality of processes and products, carries some expected consequences for the 2020-2060 period [9]. It is a scenario in which migration would reach a limit shared with the level of productivity that began to be observed since 2015, but whose antecedents go back to 1950 when the Welfare State was consolidated and the business crisis, innovation, productivity and competitiveness [10].

Regarding the educational consequences, mainly in terms of occupational specialization, the trend observed in 2010 not only prevails for the economically active population, but also worsens in 2030 when estimating the asymmetries between employment difficulties [11]. In other words, an increase in occupational skills corresponds to a reduction in work primary. In this sense, those who do not have a high level of specialization and updating of knowledge are close to unemployment, although people with postgraduate degrees do not guarantee formal employment.

Opportunities and capacities, from the logic of occupational flexibility, are factors of gender equity. As of the year 2030, not only is an occupational parity between men and women expected, but it is also assumed that the degree of education-training will allow an equitable distribution of leadership to be observed [10]. The indicators related to the level of migratory selectivity, education and training will see equity scenarios in the period from 2020 to 2040, but asymmetric after this period given the level of competitiveness and technological dependence of the organizations [12].

Modeling of the Variables of Labor Flexibility

The specification of a dependency relationship model consists of the design of the incidence trajectories between the variables related to labor flexibility on performance [13]. In this sense, the

literature warns that the reduction of flexibility in the field of occupational health involves the incidence of variables such as quality of life, subjective well-being, work culture and organizational climate - empathy, trust, entrepreneurship, innovation, productivity and competitiveness.

However, the literature also notes the influence of stress - depersonalization, exhaustion, frustration- on well-being and the cultural-organizational climate. Thus, the resilience emerges as a personal, group and organizational response to the threats and risks posed by the implementation of the flexibility work in organizations and institutions [14].

In the case of educational and health institutions, the stress associated with resilience generates absorption, dedication and dynamization [15]. These are three factors that distinguish individuals, groups and organizations that not only develop resilience, but also generate opportunities and skills linked to occupational satisfaction [16].

Method

Design: A cross-sectional, exploratory and correlational study was carried out.

Sample: A non-random selection of 100 managers of micro, small and medium enterprises was carried out in central Mexico. 67% are women and the remaining 33% are men. 32% completed their baccalaureate studies, 41% completed their bachelor's degree and the remaining 27% had postgraduate studies. 45% declared that they had income of less than 3,500 0 pesos per month ($M = 3412.0$ $SD = 238.14$), 41% mentioned that their income ranged between 3,500 0 and 7,000 0 pesos per month ($M = 5813.7$ $SD = 1130.24$) and the remaining 14% acknowledged that their income exceeded 7 0 000 pesos per month ($M = 8124.0$ $SD = 2348.56$). 42% are married, 24% are single and the remaining 34% are in common law.

Instrument: The Labor Flexibility Scale was used, assuming that the items in the literature could be adjusted to the study context. Provided that they have been tested in samples such as those in the study, as well as the inclusion of response options that imply intervals of significance in the responses of each item.

In the case of job flexibility, respondents' intentions were weighted against informality and staff turnover. This is the case of the reactive "If there were unemployment, they would take turns to have a job opportunity." Each item corresponds to one of the five response options: 0 = not likely, 1 = very unlikely, 2 = unlikely, 3 = somewhat likely, and 4 = very likely.

Procedure: The surveys were conducted online: www.atn.es.tl prior information that the results of the study would not negatively or positively affect their employment situation. In addition, the anonymity and confidentiality of the data was guaranteed in writing.

Analysis: The information was processed in the Statistical Package for Social Science. Is the alpha parameter estimated Cronbach for interpreting the consistency internal of the instrument, the statistical adaptation and sphericity Bartlett and Kaiser Meyer Olkin. To establish the factorial solution, as well as the factorial weights and the percentage of variance explained in an exploratory factor analysis of the main axes with promax rotation [17]. The validity of the instrument, which supposes a construct that emerges in different contexts and samples [18].

Finally, the correlation parameter was calculated to establish the probable trajectories s relationships put forward factors [19].

Results

The overall internal consistency of the instrument (alpha of 0.889) exceeds the minimum required (alpha of 0.80). This means that the Labor Flexibility Scale can be applied in different contexts and samples, yielding results like those of the present study (see Table 1).

Table 1: Instrument descriptions.

R	M	SD	A	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
r1	4.14	1,469	0.885						0.601
r2	4.53	1,429	0.884						0.675
r3	4.65	1,639	0.882						0.683
r4	4.23	1,178	0.881					0.549	
r5	4.48	1,303	0.882					0.673	
r6	4.85	1,108	0.881					0.693	
r7	4.40	1,483	0.881				0.671		
r8	4.85	1,993	0.888				0.543		
r9	4.57	1,141	0.881				0.581		
r10	4.11	1,204	0.882			0.612			
r11	4.57	1,289	0.889			0.567			
r12	4.94	1,055	0.888			0.673			
r13	4.57	1,910	0.885		0.541				
r14	4.74	1,100	0.888		0.543				
r15	4.52	1,798	0.892		0.654				
r16	4.47	1,472	0.883	0.623					
r17	4.40	1,599	0.884	0.635					
r18	4.32	1,126	0.886	0.625					

Source: Prepared with the study data; M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation, A = Alpha removed the value of the item. Extraction method: main axes, Rotation: Promax. Suitability and sphericity [$X^2 = 1864.322$ (300gl) $p = 0.000$; $KMO = 0,857$] F1 = Leadership (0878 and 29878 alpha% of the total variance explained) , F2 = C OMPENSATION (0.870 and 7.973 alpha% of the total variance explained), F3 = Structuration (0.894 and 7.471 alpha% the total variance explained, F4 = Conditions (alpha 0.892 and 5.84% of the total variance explained) , F5 = Contingency (0.782 and 4.996 alpha d% of the total variance explained) , F6 = Risk (alpha of 0.746 and 4.559% of the total variance explained.) All items include five response options: 0 = not likely, 1 = very unlikely, 2 = unlikely, 3 = somewhat likely, and 4 = very likely.

In fact, if a minimum requirement of 0.70 and a maximum of 0.90 is assumed as the exclusion criterion, then none of the items would be exclude. The prerequisite for estimating the validity of the instrument is the adequacy and sphericity of the scale, understood as tests that establish the volume of partial correlations and the absence or presence of a factor identity. Low correlations circumscribed to one entity suggest that analyzes are not recommended to establish dimensions or factors. Thus, the adequacy and sphericity [$\chi^2 = 1864.322$ (300gl) $p = 0.000$; KMO

$= 0.857$] suggests estimating the factors recommended by the theory.

In the case of validity, understood as the efficiency with which an instrument or scale measures what it intends to measure, from a confirmatory factor analysis of principal components with promax rotation it was possible to observe six factors configured by the five theoretical dimensions, a despite the fact that: The first factor predominantly included the theoretical dimension of the relationship with the boss (explaining 29.878% of the total variance). The second factor included the theoretical dimension of

compensation (which explains 7.973% of the total variance). The third factor included the organizational structure (explaining 7.471% of the total variance). The fourth factor on working conditions (which explains 5,584% of the total variance). The fifth factor included s contingencies the organizational environment (0.782 and 4.996% alpha of the total variance explained). The sixth factor refers to the risks of the organization's environment (alpha of 0.772 and 4.559% of the total explained varies).

Based on the reliability and validity analyzes, it is recommended to adjust the observed factors to the theoretical dimensions, suppressing those items that are dispersed or reconceptualising the dimensions. This would allow the contrast of model reflection of the organizational climate, taking into account the theoretical dimensions and the empirical factors

Furthermore, the correlation matrix shows that there are positive and significant relationships between the five factors, evidencing the possibility of a reflective structure of the organizational climate as a second-order factor (see Table 2).

Table 2: Correlations and covariations between the factors.

	M	S	N	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
F1	29.7756	5,05445	20	1,000						1,89					
F2	22,4078	4.25856	20	0.799 **	1,000					0.56	1,89				
F3	17.8349	2,83280	21	0.832 **	0.744 **	1,000				0.67	0.67	1,80			
F4	20.3173	3,29475	20	0.690 **	0.837 **	0.657 **	1,00			0.69	0.60	0.54	1,87		
F5	17.4340	2.76237	21	0.688 **	0.602 **	0.614 **	0.63	1,000		0.54	0.67	0.67	0.60	1,67	
F6	16.28 21	2.1923 1	21	0.561 **	0.506 **	0.423 **	0.33	0.403	1.0	0.58	0.65	0.59	0.65	0.57	1,78

Source: Prepared with the study data; M = Mean each factor, standard = Deviation of each factor, N = N umber of observations in each factor, F1 = Leadership , F2 = Compensation, F3 = Structuration, F4 = Conditions , F5 = Contingency , F6 = Risk. * p <0.01; ** p <0.001; *** p <0.0001

Table 3: Dependency relationships between the factors and labor flexibility.

Model	Hypothesis	Trajectory	B	P	R	R ²	R ² adjusted
I	1 A	Labor flexibility → Leadership	0.693	0.009	0.693	0.409	0.303
	1 B	Labor flexibility → Compensation	0.644	0.000	0.634	0.488	0.384
	1 C	Labor flexibility → Structuring	0.642	0.000	0.603	0.453	0.334
	1D	Labor flexibility → Conditions	0.570	0.260	0.550	0.323	0.207
	1E	Labor flexibility → Contingencies	0.542	0.000	0.542	0.395	0.291
	1F	Labor flexibility → Risks	0.592	0.000	0.592	0.342	0.238
II	2A	Leadership → Compensation	0.470	0.000	0.491	0.241	0.121
	2B	Leadership → Structuring	0.452	0.320	0.419	0.270	0.150
	2 C	Leadership → Conditions	0.412	0.202	0.401	0.240	0.115
	2D	Leadership → Contingencies	0.331	0.002	0.383	0.143	0.084
	2E	Leadership → Risks	0.332	0.067	0.357	0.184	0.072

III	3A	Compensation → Structuring	0.321	0.002	0.356	0.194	0.084
	3B	Compensation → Conditions	0.204	0.000	0.232	0.003	0.005
	3C	Compensation → Contingencies	0.201	0.000	0.212	0.001	0.001
	3D	Compensation → Risks	0.234	0.000	0.234	0.002	0.009
IV	4A	Structuring → Conditions	0.134	0.127	0.134	0.023	0.020
	4B	Structuring → Contingencies	0.189	0.135	0.165	0.024	0.021
	4C	Structuring → Risks	0.135	0.189	0.118	0.029	0.022
V	5A	Conditions → Contingencies	0.089	0.093	0.083	0.006	0.005
	5B	Conditions → Risks	0.073	0.032	0.094	0.008	0.006
SAW	6A	Contingencies → Risks	0.061	0.541	0.025	0.004	0.003

Source: Prepared with the data of the study; β = Parameter of the dependency relationship between a dependent variable and an independent one, both in relation to other determining variables. Significance = Degree error allocation dependency ratio, R = Statistic or the dependency relationship, R^2 = Statistic of the dependence to the square, $R^2_{adjusted}$ = Statistic of the dependence to the squared and adjusted, which reflects the total variance explained for each model.

The adequacy and sphericity [$X^2 = 789.577$ (10gl) $p = 0.000$; $KMO = 0.833$] suggests performing second order factor analysis. The second-order factor or labor flexibility included each of the six factors, explaining 76.690% of the total variance, which suggests the contrast of the model based on five reflective factors in which the relationship with the boss would be the predominant factor.

It is possible to observe that the organizational climate, as a second order factor formed by the relationship with the boss, compensation, structure, compensation and motivation are determinants of labor flexibility as a second order factor indicated by isolation, overload, complicity and consultations ($\beta = .634$, $p = .000$; $R = 0.634$, $R^2 = 0.402$, $R^2_{jd} = 0.399$).

Regarding the rest of dependency relationships, low values tend to be spurious and not significant relationships. Once the six first-order factors and their linear relationships had been established, their structure was observed to establish the reflective trajectories of labor flexibility.

Finally, the adjustment parameters [$\chi^2 = 5.552$ (2gl) $p = 0.062$; $GFI = 0.974$; $NFI = 0.964$; $IFI = 0.977$; $CFI = 0.972$; $RMSEA = 0.229$] shows the fit of the theoretical structure with respect to the weighted observations.

Discussion

Regarding the theoretical, conceptual and empirical frameworks, where leadership highlighted as a factor of labor flexibility, establishing two - way communication and intrinsic motivation as indicative levels of external demands and internal resources, the weighting of balances the time to establish relationships, tasks, supports and innovations in terms of conditions, rotations, salaries, rewards and benefits in situations that are increasingly

subject to the market. The present work, rather, proposes that leadership is an intangible capital in terms of skills, knowledge and experiences, which will also motivate staff to the point that a climate of relationships will coexist with a rotation of functions and decrease of wages in unemployment situations.

However, the non-experimental and exploratory type of study, as well as the non-probabilistic and rather intentional type of sample selection, limit the results of the study to the surveyed sample. It is recommended to carry out an experimental study with probabilistic selection to be able to contrast the hypotheses in a context and sample different from the present work.

Regarding the studies that warn of market contingencies as indirect determinants of the work environment and the performance of organizations. In other words, to the extent that business development and microfinance policies encourage productivity, leaders are committed to carrying out strategies that, due to their degree of improvisation, imply unidirectional communication and motivation in remuneration that allows them to be at living up to the demands. From the market. In such a scenario, labor flexibility is a mediating factor of economic, productive and employment policies, but leadership prevails, with flexibility being a distinctive feature of the environment rather than of the organization or groups working within them.

However, the influence of leadership in involves training a working environment that can be oriented labor flexibility with other types of work, goals, innovations and supports, which are a traditional leadership or guidance of employees or subordinates, while motivating the talent and intellectual capital. If the work environment is the result of local and simultaneously determines policies a type of casual performance and rotation, then

organizations in establishing a scenario of trust and expectation could influence the formation professional.

It is necessary to carry out the contrast of the labor flexibility model in groups of micro, small and medium-sized companies in order to establish the organizational determinants and their influence on the similarities and differences between MSMEs when weighing their performance, commitment and satisfaction. This design could also be extended to gender, age, income and marital status groups to elucidate the profiles that would fit the informal and austere working conditions.

Conclusion

The contribution of this work to the state of the art lies in the establishment of the reliability and validity of an instrument that measures work climate and flexibility, but the type of design and selection of the sample imitate the findings in the study sample. The statistical properties of the instrument indicate that flexibility is multidimensional since, it seems to be a mediator of the policies of local impulse on the opportunities and informal labor capacities. This reflects a validity of context that the instrument in question could develop more in samples and scenarios different from that of the study. Furthermore, in relation to other variables such as leadership, the instrument can be extended to incorporate leadership as a determinant of labor flexibility.

References

1. World Health Organization. Statistics of the SARS CoV-2 pandemic and the Covid-19 disease. Geneva: WHO. 2020.
2. Pan American Health Organization. Statistics of the SARS CoV-2 pandemic and the Covid-19 disease. New York: PAHO. 2020.
3. Casas R. Approach to the analysis of networks and knowledge flows. In M. Luna. (Coord.), Itineraries of knowledge: forms and academic content. A network approach. Barcelona, Spain: Anthropos. 2003; 19-50.
4. García C. Factorial validity structure of occupational stress. *Biomed J Sci Tech Res.* 2020; 29: 1-5.
5. Carreón J, Bustos JM, Sánchez A, Martínez E, García C. The structure of work stress. *Academic Research without Frontera.* 2020; 13: 1-23.
6. Alonso P. Comparative study of job satisfaction in administration staff. *J Work Organizational Psychol.* 2008; 24: 25-40.
7. Awargala R. An economic sociology of informal work: the case of India. *Res Sociology Work.* 2009; 18: 315-342.
8. Salamat N, Zahira N, Mustafa L. The impact of the organizational climate on the work performance of teachers. *Educational Res.* 2013; 2: 71-82.
9. Chauhan G. Development and validation of resource flexibility measures for the manufacturing industry. *J Industrial Eng Management.* 2014; 7: 21-41.
10. Peschner J, Fotakis C. Growth potential of EU human resources and policy implications for future economic growth. Paper work of the Commission European. 2013.
11. Kundu K. Development of the conceptual framework of the organizational climate. *J Commerce University Vidyasagar.* 2007; 12: 100-110.
12. Maruco M. Burnout syndrome in pediatricians. Analysis of variables that could enhance the appearance and exacerbation of general hospitals. *Academic J Social Sci.* 2012; 16: 1-9.
13. Adenike A. The organizational climate as a predictor of employee job satisfaction. *Business Intelligence Magazine.* 2011; 4: 151-166.
14. Luna M. The network as a coordination mechanism and knowledge networks. In M. Luna. (Coord.), Itineraries of knowledge: forms and academic content. A network approach. Barcelona, Spain: Anthropos. 2003; 51-78.
15. Hermosa A. Satisfaction labor and syndrome bournout teachers of primary and secondary education. *Colombian J Psychol.* 2006; 15: 81-89.
16. Meagher M. Regulatory bodies: perceptions of the academic and business sector about their relationships with a network. In M. Luna. (Coord.), Itineraries of knowledge: forms and academic content. A network approach. Barcelona, Spain: Anthropos. 2003; 259-305.
17. Bermúdez G, Bolívar E, García C. Sociopolitical flexibility in the economy 4.0. *Revista de Ciencia Política.* 2019; 37: 1-8.
18. Zalas LA, Molina HD, Coss J, Valdes Or, López S, Bucio C, et al. Exploratory factor composition of the work environment. *Hologram.* 2019; 30: 29-43.
19. Bermúdez G, Quiroz CY, Rosas FJ, Rincón RM, García C. Contrast and a confirmatory model for the study of workplace bullying in climates and professional networks of public health services. *Health Work.* 2020; 27: 121-132.