

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**Challenging Assumptions:
The Application of a World Views Model
to Involuntary Job Loss.**

This thesis is presented in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the Master of Arts in
Psychology, at Massey University.

Jeff Simpson
1999

ABSTRACT

Research by Janoff-Bulman has established that subsequent to experiencing a highly traumatic event, the world assumptions of trauma victims differ to those of individuals who have not experienced the same trauma. In utilising the Janoff-Bulman trauma model, this study investigated the world assumptions of people who had experienced involuntary job loss (IJL). As a result of my practical experience in outplacement counselling, it was my belief that IJL would be experienced differently by each individual. This study gave an the opportunity to measure the world assumptions of people who had experienced the same event and provided a model to help explain individual differences in reaction to this life stressor.

The world assumptions, perceived level of job loss impact, and demographic factors were measured of 122 IJL participants. Firstly, level of emotional impact was measured, then categorised using the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ). As a result, 36.9% (n=45) of the participant group were identified as high impact, while 63% (n=77) were identified as low impact. This confirmed the issue of response variation to IJL. A regression analysis found significant differences in four world assumptions between the two groups. The high impact group reported a lower level of self worth compared to the low impact group, though, inconsistent with the Janoff-Bulman model, the high impact group reported a higher belief in benevolence of people, benevolence of the world, and the belief of luck. These findings, along with implications for counsellors working in this area, are discussed with possible explanations proposed.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis with all my love to my wife Tracy, for her belief in me, and to
our little people: Sarah, Hannah, and Jamie.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Kerry Chamberlain, whose guidance and responsiveness overcame the difficulties of undertaking this thesis while living away from Massey.

Many thanks to my employer KPMG for their support of this research and to my colleagues throughout New Zealand who sent out questionnaires on my behalf. I would also like to acknowledge all those people who had experienced involuntary job loss and agreed to participate in this study. A special thanks to Robbie Sutton for his help with the statistical analysis.

A special mention must also go to my parents for the unconditional support they have given me while undertaking this and every other endeavor I have taken on. Also, a thank you to Graham Baker for helping create the road map and for setting the standard.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Dedication	i
	Acknowledgements	ii
	List of Tables	iii
1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	SCHEMA, BELIEFS AND WORLD ASSUMPTIONS	7
	Fundamental Assumptions, Delusions and the the Janoff-Bulman Model	9
	World Assumptions	11
	Belief in a Just World	13
	Post Trauma: The Challenge of coming to terms cognitively	18
3	BREAKING THE CAREER CYCLE: IJL AS A LIFE TRAUMA	22
	Employment and Underemployment	28
	Repeated IJL	30
	The Focus of this Study	31
4	METHOD	33

	Procedure	33
	Research Participants	34
	Measures	35
	Perceived Impact of Job Loss (PIJL)	36
	Psychological Distress	36
	Life Satisfaction	37
	Demographic Information	38
5	RESULTS	39
	Range of Psychological Responses to IJL.....	39
	Intercorrelation Between Impact variables and outcome variables	40
	Exploring the Impact on Cognitions Following Involuntary Job Loss	41
	Influence of Demographic Factors on Job Loss	45
	Salary Differences Between 'Old' and 'New' Job	46
	Change in Perceived Status and Life Satisfaction	47
	Repeated IJL	47
	Years in Job , With Employer, and In Paid Work Force.....	47
6	DISCUSSION	48
	Conclusions, Applications and Future Research	52
	REFERENCES	54

APPENDICES 66

APPENDIX A: INFORMATION LETTER

APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN STUDY

APPENDIX C: E-MAIL TO KPMG STAFF

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Range of Psychological responses to IJL.....	39
2	Correlation Matrix of Impact and Outcome Variables	41
3	Predictors of Distress and Life Satisfaction	42
4	Mean and Standard Deviations on WAS Subscales for High and Low impact of Job Loss Groups	44
5	Mean and Standard Deviation Distress and Life Satisfaction for Different Levels of Employment Status.....	46

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

"To survive she will need to adapt, to re-examine her organisational realities, and to create some optimal paths for a modified career life"

(p.201)

Youst (1990) The Case of Ronda.

This thesis explores the application of Janoff-Bulmans 'World Assumptions Model' to involuntary job loss (IJL). Janoff-Bulman (1989a), argues that the major task or challenge confronting the victim of a highly negative life event is predominantly a cognitive one. According to this model, one's reaction to traumatic events can be accounted for by the severe challenge the event places on the victim's basic assumption about their world (Schwartzberg & Janoff-Bulman, 1991). Basic assumptions, or 'assumptive worlds' refer to one's strongly held set of schema based assumptions about the world and self which is confidently maintained and used as a means of recognising, planning and acting. These assumptions are learned and confirmed by experience and solidified over many years (Parkes, 1971, 1975; Janoff-Bulman, 1989). Following a traumatic life event the victim commonly experiences anxiety, confusion, helplessness, and depression (Janoff-Bulman, 1989). The psychological distress in reaction to the event according to this model, is a result of the individual being unable to incorporate the negative information into their existing world view. The individual does not have the immediate cognitive resources to make sense of the event, as it does not follow their most fundamental assumptions about how things are supposed to happen. The structure and make up of one's fundamental world assumptions are reviewed in chapter two.

Empirical research, although low in number, has found that an individual's basic world assumptions do indeed differ between victims and non-victims of traumatic events even after many years. Janoff-Bulman, (1989a), found that people who had experienced a traumatic event such as the death of a parent at a young age, death of a sibling, incest, rape, home destroyed by fire, or serious disability due to an accident, differed in their beliefs of the benevolence of the interpersonal world, chance, and self worth when compared to people who had not experienced such events. Schwartzberg and Janoff-Bulman (1991), found that among university students, who had lost a parent, compared to students that had not, that group differed most noticeably in their belief in the meaningfulness of the world. Gluhoski and Wortman (1996), though not using the Janoff-Bulman 'world assumptions scale', found that victims of traumatic life events differed from non-victims significantly in areas of self-worth and vulnerability. Epstein (1991, cited in Catlin & Epstein, 1992), examined the basic beliefs of three groups of Vietnam war veterans at different periods before and after their service. It was found that those who had been diagnosed with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder differed greatly in their world assumptions from those who had not. Epstein summarised by concluding:

The results were consistent with the hypotheses that PTSD is caused by an invasion of basic beliefs about the self and the world, and that basic beliefs are influenced by emotionally significant experiences (p.191).

Involuntary job loss has consistently been cited as one of the top ten traumatic life experiences (Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Masuda & Holmes, 1967; Paykel, 1971; Ivancevich & Matherson, 1984; Quick & Quick, 1984; DeFrank & Ivancevich, 1986; Spera, Buhrfeind & Pennebaker, 1994). In some cases, involuntary job loss has been found to be more stressful than divorce or the death of a close friend (DeFrank & Ivancevich, 1986).

To date however, the Janoff-Bulman model has never been applied solely in attempting to explain the impact of IJL.

Considerable research has gone into explaining the impact of job loss on an individual and various theories have been applied to explain why job loss is a stressful life event. One of the more dominant models was put forward by Jahoda (1982). Jahoda proposed that job loss and subsequent unemployment was stressful in that it denied the individual the 'unintended consequences of work'. These being time and structure to one's day, shared experience with others outside family, status and identity, and enforced activity. The impact of IJL is discussed more fully and reviewed in chapter three.

To date however, little direct research has been focused on why IJL is stressful from a cognitive standpoint. It is not that the cognitive issues related to IJL have been completely ignored or over-looked. Moreover it appears that the cognitive perspective has been perceived by researchers as too difficult to effectively investigate. According to Winefield and Tiggerman (1990), for example, IJL is invariably accompanied by economic hardship thus making any other aspects of IJL difficult to research. More directly, following an extensive literature review, Fryer and Payne (1986), claimed that: "it is currently impossible to tease out the psychological effects from those of financial concomitants" (p.270).

Ullah (1987), argues that the cognitive aspects of IJL have been seen as too subjective and thus unreliable to research effectively. However, it has also been suggested that it is precisely the cognitive domain that needs addressing to further understand the impact of IJL. An individual's world view was suggested by Eby and Buch (1995), as a possible avenue of understanding which particular variables are most important to career growth following IJL.

One of the more common approaches used in understanding the IJL process and often promoted in outplacement counselling is the Kubler-Ross (1968), model. This proposes that all people experiencing a traumatic event pass through a set series of grief related stages. In practice, based on the variation of individual reaction of IJL victims, this model presents as generally unsatisfactory.

Leana and Felman (1988), proposed that the way in which people cognitively interpreted the event of IJL strongly influenced the way in which they cope. In additional research Leana and Felman (1990), concluded that: "it appears that the greatest impact is on reaction to job loss rather than adjustment to job loss" (p.1178). Prussia, Kinicki and Bracker (1993), who concluded that at least in part, the negative effects of IJL could be determined by the individual's explanations for the job loss itself, have further suggested such sentiments. Kaufman (1982), in summarising his extensive work with IJL and professionals stated:

The drastic psychological changes that some professionals experience as a result of job loss may be explained as resulting from the need to bring their cognitions about themselves into balance and therefore reduce cognitive inconsistencies (p55).

This research is primarily focused on a cognitive perspective. >From a generic perspective it is aptly described by Stewart (1982), that:

..all changes involve demands on the individual for new behaviours and internal responses, including new conceptions of the self and the place of the self in the physical or social world. It is perhaps this demand for adaptation that is the aspect of life change that has lead to their classification as stressful (p.1100-1101).

Janoff-Bulman's world assumptions model is therefore proposed as a useful theoretical model to explain the impact of IJL. That is, it is this demand or challenge to cognitively accommodate the event of IJL into the person's world assumptive view that can result in a highly negative reaction.

In utilising Janoff-Bulman's model, it is proposed that those people who react most negatively to IJL are doing so due to the cognitive challenge to their fundamental assumptions, like victims of any traumatic life event. Conversely, those who experience IJL more neutrally may not be experiencing the same level of cognitive challenge to their world assumptions. This notion has received some empirical support, particularly in the personal world view of justice. Miller and Hoppe (1994), in their study of attribution and reaction to job loss, concluded that the emotional distress among job loss victims was most exacerbated where individuals perceived the loss as "unjust" and where blame was directed toward others, more particularly, the former employer. Bies, Martin and Brocker (1993), Konovsky and Folger (1991), and LaFarge (1994) have highlighted similar findings. In addition, the belief of personal justice has been strongly associated with psychological well being (Lerner, 1980; Tomaka & Blascovich, 1994; Liplus, Dalbert & Siegler, 1996), in that individuals who perceive life events as "fair" or "just" tend to be in better psychological health than those who don't. The concept of justice in relation to IJL is more fully discussed in chapter two.

A vast amount of past research has identified whom, from a demographic perspective, is most vulnerable to responding more negatively to IJL. Historically, research has focused on professional level (Kaufman, 1982), gender (Leana & Feldman, 1991), educational level and socio-economic status (Hamilton, Broman, Hoffman & Renner, 1990), level of social support (Mallinckrodt & Bennett, 1992), job attachment (Leana & Feldman, 1990), and ethnic identity (Buss & Redburn, 1983). From such past

research it would appear that all demographic groups seem vulnerable to a negative reaction to IJL. What has not been explained however, is, why such a wide range of people experience IJL as particularly stressful and traumatic. The Janoff-Bulman model provides a basic conceptual approach to bringing some insight into this question, while some demographic factors will also be addressed in this research.

Much human activity is based around the notion of how the world functions and the creation of predictable and stable social environments (Van Der Kolk, Van Der Hart & Marmar, 1996). In the case of IJL, one's notions of how the world of work operates and how one behaves within it, can, at the very least, be challenged.

This research was primarily stimulated by my own work as an outplacement counsellor, specialising in work with people who have lost their job due to organisational downsizing and restructuring. One of the greatest challenges of this position is catering for the wide variation of individual reaction to IJL. While some individuals seen in outplacement do respond in a grief-like fashion, others do not. So, it would be of particular interest to further develop an understanding of (1), the extent of variation in response to IJL, (2), whether one's belief systems play a mediating role in that response, and (3), whether or not there are dominant demographic factors involved.

CHAPTER 2

Schema, Beliefs, and World Assumptions

Few psychologists have focused on the assumptive worlds of individuals, although considerable research has been carried out to understand the cognitive concept of "schema" (Janoff-Bulman, 1989a; 1992). A schema is a cognitive framework that consists of a number of organised ideas and works as a frame of reference for recording events and data (Chaplin, 1985). Schema enable individuals to recognise congruence/incongruence or irrelevance of data, thereby creating powerful expectations by which to compare information (Hastie, 1981).

According to Taylor and Crocker 1981 (cited in Bierhoff, 1989), one of the chief functions of a schema is to provide an answer to the question what is it?

The schema provides hypotheses about incoming stimuli, which include plans for interpreting and gathering schema related information. It may also provide a basis for actual behaviour sequences or expectations of specific behaviour sequences, i.e. scripts for how an individual behaves in a social situation (p.24).

Jean Piaget who focused particularly on babies and children developed the concept of schema. To Piaget the human quest for comprehension about their world consisted of two inter-related processes, organisation and adaptation. Individuals organise their thoughts so that they will make sense, separating important thoughts from unimportant ones and establishing links from one concept to another (Berger, 1988). Beliefs are the cognitive configuration of schema that convey one's perceptions of reality (Tomaka & Blascovich, 1994). Such beliefs can be personally formed and culturally

shared and not only reflect the individual's opinion and evaluation but also their world view. From an employment perspective, an individual may hold a vast number of beliefs. These beliefs include; particular occupations are more prestigious than others, some careers are for life, government positions are safe, one will be rewarded for studying hard, following in my parents footsteps will mean having a safe, rich and rewarding career, any job is better than no job, only lazy people are unemployed. At an even more fundamental level, is the prediction that good work will be duly rewarded.

The notion that living in a safe, predictable environment provides a sense of well being has its roots founded within developmental psychology. For example, according to the work carried out by developmental psychopathologists such as Crittenden (1994), Bowlby (1988) and Ainsworth (1989), as long as an infant is brought up in a safe and predictable environment, not only is there a good chance of positive emotional well-being and growth, but moreover the general optimism of things generally working out well and a feeling of safety and protection will develop the basis of a belief that one can control one's own world by behaving in certain ways. This paradigm is the foundation of Bowlby's attachment theory, which has been the subject of applied research in relation to adult attachment type and work orientation (Hazan & Shaver, 1990; Hardy & Barkham, 1994; Blustein & Prezioso, 1995).

Studies of this type report a relationship between one's ability to form meaningful relationships with people (as hypothesised by attachment theory based on a sound, caring, and predictable upbringing) and one's level of satisfaction within the work domain. Moreover, it is a generic belief that things will generally work out in one's best interests. As children grow they will develop a sense of autonomy by expanding their knowledge about the ways in which things work and by developing skills that will help them cope with external threats. Over time then, predictability as well as controllability involves making commitments to people, institutions, and value

systems that provide a sense of meaning, belonging, and protection against threat (Erikson, 1963). By being meaning-making creatures, humans develop and organise the world in which they live according to their own theory of personal reality. Thus the developed cognitive schema allow an individual to make sense out of emotionally arousing experiences, and in doing so the schema serve as buffers against being overwhelmed (Van Der Kolk, et al., 1996).

Fundamental Assumptions, Delusions, and the Janoff-Bulman Model

The surviving of a traumatic experience can show a great deal about the psychology of day to day existence. The powerful lesson learnt from the event highlights the way in which people tend to take for granted a few fundamental assumptions about the world and themselves. Janoff-Bulman (1992), points out that while psychologists have not tended to pay much attention to people's fundamental assumptions, the general idea is not a new one. World views were first broadly defined by Parks (1971, 1972), employing the term "assumptive worlds" and referring to an individual's.. "strongly held set of assumptions about the world and the self which is confidently maintained and used as a means of recognising , planning and acting", Bowlby's (1980), "world models", Epsteins (1980), "theory of reality", Marris's (1975), "structure of meaning", Crittenden's (1994), "internal representational models", and Kuhn's (1962), "paradigm".

Fundamental assumptions form the foundation of one's conceptual system (Janoff-Bulman, 1992) and these are assumptions that individuals are least likely to alter. As noted by Epstein (1980, cited in Janoff-Bulman, 1989a), conceptual systems are hierarchically organised. At the highest level lie one's most basic assumptions about meaning, benevolence, and self-worth. These represent the most abstract, global, and

generalised theories about the world and self. At the lower end of the conceptual system are the more narrow generalisations that deal with more specific domains of personal interactions. It is events that directly challenge the individual's highest level of conceptual system that will bring extreme psychological distress (Janoff-Bulman 1989b).

People generally underestimate the likelihood of negative personal outcome, thus mostly operating on a basis of an "illusion of invulnerability" (Janoff-Bulman, Frieze, 1983), even when they are bombarded with traumatic events being presented daily within media. We may be aware that one in four will develop cancer or that crime and accidents are common, but tend to believe these things happen only to others. Job loss is a particularly common occurrence in modern society and despite this, the event can still prove to be traumatic and a reminder of personal vulnerability.

This is at the heart of the Janoff-Bulman model, when one's fundamental assumptions are seriously challenged, bringing with it an intense psychological crisis. It is this that is trauma - incoming information regarding an event not matching a normal explanation. One's old assumptions have served them well, yet in the face of a life trauma the data does not fit, commonly bringing with it an intense sense of vulnerability (Janoff-Bulman, 1989a). By behaving in a particular way in the past - for example being good, careful, hardworking, and decent, an individual feels invulnerable, and thus tends to underestimate the likelihood of negative events occurring to them. Now, being at the receiving end of a traumatic experience, scripts at their highest conceptual levels are proving to be inaccurate.

World Assumptions

Janoff-Bulman has presented three categories of basic world assumptions from which an individual constructs reality: (1) perceived benevolence of the world, (2) meaningfulness of the world, and (3) worthiness of the self. In total, within these 3 categories there are eight primary postulates within an individual's conceptual system. These 8 are; benevolence of the world, benevolence of people, distribution principles of justice, controllability, randomness, the self-relevant dimensions of self-worth, self-controllability and luck.

Benevolence of the world refers to the assumptions regarding overall frequency of good and bad events in the world, or implicit base rates. There are two basic assumptions within this category, these being the benevolence of the impersonal world and benevolence of people. The more a person believes in the benevolence of the impersonal world, the more they have the mind set that the world is a good place and that bad events are uncommon. An individual who generally believes in the benevolence of people would tend to habitually think that people are kind, helpful and caring.

The next category, meaningfulness of the world- concerns a person's assumptions about the distribution of good and bad outcomes and why certain things happen to certain people. This refers to a person's fundamental belief in justice. People may generally live by the assumption that one gets what one deserves and deserves what one gets. This notion was conceptualised by Leaner (1980), as the "just world theory". The belief in a just world is more fully discussed later in this chapter.

A second principle applies to the perception one has of the controllability of outcomes through one's own behaviour. This involves the general perception that one can

control events by acting in a certain way thus avoiding negative life events. For example, not drinking alcohol before driving or keeping fit to avoid health problems. Taken together, the two beliefs of justice and controllability combine to create a 'sense of meaning', whereby an event makes sense when it is consistent with predictable social laws (Janoff-Bulman, 1989a). At the opposite end of the meaningfulness construct is the concept of chance. That is, the general belief that there is little one can do to protect oneself from negative life events. An individual who believes strongly in randomness will not put faith in justice or controllability in determining the outcome of events.

The third and final assumption - self-worth, is the assumption that good, worthy people take care of themselves by behaving in proper, precautionary ways. Fundamentally, it is one's "goodness", or moral character that serves to protect them from negative life events. For example, one may believe that safe drivers will not have accidents, or runners will not have heart attacks.

The Janoff-Bulman model also has three self-related dimensions that parallel the three distribution principles highlighted above. The first relates to the extent to which people perceive themselves as moral, worthy, good, decent individuals. It is this 'goodness' that determines their personal outcomes. An example of this would be the belief that 'I am an honest person therefore I should be safe from bad events.'

The second self-relevant assumption parallels the distribution concept of controllability. That is, does the individual engage in appropriate, precautionary or 'right' behaviours. In this worldview, it is the person who behaves in the most exemplary manner that will be minimally vulnerable. From a work perspective this would be the belief that 'by working hard, I will be positively rewarded.'

The third assumption relates to the perception of chance as a distribution principle, this being the assumption of 'luck'. This is the general belief that the person is normally lucky or unlucky, though for reasons that are generally unknown. Again, from a work perspective one could believe that regardless of how one acted, one could still lose one's job.

Belief in a Just World

The belief in a just world (BJW) is central to planning and engaging in purposeful long term goal directed activity and is thus considered a prime motivator within career and career related behaviour. It is also one of the foundations of the Janoff-Bulman model and deserves further elaboration. In order to plan, work, and achieve what is desired and avoid negative outcomes, people have to assume that there are manageable procedures that bring with them the desired end product (Lerner, 1981). Essentially the BJW stresses the importance of an individual's motivation to control what happens to them, be it positive or negative. According to BJW, people 'get what they deserve.' This, applied to a work situation strongly reinforces the work ethic.

In developing the BJW hypothesis, Learner, (1978, 1980), identified two major concepts for the entitlement to, or deserving of, a particular outcome - one's behaviour and one's attributes. Particular behaviours for example, are seen as appropriate for a wide range of positive or negative outcomes. If a person works hard and lives by societal rules, then they can expect the positive outcomes they desire. If a person fails to prepare, take reasonable precautions or doesn't produce significant quantity or quality, then that person can expect a certain degree of failure, deprivation or suffering as a consequence of their behaviour.

The BJW serves us in a highly practical and positive manner, no more so than the way it removes us from reality. Taylor and Brown (1988), suggested that people display three pervasive cognitive biases, or positive illusions. These being; the illusion of control, self-enhancement bias, and optimism for the future. In essence, people feel more control over situations than what reality warrants. They tend to provide overly favourable self- evaluations, and perceive the future as predominately positive. BJW can be conceptualised as a positive illusion in that it encourages people to see their world as meaningful, orderly and predictable (Lener & Miller, 1978). When a person views the world in this manner, they tend to see negative events as punishment and positive events as rewards. Such perceptions are particularly likely to contribute to personal well-being in that they strongly contribute to feelings of competence and control over life and events (Janoff-Bulman, 1988, Lipkus, Dalbert, Seigler, 1996), or that one's status, particularly if high, is justly deserved and fair ("I worked long and hard to get to this point in my career, I deserve the wage I am on").

An exaggerated perception of control or mastery coupled with unrealistic optimism, can serve a wide range of cognitive, affective, and social functions (Taylor & Brown, 1988). Individuals who strongly believe in a just world tend to experience less negative effect, and report more positive effect than individuals with a weaker BJW (Lipkus, Dalbert, Siegler, 1996). The BJW protects individuals from the day in, day out negative psychological consequences of living in a world where "bad things happen to good people" on a regular basis. A strong BJW enhances feelings of security to the degree of feeling that being good will protect one from bad events. We tend to be highly threatened by the idea that negative events can occur in a random type of fashion.

Freeman (1978) highlighted the relationship between illusions and positive mood in work. Reports of high self-esteem, control over one's life and optimism for the future

are strongly correlated with general happiness with life. Conversely, both mildly and severely depressed individuals appear to be less vulnerable to the illusion of control (Taylor & Brown, 1988). In summarising an extensive literature review Taylor and Brown (1988), suggested..

..the mentally healthy person may not be fully cognisant of the day to day flotsam and jetsam of life. Rather the mentally healthy person appears to have the enviable capacity to distort reality in a direction that enhances self-esteem, maintains beliefs in personal efficacy and promotes an optimistic views of the future...people may simply assimilate contradictory, negative, or ambiguous information to pre-existing positive schema about the self and the world with little processing at all. Positive illusions may also be maintained by a series of social and cognitive filters that discard or distort negative information. (p 203-204).

An important distinction explored by Lipkus et,al's. (1996), suggested that a person perceives BJW for one's self and BJW for others in different ways. According to Lener (1980), there is 'the world of the victim' (e.g., the poor, injured, unemployed) and the 'world of the non-victim'. Thus, there is a need to preserve a BJW for self to rationalise the outcome for a victim while at the same time reducing the threat of entering the ranks of the victim oneself (e.g., ensuring one's own environment is safe). A large number of studies have shown such a tendency. For example Clyman, Roth, Sniderman, and Charrier (1990), found that within a sample of paediatric hospital workers, strong believers in a just world were more likely to blame parents for the health problems of the infants than were weak believers. Zuckerman, Gerbasia, Kravitz, and Wheeler, 1974 (cited in Hafer & Olsen, 1989), found that strong believers in a just world derogated an alleged recipient of electrical shocks and blamed rape victims more than weak believers. Smith (1985), found that strong believers in a just

world perceived social inequalities as less extensive and fairer than did weak believers in a just world. Whilst BJW correlates highly with emotional well-being, Lipkus et al's. (1996), found that BJW for self was also the most powerful predictor of life satisfaction. From a career and employment perspective it has also been suggested by Eby and Buch (1995), that individuals who have the tendency to view the world more optimistically experience higher levels of career growth.

What happens then to people with a strong BJW when they themselves experience a highly negative event? Such experiences would run contrary to their fundamental assumptions that they had control over such events. In a controlled experimental situation Hafer and Olsen (1989), found that strong believers in a just world saw their deprivation as fair, in fact more fair than those with weaker BJW. The authors concluded that persons with strong BJW might be motivated to perceive the world as fair regardless of whether they are winning or losing. Seemingly, individuals with strong BJW may try to make sense of their own suffering by deciding that it is somehow fair and they have not been unjustly victimised. There are at least two explanations that could be applied to this. Firstly, as a laboratory experiment, particularly in the late 1980s, (due to ethical considerations) the event experienced would not be particularly stressful, and not be activating any anxieties at the highest conceptual levels. Or, as suggested by Bulman and Wortman, the use of self blame as a coping mechanism, although seeming detrimental, can play a positive functional role in allowing individuals to make some kind of sense out of personal misfortune. These authors concluded that when a negative outcome was attributed to a particular behaviour the person may or may not be successful in their facilitated coping. From that experience, the victim could still maintain their BJW and attribute their personal vulnerability to this event re-occurring, as being dependent upon their own behaviour, thus reiterating a belief of perceived controllability.

Would this however mean that the employee with a strong BJW would believe that their involuntary job loss was in some way due to his or her own behaviour and therefore in future be able to avoid IJL? A possible explanation could be that in order to maintain the fundamental belief system, the IJL victim perceives the job loss as the result of incorrect action and thus just. However, IJL is exactly that – involuntary - and more the outcome of global processes as opposed to being the result of a specific behaviour. So the IJL victim, unlike the dismissed employee, may well have some difficulty in maintaining as strong a sense of justice for their self, particularly if they have experienced the job loss as traumatic.

Another explanation could be that the job loss itself is not upsetting enough to challenge the individual at the most basic level of their conceptual system. Another person who experiences IJL may find the event particularly devastating. It is suggested that in applying the Janoff-Bulman model those who find the event particularly stressful do so because their most fundamental assumptions are being challenged.

Within the job loss context, however, an individual sense of procedural justice has been found to have strong influence of outcome severity (Miller & Hoppe, 1994, Konovsky & Folger, 1991). Further more, from a practical perspective, it has also been found that where perceived procedure fairness is at its lowest, litigation, sabotage, and decreased productivity are at their highest (Bennett, Martin, Bies, & Brocker, 1995).

Konovsky and Folger (1991), express that due to the attribution process of an IJL victim, the individual may tend to focus their attention on the employer, and thus become particularly concerned with how they are being treated. In many cases concern around fair treatment would outweigh concern around the actual job loss

itself. Why would this occur? Possibly the IJL victim believes that the cause of their job loss is due to factors beyond their control and at the same time perceive that their own behaviour and performance entitles them to be treated with dignity and respect. Being treated with dignity and respect would subsequently allow them to maintain a belief in benevolence of people. In any case, however, the event has brought with it the uncomfortable feeling of vulnerability and injustice as highlighted below by an individual who had experienced IJL.

I think it is really wrong what the company did to me and my fellow workers. They put us out on the streets without any notice. They didn't give a damn about us. They caused families to break up and even suicides. I feel you have to be strong to live in today's society - mentally. (Leana & Feldman, 1992, p.55.)

IJL is a significant life stressor in that it will, at least, challenge one's fundamental assumptions as the event itself will be experienced by people who believe that through their actions and behaviours they should experience good fortune. This is to be expected as the world of work promotes a feeling of 'getting out what I put in'. Oftentimes however, IJL is an event that is blind to such ideology, and it is because of this that one's fundamental assumptions are challenged by IJL.

Post Trauma: The challenge of coming to terms cognitively

The challenge for the victim is to regain some sense of balance to the cognitive dilemma. This can be done in two ways (Janoff-Bulman, 1992). One is to integrate the new data of the negative experience to fit one's established schema and thus make no overall change to one's personal assumptive world. The other option is to face the

challenge of accepting that previous world assumption(s) are inaccurate and then to go through the process of developing a new or at least modified view. For example, one person who experiences IJL may view the world as unfair, this event confirming their view. Another person who has just lost their job, a person with a high level of belief in controllability or justice, would face a challenging task in having to incorporate the job loss and thus redefine their belief systems with regard to personal control and/or justice.

The second of these tasks is obviously the most taxing, which is why the event itself must be of a significant enough level to promote a level of change in one's assumptive beliefs. This is not to say that schematic changes do not occur otherwise. Gradual schematic changes do however tend to be small and occur over time as a result of interaction with one's environment (Janoff-Bulman, 1989). Such changes tend not to be stressful or even noticed.

Even in the face of a traumatic event, one's assumptive world that has been established and confirmed as accurate over a number of years cannot be altered simply or quickly. The cognitive integration process is typically a gradual one that involves a number of strategies that help accommodation and change to a belief system. Janoff-Bulman suggests that this is done by the use of denial of the event, followed by intrusive reoccurring thoughts about the event, and then reinterpretation of the new data to accommodate the 'fit'.

Denial plays a role by initially pacing the rebuilding of the victim's assumption when the potential shock to one's conceptual system is at its greatest, that is, immediately following the traumatic event. Denial slows down the change process thus moderating the impact on the individual's basic assumptions and restricting the threatening information to tolerable doses (Janoff-Bulman & Timko, 1987). I have personally

experienced workers refusing to face job loss until they have reached the date of their job termination. Many will not allow themselves to "take in" the job loss until the job no longer exists. It could also be argued that this is perhaps out of loyalty, but the very loyal employee, by the same token, would be facing a large cognitive challenge by way of their loyalty ultimately being unrewarded. Thus their belief has also been found to be inaccurate.

Following the traumatic event it is common for the individual to experience recurrent and intrusive thoughts. Whilst these may occur on the surface to be somewhat disturbing, from a perspective of schema change, the process can be seen as serving a beneficial purpose. To Janoff-Bulman the repeated thinking about the event contributes to the eventual assimilation of the new and conflicting information, or, as such, an effort to cognitively process. That is, each time the event is re-experienced, new information brings with it a process of gradual assimilation of the traumatic experience and accommodation of the prior assumptions.

The next process within the Janoff-Bulman model follows on from the primary and secondary appraisals that involve the individual's re-appraisal of the event. This primarily involves two processes. One involves a comparison appraisal whereby the victim compares his or her own experiences with others. An IJL individual within this process may find that compared to others they have actually fared well. They may have received a large redundancy when others have not. They may have been given access to company car and office facilities to assist in job search when others may have been evicted from the work place. Some who are about to experience IJL may be aware well in advance that change within the firm was pending when others were given no warning. Others may have arrived at their work place to discover written notice of redundancy when others were informed in person, in a private situation, with support counsellors present.

The final process within the model involves finding meaning in the experience. From an employment perspective, it is often a challenging idea that there is no such thing as a job for life. People may be well aware of job loss in their midst and may have even survived redundancies in the past. Facing imminent redundancy, they may no longer have the immunity they believed their actions provided for them. In finding meaning, the subsequent outcome plays an important role. While many people will find IJL a difficult situation to deal with immediately, they may still identify some potential benefits as the following quotations illustrate; "I see this as a chance to finally go out there on my own without needing to depend on the company.... or put up with their guff any longer. It's great." (LaFarge, 1994, p.188). "If I learned one thing from that company, it's not to get married to your job. A Company will never repay your loyalty if push comes to shove. A job is just a job. No point in giving up the rest of your life for it" (LaFarge, 1994, p.189).

Surviving job loss requires cognitive and behavioural efforts to manage the taxing demands posed by IJL (Latack, Kinicki & Prussia, 1995).

".. the trauma survivor emerges somewhat sadder, but considerably wiser".

(Janoff-Bulman, 1992, p.175)

CHAPTER 3

Breaking of the Career Cycle: IJL as a life trauma

Downsizing, the most common term used in the planned elimination of employee positions is a reasonably recent phenomenon, which has become a highly used practice for economically troubled employers. Numbers of people in New Zealand who have involuntarily lost their jobs are difficult to come across, though the downsizing theme is well known within this country. KPMG Wellington alone, for example, saw over 200 people referred for either outplacement counselling or career planning workshops due to IJL in 1998. Overseas statistics highlight the large numbers of people downsizing affects. According to Latack, Kinicki and Prussia (1995), in the space of one year 1990-1991, 3.7 million jobs were lost in Central and Eastern Europe. In France, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands and the UK, 2.1 million jobs were lost in 1989. Even during the rapid period of growth from 1985-1989 in the United States, 4.3 million people were displaced from their jobs.

A general literate review on the personal impact of IJL brings with it a number of seemingly devastating themes. IJL has, for example, been described in the following ways; "The Terminal Executive: "It's like dying" (Finley & Lee, 1981), "shame, degradation and inferiority" (Fineman, 1983), "disillusionment, betrayal, impotence" (Braginsky & Braginsky, 1975), " a living hell" (Leventman, 1981), "like losing a leg" (Swinburne, 1981), "like being raped" and "like dying professionally" (Latack , 1984, cited in Latack & Dozier, 1986). Such themes highlight the very worst effects of IJL, where the loss impacts personally at the deepest emotional level.

The impact of IJL has been studied from a number of macro and individual perspectives, and despite moderating factors, the impact of IJL has been generally proven detrimental, according to Latack, Kinicki, and Prussia, (1995), by almost any criteria researchers have chosen to use. The most common paradigm, and probably the oldest, is that IJL victims are all uniformly confused, depressed, alienated, and have become financially and psychologically insecure (Fineman, 1983, cited in Goldenburg & Kline, 1997). Generic research has provided some support to this notion. For example, Stokes and Cochrane (1984), found that unemployment due to IJL was associated with raised levels of psychophysiological symptomatology. In addition, IJL victims reported significantly higher levels of general hostility when compared to workplace survivors. The IJL group was also found to be more critical of others and displayed paranoid attitudes, and experienced greater feelings of guilt. In relation to psychological distress Miller and Hoppe (1994), found that IJL victims experienced significant levels of anxiety and depression at a ratio of three to one when compared to employed populations. In a clinical study by Melville, Hope, Bennison, and Barraclough, (1985), the prevalence of depression was three times higher among IJL men than that of an employed control group.

This approach to job loss is closely related to the Kubler-Ross model of grieving following the loss of a loved one i.e., denial, anger, bargaining, depression, and acceptance. (GoldenBurg & Kline, 1997). This approach however has tended to come under some criticism. For example, Hartley and Fryer (1984), state that there is no agreed number of stages and none have ever been empirically demonstrated. Moreover, it presents a picture that those experiencing IJL are going to be distressed and depressed and doesn't acknowledge any variation of response, which in practice, is not the case.

The variation theme is an important aspect of IJL research as it looks at personal variables that may affect its impact. This has received some support in past and recent research. For example, Jackson and Warr (1984), have proposed that the distress associated with IJL is a variable rather than a constant and the focus of research should be on uncovering the conditions that affect it. That is, not everyone who experiences IJL will necessarily experience the event as a trauma. Practice in IJL counselling would suggest that this model has some merit. Recent research by Kets de Vris and Balazs (1997), supports this. After studying the reactions of IJL victims, they presented four main groups of reactions to IJL:

The Adaptable: these were the people who experienced little in the way of trauma as result of the job loss. At worst, these people reported a slightly cynical outlook, and were able to highlight a number of positive outcomes relating to the IJL. There is some research evidence supporting this type of reaction. For example Kasl (1979), in an investigation of the physical and psychological impact to staff due to factory closures, found that while the anticipation of the event was somewhat stressful, the overall impact of IJL was minimal. Kasl concluded that IJL may not be the traumatic experience that it is often reported to be. Kasl did not, however, propose why the impact was minimal.

The Born Again: For this group, the experience of IJL provided a new lease of life through a career and job change. The common reaction among this group was that of 'feeling alive' and of now having the opportunity to make positive changes in their lives. This group tended to people who were at a different life stage from when they started their career.

The Depressed: This group of people felt betrayed by an employer to whom they had devoted a considerable part of their lives. Kets de Vris, et.al., proposed that this

group, more than any other, had personal identities closely interwoven with their employment. The loss of a predictable environment caused them great distress and they became entrenched within a mourning process. In follow-ups, many from this group became under- employed with a generally depressed outlook on life.

The Antagonistic: In this group the common reaction was anger, and in some cases anger in the extreme. These were people who turned their aggression outward. Some from this group became dysfunctional, deciding to 'get even' with those who supposedly caused their misery. Additional research into the relationship between job loss and violence has found similar trends. For example Catalano, Dooley, Novaco, Wilson, and Hough (1993 cited in Catalano, Novaco, & McConnell, 1997), found that over a period of time series interviews, IJL workers were six times more likely to engage in some level of violence compared to workers who remained employed.

Variation to the IJL theme has been researched in terms of grief response and grief cycles. For example, Archer and Rhodes (1987, 1993, 1995), in their research of reaction to IJL, found that up to 80% of recent job loss victims reported some elements of grief, and found a clear grief like response in 27% of their sample. This would again propose that there is variation in response as would GoldenBerg and Kline's (1997) study, finding that 19 % of IJL victims had experienced a steady loss of self confidence, while 25% reported an increase, and a further 25% reported a series of ups and downs. Of the entire participant group, 39% felt negative on balance about the experience of IJL.

This however still does not provide insight as to why some people respond in a positive or negative way. In trying to understand IJL variation, most researchers have focused on situational and demographic factors. For example, Hall (1971, 1976), was one of the early IJL researchers to propose that IJL stress is created as a result of

interrupting the career success cycle and the subsequent feelings of loss of control over one's career progression and development. To Hall, individuals who set challenging, attainable career goals and reach these goals in a context of supportive autonomy, experience a sense of competence and self esteem. This process and experience contributes to the continuation of further ongoing goal setting. IJL, in very real terms threatens to break that cycle.

Hall (1971, cited in Ragland - Sullivan & Barglow,1981), also placed a strong emphasis on career and one's perception of self and well-being. Hall defined the role and purpose of 'career' in terms of goal setting, success, independence, growth, self-esteem, commitment, and the establishment of further goals. With an emphasis on the relationship between work and identity, Hall proposed:

An individual's work is often the major input to his total self-identity. One could hypothesise that the degree of one's mental health or growth is directly related to the degree of congruence between one's career work role (what one has to do) and his ideal identity (what he loves to do) (p.46)

Although slightly dated, the point made by Hall is still relevant to this day, in that there can be little doubt over the role occupation plays in society and to the development of a person's identity.

Another approach to understanding the impact of IJL proposed by Kets de Vries and Balazs (1997), focuses on the breaking of the psychological contract. The term 'psychological contract' was first introduced by Levinson (1962), and referred to people's unconscious choice of an organisation to respond to their psychological needs and support their own psychological defences in exchange for meeting their employers un-stated needs. This 'contract' implies a lifetime of secure employment in return for

hard work and loyalty. In the event of downsizing, the organisation breaks this implicit psychological contract between employer and employee. The possible result being that the feeling of dependency, perhaps progressing to a feeling of entitlement, is transformed into a strong feeling of betrayal (Kets de Vries, Balazs, 1997). This approach does form some basis of IJL impact due to an individual's strongly held assumptions, their labours will be rewarded with consistent employment.

Most research looking at IJL variation has focused on the demographic factors. For example, Hepworth (1980), in trying to identify whether work status impacted on emotional severity, found that psychiatric morbidity tended to increase with decreasing occupational status. This runs contrary to the findings of Kaufman (1982), Jackson and Warr, (1984), and Hill (1977 cited in Hepworth 1980). In general, Hepworth found IJL to be negatively correlated with objective well-being. The age group of 45-54 was most negatively affected. Hepworth found more of a mixture of responses in the 55-65 age group where some respondents were depressed and bitter at losing their jobs, while some welcomed the event.

Leana and Feldman, (1990), found that the two biggest predictors in negative reaction to IJL were the financial problems accompanied with job loss, and the personal level of attachment to one's former position. This supports the finding of De Frank and Ivancevich (1986), who found that the employees most committed to their job showed the greatest increase in psychological distress after job loss. In addition, in Leana and Feldman's study, it was found that individuals of higher occupational level experienced more anxiety and stress than those at a lower level, which runs counter to Hepworth's findings.

In investigating possible gender differences in response to IJL, Leana and Feldman, (1991), found no significant differences between men or women in psychological or

behavioural distress symptoms. There were however, differences in how each group coped with IJL. Generally, single IJL people, regardless of gender, found IJL more of an intensely negative experience, hence suggesting the buffering effects of marriage. Women and all married victims tended to attribute the job loss to external factors. Women tended to communicate more with friends about the IJL, thus undertaking a more emotional style of coping whereas men more predominantly took a more problem focused approach and searched for new employment.

What can be seen from these studies is that there is no one consistent factor that has been identifying why IJL is stressful to some but not others and in factors such as age and occupational status, the findings are conflicting.

Other research has tended to avoid the issues around the time of job loss and focused more on the factors that occur post IJL.

Employment & Underemployment

Jackson, Stafford, Banks, and Warr (1983), reported that psychological distress increased as workers went from employment to job loss and the reverse pattern occurred when IJL workers became re-employed. However re-employment following IJL has also been an area of some research with results not being as straightforward as those suggested by DeFrank. One of the major challenges faced by IJL people is to find another job, moreover one that satisfies particular needs. The risk of underemployment or dissatisfying re-employment is but one of the challenges faced by the individual.

In terms of emotional well being, according to Jahoda (1982), a person will be emotionally better off in a job, any job, than someone who is unemployed. The following quotation illustrates:

That not all is well in the world of employment is beyond question. Though it provides the required categories of experience, their quality is on occasion so deplorable that many commentators regard unemployment (with adequate financial support) preferable to such employment. For reasons highlighted earlier, I cannot agree with this.(p.61)

This is a somewhat contentious point however. Winefield and Tiggereman, (1990), for example, found that the dissatisfied employed person is just as badly off in terms of psychological well-being as the unemployed person. In addition Feather and O'Brien (1990), found that participants in poor employment and unemployed groups showed a higher depressive effect, lower work values, and lower levels of personal control than subjects in the satisfied employed group. There was however, little difference between the unemployed and unsatisfied groups.

Further research by Burke (1986), of Canadian blue collar workers, surveyed 16 months after IJL, found 72% of those working were earning less than when in their previous job. With regard to overall job satisfaction, 43% rated their new job as less satisfying than their former position. However, what is of interest here is that while many of this group ended up working for less remuneration, less than 50% disliked their new job, suggesting that financial issues may not be as critical as Leana and Feldman (1990), have suggested.

Further research has indicated the risks of underemployment, for example Mallinckrodt (1990), Liem (1992), have suggested that as a result of the IJL victim

taking an unsatisfactory job, the individual can lose their sense of personal control and thus potentially incur damage to his or her sense of self. The feeling of control and its relationship to mental health is a strong theme running through IJL research. In some of the more recent research into IJL employment follow up, Leana and Feldman (1995), found that unsatisfactory re-employed workers reported significantly higher levels of anxiety than satisfactory re-employed workers, but also significantly lower levels of life satisfaction than those still unemployed. The trauma of IJL can therefore be twofold. At one end is the challenging of old assumptions with the job loss event itself and at the other, a corresponding battle to regain meaningful employment.

Repeated IJL

It could be argued that having experienced IJL previously, one will have had the opportunity to use that experience to better cope with losing one's job again. That is, by the second time, possibly one's expectations around employment will have been redefined, and the subsequent experience of repeated IJL should not be as cognitively challenging. Conversely, experiencing repeated IJL may be more stressful as it highlights one's sense of vulnerability and loss of control over events. There appears little direct research on the effects of repeated IJL, and whether previously experiencing IJL proves to be a buffer or additional stressor. Kinicki and Latack (1990), have addressed this in passing and found that having experienced IJL previously was of no particular advantage in terms of coping with subsequent job loss. In a follow up qualitative study, an individual who had experienced IJL three times concluded.. " I can tell you that it doesn't help at all - it is just as bad this time " (p.356).

Kinicki and Latack suggested that IJL may be significantly stressful and that previous experience is of no help. Schlossberg, 1984 (cited in Kiniki & Latack, 1990), proposed that one's coping resources change over time, so the same type of life event may be experienced differently by the same person at a different life stage and thus this change in coping resources could affect appraisal. It could also be argued that when a person has experienced IJL previously, they would have built up some resistance and developed strategies to cope in the event of recurrence. This is an area that has previously received little attention, and is addressed in this study.

The focus of this study

As this was the first time the Janoff-Bulman model has ever been directly applied to IJL, and the model itself has not been empirically tested, the objectives of this study are twofold. Firstly, the design gives the opportunity to further test the concept put forward by Janoff-Bulman, that people who experience an event as highly traumatic, differ in their fundamental world assumptions from those who have not.

The second objective is to broadly investigate whether the effect of IJL can, and to what extent, be explained by its cognitive impact. If it can be assumed that an event itself must be significant enough to the individual to bring about a severe challenge and corresponding change to particular beliefs; the first question is whether or not IJL is significantly traumatic to initiate such a process. To establish this, this research asks the following question:

Do those participants who reported a high level of emotional distress resulting from IJL differ in their world beliefs from those participants reporting a comparatively lower level of distress?

To broaden the scope of this study, the more traditional, objective, and circumstantial aspects of researching IJL have also been included. From this, the following question has been addressed:

Are there demographic characteristics particular to emotional impact in IJL? The focus here will be in the following areas:

- re-employment
- sex
- change in salary between old and new job
- change in perceived status
- time in paid employment
- repeated IJL

CHAPTER FOUR

METHOD

Procedure

Two methods were used to gain access to people who had experienced IJL. Firstly, present and former outplacement clients of KPMG Wellington (n=70) were sent an information sheet (appendix A) and questionnaire (appendix B). To gain a greater pool of participants questionnaires were sent to KPMG Christchurch (n=50), Dunedin (n=12), Hamilton (n=12), and Auckland (n=20) for distribution to outplacement clients on my behalf. Those who were approached and chose to participate returned the completed questionnaire to me in a postage paid envelope.

Secondly, in an effort to increase participant numbers an email was sent out to all major KPMG offices throughout NZ inviting anyone who had experienced IJL to participate in the study (appendix C). In Wellington, this resulted in 23 responses from staff who has either directly experienced IJL or were willing to pass on a questionnaire to a relative or friend who has experienced IJL. From the Christchurch office 7 responses were received and 8 from Auckland.

In total 212 questionnaires were sent out and 124 returned. Two questionnaires were disregarded as the participants were not yet redundant and therefore ineligible. In addition, three questionnaires were returned with the participant having changed address..

In total 122 questionnaires were considered unusable thus bringing a participant response rate of 57%. This pleasing response rate was possibly due to the fact that I

and KPMG consultant staff in other offices were known to most of the people who had been invited to participate. Despite participants not being required to identify themselves many attached notes to their returned questionnaires providing updates as to their progress since working in the outplacement programme.

Questionnaires were sent out at the beginning of August and closed off at the end of September 1998.

Research Participants

Of the 122 participants, 62 (50.8%) were male, 60 (49%) were female. The average age was 41.51 years old (range 20 - 63, median=43, mode=35, SD=10.40). Of the group, 55 (45.1%) people had experienced IJL previously while 67 (54.9%) had not. Of those who had experienced IJL , 36 (29.5) had gone through it on one other occasion, 16 (13.1%) had experienced it twice, while 3 (2.5%) had lost their jobs on three occasions. This group were quite experienced in term of the amount of time they had spent in the paid work force (mean = 20.515 years, range = 1 - 45 years, median = 20.00 years, mode =30.00 years, SD = 9.905). The mean income of this participant group was well above the national norm though this was mostly due some particularly high salaries of some people. Prior to experiencing IJL the mean pre-tax income was \$50,695, (range = \$9,000 - \$200,000, median = \$40,000, mode=\$32,000, SD=31,963). At the time of this research 79 (64.8%) of participants had found new employment, while 43 (35%) had not. Of those who had found employment the collective mean income was \$47,257 , (range = \$3,000 - \$120,000, median = \$36,000, mode = \$30,000, SD = 27,786). Of this employed group 20.5% reported that they felt their new job was at a "higher occupational status", 14.8% felt it was "about the same", while 31.1% felt they were now at a "lower occupational status". Of the participant group 59% reported that they were the main income earner for their household, while 40.2% reported they were not.

Measures

Measure of World Assumptions and Belief in World Justice for Self

To measure fundamental assumptions, Janoff-Bulman's (1989) 'World Assumptions Scale'(WAS) was used. The WAS is made up of 32 statements, covering 8 sub-components of Janoff-Bulmans model. Participants responded to statements like "Bad events are distributed at random", on a scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree, to (6) strongly agree. Alpha coefficients for the WAS have been reported by Janoff-Bulman (1991), .87 for Benevolence of the World Scale, covering sub-components, benevolence of the world and benevolence of people, .76 for Meaningfulness of the World Scale, covering sub-components, justice, controllability, and randomness, and .80 for the Self-Worth Scale covering sub-components, self worth, self controllability, and luck.

With the strong emphasis in this study placed on the construct of justice, a further measure of this area was added. The work of Lipkus, Dalbert & Siegler, (1996). suggested that a slight differentiation between justice for others and justice for self should be made when measuring the concept of world justice beliefs as they had found that justice for self was the most powerful predictor of self reported life satisfaction. In response Lipkus et al, measure of 'Belief of Just World for Self' (BJWS) was added to follow on from with the WAS. The BJWS was made up of 6 statements where participants responded on a scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree, to (6) strongly agree, to passages such as, "I feel that people treat me fairly".

Perceived Impact of Job Loss (PIJL)

This section was made up of five questions and was designed to establish how the individual felt the job loss directly impacted on them. The first question was adapted from Kaufner's (1982) questionnaire on personal impact of unemployment and asked "Generally, how did the event of job loss affect you?" Response scale ranged from, (1) Hardly at all, to (5) Changed my whole life. Questions 2,3, and 5 were from Eby & Buch (1995) short questionnaire on the impact of job loss. These questions were designed to measure satisfaction with a new job and perception of the gains from the new job versus the losses. For example "Do you now consider the loss of your previous job to be " (1) The worst thing that ever happened to you , to (5) A very positive growth opportunity. Coefficient alpha for the scale was reported at .72.

One additional question (question 4) was added regarding how angry the participant felt towards their former employer. This question was my design and was based on the findings of Miller and Hoppe (1994), that suggested that impact of IJL was at its highest when the individual felt a high degree of anger towards their past employer. Participants were asked to rate on a five point scale , (1 being none at all, 5 being a great deal), the level of anger, bitterness and / or resentment they felt towards their former employer.

Psychological Distress

The General Health Questionnaire has been traditionally used to measure well-being following IJL. The 23 item version used by Payne, Warr & Hartly (1984), which found GHQ scores four times higher among unemployed men compared to employed

men, was used for this study, though it was reduced to 21 items , removing two of the three items regarding suicidal intention. It was felt that this question only needed to be asked once. This GHQ, developed by Goldberg and Hillier (1979) was made up of the 12 item version and supplemented by the 7 item anxiety and depression scales.

Participants were asked questions how they had felt since their job loss on questions like.. “have you felt constantly under strain”, to which they rated their response on a four point scale , ranging from (1) “no more than usual”, through to (4) “much more than usual”. Responses of 3-4 are typically considered as symptomatic, with four or more ratings within the questionnaire in the 3-4 range classed as potential cases for receiving psychiatric help. Total range of response for this version of the GHQ is from 21 - 84.

The inter-item reliability of the scale (coefficient alpha) has been reported Feathers and O'Brien (1986), as .95. In terms of validity, in the application of the GHQ in employment research, for example, Winefield Winefield, Tiggermann and Goldney, (1991), found dissatisfied and unemployed individuals score significantly higher on this scale than do satisfied employed.

Life Satisfaction

To measure current life satisfaction Diener, Emmons, Larsen , & Grifin's (1985) five item 'satisfaction with life scale' (SWLS) was used. Participants were asked to respond on a scale of 1 , strongly disagree, to 6, strongly agree to statements such as , “In most ways my life is ideal”. Internal consistency of this measure has been

reported by Diener, et, al, as .81, .63, .61, .75, and .66, for each of the five items. The SWLS has a correlation of .68, with the Life Satisfaction Index.

Demographic Information

Information was sought on participants gender, age, length of time since finishing their former job, job title at the time of IJL, length of time they had been in that position and with employer, whether they had previously experienced IJL, their income at the point of job loss, whether or not a new job had been found, the income level for that position, perceived status of the new job, length of time in the paid workforce, and whether or not they were the main income earner for their household.

CHAPTER FIVE

Results

Range of psychological responses to IJL.

The frequencies of responses within the GHQ are shown in table 1. This table highlights the wide range of responses participants reported through experiencing IJL. The possible range of response to the GHQ was 21 - 84, and in this group the range was 21-72. Scores are considered more symptomatic the higher they go within the possible range. When the GHQ cut off criteria is applied (as outlined in the methods section) it shows that 63.1 percent of this group would fall under the significance level of the GHQ in emotional distress in response to IJL. Conversely, 36.9 percent of the participant group scored over the significant cut off which is suggested as symptomatic and in possible need of psychiatric assistance.

Table 1. Distribution of scores relating to the GHQ

Distribution	Number	Percent
21-29	51	42.5
30-39	35	29.1
40-49	13	10
50-59	6	5
60-72	15	13.2

Intercorrelation between impact variables (perceived impact of job loss, world assumptions scale, belief world justice for self) and outcome variables (general health questionnaire, life satisfaction scale).

Intercorrelation between impact and outcome variables is presented in Table 2. Correlation was highly significant, showing correlation between impact variables, outcome variables, and between impact and outcome variables.

World assumptions directly correlated with perceived impact of the job loss, and were inversely correlated with beliefs in world justice for the self. The perceived impact of the job loss was also inversely correlated with perceived world justice for the self.

The perceived impact of the job loss, and world assumptions, were each directly correlated with distress, and inversely correlated with life satisfaction. That is, the higher levels of impact reported on the PIJL scale strongly related to levels of distress on the GHQ. The more a participant felt impacted by the job loss, the more distress they felt. Similarly world assumptions differed depending on level of distress experienced. The direction of these differences are reported below. Beliefs in world justice for the self were inversely correlated with distress, and directly correlated with life satisfaction. Distress was inversely correlated with life satisfaction. The more distressing a person found the job loss, the less satisfied they were with their life.

Table 2: Correlation matrix of impact and outcome variables*.

Variable	World assumptions	Perceived world justice for self	Distress	Life satisfaction
Perceived impact of job loss	.50 n = 97	-.57 n = 98	.66 n = 97	-.54 n = 98
World assumptions		-.80 n = 120	.54 n = 118	-.63 n = 120
Belief in world justice for self			-.51 n = 120	.60 n = 122
Distress				-.57 n = 120

*All correlations are $p < .001$.

Exploring the impact on cognitions following involuntary job loss.

Multiple regressions were conducted to test whether the impact variables, namely perceived impact of job loss, world assumptions, and belief in world justice for self, predicted the outcome variables, distress and life satisfaction. The three impact variables were first entered into a standard regression as independent variables, with distress as the dependent variable. Another simultaneous regression was performed with the same independent variables but with life satisfaction as the dependent variable. The results of these two regressions are shown in Table 3, where the left column represents the distress regression, and the right column the life satisfaction regression.

These results show that both the perceived impact of job loss and world assumptions are direct predictors of distress, and inverse predictors of life satisfaction. Specifically, the PIJL was the strongest predictor of reported distress, while the WAS best predicted life satisfaction. Belief in world justice for self did not predict either distress or life satisfaction. Thus the variation in distress and overall impact of IJL could not be explained by ones belief in justice for self.

Table 3. Predictors of distress and life satisfaction.

Predictor	Distress (N = 95)		Life satisfaction (N = 96)	
	Beta	t	Beta	t
Perceived impact of job loss	.505	5.70**	-.280	-3.06*
World assumptions	.372	3.09*	-.477	-3.81**
Belief in world justice for self	.054	0.42	.34	0.26
R ²	.507 F(3, 92) = 33.53**		.461 F(3, 93) = 28.38**	

* $p < .005$, ** $p < .001$

To establish whether or not impact of IJL influenced world beliefs, participants were split into two groups. One group was made up of participants who scored low on emotional impact, that was 63.1% of the entire group, and the other group made up of 36.9% who scored significantly high in emotional impact. The basis for dividing the participants into two groups was the individual's GHQ scores. Those who scored over the GHQ cut off score (see methods section under psychological distress for criteria),

were put in the high impact group, while those who scored under the cut off were put into the low impact group.

The means and t scores of each WAS sub-scale were calculated for both groups. The means and standard deviations scores in relation to the WAS is shown in table 4. Significant differences are found between the means of the high and low impact groups in areas of benevolence of people (low impact M = 8.61, high impact M = 10.40) , benevolence of the world (low impact M = 9.27, high impact M = 10.91), self worth where the responses were reversed scored, so the higher the score, the lower belief in personal self worth, (low impact M = 7.52, high impact M = 10.71), and luck (low impact M = 10.05, high impact M = 13.93).

These results show that there are significant differences in world beliefs between individuals experiencing IJL as either particularly traumatic or not traumatic. The high emotional impact group report stronger beliefs than the low impact group in the benevolence of the world and people, the belief that they are generally lucky. The high impact group however, also report a significantly lower belief in their own self worth when compared to the low impact group.

Table 4. Mean and standard deviations on WAS sub-scales for high and low impact of job loss groups.

WAS Subscales	Low impact (n=77)	High Impact (n=45)	t	df
Justice	14.95 (2.97)	14.69 (3.66)	0.43	120
Benevolence of the world	8.61 (2.30)	10.40 (3.18)	-3.60*	120
Randomness	14.39 (2.66)	14.93 (3.19)	-1.00	119
Benevolence of People	9.27 (2.57)	10.91 (3.99)	-2.76*	120
Self Worth +	7.52 (2.61)	10.71 (4.53)	-4.99**	120.
Luck	10.05 (3.57)	13.93 (4.84)	-5.02**	118
Control	13.68 (2.99)	14.04 (4.17)	-0.57	120
Self-Control	9.57 (2.17)	9.40 (2.78)	0.38	120

+ Items of self-worth were reverse scored

* P<.01 **P<.001

Influence of demographic factors on job loss

Re-employment

In order to establish whether or not employment status following job loss affected level of distress and life satisfaction, two, one-way, between-subjects ANOVAs were performed between the three employment status groups (No new job, Unsatisfactory new job, and Satisfactory new job). Distress was the dependent variable in one of these ANOVAs, while life satisfaction was in the other. The ANOVAs showed a significant effect of employment status on both distress and life satisfaction as shown in table 5.

Planned comparisons revealed that distress was the same for those who had no new job and those who had an unsatisfactory new job, $t(56) = -1.67$, *ns.*. However, those who had a satisfactory new job were less distressed than both the no new job group, $t(102) = -3.17$, $p < .001$, and the unsatisfactory new job group, $t(76) = -4.59$, $p < .001$.

Life satisfaction was also the same for the 'no new job' and 'unsatisfactory new job' groups, $t(58) = -0.37$, *ns.*. Participants in satisfactory new jobs were more satisfied than those without new jobs, $t(103) = -2.67$, $p < .01$, but not those in unsatisfactory new jobs, $t(77) = 1.56$, *ns.*

These results highlight the importance of not just finding a job, but finding a satisfying job. It would appear, from an emotional perspective, that there is no noticeable difference between working in an unsatisfying new job and having no job at all.

Table 5. Mean (and standard deviation) distress and life satisfaction for different levels of employment status.

Employment status	Distress	Life satisfaction
No new job N = 42	39.1 (15.4)	17.8 (6.6)
Unsatisfactory new job N = 16	46.7 (15.7)	18.5 (6.8)
Satisfactory new job N = 62	30.8 (11.42)	20.7 (4.73)
F	10.77** df = 2, 117	3.57* df = 2, 119

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$.

To assess the influence of sex on impact and life satisfaction scores, independent - samples (between subjects) t-tests were performed with each of the scores as depended variables. Men ($M = 36.5$, $SD = 15.13$, $n = 62$) were no different to women ($M = 35.1$, $SD = 14.22$, $n = 60$) on the GHQ, $t(117) = 0.517$, ns. Neither was there any difference on the LSAT (male, $M = 19.22$, $SD = 5.93$, $n = 60$; female $M = 19.51$, $SD = 5.88$, $n = 60$), $t(119) = 0.267$, ns. It would appear that sex does not play a significant role in level of response to IJL.

Salary differences between old and new job

To measure whether the mean differences in salary before and after IJL affected life satisfaction, a linear regression analysis was performed with the difference between old job salary and new job salary as the predictor variable. Life satisfaction in this case was used as the dependent variable as it provided some insight into the relationship between financial issues and general satisfaction. The finding showed there was no relationship

between these two variables, (BETA = .154, ns, R square = .010). A decrease or increase in income following IJL would appear not to affect how satisfied people are with their lives.

Change in perceived status and life satisfaction

A linear regression analysis was performed to see if change in perceived status as the predictor variable, had any influence on life satisfaction, the dependent variable. It was found that a decrease in perceived status was accompanied by lower life satisfaction, (BETA = 3.28, $p < .005$, R squared = .096). In this case there appears to be a direct link between ones perceived level of status following IJL and general life satisfaction.

Repeated IJL

An independent T-test was run to see if there was any significant difference in emotional impact between people who had and had not previously experienced IJL. The T test showed that those who had reported a prior IJL ($n=53$), had higher distress scores on the GHQ (M=39.1, SD=17.9) than those who reported no prior IJL ($n=67$), (M=33.2, SD=10.8), $t(118) = 2.12$, $p < .05$.

Years in job, with employer, and paid workforce.

A linear regression analysis was performed to see if the amount of time on a job, with the employer, or time in the workforce in general affected IJL impact. With the life satisfaction being the dependent variable, it was found that none of these factors appeared significant. Years in work (Beta = .150), amount of time in that particular job, (Beta = .046), time with that particular employer, (Beta = .117).

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

Janoff-Bulman's world assumptions model was proposed as a theoretical framework in which to investigate the impact of IJL. The world assumptions model argues that events are experienced as traumatic when they do not fit into one's established beliefs of the world. Janoff-Bulman presented eight primary postulates within an individual's conceptual system, which formed the foundation of one's world beliefs. They make up being, benevolence of the world, benevolence of people, justice, control, randomness, self worth, self controllability, and luck. The world assumptions model proposed that stressful events directly challenge these beliefs, and that if an event is experienced as highly traumatic, these beliefs may be destroyed and reformed in an altered state. That is, as found in research by Janoff-Bulman, world beliefs of trauma victims differed from world beliefs of people who had not experienced such trauma. One of the main purposes of this research was to establish whether or not the range of emotional response to IJL could be explained by its cognitive impact. The world assumption model therefore provided a framework in which to investigate this.

The fundamental question of this study was whether or not the impact of IJL altered one's world assumptions. In short, world assumptions did significantly differ between high and low impact groups in some areas. One of the most significant differences related to self worth. It would appear that IJL, when experienced as particularly stressful, impacts by diminishing of one's self view. This is consistent with Janoff-Bulman's (1989) study which found that the most predominant difference in beliefs between people who had experienced a traumatic event, and those who had not, were in their own concept of self-worth. A similar pattern was found in Gluhoski and Wortman's (1996) study on the impact of trauma on world views.

This finding highlights the very strong relationship between one's occupational identity and one's concept of self-worth. It would appear that one's own sense of usefulness is quite dramatically challenged when IJL is experienced as traumatic. To the Janoff-Bulman model, self-worth is associated with a strong internal feeling of being productive and useful. That is, a notion of personal value. As identity can be so strongly connected to one's occupational role, it is not surprising that, when this role is removed, so are the feelings of contribution and value. An interesting finding that relates to this is the effect of re-employment, new salary and status. While finding a new job does relate to lower emotional impact of IJL, the financial issues were irrelevant. Of greater importance were one's concept of status. Those who perceived that their new employment status was close to the same, or greater than their previous job, were in a stronger emotional state than those who felt their status had been diminished.

Other world beliefs that differed between the two groups were, benevolence of the world, benevolence of the interpersonal world, and luck. The direction of difference, however, was contrary to what would have been expected. Individuals who experienced high emotional impact actually reported a greater belief in these three areas. It would have been expected, based on the Janoff-Bulman model, that severe trauma would alter world assumptions and that these three beliefs would have been negative rather than positive.

These findings would appear somewhat perplexing. For example, why would an individual who had experienced IJL as traumatic, believe that; they were 'lucky', that world generally was 'a good place', or that people were basically kind and honest, when their very high levels of distress were as a result of being in the wrong place at the wrong time, employers, or the greater economy. A possible answer to this finding could firstly be found in the world assumption scale itself. In reviewing some of Janoff-Bulman findings, Catlin and Epstein (1992), found it unusual that some events that would appear relevant to specific beliefs had no effect on them. In this study,

some emphasis was placed on particular beliefs, such as justice and control, though neither of these two areas differed significantly between the high and low impact groups. This would seem incongruent when the event of IJL itself would seemingly appear to affect those two areas. With the exception of the self-worth scale, Catlin and Epstein concluded that "the items in the WAS are abstract and, thus, may reflect rationally held positions as opposed to personal, gut level beliefs" (p.192).

Upon reflection, however, there are other possible explanations. It may be that, the beliefs of the high trauma group in the aforementioned areas have not shifted as a result of IJL. That is, prior to experiencing IJL, they had a high belief in luck and of the benevolence of both the world and interpersonal world. Possibly, this is the reason as to why they have experienced IJL so traumatically. To believe that the world is basically good, and that you are a lucky person, would be incongruent to the actual event of IJL and hence bring with it a high level of distress. It is interesting to find that the low impact groups do not believe as strongly in these areas. There is no significant difference between the groups in areas of justice and control. This group, it would appear, does not view the world as a kind place, and have a lower belief in luck. Therefore the event of IJL would not be as challenging to their beliefs as it would be to the 'high' believer. As such they should not experience the same level of distress.

Another possible explanation is that, while IJL is extremely distressing for some, the event itself may not be threatening enough to alter any fundamental beliefs other than the seemingly most fragile, self-worth. It may be, as past research by Janoff-Bulman (1989), has highlighted, that experiences involving life or death may challenge other world assumptions whereas IJL challenges self-concept only.

Another explanation could relate to subsequent events and issues following the job-loss. Janoff-Bulman outlined a general process that lead to the re-adaptation of

fundamental assumptions, post trauma. It is possible that the high IJL trauma group did not experience a process of denial, extensive repeated thinking of the event, or finding meaning from the event. It may be that the high impact group's lack of cognitive processing and meaning making, strongly contributes to their continued higher levels of distress and lower life satisfaction than the lower impact group.

Around the demographic factors, the findings related to re-employment were of interest. The question focused on the mediating relationship between re-employment and IJL. Past research has generally promoted three schools of thought. Firstly, that of Johoda, which proposed any job was better than no job. The second that it was just as bad to have no job than it was to have a dissatisfying job (Mallinckrodt, 1990, Liem, 1992). The third proposed, by Leana and Feldman (1995) that one was worse off in an unsatisfying job, than if they had no job at all. This research shows that there was no difference between having a satisfying job and no job, but having an unsatisfying job had an emotional negative impact. However, this was not consistent with general life satisfaction, where, not surprisingly, those with a satisfying job reported the highest life satisfaction.

This study found that the repeated event of IJL did have a greater emotional impact on people in that those who had experienced IJL previously found the event more stressful than those who had not. This finding is congruent with past research of Kinicki and Latack (1990), and Leana and Feldman (1990). From a world assumptions model perspective, repeated IJL would be a reminder of one's vulnerability within one's career span and that jobs are not secure regardless of personal commitment.

The differences in emotional impact, found in this study of IJL, highlight the variation of response to this event as a life stressor and confirms that there is no one reaction

pattern to IJL. Of particular interest and concern is the finding that 36.9% (n=45) of this population group found IJL extremely stressful, scoring significantly high on the GHQ. Relating these scores to the cut off identified by Payne, Warr, and Hartley (1984), using this version in their study of mental health and unemployed, this group of participants would be classed as potential cases for receiving psychiatric help.

On the more positive side, 63.1% of this group did not score significantly high on the emotional impact of IJL, with only 12.3% reporting no impact at all. While IJL appears to be a reasonably common occupational occurrence, it would seem that for some it is a traumatic experience.

Another focus in this study was the identifying of the predictive factors that differentiated the emotional impact of IJL. Specifically, could one's emotional reaction to IJL be predicted by their cognitive beliefs? It was found that the cognitive factors strongly related to not only the impact of IJL, but life satisfaction after job loss. From the perspective of this study, these findings would strongly suggest the value of investigating the impact of IJL from the cognitive domain as well as having identified a method by which to do so. The Janoff Bulman model provides a method to research IJL impact beyond financial stressors while Winefield and Tiggerman (1990), Fryer and Payne (1986), and Ullah (1987), did not consider this possible.

Conclusions, Applications, and Future Research

For around 37% of this participant group, IJL has been an extremely distressing experience, with concept of self worth seemingly most affected. This study's findings have alluded to the fact that an individual's prior held beliefs may explain the variance in emotional reaction to IJL. That is, the stronger the beliefs like, 'I will experience

positive events' and that 'the world is generally a good place' are, the more vulnerable the individual to a highly negative reaction to an event such as IJL. However this is a complex area. To further build upon the findings and ideas presented in this research; future research should be aimed at measuring individual's world assumptions prior to, during, and after the event of IJL.

This study has implications for the delivery of counselling and outplacement services. Firstly, there are a high percentage of people experiencing IJL who find the event very traumatic. Therefore it is important that skilled, experienced counsellors or psychologists be available for these people, and that they be competent at working at an emotional level as well as being able to deliver the usual career planning services. Further more, from this research, employers contemplating downsizing could be educated in the impact IJL may have on employees, and thus, at least be able to make an informed decision on the level of counselling services made available to staff.

This study also highlights the need to look beyond the more obvious demographic factors, that are often seen as important, to understand the impact of IJL. In addition to this, practitioners need to be conscious that high levels of distress will be experienced if an individual's existing worldviews are challenged by the event of IJL.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M.D.S. (1989) Attachments beyond infancy. *American psychologist*. 44,709-716.
- Archer, J., Rhodes, V. (1995). A longitudinal study of job loss in relation to the grief process. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*. 5, 183-188.
- Archer, J., Rhodes, V. (1993). The grief process and job loss: A cross sectional study. *British Journal of Psychology*. 84. 395-410.
- Archer, J., Rhodes, V. (1987). Bereavement and reaction to job loss: A comparative review. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 26,211-224.
- Bennett, N., Martin, C.L., Bies, R.J., Brockner, J. (1995). Coping with a layoff: A longitudinal study of victims. *Journal of Management*. 21,6.1025-1040.
- Berger, K.S. (1988). *The Developing Person through lifespan*. (2nd Ed). New York. Worth Publishing.
- Bierhoff, H.W.(1989). *Person Perception and Attribution*. Berlin. Springer-Verky.
- Bies,R.J., Martin, C.L., Brockner, J. (1993). Just laid off but still a "good citizen"? Only if the process is fair. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*. 3,1. 227-238.

- Blustein, D.L., Prezioso, M.S.(1995). Attachment theory and career development: Current status and future directions. *The Counseling Psychologist*. 23,3, 416-432.
- Bowlby, J. (1988) Developmental psychiatry comes of age. *American Journal of Psychiatry*. 145, 1-10.
- Brajinsky, D.D., Brajinsky: B.M., (1975). Surplus people: their lost faith in self and system. *Psychology Today*. 9. 69-72.
- Bulman, R.J., Wortman, C.B.(1977). Attributions of blame and coping in the "real world": severe accident victims react to their lot. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 35, 351-363.
- Burke, R.J. (1986). Reemployment of and poorer job after a plant closing. *Psychological Reports*, 58, 559-570.
- Buss, T.F., Redburn, F.S. (1983). *Mass unemployment: Plant closings and community mental health*. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.
- Catalano, R., Novaco, R., McConnell, W.(1997). A model of the net effect of job loss on violence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 72. 6., 1440-1447.
- Catlin, G., Epstein, S. (1992). Unforgettable experiences: The relation of life events to basic beliefs about self and world. *Social Cognition*. 10, 2. 189-209.
- Chaplin, J.P.(1985). *Dictionary of Psychology*. New York, Dell Publishing.

- Clyman, R.I., Rosth, S., Sniderman, S.H., Charrier, J.(1990). Does a belief in a just world affect health care providers reactions to perinatal illness? *Journal of Medical Education*. 55. 538-539.
- Crittenden, P.M.(1994). Peering into the blade box: An exploratory treatise on the development of self in young children. In Cicchetti, D., Toth, S.L. *Disorders and dysfunctions of the self. Rochester Symposium on developmental psychopathology*. Col 5. P75-148. University of Rochester Press, Rochester, XIY.
- DeFrank, R.S., Ivancevich, J.M. (1986). Job loss: An individual level review and model. *Journal of Vocational behaviour*. 28, 1-20.
- Eby, L.T., Buch, K.(1995). Job loss as career growth: Responses to involuntary career transitions. *The Career Development Quarterly*. 44. 26-42.
- Epstein, S. (1980) The self-concept: A review and proposal of an integrated theory of personality. In E Staub (ed). *Personality: Basic Issues and current research*. Englewood Cliffs. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Feathers, N.T. (1990). Reported changes in behaviour after job loss in samples of older men. *Australian Journal of Psychology*. 41,2. 175-185.
- Festher, N.T., O'Brien, G.E. (1986). A longitudinal study of the effects of employment and unemployment on school leavers. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. 59. 121-144.
- Fineman, S. (1983). *White Collar Unemployed*. Chichester UK, Wiley.

- Fineman, S. (1983). *White Collar Unemployment, impact and stress*. Bath, Avon: Pitman Press.
- Finky, M.H., Lee, A.T.(1981). The Terminated Executive: Its like dying. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*. 59, 6.382-384.
- Fryer, D., Ullah,(1987). *Unemployed People: Social and psychological perspectives*. Philadelphia. Open University Press.
- Fryer, D., Payne, R. (1986) Being Unemployed: A review of the literature on the psychological experience of unemployment. In C.L. Cooper and I Robertson (Eds) *International review of industrial and organisational psychology*. (pp 235-277). London: Wiley.
- Gluhoski, U.L., Wortman, C.B. (1996). The impact of trauma on world views. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*. 15,4,417-429.
- Goldberg, D.P., Hillier, V.F. (1979). A scaled version of the General Health Questionnaire. *Psychological Medicine*. 9,139-145.
- Goldenberg, S., Kline, T.(1997). Canadian white- collar workers views of their experience with downsizing or job loss. *Psychological Reports*. 80,707-719.
- Hafer, C.L., Olson, J.M. (1989). Beliefs in a just world and reactions to personal development. *Journal of Personality*. 57.799-823.

- Hall, D.T.(1971). A theoretical model of career subidentity development in organisational settings. *Organisational behaviour and Human Performane.* 6,50-76.
- Hall, D.T. (1976). *Careers in Organisations.* Pacific Palisades, CA. Goodyear.
- Hamilton, V.E., Broman, C.L. Hoffman, W.S., Renner, D.S.(1990). Hard times and vulnerable people: Initial effects of plant closing on autoworkers mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour.* 31,123-140.
- Hardy, G.E., Barkham, M.(1994). The relationship between interpersonal attachment styles and work difficulties. *Human Relations.* 47.3.263-281.
- Hartley, J., Fryer, D.(1984). The psychology of unemployment: a critical appraisal. In G.M. Stephenson, and J.H. Davis (eds). *Progress in Applied Social Psychology.* Vol 2. Chichester. UK Wiley. P3-30.
- Hastie, R. (1981). Schematic principles in human memory. In E.T. Higgins, C.P. Herman, M. Zana (eds) *Social Cognition.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hazan, C., Shauer, P.R.(1990). Love and Work: An attachment – theoretical perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* 59,2.270-280.
- Hepworth, S.J.(1980). Moderating factors of the psychological impact of unemployment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology.* 53.139-145.
- Holmes, T.H., Rahe, R. (1967). The Social Readjustment rating scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research.* 11,391-400.

- Ivancevich, J.M., Matteson, M.T.(1984). *Stress and Work*. Glenview, IL..Scott, Foresman.
- Jackson, P.R., Stafford, E.M., Banks, M.H., Warr, P.B.(1983). Unemployment and psychological distress in young people. The moderating role of employment commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 68.525-535.
- Jackson, P.R., Warr, P.B(1984) Unemployment and psychological ill-health.: the moderating role of duration and age. *Psychological Medicine*. 14,605-614.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1992). *Shattered assumptions: Towards a new psychology of trauma*. New York: Free Press.
- Janoff-Bulman, R.(1989). The Benefits of illusions, the threat of disillusionment, and the limitations of inaccuracy. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*. 8.2.158-175.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1989). Assumptive worlds and the stress of traumatic events: Applications of the schema construct. *Social Cognition*. 7,2.113-136.
- Janoff-Bulman, R., Lang-Gunn, L. (1988). Coping with disease, crime and accidents: The role of self-blame attributions. In Abramson, L.Y. (Ed). *Social Cognition and clinical psychology: A synthesis*. New York. The Guilford Press.
- Janoff-Bulman, R., Frieze, I.H.(1983). A theoretical perspective for understanding reactions to victimization. *Journal of Social Issues*. 39.1-17.

- Janoff-Bulman, R., Timko, C.(1987). Coping with traumatic events: the role of denial in light of peoples assumptive worlds. In C.R. Synder and C Ford (eds). *Coping with negative life events: Clinical and Social psychological perspectives*. New York: Plenum.
- Jahoda, M. (1982). Employment and Unemployment. A social-psychological analysis. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Kasl, S.V.(1979) Changes in mental health status associated with job loss and retirement. In J. Barrett, R.M. Ross and G.L Klerman (eds). *Stress and mental disorder*. New York: Raven Press.
- Kaufman, H.G. (1982). Professionals in search of work. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Kets de Vries, M., Balazs, K. (1997). The downside of downsizing. *Human Relations*. 50.1.,11-50.
- Kinicki, A., Latack, J. (1990). Explication of the construct of coping with involuntary job loss. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 36:339-360.
- Konovsky, M.H., Folger, R. (1991). The effects of procedures, social accounts, and benefits level on victims' layoff reactions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 21.8.630-650.1.
- Kubler-Ross, E.(1969). *On death and dying*. New York: Macmillan.

- Kuhn, T.S.(1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Latack. J.C., Kinicki, H.J., Prussia, G.E. (1995). An integrative process model of coping with job loss. *Academy of Management Review*. 20.2.311-342.
- Latack, J.C., Dozier, J.B. (1986). After the axe falls: Job loss as a career transition. *Academy of Management Review*. 11,2375-392.
- LaFarge, V.V. (1994). The ambivalence of departing employees: Reactions of involuntary and voluntary exiters. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. 30,2.175-197.
- Leana, C.R., Feldman, D.C. (1995). Finding new jobs after a plant closing: Antecedents and outcomes of the occurrence and quality of reemployment. *Human Relations*. 48.12.1381-1400.
- Leana, C.R., Feldman, D.C. (1992). *Coping with job loss*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Leana, C.R., Feldman, D.C. (1991). Gender differences in responses to unemployment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 38,65-77.
- Leana, C.R., Feldman, D.C. (1990). Individual responses to job loss: Empirical findings from two field studies. *Human Relations*,43.11.1155-1181.
- Leana, C.R., Feldman, D.C. (1988). Individual responses to job loss: Perceptions, reactions, and coping behaviors. *Journal of Management*. 14,3,375-389.

- Lerner, M.J. (1980). *The belief in a just world*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Lerner, M.J., Miller, D.T. (1978). Just world research and the attribution process: Looking back and looking forward. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85,5. 1030-1051.
- Leventman, P.G. (1981). *Professionals out of work*. New York: Free Press.
- Levinson, H. (1962). *Men, management and mental health*. Cambridge, M.A. Harvard University Press.
- Liem, R. Unemployed workers and their families: Social victims or social critics? In Voydanoff and Majka (Eds), (1992), *Families and economic distress*. Beverly Hills, CA. Sage, 1992. P135-151.
- Lipkus, I.M., Dalbert, C., Siegler, I.C. (1996). The importance of distinguishing the belief in a just world for self versus others: Implications for psychological well-being. *Social Psychology Bulletin*. 22.7.666-677.
- Little, C.B.(1976). Technical – professional unemployment: Middle Class adaptability to personal crisis. *The Sociological Quarterly*. 17.262-274.
- Mallinckrodt, B., Bennett, J. (1992). Social support and the impact of job loss in dislocated blue-collar workers. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 39,4,482-489.
- Mallinckrodt, B. (1990). Satisfaction with a new job after unemployment: consequences of job loss for older professionals. *Journal of counseling Psychology*. 37,2.149-152.

- Marris, P. (1975). *Loss and change*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Masuda, M., Holmes, T.H. (1967). The social readjustment rating scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*. 11,219-225.
- Melville, D.I., Hope, D., Bennison, D., Barraclough, B, B. (1985). Depression among men made involuntarily redundant. *Psychological Medicine*. 15,789-793.
- Miller, M.V., Hoppe, S.K. (1994). Attributions for job termination and psychological distress. *Human Relations*. 47,3,307-327.
- Parkes, C.M. (1975). What becomes of redundant world models? A contribution to the study of adaption to change. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*. 48,131-137.
- Parkes, C.M. (1971). Psycho-social transitions: A field of study. *Social Science and medicine*. 5,101-105.
- Paykel, E.S. (1971). Scaling of life events. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 25,340-347.
- Prussia, G.E., Kinicki, A.J., 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*. 78.3.382-394.
- Quick, J.C., Quick, J.D. (1984). *Organisational stress and preventive management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Ragland-Sullivan, E., Berglow, P. (1981). Job loss: Psychological response of university faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*. 52,1.45-66.
- Spera, S.P., Buhrfeind, E.D., Pennebaker, J.W. (1994). Expressive writing and coping with job loss. *Academy of Management Journal*. 37,3,722-733.
- Stewart, A.J. (1982). The course of individual adaption to life changes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 42,6.1100-1113.
- Stokes, G., Cochrance, R. (1984). A study of the psychological effects of redundancy and unemployment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. 57:309-322.
- Schwartzberg, S.S., Janoff-Bulman, R. (1991). Grief and the search for meaning: Exploring the assumptive worlds of bereaved college students. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*. 10.3.270-288.
- Swinburne, P. (1981). The psychological impact of unemployment on managers and professional staff. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. 54,47-64.
- Taylor, S.E., Brown, J.D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin*. 103,2.193-210.
- Tomaka, J., Blascovich, J. (1994). Effects of justice beliefs on cognitive appraisal of and subjective, physiological and behavioral responses to potential stress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 67.4,732-740.

- Van der Kolk, B.A., McFarlane, A.C., Weisneth, G. (1996). *Traumatic Stress. The effects of overwhelming experience on mind, body and society.* N.Y. The Guilford Press.
- Winefield, A.H., Winefield, H.R., Tiggemann, M., Goldmen, K.D. (1991). A longitudinal study of the psychological affects of unemployment and unsatisfactory employment on young adults. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 76,3. 424-431.
- Winefield, A.H., Tiggemann, M. (1990). Employment status and psychological well-being: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 75,4.455-459.
- Youst, D.B. (1990). Facing organisational realities. The Case of Rhonda. *The Career Development Quarterly.* 38.201-203.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Information letter

Information Sheet

My name is Jeff Simpson and I work at KPMG Wellington as a consultant in career counselling and transition planning. In addition to this position I am completing my masters degree thesis in psychology through Massey University. As I am extensively involved in career outplacement and enjoy working with people who have undergone career transition I have chosen to focus my research thesis on the impact of involuntary job loss.

Supervising this research is Kerry Chamberlain senior lecturer in the Department of Psychology, Massey University. This research has also been approved by the Massey University's Ethics Committee.

I am contacting former clients of KPMG's outplacement service throughout New Zealand and inviting them to participate in this study. If you live in the lower North Island I will have obtained your address through my own Wellington office. However if you live in the Auckland, Hamilton, Christchurch or Dunedin regions this package has been distributed on my behalf by our offices in those locations. It is important to note that your address or any information regarding you or the work you did with KPMG has not been provided to me. I am also inviting the participation of others who have experienced involuntary job loss who were not former KPMG clients.

The attached questionnaire looks at a number of issues relating to involuntary job loss and its aftermath. These cover areas relating to your current employment status, how you feel about the loss of your previous job, belief systems, as well as personal levels of current well-being and life satisfaction.

The questionnaire should take under 30 minutes to complete and upon completion be enclosed in the postage paid box link envelope provided and returned at your earliest convenience.

In considering your participation in this research it is important to note the following:

- Participation in this study is voluntary and completely anonymous. At no time are you required to identify yourself.
- You have the right to choose not to participate.
- You can leave out any particular questions you choose not to answer.
- I can be contacted to discuss any part of the questionnaire that you may require some clarity on.
- The results from this research can be made available to you upon request. You will not be required to identify yourself by name. "Feedback Request" followed by an address would be sufficient.
- This is a research study and not a KPMG survey. Your choice to participate or decline will in no way affect any ongoing or future work you may undertake with KPMG.
- Returned questionnaires will be used solely for the purpose of this research and not be made available to any other person other than myself.
- It is hoped that the information gained from this research can further assist in the understanding of the impact of job loss and therefore your participation would be most appreciated.

It is hoped that the information gained from this research can assist practitioners working in this area in the further understanding of the impact of job loss and thus the overall findings may be published in an academic journal.

I can be contacted during working hours on (04) 382 8800 or e-mail jeffs@kpmg.co.nz.
should you like any further information or wish to discuss any part of this study as can Kerry Chamberlain on (06) 350 4116

Thank you for your participation

Jeff Simpson

Organisational Development Unit
KPMG
PO Box 996
Wellington

APPENDIX B: Questionnaire used in this study

The following questionnaire is based on the assumption that within the last 12 months you have involuntarily left your job due to an organisational change (for example, the result of a company downsizing, a closure, a position being made redundant).

This questionnaire is divided into five main sections and asks you to respond to a number of questions or statements. There is no "right" or "wrong" answer, but it is important that you respond as frankly as you can. Try not to spend too long on any one response.

The questionnaire should be completed in under 30 minutes, and then returned in the pre-paid envelope.

There is no need to identify yourself at any point and your responses are entirely confidential.

3 0 0

*For Office use
only*

Female Male (please circle)

1

In what year were you born?

How long in months has it been since you finished your previous job?

What was your job title at the point of leaving that job?

How long had you been employed in that position?

_____ Years _____ Months

How long had you been employed by your previous employer?

_____ Years _____ Months

Have you ever lost your job due to redundancy/downsizing on any other occasions?

If yes, how many times?

What was your pre-tax annual income from your previous job?

_____ thousand

Have you found a new job?

Yes No

If 'yes', what is your pre-tax annual income?

_____ thousand

Do you consider your new job to be at a (please tick one)

- "higher occupational status"
- "about the same level of status as your former job" or at a
- "lower occupational status"

How many years have you been in the paid workforce?

_____ Years

Are you the main income earner for your household?

Yes No (please tick)

14

This section examines the impact and your reaction to your job loss. Read each question or statement and then **circle** the appropriate answer to indicate how you generally feel.

Generally, how did the event of job loss affect you?

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1
Hardly at all | 2
A little
upsetting | 3
Somewhat
disturbing | 4
Very disturbing | 5
Changed my
whole life |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|

15

Do you now consider the loss of your previous job to be

- | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1
The worst
thing that
ever
happened to
you | 2
Generally a
negative event | 3
Neither
particularly
positive or
negative event | 4
Generally a
positive event | 5
A very positive
growth
opportunity |
|---|---|--|---|--|

Prior to experiencing the job loss I generally considered my job to be

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1
Highly
dissatisfying | 2
Generally
dissatisfying | 3
Neither
particularly
good or bad | 4
Generally
satisfying | 5
Very satisfying |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

The level of anger, bitterness and/or resentment I feel towards my previous employer is

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1
None at all | 2
A little | 3
Some | 4
Quite a lot | 5
A great deal |
|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|

My feelings toward my current employment can be best described as

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1
Highly
dissatisfying | 2
Generally
dissatisfying | 3
Neither
particularly
satisfying or
dissatisfying | 4
Generally
satisfying | 5
Very satisfying |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

19

This section asks about your general assumptions regarding a number of aspects of life. Read each statement carefully and circle the appropriate answer to indicate how you feel. Try not to spend too much time on any one question.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree

Misfortune is least likely to strike worthy, decent people	1	2	3	4	5	6
People are naturally unfriendly and unkind	1	2	3	4	5	6
Bad events are distributed to people at random	1	2	3	4	5	6
Human nature is basically good	1	2	3	4	5	6
The good things that happen in this world far outnumber the bad	1	2	3	4	5	6
The course of our lives is largely determined by chance	1	2	3	4	5	6
Generally, people deserve what they get in this world	1	2	3	4	5	6
I often think that I am no good at all	1	2	3	4	5	6
There is more good than evil in the world	1	2	3	4	5	6
I am basically a lucky person	1	2	3	4	5	6
People's misfortunes result from mistakes they have made	1	2	3	4	5	6
People don't usually care what happens to the next person	1	2	3	4	5	6
I usually behave in ways that are likely to maximise good results for me	1	2	3	4	5	6
People will experience good fortune if they themselves are good	1	2	3	4	5	6
Life is too full of uncertainties that are determined by chance	1	2	3	4	5	6
When I think about it, I consider myself very lucky	1	2	3	4	5	6
I almost always make an effort to prevent bad things from happening to me	1	2	3	4	5	6
I have a low opinion of myself	1	2	3	4	5	6
By and large, good people get what they deserve in this world	1	2	3	4	5	6
Through our actions we can prevent bad things happening to us	1	2	3	4	5	6

For Office use only

20

39

	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Generally Disagree	3 Disagree Slightly	4 Agree Slightly	5 Generally Agree	6 Strongly agree	For Office use only				
Looking at my life, I realise that chance events have worked out well for me				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	40
If people took preventative actions, most misfortune could be avoided				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
I take the actions necessary to protect myself against misfortune				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
In general, life is mostly a gamble				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
The world is a good place				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
People are basically kind and helpful				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
I usually behave so as to bring about the greatest good for me				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
I am satisfied with the kind of person I am				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
When bad things happen, it is typically because people have not taken the necessary actions to protect themselves				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
If you look closely enough, you will see that the world is full of goodness				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
I have reason to be ashamed of my personal character				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
I am luckier than most people				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
I feel that the world treats me fairly				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
I feel that I get what I deserve				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
I feel that people treat me fairly in life				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
I feel that I earn the rewards and punishments I get				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
I feel that people treat me with the respect I deserve				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
I feel that I get what I am entitled to have				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
I feel that my efforts are noticed and rewarded				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	
I feel that when I meet with misfortune, I have brought it upon myself				1	2	3	4	5	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	59

The following questions refer to your general sense of well being. Circle the appropriate answer that best indicates how you feel.

Scale:

- | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| No more than
previously | A little more
than usual | Generally more
than usual | Much more than
usual |

Since leaving your job due to restructuring/downsizing have you.....

	1	2	3	4	For Office use only	
Been unable to concentrate on whatever you're doing	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	60
Lost much sleep over worry	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Had difficulty in staying asleep once you are off	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Felt that you are not playing a useful part in things	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Felt incapable of making decisions about things	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Felt constantly under strain	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Felt you couldn't overcome difficulties	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Been unable to enjoy your normal day to day activities	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Been getting edgy and bad tempered	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Been getting scared or panicky for no good reason	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Been unable to face up to your problems	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Found everything is getting on top of you	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Been feeling unhappy and depressed	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Been losing confidence in yourself	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Been thinking of yourself as a worthless person	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Felt that life is entirely hopeless	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Been feeling reasonably unhappy	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Been feeling nervous and strung up	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	77

	1 No more than previously	2 A little more than usual	3 Generally more than usual	4 Much more than usual					
Felt that life isn't worth living			1	2	3	4	For Office use only	<input type="checkbox"/>	78
Found yourself wishing you were dead and away from it all			1	2	3	4		<input type="checkbox"/>	
Found at times you couldn't do anything because your nerves were too bad			1	2	3	4		<input type="checkbox"/>	80

This section contains statements regarding your current level of life satisfaction. Circle the response that most closely indicates how you feel.

Scale:

	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Generally Disagree	3 Disagree Slightly	4 Agree Slightly	5 Generally Agree	6 Strongly Agree					
In most ways my life is close to my ideal				1	2	3	4	5	6	For Office use only	<input type="checkbox"/>
The conditions of my life are excellent				1	2	3	4	5	6		<input type="checkbox"/>
I am satisfied with my life				1	2	3	4	5	6		<input type="checkbox"/>
So far I have gotten the important things I want in life				1	2	3	4	5	6		<input type="checkbox"/>
If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing				1	2	3	4	5	6		<input type="checkbox"/>

*Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Your participation is most appreciated.
Please place this in the envelope provided and return.*

APPENDIX C: Email to KPMG staff

Simpson, Jeff

From: Simpson, Jeff
Sent: Monday, 17 August 1998 12:19
To: *CHCH Staff
Subject: Research

Hello everyone

I work in the outplacement service section in the Wellington office and as some of you may know I am currently undertaking a research project as part of my masters degree thesis. What I am researching is the short and long term effects of involuntary job loss (IJL) / redundancy. In doing this I am asking people who have experienced IJL if they would be interested in filling out a questionnaire I have developed to assess its impact. If you are one of these people and would like to help I would be most grateful for your participation. The questionnaire takes about 10-15 minutes to fill out, is completely anonymous and responses confidential. Let me know via this email and I will forward a questionnaire down to you.

Many thanks
Jeff