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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Fortune 500 companies slashed about four million jobs in the 1980's (Applegate, 1992). The merging, consolidating, downsizing, delayering, restructuring, and right sizing that has permeated American corporations has made involuntary job loss a concern for all workers. Historically, education and age have been highly inversely correlated with unemployment during soft labor market periods. Typically, less skilled workers with less seniority were the first employees terminated. In a study of the incidence of job loss covering the period 1982-1991, while the historical correlation holds true, older, more educated workers actually became more susceptible to job loss during the most recent 1990-91 downturn. Women with at least a college education had a significantly higher rate of job loss during the 1990-91 recession (Farber, 1993). Additionally, full-time reemployed displaced workers tended to suffer substantial earnings losses when compared with full-time workers who were not displaced (Farber, 1993).

Corporate downsizing has made a permanent change in white-collar middle management employment particularly in large corporations. Long term career growth and job security with a single company is no longer a viable option. It is estimated that some two million middle-management jobs were permanently eliminated during the 1980's due to corporate downsizing (Business Week, March 1992). Steve Harrison, president of Lee Heckt
Harrison, an outplacement firm, predicts that 90% of all executives now in the work force will be fired at least once in their careers (Koltnow & Dumas, 1990). During earlier recessions, 90% of white-collar employees who lost their jobs could expect to replace them with similar positions in a large company for the same or better salary. The current figure is 25% and falling according to Charles Sweet, president of A.T. Kearney Executive Search (Business Week, March 1992). This current climate of job insecurity among a once upwardly mobile white-collar population shows no sign of disappearing. Corporations strive to minimize their personnel costs by using temporary and contract workers in many white-collar positions. Few companies can resist the appeal of the rather immediate positive effect staff reductions have on the financial bottom line.

Simultaneously, over the same time period, women have greatly increased their proportion within the work force. This increase is largely due to the continued participation in the world of work of mother's with young children. In 1968, only one-fourth of all 25-44 year old mothers with children under 3 years of age worked outside the home. By 1988, more than half of similarly aged mothers with toddlers were in the labor force. An increased trend toward delayed child bearing has also increased labor force participation (Howe, 1990). Women have made significant advances into management positions. In 1968, women represented just 15% of all managers while in 1991 that percentage had grown to almost 41%, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (Business Week, June, 1992). Environmental changes such as rising levels of education, the Women's Movement, and changes in federal law to foster equal opportunity for women have all contributed to this significant increase.
In 1988, of the 3.1 million workers in the United States who lost their jobs, approximately one-third were women (Koltnow & Dumas, 1990). Since women represent almost half of the labor force, this would tend to indicate a slightly lower unemployment rate than for men. However, as cited earlier, during the most recent 1990-1991 recession, more highly educated women showed a significant increase in unemployment when compared to previous recessions (Farber, 1993). Management women seem also to experience longer periods of unemployment. There is indication from outplacement firms that women managers tend to be unemployed longer and obtain new jobs at reduced salaries more frequently than male clients (Phelps & Mason, 1991).

People respond to job loss with a broad range of behaviors. In American culture, people are typically defined by what they do for a living. When middle aged managers who may have tied so much self-esteem to successful corporate careers find themselves abruptly terminated, there is frequently a sense of failure, loss, and desperation (Business Week, March, 1992; Koltnow & Dumas, 1990). Anger and depression are typical reactions and behavior can be as extreme as suicide for those that lack the support and coping skills to utilize positive alternatives (Murphy, 1992). In addition to the normal economic distress of unemployment, downward mobility is an issue many executives must face because their middle management jobs have either disappeared or now pay substantially less (Business Week, March, 1992).

Involuntary unemployment is a distressing experience for any worker. It has become a high visibility issue in the last few years because of the increased incidence of involuntary job loss among middle managers and their difficulty in replacing the lost positions. The role of gender in this transition process has not been clearly understood. Economic and unemployment statistics indicate
the disparity in power, position, and economic resources between women and men managers which may make a job search more difficult (Business Week, June, 1992; Farber, 1993; Gergen, 1990; Wentling, 1992; Gates, 1992). However, there has been limited examination of how women managers cope with the job search process (Leana & Feldman, 1991; Phelps & Mason, 1991).

Self-efficacy theory posits that one's belief in her/his ability to complete a task effects the initiation and persistence of behavior (Bandura, 1986). Therefore, having high career search efficacy should increase job search coping behavior and therefore, the final positive outcome of reemployment. Self-efficacy as an explanation for differences in male and female career choices has been studied, though not with managers (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987; Hackett & Betz, 1981; Stickel & Bonett, 1991). The connection between career search efficacy and job search coping behavior of professional managerial unemployed has not been studied directly.

There is some indication that management women take longer to become reemployed and are more likely to have a reduced salary than men. One important area which may impact management women's reemployment is the ability to network with people in a position to help with the job search. The growing ranks of managerial women represent a change in the power and earnings that women can aspire to and model. However, women frequently remain outside of the "old boy" network that encourages corporate political savvy which aids in locating new positions. This informal network can provide information and recommendations for promotion opportunities as well as the much needed support system so important for an unemployed manager (Koltnow & Dumas, 1990; Wentling, 1992).
Managerial women's career search self-efficacy and it's effect on job search coping behaviors is another area which impacts reemployment that we really do not understand. Non-traditional career choices among women has been associated with higher levels of career self-efficacy (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987; Betz, 1992). Therefore, this thesis will examine job search coping behavior and career search efficacy among unemployed managerial women and men. The purpose is to investigate gender variations to gain insight into the role that career search efficacy may play in job search coping behavior. Hiring biases aside, understanding the way men and women approach the job search as well as issues of career search efficacy which may underlie any differences, may be helpful in expediting reemployment. Insight into these issues may suggest interventions to career counselors that may enable them to facilitate more favorable workforce reentry for their female clients.

In conclusion the specific research questions being investigated in this study are:

1) What is the relationship between gender and job loss coping behavior among unemployed managers? Specifically, what is the relationship between gender and problem solution (job search) coping behavior and symptom solution (support seeking) coping behavior.

2) What is the influence of gender on career search efficacy in the unemployed managers?

3) What is the relationship between career search efficacy and job loss coping behavior among unemployed managers?

4) Among the variables gender, career search efficacy and other research variables, what is the best predictor of job loss coping
behavior?
The investigation will provide answers to the above questions in order to gain greater understanding of the job loss coping behavior of unemployed managerial women.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter will review relevant empirical research literature on the two constructs job loss coping behavior and career search self-efficacy with particular attention to the influence of gender. These constructs will be discussed in terms of how they relate to job search among the unemployed.

Job Loss Coping Behavior

As discussed in the introduction, job loss has become a frequent occurrence in the modern working world. Job loss is consistently ranked among the top ten life changes in the degree of stress it creates (DeFrank & Ivancevich, 1986). How a person copes with job loss has an impact on their economic status, physical and psychological well-being.

Coping behavior refers to things people do to try to mediate the harmful effects of stressful life conditions and events. Pearlin and Schooler's (1978) research on the structure of coping provides a useful framework for the investigation of coping behavior. They examined the efficacy of three major types of coping responses: 1) responses that changed the situation causing the strain; 2) responses that controlled the meaning of the experience before it caused stress; and 3) responses that controlled the stress itself.

Pearlin and Schooler (1978) interviewed a sample (2300 people) representative of the Chicago metropolitan area limited to those between 18-
65 years of age. Males and Females were equally represented. Normal life stressors and the coping behaviors used to deal with them were examined within the context of four major life roles: marital, parenting, household economics, and occupational. In general, results indicated that coping interventions were most effective in dealing with interpersonal relationships such as marital and parenting roles were one's responses may more directly modify a situation and least effective when dealing with more impersonal issues such as those found in the occupational arena where one's responses to a corporate decision are less likely to modify that decision.

Pearlin and Schooler (1978) also investigated the role of coping resources (defined as the general psychological resources) to assess whether general psychological disposition was more efficacious than situation specific coping responses to stressors. Results indicated that subjects having a repertoire of coping behaviors and strong psychological resources were better able to deal this stressors than those having either one alone. However, there were indications that psychological characteristics were more helpful in sustaining people facing strains arising out of more impersonal conditions over which they may have little direct control such as finances and jobs. These findings imply that appropriate coping behaviors alone may not be sufficient to allow people to effectively cope with stressor situations in the occupational arena.

Even though Pearlin and Schooler's (1978) study did not deal directly with unemployment, findings appeared to suggest that subjects who used individual coping responses that were problem-focused (i.e., trying to eliminate the source of the stress/finding another job) rather than symptom-focused coping (i.e., trying to decrease the isolation or hardship associated
with unemployment) were more likely to reduce stress particularly if they also had a repertoire of coping resources.

Another conceptualization views coping as a complex and dynamic cognitive and behavioral process to manage internal and external demands that are appraised as stressful (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Stressful situations are those in which a person's coping resources are taxed or exceeded. Coping can be problem-focused (i.e., deal with the stressful situation) or emotion-focused (i.e., deal with the feelings resulting from the stressful situation). People use a combination of problem and emotion focused coping in response to a specific stress.

Kinicki and Latack, (1990) utilized Lazarus and Folkman's framework in their study of 104 laid off employees, who varied in education and type of employment. Over half the sample were female. Five situation-specific coping scales: Proactive Search, Nonwork Organization, Positive Self-assessment, Distancing from Job Loss, and Job Devaluation were used to measure respondent attitudes and experiences across two waves of data collection which were one month apart. Results associated the problem-focused coping behavior of proactive job search and positive self-assessment with high self-esteem (positive appraisal). The emotion-focused coping behavior of social support was associated with positive self-assessment. The data suggested that both problem and emotion-focused coping behavior have an impact.

Job loss coping behaviors were similarly categorized by Pearlin and Schooler (1978) and Lazarus and Folkman (1984) as Problem-focused or Symptom/Emotion-focused. Regarding job loss, problem-focused behavior appears to consistently effect a more positive outcome while there are mixed findings on symptom-focused behavior.
Job Search Coping Behavior

Coping with job loss is a complex process that involves many types of behaviors and resources. Active job search coping behavior appears to be an important factor in successful coping (Kinicki & Latack, 1990). In this section, research which explores the association between reemployment and active job search will be discussed.

Kanfer and Hulin (1985) studied the attitudinal and behavioral variables associated with reemployment among thirty-five terminated employees immediately after termination and one month later. Results indicated that reemployed persons were significantly more confident in their job search skills and had performed more job search behaviors than those who remained unemployed. This study closely associates job search efficacy with job search behaviors the implication being that lacking positive efficacy expectations regarding search skills may reduce search efforts and prolong unemployment.

Several studies have provided good evidence that an intervention of job search skill training increases job seeking behavior, speeds reemployment and may also have a positive effect on the physical and mental health of the unemployed (Caplan, Vinokur, Price & van Ryn 1989, DeFrank, van Ryn & Vinokur 1992, Eden & Aviram 1993, Gordus 1986, and Price, van Ryn & Vinokur, 1992). These studies focused on manipulating job search coping behavior and general self-efficacy to positively effect reemployment and mental health. Price et al (1992) found that job search interventions were most effective with those at high-risk for depression. Similarly, Eden and Aviram (1993) found that training aimed at increasing job search self-efficacy was most effective in increasing job search behavior among those with the
lowest initial efficacy.

In summary, job search coping behavior studies appear to indicate that pro-active search is important to reemployment. Additionally, job search behavior is associated with job search efficacy and can be manipulated using techniques which increase a subject's belief in their ability to perform job search behaviors.

Influence of Gender on Job Search Behavior

In Pearlin and Schooler's (1978) study, coping responses that changed the stressor situation were the more effective in dealing with all situations, however, occupational and financial stressors were alleviated most effectively by those participants who had a large variety of coping resources available. Gender differences surfaced in this study indicated that women utilized coping responses that were more passive and actually exacerbate stress. Men utilized coping responses that inhibited stressful outcomes to life problems and possessed a larger variety of psychological resources to deal with stressors. Pearlin and Schooler suggested that women's higher frequency of psychological disturbance may be a consequence of their being socialized in a way that less effectively equips them to cope with life stressors. Women are disadvantaged in the effectiveness of both their coping responses and the variety of coping resources they employ. Even though this study did not deal directly with unemployment, findings suggest that women are likely to utilize more passive and less effective methods of coping with job loss.

Pearlin and Schooner's (1978) investigation on coping with stressful events suggested that individual coping strategies can be problem-focused coping (i.e., trying to change the environment to eliminate the source of the stress) or symptom-focused coping (i.e., trying to decrease the isolation or
hardship associated with the stressful life events). These types of activities have been differentially ascribed and measured in women and men in line with gender role expectations in recent studies (e.g., Harris, Heller & Braddock, 1988; and Leana & Feldman, 1988, 1991).

Gender differences in job loss coping behavior have received little research effort until recently. Women tended to be excluded because chronic stereotypes caused researchers to assume women had differential goals and interests that would effect the severity of their response to job loss. These stereotypes included: women's lives are focused on home and family so work outside the home is less central to their identities; women are not primary wage earners and work more to supplement family income than any reward or sense of accomplishment they receive from working; and women tend to hold jobs with less authority, status and pay so loss is not as important (Leana & Feldman, 1991; Wentling, 1992). As in the workplace, these gender stereotypes have led researchers to conclude that work for pay is less important to women and therefore they were not included in job loss coping behavior studies. When women were included in the sample the influence of gender was rarely investigated.

Recent research by Leana and Feldman (1991), investigated the influence of gender on perception, coping behavior and reaction to job loss. Workers dislocated by the Challenger disaster in Florida were studied and provided a sufficient sample of women for a separate analysis. The goal of the study was to examine the gender stereotype that women were less traumatized by job loss than men. There were no significant gender differences in psychological and behavioral distress. Coping behavior was the only area of significant difference between men and women. Findings
indicated that men tended to focus more on problem solution behaviors that eliminated the source of stress (i.e., more active job search activities), while women focused more on support seeking behaviors to reduce the symptoms of stress (i.e., sought out social and financial support). This research was conducted on a largely blue collar population with some technical and managerial personnel included. This 1991 study is one of the few to examine gender differences in job loss coping behavior. The differences in coping behavior could impact the speed with which women become reemployed.

Studies of job loss coping behavior among managerial unemployed which include a measurable sample of women are rare. One study based on interviews and observations of subjects in an outplacement environment indicated that men and women responded differently to job loss (Phelps & Mason, 1991). Women in the study were more likely to deal with the grief process of job loss and look at job loss as a personal rejection while men tended to downplay or deny the emotional side of job loss and focus on finding another job while taking the job loss less personally. Men conducted a more solitary job search process and segregate the search from other aspects of their lives while women sought out the creative advise and support of others and took a more holistic approach to job search as an opportunity to take stock of their lives and which effected many aspects of their lives. Phelps and Mason observed that women took longer to transition to another employer or career and were more likely to leave the corporate track and go into consulting or start their own businesses. Phelps and Mason suggest that cultural conditioning and societal expectations may produce this differential response to job loss. They encourage outplacement counselors to be aware of these differences and be prepared to deal with the specific needs of women
and men.

The studies by Leana and Feldman (1991) and Phelps and Mason (1991) would seem to suggest a similar coping behavior in response to job loss between managerial and non-managerial women, with more concentration on seeking out emotional and/or stress reducing support rather than the proactive job search behaviors more often utilized by men. This reliance on coping behavior which is more likely to reduce job loss stress instead of eliminate it (reemployment), implies protracted unemployment and therefore continued need for emotional support among unemployed women.

**Career Efficacy**

Self-efficacy was deemed to be important as a mediating influence among those dealing with job loss in several of the coping behavior studies cited earlier in this chapter. These studies explored facets of job loss coping behavior such as: positive belief, job search behavior and reemployment (Eden & Aviram, 1993; Homes & Werbel, 1992); positive expectancies and job seeking behavior (Caplan, Vinokur, Price & van Ryn, 1989, and Kanfer & Hulin, 1985); and impact of instrumental and emotional support on pro-active job search (Kinicki and Latack, 1990). Since the initiation and persistence of job search coping behavior appears to be an important factor in reemployment and positive well being, career search efficacy is an important variable to examine to better understand the role of self-referent beliefs to the performance of career related tasks. Discussion of research on this construct follows.

Bandura (1986) described self-efficacy expectations as a belief or conviction that one can successfully organize and execute courses of action required to achieve certain ends. Bandura hypothesized that self-efficacy
beliefs determined whether a person would initiate a course of action, how much effort would be expended on the action, and the persistence of that action when confronted with difficulty. The sources of self-efficacy information are enactive attainment (a person experiences repeated success and mastery of a behavior); vicarious experience (observing others performance and assuming mastery as in a mentoring relationship); verbal persuasion (receiving appraisal of skills from others); physiological state (stress or other feelings aroused by a situation); and cognitive processing of self-efficacy information. Self-efficacy theory has been used to study many areas of behavior but this review will focus on career related self-efficacy.

Hacket and Betz (1981) were the first to apply self-efficacy theory to the career domain to investigate self-efficacy's influence on career decisions and achievements. They were particularly interested in career self-efficacy's potential to explain women's career development by linking differential gender role socialization to occupational behavior. Hacket and Betz (1981) study examined gender differences in self-efficacy in terms of the educational requirements and job duties of 10 traditionally male and 10 traditionally female occupations across the six Holland themes. Results indicated that college men's efficacy expectations for mastering educational requirements and job functions were similar across traditionally male and female occupations, but college women's efficacy beliefs varied according to the gender appropriateness of the occupation, higher for female occupations lower for male occupations. However, high efficacy beliefs were associated with non-traditional career choice for both genders. This study surfaced the role of self-efficacy beliefs in a person's perceived range of career options and stimulated career development research.
Career self-efficacy has become a prominent construct in career development theory. In Hackett and Lent's (1987, 1992) reviews of career self-efficacy research, the authors discussed career self-efficacy research developments in several areas:

a) vocational interest studies which found a significant relationship between self-efficacy and technical/scientific interest (e.g., Lent, Brown & Larkin, 1986);
b) performance studies which considered self-efficacy and the performance of career relevant behaviors finding that self-efficacy moderated the relationship of aptitude and academic achievement as well as job search success after layoff (e.g., Kanfer & Hulin, 1985);
c) career decision and academic choice studies which looked at self-efficacy and occupational consideration and performance finding that subjects with higher levels of self-efficacy had less career indecision and more career exploratory activity (e.g., Nevill & Schlecker, 1988);
d) intervention studies which explored the causal link between self-efficacy and behavior (e.g., Hackett et al, 1990);
and e) studies of gender's influence on career self-efficacy over a number of dimensions such as traditionality vs. non-traditionality of career choice to explore women's career development (e.g., Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987).

Hackett and Lent concluded in their 1992 review that current research indicated that: a) self-efficacy is related to work adjustment outcomes such as performance and coping with job loss, and b) gender differences in self efficacy frequently help explain gender differences in occupational consideration.

In summary, the enactive mastery experiences one receives and the
exposure to successful role models one experiences provide valuable information for developing beliefs about competency in many career realms. In the area of job loss, successful coping (reemployment) is related to positive self-efficacy regarding skills required to search for another job.

**Job Search Efficacy**

In applying self-efficacy to the unemployed, self-efficacy expectations refer to expectations of mastery over the behaviors prerequisite to reemployment. Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) research of stress and coping identified six basic coping resources which give people the ability and desire to engage in useful coping responses. These resources include: health and energy, positive beliefs, problem-solving, social skills, social support, and material resources. Holmes and Werbel (1992) studied 186 unemployed people from a variety of employment and educational backgrounds regarding the coping resources described by Lazarus and Folkman (1984) and their job search success (reemployment). Positive beliefs measured in this study refer to a participants self-efficacy in their ability to find a new job within a range of time periods and locus of control. Three months after job loss, those participants who had become reemployed had higher self-efficacy and more internal locus of control. These findings imply that self-efficacy is an important element in expediting the job search process and reemployment.

Self-efficacy beliefs of particular interest are those concerning job search behaviors. Job search efficacy refers to a person's beliefs regarding their ability to perform the various tasks involved in looking for a job. Kanfer and Hulin (1985), conducted a study which examined attitudinal and behavioral variables associated with reemployment after involuntary lay-off. Analyses of the twenty-three participants from clerical and nursing
occupations re-contacted after one month unemployed, indicated that those who were reemployed had been significantly more confident in their job search skills during the first interview than those who remained unemployed. No significant differences in affective response to termination or nonwork-related variables were found between the two groups. The influence of gender was not analyzed. These findings suggest that successful reemployment is related to a positive belief in one's ability to perform the skills associated with a job search.

Together these studies imply that successful reemployment is related to both the self-efficacy beliefs in one's ability to find a job and to perform the skills associated a job search. Training interventions in job search skills with unemployed subjects have produced increased job seeking behavior (e.g., Caplan, Vinokur, Price & van Ryn, 1989). The effect of such training was greatest among those with low self-efficacy. This increase in job seeking behavior is likely the result of increased job search efficacy. None of the job search efficacy studies examined the managerial population or the influence of gender. Since the managerial population may have more of the resources described by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), it would seem likely that their job search efficacy would be high. This may be less true for women than men.

Influence of Gender on Career Efficacy

Institutional practices and socialization contribute to the development of self-efficacy beliefs. Hackett and Betz (1981) in their initial study of career efficacy proposed that since men and women are socialized differently and they may have different levels of access to the primary sources of efficacy information (i.e., enactive performance opportunities; available vocational role models; and encouragement to pursue non-stereotypical behaviors).
Women's career interests and pursuits appeared to be constricted by their self-beliefs that traditionally male occupations were inappropriate for them because they lacked the ability to master the required skills. Hackett and Betz (1981) suggested that the differences between male and female self-efficacy for traditional male and female career areas was produced by socialization differences and could be a factor in women's underemployment and low representation in many male dominated careers. Additional findings indicated that self-efficacy, gender and interest contributed significant variance to the prediction of range of perceived nontraditional career options for both sexes while academic ability did not.

Research on math self-efficacy and/or math task performance and its effect on career choice and decision making, has been particularly productive in examining the influence of gender. Hackett and Betz (1981) investigation of career related self-efficacy expectations and perceived career options found that female ACT math scores were not related to perceived range of career options while male ACT math scores were significantly related. Occupations that emphasized mathematics such as engineer, accountant, and mathematician consistently produced gender differences in self-efficacy expectations in favor of males. Betz and Hackett (1983) examined the effect of math self-efficacy expectations on the selection of science-based college majors. Math self-efficacy expectations were significantly related to the choice of science-based majors and males had significantly stronger math related self-efficacy than females. Within a group that is likely to have higher math efficacy (engineering students) and academic self-efficacy was the best predictor of academic performance, female academic self-efficacy was not significantly lower than males (Hackett et al, 1992). Investigations of the effects of math
task performance on math self-efficacy and task interest (Campbell & Hackett, 1986; Hackett et al, 1990) tend to support hypotheses developed from career self-efficacy theory. Positive performance increased efficacy and interest. In summary, these studies of math self-efficacy appear to support the mediating effects of self-efficacy on career choice and interest. Efforts to enhance self-efficacy and encourage women in their pursuit of nontraditional careers is likely to be more successful than supporting a null environment (Betz, 1989).

Level of self-efficacy has been found to be predictive of career decision making (O'Hare & Beutell, 1987; Mathieu et al, 1993; and Taylor & Betz, 1983). Subjects with weak levels of self-efficacy reported higher levels of career indecision and vice versa. O'Hare & Beutell (1987) found higher levels of career indecision and lower levels of career self-efficacy among women when they analyzed gender differences in their study while Mathieu et al (1993) reported women who were undecided about occupational choice had lower self-efficacy than women who preferred nontraditional or gender neutral occupations. The ability to make a decision to change careers may be beneficial to those coping with job loss. Since self-efficacy is closely liked with career decision making it is likely to be liked to the decision to change careers. A gap in the research exists with regard to career change and self-efficacy.

Research has indicated that gender differences in self-efficacy influence career choice and decision. A general association between positive job search self-efficacy and reemployment has been demonstrated (Kanfer & Hulin, 1985). However, a gap in the research literature exists regarding gender's influence on job search self-efficacy with respect to reemployment. Women may be disadvantaged in their efforts to get a new job because of
lower perceived efficacy with respect to job search skills. In their 1992 review of career self-efficacy literature, Hackett and Lent concluded that: a) self-efficacy is related to work adjustment outcomes such as performance and coping with job loss, and b) gender differences in self efficacy frequently help explain gender differences in occupational consideration. These conclusions lead to the suggestion that since gender differences in self-efficacy explain differential occupational consideration, gender differences in self-efficacy may also relate to differential coping with job loss.

In conclusion, the main constructs examined in this literature review, job loss coping behavior and career efficacy, appear to be complimentary to each other and increase the likelihood of rapid reemployment. If an unemployed person has appropriate coping behaviors in their repertoire but is not positive about their ability to perform those behaviors, they are less likely to act and be persistent in those actions. Conversely, skills training has been shown to effect self-efficacy beliefs and performance of tasks. Therefore, coping behavior and the internal coping resource of self-efficacy appear to combine to aid the unemployed become reemployed. A more specific understanding of the influence of gender on these constructs in terms of unemployed females managers would be useful to counselors working with this population. Job search self-efficacy studies focused on managerial unemployed and/or investigating the influence of gender are both absent from current literature.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Participants

The target population for the survey was involuntarily unemployed adults who previously held managerial positions. Participants were drawn from several Chicago area job clubs and job search support groups, university career centers, a non-profit women's organization, and outplacement firms. Subjects were at these locations to obtain various career support services.

Unemployed management women proved to be more difficult to locate than unemployed male managers. The final sample included 86 men and 45 women for a total of 131 participants. Demographically the population was overwhelmingly white (94%), married (65%), 40 years of age or older (60%), had participated in the workforce an average of 18 years (S.D.= 9.6 with a range from 1 to 36 years). They contributed a mean of 80% (S.D.= 1.24 with a range of 5% to 100%) and mode of 100% (40% of sample) of the total family income prior to losing their job. Participants on average had been employed in their most recent job for 6 years (S.D.= 7.5 with a range of 1 to 36 years) and had been unemployed 6.25 months (S.D. = 6.04 with a range of 1 month to 36 months) the modal number of months unemployed was 1. Respondents were highly educated with 46% having completed a bachelor's degree and 41% a Masters or Doctoral degree. Men and women differed on several demographic dimensions which will be discussed more fully in the Results.
section.

Instruments

Data was collected using a survey instrument consisting of a demographic measure, the Job Loss Coping Behavior (JLCB) scale authored by Leana and Feldman (1992) and the Career Search Efficacy Scale (CSES) developed by Solberg, Good, and Nord (1994).

Job Loss Coping Behavior (JLCB, Leana & Feldman, 1992) was utilized to measure job loss behavior. A copy of the measure can be found in Appendix A. The questions were developed using Pearlin and Schooler's (1978) research on coping with stressful life events. Frequency of engaging in a behavior was measured on a four-point scale ranging from 1 = "not at all" to 4 = "a lot". A factor analysis with varimax rotation indicated that the factors loaded on six types of behavior: a) self-initiated job search activities; b) seeking education and/or retraining; c) investigating geographical relocation; d) seeking for financial assistance; e) community activism; and f) seeking social support. The first three factors were problem-focused aimed at finding employment while the last three were symptom-focused aimed at alleviating the adverse effects of job loss. Leana and Feldman did not report reliability and validity data. In this study the reliability coefficient for the total JLCB scale was low at .65. For Subscale 1: Problem Solving scale the reliability coefficient was found to be .58. For Subscale 2: Symptom Solution scale the reliability coefficient was found to be .43.

Because the original measure was developed for an unemployed population which included clerical, blue collar and technical workers as well as managerial, some clarifying changes were made to make the scale more consistent with the job search techniques used by a management population.
Question #1 which originally read as, "Followed up on help wanted notices?" was changed to "Followed up on newspaper and other help wanted notices?". Question #3 originally read, "Tried to get a job through a government employment agency?" and was changed to "Tried to get a job through an executive search or other employment agencies?". Question #11 which originally read, "Taken steps to learn a new trade/skill/profession?" was changed to "Taken steps to learn a new skill/profession?". Question #14 originally read, "Applied for government financial assistance?" was changed to "Applied for unemployment compensation or other government financial assistance?". Question #16 was completely changed from the original "Used community job bank services" to "Networked at business or professional associations" since the vast majority of managerial jobs are obtained through networking with colleagues employed in the desired field and others (Gates, 1992).

The Career Search Efficacy Scale (CSES; Solberg et al, 1994) was utilized to assess level of confidence in being able to accomplish various tasks involved in the job search process. A copy of the scale can be found in Appendix B. The CSES was developed to measure a person's efficacy expectations in their ability to perform on four subscales (i.e., Job Exploration, Interviewing, Networking, and Personal Exploration Efficacy) associated with career selection and search. Items were identified from a survey of career self-help books. A group of 35 items was rated on a 10 point rating scale indicating how confident the respondent was in his/her ability to accomplish a task. The scale ranged from 0 = "very little" to 9 = "very much". Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and yielded an estimate of .97 for the full scale. Convergent and discriminate validity of CSES was
assessed in a comparative analysis with five other scales. The other measures included: the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale (CDMSE) (Taylor & Betz, 1983), the Rathus Assertiveness Scale (Rathus, 1973), the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence & Helmreich, 1978), and a measure of interpersonal facility or skills (Jones, Briggs, & Smith, 1986). A principle component analysis was performed on all the measures producing three factors with eigenvalues greater than one. The four subscales of the CSES and the five subscales of the CDMSE loaded together on one factor with factor loadings ranging from .90 to .69 which suggests that this factor estimated career search efficacy. Factor 2 consisted of constructs associated with human agency and factor 3 consisted of expressive personality characteristics. Since the objective of the current study is to assess career search efficacy as a whole, the subscales on the CSES were not be analyzed separately.

Procedure

The survey packet consisted of a cover letter, questionnaire, and plain white business size envelope. The cover letter explained the anonymous, voluntary and confidential nature of the survey and potential uses of the data. It also assured respondents that participation would in no way influence the services provided by the distributing agency. A "drop box" or large envelope was available at each site for the respondent to deposit their survey. The cover letter is in Appendix C. Questionnaires were made available at distribution sites for respondents to pick-up or they were distributed at group meetings depending on the organizations' normal process. Participants were instructed by the cover letter to insert the completed questionnaire into the white envelope and seal it before depositing it in the "drop box". When the
participant requested, stamped self-addressed envelopes were provided to respondents so they could mail the questionnaires to the researchers address. Mail receipt was infrequent with eight questionnaires returned in that manner.

Analysis of Data

Completed surveys were collected and data was entered on the Loyola mainframe using SPSS. Each institution and respondent involved in the study was given a unique code number. All statistics were conducted using SPSS.

Various statistical techniques were used to assess significant differences and relationships between the research variables. Chi-square analyses were used to analyze gender differences in demographic frequencies and select variables for further analysis by assessing the independence of variables. Gender differences on JLCB and CSES scales and individual items were analyzed using t-tests. Correlation coefficients were generated among the research variables of interest. Finally, to determine the best predictor of job loss coping behavior from career search efficacy, gender and other continuous demographic variables, a stepwise regression was performed using scores from the JLCB as the dependent measure. Similar stepwise regressions were also conducted on two subsets of the JLCB scale. The first subset focuses on problem solution coping behavior (i.e. getting another job) and the second subset focuses on symptom solution coping behavior (i.e. reducing stress associated with job loss).

Hypotheses tested include:

1) Unemployed management women use different types of job loss coping behaviors than unemployed management men. Specifically, women are less likely to use problem solution (job search) behavior than men and more likely to use symptom solution
(support seeking) behavior than men.

2) Unemployed management women have lower levels of career search efficacy than unemployed management men.

3) High career search efficacy is predictive of more frequent job loss coping behavior.

4) Gender is the best predictor of job loss coping behavior.
CHAPTER VI

RESULTS

The findings reported in this study are divided into two sections: a) demographic characteristics and b) primary analysis. All data tables are in Appendix D.

Demographic Characteristics

The overall characteristics of the sample were discussed in Chapter III under the Subjects section. Chi-square analyses were conducted on frequencies for the total sample and according to gender and are presented in Table 1 (Appendix D). Women and men differed significantly on several demographic measures. Men were significantly older with 78% of the men over 40 years of age verses only 27% of women over 40 years of age. Eighty-one percent of the men in the sample were married while only one-third of the women were married. Half of the women in the sample had been employed 10 or more years (mean 12.2, S.D. 8.1) verses 81% of the men (mean 21.1, S.D. 8.9). Additionally, one-quarter of the men had spent 10 or more years on their most recent job which was a significantly longer tenure than women (7% had spent 10 or more years). Male compensation was also significantly higher with 51% earning $55,000 or more while only 18% of the women earned in that range.

The null hypothesis that gender is not related to other demographic
variables is not supported in this sample. The significant differences imply that
the men in the sample are more experienced managers who probably had
achieved higher positions in their former companies hence the higher salaries.

The results of Chi-square analyses of independence between the
variable age and other demographic variables indicated that age is not
independent of other demographic variables. Therefore, the null hypothesis
was not supported in this sample. Age was significantly related to gender,
marital status, years employed full-time, years in last job, and most recent
salary. Respondents over 40 were more likely to be married (85%) while
those under 40 were unmarried (65%); those over 40 had been employed an
average of 24 years (S.D. = 6.5) while those under 40 had been employed an
average of 9 years (S.D. = 5.5). The years in most recent job was significantly
higher for respondents over 40 years of age with a mean of 8.4 years (S.D. =
8.6) and mean of 2.8 years (S.D. = 3.1) for those under 40. Seventy-six
percent of participants over 40 earned over $40,000 in their most recent job
while 63% of those under 40 earned less than $40,000.

Table 2 (Appendix D) provides means, standard deviations, and results
of t-tests for the significance of gender differences on the total Job Loss
Coping Behavior (JLCB) scale scores, Subscale #1: Problem Solution
Behavior scores, Subscale #2: Symptom Solution Behavior score, and Career
Search Efficacy Scale (CSES) scores for females and males. Additionally,
individual items from each scale which produced a statistically different t-tests
are indicated in Table 2. There are statistically significant differences between
the mean scores of women and men on the Job Loss Coping Behavior scale,
Subscale #1: Problem Solution Behavior, and the Career Search Efficacy
Scale. Men reported significantly higher total mean scores on all of these
scales. This led to a rejection of the null hypothesis that mean scores of the population are equal.

There is no evidence to believe the null hypothesis is not true for Subscale #2: Symptom Solution. The mean scores of women and men are not significantly different on this subscale and are therefore considered to be equal or very similar.

**Primary Analysis**

**Relationship of gender to job loss coping behavior.**

Scores on the JLCB scale were used as a measure of job loss coping behavior and gender responses in the demographic section of the questionnaire were used as gender measures. Results of t tests (Table 2) indicated that males had a significantly higher total mean score on the JLCB scale than females, 37.5 (S.D.=7.1) vs. 34.0 (S.D.=5.6), respectively.

On a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) comparing the variability between and within the gender groups on Job Loss Coping Behavior scores, males scored significantly higher than females (F= 8.01, p<.01). A one-way ANOVA comparing the variability between and within age groups on JLCB scores produced a significant difference (F= 7.02, p<.00005) indicating that older participants utilized more job loss coping behaviors than younger. A two-way ANOVA was performed to assess the interaction between gender and age on JLCB scores. No significant interactions were found. This means that although gender and age each significantly effected Job Loss Coping Behavior scores, the relationship between JLCB scores and gender was not effected by age.

Pearson product moment correlation's (Table 3) were generated to determine the relationship among the research variables of interest. The
correlation between gender and scores on the JLCB was .24 which is significant at p<.01. Number of years employed full-time (.36) and scores on the CSES (.33) were also correlated to JLCB.

A stepwise regression analysis (Table 4) was used to determine which variables were significantly predictive of job loss coping behavior. Variables used in the equation included: CSES, Gender, # of years employed full-time, # years in last job, and # of months in job search. The only significant predictors were CSES score with an R squared of .090 which predicted 9% of the variance and # years employed with an R squared of .152 which predicted 15% of the variance in JLCB scores.

Relationship of gender to problem solution behavior.

Problem solution behavior was measured by Subscale #1 of the JLCB. Results of t tests (Table 2) indicated that males had a significantly higher mean score on the Subscale #1 than females, 19.4 (S.D.=4.4) vs. 17.3 (S.D.=3.3), respectively. Men were more likely to use pro-active job search behaviors in response to job loss than women.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) comparing the variability between and within the gender groups on Subscale #1 scores produced a significant difference (F= 8.4, p<.01) with males scores being higher. A one-way ANOVA comparing the variability between and within age groups on Subscale #1 measured a significant difference (F= 2.8, p<.05) with participants over 50 years of age scoring higher on problem solution behavior than those under 30 years of age. A two-way ANOVA was performed to assess the interaction between gender and age on Subscale #1 scores. There was no significant interaction meaning the relationship between problem solution (support seeking) behavior and gender is not effected by age.
Pearson product moment correlation's (Table 3) were generated to determine the relationship among the research variables of interest. A correlation of .25 was found between gender and problem solution behavior which is significant but weak and the same as the gender correlation with the total JLCB scale (.24). Scores on the CSES (.33) and the number of years employed full time (.36) were similarly correlated with problem solution behavior.

A stepwise regression analysis (Table 4) was used to determine which of the variables were significantly predictive of problem solution behavior. Variables used in the equation included: CSES, # years employed full-time, gender, # years in last job, and # of months in job search. Career Search Efficacy Scale score predicted 10% of the variance with an R squared of .096 and with gender predicted 14% of the variance in Subscale #1 scores with R squared of .137.

**Relationship of gender to symptom solution behavior**

Scores on the Subscale #2: Symptom Solution Behavior of the JLCB scale were used as a measure of symptom solution behavior. Results of t tests indicated no significant difference between the mean scores of males and females on the Subscale #2.

A one-way ANOVA comparing the variability between and within the gender groups on Subscale #2 scores indicated no significant difference between within group and between group variability. A one-way ANOVA comparing the variability between and within age groups on Subscale #2 scores produced a significant difference (F= 7.6, p<.00005) indicating that participants 30-35 and 40+ scored higher on Subscale #2 than those under 30 while those 50+ also scoring higher than 35-40 year olds on the subscale.
two-way ANOVA was performed to assess the interaction between gender and age on Subscale #2. No significant interaction was found. These findings indicate that while men and women do not differ on support seeking behaviors in response to job loss, older respondents are generally more likely to seek support.

Pearson product moment correlation's were conducted to determine the relationship among the research variables of interest and the question of how gender related to scores on Subscale #2: Symptom Solution Behavior. The correlation between gender and Subscale #2 was .16 which is not significant. Number of years employed full-time (.35) and scores on the CSES (.22) were both significantly correlated to symptom solution behavior.

A stepwise regression analysis (Table 4) was used to determine which of the variables were significantly predictive of symptom solution behavior. Variables used in the equation included: CSES, gender, # of years employed full-time, # years in last job, and # of months in job search. Number of years employed full-time with an R squared of .056 predicted 6% of the variance in scores on the Subscale #2 and was the only variable found to be significantly predictive symptom solution behavior.

**Relationship of gender to career search efficacy.**

Scores on the CSES were used as a measure of career search efficacy. Results of t tests (Table 2) indicated that males had a significantly higher total mean score on the CSES than females, 234.7 (S.D.= 40.8) vs. 216.7 (S.D.= 48.6), respectively.

A one-way ANOVA comparing the variability between and within the gender groups on Career Search Efficacy Scale scores produced a significant difference (F= 5.1, p<.05) with male scores indicating higher career search
efficacy than females. A one-way ANOVA comparing the variability between and within age groups on CSES scores produced a significant difference (F=2.6, p<.05) with participants 45-50 years old scoring higher than those under 30. A two-way ANOVA was performed to assess the interaction between gender and age on CSES scores. No significant interaction between gender and age was found. These findings indicate that the relationship between gender and career search efficacy is not effected by age.

Pearson product moment correlations (Table 3) were generated to determine the relationship among the research variables. The correlation between gender and the CSES scale scores was significant but weak at .19. JLCB scores (.33), Problem Solution Subscale #1 (.32), Symptom Solution Subscale #2 (.22), and number of years employed in last job (.22) are all correlated to CSES scores.

**Relationship between career search efficacy and job loss coping behavior.**

Pearson product moment correlations (Table 3) were generated to determine the relationship between Career Search Efficacy Scale scores and scores on the Job Loss Coping Behavior scale. The two scales used to measure these constructs were correlated significantly at .33.

A stepwise regression analysis (Table 4) was used to determine if CSES scores were significantly predictive of JLCB scores. Variables used in the equation included: CSES, Gender, # of years employed full-time, # years in last job, and # of months in job search. Scores on the Career Search Efficacy Scale were significantly predictive of scores on the Job Loss Coping Behavior Scale with 9% of the variance explained and an R squared of .090.
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DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the influence of gender on job loss coping behaviors among unemployed managerial workers. Specifically, this study examined the relationship between gender and problem solution coping behavior (i.e., behaviors focused directly on eliminating the problem of unemployment) and symptom solution coping behavior (i.e., behavior focused on reducing the stress of being unemployed). The influence of gender on career search efficacy as well as the relationship between career search efficacy and job loss coping behavior were also explored. Additionally, the relationship among selected demographic variables, career search efficacy, and job loss coping behavior were examined.

Relationship of the Data to the Research Questions

Question 1 pertained to the influence of gender on job loss coping behavior among unemployed managerial workers. According to this study, managerial men and women coped with job loss differently. Statistical measures indicated that men had significantly higher scores on the Job Loss Coping Behavior (JLCB) scale than women. Men engaged in job search activities and other coping behaviors more frequently than women. They were significantly more willing to relocate for a new job; more likely to look for work through executive search firms; and more likely to talk about job search problems with friends, spouse or support group. Support was found
for the hypothesis that gender influences job loss coping behavior. All things being equal, the aggressiveness with which one approaches the job search is likely to impact the length of time unemployed (Eden & Aviram, 1993; Gates, 1992, and Holmes & Werbel, 1992). The finding that women engage in job search and support seeking activities less frequently than men, implies that they may be unemployed longer and suffer the attendant economic hardship of longer unemployment.

Specific coping methods were examined using two subscales of the JLCB. Subscale #1: Problem Solution Behavior focused on coping behaviors that are aimed at eliminating the source of stress (i.e. being unemployed). Men scored significantly higher on this subscale than women indicating they engaged in problem solution coping behavior significantly more frequently than women. They more frequently engaged in activities that were directly involved in finding another management job such as working with executive search firms and looking for job opportunities outside their community or in a different city. Gender differences in Subscale #1 scores in the current study are similar to those in Leana and Feldman's (1991) study. Age also effected the frequency of problem solution behavior, however, there was no interaction between age and gender in this study. Younger participants tended to engage in fewer job search activities than older participants. These findings imply that the men in this study may have been more knowledgeable about the job search process and may have had greater access to some job search vehicles such as executive search firms. According to the Chi-square analyses, they have been working longer and achieved higher status than the women, therefore networking opportunities which provide access to opportunities are likely to be more available.
Subscale #2: Symptom Solution Behavior focuses on behaviors that involve seeking social and other types of support in order to reduce the stress and other symptoms of job loss and being unemployed. There was no significant gender difference in symptom solution behavior subscale scores. In this study, men and women participated in behaviors designed to relieve stress associated with job loss with similar frequency. This finding implies that social support to relieve job loss related stress is similarly important to managerial men and women.

Other studies have found women to rely on social support more than men. For instance, Leana and Feldman (1991) found that women scored significantly higher on the Subscale #2: Symptom Solution than men. Difference in the results on this subscale may be attributable to changes in the questions included in the scale. Variance in the populations from which the samples for these two studies were drawn may also help explain the difference. Leana and Feldman's respondents were largely blue collar workers and a smaller group of technical and managerial workers, while the sample in the current study was drawn exclusively from a managerial population. Thus, comparisons across the two studies must be made cautiously.

Question 2 examined the influence of gender on career search efficacy in the unemployed managerial population. Do men and women differ in their confidence in their ability to perform the tasks associated with finding a job? The results of t tests and ANOVA indicated that men in this study had significantly higher career search efficacy as measured by the Career Search Efficacy Scale (CSES). Men were significantly more confident in their ability to identify and evaluate career preferences, personal values, job requirements and personal capabilities. They were also more confident in networking skills.
such as ability to select helpful people in the workplace. As with the other subscale there were some significant differences by age group with older participants tending to have higher scores and there was also no interaction between age and gender. This lack of confidence in their ability to perform the tasks associated with the job search is likely to hinder women's reemployment. Several studies (Caplan, Vinokur, Price & Van Ryn, 1989; DeFrank, Van Ryn & Vinokur, 1992; Eden & Aviram, 1993; and Holmes & Werbel, 1992) have indicated the importance of confidence in job search skills in finding another job.

The finding of gender differences on the CSES contrasted from the original Solberg, Good & Nord (1994) study which indicated no significant gender differences on the CSES scale. These differences may be the result of population differences since the original study utilized a college aged population with little work experience compared to the adult population with lengthy work experience utilized in this study. This would seem to imply that years spent in the workforce may contribute more to males' development of higher confidence in their career search capabilities than females.

Question 3 related to the relationship between career search efficacy and job loss coping behavior. Scores on the Career Search Efficacy Scale and the Job Loss Coping Behavior Scale were positively and significantly correlated in this study (r = .33). Career Search Efficacy Scale scores were also significantly and positively correlated to the problem solution behavior and symptom solution behavior subscales (r = .32 and r = .22, respectively). These correlation though weak support the hypothesis that positive attitudes about one's ability to perform career search tasks will lead to the performance of more job search behaviors. Since management women in this study had
lower scores on both the CSES and JLCB than men, the lack of career search efficacy among these women appears to be related to lower levels of job search behaviors. This again could lead to a longer period of unemployment.

Question 4 asked from among variables gender, career search efficacy, and other research variables of interest, what was the best predictor of job loss coping behavior. Scores on the Career Search Efficacy Scale and the number of years employed full-time were the only variables significantly predictive of job loss coping behavior. Together they accounted for 15% of the variance. The results of this study supported the hypothesis that higher career search efficacy produces higher job loss coping behavior. Implications for women in this study is that their lower confidence in their ability to conduct a job search may be likely to lead to longer unemployment.

Career search efficacy was similarly predictive of performance on the problem solution behavior subscale as it had been of the total JLCB scale. However, it was not predictive for the symptom solution behavior subscale. Therefore, the CSES was more predictive of actual job search behaviors in this sample than the symptom or stress reducing behaviors. This implies that higher career search efficacy encourages more frequent job search behavior but has no impact on symptom or stress reducing behavior. Since more frequent job search behavior may lead to faster reemployment, the need for symptom or stress reducing behavior may be reduced.

Limitations of the Present Study

The results of the present study may be limited by several factors. It is unknown if this sample is representative of unemployed managerial workers. The sample appears to be positively skewed since men are older, more frequently married and earn higher salaries than the women in the study.
but, this may be consistent with the current management population. Women are more recent entrants into the management job market, most have entered in the last 20 years. Therefore the age differences may be reality with fewer women managers in the over 40 age bracket. The survey was voluntary, therefore it is unknown how non-volunteers would have responded. This sample was obtained through a variety of career assistance settings. It is unknown how unemployed managers who have not sought career assistance might differ from this group but, if they have not actively sought job search assistance they may be less likely to proactively seek job opportunities.

Though the sample was drawn from a variety of settings these settings were located largely in the affluent north shore area of Chicago so are not representative of the Chicago metropolitan area. This sample was not culturally diverse so it is unknown how a culturally diverse sample would respond. All of these produce selection bias in the sample therefore, findings may no be generalizable to the management population.

This study used self-reported measures. There is no guarantee that the participants accurately reported their attitudes and/or behaviors. Also, as stated earlier, several questions on the Job Loss Coping Behavior scale were changed to be more consistent with the job search behaviors of a managerial sample. Scale reliability coefficients were low, however, reliability coefficients may not be the best indicator for this measure. This measure may more properly be referred to as an index rather than a scale since it measures behaviors rather than an underlying psychological construct.

Implication for Counseling

The implications of the present study's findings are important for those counselors working with managerial unemployed. According to this study,
career search efficacy is significantly predictive of job loss coping behavior among unemployed managers. Assessing these client's confidence in their job search abilities would appear to be an important part of the counseling process when dealing with those coping with job loss. Since job replacement is typically a desired outcome, helping clients gain confidence with job search skills that concern them is likely to be useful.

Managerial women in this study appeared to cope with job loss less effectively than men because they tend to be less proactive in their job search. These women lacked confidence in their ability to use job search techniques used by men such as working to find a job through executive search firms and seeking employment that would require relocation. Unemployed women managers appeared to suffer from lower efficacy in their ability to perform the tasks associated with finding another job as reflected on Subscale # 1: Problem Solution Behavior scores. In addition to being less confident in their job search skills, management women are likely to be younger and have been in the workforce a shorter period of time and consequently less experienced in job search techniques. Therefore, counselors need to provide or help female clients obtain training in key job search skills such as networking and interviewing. Increased training and experience in job search skills has been shown to help unemployed people be more effective in their job search (Caplan, Vinokur, Price, & van Ryn, 1989; Eden & Aviram, 1993; Kanfer, 1985; and Price, van Ryn, Vinokur, 1992). Stronger career search efficacy beliefs should increase the client's persistence in the job search and frequency in performing career search behaviors.

Seniority in the workplace may play a role in job loss coping behavior and career search efficacy. As mentioned earlier, the men in this sample are
significantly older, have significantly more work experience, and earned significantly higher salaries than the women. Since women's movement into managerial jobs has taken place in the last 20 years, this age and experience differential may be representative of the workplace. Counselors may need to facilitate the development of mentoring and networking relationships for unemployed women managers. Since managerial women do not have easy access to the "old boy" network, they do not get job search assistance such as referral to executive search firms as frequently as male managers. They need encouragement and guidance in developing these relationship. This assistance could include reference to managerial job search support groups.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

Since the unemployed managerial population is expected to be a continuing problem, further research is needed with this population to investigate how to best facilitate workforce reentry. The use of self-efficacy training as a self-help mechanism to encourage job search efforts has been studied in a limited manner but needs to be expanded to assess the effect of age and gender on the success of this type of training.

Since the current sample was skewed demographically by gender, and a significant relationship was found between gender, age and years in the work force, a similar study with unemployed female and male managers who are the same age and level of work experience would be useful. Younger men with similar levels of workforce experience may be more like the females in this study than the older men in the current studies sample.

In conclusion, this study has helped increase the understanding of the influence of gender and career search efficacy on the job loss coping behavior of unemployed managers. According to this study, higher career search
efficacy is more likely to produce higher frequency of job loss coping behavior. The CSES scale was predictive of the JLCB scale. Gender was not predictive of job loss coping behavior, however, the men performed job loss coping behaviors significantly more frequently than women. It is hoped the results of this study will prompt other research in this area.
APPENDIX A

JOB LOSS COPING BEHAVIOR SCALE
JOB LOSS COPING BEHAVIOR SCALE

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ASK YOU ABOUT VARIOUS ACTIVITIES YOU MIGHT HAVE ENGAGED IN SINCE LOOSING YOUR JOB. FOR EACH ITEM, CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT BEST REPRESENTS HOW OFTEN YOU HAVE ENGAGED IN EACH ACTIVITY.

WHILE UNEMPLOYED HAVE YOU:

1. Followed up on newspaper ads or other "help wanted" notices? 1 2 3 4
2. Looked into job opportunities outside this community? 1 2 3 4
3. Tried to get a job through employment agencies or executive search firms? 1 2 3 4
4. Talked to your spouse about your feelings? 1 2 3 4
5. Taken courses at a university or technical school? 1 2 3 4
6. Gone to a support group for the unemployed? 1 2 3 4
7. Kept in touch with people on the old job? 1 2 3 4
8. Participated in a retraining program? 1 2 3 4
9. Talked to friends about problems associated with being unemployed? 1 2 3 4
10. Looked for a job in a different city? 1 2 3 4
11. Taken steps to learn a new skill/profession? 1 2 3 4
12. Made plans to move to a new community? 1 2 3 4
13. Asked for financial assistance from friends or relatives? 1 2 3 4
14. Applied for unemployment compensation or other government financial assistance? 1 2 3 4
15. Applied for other financial aid (e.g., community or church)? 1 2 3 4
16. Networked at business or professional association meetings or conferences? 1 2 3 4
17. Become active in community efforts to aid the unemployed? 1 2 3 4
WIDLE UNEMPLOYED HAVE YOU:

18. Become active in community efforts to stop further unemployment in the area?

Not at All Little Some A Lot

1 2 3 4
APPENDIX B
CAREER SEARCH EFFICACY SCALE
CAREER SEARCH EFFICACY SCALE

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ASK YOU TO RATE YOUR CONFIDENCE IN YOUR ABILITY TO PERFORM VARIOUS ACTIVITIES YOU MIGHT ENGAGE IN DURING A JOB SEARCH ON A TEN-POINT RATING SCALE FROM 0 (VERY LITTLE) TO 9 (VERY MUCH). (Please rate yourself by circling number.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW CONFIDENT ARE YOU IN YOUR ABILITY TO:</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Identify and evaluate your personal values.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Meet new people in careers of interest.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Develop an effective cover letter to mail to employers.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Evaluate a job during an interview.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Conduct an information interview.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Identify and evaluate your career preferences.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Clarify and examine your personal values.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Utilize your social networks to gain employment.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Identify and evaluate your personal values.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Market skills and abilities to an employer.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Use your social networks to identify job opportunities.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Integrate your knowledge of yourself, the beliefs and values of others, and career information into realistic and satisfying career planning.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Develop realistic strategies for locating and securing employment.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Join organizations that have career emphasis</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Develop variety of skills you can use throughout a lifetime of career decision making.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Dress in a way that communicates success during a job interview.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW CONFIDENT ARE YOU IN YOUR ABILITY TO:</td>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Identify the resources you need to find the career you want.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Contact personnel office to secure interview.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Know where to find information about potential employers to make informed career decisions.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Solicit help from an established career person to help chart a course in a given field.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Achieve a satisfying career.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Market your skills and abilities to others.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Identify and evaluate personal capabilities.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Identify and employer with job opportunities you want.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Know how to relate to your boss in order to enhance your career.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Evaluate the job requirements and work environment during a job interview.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Prepare for a job interview.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Select helpful people at the workplace with whom to associate.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Identify your work skills.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Organize and carryout your career plans.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Deal effectively with societal barriers.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Research potential career options prior to searching for a job.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Deal effectively with personal barriers.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Develop effective questions for an information interview.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Understand how your skills can be used effectively in a variety of jobs.</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER
Dear Job Search Survey Participant:

The attached questionnaire is being distributed to gather information regarding the job search activities of professional/managerial job seekers. This information will be the basis for my master's thesis for an M.A. in Counseling which is being completed as part of a career change. The survey is anonymous, voluntary and confidential and in no way impacts the services you receive at the distribution site. Questionnaires are coded by number so neither your name or any other identifying information is included on the survey.

Instructions are provided at the beginning of each section of the questionnaire. Almost all of the questions require only a check mark or circling a number to respond. It should take approximately 20 to 25 minutes to complete. When completed, please enclose the questionnaire in the envelope provided and deposit it in the designated container. Data will be reported in aggregate and no individual data will be reported separately.

I appreciate your participation in this study. Results will provide information that can help to enhance career counseling services. If you have any questions or comments regarding this survey, please contact me or Suzette Speight, Ph.D. at (312) 915-6034.

Sincerely,

E. Ann Malen
APPENDIX D
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Table 1--Chi-square Analyses of Percentages on Demographic Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Women (%)</th>
<th>Men (%)</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (over 40)</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>32.4****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (married)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>30.1****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed &gt; 10 years</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>17.3****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 years last job</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>5.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary ($55,000+)</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>11.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (white)</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (MA/MS/PhD)</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depend. Children (zero)</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrib. &gt;75% Fam. Incm.</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 6 mos. Unemployed</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total N = 131 (86 males and 45 females). Levels of probability are *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001, ****p<.0001.
Table 2--Significant Mean Scores for Items of the JLCB and CSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Loss Coping Behavior (JLCB)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked outside this community</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-3.4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried employment agencies</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-3.5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked for job in different city</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-2.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subscale # 1: Problem Solution Score</strong></td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-3.2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked to spouse about feelings</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-3.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended unemployed support group</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-2.8**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked to friends about problems</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subscale # 2: Symptom Solution Score</strong></td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JLCB Total Score</strong></td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-3.0**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Career Search Efficacy Scale (CSES)</strong></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify personal values</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-2.7**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify career preferences</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-4.0***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market skills/abilities</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-2.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop realistic strategies</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-2.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact personnel office</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify personal capabilities</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-2.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate job requirements</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-3.4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select helpful people at workplace</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-2.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify work skills</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-2.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize and carryout career plans</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-2.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with personal barriers</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-2.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop ques. for information interview</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-2.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSES Total Score</strong></td>
<td>216.7</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>234.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>-2.1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Levels of probability are * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001
Table 3--Correlations Among Variables Used in Stepwise Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Loss Coping Behav. Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Problem Solution Subscale</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Symptom Solution Subscale</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Career Search Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gender</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. # years employed fulltime</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. # years last job</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. # months searching for job</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Levels of probability are *p< .05, **p< .01.
Table 4--Significant Predictors of JLCB Total Scale and Subscales

Job Loss Coping Behavior (JLCB) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R Sq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Search Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>.2999</td>
<td>10.97***</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Years Employed Full-time</td>
<td>.2500</td>
<td>9.84****</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscale # 1: Problem Solution Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R Sq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Career Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>.3096</td>
<td>11.77***</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.2055</td>
<td>8.73***</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscale # 2: Symptom Solution Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R Sq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Years Employed Fulltime</td>
<td>.2360</td>
<td>6.55**</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Levels of probability are * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001, ****p<.0001.
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