INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

MOTIVATION FOR REEMPLOYMENT:

THE ROLE OF SELF-EFFICACY AND IDENTITY

MARIANGELA BATTISTA

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1996

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

September 16, 1996
Date

Donna E. Thompson
Chair of Examining Committee

September 16, 1996
Date

Executive Officer

Donna E. Thompson
Kay Deaux
Walter Reichman
Edwin P. Hollander
Robert J. Lee

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

MOTIVATION FOR REEMPLOYMENT:

THE ROLE OF SELF-EFFICACY AND IDENTITY

by

Mariangela Battista

Advisor: Professor Donna E. Thompson

Millions of jobs are lost each year because of plant shutdowns, layoffs, and eliminations of positions. Although a relatively large body of job loss research exists, it has tended to be descriptive, outlining the effect of unemployment on society and individuals, and not theory-driven research. In addition, unemployment research has ignored individual difference variables that distinguish between individuals who succesfully find reemployment and those who do not. The present study was designed to address the issue of motivation for reemployment following a job loss and investigate the potential roles of self-efficacy and identity in job-seeking behavior.

Using self-efficacy and identity theories as a framework to study motivation for reemployment is advantageous because both theories are dynamic constructs. They recognize individuals as active agents and not as a passive point of contact as implied by prior unemployment research. Thus, these two theories provide a potential explanation for what distinguishes active versus non-active

job seekers.

Two-hundred fifty unemployed individuals, recruited through outplacement centers, completed a questionnaire assessing career self-efficacy, career identity, identity valence, identity salience, threat to identity, and job search behaviors. Results suggest that career self-efficacy and career identity are useful predictors of job search behaviors. Identity valence, or the value one places upon an identity, also appears to play a role in determining the strength of an individual's career identity and the intensity of job search. Correlations show moderate to strong relationships among the variables under study. Significant main effects indicate that career self-efficacy and identity valence account for significant variance in career identity. Further, career identity and identity valence account for significant variance in job search behaviors. Theoretical and practical implications of research findings are discussed as are directions for future research.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisory committee for all their assistance and encouragement throughout this process. I am especially indebted to Bob Lee for his practical insights and his opening the door to some date collection sites, and Kay Deaux for helping me wade through the identity literature. A special acknowlegement to my chair Donna Thompson for all the time and patience she gave me by continuing to encourage me and believe in me when the end never seemed near.

Thank you also to my family. To my parents and my brother Michael I am grateful for the patience and support you have shown me throughout my life and especially through graduate school. To my dear husband Al, thank you for all your encouragement and technical expertise and I am sorry you had to live through this process twice.

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents without whose encouragement and sacrifice I would not be where I am today. I love you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Part I

Chapter 1

Introduction

Millions of jobs are lost each year due to plant shutdowns, organizational restructuring, and elimination of positions. This trend toward greater unemployment is expected to continue as organizations downsize to remain competitive (Cascio, 1993). It has also resulted in a refocusing of attention on unemployment and the negative consequences of job loss.

Though often used interchangeably, job loss and unemployment have different antecedents and psychological consequences. Job loss refers to any involuntary withdrawal from the workforce, either by firing or by layoff (Leana & Feldman, 1990). Unemployment refers to a lack of paid employment; an unemployed individual may not necessarily experience a withdrawal because he/she may have never been part of the workforce (e.g., hard-core unemployed, new college graduate, etc.). Although both the job loss and unemployment literatures are reviewed, the focus of the present study is job loss (i.e., previously employed individuals who have lost their job) .

Although a relatively large body of job loss research exists, it has tended to be descriptive, outlining the effect of unemployment on society and individuals rather than theory-driven. In a critical review of the job loss

literature, Hartley and Fryer (1984) stated that the field of psychology thus far has made a poor attempt at understanding the impact of unemployment. They blame this on the lack of coherent theoretical underpinnings in prior research, the relative lack of empirical research since the 1930's, and the focus among researchers of treating the unemployed as passive subjects acted upon by external forces rather than active coping agents. Feather (1990, 1993) has made a similar plea that the study of psychological effects of unemployment must move beyond description to the formulation of hypotheses that are linked to theoretical models. Feather (1990) states:

> What is needed is the application of theoretical models from different areas of psychology (e.g., motivation, coping behavior, developmental psychology) so as to bring some order into the wide array of findings and to generate new predictions that can be tested in further research. (p.6)

It has been stated that unemployment is an experience unique to each individual and that it is necessary to understand the individual impact of unemployment before research generalizations can be made (Swinburne, 1981; Jahoda, 1982). Unfortunately, research has not focused on individual difference variables. Little is known about

individual difference variables that distinguish between individuals who successfully find reemployment and those who do not. Thus, it is appropriate for research to examine variables, such as self-efficacy and identity, which may moderate the job loss experience. Other than demographics, rarely have individual difference variables been examined when investigating job loss. Further, individual difference variables have never been examined in relation to motivation for reemployment. Improved knowledge of moderating variables would permit greater precision in understanding the impact of job loss and also enhance understanding of individual reactions and potential practical interventions (DeFrank & Ivancevich, 1986).

The present study focuses on motivation for reemployment following a job loss. It is designed to investigate the potential roles of self-efficacy and identity in job-seeking behavior. Identity focuses on the meanings comprising the self as an object, gives structure and content to the self-concept, and anchors the self to social systems (Gecas, 1982). Thus, an identity is a definition, an interpretation, of the self (Baumeister, 1986). Self-efficacy, as defined by Bandura (1986), is the strength of one's conviction that he/she can successfully execute a behavior required to produce a certain outcome. Efficacy expectations influence the initiation, persistence, and strength of behaviors.

Using self-efficacy and identity theories as a framework to study individual reactions to job loss is advantageous because both theories are dynamic constructs. They recognize individuals as active agents and not as a passive point of contact as implied by prior unemployment research. What is special about both self-efficacy and identity theories, and what makes them appropriate for studying job loss, is they focus on what individuals do in reacting to job loss rather than what happens to them. In addition to taking a theory-driven approach to the study of job loss and motivation for reemployment, the present study also follows the recommendation of Feather (1990, 1993) and integrates contributions from different fields of psychology: self-efficacy and identity theories represent key theories in social psychology; vocational identity theories are from vocational and counseling psychology; and motivation is a key area of study within industrial and organizational psychology.

Outline of Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into five parts. Part One consists of this Introduction and Chapter 2. Chapter 2 provides a review of the job loss literature including brief descriptions of stage models of unemployment, stress, demographics, and mental and physical health effects of unemployment. It also includes a review of the most current research in the job loss area. The chapter ends with a

description of the present study and the research gaps it attempts to fill.

Part Two consists of Chapters 3 and 4 and presents an overview and explanation of the two theories under investigation: identity and self-efficacy. It would be difficult to understand the application of identity and self-efficacy theories to motivation for reemployment without a thorough explanation of the theories. Thus, Chapter 3 introduces identity theory by presenting an overview of the construct including the role of identity in the self-concept, descriptions of the functional aspects of identity, content and value dimensions of identity, and the structure of the self-concept. The chapter ends with a description of the self-concept as a motivational system and and the motivational implication of a threatened identity.

Chapter 4 focuses on self-efficacy theory and begins with an overview of the construct including the dimensions of self-efficacy, the four sources of efficacy information, and efficacy expectancies. The chapter concludes with implications of self-efficacy for motivation.

Part Three contains Chapters 5 and 6 and focuses on the integration and application of identity and self-efficacy to the job loss phenomenon, specifically examining application of the theories to motivation for reemployment. Chapter 5 is devoted to the application of both self-efficacy and identity theories to research and intervention especially in

the areas of organizational and vocational behavior. It consists of a review of the relevant literature in these areas. The chapter concludes with implications of self-efficacy and identity theories for job loss. Chapter 6 outlines the present study by introducing the research hypotheses.

Part Four is devoted to research methodology and results. Chapter 7 describes the research methodology employed including a description of the participants, the pilot study conducted and operationalizations of the constructs. Chapter 8 presents research findings including correlational relationships among the variables, results of individual hypotheseses, and exploratory effects.

Part 5 contains the final chapter, Chapter 9, the Discussion. This chapter summarizes the role of self-efficacy and identity in motivation for reemployment by highlighting present research findings, describing study limitations, and also discussing theoretical contributions and practical implications of the present research study. The chapter concludes with directions for future research.

Chapter 2

Job Loss: Review of Prior Research

Job loss has been examined by scholars in a variety of disciplines including labor economics, social and government policy analysis, and sociology (Dooley & Catalano, 1988; Leana & Feldman, 1990). In the field of psychology, early research on unemployment consisted largely of qualitative case studies of communities or families (Dooley & Catalano, 1988). These studies were essentially descriptive and involved close investigation of communities in well-specified geographical locations (please see Feather, 1990 for a review).

Because these studies were often based on small samples and case studies, the methodology used in these 1930's studies has been described as deficient (Feather, 1990). Improvements in methodology have been made over the years as large survey and quasi-experimental procedures have become available. This has contributed to more recent research (i.e., 1970's-1990's) focusing on the psychological impact of unemployment, with particular emphasis on health and psychological well-being (Feather, 1990) and the blue-collar unemployed (Kaufman, 1982).

For example, there is substantial literature which indicates that job loss leads to a variety of negative changes in people's affective states. Research has found that individuals who have lost their jobs report increased

depression, increased boredom, decreased life satisfaction, increased feelings of apathy, passivity, and resignation, and overwhelming pessimism and fatalism about life (Leana & Ivancevich, 1987; Leana & Feldman, 1992). Little if any research has focused on reemployment. The more recent descriptive research on job loss can be classified along the following parameters: stage models of unemployment, stress, demographics, and mental and physical health. Each of these will be reviewed briefly in the sections which follow.

Stage Models

The notion that individuals move through discrete and successive stages in their response to unemployment is a legacy of the 1930's. Stage models suggest that people move through discrete stages of adjustment, typically beginning with feelings of shock, anger, and protest immediately following the job loss, then moving to a phase of optimism and active job search, and ending with pessimism, withdrawal, and passivity if the job search is unsuccessful. (Leana & Feldman, 1992).

The use of stage models has persisted into the 1970's and 1980's. For example, Kaufman (1982) described a four-stage model of response to unemployment based on his research with professionals who had lost their jobs. The first stage involves shock, relief, and relaxation, followed by the second stage in which the person makes a concerted effort to find a new job. If this search is unsuccessful,

the person moves to the third stage in which he/she begins to feel vacillation, self-doubt, and anger, followed by the final stage, resignation and withdrawal. Kaufman's work suggests that professionals move from shock to resignation in a relatively short period of time, usually from five to seven months.

Although stage models have been critical to the development of the study of unemployment, evidence supporting early stage models consists largely of autobiographies, memoirs, case histories, and interviews (Feather, 1990). The models have tended to be descriptive with explanations of behavior attributed to the particular stage of unemployment. It has been argued that the description of stages does not provide an explanation of the effects of unemployment (Feather, 1990). Criticisms of stage theories point to the non-generalizability of many of the alleged effects of job loss due to a range of moderating factors, including individual differences, which are typically ignored (Fryer, 1985). Thus, stage models may not be accurate nor comprehensive because they neglect individual differences as potential explanations of behavior.

Stress

Previous research has acknowledged the presence of stress and its negative effects on physical and mental health following a job loss. Stress has typically been

investigated as an independent variable in the job loss literature. Leana and Feldman (1988, 1992) have argued that the concept of stress is implicit in much of the research conducted on job loss. Job loss is stressful because it places the individual in a situation that is threatening and uncertain. Individuals now have to make changes and learn how to adjust to these changes. The individual is torn from existing routines and forced to establish new behavior patterns. The continued threat of job loss is seen as the causative agent in deteriorating psychological health and in inducing stress-related illnesses such as heart disease and ulcers (Leana & Feldman, 1988).

Kasl and Cobb (1982) in a study on stress and unemployment conducted a longitudinal study of the effects of plant closure and job loss. In this study, stress was operationalized as job loss. They investigated the effects on male workers of a plant closure in both a large metropolitan area and a rural community. Data collection occurred four to seven weeks prior to plant closure and at different intervals thereafter for approximately two years. Information was obtained on a range of variables using both objective and subjective measures. Variables such as job satisfaction, work-role deprivation, perceived social support and physiological measures (based on blood specimens, blood pressure, and pulse rate) were investigated. A control sample of male workers who were

continuously employed in comparable jobs over the same period of time as those whose jobs were terminated were also included in the study design.

In general, results indicated a negative effect in the dependent variables (both objective and subjective measures as briefly mentioned above) when the plant workers moved from employment to unemployment. However, there was a tendency for the men who remained unemployed to return to baseline levels on the variables some four to eight months after the plant closure. Kasl and Cobb (1982) noted that this pattern suggested evidence of adaptation by the unemployed men so that following an initial period of unemployment those remaining unemployed could not be distinguished from those finding a new job. In addition, some effects were moderated by the social setting (urban or rural). For example, levels of depression, anxiety-tension, and low self-esteem increased when testing occurred soon after job loss for the unemployed men in the urban setting when compared to men in the rural setting.

Although much research has examined stress and unemployment, research generalizations are difficult to make. Feather (1990) states the study of stress is controversial because debate exists even among those who work in the field concerning construct definition. How does one define stress? Stress can be located within the person or the focus can be on stressful events in the environment

(e.g., Kasl and Cobb (1982) study). Further, the same stressful event may have different meaning to different individuals and what may be stressful to one may not be stressful to another (Jabobson, 1987). Thus, one can understand why Kasl and Cobb (1982) argue that generalizations of stress and job loss results are difficult to make due to poor research methodologies and questionable interpretations of associations.

Demographics

Demographics play a key role in the study of unemployment and have been examined as potential moderating variables of the job loss experience. Research indicates that factors such as age, gender, race, and education level, may affect how an individual reacts to job loss (Leana & Ivancevich, 1987; Feather, 1990). Age has consistently been found to be a significant determinant of how long people stay unemployed, both for professional workers and for blue-collar workers (Leana & Feldman, 1992). In addition, research has reported that workers lacking a college education have more difficulty getting reemployed than college graduates (Feather, 1990).

Surprisingly, although gender is mentioned as a possible moderator of the job loss reaction, the literature is almost silent on the effects of unemployment on women. Most unemployment research has focused on males (Jackson & Warr, 1984; Warr & Jackson, 1984; and Payne & Hartley,

1987). However, with the increased number of females in the work force, unemployment is also an issue for women especially since many women in the work force today are primary wage earners.

Women are frequently assumed to adjust more readily to job loss because work is thought to be less central to women's identities than it is to men's. That is, traditional female roles of wife and mother should supersede any career role. Research suggests this may not be the case (Novak & Snyder, 1983). Results have shown that work in the household does not compensate for loss of employment (Davies & Esseveld, 1985). Not only does employment serve as a paid position, but it also gives women a sense of identity within another social framework (Shamir, 1985). Further, several authors suggest that when discussing psychological consequences of unemployment for women, it is important to make distinctions among different populations of women (Taylor, 1988). For example, unemployment is just as negative to women who are primary wage earners as it is to men, however some research indicates it is not as aversive to women who have financial stability through their spouses (Shamir, 1985).

Mental and Physical Health

Mental and physical health effects have been investigated as dependent variables of the job loss experience (Liem & Liem, 1988). Evidence is fairly strong

that employees' health suffers as a result of job loss (Warr & Payne, 1982). The unemployed tend to have more heart disease, hypertension, and a greater number of days "not feeling well" (Kasl, Gore, & Cobb, 1975).

Research shows that movement from employment to unemployment is accompanied by a reduction in well-being (i.e., mental health), while an increase in well-being follows the transition from unemployment to paid work (Jackson, Stafford, Banks, & Warr, 1983). In a review of some British studies, Warr, Jackson, and Banks (1988) found that between 20 and 30 percent of unemployed men reported deterioration in mental health after job loss. In addition, Feather and Davenport (1981) found that higher levels of depressive affect about unemployment were accompanied by an increasing tendency to blame present difficulties on relatively stable, external factors rather than on internal factors. Depressive affect is a common reaction to a stressful situation. A movement from transient, situation-specific affective states to more general depression may occur in some people following prolonged and/or repeated periods of unemployment.

Most recently, Leana and Feldman (1992) in a study of the steel and aerospace industries, found depressed affect to be the greatest in the first six months of unemployment. Those out of work seven to nine months exhibited the lowest levels, while for those unemployed over nine months,

depression rose once again. They linked this pattern to unemployment benefits. Unemployment benefits usually end after six months. People may respond to this with reactance. They need to regroup and go on. If they are still unemployed after nine months, depression returns.

Current State of Research

In summary, unemployment research to date has been descriptive, focusing on physical and mental health effects of job loss. This descriptive research has neglected to examine potential individual difference variables which may help to explain the successful reemployment of some and not others. Given the individual and societal implications of job loss, it is surprising to find prior research in the area to be inconclusive and non-generalizable due to the influence of moderator variables. And further, according to Jahoda (1982), the research has been poorly suited for potential intervention because often the examined outcomes of job loss are not appropriate for intervention (e.g., depression, physical health effects).

In addition, it is surprising so little work has been done in the industrial psychology and organizational behavior fields. Until very recently, most unemployment research has been conducted outside the United States, most notably by social and organizational psychologists in Great Britain and Australia. Further, almost all of this work has focused on young adolescents at the start of their careers,

or on the blue-collar unemployed (Kaufman, 1982; Feather, 1990).

Most recently work conducted in the United States has begun to increase our understanding of the job loss phenomenon. Leana and Feldman (1992) have provided a substantial contribution with their theoretically-driven and empirically tested model of job loss. According to the model, contextual or situation factors of layoffs (including job loss characteristics, unemployment rates, and attachment to job) produce individual reactions to layoffs (which include cognitive appraisal, emotional and physiological arousal). The individual reactions result in individual coping strategies (emotion-focused and problem-focused) which are influenced by both personality traits (including locus of control, Type-A, and self-esteem) and company interventions (e.g., outplacement). The coping strategies result in outcomes of coping efforts (i.e., reemployment and psychological adjustment) which are influenced by demographic variables and company interventions.

Results of the Leana and Feldman (1992) study have shed additional light on the job loss phenomenon. Results found financial distress and attachment to the previous job to be the strongest predictors of negative reactions to job loss (Leana & Feldman, 1990). In addition, results indicated that Type-A's were more likely to engage in problem-focused coping behaviors which attempt to change the environment by

eliminating the source of stress itself. Examples of such behavior are seeking a new job or getting retrained in a new occupation. Locus of control and self-esteem played less significant roles because most participants viewed their job loss as caused by external factors not under their control (i.e., balance of trade, budget deficits, accidents, etc.).

The University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research has also advanced our study of the unemployed through their Jobs project. The framework for the experimental intervention involved a process model in which social intervention (i.e., training in job seeking) influences motivation and skill, which, in turn, jointly determine job-seeking behavior. Motivation to engage in continued job-seeking, according to this framework, is enhanced by a problem solving process emphasizing innoculation against setbacks and positive social reinforcement (Caplan, Vinokur, Price, & van Ryn, 1989).

Although both the Leana et al. (1992) and Caplan et al. (1989) studies provide valuable contributions to the job loss literature, their emphasis on potential moderators of the job loss experience was limited. The Jobs project focused on building job-seeking skills with social support the only moderator of the job loss and job-seeking relationship. In addition, it can be argued that self-esteem, Type-A, and locus of control variables studied by Leana and Feldman (1992) are static variables providing no

opportunity for malleability or potential influence on intervention. Further, there was no explicit examination of individual motivation for reemployment.

Other than the demographic variables mentioned earlier, or the few variables examined by Leana et al. (1992) and Caplan et al. (1989), little is known regarding potential moderating effects of job loss. As previously mentioned, improved knowledge of moderating variables would permit greater precision in understanding the impact of becoming unemployed and also enhance understanding of individual reactions and potential practical interventions (DeFrank & Ivancevich, 1986). Of the potentially relevant moderating variables, adequate measures are lacking. Such measures are necessary for future research to be able to empirically test the theories which can address this applied problem.

In addition, little is known regarding the potential motivational aspects of job loss because most research has been descriptive focusing on physical, mental, and even societal effects. What determines active or non-active job-seeking behavior is a critical question to answer because it has strong implications for potential interventions.

The Present Study

The present study is designed to address some of the deficiencies in the job loss literature and contribute to furthering our knowledge of reactions to job loss by pursuing several new directions in job loss research. It

addresses several criticisms which currently exist in the field. First, addressing one of the major criticisms in the literature, lack of theory-driven research, this study will investigate two theories, self-efficacy and identity theories, to address an applied problem (i.e., job loss). A framework is presented to help organize existing knowledge and to suggest a research agenda for systematically investigating individual reactions to job loss using self-efficacy and identity theories.

Second, this study will go beyond the descriptive studies currently cited and focus on individual difference variables, such as self-efficacy and identity, as potential moderators of the job loss experience. Personal characteristics of the unemployed have tended to be ignored and these variables may suggest how some individuals cope better than others with job loss. For example, prior research has neglected to examine the motivational aspects of job loss and reemployment. What determines/explains an active job-seeker versus a non-active seeker? Are there individual difference variables which can help to explain this phenomenon? Prior research has examined moderating variables such as demographics. Demographic research has told us how individuals tend to feel (e.g., depressed, angry) after a job loss based on their age, gender, etc. What research has not told us is how individual difference variables, such as self-efficacy and identity, can

contribute to job-seeking behavior. Such research is beneficial because it provides possible solutions for interventions.

Third, a lack of theory has inhibited the development of appropriate research measures. Case study and anecdotal, observational research has not required the use of measures to empirically test hypotheses. This study will further our understanding by attempting to develop new measures by which to examine job loss. As such, it will provide tools to expand the body of research.

In summary, the unemployed face financial, psychological and physical problems. As stated, research in this area has typically focused on the consequences of job loss and job search on individual mental health. Less attention has been directed to examining individual characteristics that distinguish between individuals who successfully find reemployment and those who do not. The effects of job loss on individuals is profound and theoretical and empirical research has made little progress in being able to better predict and explain individuals' reactions to job loss. A better understanding of job loss and its consequences, especially with regard to future job search, is necessary. It is posited that self-efficacy and identity provide the framework to further this understanding. Part Two provides a general overview of the two theories by outlining both identity and self-efficacy

theories in order to lay the groundwork for the application of the theories to job loss and motivation for reemployment.

Part II

Chapter 3

Identity Theory: A Review

Identity theory sets out to explain individuals' self-concept, by examining role-related behaviors. It helps explain the social basis of the self-concept and the nature of normative behavior. Identity theory acknowledges a multifaceted and dynamic self that mediates social structure and individual behavior. Identity theory is most closely associated with the work of McCall and Simmons (1978), Stryker (1978), and Rosenberg (1979).

Identity is the vast domain of meanings attached to the self and comprising the content and organization of self-concepts (Gecas, 1982). At its most expansive, identity has been said to encompass all things a person may legitimately say about him/herself.

> The self-concept is conceptualized as an organization (structure) of various identities and attributes, and their evaluations, developed out of the individual's reflexive, social, and symbolic activities. As such, the self-concept is an experiential, mostly cognitive phenomenon accessible to scientific inquiry. (Gecas, 1982, p. 4).

Identity theory is based on a sociological view of the

self as a system of reciprocal role relationships based upon a hierarchical structure. The sociological perspective focuses on the antecedents of self-conceptions, examining these antecedents within the pattern of social interaction (Gecas, 1982). This focus on role-related behaviors is the foundation of identity theory.

Although an apparently well-defined construct, much confusion exists regarding what is meant by identity. It has been stated that one's definition of identity varies with one's overall definition of reality (Breakwell, 1983). Identity theory is plagued with problems of terminology and definition. The term used to describe the construct is often dependent upon the philosophical and methodological foundations of the theorist (Breakwell, 1983). Thus, the same term may be used by two different theorists whose definition may be completely different. This contributes to an imprecise understanding of identity even among researchers and makes direct comparisons across theories difficult. For example, Social Identity Theory (SIT) is a social psychological theory developed by Tajfel and Turner (1979). It is similar in some respects to identity theory, but examines the concept of self from a group process perspective rather than an individual role perspective.

Although I acknowledge the existance of social identity theory and its contribution to psychology, the present research will apply identity theory as defined by Stryker

(1978) to help explain motivated behavior following a job loss.

Identity Theory

Identity theory proposes that the self reflects society as a multifaceted and organized construct. This central tenet of identity theory reflects the theory's origins in symbolic interactionism (Mead, 1934) which states that society affects social behavior through its influence on self. Identity theorists refer to the multiple components of self as identities (more specifically role identities). The notion of identity salience is used to account for the impact of role identities on social behavior.

The general perspective of identity theory forms the basis for a relatively large body of microsociological literature concerned with predicting role-related behavior and individualistic consequences of identity-related processes (Rosenberg, 1979). Continuing with our sociological perspective, let us follow Gecas' (1982) formulation of the constructs mentioned. "Self" refers to the process of reflexivity which "...develops in social interaction and is based on the social character of human language. The concept of self provides the philosophical underpinnings for social-psychological inquiry into the self-concept but is itself not accessible to empirical investigation." (Gecas, 1982, p. 3). The "self-concept" is a product of this reflexive activity. Rosenberg (1979)

defines self-concept as "the totality of the individual's thoughts and feelings having reference to himself as an object" (p.7). The self-concept is comprised of multiple "identities."

> Identity focuses on the meanings comprising the self as an object, gives structure and content to the self-concept, and anchors the self to social systems. (Gecas, 1982, p. 4).

Thus, an identity is a definition, an interpretation, of the self (Baumeister, 1986). In addition, identities can be thought of as reflexively applied cognitions in the form of answers to the question "Who am I?" (Stryker and Serpe, 1982). People may have as many identities as the number of distinct sets of structured relationships in which they are involved. An individual's actions may be said to be the result of the need to act in accordance with his or her self-concept. Thus, as a psychological phenomenon, identity is a potentially important variable for explaining and predicting individuals' behavior. "Often self refers to a fairly abstract, global concept whereas identity is linked to specific aspects of self-definition." (Deaux, 1992, p. 10). Therefore, one might have a general self-concept but a specific identity as a stockbroker. Knowing something about a person's self-concept helps others explain and predict

that individual's actions. The study of people's self-concepts provides a key to the study of human behavior (Ross, 1992).

People who have problems defining their identity generally struggle with the more difficult aspects of defining the self, such as the establishing of long-term goals, major affiliations and basic values (Baumeister, 1986). All aspects of identity are tied to value and belief systems since these are central defining properties of any social niche. Previous research has supported the existence of a relationship between identity and its social context (Breakwell, 1983). Further, one's beliefs and values are developed through prior exposure to particular identities either through the observation of others' behavior or through actual personal performance (and success) of the behavior (Super, 1952, 1954).

Role identities. Identity theory views the self not as an autonomous psychological entity but as a multifaceted social construct that emerges from people's roles in society. One can say that variations in self-concepts are due to the different roles that people occupy in society. This view is a reflection of the social interactionist perspective which states that people come to know who they are through their interactions with others. Stryker (1980) took this view a step further when he proposed that we have distinct components of the self, called role identities, for

each of the role positions we occupy in society. For example, a person's role identities may include being a son, husband, father, lawyer, and a hockey fan.

Role identities are self-conceptions or self-definitions that people apply to themselves as a consequence of the structural positions they occupy, and through a process of labeling or self-definition as a member of a particular social category (Burke, 1980). "Role identities provide meaning for self, not only because they refer to concrete role specifications, but also because they distinguish roles from relevant complementary or counterroles." (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995; p. 256). Ultimately, it is through social interaction that identities actually acquire self-meaning. Thus, as stated earlier, identities are reflexive because others respond to a person in terms of his/her role identities. These responses, in turn, form the basis for developing a sense of self-meaning and self-definition (Hogg, Terry & White, 1995).

Role identities, by definition, imply action (Callero, 1985). It is through action that identities are realized and validated. Identity is the core concept by which social structure is linked with individual action. Thus, in order to predict behavior one must analyze the relationship between the self and social structure. From an identity theory perspective, a role is a set of expectations prescribing behavior that is considered appropriate by

others. It is socially recognized and defined by action. In this sense a role identity serves as a link between the individual self and society.

The satisfactory enactment of a role confirms and validates the individual's status as a role member. This also positively impacts on one's self-evaluation since enacting a role satisfactorily should enhance feelings of self-esteem whereas a sense of poor role performance may produce doubts about one's self-worth (Stryker & Serpe, 1982). Individuals act in a way to maintain their identity and their notion of self-worth. Identities can act as a cybernetic control system whereby people modify their behavior to achieve a match with their internalized identity standards (Hogg, Terry & White, 1995). One can see the notion of motivation implicit in this control system; one is motivated to behave in a way which will maintain and reinforce his/her identity. For example, an individual who defines herself as a mother, will perform behaviors which will maintain and reinforce that identity (e.g., cook meals, take child to school, read bedtime stories, etc.).

When individuals are asked to define themselves (e.g., The Twenty Statements Test (Kuhn & McPartland, 1954)), typically a long list is generated. Some items in this list may be considered individual attributes such as gender, ethnicity, or physical description (e.g., female, German, tall, athletic). Some items may be more role specific

(e.g., daughter, teacher, bowler). Identity theory focuses on the self-defining roles that individuals occupy in society rather than the broader attributes that can be ascribed to the self. Although these attributes reflect the features of the social structure in which individuals' role identities are embedded, they are not considered separate components of the self because they do not carry specific behavioral expectations. The present study will only focus on role identities and not these individual attributes since the study's focus is on career identity and the motivated behavior associated with such an identity.

Dimensions of identity. Breakwell (1986) speaks of the two dimensions of identity: the content dimension and the value dimension. The content dimension of identity comprises the defining properties of identity; i.e., the characteristics one uses to describe oneself. The process of knowing or experiencing these distinguishing features of the self is inextricably bound to the process of evaluating them which comprises the value dimension of identity. Each element in the content dimension will have a value attached to it. This value is based on prior interactions and is subject to perpetual revision. There will be more elaboration on the evaluative aspect of identity in the section on the self-concept as a motivational system.

Self-concept structure. The structure of the self-concept is viewed as a hierarchical organization of an

individual's role-identities (Stryker, 1980). Identities are ordered in relation to one another such that one identity can be said to have more (or less) prominence than another at any given time (Stryker & Serpe, 1994). For example, the identity of accountant may be most prominent while in the office, but the identity of father would be most prominent while at home.

Because identities are derived from role positions, a person can have numerous identities that are arranged hierarchically in terms of valence, centrality, and salience (Hofman, 1983). Valence is the value one attaches to the identity. Centrality is the importance of that identity and salience is the frequency with which that identity is called into use. Salience is also defined as the individual's level of commitment to the role (Stryker & Serpe, 1982, 1994). This assumes that time spent in a role is a key outcome of role/identity salience.

Although Hofman's (1983) model of the self includes valence and centrality in describing the role hierarchy, research in this area is most closely associated with the work of Stryker and his emphasis on the self-concept as a salience hierarchy of identities. According to Stryker,

> the hierarchy in which identities are organized is based on identity salience, defined as a readiness to act out an identity as a consequence of the identity's

properties as a cognitive structure or schema. (Stryker & Serpe, 1994, p. 17).

The hierarchical organization of the self is used as a theoretical framework by which to base predictions as to which self component (i.e., identity) will take precedence in accounting for some self-relevant outcome (Stryker & Serpe, 1994). Salient identities are conceptualized as being positioned at the top of the hierarchy and identities less important to the self positioned closer to the bottom.

Commitment to the role dictates the salience attached to the identity it confers, and salience subsequently shapes role performance. Some identities are more a part of the self than others and consequently have a variable effect on the self-concept. Thus, identity salience provides an explanation for why one behavioral option is selected over another in situations in which both are available (Stryker & Serpe, 1994). The choice of the behavior is a function of the relative salience of the identities to which the choices are related; the relative salience of identities is a function of commitment to the role to which the identities are attached. Further, there is a belief that individuals need not be directly aware of the salience of their identities (Stryker & Serpe, 1994).

Stryker (1980) views identities and identity salience as stable constructs. Salience is intrapersonal and by

definition transsituational. Although identity salience may be affected by features of a situation, it is really a product of prior interactions which has an independent effect on behavior in those situations (Stryker & Serpe, 1982). The identity's location in a salience hierarchy will affect its threshold for being invoked in situations and thus the likelihood that the behavior called for by the identity will ensue. Identity salience is carried by individuals as they move across situations and respond in particular situations. Thus situations themselves do not determine the identities invoked in them. We see an independence of behavior from immediate situational demands.

Let us examine the identity of professor as an illustrative example of identity structure. If the identity is valued, the individual will be committed to it and that can be manifested and measured by the amount of time devoted to related endeavors. Salience is concerned with the frequency in which the identity is brought into play. One with a strong identity as a professor will engage in scholarly behaviors not only when in the classroom, but also in the office and at home. One's "spare time" (leisure time) may also be spent reading journals or books that are directly related to his/her scholarly work. In this example, the identity of professor is quite strong because behaviors related to being a professor are performed outside the traditional setting/context for such behavior. Hence

the identity salience is transsituational and we see a stable identity exhibited in different situations.

Although theoretical and conceptual work regarding identity salience has progressed, little has been done empirically to advance the construct. Work which has been identified examines the salience of blood donor identity (Callero, 1985) and student identity (Stryker & Serpe, 1994). Although valuable contributions to a sparse empirical literature, the generalizability of these identities is suspect. The blood donor identity examined by Callero (1985) can really be defined by a single act; therefore, one must ask how salient can a one-time act be for purposes of empirical testing? One questions how significant a dimension of the self-concept the blood donor identity truly is. Also, Stryker and Serpe (1994) investigated new college freshmen and their newly acquired student identities. This student self-concept included five roles and identities all related to being a student. Although a more appropriate identity for investigation than the blood donor identity (which can be defined by a single act), the student identity is acknowledged as a newly acquired identity. Future research would benefit by examining an established identity.

In sum, it is said that "action is the social expression of identity" (Breakwell, 1986, p. 43). Identities are components of one's overall self-concept. They are structured according to the valence and salience

placed upon them and they dictate purposeful and goal-directed behavior (i.e., motivation). The next section will further elaborate on this notion of motivated behavior.

Self-Concept as a Motivational System

The self-concept is considered by some theorists to act as a source of motivation (Rosenberg, 1979; Burke & Reitz, 1982; Gecas, 1982; and Breakwell, 1986). Individuals are motivated to formulate plans and achieve levels of performance or activity that reinforce, support, and confirm their identities (Burke & Reitz, 1982). Two separate and distinct motives are usually discussed: the self-esteem motive -- the wish to think well of oneself; and the self-consistency motive -- the wish to protect the self-concept against change or to maintain one's self-picture (Rosenberg, 1979). The self-esteem motive is also sometimes referred to as the self-enhancement motive (Gecas, 1982).

Motivation, as defined by Steers and Porter (1977), is a construct which is concerned with what energizes human behavior, what directs or channels behavior, and how this behavior is maintained. From the previous discussion, one notes the implicit relationship between identity and motivation. The functional aspects of identity allow for explanation of behavior. Functional aspects of identity, such as values, goals and potentiality, permit the establishment of personal goals that provide purpose and direction in one's life. Life is oriented toward specific

goals that include the fulfillment of one's potential. The potentiality aspect of identity encompasses identity's actual and possible goals. This continued striving illustrates directed, energized behavior.

Valence, centrality and salience are key aspects of identity (Hofman, 1983). Valence is also a key component of expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) in the motivation literature. As defined by Vroom, valence is the perceived value of the outcomes of performance. If the outcome is of value to the individual, and they have a high expectancy that their behavior will lead to the outcome, then one is motivated to perform the task. Similarly, if one's identity is valued, the individual is motivated to perform behaviors which will maintain that specific valued identity. One would not be motivated to perform a behavior unless the outcome of the behavior was of value. In this situation the outcome would be maintaining a valued identity.

Identity is a multi-dimensional construct. An individual can see him/herself as a parent, male/female, Catholic, and/or a stockbroker to list some examples. Motivation, or motivated behavior, is typically directed toward a specific goal, toward the maintenance of a specific identity (i.e., the self-consistency motive previously mentioned). Also, identity becomes a motivating construct when the general self-concept is transformed into a specific identity that is motivating. Thus, if one were studying

motivation for reemployment, a career identity would be more appropriate than a more global measure. Further, identity is a dynamic construct. It includes not only current representations that people hold of themselves, but also future strivings and potential identities (Markus & Nurius, 1986). According to Erikson (1968), identity "contains a complementarity of past and future both in the individual and society; it links the actuality of a living past with that of a promising future" (p.310). One can infer motivation from this sense of future and continuity.

Individuals are continually undergoing validation and invalidation of their self-concept. This validation process is central to the value dimension of identity (Breakwell, 1986). The value placed on an identity is based on prior interactions and is subject to constant revision. This constant self-evaluation is related to the self-esteem motive. This is self-esteem based on a sense of virtue or moral worth (Gecas, 1982). Self-esteem based on virtue (i.e., self-worth) is grounded in norms and values concerning personal and interpersonal conduct. It is during this continual evaluation, that an individual acknowledges any threats to an identity.

Recent work has begun to examine the motivational implications of self. This work focuses on content relevant research which implicates specific features of self definition (Deaux, 1992). Self-schema and self-discrepancy

research are examples of content relevant research. These concepts are grounded in the individual's experience. Until recently, research has tended to focus on process and ignore the context in which the self develops and is enacted. There is a call for research to begin examining the relationship between identity and motivation (i.e., identity motivated behavior) (Deaux, 1992). Further, theorists have also urged future researchers to go beyond self-esteem in hopes of better understanding the self-concept and its motives (Rosenberg, 1979).

In order to maintain an existing level of identity, individuals are motivated to perform at a level that is consistent with their self-perception. The field of work motivation, while vast, has neglected to study the relationship between identity and motivation. While aspects of identity are implicit in motivation theories, no research has explicitly examined the construct in regards to actual behavior even though identity theorists have noted the linkage.

Threatened identity. As mentioned, self-consistency is considered a source of motivation for the self-concept. Continuity over time is a main criterion of identity (Baumeister, 1986). Continuity entails being the same person today as yesterday or last year or tomorrow. One's sense of identity is strengthened by things that require one to be the same person across time. Therefore any experience

which can disrupt this continuity can potentially constitute a threat to an individual's identity. Any thought, feeling, action or experience which challenges the individual's personal or social identity is a threat. They can be manifested in many forms (see Breakwell, 1986 for a variety of case studies on threats). Job loss is such a disruption of continuity which can constitute a threat to one's identity.

A threat cannot be defined in terms of what it is, only in terms of what it does (Breakwell, 1983). The definition of a threat must be derived from its implications for identity. The justification for labeling something as a threat lies in the structure of the predicament it poses for one's identity. Any sort of social change may act as a threat to identity so long as it obstructs the principled operation of the process of identity. The challenge may be at either or both the level of content or evaluation of identity (Breakwell, 1983). In content terms, identity is comprised of the labels one would use to describe oneself. A perceived threat would attack the content of identity by challenging one's self-definition both by oneself and by others. For example, loss of employment would challenge one's definition as a stockbroker.

There is another type of threat which does not challenge the content of identity but is a parallel evaluative dimension which questions its value. Thus, a

negative connotation can be viewed as a fundamental threat to identity as long as the individual accepts the legitimacy of those connotations. To continue with the stockbroker example just mentioned, unemployment may connote a negative social stigma. Thus, unemployment in and of itself may pose a threat to one's identity. The potency of these two types of threats seems to rest upon the importance which people place upon being consistent and upon being able to maintain self-esteem (Breakwell, 1983). Importance can also be interpreted as salience or valence of the identity.

Threats demand changes to either the content or the value dimensions of identity which would be inconsistent with the continued integrity of identity. One therefore tries to maintain identity by acting in accordance with his/her 'historical true' self (Breakwell, 1983).

Not all changes are threatening, only those which challenge the principles underpinning the integrity of identity. Anything which prevents such consistency represents a real threat to identity (and perhaps even to one's sense of efficacy). Also, threat is related to the salience and valence placed upon an identity such that there is more perceived threat to an identity when the identity is frequent and of importance to the individual.

In summary, the self-concept is comprised of multiple components called identities. An identity is an interpretation, a definition, of the self. Individuals

possess multiple identities which are organized hierarchically according to the valence and salience of each identity. Identities are thought to possess motivational components, most notably aspects of self-esteem and self-consistency which indicate behavior motivated to enhance and maintain one's identity. Threats to identity can challenge these very components of motivation. The identity literature has not examined what may reduce the perceived threat to identity and thus maintain motivated behavior. One potential explanation may include self-efficacy.

Chapter 4

Self-Efficacy Theory: A Review

Self-efficacy as defined by Bandura (1977, 1982, 1986a, 1990) is the strength of one's conviction that he/she can successfully execute a behavior required to produce a certain outcome. Efficacy expectations influence the initiation, persistence and strength of behaviors (Bandura, 1977). Further, this is a reciprocal causation theory in which behavior, cognitions, and the environment all influence each other in a dynamic fashion. Research has shown self-efficacy to be an important motivational construct (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). In much of his work, Bandura discusses the role of self-referent thought in psychosocial functioning. He views motivation as governed by a self regulating mechanism which is an individual's belief in one's personal efficacy (Bandura, 1986b). Among the different aspects of self-knowledge, he views self-efficacy as probably the most influential self-regulating mechanism in people's everyday lives.

Perceived self-efficacy concerns people's beliefs about their capabilities to mobilize the motivating, cognitive resources and courses of action needed to exercise control over events. It is not enough to possess skills, but one must have the belief that one can use these skills well. Thus people with the same skills may perform differently depending on their self-efficacy beliefs. Individuals do

not always operate optimally because of this cognitive component (self-efficacy) which mediates the relationship between skills/knowledge and performance. Knowledge and skills are seen as necessary but not sufficient to accomplish behaviors. Bandura sees this as a dynamic construct since self-efficacy is a comprehensive summary or judgment of perceived capability for performing a specific task. This judgment comes from information gathered via others, the specific task and one's own beliefs. The efficacy judgments change as new information and experience are acquired.

Self-efficacy is seen as a cognitive source of motivation. Individuals avoid activities that they believe exceed their coping capabilities but they undertake and perform with confidence behaviors which they judge themselves capable of managing. Individuals who doubt their capabilities slacken their efforts or give up altogether, while those with greater efficacy exert greater effort to meet the challenge (Bandura & Schunk, 1981). Self-efficacy maintains that all behavioral and psychological change occurs through alteration of an individual sense of personal mastery or efficacy (Bandura, 1977, 1982, 1986a).

Although Bandura sees past performance as a key determinant of self-efficacy, he reports that self-efficacy is a better predictor of future performance than is past performance (Bandura, 1982). It influences people's

expectations about their ability to perform successfully in new situations (Jones, 1986). People with greater degrees of self-efficacy (independent of actual ability) will also tend to set or choose higher goals and remain more committed to these self-set goals (Locke, Motowildo & Bobko, 1984). Self-efficacy is also believed to predict performance in a variety of domains (e.g. physical endurance, academic performance) as long as the efficacy measure is tailored to the specific task being assessed (Barling & Beattie, 1983).

Dimensions of Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy has three dimensions: magnitude, strength, and generality (Bandura, 1977, 1986). Magnitude refers to the level of task difficulty that the individual believes he/she can attain ("can do" attitude). It can also be thought of conceptually as the number of behavioral "steps" a person believes him/herself capable of performing successfully. Strength is whether the conviction regarding magnitude is strong or weak (certainty). It is the resoluteness of an individual's conviction that he/she can perform successfully a behavior in question. Generality is the degree to which strong or weak expectations are generalized across situations. In other words, it is the degree to which one's perception of past success or failure in a given domain influences future efficacy expectations in related domains.

A work-related example may help to illustrate self-

efficacy dimensions. "Larry" is a trial lawyer. He has a firm belief in his capability to be an effective trial lawyer. This belief is manifested by his taking on more difficult cases over time (self-efficacy magnitude). Larry takes on these more difficult cases with a sense of certainty that he can win (self-efficacy strength). As Larry continues to win cases, his sense of efficacy carries over to the next case, even if the nature of the case is different than the previous one (self-efficacy generality) enhancing his sense of efficacy as a trial lawyer.

Sources of Efficacy Information

Bandura (1982) states that personal judgements of self-efficacy are based upon four principal sources of information: enactive mastery (past performance attainments); vicarious experiences (modeling/observing the performance of others); verbal persuasion (aimed at convincing a person of his/her capability of performing a task); and emotional (physiological) arousal.

Enactive mastery provides the most influential source of efficacy information because it is based on authentic mastery experiences. Feather (1966, 1968) suggests that prior success and failure influences subsequent performance of a task but this depends upon both the characteristics of the person and the particular situation. Prior success or failure results in changes in self-efficacy. Performance success strengthens self-efficacy beliefs of capability

while failure creates self-doubt. A resilient sense of self-efficacy comes about through perseverant effort and repeated successes. Failures that are overcome by determined effort can instill robust perceptions of self-efficacy through experience that one can eventually master even the most difficult obstacles (Bandura, 1986a).

Vicarious experience, the second most powerful source of efficacy information, is seeing or visualizing other similar individuals performing successfully. It can raise self-percepts of efficacy in observers that they too possess the capabilities to master comparable activities. They persuade themselves that if others can do it they should be able to also. Similarly, observing that others who are perceived to be similarly competent fail despite high effort, lowers an observer's judgement of his/her own capabilities (Bandura, 1986a).

Verbal influence is the third most powerful source of efficacy and is influenced by other factors such as expertness, trustworthiness and attractiveness of the feedback source (Maddux & Stanley, 1986). Verbal persuasion is widely used to try to talk people into believing they possess capabilities that will enable them to achieve what they seek. Persuasory efficacy attributions have their greatest impact on people who have some reason to believe that they can produce effects through their actions. However, if unrealistic beliefs of personal competence are

raised, this results in failures that will discredit the persuaders and will further undermine the recipient's perceived self-efficacy.

Feedback is assumed to influence intrinsic motivation through perceptions of efficacy, that is, expectancy concerning future performance (Bandura, 1977). Interpersonal evaluative feedback has been found to influence the recipient's reaction to a task (Jussim, Coleman & Nassau, 1989). It is theorized that positive feedback enhances performance (Bernardin & Beattie, 1984). People who are verbally persuaded, by others, that they possess the capabilities to master a given task are more likely to mobilize greater sustained effort than if they harbor self doubts (Bandura, 1986a). Those who have been persuaded of their inefficacy tend to avoid challenging activities and give up quickly in the face of difficulties.

The least powerful source of efficacy information is physiological arousal. People sometimes rely on information from their physiological state in judging their capabilities. They interpret somatic arousal in stressful or taxing situations as ominous signs of vulnerability to dysfunction, and this high arousal usually debilitates performance (Bandura, 1986a).

In keeping with his theory of self-referent thought, Bandura is not interested in the different types of feedback (as described above) per se, but the cognitive appraisal of

this feedback by the individual. "...people process, weigh and integrate diverse sources of information concerning their capability and they regulate their choice behavior and effort expenditure accordingly" (Bandura, 1977, p.212). The interest is in the type of cues that people use to determine personal efficacy. Thus, the issue is how people judge their capabilities and how this in turn affects their motivation and subsequent behavior. Actual ability is not a direct issue.

In forming efficacy beliefs, individuals have to weigh and integrate the different sources of efficacy information. Gist and Mitchell (1992) state that self-efficacy is "..a superordinate judgment of performance capability that is induced by the assimilation and integration of multiple performance determinants" (p. 188). However, there has been little research as to how people actually process this multidimensional efficacy information (Bandura, 1986a). Most of the research in this area has focused on verbal feedback and past performance as two distinct and separate sources of feedback (Goltz, 1990). It is believed that performance information (feedback) and a performance standard together, have a strong motivational impact, more so than either alone (Bandura & Cervone, 1983). Locke and Latham (1990), in an extensive review of the goal-setting and feedback literature, have found unequivocal support for this interactive effect.

Expectancies

Another integral element in self-efficacy theory is the concept or use of expectancies to determine behavior. Self-efficacy theory conceptualizes efficacy expectations as being a result of efficacy beliefs and leading to increased or decreased indices of effort. Bandura states that an individual holds two related expectancies: outcome expectancies and self-efficacy expectancies; they are the primary determinants of change in human behavior (Bandura, 1982). An outcome expectancy is the belief that a given behavior will or will not lead to a given outcome. It is seen as the probability that engaging in a particular behavior will lead to a certain outcome. A self-efficacy expectancy, in contrast, is the belief that an individual is or is not capable of performing the behavior. Efficacy and outcome judgements are differentiated because individuals can believe that a particular course of action will produce certain outcomes without believing that they can actually execute the necessary behaviors or vice versa (Bandura, 1986). Thus, individuals may cease their attempts to attain goals either because they believe themselves incapable of adequately performing the necessary behaviors (low self-efficacy expectancy) or because they believe that their performance, even if successful, will go unrewarded (low outcome expectancy).

Bandura goes on to state that the relationship between

expected outcomes and effort depends in part on one's perception of personal capabilities. Those with greater beliefs in their capabilities will exert greater effort to attain an expected outcome (Bandura & Cervone, 1983; Weinberg, Gould & Jackson, 1979; Wood & Bandura, 1989). Thus, expectations that high grades will gain students entry into college and hence higher paying jobs, will not steer high school students into college if they have serious doubts about their school ability.

According to Bandura, the self-efficacy expectancy is presumed to have the most powerful influence on both initiation of behavior and persistence in the face of frustration or failure. Judgments of efficacy will determine how much effort people expend and how long they will persist in the face of obstacles or aversive experiences. It is suggested that an individual who doubts his/her self-efficacy will not attempt a behavior, regardless of the outcome information. Similarly, those with high self-efficacy will believe that they are capable of performing the behavior and attaining the desired outcome and therefore persevere in their efforts even after unsuccessful performance attainment. Thus, self-efficacy expectations should be the best predictor of persistence. The stronger the perceived self-efficacy expectations, the more vigorous and persistent the individual is in his/her efforts (Bandura, 1986).

Self-efficacy: Defining the Construct

Gist and Mitchell (1992) note the importance of conceptually differentiating between self-efficacy and similar constructs in order to further theoretical development of self-efficacy. Therefore, it is important here to distinguish self-efficacy from other psychological constructs with which it has been compared, most notably expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), and self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1979).

Expectancy theory. Expectancy as defined by self-efficacy theory and expectancy as defined by Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory are different constructs. Several conceptual and measurement distinctions between self-efficacy and expectancy theory concepts have been discussed previously (Bandura, 1984; Bandura, 1986; Gist, 1987). In general, previous work states that self-efficacy may represent a more comprehensive formulation of the rationale underlying the expectancy theory construct. Self-efficacy generally encompasses a broader range of predictors of a performance level for a specific task (Locke et al, 1984), whereas expectancy focuses on a narrower behavioral predictor of overall performance on a job. Though both constructs involve forethought, self-efficacy is viewed as having generative capability -- it prompts actual behavior (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Self-efficacy influences thought patterns, emotional reactions and the orchestration of

performance through adroit use of subskills, ingenuity, resourcefulness, and so forth.

Expectancy theory asserts that performance is a multiplicative function of expectancy (belief that effort will lead to performance), instrumentality (belief that performance will lead to rewards), and valence (the perceived value of the outcomes of performance). Self-efficacy, according to Bandura (1986), is a concept which is similar to but broader in meaning than expectancy as defined by Vroom. Self-efficacy includes an estimate of the degree to which effort will pay off; an estimate of one's ability, adaptability, creativity and the capacity to perform in the specific situational context (Locke & Latham, 1990). Self-efficacy measures often distinguish between magnitude and strength whereas effort-performance measures typically do not. Although it can be argued that expectancy ratings as measured in expectancy theory are most similar to the strength component of self-efficacy, it does not encompass all that the self-efficacy measure does.

A key component of self-efficacy theory is efficacy expectancy (the belief of being able to perform a behavior) which is not incorporated in the Vroom model. Confounding between self-efficacy expectancies and outcome expectancies is possible but clear operationalization of the self-efficacy expectancy should reflect the theoretical differentiation between the constructs (Maddux, Norton, &

Stoltenberg, 1986). Thus the self-efficacy expectancy should be specific to the construct of belief in ability to perform and not specific to the construct of belief in receiving the outcome of performing those behaviors. Independent manipulations of these constructs were found to support this notion in a laboratory study examining subjects' ability to learn the broken-record technique used in assertiveness training (Maddux, et al., 1986).

Self-esteem. A distinction also needs to be made between self-efficacy and self-esteem. Self-esteem is usually considered to be a trait reflecting an individual's affective evaluation of the self (as in feelings of self-worth). Self-efficacy differs from self esteem in that self-efficacy is not a global personality trait but is contingent on the situation, task and previous experience of the individual. Also, self-efficacy is not inherently evaluative. For example, a nuclear physicist may have very low self-efficacy pertaining to dancing, yet may decide that this is satisfactory and it does not diminish his/her overall evaluation about him/herself. In contrast, self-esteem pertains to evaluations of self worth which Bandura (1986) states are based on cultural values, while self-efficacy is concerned with judgements of one's capabilities. Further, self-efficacy is considered the behavioral aspect of the self, while self-esteem is considered the emotional aspect of the self (Hines, Durham, & Geoghegan, 1991).

Brockner (1988), in a thorough examination of the distinctions between self-efficacy and self-esteem, stated that self-esteem typically refers to a global construct that taps individual's self-evaluations and not merely their confidence judgments across a wide variety of situations. He also noted conceptual differences between global and task-specific self-esteem and noted the conceptual similarity between task-specific self-esteem and self-efficacy. Task-specific self-esteem includes the individual's perception of his/her ability, aptitude, estimated performance and capability (Cohen & Lefkowitz, 1977). Self-efficacy, as previously stated, is the individual's belief in his/her capability to perform. The constructs are measured differently. Measures of task-specific self-esteem tap ability, aptitude, performance and capability (which is conceptually different than belief in capability to perform). Scale measures for self-efficacy include measures of magnitude and strength. It is argued here that magnitude and strength are conceptually different from scale measures of task-specific self-esteem.

Implications of Efficacy Beliefs on Levels of Motivation

The self-efficacy expectancy is presumed to have the most powerful influence on both initiation of behavior and persistence in the face of frustration or failure. People with high self-efficacy persist in the face of difficulty because they are convinced they can succeed (Locke & Latham,

1990). Individual efficacy beliefs will determine how much effort people expend. If an individual's efficacy level is high so that he/she believes in his/her capability to successfully accomplish a particular behavior/task, then one should see motivated behavior toward that task. If however, an individual's efficacy belief is low such that the individual has little faith in his/her capability concerning the behavior, then one should see a lower level of effort and motivation concerning that particular task.

People with firm beliefs in their efficacy through ingenuity and perseverance figure out ways of exercising some measure of control in their environment in order to achieve success. If they see circumstances as controllable, they will exhibit resiliency. If people approach a situation as uncontrollable, they are likely to exercise their efficacy weakly and thus find failure (Wood & Bandura, 1989). People will experience anxiety when they perceive themselves ill-equipped to manage potentially aversive situations (Bandura, 1986b). They become saddened and depressed by perceived inefficacy to control highly valued outcomes. Perceived self-efficacy is one factor that will determine whether failures are motivating or depressing. Self-efficacy differs from perceived control because self-efficacy deals with the beliefs about actual capacity to perform a task which is much more specific and concrete than perceived control over the task.

Distorted understandings of the consequences of action have potential to undermine efficacy by producing decreasing attempts to exert control over the situation. For example, if "Alan" possesses inefficacious beliefs about his work performance, then he might feel that no matter how much he searches for a job, it will not matter because he will not do any better than what his beliefs indicate. Thus, if "Alan" feels that he will not get a job, he may put off looking for a job (decrease in motivation) since he believes he will have no control over the outcome anyway. Therefore, distorted understandings of the consequences of action have potential to undermine efficacy and efficacy-based esteem by producing decreasing attempts to exert control over the situation. Those who believe they cannot manage potential difficulties experience high levels of stress. They dwell on deficiencies and view many aspects of the environment as threatening. Disbelief in one's capabilities to attain valued goals that affect one's sense of self worth creates depression. Through inefficacious thought, people depress themselves and thus impair their level of functioning. If people's self-beliefs are firmly established they remain resilient to adversity. However, individuals with weakly held self-beliefs are highly vulnerable to change, and negative experiences readily reinstate their disbelief in their capabilities.

In summary, self-efficacy is the belief in one's

capability to perform a task -- to mobilize the motivating, cognitive resources and courses of action needed to exercise control over events. Efficacy expectations influence the persistence and strength of behaviors. Individuals avoid activities they believe exceed their coping capabilities but undertake and perform with confidence behaviors which they judge themselves capable of managing. People with high self-efficacy persist in the face of difficulty because they are convinced they can succeed.

The next chapter will elaborate upon our understanding of both identity and self-efficacy theories by describing the relationship between self-efficacy and identity, and outlining potential application of both self-efficacy and identity theories in the industrial psychology and organizational behavior fields.

Part III

Chapter 5

Applications of Self-Efficacy and Identity Theories

Self-efficacy has been mentioned as a potential motive of the self-concept (Gecas, 1982; Erez & Earley, 1993), and a possible facet of identity structure generated by the process of self-evaluation (Breakwell, 1992). People are normally self aware, monitoring the status of identity (Breakwell, 1986). Self-evaluation, or self-regulation, is a key construct in Bandura's notion of personal agency (Bandura, 1986). Without the subjective belief that it is possible to act in certain ways, action is unlikely to occur. Self-efficacy acting as an antecedent to motivated behavior is well documented in the literature (Bandura, 1986). Further, some theorists have previously argued that a global dimension of self-efficacy operates as a general facet of self-concept (Breakwell, 1986, 1992). "The perception of self-efficacy can well be construed as central to the person's self-concept." (Ross, 1992; p. 107).

The constructs of identity and self-efficacy, as presented in this review, allude to their potential as possible explanations of behavior. Although the discussion thus far has been mainly theoretical, one notes the potential of self-efficacy and identity theories as applied theories. Organizational behavior and vocational behavior are areas of potential application. Issues such as work

motivation, job satisfaction, and employee and organizational performance and productivity can be theoretically linked to self-efficacy and identity. Also, previous theoretical writing has addressed the possible role of self-efficacy and identity in vocational behavior, most notably in career development. However, little work has been done beyond career development in actually applying these theories to societal issues such as job loss. The following sections examine the application of self-efficacy and identity theories to organizational and vocational behavior. It concludes with implications for job loss and motivation for reemployment.

Organizational Behavior

Self-efficacy theory. Self-efficacy as a theory of motivation has potential theoretical and practical implications for organizational behavior and human resource management. Issues such as work motivation, employee performance and productivity, and absenteeism can be theoretically and empirically linked to self-efficacy. Also, there are implications for task effort, persistence, expressed interest in the task and the level of goal difficulty selected for performance. Considering the implications for self-efficacy in the organizational behavior field, especially in the area of motivation, the lack of empirical validation is surprising.

Gist (1987), in a theoretical review, linked self-

efficacy to motivation via goal setting, feedback, intrinsic interest and reinforcement, expectancy theory, pygmalion effect, internal locus of control, and behavior modification. She found implications for organizational behavior in regards to selection, leadership, training and vocational counseling, performance appraisals and organizational performance.

Both Bandura (1986a) and Gist (1987) review an abundant literature, mostly from laboratory and clinical settings (e.g., smoking cessation, weight loss, mathematical performance). However, there are only a handful of articles in the literature which relate self-efficacy to organizational behavior. Unfortunately, most are theoretical with little empirical validation of the construct (Locke, Motowildo, & Bobko, 1986; Locke & Latham, 1990). Self-efficacy theory is a very recent addition to the organizational research agenda (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Empirical work in this area has yielded consistent findings, most notably the relationship between self-efficacy and work-related performance (Barling & Beattie, 1983; Campbell & Hackett, 1986; Lent & Hackett, 1987; Stumpf, Brief & Hartman, 1987; Wood & Locke, 1987). In a seminal work in this area, Locke, Frederick, Lee and Bobko (1984) examined self-efficacy in relation to goal setting. They found that ability, past performance, and self-efficacy were the major predictors of goal choice. However, the research was

conducted in a laboratory environment, which makes results difficult to generalize.

Bandura (1990) himself has stated the value of self-efficacy in an organizational context (especially with regard to work motivation). In a related article he discusses the relevance of self-efficacy in an organizational environment through "....the development of people's cognitive, social, and behavioral competencies through mastery modeling, the cultivation of people's beliefs in their capabilities so that they will use their talents effectively and the enhancement of people's motivation through goal systems" (Wood & Bandura, 1989, p.362).

In summary, self-efficacy as a theory of motivation has obvious theoretical and practical implications for the field of organizational behavior. Self-efficacy has been applied and studied successfully in a number of laboratory and clinical settings (Bandura, 1986). Its recent entry into the organizational behavior research arena is a welcome addition.

Similarly, the construct of identity in the field of organizational behavior is a relatively new and neglected construct which merits further consideration.

Organizational identity. Identity, in organizational behavior, has been studied as organizational identification.

> Organizational identification has long been recognized as a critical construct in the literature on organizational behavior, affecting both the satisfaction of the individual and the effectiveness of the organization. (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, p.20).

However, poor construct definition has often confused organizational identity with related constructs such as organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors (Mael & Ashforth, 1992).

Ashforth and Mael (1989) proposed a reconceptualization of organizational identity based on social identity theory (SIT). According to social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1985), people tend to classify themselves and others into various social categories such as gender, age, religious affiliation, and organizational membership. Social identification enables the individual to locate him or herself in the social environment; it is the perception of oneness with or belongingness to an organization where the individual defines him/herself in terms of the organization in which he or she is a member (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). In order to identify with a group, an individual need only perceive him/herself as psychologically intertwined with the fate of the group. Also, social/group identification is seen as personally experiencing the successes and failures of the group. Ashforth and Mael

(1989) argue that organizational identity is a specific form of social identification in that it may provide one answer to the question, "Who am I?"

Ashforth and Mael (1989) were able to distinguish organizational identity from other related constructs by outlining the critical antecedents and consequences of organizational identity. The authors list a number of antecedents which lead to social identification in organizations, including the distinctiveness of the group's values and practices in relation to those of comparable groups. A second and related factor that increases identification is the prestige of the group, because individuals often cognitively identify themselves with a winner (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Consequences of identification include enhanced support and commitment, and increased loyalty to and pride in the group and its activities. The consequences will also reinforce the very antecedents of identification including distinctiveness of group values, group prestige, salience of and competition with out-groups.

Mael went on to empirically test his SIT-based definition of organizational identity. He found that college alumni's identification with the alma mater was associated with organizational distinctiveness and prestige; satisfaction with the organization; and financial contributions (Mael & Ashforth, 1992). He also found

organizational identity to be conceptually distinct from organizational commitment (Mael & Tetrick, 1992).

Although a valuable contribution to the literature on organizational identity, and the first work applying Tajfel and Turner's social identity theory to the organizational behavior field, Mael's work focused on identity solely as a social identity construct. He did not examine the personal aspect of social identity. Further, the motivational aspects of identity, which link it to behavior, were neglected in this research.

To briefly summarize, although the basic theoretical constructs of both self-efficacy and identity theories lend themselves to OB application, there is actually a relative lack of theoretical and empirical research in the organizational behavior field. This is especially evident in the area of work motivation and job loss. As dynamic constructs, both theories have much to offer to the industrial psychology and organizational behavior fields. The following sections highlight the relationship of self-efficacy and identity theories to vocational behavior and the potential contribution of these two theories to the study of job loss.

Vocational Behavior

Self-efficacy in career development. In recent years there has been a growing interest in the application of self-efficacy to theories of career choice and development

(Betz & Hackett, 1981, 1986; Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987; Arnold & Bye, 1989). Hackett and Betz (1981) have suggested that self-efficacy beliefs serve as an important cognitive influence on career decisions and achievements, helping to determine people's range of perceived career options and their success and persistence in those chosen options.

A review of the literature on vocational behavior shows an emphasis on the "content" of career choice (what the individual considers or chooses) rather than the "process" of career choice (how decisions are made) (Betz & Hackett, 1986). Self-efficacy theory may be beneficial in exploring the "process" dimension of career choice. Career-related behaviors can be studied as a process of becoming motivated to perform through developing self-efficacy expectations and subsequent coping behaviors (i.e. job search behaviors). Self-efficacy as a cognitive theory of motivation is a beneficial tool in understanding this "process" of career choice.

It has been stated that self-efficacy theory has potential utility as a framework for understanding, assessing and treating some of the antecedents to vocational indecision (Taylor & Betz, 1983). The term "career self-efficacy" is used as a generic label encompassing judgments of personal efficacy in relation to the wide range of behavior involved in career choice and adjustment (Betz & Hackett, 1986). However, self-efficacy is a domain or task-

specific construct, and researchers tend to study different aspects or subcomponents of career self-efficacy such as interviewing self-efficacy (Stumpf, Brief & Hartman, 1987) and job search self-efficacy (Kanfer & Hulin, 1985; Vinokur & Price, 1994).

Hackett and Betz (1981), in a review on self-efficacy and career development, proposed that career self-efficacy expectations, referring to beliefs about personal capabilities to perform vocationally relevant behaviors, might influence the educational and career decision, achievements, and adjustments of men and women. For example, self-efficacy has been found to be predictive of such career relevant behaviors as perceived career options (Betz & Hackett, 1981, 1983; Lent, Brown & Larkin, 1986), career indecision (Taylor & Betz, 1983), and academic grades and persistence (Lent, Brown & Larkin, 1984, 1986, 1987).

The literature on self-efficacy and careers possesses an abundance of work focusing on college students and their career choices at entry level and little work relating self-efficacy to career issues beyond college or exploring causal connections between self-efficacy and career behaviors. Almost no work has been done examining self-efficacy in relation to job loss. Of the self-efficacy research which has been done, task-specific job-seeking self-efficacy was examined (Kanfer & Hulin, 1985; Caplan et al., 1989). Kanfer and Hulin's (1985) field study examined attitudinal

(job satisfaction, perceived fairness, perceived reemployment difficulty) and behavioral (job-seeking behavior) variables associated with reemployment following job loss. Results found that reemployed individuals were significantly more confident of job search skills (e.g., fill out applications, investigate job leads) and had engaged in a greater number of search behaviors than individuals who remained unemployed. Confidence was assessed by examining self-efficacy expectations for specific job search skills.

Similarly, Caplan, et al., (1989) in their experimental intervention provided training in job-seeking behavior. Results suggest that individuals in the experimental training had higher perceived self-efficacy in their job-seeking ability than those in the control group. Job-seeking self-efficacy can be defined as how good one feels one is performing behaviors required for getting a job; for example, how well one thinks one can put together a resume. The motivational implication in this example is specific to resume writing and other related job-seeking tasks. It does not address the motivational implication of career or work self-efficacy (i.e., how capable one feels about performing a job) which is the focus of the present study.

Career identity. London (1983), in his seminal work on career motivation, noted that individual dimensions of career motivation included career identity, career insight

and career resilience (which includes the subdomain of self-efficacy). Career identity, according to London, reflects the direction of career motivation. It is how central one's career is to one's identity. It consists of two subdomains: work involvement and desire for upward mobility. He hypothesized that individuals high in career identity are likely to find career satisfaction to be more important than satisfaction from other areas of life. A recent study by Noe, Noe, and Bachhuber (1990) found that the importance that individuals placed on work and career, was significantly related to all aspects of career motivation.

Little work, except for Noe et al., has been conducted to empirically test this theory of career motivation, and to examine career identity. Some work, most notably that of Levinson (1978), Super (1952) and Schein (1978), empirically examined the development of career identity, but methodological issues (e.g., case studies, heterogenous male samples) make generalizability of results dubious. Empirical research has not examined the consequences of an established career/work identity, especially in relation to behavior and motivation. In addition, no research has investigated the consequences of job loss on career identity.

To recap, both self-efficacy and identity theories have potential application to the study of vocational behavior. Self-efficacy has been found to be predictive of career-

relevant behaviors however this research has only focused on college students embarking on their career path (Betz & Hackett, 1983). Research has not examined self-efficacy and career issues beyond college. Self-efficacy related to job loss has thus far been narrowly studied only as job-seeking self-efficacy (i.e., how capable one is of finding a job) and not career self-efficacy (i.e., how capable one is of performing career-related behaviors). Similarly, the theoretical work which has outlined the potential of career identity as an explanation of career motivation has largely been ignored empirically.

Implications for Job Loss

As one can see, there are obvious applications of identity and self-efficacy theories to vocational behavior and consequently to the area of job loss. An area for potential investigation is the established career identity. How does one react to a loss of an established identity, most notably a career identity threatened by a job loss? How can self-efficacy and identity theories be used to help understand individual reactions to job loss, specifically the motivation implications of job loss and job search? The present research attempts to answer these questions.

Identity theory in social psychology predicts that the work roles we perform affect our perceptions of ourselves and our relations with others (West, Nicholson, & Arnold, 1987). Work is a central and defining aspect of life and it

is through work that identity is often defined. It is what gives individuals meaning and purpose to their lives (Swinburne, 1981); their work is who they are. For some individuals, work ranks high among their central life interests (Dubin & Champoux, 1977), and there is a sense of illegitimacy when one is without a job. Being out of work can make some feel like a "nonperson" (Houston, 1992). It has been suggested that white collar workers may suffer in more psychological ways, during job loss, because work is more central to their self-definition and social status (Kozlowski, Chao, Smith, & Hedlund, 1993). Their career is seen as a central life interest. Because of the centrality of work, going through a permanent layoff, closure or termination may bring about a personal crisis undermining an individual's ability to seek a new job or career.

According to social role theory, work in Western society, (particularly for men, but increasingly for women) serves as an anchor for role identity, rewards, and personal identity (Brenner & Bartell, 1983). Job loss is a role disruption. It is the loss of continuity -- a potential threat to one's identity. Research shows that individuals still characterize themselves by their occupations even after being unemployed for a while (Joelson & Wahlquist, 1987). This is perhaps to maintain a sense of continuity of one's identity.

Jahoda (1977, 1981, 1982) has suggested that work is a

person's strongest link with reality. Work not only defines what we do, but our jobs also define who we are and our place in society. Work has psychological advantages and paid employment has both manifest and latent benefits. Manifest benefits are the monetary rewards for work. Latent benefits are not as tangible but the loss of benefits becomes evident when work is no longer available. A job normally defines a person's status, establishes a network of social interaction, provides an area where competence can be shown and praised, and determines a time table for the day giving it structure and meaning (Breakwell, 1986). Deprivations of these latent benefits is said to account for the debilitating effects of unemployment.

Unemployment can also mean loss of important identity forming factors (Joelson & Wahlquist, 1987). Work serves as proof of one's competence and knowledge. It is a time structuring factor as well as a relationship structuring factor. While some may view job loss as a problem in middle career stages the relationship of job loss to an individual's career identity can occur at any time as long as an identity has been established (Feldman, 1988).

Unemployment can be seen as a threat to one's social category membership as well (Breakwell, 1986). The threat is generated by a movement into a social category which is socially stigmatized. Threats have an impact upon one's identity by challenging continuity, distinctiveness or self-

esteem and are the products of social influence processes set into motion by the changing pattern of intergroup relations. Unemployment and employment are not dichotomous but can be seen as different ends of the same continuum with different defining characteristics. The negative consequences of unemployment include not only the withdrawal of the positive benefits of employment, but the negative social experience of unemployment itself. To become unemployed is to become assigned to a different social category. Some may consider it a social stigma. (A stigma, according to Goffman (1963), is an attribute that is deeply discrediting. A review of the stigma literature is beyond the scope of this discussion. Please see Goffman (1963) for a review.) This social stigma may be even greater for a professional in middle-management. Previously society dictated that an individual in such a position, almost by definition of the position, should not be unemployed. The economy has made this no longer viable and some individuals may experience difficulty with this new category membership of unemployment.

Not all unemployment can be considered threatening to one's identity. A plant closing, for example, should pose less of a threat to an individual because it is a whole group undergoing this transition. It is not as isolating or socially demeaning and should not result in a personal affront on one's self-esteem. Breakwell (1992), in a study

of British teenagers, found that unemployment is associated with lower general efficacy. However, she also noted that geography may play a role in this. In a high unemployment area, failure to get a job may not carry the same level of social stigma as in an area where jobs are more plentiful.

Assessments of the value of work moderate the psychological impact of unemployment. The more the individual is personally committed to gaining work, and the more central its importance in his/her life, the greater the distress during unemployment (Stafford, Jackson & Banks, 1980). The depreciation of the unemployed by society may in itself be a serious blow to one's self-esteem and identity and may be perceived as a threat.

Chapter 6:

The Present Study: Summary and Research Questions

The present study was designed to address some of the deficiencies in the job loss literature and contribute to furthering our knowledge of the job loss phenomenon, especially motivation for reemployment, by pursuing several new directions in job loss research.

To reiterate, a relatively large body of job loss research exists. Previous research has tended to be descriptive, outlining the effect of unemployment on society and individuals. Much work has been done in the job loss arena especially with regard to stage models of job loss, the role of stress, the role of demographics, and the negative consequences of job loss on mental and physical well-being. Despite this large body of research, the field of psychology has been criticized for its poor attempt at understanding the impact of job loss (Hartley & Fryer, 1984). A request has been made for job loss research to move beyond the descriptive and begin to treat the unemployed as active coping agents rather than passive subjects (Feather, 1990). More theory-driven research is needed to accomplish this goal.

Identity theory and self-efficacy theory create an appropriate framework from which to study reactions to job loss, specifically motivation for reemployment. As mentioned previously, identities are socially recognizable

categories to which individuals attach themselves and with which they define themselves (Shamir, 1990). Identities are organized in the self-concept according to a hierarchy of salience. Identity salience is a powerful influence upon behavior. The higher the salience of an identity within the self-concept the greater its motivational significance (Stryker, 1980). The hierarchical structure of the self indicates the salience of each identity and provides explanation for behavioral choices. Behaviors which maintain one's identity serve as a motivating force for action. The relationship between identity and behavior is reflexive. Identity motivates action which in turn reaffirms the individual's identity (West, Nicholson & Arnold, 1987).

Identity becomes motivational in nature when some threat to that identity exists. The individual becomes motivated to maintain the identity and identity becomes actionable. Motivation for reemployment can be assessed through job seeking behavior. The severity of the threat to one's identity determines the intensity of the motivating behavior. One who loses his/her job to a plant closing where job loss is due to economic factors, should not feel as greatly threatened as one who is fired for poor performance.

Self-efficacy influences the intensity of perceived threat. Those with high self-efficacy will be more likely

to view the job loss as an opportunity to demonstrate skill rather than a threat. People with strong feelings of self-efficacy are thought to be more active and persistent in their efforts to handle threatening situations (Moos & Billings, 1982). In this case, individuals with a strong sense of career self-efficacy should be more active and persistent in seeking reemployment than someone with low career self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy has been theoretically linked to identity because it is seen as a potential motive of the self-concept (Gecas, 1982). Some theorists have even argued that a global dimension of self-efficacy operates as a general facet of the self-concept such that self-efficacy can be considered central to an individual's self-concept (Breakwell, 1986, 1992; Ross, 1992).

Although self-efficacy may be a component of identity, threats to either construct may act independent of one another. One can have a threatened identity without any threat to one's sense of efficacy for the task. For example, a recently laidoff stockbroker may experience a threat to his/her stockbroker identity because he/she is no longer working actively in the position. However, the sense of efficacy may not necessarily differ (i.e., is threatened) because the job was lost due to a corporate downsizing and not reflective of the individual's capability. Hence, the sense of efficacy for the job may remain unchanged, however

the identity has been threatened.

One's sense of capabilities for a task may be an indicator of his/her identity. However, one's level of efficacy for a role may contribute to one's identity only to the extent to which the efficacious behavior is valued or salient to the individual identity.

For example, one has a high degree of efficacy in regards to being a stockbroker. One may also identify oneself as a stockbroker. However, one may be efficacious yet not possess that self definition if he/she places little value on the identity. In addition, one may have high efficacy in terms of bowling behavior, but in the identity hierarchy being a bowler is of little value/importance to him/her and hence is not part of his/her identity makeup.

One could argue that financial reasons are what prompt individuals to seek reemployment and not the loss of identity. However, financial loss is related to identity by way of status. For example, an executive possesses the identity of an executive not only because of the tasks and behaviors he/she performs but also because of the financial status it assigns. Thus, the executive's identity is wrapped up in the trappings given him/her by salary and financial status. Further, financial status may also be tied to an individual's identity as the "family provider." With financial loss, the provider identity is threatened.

To conclude, given our knowledge of the job loss

phenomenon, research questions still exist. Self-efficacy and identity theories are offered as a theoretical framework to address these research questions. Self-efficacy and identity, as dynamic constructs, provide the research direction needed in an area where theory-driven research has been lacking (Feather, 1993), subjects have typically been treated as passive, and individual differences typically ignored (Hartley, 1980).

Given the call for further research in job loss, and what we know regarding self-efficacy, identity, and motivated behavior, the following hypotheses are proposed.

Hypothesis 1: Career self-efficacy and career identity are positively related such that those with a strong sense of efficacy will also have a strong sense of identity for that specific domain.

Hypothesis 2: The relationship between self-efficacy and identity is moderated by the valence and/or salience placed upon the identity. Individuals with a strong career self-efficacy will possess a strong career identity only if that identity is salient and/or of value to the individual.

Hypothesis 3: Career self-efficacy is positively related to motivated behavior such that one with strong career self-efficacy demonstrates more motivated job-

seeking behavior than an individual with a weak career self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 4: Career identity is positively related to motivated behavior such that one with strong career identity demonstrates more motivated job-seeking behavior than an individual with weak career identity.

Hypothesis 5: Career self-efficacy and career identity will be related to motivated job-seeking behaviors incrementally greater than career self-efficacy or career identity alone.

Hypothesis 6: Loss of work is a threat to one's identity. This threat is motivating such that one with a strong sense of career identity is more motivated to seek reemployment, when a threat occurs, than one with a weak career identity.

Hypothesis 7: The relationship between threat and motivation is moderated by the valence placed upon the identity. That is, the threat to career identity becomes motivating to individuals only if they value their career identity.

Part IV

Chapter 7

Method

Participants

Two-hundred fifty unemployed individuals participated in this study. All participation was voluntary and anonymity was guaranteed. Participants were solicited through outplacement firms.

Table 1 contains demographic information. Participant age ranged from 23 years to 61 years. Twenty-seven percent were between 45 and 50 years of age. Seventy-two percent were male, 91% Caucasian. Seventy-five percent were married; and 75% had dependent children. Twenty-five percent had college degrees, 45% had graduate school experience.

For almost all participants, this was their first experience with job loss. Sixty-three percent attributed their unemployment to a corporate-wide downsizing; less than one percent stated they were let go due to poor performance. Length of unemployment ranged from less than a week to sixty-eight weeks, with approximately 37% of those responding stating more than eight weeks. Approximately 50% had been in outplacement eight weeks or more. Approximately 17% of the participants were engineers, 13% programmers, 10% managers, and 9% vice presidents. Tenure

ranged from less than sixth months to 33 years. Eighteen percent had been with their previous employer between 25 and 30 years.

Table 1

Demographic Information of Study Participants

N=250

Sex		
Male	72%	(176)
Female	28%	(68)
Age		
Less than 25 years old	<1%	(3)
25 years old, less than 30 years old	4%	(10)
30 years old, less than 35 years old	6%	(14)
35 years old, less than 40 years old	12%	(27)
40 years old, less than 45 years old	19%	(45)
45 years old, less than 50 years old	26%	(64)
50 years old, less than 55 years old	23%	(54)
55 years old, less than 60 years old	9%	(22)
60 years or older	<1%	(1)
Race		
White	91%	(222)
African-American	4%	(10)
Hispanic	3%	(8)
Asian	1%	(3)
Other	<1%	(1)
Education		
High School Graduate	5%	(13)
Some College	12%	(30)
Technical school or Two-Year College	12%	(30)
College Graduate	25%	(62)
Some graduate study	14%	(35)
Master's Degree	25%	(61)
Professional Degree (J.D., Ph.D.)	6%	(15)
Marital Status		
Married	74%	(183)
Single	14%	(35)
Divorced	7%	(18)
Separated	2%	(4)
Co-habitating	2%	(5)
Children		
Yes	75%	(181)
No	25%	(61)

Table 1 (Cont'd)

Demographic Information of Study Participants

Tenure in Last Job		
Less than 5 years	21%	(50)
5 years, less than 10 years	18%	(45)
10 years, less than 15 years	14%	(35)
15 years, less than 20 years	15%	(37)
20 years, less than 25 years	10%	(26)
25 years, less than 30 years	17%	(43)
30 years, less than 35 years	3%	(7)
Weeks Unemployed		
Less than 4 weeks	23%	(54)
Between 4 and 8 weeks	40%	(92)
Between 9 and 12 weeks	19%	(46)
Between 13 and 16 weeks	6%	(12)
Between 17 and 20 weeks	3%	(7)
Between 21 and 24 weeks	1%	(3)
Between 25 and 28 weeks	2%	(4)
Between 29 and 32 weeks	1%	(3)
Between 33 and 36 weeks	1%	(2)
Between 37 and 40 weeks	1%	(3)
Between 41 and 48 weeks	<1%	(1)
Between 49 and 68 weeks	3%	(6)
Weeks in Outplacement		
Less than 4 weeks	25%	(51)
Between 4 and 8 weeks	36%	(74)
Between 9 and 12 weeks	21%	(43)
Between 13 and 16 weeks	5%	(11)
Between 17 and 20 weeks	4%	(8)
Between 21 and 24 weeks	1%	(2)
Between 25 and 28 weeks	3%	(5)
Between 29 and 32 weeks	1%	(2)
Between 33 and 36 weeks	1%	(2)
Between 37 and 40 weeks	<1%	(1)
Between 41 and 48 weeks	1%	(2)
Between 49 and 68 weeks	1%	(3)

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to test individual questionnaire items for clarity, usability, and psychometric rigor, and to statistically eliminate poor items in order to shorten the questionnaire. Although longer scales prove to be more statistically reliable, questionnaire length can be intimidating and reduce potential sample size.

Pilot study participants were unemployed individuals from the New York City area solicited from community job loss support groups (21 participants) and a New York State unemployment office in downtown Manhattan (12 participants)[1]. Approximately 33 individuals completed prototype scales. All participation was voluntary and anonymity was guaranteed. Participants from the New York State unemployment office were monetarily compensated for their involvement. After many futile attempts to solicit participation, the incentive was used in order to increase potential participation in the pilot study.

At the end of support group sessions, the researcher introduced herself to the group, briefly described the purpose of the research (to understand individuals' reaction to job loss) and asked for volunteers. At the unemployment office, the researcher approached potential participants individually as they exited the unemployment office. After

---

[1] No differences between the two groups were found on any variable.

a brief introduction and description of the study, individuals were asked to participate in exchange for a monetary reward for their time. Survey length was 133 items and completion time for both groups ranged from 20 to 45 minutes.

Data collected were statistically analyzed and resulted in shortened, internally consistent scales for the subsequent study. Feedback from pilot study participants and content analysis of items by four external reviewers also contributed to constructing the final scales.

Measures

Independent Variables

Independent variables under investigation included career self-efficacy, general self-efficacy, and career identity. Each measure is described in detail including scale development and internal consistency measures resulting from the pilot study. Items are listed in Appendix A (these items are also in Section A of Appendix B).

Career self-efficacy. A five-item scale, was adapted from Jones (1986) who examined the self-efficacy of future role requirements (i.e., new job). Jones self-efficacy measure examines people's expectations that they can successfully execute the behavior required to produce an outcome, in this case, mastery of role requirements. This scale was slightly modified to reflect an individual's

current state of efficacy; only five of the eight original items were used. Items were rated on a five-point scale with 1= Strongly agree and 5= Strongly disagree. Items include, "My old job was well within the scope of my abilities," "I feel confident that my skills and abilities equal or exceed those of my future colleagues." An internal consistency of .85 was obtained in the pilot study.

General self-efficacy. Self-efficacy has been primarily conceptualized as a situation-specific belief. However, there is evidence that the experiences of personal mastery contributing to efficacy expectancies generalize to actions other than the target behavior (Sherer, Maddux, Mercandante, Prentice-Dunn, Jacobs, & Rogers, 1982). Thus, to assess this generalized sense of efficacy, a seventeen item measure of general self-efficacy (Sherer, et al., 1982) was pilot tested. The self-efficacy scale measures generalized self-efficacy expectations dependent on past experiences and on tendencies to attribute success to skill as opposed to chance (Sherer, et al., 1982). Construct and criterion validation has been demonstrated for this scale (Sherer, et al., 1982). Items were rated on a five-point scale with 1= Strongly agree and 5= Strongly disagree, and were reversed scored. Items include, "I avoid facing difficulties.," and "When unexpected problems occur, I don't handle them well."

One purpose of the pilot was to statistically address

questionnaire length by empirically eliminating items. Internal consistency for the seventeen item general self-efficacy scale was .93, higher than what has been reported in the literature (.86). The seventeen item scale was reduced to a five-item scale with a Cronbach alpha of .92.

Career identity. In the pilot study, the career identity variable was measured by eighteen-items from three different sources: Hines, Durham and Geoghegan (1991), Noe, Noe and Bachhuber (1990), and the author. Hines et al. (1991) developed the commitment to work subscale of the Work Self-Concept Scale (WSCS). The WSCS includes five subscales: cooperation at work, commitment to work, persistence and confidence, conflict with supervisors, and recognition and reward. Only the commitment to work subscale was used in this study because these subscale items are the most appropriate for assessing career identity. Noe et al. (1990) developed a career motivation scale based on London's career motivation theory. Only the career identity subscale was used in this study.

The eighteen items resulted in a Cronbach alpha of .90. Item analysis reduced scale length to ten items with an internal consistency of .87. The final set of items included, "My work is the center of my existence.," "To what extent have you joined professional organizations related to your career goal?," "I asked for extra work." Items were rated on three different five-point scales. One scale was

an agree/disagree scale with 1= Strongly agree and 5= Strongly disagree. Another was an extent scale with 1=A great extent and 5=Not at all. The third scale was a true/false scale with 1= Completely false and 5= Completely true. Four items were reversed scored.

Moderating Variables

Three moderating variables are under investigation in order to better understand and explain the relationships between self-efficacy, career identity, and motivation. These variables are identity salience, identity valence, and threat to identity. Each is described in detail below including resulting internal consistency measures from the pilot study. Items are listed in Appendix A (these items are also in Section A of Appendix B).

Identity salience. A total of five items were included for testing. Two items assessing identity salience were adapted from Lobel and St. Clair (1992). The items are: "The major satisfactions in my life come from my job." and "The most important things that happen to me involve my job." Each item is rated on a five-point scale with "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree" as anchors. Higher values indicate strong career identity salience. Three items developed by the author were also included. All items were based on the definition of salience as how much the identity in question is in one's awareness; how frequently the identity is brought into play. An example of an item

is, "I live, eat, and breathe my work."

Resulting internal consistency measures for the five-item scale was .83. Item analysis resulted in removal of two items. The resulting three-item salience scale had an internal consistency of .87.

Identity valence. Ten items were originally used to measure identity valence in the pilot study. A three-item scale assessing valence of work was taken from Vinokur and Caplan (1987). The items included: "To what extent is work an important part of your daily life?", and "To what extent is work a source of satisfaction in your life?". Each item is rated on a five-point scale with "a great extent" and "not at all" as anchors. Cronbach alpha for this scale was reported by Vinokur and Caplan as .62. Seven additional items developed by the author were also included. These items were based on the definition of identity valence as how much the individual values the identity in question. An example of an item is, "My work is important to me."

The ten-item scale resulted in a Cronbach alpha of .57. Item analysis resulted in a three-item scale with internal consistency of .81.

Threat to identity. Threat to identity has been conceptualized in this study as job loss. To assess whether job loss was actually perceived as a threat, six items were developed by the author to operationally measure threat to career identity. These items focus on "the loss of a job"

and the emotional reactions related to that. An example of an item is, "With the loss of my job, I do not feel like my usual self."

The six-item scale resulted in an alpha of .89. Item analysis eliminated two items resulting in a four-item scale with an alpha of .87.

Mediating Variable

Although not included in the hypotheses, the mediating variable of depression has been assessed in order to conduct further exploratory analyses. Please see Section C in Appendix B for items.

Depression. The Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D Scale) is a short self-report scale designed to measure depressive symptomatology in the general population (Radloff, 1977). The items of the scale are symptoms associated with depression which have been used in previously validated longer scales. The items are rated on a frequency scale of how often the symptoms have occurred in the last week. Content, criterion-related and construct validity have been established. Coefficient alpha for reliability was reported in Radloff (1977) as .85.

Pilot testing of the original twenty-item scale resulted in an alpha of .81. Item analysis reduced the scale to ten-items with an internal consistency of .87.

Dependent Variable

Motivation. Motivation is operationalized behaviorally

in this study as job seeking behaviors. Twelve of the fifteen items in the pilot study were from a scale developed by Blau (1993); three items were taken from Quint and Kopelman (in review). Internal consistency measures for the Blau scale were not available. The items were developed as behavioral and not attitudinal measures of job search because research has shown that there is higher reliability in assessing actual behaviors than behavioral intentions (Kopelman, Rovenpor, and Millsap, 1992). Subjects were asked to indicate the frequency with which they carried out each behavioral item within the last six months. A frequency range was given within each verbal anchor under the assumption that subjects are more likely to recall an approximate (versus exact) number of times they carried out a particular behavior (Blau, 1993). This five-point response scale allowed the frequency of each search behavior to be more precisely measured, as opposed to previous search measures using a yes/no response scale (Kanfer & Hulin, 1985; Kopelman et al., 1992).

Extensive work with subject matter experts (outplacement specialists) resulted in modification and elimination of some job-seeking items used in the pilot study. For example, an item in the pilot study asked respondents if they read classified ads. The more appropriate behavior, and hence question to ask, is did they respond to the classified ads. Further, the original Blau

(1993) scale asked participants to indicate the frequency with which they carried out each behavioral item within the last six months. Subject matter experts stated this time span was problematic for a number of reasons, the most obvious that scale anchors were not appropriate for a six-month period, and most individuals in outplacement are reemployed before six months. The cognitive reference point was thus modified to "Within THE LAST WEEK, how often have you: (if last week was not typical for you, please report on the previous week)." Subject matter experts also suggested the inclusion of an item asking on average, how many hours a week is spent on the job search. Testing of the fifteen-item scale resulted in a Cronbach alpha of .77. Item analysis, including examination of content domain by subject matter experts, reduced the scale to eleven items with an alpha of .79. Please see Section B of Appendix B (questions 4-14) for items.

Intention to engage in job-seeking behavior was assessed by one item, "In the next month, how hard do you intend to try to find a job where you'd work over 20 hours a week?" (Vinokur & Caplan, 1987). Job seeking effort was assessed by "I am putting in a great deal of effort, beyond that normally expected, in order to find a job." (Lobel & St. Clair, 1992). Please see Section B of Appendix B (questions 1, 2, and 3) for items.

Demographic Information

Participants were also asked a number of demographic questions including age, gender, race, years of education, length of unemployment, length of outplacement, previous job, tenure, and perceived obstacles faced in finding reemployment. Previous theory and research have identified several demographic variables related to job loss, most notably age, gender, race, and education. Where appropriate, demographics will be analyzed as control variables to understand if the independent variables under investigation add explanatory power beyond that offered by the demographic variables. Additional demographic information collected (including responses to open-ended questions) will not be reported because they are not appropriate to the hypotheses under investigation. Because demographic issues are not central to the hypotheses of the present research, additional analyses including breakdowns of demographic variables will not be included. Please see Section D of Appendix B for items.

Materials

Data were collected via a questionnaire which can be found in Appendix B. The questionnaire contains 79 Likert-type items and two open-ended questions presented in four sections. Section A (30 items) addresses career self-efficacy, general self-efficacy, career identity, identity salience, identity valence, and threat to identity. Section B (20 items) concerns job search behaviors and potential

obstacles to successful reemployment. Section C contains a 10-item depression scale and an open-ended question asking "How do you feel about not having a job?" Section D (19 items) is concerned with job history, demographic information, and an open-ended question soliciting any additional thoughts or comments.

Procedure

Questionnaires were sent to seven outplacement locations. The outplacement locations were either on-site career centers, which were associated with a corporate downsizing, or an outplacement firm's practice office which handles a more diverse clientele. Data were collected in the Northeast, Southeast and Midwest United States. Questionnaires were distributed by outplacement counselors after counseling sessions with the explanation that participation was voluntary and was not part of the outplacement procedure. Participants were told that the purpose of this university-sponsored study was to investigate individuals' reactions to job loss. Upon completion of the questionnaire, participants returned the questionnaire to one of two possible designated drop off areas - a collection bin or an on-site mailbox where questionnaires would be mailed directly to the researcher by the respondents. Response rate was 29%.

Chapter 8

Results

Analyses

Correlations and hierarchical regression analyses were used to analyze this data. Hierarchical regression analyses were chosen as the appropriate statistical analyses based upon prior empirical research with self-esteem and identity (Ross, 1992). For hierarchical regression analysis, the SAS regression procedure (PROC REG) was used because it is a general purpose procedure for regression and is the most appropriate of the SAS regression procedures. The regression procedure also computes special collinearity diagnostics.

Treatment of missing data. Thirty-six cases were missing the identical item in the career identity measure (question 21 in Section A of Appendix B). In order to include these 36 cases in the analyses, a mean for the missing item was computed, rounded to the nearest whole number, and substituted per each case. A comparison of the two data sets (with and without missing data) shows essentially identical descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and internal reliabilities). The correlation between the nine-item identity variable (including the substituted mean) and the ten-item identity variable is almost perfect (r=.98, p<.0001). Lack of perfect correlation is due to rounding error.

Psychometric Properties of the Scales

Table 2 presents means, standard deviations, minimum/maximum ranges, and alpha coefficients for all variables. The reliabilities for multi-item scales were generally very good, with alphas ranging from .62 to .87. Almost all alpha coefficients for all the multi-item scales were about Nunally's (1978) recommended level of alpha (.70), indicating that scales had an acceptable level of internal consistency. Only the five-item career self-efficacy scale was less than .70 (alpha = .62).

Correlational Relationships

Table 3 presents the correlation matrix for all the variables. The patterns of correlations indicate associations among the variables consistent with theoretical predictions. The theoretical literature describes salience and valence as dimensions of the identity construct. Thus, one would expect to see strong relationships among these variables. Correlations do indicate fairly strong relationships among valence, salience, and identity. However, the relationships are not strong enough to indicate possible redundancy of the constructs.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, Coefficient Alphas of Key Variables[2]

	Means[3]	S. D.	Min.	Max.	Alpha
1. CSE	1.65	.47	1.00	3.00	.62
2. GSE	1.95	.67	1.00	4.40	.77
3. DEP	9.19	5.76	1.00	27.00	.81
4. SEARCH	3.65	.71	1.00	4.63	.85
5. SALIEN	3.57	.86	1.00	5.00	.79
6. THREAT	3.32	1.00	1.00	5.00	.87
7. IDENT	2.72	.54	1.40	4.40	.75
8. VALEN	1.76	.58	1.00	4.33	.78

CSE = Career Self-efficacy

GSE = General Self-efficacy

DEP = Depression

[2] Depression was calculated, according to Radloff (1977), by summing all responses. All other means were calculated by summing all items and dividing by the number of items.

[3] Scores ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 indicating a high rating and 5 indicating a low rating. This applies to all variables listed except DEP.

Table 3

Correlation Matrix of Key Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. CSE	1.00							
2. GSE	.34***	1.00						
3. DEPRES	.12	.32***	1.00					
4. SEARCH	.41***	.19**	-.11	1.00				
5. SALIEN	.16*	-.07	-.26***	.31***	1.00			
6. THREAT	-.07	-.37***	-.66***	.12	.47***	1.00		
7. IDENT	.38***	.19**	-.02	.48***	.61***	.21**	1.00	
8. VALEN	.30***	.19**	-.18**	.43***	.48***	.31***	.66***	1.00

*** p<.0001
** p<.01
* p<.05

As expected, an association exists between career self-efficacy and general self-efficacy (r=.34, p<.0001). Career self-efficacy is also positively related to career identity (r=.38, p<.0001), identity valence (r=.30, p<.0001), and job search behavior (r=.41, p<.0001). These positive relationships indicate that strong career self-efficacy is associated with strong career identity, high value placed upon the identity, and increased job seeking behaviors. Conversely, weak career self-efficacy is associated with weak career identity, little value placed upon the identity, and decreased job seeking behavior.

Career identity is positively related to job search behaviors (r=.48, p<.0001) such that one with a strong career identity also partakes in greater job search behaviors and vice versa. Job search behaviors are also positively related to identity salience (r=.31, p<.0001) and identity valence (r=.43, p<.0001).

Perceived threat to one's identity is positively related to career identity (r=.21, p<.001), identity valence (r=.31, p<.0001), and identity salience (r=.47, p<.0001). As expected, the stronger one's career identity and the more valued and salient the identity, the greater the perceived threat. Threat is negatively related to general self-efficacy (r= -.37, p<.0001), and to depression (r= -.66, p<.0001). The negative relationship indicates that an individual with a strong sense of personal efficacy is not

threatened by the loss of work however one with a weak sense of efficacy does perceive a threat. Similarly, one who is highly depressed does not perceive a threat, however, one who is not depressed does experience a perceived threat. These relationships will be further discussed in the Discussion section.

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis predicts a relationship between career self-efficacy and career identity. As shown in Table 2, results support the predicted positive relationship (r=.38, p<.0001) indicating that the greater one's sense of career self-efficacy, the greater one's career identity and vice versa.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 predicts that the relationship between career self-efficacy and identity is moderated by the valence and salience of that identity. To test the hypothesis, a hierarchical regression analysis was performed (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). At step 1, self-efficacy, identity valence and identity salience were entered simultaneously as a predictor set. At step 2, cross-products of the variables were entered to test for two-way interactions. At step 3, a three-way interaction of all the components (self-efficacy by salience by valence) was examined.

The predicted three-way interaction was not significant; since the addition of step 3 contributed no

incremental variance in identity it is not reported. Step 3 eliminated all significance of the independent variables, even though the overall F statistic was significant. The multiple interaction terms resulted in possible multicollinearity as indicated by the lack of significant effects in step 3. Results of this analysis are in Table 3.

Table 3

Hierarchical Regression of Career Self-Efficacy, Identity Salience, and Identity Valence on Career Identity

Variable	Beta	R^2	Adj. R^2	Change in R^2	F	p
Step 1:		.59	.58	.58	55.75	0.0001
CSE	0.62**					
Valence	0.53*					
Salience	0.15					
Step 2:		.59	.58	.00		
CSE X salience	-0.01					
CSE X valence	-0.20*					
Salience X valence	0.06					

** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

Moderator effects were not found, thus the hypothesis was not supported. Significant main effects were found for career self-efficacy and identity valence indicating prediction of career identity by these two variables (beta = 0.62, $p<.01$ and beta = 0.53, $p<.05$ respectively). Fifty-eight percent of the variance in career identity is accounted for by career self-efficacy and identity valence. Results indicate that those with a strong sense of career self-efficacy and who value their career identity have stronger career identities. Further, a significant effect was found for the self-efficacy and valence interaction (beta= -.20, $p<.05$). Evidence of moderation exists when interaction terms account for significant incremental variance in a dependent variable, either individually, signified by the values of the betas, or collectively, signified by the values of the incremental F-statistic (Dean & Snell, 1991). The significant interaction indicates that valence moderates the relationship between career self-efficacy and identity. No such interaction effects were found for salience.

Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis predicts a relationship between self-efficacy and job-seeking behavior. As shown in Table 2, the results support the predicted positive relationship ($r=.41$, $p<.0001$) indicating that the greater one's sense of career self-efficacy, the greater the amount of job search

behavior and vice versa.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 predicts a positive relationship between career identity and job-seeking behavior. Results, reported in Table 2, support the hypothesis (r=.48, p<.0001) indicating the stronger one's career identity, the greater the reported number of job search behaviors. Conversely the weaker the career identity, the lower the number of job search behaviors reported.

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 predicts that career self-efficacy and career identity are related to job search behaviors incrementally greater than career self-efficacy or career identity alone. To test the hypothesis, a hierarchical regression analysis was performed. At step 1, self-efficacy was entered in the regression equation; identity was entered in the equation at step 2. At step 3, cross-products of the variables were entered to test for two-way interactions.

Results are presented in Table 5. Significant main effects were found for career self-efficacy and career identity indicating prediction of job search behaviors by these two variables (beta=1.09, p<.01; beta=.93, p<.0005 respectively). Twenty-nine percent of the variance in job search behaviors is accounted for by career self-efficacy and career identity. Results indicate that those with a strong sense of career self-efficacy and strong career

identity perform more motivated job-seeking behaviors. No significant effect was found for the self-efficacy and identity interaction, therefore no moderator effects were found.

Table 5

Hierarchical Regression of Career Self-Efficacy, and Career Identity on Job Search Behaviors

Variables	Beta	R^2	Adj. R^2	Change in R^2	F	p
Step 1:		.17	.16	.17	33.19	0.0001
CSE	1.09*					
Step 2:		.29	.29	.12		
Identity	0.93***					
Step 3:		.30	.29	.00		
CSE X Ident	-0.25					

***p < .001
* p < .01

Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 predicts that motivation to seek reemployment is a result of a perceived threat to one's career identity only if the identity is strong. Hierarchical regression was again utilized to test this hypothesis. At step 1, identity and threat were entered into the equation simultaneously. At step 2, cross-products of the variables were entered to test for a two-way interaction.

The overall hypothesis was not supported. Results, presented in Table 6, demonstrate a positive main effect for career identity, explaining 23% of the variance in job search behavior. This indicates that those with a strong career identity are more likely to participate in job search behaviors (i.e., seek reemployment). Further, no moderator effect was found for the identity by threat interaction. Perceived threat to identity did not contribute to the variance accounted for in predicting job search behaviors. Step 2, the interaction of identity and threat, eliminated the significance demonstrated in step 1 and is not reported.

Table 6

Hierarchical Regression of Identity and Threat on Job Search Behaviors

Variables	Beta	R^2	Adj. R^2	Change in R^2	F	p
Step 1:		.23	.23	.23	35.85	0.0001
Ident	0.64***					
Threat	0.01					

*** p < .0001

Hypothesis 7

Hypothesis 7 predicts perceived threat to identity to be motivating only if career identity is a valued identity. Using a hierarchical regression approach, identity valence and perceived threat were entered simultaneously in step 1 of the equation. At step 2, the cross-products of threat and identity valence were entered into the equation. No significant effect was found.

Table 7 shows results. No interaction was found, thus the hypothesis is not supported. A main effect was found for identity valence (beta = .53, $p<.0001$) indicating the value placed on career identity contributes to the prediction of job search behavior. Identity valence explains 18% of the variance in job search behavior.

Table 7

Hierarchical Regression of Threat and Valence on Job Search Behaviors

Variables	Beta	R^2	Adj. R^2	Change in R^2	F	p
Step 1:		.19	.18	.18	26.81	0.0001
Valence	0.53***					
Threat	-0.02					

*** $p < .0001$

Exploratory Effects

General self-efficacy. Bandura has described self-efficacy primarily as a situation/task-specific belief. In line with this thinking, career self-efficacy is examined in this study. However, evidence does exist that experiences of personal mastery that contribute to efficacy expectancies generalize to actions other than the target behavior (Sherer, et al. 1982). Individuals with histories of varied and numerous experiences of success may be expected to have positive self-efficacy expectancies even in the face of limited success and failure. The general self-efficacy scale measures generalized self-efficacy expectations dependent on past experiences and on tendencies to attribute success to skill as opposed to chance. General self-efficacy was included in this study to examine the potential contribution of general self-efficacy to the identity and motivation relationship.

General self-efficacy was found to be positively associated with career self-efficacy (r=.34, p<.0001), depression (r=.32, p<.0001), career identity (r=.19, p<.01), identity valence (r=.19, p<.01), and job search behavior (r=.19, p<.01). General self-efficacy was also found to be negatively related to perceived threat (r= -.37, p<.0001) indicating that one with a strong general sense of efficacy experiences less perceived threat and threat is stronger for those with a weaker sense of efficacy. A comparison of

correlation coefficients indicates stronger associations between career self-efficacy and career identity, identity salience, identity valence, and job search behaviors than general self-efficacy. This is consistent with the theoretical literature. However, results also show moderate associations between general self-efficacy and depression and perceived threat to identity. No relationships exist between career self-efficacy and depression or threat.

Following the same hierarchical regression analysis procedure for Hypothesis 2, general self-efficacy was substituted for career self-efficacy and entered simultaneously into the regression equation with identity valence and identity salience. In step 2, cross-products of the variables were entered to test for two-way interactions. In step 3, a three-way interaction of components was entered. Table 8 presents results.

Table 8

Hierarchical Regression of General Self-Efficacy, Identity Salience, and Identity Valence on Career Identity

Variables	Beta	R^2	Adj. R^2	Change in R^2	F	p
Step 1:		.57	.55	.55	50.77	0.0001
GSE	0.02					
Valence	0.48*					
Salience	0.14					
Step 2:		.57	.55	.00		
GSE X Salience	0.05					
GSE X Valence	-0.05					
Sal X Valence	0.01					

** p < .01
* p < .05

Results indicate a main effect for identity valence (beta = .48, $p<.03$) consistent with results for Hypothesis 2. No moderating effects were found since none of the interaction terms were significant. General self-efficacy did not contribute any variance to the equation. This is consistent with the weak correlational relationship between general self-efficacy and career identity ($r=.19$, $p<.01$).

To determine if situational self-efficacy (i.e. career self-efficacy) is a better predictor of career identity than general self-efficacy, a hierarchical regression procedure was conducted. In step 1, general self-efficacy was entered into the equation. At step 2, career self-efficacy was entered.

Table 9 presents results. General self-efficacy accounted for 3% of the variance in career identity. The introduction of career self-efficacy into the equation accounted for a change in R^2 of .12. The results lend evidence to situational self-efficacy (i.e., career self-efficacy) acting as a better predictor of career identity.

Table 9

Hierarchical Regression of General Self-Efficacy, Career Self-Efficacy on Career Identity

Variables	Beta	R^2	Adj. R^2	Change in R^2	F	p
Step 1:		.04	.03	.03	21.54	0.0001
GSE	0.07					
Step 2:		.15	.15	.12		
CSE	0.40***					

***p <.0001
** p < .01
* p < .05

Depression. The role of depression in job loss has been well documented in the unemployment literature (Leana & Feldman, 1992). Exploratory post hoc analyses were conducted to examine the role of depression and its potential influence on career self-efficacy, career identity, perceived threat, and job search behaviors. Correlational results demonstrate negative associations with identity salience (r= -.26, p<.0001), and identity valence (r= -.18, p<.01). Results also show a moderate, positive relationship with general self-efficacy (r=.32, p<.0001) and a strong, negative relationship with perceived threat (r= -.66, p<.0001).

To better understand the role of depression in the self-efficacy, identity, and job-seeking relationship, a hierarchical regression procedure was performed. In step 1, career self-efficacy, was entered into the regression equation (similar to the analysis for Hypothesis 5). In step 2, identity was added to this block. In step 3, depression was added to this block to see if depression could account for any additional variance in job search. As Table 10 shows, the addition of depression to the regression equation resulted in an R^2 change of .01 accounting for another 1% of the variance in identity. Main effects were significant for each variable.

Table 10

Hierarchical Regression of Career Self-Efficacy, Career Identity, and Depression on Job Search Behaviors

Variables	Beta	R^2	Adj. R^2	Change in R^2	F	p
Step 1:		.17	.16	.16	33.83	0.0001
CSE	0.45***					
Step 2:		.29	.29	.13		
Ident	0.50***					
Step 3:						
Depress	-.02*	.31	.30	.01		

***p <.0001
** p < .01
* p < .05

Demographics. Previous research has demonstrated the role of demographic variables in unemployment research. Research indicates that factors such as age, gender, race, and education level may affect how an individual reacts to job loss (Leana & Ivancevich, 1987; Feather, 1990). In order to more precisely understand the potential effects of self-efficacy and identity on motivation for reemployment, an analysis was conducted controlling for potential demographic effects. The analysis for hypothesis 5 was repeated, however at step 1 age, gender, race, and education were entered simultaneously into the equation as a covariate block[4]. In step 2, career self-efficacy was added to the equation; career identity was added in step 3.

Results are presented in Table 11. Consistent with the job loss literature, results indicate that demographics do play a role in job-seeking behavior with eight percent of the variance in job search behaviors accounted for by demographic variables. However, career self-efficacy and career identity are better predictors of job search behaviors by accounting for an additional twenty-two percent of the variance in job search behaviors beyond the demographic variables.

---

[4] Race was coded as a dicotomous variable of white/non-white due to a small sample size. Age and education were treated as continuous and not categorical variables.

Table 11

Hierarchical Regression of Demographics, Career Self-Efficacy, and Career Identity on Job Search Behaviors

Variables	Beta	R^2	Adj. R^2	Change in R^2	F	p
Step 1:		.10	.08	.08	14.63	0.0001
Demos						
Age	.01**					
Sex	-.07					
Race	-.35**					
Educ	-.00					
Step 2:		.21	.19	.11		
CSE	0.81					
Step 3:		.32	.30	.11		
Identity	0.78*					
Step 4:		.32	.30	.00		
CSE X Ident	-.16					

***p < .001
**p < .05
* p < .01

Part V

Chapter 9

Discussion

This study was designed to address the issue of motivation for reemployment following a job loss and investigate the potential roles of self-efficacy and identity in job-seeking behavior. Results are consistent with previous research and also extend our knowledge with regard to job loss.

Overall Findings

The present study advances our knowledge of the self-efficacy, identity and motivation relationship. Previous theoretical work has linked identity and the construct of motivation (Deaux, 1992; Breakwell, 1992). The present study provides empirical support for the relationship between identity and motivated behavior. Also, the empirical evidence relating self-efficacy and identity is consistent with the theoretical assertion that self-efficacy potentially operates as a general facet of self-concept (Breakwell, 1986, 1992).

Prior theoretical work has focused on the motivating aspects of self-esteem in describing the self-concept. Rosenberg (1979) believed that in order to understand the self-concept, research had to move past self-esteem with which it had been most closely associated and study other

motivational aspects of the self-concept. The present research offers self-efficacy as a potential contributor to identity above self-esteem and provides empirical evidence to support the relationship.

In addition, the present study goes beyond previous theoretical work on identity valence and provides empirical evidence for the role of identity valence in predicting both career identity and job-seeking behavior. Identity valence, or the value one places upon an identity, also appears to play a role in determining the strength of an individual's career identity and the intensity of job search. Correlations show moderate to strong relationships among the variables under study. Significant main effects indicate that career self-efficacy and identity valence account for significant variance in career identity. Further, career identity and identity valence account for significant variance in job search behaviors.

The present findings also support previous research in the job search arena as well as advance our knowledge on the topic. The present results are consistent with research conducted by Eden and Aviram (1993) who found evidence that raising general self-efficacy motivates intensification of effort in job search. They did not directly measure situation-specific efficacy; however, they infer it would rise since situation-specific efficacy is seen as a more malleable construct than general self-efficacy. In the

present study, task-specific self-efficacy (i.e., career self-efficacy) was found to be a stronger predictor of career identity and job search than general self-efficacy.

Similarly, present study results support those found by Ellis and Taylor (1983) in their examination of the job search process. They found that task-specific self-esteem was more strongly related to job search motivation and satisfaction. Global self-esteem proved a better predictor of search outcomes dependent upon social skills. The present study provided evidence for the utility of task-specific self-efficacy (i.e., career self-efficacy) in predicting job search.

Researchers agree that greater work is needed in understanding the job search process. Theories that examine demographic, attitudinal, and personality variables provide such a framework (Latham, 1987). Displaced workers' self-perceptions and their expectations for reemployment is seen as a critical component of motivation to find reemployment (Prussia, Kinicki, & Bracker, 1993). The present research findings add support to Vinoker, van Ryn, Gramlich, and Price's (1991) claim that job loss intervention programs should focus on increasing unemployed workers' confidence and self-efficacy about obtaining another job and enhancing their motivation to find a job. Results suggest that career self-efficacy and career identity are useful predictors of job search behaviors. In the sections which follow each

study variable will be discussed in detail.

Career self-efficacy. As predicted, a positive relationship between career self-efficacy and career identity was found. Individuals who are efficacious in their ability to be successful at work are also more likely to define themselves by their career. In addition, results of a hierarchical regression analysis suggest career self-efficacy to be a good predictor of career identity and job seeking. Individuals who are confident in their ability to be successful at work are also more likely to actively seek reemployment following a job loss. This is demonstrated by the number of reported job-seeking behaviors.

Further, career self-efficacy was found to be a better predictor of career identity than general self-efficacy. This is an important finding since it supports the theoretical assertion that self-efficacy is a task/situation specific construct (Bandura, 1986). The analysis employed (hierarchical regression analysis) provided a strong test of the utility of the career self-efficacy construct. That is, not only does career self-efficacy relate to career identity, but it adds unique information to the regression equation not accounted for by general self-efficacy.

Career identity. A positive main effect for identity was found demonstrating the link between career identity and behavior (i.e., job search behavior). Psychological research, including both the identity and motivation fields,

has neglected to empirically study the relationship between identity and motivation. Theoretical linkages between the two constructs have been made (Deaux, 1992; Breakwell, 1992). In order to maintain an existing level of identity, individuals are motivated to perform at a level that is consistent with their self-perception. Results of this study provide support for the evidence of a relationship between identity and identity motivated behavior. The present study suggests that those with strong work identities are motivated to maintain their career identity by seeking reemployment which is manifested through frequency/intensity of job search behaviors. In addition, identity may mediate the relationship between self-efficacy and motivated behavior such that individuals with strong self-efficacy will also possess a strong career identity. These results provide additional information about those individuals who might benefit most from targeted career counseling. Enhancing one's career self-efficacy, through specific professional skill acquisition (e.g., refresher courses for a nurse) should also strength and enhance one's career identity which should manifest itself into increased job-seeking behavior.

Identity valence. Results indicate that identity valence, the value one places upon an identity, is a strong predictor of both career identity and job search behaviors. The value one places upon an identity predicts the strength

of that identity. Career identities which are valued were found to be better predictors of job search behaviors. This is an important contribution because it demonstrates that the value placed upon an identity has some predictive utility. Individuals possess multiple identities and the strength and probability of the identity invoking behavior may be a function of the value placed upon it. "Dave" defines himself as a father, accountant, downhill skier. In the hierarchy of identities, downhill skier may not be as valued an identity as father. If an identity provoking opportunity should arise (e.g., a free Saturday) one would expect to see more "father-related" behaviors performed than "skier-related" behaviors. This study provides evidence for the critical role of identity valence in predicting motivated behavior. Behavior is not haphazard; self-definition involves aligning oneself with values that provide direction for future behavior. Values allow an individual to make behavioral choices in a directed, purposeful, goal-oriented manner. If the identity (i.e., career identity) is valued, the individual is motivated to perform behaviors which will maintain that specific valued identity (i.e., finding a new job). This study was able to provide some evidence for this.

In sum, results indicate the utility of using career self-efficacy, career identity, and identity valence in predicting motivation for reemployment (i.e., job search

behaviors). Present results are consistent with previous research conducted in the area of job search and it also advances our knowledge of the role career self-efficacy and career identity play in motivated behavior (i.e., job-seeking behavior).

Unsupported Hypotheses

Although correlational relationships and significant main effects were found for the principle study variables (career self-efficacy, career identity, and job search), not all hypotheses were supported. Identity salience and threat to identity did not influence relationships as predicted. Further, hypothesized interaction effects among variables were also not found. Potential explanations for the non-findings are considered below.

Identity salience. Correlational results indicate moderate associations between identity salience and career identity, identity valence, perceived threat to identity, and job search behaviors. Although correlational analysis was able to demonstrate an association among the variables, hierarchical regression analysis failed to demonstrate the predictive utility of identity salience in explaining the variance in career identity.

Commitment to an identity is demonstrated through the frequency that identity is called into use. A possible explanation for the lack of predictive utility concerns the identity hierarchy. Perhaps with job loss, the individual's

identity hierarchy has shifted and career identity is no longer dominant (or salient) -- other identities could have taken the top position. Also, perhaps the identity of "unemployed" has become part of the hierarchy and this is distinct from a career identity and would not be operationalized by a lack of career identity.

In addition, salience was measured in this study via a Likert-type scale. Others have used Likert-scale approaches with success (Callero, 1985). Although the internal consistency measure of the present scale is high, perhaps this is not the most effective and appropriate method for assessing one's identity hierarchy. The current method does not allow for examination of additional identities other than the one in question. Stryker and Serpe (1994) in a study on identity salience and psychological centrality asked subjects to report, in meeting others for the first time in various situations described by the researchers, what they would tell others about themselves. Subjects were given identities to rank order for each situation. Although an innovative measurement approach, Styker and Serpe's method is not ideal because identities are presented to subjects to rank order and the method has no way to tap negative identities.

Some researchers have considered valence, salience, and centrality to be conceptually the same and have assessed it as commitment to an identity (Harquail, in progress).

Others have argued that salience and centrality are conceptually equivalent (Gecas, 1982). As with identity, confusion exists as to the definition of salience. Even those who define salience as Styker does (a readiness to act out an identity) operationalize it as rankings of importance. Stryker and Serpe (1994) make the claim that it is most useful to have analyses which contain both salience and centrality and examine how the two relate to one another and how each fits identity theory. Salience should influence behavior because an identity that is higher in the hierarchy is more salient in more situations and therefore more likely to influence behavior. Present results fail to support this theoretical position[5].

Threat. Results indicate perceived threat to career identity is associated with general self-efficacy, depression, identity salience, career identity, and identity valence. No relationship was found between threat and career self-efficacy and threat and job search behaviors. In addition, Hypotheses 6 and 7, where perceived threat was hypothesized to predict job search behaviors, were not supported. Threat failed to demonstrate any main effects or moderator effects suggesting that threat is not a useful

---

[5] Examination of the alpha coefficients and items for identity salience and identity valence indicate they are more conceptually in common than previously thought. The 6-item combined construct has an alpha coefficient of .87 higher than either identity salience or identity valence on its own (.79 and .78respectively).

predictor of job search behavior (i.e., threat is not motivating). Interestingly, perceived threat demonstrated a strong, negative relationship with depression. One who is highly depressed perceives no threat to his/her identity, and perceived threat is experienced by those not depressed. Theoretically this interpretation makes sense since one who is depressed is more likely to exhibit a learned helplessness reaction than a motivated fight/flight reaction triggered by a threatened identity. Similarly, if one is threatened, they are mobilized to reduce the threat and therefore could not be lethargic as characterized by depressed affect.

Perceived threat was hypothesized to be a motivator. The high internal consistency of the current measure, both in the pilot and in the study, indicates that the construct measure holds together well. Therefore if we assume the construct was accurately assessing threat, why was threat not a factor in predicting job search? One possible explanation is that individuals did not feel threatened by their job loss. Individuals who are highly efficacious and believe in their capability to be effective in their job, may not view unemployment as a threat to their identity. Job loss may be viewed just as a temporary setback but it does not influence their belief in their competence or ability.

In addition, almost all the individuals in this study

were laidoff as part of a corporate downsizing. The participants were not let go individually but along with many of their colleagues and friends. According to Breakwell (1992) an event such as this should be less threatening to an individual because a whole group is undergoing this transition; it should not result in a personal affront to one's self-esteem. Therefore, perhaps being laidoff in this manner actually was not perceived as a threat.

The environment is another potential explanation. Although participants were solicited from outplacement centers, the nature of how they arrived there could be different. For most individuals, job loss was an involuntary situation; the organization downsized and laidoff workers. For some, early retirement incentives could have been offered. This implies a more voluntary withdrawal from work than a layoff (however one can easily argue the point, as outplacement counselors do, that voluntary programs are really involuntary when incentives are involved (Robert Lee, personal communication, August 29, 1994)). Individuals who participated in an early retirement program may have felt more in control of their situation and therefore did not perceive the current job loss situation as a threat. Unfortunately no data were collected to specifically explore this issue.

Individuals respond differently to job loss. For some

it can be seen as a devastating loss; for others, it can be seen as a great opportunity to explore other areas -- perhaps embark upon another career. One could argue that for individuals who exhibit entrepreneurial tendencies, job loss is not perceived as a threat. Future research should examine the potential link between entrepreneurship and job search intensity.

Theoretical Contributions of Research

The present research makes some valuable contributions to the field of Industrial and Organizational psychology and its understanding of motivation for reemployment. Results and implications are discussed below.

Contributions to the field of job loss. This study followed a scientist/practitioner model by using two theories, self-efficacy and identity theories, to address an applied problem (i.e., job loss). Results were obtained via a field study with participants who were experiencing actual job loss. Participants were actually faced with the unfortunate situation of job loss and all its consequences. This increases accuracy of the results because it eliminates threats to external validity which would occur in a laboratory study.

This study made a valuable contribution to our knowledge about the job loss experience by going beyond the descriptive research previously conducted and focused on individual difference variables such as such as self-

efficacy and identity. These variables suggest to us why some individuals are more active job seekers than others. Previous job loss reseach only focused on what happened to the unemployed. This research actually examined what people do in response to the job loss. In addition, the present study focused on two individual difference variables with potential malleability for interventions. Previous job loss research examining individual differences has focused on locus of control, Type A, and self-esteem (Leana & Feldman, 1992). These variables are stable personality traits, not dynamic constructs such as self-efficacy and identity which would be more appropriate for intervention programs.

Further, past research in the areas of career self-efficacy and career identity has typically focused on college students and their developing sense of vocational self-efficacy and identity. No published study has attempted to examine these variables under the context of job loss.

Finally, reliable measures of career identity, identity valence, identity salience, and perceived threat are lacking in the literature. The present study offers potential measures for these variables. As demonstrated by the pilot study, scales developed to measure the study variables appear to be stable and tap the appropriate phenomenon. These measures can act as a foundation for future measurement work.

Contributions to the field of motivation. Theoretical work has hypothesized about the potential link among self-efficacy, identity, and motivation. However, empirical data demonstrating such relationships have been lacking. In addition, we know nothing about the motivational aspect of job loss. The present study results offer evidence demonstrating a predictive relationship specifically in the domain of career and work. Career self-efficacy and career identity contribute to motivated behavior which is operationalized as job search behavior. Individuals with a strong sense of efficacy regarding their ability to be successful at work, and those with a strong career identity, demonstrate greater motivation to be reemployed. In addition, evidence suggests identity valence plays an important role in explaining motivated behavior because individuals demonstrate motivated behavior to regain an identity only if they value that particular identity (i.e., career identity).

Practical Implications of Research

Research results provide some insights into individual reactions to job loss with potential implications for outplacement. In addition, the association between identity and motivation offers some interesting possibilities for managers.

Job loss interventions. The present research provides theoretically based, and empirically valid principles to

help guide the specification and development of unemployment counseling interventions. For example, present results suggest that perhaps extra attention can be given to those with weak career self-efficacy and career identity. Individuals with a strong career self-efficacy and career identity appear to be more motivated to seek reemployment and thus would need minimal actual counseling, but may benefit more from a job search skills approach (i.e., how to network, write a resume, etc.). Individuals with a weak career identity may need more help in job seeking than others with a strong career identity. They may require help in assessing where they are in their career and if they are pursuing the correct avenues.

Individuals who opted for a managerial track versus a technical track in their career path may experience increased sense of inefficacy when unemployed. These individuals may be less efficacious in their ability to be successful at work because they have not kept up with the technical innovations in their field. Refresher courses in their technical areas of expertise may enhance their sense of efficacy and identity and thus increase their motivation for reemployment.

The status of unemployment may also allow one the opportunity to redefine his/her career identity. Unemployment experiences often offer individuals opportunities for career shifts which require efficacy

enhancements through appropriate skill acquisition and identity reinforcement. Counselors may be better able to provide the counseling and advice, as well as develop new counseling interventions appropriate for the individual, if they can assess the individual's level of career identity. Those with strong career self-efficacy and career identity are already motivated (as suggested by the present study results) and they will seek employment on their own.

Using Eden and Aviram's (1993) behavioral plasticity notion, interventions should be aimed at those with weak career self-efficacy and career identity. This would be more beneficial than providing interventions to those with strong career self-efficacy and career identity because these individuals are already motivated. Eden and Aviram (1993) provide evidence to support that reemployment interventions are best targeted at individuals with low self-efficacy. However, they examined general self-efficacy and not career self-efficacy in their study. Eden and Aviram also mentioned a potential ethical dilemma for practitioners -- the selectivity in application of interventions. What should participants be told when individuals are selected for certain interventions based upon the strength or weakness of their career self-efficacy and career identity scores? This is not as profound a dilemma as Eden and Aviram believe it to be. Outplacement counselors should be concerned with giving additional

assistance rather than different interventions. For example, many outplacement offerings are conducted in group sessions. For those with strong self-efficacy, some motivation to seek reemployment already exists. Simple skill-building such as resume writing may be enough of an intervention because motivation exists. For individuals with weak self-efficacy, additional one-on-one counseling may be needed to address issues such as resilience in the job search process after initial rejection. It is a question of providing more intervention rather than exclusion from an intervention.

Implications for managers. Another practical implication concerns the notion of managing professionals. If career identity is linked to motivation, then some managerial techniques (e.g., job enrichment programs, rotation programs, etc.) can be developed to better manage professionals and their work. This can be accomplished by reinforcing their professional identities which in turn should invoke desired behaviors. Extensive work done on the development of vocational identities (Levinson, 1978; Schein, 1978; and Super, 1954) suggests that identification with others, mastery of performance, and modeling of others' behavior contribute to the formation of a vocational identity. The role of the manager then is to reinforce subordinates' professional identities in order to provoke desired work behavior. This can be done by providing

appropriate work experiences which strengthen the professional identification (e.g., giving a chemist responsibility to test new compounds rather than budget responsibilities for the department; encouraging and supporting membership in professional organizations, etc.). Individuals should be more motivated to partake in tasks which reinforce their career identity.

Limitations of the Study

Caution should be taken in interpreting results as some potential limitations of this study do exist. Each is described in detail below.

General cautions. The present study is a field study and not a randomized experiment where random assignment to treatment and control groups accounts for reducing potential threats to internal validity. All the usual cautions applied to field research should be considered here as well. The possibility of mono-method bias exists since all data were collected on one questionnaire at one point in time. However, some precautions were taken to reduce potential threat from this approach. Different scale types were presented including negatively worded-items and reverse-scored items (Cooke & Campbell, 1979). Although independent and dependent variable measures were assessed at the same time, independent and moderating variables were assessed on attitudinal Likert-type scales whereas the dependent measure of job search behavior was assessed using frequency-anchored

scales.

Self-report measures are always problematic because potential inaccuracies exist due to dishonest responses or poor recall. In this situation, social desirability is also a potential threat to internal validity. Questionnaires were distributed by career counselors in outplacement centers. Although instructions emphasized the questionnaire was part of a university-sponsored research project and would have no influence on their individual counseling, some evaluation apprehension could have occurred. Also, there is a self-selection bias as participation was voluntary. T-tests were conducted to examine if differences existed among the study variables due to geographical differences. The only differences found were for general self-efficacy ($F(1,3) = 2.85$, $p<.05$), and perceived threat ($F(1,3) = 3.99$, $p<.01$) establishing confidence that data were not effected by self-selection[6]. However these differences should also be interpreted with caution since sample sizes are unequal for each geography represented.

Caution should also be used in generalizing results because the sample is quite homogeneous. Participants are predominantly male, white, well-educated, professional, with lengthy tenure in their respective organizations. These

---

[6]The Metropolitan New York area exhibited the lowest mean for general self-efficacy and the highest mean for perceived threat. Given the unemployment rates and general economic conditions in the New York area the high sense of threat is not surprising.

demographics are consistent with outplacement clientele populations[7]. Confidence exists that study results will generalize to another similar group, but the results should be cautiously interpreted for different target populations. For example, it would not be appropriate to generalize the current results to a group of hard core unemployed individuals. Their experiences with job loss, career identity, and career self-efficacy is expected to be quite different.

Caution in interpretion also exists because of the relatively low response rate of 29%. Given the sensitivity of the topic area (i.e., job loss) and the manner with which the questionnaire was distributed (i.e., by outplacement counselors at different counseling centers) the response rate is not surprising. In general, given what we know about field research, the response rate of 29% is actually better than expected.

Decreasing internal reliabilities. There was a substantial decrease in internal reliability measures from the pilot to the actual study. The largest decrease occurred with career self-efficacy which went from an alpha of .85 in the pilot to .62 in the actual study. Because of the decrease in reliabilities of the constructs, caution must be taken in interpreting the data. A possible

---

[7]Data was reviewed by outplacement professionals who confirmed consistency.

explanation for the decrease in internal consistency measures includes the homogeneity of the two sample populations. Heterogeneity of the sample increases the variance which inflates the internal consistency measure (Crocker & Algina, 1986). It is very possible that the 33 individuals who participated in the pilot study were a more heterogeneous group than the 250 who participated in the actual study.

The pilot data were collected at church-sponsored job search support groups in Manhattan; participation in the support groups was voluntary and free. The study data were collected through corporate-paid and sponsored outplacement centers; these company-sponsored career centers were established in response to a corporate layoff. Thus a concentration of companies and industries exists. Demographic data also indicate that a majority of participants were well-educated and technically-oriented. An argument can be made that this sample group is more homogeneous than the pilot. In addition, outplacement centers are provided to former employees immediately after layoff notification and are usually located very close to the former work site. Employees can avail themselves of the outplacement offerings immediately with little effort or concern. Individuals who use non-corporate sponsored support groups must actively seek them out which implies a potential difference in the samples.

Another possible explanation for shrinkage concerns questionnaire length and the context in which the items were answered. The pilot study, for obvious reasons, contained many more items (some redundant) for the individual to respond to. Thus the pilot questionnaire presented a broader context and framework from which the individuals could respond. Longer questionnaires with more items are typically more reliable than shorter questionnaires because more items are based on similar content and therefore give a broader context for responses.

Career self-efficacy construct. A strength of the current career self-efficacy measure is that it is a multi-item measure and not a one-item rating which has been shown to be problematic (Lee & Bobko, 1994). Although results do indicate a link between career self-efficacy and career identity as hypothesized, caution must be taken in interpretation. In the present study, both career self-efficacy and general self-efficacy were measured via Likert-type items; the general self-efficacy measure was adopted from Sherer et al. (1982) which has well-documented the validity of the construct and career self-efficacy was modified from Jones (1986). Bandura (1986) does not recommend using Likert-type scales because they fail to assess the strength and magnitude of self-efficacy. Career self-efficacy in this study was operationalized as one's sense of confidence/capability that one can be successful in

his/her last job. As such, the measure does not directly assess strength and magnitude of one's sense of confidence. An attempt at piloting a career self-efficacy scale, which contained both strength and magnitude measures, was unsuccessful; only one person out of 33 was able to successfully complete the two parts (i.e., strength and magnitude) required. Because of the poor utility of such a measure in the pilot, it was dropped from subsequent use.

Future Research

Results of this study lend some support to the link among self-efficacy, identity, and motivation especially as it relates to careers and unemployment. This exploratory research leads to more questions in need of answers.

Longitudinal research. Both self-efficacy and identity are fluid, dynamic constructs that can change over time. Future research should examine individuals' level of self-efficacy and identity throughout the span of unemployment -- when are these variables particularly weak or strong? What impact does this have on potential reemployment? In addition, the present study examined motivation for reemployment at a specific point in time. A longitudinal design should investigate the probability of actual reemployment. What contributes most to actual reemployment -- self-efficacy, identity, motivation/effort? Potential differences in career self-efficacy and career identity both during unemployment and in reemployment should be examined.

Entrepreneurism. As mentioned previously, individuals may react differently to job loss. Some may become paralyzed with fear at the prospect of being without work; others may view it as a grand opportunity. Perhaps a possible mediator of the career identity and motivation relationship could be entrepreneurism. Individuals with a strong career identity who do demonstrate motivated behavior for reemployment may do so because they see potential opportunities. For individuals with strong career identities who do not exhibit motivated behavior, a lack of vision or opportunity may explain why.

Underemployment. Reemployment is assumed to occur in a similar occupation or industry. Research tells us that underemploymemt (Leana & Feldman, 1992) is a realistic problem which the unemployed face. What is the consequence of underemployment on career self-efficacy, career identity, identity valence, identity salience, and perceived threat to identity? This is an especially critical issue given the number of unemployed professionals today.

The hard-core unemployed. As mentioned, the present subjects were well-educated professionals who were experiencing job loss for the first time. What are the implications of career self-efficacy and career identity on the hard-core unemployed? Present results would suggest developing intervention programs aimed at increasing individuals' career self-efficacy and career identity but

that may prove difficult with a population that lacks the opportunity to build skills and confidence and establish a career identity.

Career identity versus organizational identity. Individuals possess multiple identities (Hofman, 1983; Styker & Serpe, 1982). What are the implications for both individuals and organizations if individuals possess an organizational identity as opposed to a career identity? What are the consequences when a downsizing event occurs? Would an organizational identity make it more difficult to transition out of an organization after a downsizing? Can an organizational identity replace a career identity and contribute to motivated behavior in the same way? Research conducted by London (1993) suggests that career identity may be composed of two independent dimensions, career identity and organizational identity. Given the motivational implications of these constructs, these questions merit further investigation.

Demographics. Previous research has examined the role of demographics in job loss (Leana & Ivancevich, 1987). We know that factors such as age, gender, race, and education level may affect how an individual reacts to job loss. What we do not know is how demographics may affect the self-efficacy, identity, and job search relationship. For example, some have hypothesized that to the extent an older individuals' self-identities are tied to work, the less

likely older workers will be to retire early (Feldman, 1994). For older workers whose identity is closely tied to work, retirement can indicate a loss of identities and of valued activities. Future research should examine how demographics may influence the career identity and motivation relationship.

Conclusions

This research investigated motivation for reemployment following job loss using identity and self-efficacy theories as a guiding framework. Results found that career self-efficacy and career identity are useful predictors of job search behaviors (i.e., motivation for reemployment). Identity valence, the value one places upon an identity, also plays a role in determining the strength of an individual's career identity and the intensity of job search.

The present study advances our knowledge of the self-efficacy, identity, and motivation relationship. It provides empirical support for theoretical asertions previously made with regard to self-efficacy, identity and job seeking (i.e., motivation for reemployment) (Breakwell, 1992; Leana & Feldman, 1992; Rosenberg, 1979). In addition, it furthers our understanding of the job loss phenomenon by focusing on two well-defined constructs previously unexamined in the job loss arena. These constructs were found to be useful in explaining why some individuals are

more active job seekers than others. Previous job loss research only focused on what happened to the unemployed. This research actually examined what individuals do in response to the job loss. As such, it focused on two variables with potential malleability for interventions.

This research contributes to our existing knowledge and highlights a number of research questions in need of investigation. Hypotheses for future research include examining the longitudinal implications of self-efficacy and identity in job loss since they are dynamic constructs; entrepreneurialism as a mediator of the identity and motivation relationship; implications of self-efficacy and identity on the underemployed and the hard core unemployed; and the organizational implications of individuals possessing multiple identities such as an organizational and a career identity. Given the individual and societal implications of job loss understanding individual reactions to job loss, especially individual motivation for reemployment, is an area which merits further investigation.

Appendix A

Independent and Moderating Variables

No item in this appendix can be replicated or used without the expressed written permission of the author.

Career Self-Efficacy

1. My old job was well within the scope of my abilities.

2. If given my old job back, or a similar job in another organization, I am confident that I have all the technical knowledge I need to do my job.

3. I feel confident that my skills and abilities equal or exceed those of my future colleagues.

4. My past experiences and accomplishments increase my confidence that I will be able to perform successfully in the future.

5. I can handle a job more challenging than my last one.

General Self-Efficacy

1. One of my problems is that I cannot get down to work when I should.

2. I avoid facing difficulties.

3. When trying to learn something new, I soon give up if I am not initially successful.

4. When unexpected problems occur, I d not handle them well.

5. I give up easily.

Career Identity

1. I am very much personally involved in my work.

2. My work is the center of my existence.

3. To me, my work is only a small part of who I am.

4. To what extent have you joined professional organizations related to your career goal?

5. To what extent do you stay abreast of developments in your line of work?

6. Some people are completely involved in their job -- they are absorbed in it day and night. For other people, their job is simply one of several interests. How involved do/did you feel in your job?

7. I look forward to leaving work.

8. I asked for extra work.

9. My job was important to me.

10. I looked forward to coming to work.

Identity Salience

1. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my work.

2. The most important things that happen to me involve my work.

3. I live, eat, and breathe my work.

Identity Valence

1. My work is important to me.

2. To what extent is work an important part of your daily life?

3. To what extent is work a source of satisfaction in your life?

Threat to Identity

1. With the loss of my job, I do not know who I am anymore.

2. With the loss of my job, I do not feel like my usual self.

3. With the loss of my job, I feel that a part of me has been taken away.

4. I am lost without my job.

Appendix B

Questionnaire

ATTITUDES TOWARD JOB LOSS

In the past few years, the number of Americans who have lost their jobs has increased. Along with this, there has been an increased interest among researchers about individuals' experiences with job loss. This survey asks about your feelings and experiences being unemployed. Your responses will help us to better understand some of these experiences and how individuals cope with job loss.

Please try to answer all the questions in the survey. Even if you do not know or are not sure, please give the best estimate you can. It should take about ten minutes to complete.

Your participation is completely voluntary. The information you will give in this survey is confidential and anonymous. You do not have to give your name in any part of the survey, and I will not be able to identify any respondents. No names will be associated with any data provided.

Please separate this sheet from the questionnaire and keep it for your reference.
If you have any questions about this survey, or if you would like to receive a copy of the study results, please contact Mariangela Battista at Baruch College, City University of New York, Box 512, Psychology, 17 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10010, (212) 387-1540.

****** THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION ******

SECTION A

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	Neither Agree nor Disagree 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5

1. My old job was well within the scope of my abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
2. If given my old job back, or a similar job in another organization, I am confident that I have all the technical knowledge I need to do my job.	1	2	3	4	5
3. My work is important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
4. One of my problems is that I cannot get down to work when I should.	1	2	3	4	5
5. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my work.	1	2	3	4	5
6. With the loss of my job, I do not know who I am anymore.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I feel confident that my skills and abilities equal or exceed those of my future colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I avoid facing difficulties.	1	2	3	4	5
9. My past experiences and accomplishments increase my confidence that I will be able to perform successfully in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
10. With the loss of my job, I do not feel like my usual self.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I can handle a job that is more challenging than my last one.	1	2	3	4	5
12. When trying to learn something new, I soon give up if I am not initially successful.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I am very much personally involved in my work.	1	2	3	4	5
14. With the loss of my job, I feel that a part of me has been taken away.	1	2	3	4	5
15. When unexpected problems occur, I don't handle them well.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I give up easily.	1	2	3	4	5
17. The most important things that happen to me involve my work.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I live, eat, and breathe my work.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I am lost without my job.	1	2	3	4	5
20. My work is the center of my existence.	1	2	3	4	5
21. To me, my work is only a small part of who I am.	1	2	3	4	5

Please circle the number under the appropriate choice.

A great extent 1	To some extent 2	Somewhat 3	Not much 4	Not at all 5
22. To what extent is work an important part of your daily life?				1 2 3 4 5
23. To what extent is work a source of satisfaction in your life?				1 2 3 4 5
24. To what extent have you joined professional organizations related to your career goal?				1 2 3 4 5
25. To what extent do you stay abreast of developments in your line of work?				1 2 3 4 5
26. Some people are completely involved in their job -- they are absorbed in it day and night. For other people, their job is simply one of several interests. How involved do/did you feel in your job?				1 2 3 4 5

Below is a list of statements that describe feelings people have about their jobs. Please read each one carefully. Circle the number which best describes HOW YOU FELT WHILE YOU WERE EMPLOYED.

Completely False 1	Mostly False 2	Partly False & Partly True 3	Mostly True 4	Completely True 5
27. I looked forward to leaving work.				1 2 3 4 5
28. I asked for extra work.				1 2 3 4 5
29. My job was important to me.				1 2 3 4 5
30. I looked forward to coming to work.				1 2 3 4 5

SECTION B

The following questions ask about your current job search. Please circle the appropriate number.

1. I am putting in a great deal of effort, beyond that normally expected, in order to find a job.

1 Strongly Agree	2 Agree	3 Neither agree Nor disagree	4 Disagree	5 Strongly Disagree

2. How difficult are you finding it to obtain new employment?

1 Extremely Difficult	2 Difficult	3 So-So	4 Easy	5 Extremely Easy

3. In the next month, how hard do you intend to try to find a job where you'd work over 20 hours a week?

1 Not at all hard	2 A little	3 So-So	4 A lot	5 Extremely hard

Please circle the appropriate number.

Never (0 times) 1	Rarely (1 or 2 times) 2	Occasionally (3 to 5 times) 3	Frequently (6 to 9 times) 4	Very Frequently (more than 10) 5

Within the LAST WEEK, how often have you: (if last week was not typical for you, please report on the previous week)

4. Read the help wanted/classified ads in newspaper, journal, or professional association?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Sent out resumes to potential employers?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Read a book or article about getting a job or changing jobs?	1	2	3	4	5
7. Filled out a job application.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Had a job interview with a prospective employer?	1	2	3	4	5
9. Talked with friends or relatives about possible job leads?	1	2	3	4	5
10. Contacted an employment agency, executive search firm, or state employment office?	1	2	3	4	5
11. Spoke with previous employers or business acquaintances about their knowing of potential job leads?	1	2	3	4	5
12. Telephoned a prospective employer?	1	2	3	4	5
13. Used former colleagues to generate potential job leads?	1	2	3	4	5
14. Attended a club or professional organization for the purpose of networking?	1	2	3	4	5

15. On ***average***, how many ***hours a week*** do you spend on your job search? _____ hours/week

16. Below are a list of factors that sometimes make it difficult for people to find a new job. How important are the following factors in causing you difficulty in finding a new job?

Please circle the appropriate number.

Not at all Important 1	Somewhat Important 2	Moderately Important 3	Quite Important 4	Extremely Important 5

a. Inappropriate education.	1	2	3	4	5
b. Overqualified.	1	2	3	4	5
c. Age.	1	2	3	4	5
d. Lack of jobs.	1	2	3	4	5
e. Reluctance to relocate.	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION C

Please answer the following questions regarding your personal feelings during the PAST WEEK. Circle the number under the appropriate choice.

Rarely (less than 1 day) 0	Some of the time (1-2 days) 1	Occasionally (3-4 days) 2	Most of the time (5-7 days) 3

During the past week:

1. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with help from my family and friends.	0 1 2 3
2. I felt depressed.	0 1 2 3
3. I felt that everything I did was an effort.	0 1 2 3
4. I felt fearful.	0 1 2 3
5. My sleep was restless.	0 1 2 3
6. I talked less than usual.	0 1 2 3
7. I felt lonely.	0 1 2 3
8. I enjoyed life.	0 1 2 3
9. I felt sad.	0 1 2 3
10. I could not get "going".	0 1 2 3

A. How do you feel about not having a job?

SECTION D

JOB HISTORY

The following questions ask about your job history and demographic information. To reemphasize, the information you will provide is confidential and anonymous. Please do not give your name.

1. In the past 5 years, how many times has it happened that you lost a job and were then unemployed for 4 weeks or more?
_____ Times

2. Approximately how many weeks did it take you to find a new job, the last time you were unemployed?
_____ Weeks

3. How difficult was it to obtain new employment?

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Difficult	Difficult	So-So	Easy	Extremely Easy

4. How many weeks have you currently been unemployed?

_____ Weeks

5. How many weeks have you been in outplacement? (if applicable)

_____ Weeks

6. Which of the statements best describes the reason that you lost this job? *(please circle one)*

   a. I was forced to retire.
   b. The place I worked closed.
   c. I was laidoff because of a reduction in the number of employees at my workplace.
   d. I was terminated or fired by my employer.
   e. I quit.
   f. Other _____

7. How many others at your workplace also lost their jobs at the same time?

_____ People

8. Title of your last job: _____

9. Tenure in last job: _____years _____months

DEMOGRAPHICS

10. Age: _____years _____ months

11. Sex:
   a. Male
   b. Female

12. Race:
    a. African-American
    b. American Indian or Alaskan Native
    c. Hispanic
    d. Asian
    e. White
    f. Other_____

13. Education:
    a. Grade school or some high school
    b. High school or equivalent diploma
    c. Some college
    d. Technical school or a two-year college graduate
    e. College graduate (Bachelor's degree)
    f. Some graduate study
    g. Master's degree (MA, MS, MBA, etc.)
    h. Professional degree (J.D., Ph.D., etc.)

14. *Marital Status:*
    a. Single
    b. Married
    c. Separated
    d. Divorced
    e. Widowed
    f. Co-habitating

If MARRIED OR CO-HABITATING, are you in a dual-income relationship?
    a. Yes
    b. No

15. Do you have children?
    a. Yes
    b. No

If YES, how many are dependent upon you? _____

16. How difficult is it for you to meet the monthly payments on your (family's) bills?

1	2	3	4
Extremely Difficult	Very Difficult	Somewhat Difficult	Not Very Difficult

17. When you think of your **current** financial situation, are you:

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Worried	Very Worried	Somewhat Worried	Slightly Worried	Not At All Worried

18. At what point do you think you may have to start thinking about your financial resources?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Immedi -ately	Next Month	4 Months From Now	6 Months From Now	8 Months From Now	10 Months From Now	1 Year From Now	Never

19. To what extent were you and your family dependent on the income from your last job (e.g. mortgage payments, car payments, tuition, etc.)?

1 Not At All (other financial assets are available, e.g., savings, investments, etc.)	2 Slightly	3 Somewhat (some financial assets available, but not enough, e.g., some savings, other family income)	4 Primarily	5 Completely (no financial assets available)

B. If you have any additional thoughts or comments you would like to share, please use the space below.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION

References

Arnold, J. and Bye, H. (1989). Sex and sex role self-concept as correlates of career decision making self-efficacy. British Journal of Guidance and Counseling, 17, 201-206.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy in human agency. American Psychologist, 37, 122-147.

Bandura, A. (1986a). Social Foundations of Thought and Action. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1986b). From thought to action: Mechanisms of personal agency. New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 15, 1-17.

Bandura, A. (1990). Lecture at Stevens Institute of Technology. Hoboken, New Jersey.

Bandura, A. and Cervone, D. (1983). Self evaluative and self- efficacy mechanisms governing the motivational effects of goal systems. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 1017-1028.

Bandura, A. and Schunk, D.H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 586-598.

Barling, J. and Beattie, R. (1983). Self-efficacy beliefs and sales performance. Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 5, 41-51.

Baumeister, R.F. (1986). Identity: Cultural change and the Struggle for Self. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bernardin, H.J. and Beattie, R.W. (1984). Performance Appraisal: Assessing Human Behavior at Work. Boston, MA: Kent Publishing Co.

Betz, N.E. and Fitzgerald, L.F. (1987). The Career Psychology of Women. New York: Academic Press Inc.

Betz, N.E. and Hackett, G. (1981). The relationship of career related self-efficacy expectations to perceived career options in college women and men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, 399-410.

Betz, N.E. and Hackett, G. (1986). Applications of self-efficacy theory to understanding career choice behavior. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4, 279-289.

Blau, G. (1993). Further exploring the relationship between job search and voluntary individual turnover. Personnel Psychology, 46, 313-329.

Breakwell, G. (1983). Threatened Identities. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Breakwell, G. (1986). Coping with Threatened Identities. New York: Methuen and Company.

Breakwell, G. (1992). Processes of self-evaluation: Efficacy and estrangement. In G. Breakwell (eds.) Social Psychology of Identity and the Self Concept. London: Academic Press.

Brenner, S.O. and Bartell, R. (1983). The psychological impact of unemployment: A structural analysis of cross-sectional data. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 56, 129-136.

Brockner, J. (1988). Self-esteem at Work. Lexington MA: Lexington Books.

Burke, P.J., and Reitzes, D.C. (1981). The link between identity and role performance. Social Psychology Quarterly, 44, 83-92.

Callero, P.L. (1985). Role-identity salience. Social Psychology Quarterly, 48, 203-215.

Campbell, N. K. and Hackett, G. (1986). The effects of mathematics task performance on math self-efficacy and task interest. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 28, 149-162.

Caplan, R.D., Vinokur, A.D., Price, R.H., and van Ryn, M. (1989). Job seeking, reemployment, and mental health: A randomized field experiment in coping with job loss. Journal of Applied Psychology, 14, 759-769.

Cascio, W. (1993). Downsizing: What do we know? What have we learned?, Academy of Management Executive, 7, 95-104.

Chartrand, J. M., and Camp, C.C. (1991). Advances in the measurement of career development constructs: A 20 year review. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 39, 1-39.

Cohen, R. S. and Lefkowitz, J. (1977). Self-esteem, locus of control, and task difficulty as determinants of task performance. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 11, 314-321.

Cohen, J., and Cohen, P. (1983). Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cooke, T.D., and Campbell, D.T. (1979). Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Crocker, L. and Algina, J. (1986). Introduction to Classical and Modern Test Theory. Orlando: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Davies, K. and Esseveld, J. (1985). Women and unemployment: A qualitative analysis Or playing hopscotch in the Swedish labor market. Women's Studies International Forum, 8, 263-271.

Dean, J.W., and Snell, S.A. (1991). Integrated manufacturing and job design: Moderating effects of organizational inertia. Academy of Management Journal, 34, 776-804.

Deaux, K. (1992). Personalizing identity and socializing self. In G. Breakwell (eds.) Social Psychology of Identity and the Self Concept. London: Academic Press.

DeFrank, R.S., and Ivancevich, J.M. (1986). Job loss: An individual level review and model. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 28, 1-20.

Dooley, D. and Catalano, R. (1988). Recent research on the psychological effects of unemployment. Journal of Social Issues, 44, 1-12.

Dubin, R.L., and Champoux, J.E. (1977). Central life interests and job satisfaction. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 18, 366-377.

Eden, D., and Aviram, A. (1993). Self-eficacy training to speed reemployment: Helping people to help themselves. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 352-360.

Ellis, R.A., and Taylor, M.S. (1983). Role of self-esteem within the job search process. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 632-640.

Erickson, E. (1968). Identity: Youth and Crisis.

London: Faber and Faber.

Feather, N.T. (1966). Effects of prior success and failure on expectations of success and subsequent performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 287-298.

Feather, N.T. (1968). Change in confidence following success or failure as a predictor of sunsequent performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9, 38-46.

Feather, N.T. (1990). The Psychological Impact of Unemployment. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Feather, N.T. (1993). Success and failure in the labor market: Some Comments. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14, 573-576.

Feather, N.T. and Davenport, P.R. (1981). Unemployment and depressive affect: A motivational and attributional analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 422-436.

Feldman, D. C. (1988). Managing Careers in Organizations. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman & Company.

Feldman, D. C. (1994). The decision to retire early: A review and conceptualization. Academy of Management Review, 19, 285-311.

Fryer, D. (1985). Stages in the psychological response to unemployment: A (dis)integrative review. Current Psychological Research and Reviews, Fall, 257-273.

Gecas, V. (1982). The self-concept. Annual Review of Sociology, 8, 1-33.

Gist, M. (1987). Self-efficacy: Implications for organizational behavior and human resource management. Academy of Management Review, 12, 472-485.

Gist, M. and Mitchell, T. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. Academy of Management Review, 17, 183-211.

Gleason, P. (1983). Identifying identity: A semantic history. The Journal of American History, 69, 910-931.

Goltz, S.M. (1990). Investigating self, task and supervisory feedback effects. Paper presented at the Fifth Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Miami, FL.

Goffman, E. (1963). Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Hackett, G. and Betz, N.E. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18, 326-339.

Hartley, J.F. (1980). The impact of unemployment on the self-esteem of managers. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53, 147-155.

Hartley, J. and Fryer, D. (1984). The psychology of unemployment: A critical appraisal., in G. Stephenson and J. Davis (eds.), Progress in Applied Social Psychology, 2, 186.

Harquail, C. (in progress). Is sisterhood powerful? The influence of social identification on women's advocacy in organizations.

Hines, L.L., Durham, T. W. and Geoghehan, G. R. (1991). Work self-concept: The development of a scale. Journal of Social Behavior and Persoanlity, 6, 815-832.

Hofman, (1983). Social identity and inter-group conflict. Cited in G. Breakwell (1986). Coping with Threatened Identities. New York: Methuen and Company.

Houston, P. (1992). Surviving the survivor syndrome. Working Woman, August, 1992, 57-60.

Jackson, P.R., Stafford, E.M., Banks, M.H., and Warr, P.B. (1983). Unemployment and psychological distress in young people: The moderating role of employment commitment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 525-535.

Jahoda, M. (1981). Work, employment, and unemployment: Values, theories, and approaches in social research. American Psychologist, 36, 184-191.

Jahoda, M. (1982). Employment and Unemployment. London: Cambridge University Press.

Joelson, L., and Walquist, L. (1987). The psychological meaning of job insecurity and job loss: Results of a longitudinal study. Social Science and Medicine, 25, 179-182.

Jones, G. (1986). Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and newcomers' adjustments to organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 29, 262-279.

Jussim, L., Coleman, L. and Nassua, S. (1989).

Reactions to interpersonal evaluative feedback. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19, 862-884.

Kanfer, R. and Hulin, H. (1985). Individual differences in successful job searches following lay-off. Personnel Psychology, 38, 835-847.

Kasl, S.V., and Cobb, S. (1982). Variability of stress effects among men experiencing job loss. In L. Goldberger and S. Breznitz (Eds.) Handbook of Stress: Theoretical and Clinical Aspects. New York: The Free Press.

Kaufman, H.G. (1982). Professionals in Search of Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Kopelman, R., Rovenpor, J.L., and Millsap, R. (1992). Rationale and construct validity evidence for the job search behavior index: Because intentions (and New Year's resolutions) often come to naught. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 40, 269-287.

Kozlowski, S., Chao, G., Smith, E. M., and Hedlund, J. (1993). Organizational Downsizing: Strategies, Interventions, and Research Implications. International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Latham. V.M. (1987). The job search process: An attitudinal and behavioral analysis. Journal of Employment Counseling, 24, 7-9.

Leana, C. and Feldman, D. (1988). Individual responses to job loss: Perceptions, reactions, and coping behaviors. Journal of Management, 14, 375-389.

Leana, C. and Feldman, D. (1990). Individual responses to job loss: Empirical findings from two field studies. Human Relations, 43, 1155-1181.

Leana, C. and Feldman, D. (1992). Coping with Job Loss. New York, NY: Lexington Books.

Leana, C. and Feldman, D. (1994). Coping with job loss through community-based creation and retention strategies. Paper presented at the Ninth Annual Conference of The Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Nashville, TN.

Leana, C. and Ivancevich, J. (1987). Involuntary job loss: Institutional interventions and a research agenda. Academy of Management Review, 12, 301-312.

Lee, C., and Bobko, P. (1994). Self-efficacy beliefs: Comparison of five measures. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 364-369.

Lent, R., Brown, S. and Larkin, K. (1984). Relations of self-efficacy expectations to academic achievement and persistence. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31, 356-363.

Lent, R., Brown, S., and Larkin, K. (1986). Self-efficacy in the prediction of academic performance and perceived career options. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33, 265-269.

Lent, R., Brown, S. and Larkin, K. (1987). Comparison of three theoretically derived variables in predicting career and academic behavior: Self-efficacy, interest congruence, and consequence thinking. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 293-298.

Lent, R. and Hackett, G. (1987). Career self-efficacy: Empirical directions and future status. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 30, 347-382.

Levinson, D.L. (1978). The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Ballatine Books.

Liem, R. and Liem, J.H. (1988). Psychological effects of unemployment on workers and their families. Journal of Social Issues, 44, 87-106.

Lobel, S. A. and St. Clair, L. (1992). Effects of family responsibilities, gender, and career identity salience on performance outcomes. Academy of Management Journal, 35, 1057-1069.

Locke, E., Frederick, E., Lee, C. and Bobko, P. (1984). Effect of self-efficacy, goals, and task strategies on task performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 241-251.

Locke, E. and Latham, G. (1990). A Theory of Goal Setting and Task Performance. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Locke, E., Motowildo, S.J. and Bobko, P. (1986). Using self-efficacy theory to resolve the conflict between goal setting theory and expectancy theory in organizational behavior and industrial/organizational psychology. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4, 328-338.

London, M. (1983). Toward a theory of career motivation. Academy of Management Review, 8, 620-630.

London, M. (1993). Relationships between career motivation, empowerment and support for career development. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 66, 55-69.

Maddux, J.E., Norton, L.W. and Stoltenberg, C.D. (1986). Self-efficacy expectancy, outcome expectancy, and outcome value: Relative effects on behavioral intentions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 783-789.

Maddux, J.E. and Stanley, M.A. (1986). Self-efficacy theory in contemporary psychology: An overview. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4, 249-255.

Markus, H.R. and Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. American Psychologist, 41, 954-969.

McCall, G.J. and Simmons, J.L. (1978). Identities and Interactions. New York: Free Press.
Michigan Prevention Research Center. (1992). Author.

Moos and Billings, (1982). Conceptualizing and measuring coping resources and processes. In L. Goldberger & S. Breznitz (Eds.), Handbook of Stress (pp. 212-230). New York: The Free Press.

Noe, R.A., Noe, A.W., and Bachhuber, J.A. (1990). An investigation of the correlates of career motivation. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37, 340-356.

Novak, T.C., and Snyder, K.A. (1983). Women's struggle to survive a plant shutdown. Journal of Intergroup Relations, 11, 25-44.

Nunnally, J.C. (1978). Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw Hill.

Osipow, S. H. (1990). Convergence in theories of career choice and development: Review and Prospect. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 36, 122-131.

Price, R. (1992). Psychosocial impact of job loss on individuals and families. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 1, 9-11.

Prussia, G.E., Kinicki, A.J., and Bracker, J.S. (1993). Psychological and behavioral consequences of job loss: A covariance structure analysis using Weiner's (1985) attribution model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 382-394.

Quint, E.D. and Kopelman, R.E. (in review). Job search

behavior, vocational maturity, and job acquisition success: Is there an interaction? Journal of Business and Psychology.

Radloff, L.S. (1977). The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. Applied Psychological Measurement, 1, 385-401.

Ross, A.O. (1992). The Sense of Self: Research and Theory. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). Conceiving the Self. New York: Basic Books.

Schein, E. (1978). Career Dynamics: Matching Individual and Organizational Needs. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Shamir, B. (1985). Sex differences in psychological adjustment to unemployment and reemployment: A question of commitment, alternatives or finance? Social Problems, 33, 67-79.

Shamir, B. (1990). Calculations, values, and identities: The sources of collectivistic work motivation. Human Relations, 43, 313-332.

Steers, R.M. and Porter, L. (1987). Motivation and Work Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sherer, M., Maddux J.E., Mercendante, B., Prentice Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., and Rogers, R.W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: construction and validation. Psychological Reports, 51, 663-671.

Stratford, E.M., Jackson, P.R., and Banks, M.H. (1980). Employment, work involvement and mental health in less qualified young people. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53, 291-304.

Stryker, S. (1980). Symbolic Interactionism: A Social Structural Version. Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin-Cummings.

Stryker, S. and Serpe, R.T. (1982). Committment, identity salience, and role behavior: Theory and Research Example. In W. Ickes and E.S. Knowles (eds), Personality, Roles, and Social Behavior, New York: Springer-Verlag, 199-218.

Stryker, S. and Serpe, R.T. (1994). Identity salience and pyschological centrality: Equivalent, overlapping, or complementary concepts? Social Psychology Quarterly, 57,

16-35.

Stumpf, S., Brief, A., and Hartman, K. (1987). Self-efficacy expectations and coping with career-related events. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 31, 91-108.

Swinburne, P. (1981). The psychological impact of unemployment on managers and professional staff. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 54, 47-64.

Super, D. (1954). Career patterns as a basis for vocational counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1, 12-20.

Super, D. (1963). Self-concepts in vocational development. In D.E. Super, R. Starisheevsky, N. Martin, & J.P. Jordon, (Eds.), Career development: Self-concept theory. New York: CEEB Research Monograph No.4.

Tajfel, H. and Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel and W.G. Austin, eds. Psychology of Intergroup Relations. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Taylor K.M. (1988). Advances in career planning systems. In W.B. Walsh and S.H. Osipow (Eds.), Career Decision Making (pp. 137-212), Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Taylor, K. and Betz, N.E. (1983). Applications of self-efficacy theory to the understanding and treatment of career indecision. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 22, 63-81.

Vinokur, A. and Caplan, R. (1987). Attitudes and Social Support: Determinants of Job-Seeking Behavior and Well-Being among the Unemployed. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 17, 1007-1024.

Vinokur, A. and Price, R. (1994). Mastery-building job search intervention for high displaced workers: The JOBS II extended field experiment. Paper presented at the Ninth Annual Conference of The Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Nashville, TN.

Vinokur, A.D., van Ryn, M., Gramlich, E.M., and Price, R.H. (1991). Long-term follow-up and benefit-cost analysis of the jobs program: A preventive intervention for the unemployed. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 213-219.

Vroom, V. (1964). Work and Motivation. New York: Wiley.

Warr, P.B., Jackson, P., and Banks, M. (1988). Unemployment and mental health: Some British studies. Journal of Social Issues, 44, 47-68.

Weinberg, R., Gould, D., and Jackson, A. (1979). Expectations and performance: An empirical test of Bandura's self-efficacy theory. Journal of Sport Psychology, 1, 320-331.

West, M., Nicholson, N., and Arnold, J. (1987). Identity changes as outcomes of work-role transitions. In Honess and Yardley (eds), Self and Identity: Perspectives across the Lifespan. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Wood, R. and Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. Academy of Management Review, 14, 361-384.

Wood, R. and Locke, E. (1987). The relation of self-efficacy and grade goals to academic performance. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 47, 1013-1024.