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ABSTRACT

This study investigated the effect of participation in a 14-day career redirection program on the reemployment, explanations for unemployment, and levels of depression and self-esteem of 44 unemployed adults who had recently become physically disabled. The career redirection program was delivered using an extended Solomon four-group design. The subjects' explanations for their unemployment, and their levels of depression and self-esteem were measured on at least two of four possible occasions: (a) before participating in the program, (b) after completing the program, (c) after waiting to participate in the program, or (d) eight weeks after completing the program. The researcher contacted the subjects who completed the program after eight weeks to determine their employment status and to request the completion of the final questionnaire battery. A random sample of the subjects who finished the program were also interviewed in-depth to obtain detailed information about their experiences of: (a) becoming disabled, (b) being confronted with the need to change jobs as a result of their disabilities, and (c) participating in the career redirection program. All the incidents reported by the subjects that related to their emotional reactions to these three experiences were identified from transcripts of the interviews. Incidents describing similar reactions to components of these experiences were grouped into categories. Six stages were discerned from the analysis of the categories of emotional reactions. Taken together, these six stages described a career redirection process. The results of the study demonstrated the effectiveness of the treatment program in assisting the subjects through the career redirection process. Eight weeks after finishing the program, 60.5% of the subjects were involved in reemployment activities (11.6% working; 28% independent in job search; 20.9% taking training). Contrary to the researcher's expectations, the subjects did not exhibit the effects of long-term unemployment documented in the literature, possibly because they
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Nature of the Problem

Unemployment continues to be a problem faced by many Canadians. Research has identified many specific features of the experience of unemployment (Borgen & Amundson, 1984) as well as certain subsets such as the experience of underemployment (Borgen, Amundson, & Harder, 1988). Increasingly, Canadians are faced with the prospect of involuntary job loss. The trend to downsize large organizations is leading to involuntary job loss amongst white collar workers and is no longer limited to the industrial sector.

Job loss can adversely affect physical and mental health. Kasl, Gore, and Cobb (1975) and Warr and Jackson (1984) associated job loss with coronary disease, hypertension, ulcers, and headaches. Liem and Rayman (1982) linked job loss with increased levels of depression, anxiety and hostility. They showed specifically that there was an increased level of anxiety amongst spouses of the unemployed. Margolis and Farran (1981, 1984) documented an increased illness rate amongst children of unemployed fathers.

While job loss has a serious impact on the general population, it has an even greater impact on persons with physical disabilities. Gower (1988) found in an analysis of the Canadian Health and Disability Survey of 1983-84 that only 48% of persons with disabilities between the ages of 35-64 were employed, whereas 72% of their non-disabled counterparts were employed. Equally telling, of those with disabilities, 46% had removed themselves from the labour force compared with 23% of the non-disabled.
Gower (1988) identified four causes for the lower labour force participation rates of the physically disabled. First, the presence of the disability itself may have a negative impact on employers and restrict disabled individuals' access to job opportunities. The negative impact of the disability increases as the disability becomes more severe. Second, a low education level has a greater impact on the disabled population than it does on the non-disabled population. Because many jobs available to poorly educated people tend to require physical labour, many uneducated disabled workers do not even try to look for jobs. Third, disabled workers are more likely to withdraw from the workforce because they become frustrated with trying to overcome their employment barriers. A higher number of recent employment leavers (e.g. individuals who have been in the workforce within the preceding five years) are found among the disabled population. Fourth, in three subgroups of the disabled population, younger disabled men and women and older disabled women, a higher percentage of individuals exist who have never entered the workforce than are found among comparable groups in the non-disabled population.

Society has attempted to provide assistance to reemploy the unemployed through government agencies such as Employment and Immigration Canada and through private agencies that teach job search skills. Disabled persons have been assisted through agencies such as the Canadian Paraplegic Association and its provincial counterparts, as well as private agencies. Those who have become disabled due to a work-related incident have received assistance through the Vocational Rehabilitation Departments of their provincial Workers' Compensation Boards.

Most of these agencies have designed their job search assistance programs according to the Job-Finding Club (JFC) model which was developed by Azrin, Flores and Kaplan (1975). These researchers used the JFC approach with a general unemployed population and found that job seekers who participated in the program
obtained full time jobs at higher starting salaries in a much shorter average period of
time than job seekers who did not have access to the program. The JFC job seekers
benefited from help with interview techniques, telephone strategies, resume
preparation, counselling and social support. Zadny and James (1977) and Fraser
(1978) found that job search training strengthened clients' coping skills, thereby helping
them to perform necessary job search activities.

The Job-Finding Club model has also been used with a disabled population (Azrin
& Philip, 1979) and an economically disadvantaged population (Azrin, Philip, Thienes-
materials designed to teach job search concepts and behaviors with 66 rehabilitation
clients who ranged in age from 20 - 51 years and had physical, mental or perceptual
disabilities. The researchers tested these materials in a controlled experiment. They
found that the self-help materials significantly increased both cognitive and behavioral
activities in the experimental group. The experimental group had a higher number of
job placements when compared with the control group.

Azrin and Besalel (1980) published a counsellor's manual which outlined the
information and procedures required for establishing and operating a job finding group
or job club according to the program tested by Azrin et al. (1975). The manual
contains instruction on identification of goals, resume preparation, methods for
identifying the hidden job market and obtaining job leads, interview strategies, and
completion of applications.

Despite these claims, most research on job search training emphasized programs
for non-disabled clients. Few studies have addressed the question of which type of
program benefits which specific type of client (Flynn, 1991). Dunn (1981) posed the
question: "What works best with which people, under what circumstances?" (p.141).
Fretz (1981) searched the fields of career psychology, educational instruction and
psychotherapy for evaluations of career counselling and career development interventions. He found few empirical studies and many of these studies did not adequately specify the treatment parameters or define the appropriate outcomes for people already attached to the labour force. Few studies examined the interactions between treatments and client attributes. Fretz recommended strategies for increasing the detail and specificity of findings from individual research studies.

Career interventions should be described in terms of the three treatment parameters of content domain, interpersonal context and degree of structure. Content domain refers to occupational information, self-knowledge and decision skills. Interpersonal context relates to three options for program delivery: (a) one-to-one counselling, (b) group counselling, and (c) self or computer-assisted programs. Programs may be highly structured, semi-structured or unstructured. Fretz (1981) directed evaluators to use measures from previous research with established reliability and validity. He stated that evaluators should be prepared to report the costs associated with an intervention. In evaluating studies of career counselling, Fretz recommended that researchers compare at least two interventions and assign subjects randomly to treatment groups. He indicated that in ideal evaluation designs, researchers would have a minimum of four treatment groups in order to assess two levels in each of two different treatment parameters. If only two treatment interventions were evaluated then the interventions should be compared using two levels of a single treatment parameter (e.g., structured one-to-one counselling centered on occupational information compared with structured self-administered counselling focused on occupational information). When a sufficient number of subjects were available Fretz (1981) recommended that subjects should be divided or blocked into high and low groups according to at least one specific attribute or characteristic. Evaluators should check that the groups do not vary significantly on non-blocked
characteristics. Fretz encouraged evaluators to use as many outcome criteria as feasible including post treatment and follow-up criteria. Finally, Fretz directed evaluators to determine the statistical relationships among the content domain, interpersonal context, and structure variables used in an intervention.

After a review of the job-placement research Vandergoot (1987) concluded that only clinical services or administrative reward systems related to placement are effective. He recommended academic upgrading and post-placement support as useful techniques for providing rehabilitation assistance.

Flynn (1991) undertook a study to look at the question of "how best to match different types of clients with different job search programs" (p.134) following Fretz's (1981) research design strategies. The study was designed to measure the interaction of a broad range of client attributes with three self-directed job search methods delivered in a group format. The three job search methods varied in degree of intensity and structure. The Job Finding Club method was a slightly modified Canadian version (Mills, 1983) of Azrin and Besalel's (1980) Job Finding Club. It was a highly structured learning situation. Creative Job Search Techniques (Cote, 1984, 1985) was less structured, less intensive, more flexible, and briefer than the Job Finding Club. Overcoming Employment Barriers was the least structured, least intensive, and most flexible in implementation of the three methods.

All three treatment methods had a content domain of job search training and an interpersonal context of group format. Two counsellors delivered all treatments in the study. They were rotated through the three treatment programs on a predetermined, counterbalanced basis. Pre-treatment and follow-up measures were taken. The follow-up measures were taken at one-month, six-month and twelve-month intervals. The outcome measure for the study was employment status. Flynn used a comparative experimental design with three experimental groups and no formal control group. He
used this design to avoid crossing subject attributes with an inactive treatment. The subjects were randomly assigned to one of the three treatment programs. The subjects were 210 clients with special needs who ranged in age from 20 to 62 years; 59% of the subjects were male. The special needs were distributed in the subject group as follows: (a) 35% psychiatric disability, (b) 34% physically disabled, (c) 25% socially disadvantaged, and (d) 5% learning disabled. Almost all the subjects (206) were unemployed at the time of the study.

Flynn (1991) identified three guidelines for matching clients with job search programs. He concluded that all three job search programs can be recommended for the types of clients included in the study. Since his study had no control group, Flynn was unable to compare the results of job search treatment and no job search intervention. Significant attribute and treatment interactions were found for gender, marital status and age. The Job Finding Club method (Mills, 1985) appears to be a promising method for disabled or disadvantaged women. The Job Finding Club is also useful for single job seekers. Flynn concluded that most of the attributes examined in the study did not prove useful for matching clients with job search programs when only employment status was used as a measure of job finding success. Therefore, the question of how to match job search programs to client attributes remained unanswered.

Two client attributes that have not been investigated very fully by Canadian researchers are level of work experience and reason for unemployment. Researchers have studied unemployed subjects (Amundson & Borgen, 1987; Amundson & Borgen, 1988; Borgen & Amundson, 1987), underemployed subjects (Borgen, Amundson, & Harder, 1988), unemployed and disabled subjects (Borgen, Amundson, & Biela, 1986) and unemployed subjects with special needs (Flynn, 1991). However, none of these studies reported any analysis of interactions between treatment and work experience or
treatment and reason for unemployment. While Flynn collected data on average
duration of past job he did not find significant interactions for this attribute with any of
his study's treatment programs. Individuals who have been displaced from their jobs in
a restructuring economy or as a result of a work-related injury or disease all have work
experience and a clearly identifiable reason for their unemployment. Therefore,
programs designed to assist these individuals with career redirection should include
opportunities for expressing feelings about the reasons for their unemployment and
activities focused on the identification of skills from previous work experience that can
be transferred to new jobs

A group format became the preferred choice for job search programs because
research findings demonstrated that the group context was beneficial for helping clients
develop the support systems necessary for dealing with the stresses of career indecision
and job search (Amundson, Borgen, & Westwood, 1990). Borgen and Amundson
(1984) recommended job search support groups to help job seekers cope with repeated
job rejections, evaluate their options, and improve their job search techniques.
Structured learning groups were found to provide participants with opportunities for
mutual encouragement and support, comparing experiences, practising career decision-
making and job search skills, and making commitments for action (Amundson, Borgen,
& Westwood, 1990). Amundson and Borgen (1988) found that group participants
valued the experience of group support beyond their completion of the job search
program.

Purpose of the Study

Although several studies have examined the impact of unemployment (Borgen &
Amundson, 1984, 1987; Jahoda, 1982; Tiggeman & Winfield, 1984), research about
how the physically disabled experience unemployment is limited (Borgen, Amundson, & Biela, 1987). Many of the needs of the physically disabled are no different than those of their non-disabled counterparts. Research has shown that work plays an important role in maintaining a healthy identity (Orwell, 1972; Kelvin, 1981) and that unemployment can lead to psychological reactions (Shaw, 1976; Gurney, 1980; Kelvin, 1981). Acton (1981) stated that the disabled need employment for financial reasons, to give meaning to life, to establish social relationships, and to provide a structured routine. However, the physically disabled do face unique challenges. Stone and Sawatzki (1980) identified three specific areas: (a) initial employment handicaps, (b) management misconceptions, and (c) the job interview process. Meeting and successfully overcoming these challenges requires that the physically disabled receive special assistance.

One way that this assistance is provided is through Workers' Compensation Boards (WCBs). Many physically disabled persons are involved with Workers' Compensation Boards yet no research has come to light regarding how WCB clients fare when they must look for employment. This study evaluated a career planning and job search program created by combining two separate program modules. The program was adjusted to meet the needs of unemployed, physically disabled WCB clients.

Treatment

Treatment took place over 14 days and consisted of two parts. Part one was a program designed by Amundson and Poehnell (1993) called Setting New Career Pathways. The Career Pathways part of the program was divided into 2 five-day segments referred to as Week 1 and Week 2. Part two, called Job Search Skills, was
adapted from the work of Amundson, Borgen, Westwood and Swain (1987). Part two consisted of 1 four-day segment called Week 3.

The program began with the establishment of a positive group climate to provide the participants with a safe environment for a personal career self-assessment. The participants learned a self-assessment model which they used to examine their responses to unemployment. Week 1 ended with a series of guided activities that gave participants a basis for generating career options for themselves.

Week 2 focused on career exploration and began with an examination of the current labour market and how to access it. After the participants had generated career options the focus shifted to learning about research methods and developing decision-making and problem-solving skills. Week 2 ended with the establishment of action plans for the pursuit of career goals.

Week 3 centered on acquiring specific job search skills. Due to the importance of the actual employment interview (Stone & Sawatzki, 1980), increased emphasis was placed on preparing for this often intimidating encounter.

Outcome Goals

This study examined four areas of outcome: (a) employment, (b) self-esteem, (c) depression, and (d) explanations about unemployment. Employment of the client was the most significant of the outcome measures. Acton (1981) suggested that employment is important for four reasons: (a) to create income, (b) to have value, (c) to fit in to the normal flow of society, and (d) to add structure and discipline to life.

Both society and the WCB place a high value on work. The WCB provides clients with an income while they are recuperating from an injury. When clients have recovered, they are expected to return to gainful employment. Usually, benefits are
paid until the client has returned to employment. As a result of this policy of paying benefits until clients return to work, the WCB emphasizes reemployment assistance for clients. Most clients are eager to return to a normal life and view reemployment as the quickest way to achieve their goal.

Self-esteem is an important part of every individual. Researchers such as Tiggemann and Winefield (1984), Warr (1983), and Hayes and Nutman (1981) have shown that unemployment can have a negative impact on people's psychological well being. Tiggemann and Winefield (1984) stated that: "Perhaps the most consistently noted effect is that of a loss of morale or self-esteem" (p.34). Borgen, Amundson and Biela (1987) found that one of the four major internal factors that influenced people's reaction to unemployment was their sense of self-worth apart from work. Therefore, these researchers thought that increasing people's sense of self-worth would increase their likelihood of success in becoming reemployed.

Depression seems to be a common reaction to unemployment (Tiggemann & Winefield, 1984). However, depression usually takes some time to become a factor (Frese & Mohr, 1987). These researchers completed a longitudinal study with 51 German, male, blue-collar workers who were 45 years or older. A questionnaire was administered to the subjects in July and August 1975 and again in February 1977. The questionnaire included a depression scale, a hope for control scale, an internal/external control scale, and two indices of leisure time activities. Although the researchers acknowledged that their study had limitations because of the homogeneity of subject characteristics and small sample size, they concluded that unemployment had a strong and consistent impact on depression. Frese and Mohr determined that long term exposure to the daily hassles of unemployment, such as financial problems and disappointments, increases depression. The attending effects of depression such as lethargy and sleep disturbance can negatively affect people's job seeking behaviour.
They postulated that an improvement in people's mood, with an attending decrease in the effects of depression, would lead to increased success in finding employment.

Conventional wisdom suggests that when people have a problem, the more they take responsibility for it the sooner they will be able to resolve it. This is often not the case with unemployment. For unemployed people, placing blame on an external source is often an attempt to maintain the last shreds of self-esteem (Tiggeman & Winefield, 1984). If people accept responsibility for their unemployment, based on their characteristics or actions, they are at risk for slipping into a state of despair.

Seligman's (1975) learned helplessness model provides a combined behavioral and cognitive explanation for the experience of loss of control during periods of unemployment. This model contends that the motivation to make a response to control an outcome comes from the expectation that responding will produce that outcome. For example, if people expect that job search will produce a new job then they are motivated to look for work. However, prior experience affects the formation of expectations. If people learn that every contact with a prospective employer does not produce a job offer their confidence in the success of their job search may diminish and they may become less motivated to job search. On the other hand, they may have prior experience with job search eventually resulting in employment and therefore, they persist in looking for work. Experience can teach people that they can control outcomes in some situations but not in others. Individuals displaced from jobs in faltering sectors of the economy may understand that they cannot stop economic change but maintain confidence in their ability to become reemployed in a different sector of the economy. Expectations of lack of control may generalize from more traumatic or important events to less traumatic or important events, but not vice versa. For many people losing their job is an important and traumatic event which occurred in spite of their effort, commitment, and skill. People's expectation of being successful in
finding a new job may be threatened and they may lose motivation to search for work. However, reminding individuals of past situations in which they were in control and were successful and helping them to accept objective and factual explanations for their unemployment may encourage them to search for work again.

In summary, this evaluation of the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program investigated the impact of:

1. the treatment on the participants' eventual return to work (the treatment's design and implementation was expected to have a positive effect on the participants' return to work).

2. the treatment on the participants' self-esteem (an increase in self-esteem was anticipated to have a positive effect on people's job-seeking behaviour).

3. the treatment on the participants' level of depression (an elevation in mood was expected to have a positive effect on people's job-seeking behaviour).

4. attribution on the eventual outcome goal of employment (a balanced view of neither taking nor placing blame was expected to be associated with successful reemployment).

Findings about these treatment and attribution interactions were supplemented by data from: (a) feedback questionnaires completed by the participants during the program, (b) telephone interviews with the participants eight weeks after they completed the program, and (c) in-depth interviews conducted with a random sample of subjects about their experiences of being disabled, unemployed and taking part in the program.
Limitations

This study was designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program in helping physically disabled adults return to employment. The researcher expected to increase the likelihood of reemployment for physically disabled adults by bolstering their self-esteem, alleviating their depression, and assisting them in explaining their unemployment in more objective, neutral terms. These changes in self-esteem, depression levels and attribution were forecast to occur in the course of the subjects' participation in the treatment program.

The results of this research were expected to be applicable to other physically disabled adult populations. The fact that the experimental group was composed of WCB clients was not viewed as a limiting factor since the majority of physically disabled adults in Canada are eligible for assistance from national, provincial or private agencies and do access the services of these agencies.

An argument could be made for extending claims for the efficacy of the treatment program to all disabled adults and, likely all unemployed adults as well, since the employment needs of disabled adults do not differ substantially from the work needs of non-disabled adults. The reasons that motivate disabled adults to seek employment are similar to the factors that prompt non-disabled adults to search for jobs. Both non-disabled and disabled adults are prone to the erosion of self-esteem, increase in depression, and sense of loss of control that can accompany prolonged unemployment.

Limitations arising from the design of the study are discussed in Chapter 3.
Definitions

The following is a list of definitions of terms used within this paper:

**Workers' Compensation Board (WCB)**

The Workers' Compensation Board is a corporation set up under the Workers' Compensation Act to administer the provisions of the Act.

**Vocational Rehabilitation Consultant (VRC)**

An officer of the WCB directly responsible for the vocational assessment and job placement of disabled WCB clients.

**Structural Unemployment**

Structural unemployment results from changes in the structure of the economy caused by falling demand for products, exhaustion of product supplies, foreign competition, taxation policies, or new technology. These structural changes are long-term and persistent. Over the last ten years there has been an erosion in resource-based and manufacturing jobs in Canada through falling demand, supply exhaustion, and foreign competition. New technology has created an information-based economy. These changes have resulted in an ongoing unemployment rate of approximately 10%.
Disability

An individual who has a valid WCB claim and who is in the process of being assessed for a disability pension will be considered to have a disability. The WCB awards permanent partial disability pensions to compensate individuals for sustaining a physical impairment. Return to work does not jeopardize this award.

Career Redirection

The process whereby an individual who has been displaced from the workforce due to a disability or structural unemployment becomes reemployed.

Job Ready Clients

People who have recovered physically from an injury to the extent that they have been cleared to plan for a return to work and who have no outstanding compensation issues that would stand in the way of planning for reemployment.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Few activities are as pervasive in people's lives as work. Because of its central role in human life, work has been the focus of much social science research in the twentieth century. The research has concentrated on employment and has ignored work outside of contractual arrangements (Jahoda, 1981). In spite of the empirical research on work, employment, and unemployment, no theory exists that binds the available knowledge together (Jahoda, 1981). The gap between empirical knowledge and theoretical explanations has not narrowed as a result of social science research. Jahoda (1981) stated that researchers must find an approach that "recognizes the legitimacy of a variety of theories, counteracts fragmentation, and presents in an orderly and rational manner what we know" (p. 186).

As a step toward establishing some order in the development of an approach for reducing the gap between empirical knowledge and theory, Jahoda (1979, 1981) identified the most important reason for employment and suggested secondary explanations for the primacy of employment for individuals. Jahoda stated that earning a living is taken for granted as the most important reason for working but employment also has psychological implications for individuals. The time structure, social contacts, purpose, activity, status, and identity that result from employment help to tie people to reality. Jahoda (1981) concluded that these psychological benefits override the reward of wages and explain why employment, even in bad conditions, can be psychologically supportive while unemployment can be psychologically destructive.
Winefield, Tiggemann and Winefield (1991) challenged Jahoda's deprivation model of employment on the basis of the results of their seven-year longitudinal (1980-1987) study on the psychological impact of unemployment and unsatisfactory employment in young Australian men and women. The researchers concluded that their findings were difficult to reconcile with the belief that unsatisfactory employment is preferable to unemployment. However, they recommended that their findings of the opposite impact of unsatisfactory employment against unemployment for young men and young women be investigated further.

Winefield, Tiggemann and Winefield's (1991) analysis of their research findings in light of Jahoda's (1979, 1980) theoretical perspective is consistent with her challenge to social science researchers to work towards improving our understanding of the impact of unemployment.

Unemployment

The decade spanning the mid 1970's to the mid 1980's saw an upsurge in research on the impact of unemployment (Borgen & Amundson 1987; Hill, 1977; Jahoda, 1982; Warr, Jackson & Banks, 1982). The research followed case study research arising out of the Great Depression such as Jahoda, Lazarsfeld and Zeisel (1971), and quantitative analyses of psychosocial (Ferman & Gardner, 1979) and health effects (Durkheim, 1951; Marshall & Hodge, 1981; Pierce, 1967).

Interest in this field waned with the resurgence of the economy and the subsequent decrease in unemployment. Recently, interest in unemployment has increased due to the effects of another recession, but perhaps more importantly, due to the effects of a restructuring economy. As the western world moves from a resource and industrial-based economy to an information-based economy, it is being forced to deal with and accept a high level of structural unemployment. Currently, Canada is
facing the erosion of jobs in the resource sector, the loss of low skill, labour-intensive jobs in the manufacturing sector and the resulting need to reemploy the largely unskilled and undereducated workforce who have been displaced from these jobs. This fact, along with a commonly held belief that unemployment is causing an increase in health care costs has led to a new interest in examining the impact and treatment of unemployment. Recent studies have demonstrated the impact unemployment has on physical health (Kessler, Turner & House, 1987, 1988; Leeflang, Klein-Hesselink & Spruit, 1992a, 1992b), depression (Frese & Mohr, 1987; Turner & Noh, 1988) and health care usage and costs (Studnicka, et al., 1991). The dramatic rise in health care costs, particularly in the field of workers' compensation, has led to a greater willingness to examine how persons with disabilities can be assisted to reenter or remain in the workforce.

Unemployment of the Physically Disabled

Researchers have examined the impact of unemployment on particular groups (Brenner & Levi, 1987; Jahoda, 1982; Tiggemann & Winefield, 1984; Winefield, Tiggeman & Winefield, 1991). The literature also contains many studies that demonstrated the importance of work in establishing a healthy identity (Kelvin, 1981; Orwell, 1972; Schaufeli, 1988) and the resulting psychological impact of unemployment (Dooley & Catalano, 1988; Gurney, 1980; Kaufman, 1982; Rump, 1983; Shaw, 1976; Shelton, 1985; Winefield, Tiggeman & Smith, 1987; Winefield, Tiggeman, & Winefield, 1991). The impact of unemployment on the disabled is similar (Borgen, Amundson & Biela, 1987). Acton (1981) identified four reasons why work is an essential goal for disabled persons: (a) they need the income derived from gainful employment, (b) nearly all cultures place a high value on work as a part of rich and
complete life, (c) to form social relationships, and (d) it gives structure and discipline to living. Maslow (1968) and Toffler (1980) consider these to be basic needs for everyone.

While the needs of the physically disabled are similar to the general population, the physically disabled face special challenges in becoming employed (Bean & Beard, 1975; Cohen, 1962; Eggers, 1960; Florian, 1978; Leigh, 1987; Perlman & Strudler, 1976; Polner, 1958; Rickard, Triandis, & Patterson, 1963; Sears, 1975; Tagalakis, Amsel, & Fichten, 1988; Thoben, 1975; Williams, 1972; Zuger, 1971). Stone and Sawatzki (1980) classified these factors into three specific areas: (a) numerous employment handicaps at the outset of a job search (e.g., lack of marketable skills, poor employment record), (b) management's misconceptions about what disabled persons bring to employment (i.e., lower productivity, higher absenteeism, higher accident rates, resentment of co-workers, negative attitudes, job site modifications, etc.), and (c) the employment interview process (mainly the interviewer's preconceived negative impressions). Thus the disabled have the same needs for employment as the general population, but face barriers to employment that may alter their experience of both working and job search.

Borgen, Amundson and Biela (1987) conducted a study examining how the physically disabled experience unemployment. Utilizing a combination of phenomenology and critical incident methodologies, these researchers interviewed 35 people whose disabilities ranged from brain injury to arthritis. Their findings suggested that individuals with similar disabilities do not necessarily react to unemployment in the same manner. As a result, type of disability cannot be used to predict peoples' reaction to unemployment. However, Borgen et al. (1987) did find that people's reactions to unemployment were influenced by four factors: (a) the importance they placed on the idea of work, (b) their personal sense of self-esteem apart from work, (c) whether they
believed they were in control of their destiny, and (d) who they blamed when they could not find a job. If they blamed themselves their self-esteem suffered and they had difficulty continuing a job search. However, if they attributed their lack of success to external factors, the impact on self-esteem was minimal and they were able to continue with their job search. These findings indicate that the physically disabled react to unemployment in much the same manner as the non-disabled and that the psychological impact of unemployment is felt equally by both these groups.

**Psychosocial Impact of Unemployment**

Unemployment is a stressful event that has been shown to have negative psychosocial and health consequences (Dean & Lin, 1977; Dohrenwend, B. S. & Dohrenwend, B. P., 1974; Greenblatt, Becerra & Serafetinides, 1982; Liang, Dvorkin, Kahana & Mazian, 1980; Liem, R. & Liem, J., 1978; Pearlin & Lieberman, 1979) and has been directly linked to depression, substance abuse and suicide (Atkins, Ferguson, & Blankenship, 1983; Dooley & Catalano, 1988; Jones, 1991; Peregoy & Schliebner, 1990; Shelton, 1985). Finding ways to mitigate the reactions to this psychological distress is necessary in a society that is going to continue to have high levels of unemployment.

The unemployment literature reveals several important factors regarding the importance of work. Western, industrialized and increasingly high-technology societies place a great deal of value on gainful employment (Feather & Bond, 1983; Winegardner, Siminetti & Nykodym, 1984). People's work environments may well represent the most important group membership and focus of time in their lives. In fact, Uris and Tarrant (1983) suggested that the work group is more important than family, friends and community. Peregoy and Schliebner (1990) examined the effects of
long-term unemployment and found that people look to the work place to meet their needs for primary social interaction, and as a surrogate family system.

Sullivan (1972) linked Maslow's hierarchy of needs with employment and found that most people use work as a way of satisfying personal needs ranging from survival to self-actualization. Erikson (1980) suggested that productivity in the workplace is a major contributor to healthy ego identity. If this productivity is reduced or eliminated through unemployment, for example, ego identity is strained and begins to disintegrate. This weakened ego identity can lead to feelings of inadequacy, loss, and doubting of one's self-worth and belonging. Erikson (1980) suggested that if this occurs the individual can begin to stagnate and die.

Shelton (1985) reviewed studies on the social and psychological impact of unemployment which considered the economic costs of unemployment and the impact of unemployment on the individual and the family. Based on her review Shelton stated that "professionals who work with the unemployed should be prepared to deal with depression, anxiety, and loss of self-esteem in the individual. These emotions may directly interfere with the job-seeking process".

The Impact of Unemployment on Health

Compared with unemployment in the late 1970's and early 1980's, the structure of unemployment in the late 1980's and early 1990's is changing. Even though the percentage of people unemployed is smaller, those who are unemployed remain so for longer periods of time. This change has been documented in Europe (Studnicka & Scheiber, 1988) and is often discussed in the popular media in North America. The increase in long-term unemployment is having an impact on the amount of money spent on health care (Kessler, Turner, & House, 1987; Leeflang, Klein-Hesselink, & Spruit,
Studies on mortality have shown that those who have been unemployed at least once in their lives die younger than those who have not been unemployed (Cook, 1985; Iversen, Andersen, O., Andersen, P. K.; Cristoffersen & Keiding, 1987; Moser, Goldblatt, Fox, & Jones, 1987). Westin, Schlesselman and Korper (1989), examining the effects of a factory closure over a ten-year period, found that levels of illness and disability increased with unemployment and that this increase could not be explained by preexisting health problems. More commonly the literature examines the impact of unemployment on the mental or physical health status of men. For example, Linn, Sandifer, and Stein (1985) studied unemployed veterans and found an increase in somatization, anxiety, depression, and disability behaviour six months post job loss. These results were also not attributable to preexisting conditions.

Negative effects on health can precede unemployment. The prospect of becoming unemployed increases the level of stress in workers (Schwefel, 1986), especially for those who feel immediately threatened (Grayson, 1985). The experience of being dismissed has a varied impact. Some workers experience short term health improvement after dismissal (Joelson & Wahlquist, 1987; Warr, 1987). For others their dismissal has an immediate negative health impact (LaHELMA & Kangas, 1989). The most likely explanation for this variance is that the research tends to focus on certain categories of workers and some of these categories may be more vulnerable to the negative impact of unemployment. For people employed in an unhealthy industry, their health may actually improve if they are removed from the work place (Studnicka et al., 1991).

The impact of long-term unemployment on health varies over time. In the long term, some people find their health remains the same; others find that it improves, but the majority find that long-term unemployment has a negative impact on their health (Grayson, 1985; Sabroe & Iversen, 1989; Verkleij, 1989).
A possible explanation of this variation is that unemployment leads to financial strain or hardship which in turn results in poorer health. In cases where workers have received substantial severance packages there was no negative impact on health until the money began to run out (Kessler, House, & Turner, 1987; Studnicka et al., 1991). For most people unemployment causes financial problems which create daily hardships and personal disappointments (Spruit, 1983; Spruit, 1985). Olafsson and Svensson (1986), studying the impact of unemployment on the lifestyle changes and health of adolescents, concluded that unemployment concentrates risk factors such as poverty, low levels of education, and low status on workers and their families.

**Unemployment and Causal Attribution**

A commonly held belief is that unemployment leads to psychological depression. However, Frese and Mohr (1987) suggested that empirical studies have had difficulty demonstrating a causal relationship and that it may be more appropriate to say that: "Depressed persons who are inactive and pessimistic in their outlook will be unemployed much longer or will become unemployed more readily" (p.173). They further suggested that unemployment should not be viewed as one major life event, but rather as a life event that leads to a host of daily problems such as financial hardship and learned helplessness.

The concept of learned helplessness (Seligman, 1975) is a useful framework through which to view the financial impact of unemployment. Learned helplessness is caused by repeated experiences of aversive, noncontrollable situations. A person caught up in learned helplessness exhibits passive, resigned, inflexible behaviour, linked to dysphoric feelings of depression brought on as a result of repeating these situations. The only escape from this condition is to exercise control over these situations.
Individuals' reactions to being unemployed may be affected by how they explain the source of their job loss. People with an external locus of control are more passive, generally achieve less (Lefcourt, 1976), and are more depressive (Prociuk, Breen & Lussier, 1976) than people with an internal focus. The locus of control construct refers to how people view themselves in conjunction with the events that befall them. The construct also encompasses the meaning that people give to the interaction between self and experiences (Lefcourt, 1982). Individuals with an external locus of control tend to perceive experiences as the result of causes outside of their behaviors and thoughts. Conversely, people with an internal locus of control make sense of experiences in terms of their own actions and thoughts. If people do not understand experiences as a result of their actions, then the experiences, either positive or negative, are not effective in altering their locus of control and therefore have no impact on their actions.

Gurney (1981) suggested that the kind of causal ascription made about unemployment by those who want to work can have important implications on their well-being. He further stated that "their attribution about the reasons for not having a job may play an appreciable role on either intensifying or mitigating their feelings of failure and self-worth" (p. 79). Causal attribution has seen widespread academic interest arising out of the work of Heider (1944), who stated that "when we have a disagreeable experience, or a pleasant one, we may locate its origin in another person, in ourselves, or in fate" (p. 358). Later Heider (1958) limited attribution to two factors, internal or external. In interpreting how people choose among possible causes, attribution theorists have identified two general categories. The first category posits the perceiver as a systematic analyst looking for covariation between a given effect and different possible causes (Kelley, 1967, 1971, 1973). The second categorizes the
perceiver as tending to seek a single, salient, explanation for a behavior (Jones & Davis, 1965).

Applying these two categories to predict the kind of causal attributions unemployed workers would make about their unemployment is useful. The conclusion can be drawn that people in the second category would look for a single external cause, like the economy, and be unlikely to change their causal attributions unless the economy changed. The first category suggests that individuals would see many causes, apply the principles of consistency and distinctiveness (Kelley, 1973) and come up with internal reasons for their unemployment. An internal focus would make it easier for an individual to deal with unemployment and eventually become reemployed. However, Gurney (1981) stated that this may not be the case. He suggested that causal attribution and locus of control are largely independent of each other. For example, unemployed people may believe themselves to be powerless to change their circumstances thus exhibiting an external locus of control. However, the fact that they are unemployed when others are not may eventually lead them to see themselves as responsible for their unemployment, an internal focus, and blame themselves for their situation. Gurney (1981) concluded that this particular combination of an internal attribution with an external locus of control may be the cause for the devastating impact that unemployment has on self-esteem.

Unemployment and Self-esteem

Unemployment is related to psychological distress (Donovan & Oddy, 1982; Feather, 1982; Feather & O'Brien, 1986; Warr, 1984). More specifically, unemployment is directly related to poorer self-esteem (Gurney, 1980; Shamir, 1986; Winefield & Tiggeman, 1985). Most research into the effect of unemployment on self-
esteem (Feather, 1982; Gurney, 1980; Shamir, 1986; Warr & Jackson, 1983; Winefield & Tiggeman, 1985) has used the Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale (RSE) (Rosenberg, 1965) or measures derived from it (Bachman & O'Malley, 1977; Bachman, O'Malley, & Johnston, 1978; Sheeran & McCarthy, 1990; Sheeran & McCarthy, 1992). Warr and Jackson (1983) developed the Self-esteem Scale using items from Bachman and O'Malley's (1977) measure, O'Malley and Bachman's (1979) index, and the RSE (Rosenberg, 1965). The Self-esteem Scale contains a positive and a negative subscale. Warr and Jackson (1983) used their scale in a study of self-esteem and unemployment in two cohorts of recent school leavers in a British city. The researchers found that, although the content of the positive and negative items in their scale appeared to be similar, the intercorrelation between the scales was low and the two subscales yielded a different pattern of relationships with employment status. Warr and Jackson (1983) concluded that their findings suggested that unemployment affects only some aspects of self-perception and recommended further conceptual and empirical examination of the impact of unemployment.

An important distinction has been made in the self-esteem literature between self-evaluation and self-affection (Wells & Marwell, 1976). Self-evaluation refers to the tendency of individuals to judge themselves against their ideals, and thereby determine success and failure. Self-affection is not tied to performance and notions about success and failure. It is concerned with personal feelings of worthiness or value. Wells and Marwell (1976) point out that RSE and RSE-derived scales measure only self-affection, and as Sheeran and McCarthy (1992) stated, this means that "unemployment research has only measured self-affection. Self-evaluation has not been operationalized in previous job loss studies" (p.118).

In a study designed to examine the impact of unemployment on six self-concept measures: self-consistency, self-involvement, self-evaluation, self-affection, positive
self-esteem, and negative self-esteem, Sheeran and McCarthy (1990) demonstrated that unemployed individuals had poorer evaluation and consistency scores, and that long-term unemployment was associated with poorer self-affection and lower negative self-esteem scores. They further noted that while poor self-evaluation is an immediate result of unemployment, only self-affection is affected by long-term unemployment. For example, people who become unemployed may exhibit immediate poorer self-evaluation when they realize that they are not going to meet their goals, but they can still feel good about themselves, thus demonstrating unchanged self-affection. With the long-term unemployed however, feelings of worthlessness and rejection eventually set in, which are indicators of poorer self-affection (Wells and Marwell, 1976).

Career Decisions

Since the 1950's there has been an increasing trend toward self-determination and personal planning with individuals taking control of their lives and accepting more responsibility for personal choices and life developments (Forster, 1985). An interest in the elements of personal decision making and planning has generated a great deal of academic and public attention on the concept of personal goal (Forster, 1985). Since establishing a personal goal is essential in career planning and job search, developments in the theory related to personal decision-making are relevant for designing programs to assist unemployed people to return to work. Forster concluded that "personal construct psychology would seem to be a theoretical framework well suited for the articulation and study of personal goals" (p. 261).

The fundamental unit in personal construct psychology is the "personal construct" (Forster, 1992). A personal construct is a transparent pattern created by individuals to organize the realities of their world. Individuals create constructs by
deciding what theme is common in two or more events. This common theme is determined through a process of comparing and contrasting events until a similarity is found between at least two of these events. Personal constructs are developed over time, as a result of personal experience, and are formed into systems. Constructs provide a window or lens through which people perceive and understand events and also supply a mechanism for anticipating events and experiences. For example, suppose that a woman notices that her supervisor is more irritable at the end of the work week than at the beginning of the week. She has a construct that enables her to recognize irritability. She may also use related constructs such as (a) more rest on the weekend, and (b) time to participate in relaxing activities, as she attempts to interpret her experience with her supervisor and anticipate future interaction. Forster (1992) selected the personal construct as the "primary conceptual unit for investigating the elicitation and articulation of a person's goals" (p. 176).

Neimeyer (1992) and Kortas, Neimeyer and Prichard (1992) stated that the area of employment was accepted as a logical field of study for investigating the application of the concept of personal construct because Kelly (1955), the creator of personal construct theory, felt that vocational development "is one of the principal means by which one's life role is given clarity and meaning" (p. 751). Construct systems developed by individuals in the course of their work experience are called vocational construct systems. Vocational construct systems might contain constructs like outdoor work, desk jobs, high wages and low salary. Individuals would use these constructs to organize and systematize their work experience and to anticipate future employment experiences. Gimenes (1990) assigned the label of vocational development construct to the interaction of: (a) the factors which motivate people to form vocational construct systems, (b) the elements which prevent people from forming vocational construct systems, and (c) the factors which trigger specific employment decisions. Since
vocational development is based on work experience and all previous vocational
decisions, Gimenes concluded that the construct clearly indicated that selecting an
occupational goal is a complex process that takes time.

Efforts to organize findings of the research on the relationship between aspects of
the vocational construct system and a wide variety of career variables led to the
formulation of the structural model of vocational development (Kortas, Neimeyer &
Prichard, 1992). The structural model emphasizes both the individual variation in
career decision making and its developmental progression (Kortas et al., 1992). The
model is based on the premise that individuals move through stages of structural
development that are characterized by progressively higher levels of integration and
differentiation. Differentiation refers to the different dimensions of judgment used by a
person and integration relates to the interrelationship among dimensions in a system.
The structural model holds that vocational maturation should be marked by increasingly
diverse perceptions of the world of work. These diverse perceptions are organized by
an overall integration that gives the system coherence and directs evolution (Kortas et

In a quasi-experimental study, Kortas, Neimeyer and Prichard (1992) measured
the relationship between the level of development of a vocational construct system and
styles of vocational decision-making in a group of 598 community college students who
ranged in age from 16 to 75 years (85.5% 16 - 30 years). The majority of the sample
were employed (either part time or full time), and 83% of the group had one year or
less of college education. These researchers found that the level of integration in
vocational construct systems was a better predictor of decision-making style than level
of differentiation. Higher levels of integration were linked to a rational style of
decision-making and lower levels of integration were associated with more dependent
and intuitive styles. Lower levels of integration were also found to be connected to
higher levels of career indecision. The investigators cautioned that their findings indicated a correlation only because of the lack of rigor in their experimental design.

Evidence of some relationship between level of integration in vocational construct systems and career decision-making has implications for the design of a treatment program that includes the identification of skills based on previous work experience and the selection of new job goals. Successful career redirection may require higher levels of integration in vocational construct systems. All unemployed people, but particularly individuals faced with the reality of having to make an occupational change in order to be reemployed, must reorganize their vocational construct systems to incorporate both the experience of becoming unemployed and the vocational constructs that will guide their decision-making throughout their vocational planning and job search.

Unplanned Job Loss

The process of becoming unemployed varies according to the experience of each individual. Generally, there are two categories for classifying employment termination scenarios: voluntary unemployment and involuntary unemployment. Voluntary unemployment is understood to include activities like switching to a new employer in the same industry or type of business, retiring from the labour force, changing to self-employment, and making a career change. The common themes in voluntary unemployment are the worker's selection of the timing of the termination and the worker having a pre-determined goal for the future.

Voluntary unemployment, although planned, is not without risk. One of the riskier types of voluntary unemployment is career change, especially when the change requires some form of preparation such as training. Doering and Rhodes (1989) found
that the phenomenon of career change has received limited research attention. These researchers undertook a qualitative study with 20 public school teachers to identify the range of factors important to the career change decision and process. They used Lawrence's (1980) definition of career change as movement to an occupation that is not part of a traditional career progression. They found that the major reasons for career change were job-related and included factors such as inadequate pay, and lack of advancement opportunities, challenge, and stimulation. Their results also indicated that career change was planned. These findings support the themes of personal control and planned future activity for voluntary unemployment.

Involuntary unemployment, on the other hand, is generally understood to refer to the displacement of workers that results from cyclical downturns in the business cycle, the growth of the global economy, technological advances, and pressures for increased productivity (Gordus, 1986). Although Gordus listed these factors as the reasons for the displacement of American workers in 1986 they remain relevant for Canada in the 1990's. Leana and Ivancevich (1987) concluded that job loss is a world wide phenomenon that is likely to continue to be a problem for many years.

Unplanned job loss from plant closures, layoffs resulting from technological innovations, and the resulting reduction in supervisory and management staff required contribute to the displacement of workers. Displaced workers are often not competitive because of the limited transferability of their job-specific or firm-specific skills. They are at risk for negative physical and health outcomes and may exhibit unemployment-related behavioral changes that tend to reduce their employability. For these reasons displaced workers are in need of support to help prevent the psychosocial, health and self-esteem problems that can accompany unemployment (Gordus, 1986). Gordus suggested that displaced workers may seek help for their
unemployment-related problems from career development services rather than mental health services.

Researchers investigating the problems of displaced workers have ignored the plight of workers that are disabled through injury or disease in the course of their work careers. Workers with employment-related disabilities and individuals with non work-related injuries can be displaced from their jobs if their work restrictions prevent them from continuing to work in their pre-injury occupations. They can be left with a reduced repertory of job specific skills that are not transferable to occupations that are compatible with their limitations in physical activity and therefore, end up unemployed. Like other unemployed workers they are at risk of developing psychosocial, health and self-esteem problems and may need help and support to become reemployed.

**Group Interventions**

Unemployed people, both those displaced through structural changes in the economy and those with disabilities who are physically unable to continue working in their pre-injury jobs, are cut off from the essential activity of work. Their financial security is threatened and their interactions with people outside of their family unit are often greatly reduced. Financial hardship resulting from prolonged unemployment can lead to health problems. The obvious solution to the financial, social, and health problems associated with job loss is reemployment. However, research has shown that unemployment can lead to poor self-evaluation in the short term and poor self-affection in the long term. Loss of self-esteem and the associated feelings of worthlessness and rejection can make vocational decision making and job search very difficult for unemployed people. Gordus (1986) stated that unemployed people need support to prevent the psychosocial, health and self-esteem problems that accompany unemployment. Based on a thorough review of the empirical research relevant to the
temporal relationship between job loss and the manifestation of consequences, Jones (1991) formulated the generalization that "social support has been found to be an important factor in mitigation of the stress of unemployment" (p. 49).

Group employment counselling has been reported as a positive experience by unemployed individuals (Amundson & Borgen, 1987; Borgen & Amundson, 1987). This positive reaction is not surprising when viewed from a broad counselling perspective because a group approach helps job seekers to: (a) understand other people's point of view, (b) develop social interaction skills, (c) learn to share concerns and ideas with others who face similar problems, (d) obtain several reactions to problems expressed, (e) receive support and encouragement from others, and (f) obtain relevant information (Amundson & Borgen, 1980, 1987; Bailey, 1993).

Desmond and Seligman (1977) also reported the merits of a group approach to vocational counselling with rehabilitation clients because "the clients can benefit from the input, interaction and experiences provided by their peers" (p. 273). These authors suggested that vocational groups usually involve participants exploring their personal self-concept and the world of work. In the course of this exploration participants assess their needs, interests, skills, abilities, and limitations. They also must evaluate the benefits of jobs and the requirements of specific occupations in order to make decisions on job goals. Information and feedback from other group members can be helpful in vocational decision making.

The group setting can provide a realistic and supportive environment for practice of job search tasks like completing applications and job interviews. Other group participants can support job seekers in coping with the ups and downs of job search (Desmond & Seligman, 1977; Rife & Belcher, 1993).

Shulman (1984) described the group as a "mutual aid system" (p. 163). However, he cautioned that simply bringing people together to form a group does not
guarantee mutual aid. Shulman stated that a group worker or leader is necessary in order to help members create the conditions necessary for mutual aid to occur. Amundson and Borgen (1988) suggested that the group serves as an efficient system for a counsellor to deliver services to clients. The mutual aid process that occurs in groups includes sharing of information, debate of ideas, discussion of difficult topics, empathy, expectations for participation, and opportunity to try out new ideas or skills.

Unemployed individuals can benefit from participating in a group led by a skilled and knowledgeable counsellor. They can gain support from knowing that they are not alone in their struggle to become reemployed. They can learn to accept the reality of their job loss and gain confidence in their ability to achieve new job goals. Participation in an employment group provides people with an opportunity to receive vocational information and practice their job search skills.

Treatment Modalities

Amundson and Borgen (1988) reported that group counselling with the unemployed gathered momentum in the 1980's. However, this increase in the use of group techniques for helping the unemployed was not accompanied by research into the factors responsible for the success of job finding groups. To address this research gap, Amundson and Borgen undertook a study with 77 participants (41 men; 36 women; average age 34.6 years; variable educational background) who had been unemployed an average of eight and a half months before entering a job search group. The research interviews were held about three months after the participants finished their attendance at the job search groups. At the time of the interviews 37 participants were working and the remaining 40 people were unemployed. The interviews started with an open-ended question to elicit information about each participant's experience of
unemployment and the subsequent questions focused on the positive and negative aspects of each participant's experience with the job search group. The researchers found that most participants were extremely satisfied with the group experience and had difficulty thinking of anything that was negative about the job search group.

Amundson and Borgen (1988) further organized the positive and negative factors reported by the participants into the two categories of task-orientation factors and factors that promote support and self-esteem. The task orientation factors related to job search techniques, information, and practice. The support and self-esteem factors focused on interpersonal relations and self-concept development. The list of support and self-esteem factors included belonging, mutual support and encouragement, absorbing others' enthusiasm and success, social comparison, contribution, ventilating, positive outlook, and leadership. The authors drew a parallel between the support and self-esteem factors in this list and the developmental factors (support from family and friends and participating in job search groups) identified in their earlier research (Amundson & Borgen, 1987; Borgen & Amundson, 1987).

Amundson and Borgen (1988) concluded that the power of the group in halting the downward emotional slide of unemployed people was quite striking. They were also impressed by the perseverance of the positive stance of the job search group participants even when they were not yet employed. The researchers reported that the unemployed participants stated that they were able to maintain a more effective job search and positive self-image based on their participation in the job search group.

These findings on the importance of providing social and self-esteem support to unemployed individuals challenges the effectiveness of treatment programs focused on job search strategies and labour market information (Azrin & Besalel, 1980; Azrin, Flores & Kaplan, 1975; Gordus, 1986). From the research highlighted in this review it can be seen that group-based counselling interventions are an effective strategy in
assisting unemployed people back to work. A case has been made that unemployment affects disabled individuals in much the same way as non-disabled people. However, the unemployment of people with disabilities is complicated by special challenges associated with their disabilities. Therefore, special programs are needed to help individuals with disabilities to become reemployed (Roessler, 1988).

Summary

This study was designed to address three specific gaps in the literature and to add to the general understanding of the treatment of unemployment. First, the literature review revealed that existing treatment programs are based extensively on the work of Azrin and colleagues (Azrin, Flores & Kaplan, 1975; Azrin & Besalel, 1980) which focused on the development and maintenance of job search behaviours. The review of personal construct literature suggests that this is not sufficient. Programs designed to assist the unemployed return to work must also include time and mechanisms for them to rebuild their vocational construct systems. Second, the literature review identified a lack of experimental evaluation of treatment programs and suggested a need to examine the assistance provided to the unemployed using true experimental designs and reliable, standardized instruments. Third, the literature review showed that studies of the unemployed, and programs designed to help them, were focused on only certain populations. Also, the literature suggests that the evaluation of treatment programs would be enhanced by gaining a more thorough understanding of the subjects' experience of the treatment program through the use of qualitative methodologies such as phenomenology and critical incident analysis.

This study was designed to evaluate a new treatment program which was created to assist unemployed people develop feasible job goals and learn job search skills. The
evaluation of this treatment program employed a true experimental design and reliable, standardized instruments combined with a qualitative methodology. The researcher anticipated that:

1. People who participated in the program would enhance their self-esteem, develop a more internal focus towards causation and increase their job search skills.

2. If people experienced changes in these three areas their attitude towards job search and eventual reemployment would change, resulting in a more focused approach and positive attitude.

3. This focus and attitude change would result in a successful return to work.

This study was also designed to examine a new population. Previous studies have focused almost entirely on young people, recent school leavers or the long-term unemployed. Generally these were people who either no longer or never had a strong attachment to the workforce. This study's population were adults who had strong ties to the workforce, had become unemployed due to a traumatic injury or industrial disease and were having difficulty returning to work because of the resulting disability, and who were also receiving WCB benefits while unemployed.

The qualitative component of this study followed a model outlined by Borgen and Amundson (1984) which combined critical incident analysis with phenomenology. The use of this method added richness and depth to the evaluation by encouraging the subjects to express their experience of participating in the treatment program.

Based on the above, it was anticipated that this study would make a contribution to the literature by adding further understanding to the treatment of unemployment and the evaluation of such treatment programs.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the design of the study, the client population, and the instruments. It also describes the treatment program, the instructors, the procedures, and the data analysis. It concludes with a statement of the hypotheses under investigation.

Design of the Study

This study employed a Solomon four-group design. The validity of a repeated measures design is threatened by the fact that a pretest may predispose subjects to react in a particular way to the treatment. The Solomon design was used for three reasons: (a) to assess the effect of the experimental treatment relative to the control treatment, (b) to assess the effect of a pretest, and (c) to assess the interaction between pretest and treatment conditions (Borg & Gall 1983, p.692). This design requires more effort than some simpler designs but it is a powerful experimental design which provides a test of whether or not the pretest affects the treatment.

Sixty unemployed, physically disabled workers who had been referred by their Vocational Rehabilitation Consultants (VRCs) were blocked (Reichardt, 1979) on gender, level of disability and length of time out of work. Subjects within each block were then randomly assigned to the four treatment groups. Following random assignment, Groups 1 and 3 were brought in for pretest measures ($O_1$). Group 1 then proceeded to treatment while Group 3 waited. Group 2 received treatment at the
same time as Group 1 but did not receive a pretest. After Groups 1 and 2 had completed their treatment, all four groups were tested (O_2). A traditional Solomon four-group design normally stops at this point; however, since the researcher was ethically obliged to treat the wait-listed groups, the design was extended. The posttests (O_2) were treated as pretests for Groups 3 and 4 and these groups were treated and tested again (O_3). This extension further strengthened the design because it provided two additional tests of the effect of treatment and waiting.

Figure 1

Design of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R O_1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T O_2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>O_2</td>
<td>O_2</td>
<td>T O_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O_4</td>
<td>O_4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R = Random Assignment; O = Observation; T = Treatment

Eight weeks after treatment (O_4) all groups were contacted by telephone. They were asked a series of questions, and notified that the test battery had been mailed to them. They were asked to complete the instruments and mail them back to the researcher. A number of participants, previously selected, were also asked to participate in an in-depth interview and appointments were arranged with participants who agreed to be interviewed. These interviews were analyzed using a combination of critical incident and phenomenological techniques based on a refinement of Flanagan's (1954) and Fischer's (1979) work for research on unemployment (Borgen and Amundson, 1984). The purpose of these interviews was to gain in-depth knowledge of
the subjects' experience of the program. Swinburne (1981) stated that "learning about the consequences of unemployment entails understanding sensitive thoughts and feelings which do not lend themselves to survey techniques, hence the need for small sample, in-depth studies" (p.47). Phenomenology allows people to tell their own story, emphasizing their own values and beliefs. It allows a comprehensive recounting of the experience as it was lived and a further analysis of that experience and others for their common structure (Fischer, 1979).

A research methodology that combines a subject's viewpoint with a directive interviewing style, the critical incident technique (Flanagan, 1954), has proven to be very effective in identifying the facilitating and hindering factors of an experience (Anderson & Nilsson, 1964; Flanagan, 1978; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). When these two techniques - phenomenology and critical incident - are combined, they can be highly effective in documenting the experience of being unemployed (Borgen & Amundson, 1984; Borgen, Amundson & Biela, 1987), or underemployed (Borgen, Amundson & Harder, 1988). This study used these methodologies to acquire an understanding of the subjects' experience of participating in the treatment program.

Subjects

A total of 60 subjects were selected from a waitlist of clients referred for job search training by VRCs at the Workers' Compensation Board (WCB) of British Columbia. VRCs ensured that the clients were job ready before referral. The researcher screened the clients on the waitlist to ensure that they were disabled and had no outstanding compensation issues. Subjects with unresolved compensation issues or no disability were excluded. The subjects were informed about the research study prior
to their commencement of the Program. While the subjects could decline participation in the research component of the Career Redirection and Job Search Program, non completion of the actual Program was not an option since the WCB required the subjects to attend the program in order to continue receiving benefits.

Instruments

Beck Depression Inventory (Beck & Beck, 1972)

The Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) was created in 1961 as a structured interview, but evolved into a questionnaire which was revised in 1971 (Sundberg, 1992). Sundberg has described the BDI as "probably the most widely used clinical self-report test of depression" (p. 79).

The original BDI was based on clinical observations of attitudes and symptoms frequently displayed by depressed psychiatric patients (Beck, Steer & Garbin, 1988). The clinical observations were consolidated into 21 items or sets of statements as follows: (a) mood, (b) pessimism, (c) sense of failure, (d) lack of satisfaction, (e) guilt feelings, (f) sense of punishment, (g) self-dislike, (h) self-accusation, (i) suicidal wishes, (j) crying, (k) irritability, (l) social withdrawal, (m) indecisiveness, (n) distortion of body image, (o) work inhibition, (p) sleep disturbance, (q) fatigability, (r) loss of appetite, (s) weight loss, (t) somatic preoccupation, and (u) loss of libido. The items were selected to measure the intensity of depression. Although Beck used a cognitive therapy approach (Sundberg, 1992), the items were not based on a specific theory of depression (Beck, Steer & Garbin, 1988). Items and item weights were determined by judgment rather than empirically (Sundberg, 1992).
Each item in the original BDI included four alternate statements ranging in severity from 0-3 with 0 indicating no complaint and 3 showing a severe complaint. The original BDI contained two subscales: a cognitive-affective subscale and a somatic-performance subscale. The first 13 items constituted the cognitive-affective subscale (e.g., pessimism, guilt, self-accusations, crying, indecisiveness) and the final eight items formed the somatic-performance subscale (e.g., body image, work and sleep difficulties, loss of interest in sex). However, the manual for the instrument gives no information about the origin or uses of the subscales (Conoley, 1992).

Conoley (1992) reported that "the BDI is a well-researched assessment tool with substantial support for its reliability and validity" (p. 79). The split-half reliability for the long form is 0.93 (Beck, A. T. & Beck, R. W., 1972). Recent studies supported the internal consistency and the content, construct, concurrent and factorial validity of the BDI (Conoley, 1992; Sundberg, 1992).

Beck and Beck (1972) developed a 13-item, short form of the BDI for family physicians to use in the identification of depressed patients. They used multiple regression analysis to select items that would permit reduction of the length of the instrument without loss of reliability and validity of the inventory. These researchers rescored the inventories of 598 patients used to test the original BDI, scoring only the 13 items from the shortened form. The short form correlated 0.96 with the long form total score. The short form correlated 0.61 with independent clinician ratings of depth of depression. This correlation was higher than the long form correlation with clinician rating of 0.59.

The short form of the BDI has the following items: (a) sadness, (b) pessimism, (c) sense of failure, (d) dissatisfaction, (e) guilt, (f) self-dislike, (g) self-harm, (h) social withdrawal, (i) indecisiveness, (j) self-image change, (k) work difficulty, (l) fatigability and (m) anorexia. The cut-off scores for the short form are: 0-4, none or minimal
depression; 5-7, mild depression; 8-15, moderate depression, and 16+, severe depression (Beck & Beck, 1972). No subscales were reported for the short form of the BDI. The short form of the BDI was used in this study.

Self-esteem Scale (Warr & Jackson, 1983)

The Self-esteem Scale is a further refinement of Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965) as amended by Bachman and O'Malley (1977) and O'Malley and Bachman (1979). Warr and Jackson (1983) simplified the Bachman and O'Malley scale for use with their low education sample. Easy readability made the Self-esteem Scale appropriate for use with this study's subjects.

Bachman and O'Malley (1977) reported the reliability and construct validity for the self-esteem instrument they used in their study of self-esteem in young men. The researchers collected their data in 1966 and 1974. Bachman and O'Malley's 10-item index included six items from the RSE and four items, similar in content, developed by Cobb, Brooks, Kasl and Connelly (1966). The scale contained six positive items and four negative items. The self-esteem index was an unweighted mean of the 10 items, with up to two missing values permitted. The index was tested on 1,608 subjects. The 1966 item-index correlations ranged from 0.48 to 0.62. The 1974 item-index correlations ranged from 0.51 to 0.69 (Bachman & O'Malley, 1977). The researchers reported a test-retest reliability of 0.75 for their instrument.

To establish the validity of their instrument Bachman and O'Malley (1977) hypothesized that self-esteem would correlate in specific directions with the following variables: (a) intellectual ability (positive), (b) somatic symptoms (negative), (c) negative affective states (negative), (d) happiness (positive), (e) rebellious behaviour in school (negative), (f) needs for self-development (positive), and (g) social approval
were receiving compensation benefits. Consequently, there was little room for improvement on the psychological measures used in the study. Nevertheless, the findings indicated that subjects were less dependent and perceived themselves as being more in control of their lives following participation in the career redirection program. The program was effective in reducing depression but participation in the program did not appear to affect the subjects' levels of self-esteem, or their identification of their disabilities as the cause of their unemployment. Most subjects maintained a willingness to consider taking action to change their situations. The researcher concluded that individuals who are faced with the need to redirect their careers must develop new guidelines for making vocational decisions. Broadening their knowledge of occupations may enhance people's ability to identify their transferable skills and select new job goals. Helping individuals to understand and accept these new guidelines may encourage them to make rational career decisions. Future research on career redirection programs should assess the effects of building confidence, reducing stress, and acquiring the knowledge necessary for applying rational decision-making skills to reemployment planning.
positive). They obtained the following correlations: (a) intellectual ability (.21), (b) somatic symptoms (-.34), (c) negative affective states (-.52), (d) happiness (.54), (e) rebellious behaviour in school (-.33), (f) need for self-development (.44), and (g) social approval (.29). Bachman and O'Malley (1977) concluded that obtaining correlations between self-esteem and these seven variables in the anticipated direction could be accepted as confirmation of the construct validity of their instrument.

O'Malley and Bachman (1979) looked at self-esteem data for two groups of high school students. For a group of male students, the researchers used an eight-item index similar to the RSE (Rosenberg, 1965). Measures were taken for this first group in 1969. For the second group of male and female students, the researchers employed a 10-item index which contained seven items from the index used by Bachman and O'Malley (1977). Seven items were common to both indexes. The coefficient alpha for males in the first group (0.79) was the same as the value for males in the second group. Given the similarity in content between the self-esteem indices and the index characteristics (coefficient alphas and item-index correlations) O'Malley and Bachman were confident in deciding that correlations of either index with other variables would be comparable. They enhanced the comparability of the two indices by using subscales based on the seven items common to both indices.

Warr and Jackson's (1983) Self-esteem Scale is comprised of eight items compiled from Bachman and O'Malley's (1977) instrument, O'Malley and Bachman's (1979) index, and the RSE (Rosenberg, 1965). Each item contains five response alternatives. The items in the Self-esteem Scale were shown to be reliable by Bachman and O'Malley (1977), O'Malley and Bachman (1979) and Warr and Jackson (1983). Bachman and O'Malley established the construct validity of an instrument which contained six items that are identical to six items in the Self-esteem Scale.
The Attribution About Unemployment Scale (Gurney, 1981)

Gurney (1981) constructed an eight-item scale to measure how jobless people explain the causes of their unemployment. He used four propositions and developed two items for each proposition. To ensure that the items were appropriate for both employed and unemployed respondents the items were general and referred to both getting work and not getting work. Gurney expected that the respondents would project their beliefs about themselves into their answers.

The following four propositions were the basis for items developed for the scale:

1. The ability to get work is mainly a function of factors internal to job seekers.

2. The ability to get work is mainly a function of factors external to job seekers.

3. The inability to get work is mainly a function of factors internal to job seekers.

4. The inability to get work is mainly a function of factors external to job seekers.

Gurney created a pool of items based on these four propositions that included statements like: (a) it is mainly a matter of luck whether a school leaver gets a job or not, and (b) unemployed kids haven't tried hard enough and don't know how to sell themselves. Two items were selected for each proposition, randomly ordered and presented in a format with a five-point Likert scale. Possible scores for each item ranged from 1 to 5 with lower scores representing a more external attribution.

Gurney (1981) tested the questionnaire in a cross-sectional study with Australian school-leavers. He obtained an alpha coefficient of 0.442 (N=131). Gurney suggested that the shortness of the questionnaire may have contributed to this modest reliability.
Gurney revised the questionnaire by adding items and eliminating ambiguities discovered during the cross-sectional study. The extended version contained three items for each of the four causal propositions. The revised questionnaire was used in a longitudinal study with measures taken in November 1978 and April 1979. Gurney reported an alpha correlation of 0.51 (N=688) for November 1978 and 0.54 (N=434) for April 1979. He obtained inter-item correlations ranging from -.24 to .52 with a median of 0.06.

The revised 12-item Attribution Questionnaire was used for this study.

**Causal Dimension Scale (Russell, 1982)**

Russell (1982) formulated the Causal Dimension Scale to measure how people perceive their explanations for the causes of events. He developed a questionnaire that consisted of descriptions of eight different achievement situations, which included either a successful or an unsuccessful outcome. Each description was followed by 12 semantic differential scales that posed questions about locus of causality, stability of effort, and controllability factors. Locus of causality was defined as referring to whether the cause was something about the person making the attribution (internal) or something outside of the attributer (external). Stability was defined as referring to whether the cause was constant over time (stable) or variable over time (unstable). A controllable cause was defined as a cause that could be changed or affected by someone, either the actor or other people and an uncontrollable cause was one that could not be changed or affected by anyone. Therefore, both internal and external causes were potentially controllable.

A group of 189 undergraduate students (117 females; 72 males) completed the questionnaire. Each student made 96 ratings, evaluating the eight achievement
situations on the 12 semantic differential scales. Russell (1982) obtained an alpha coefficient of 0.88 for both the locus of causality and stability items. He concluded that the three items for each of these two factors could be considered subscales, and that these two subscales were reliable. Russell tested the validity of the individual semantic differential scales by completing an analysis of variance on each item. He found that the locus of causality main effect accounted for 46-59% of the variance in the internal and external cause items, and that the locus of causality items adequately differentiated between internal and external causes. Russell also determined that the stability main effect accounted for 18-19% of the variance in the stability items. He concluded that the stability scales differentiated stable from unstable causes. However, Russell found that the controllability items were confounded by the locus of causality dimension so he revised the controllability items.

Russell (1982) tested the revised nine-item Causal Dimension Scale on a second group of 99 undergraduates (33 females; 61 males) using a design identical to his first study. He obtained an alpha coefficient of 0.867 for the locus of causality subscale and 0.837 for the stability subscale in his second study. For the controllability dimension Russell obtained an alpha coefficient of 0.730. He found that all three subscales were internally consistent.

Russell (1982) reported preliminary evidence for the construct validity of the Causal Dimension Scale by relating initial findings of strong relationships between scores on the locus of causality subscale and affective reactions to success and failure. This relationship was consistent with predictions based on Weiner's (1979) model of attribution categories. Russell reported that he had established the validity of the Causal Dimension Scale for assessing perceptions of causes in particular or isolated situations but the validity of the instrument for evaluating causal dimensions in real-world settings where situational factors come into play remained untested.
Questionnaire Battery

These four instruments, the Beck Depression Inventory (short form), the Self-esteem Scale, the Attributions about Unemployment Scale, and the Causal Dimension Scale were used recently in a national, longitudinal study on the effects of unemployment, employment and post secondary education on psychological well-being. The study was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (W. A. Borgen, personal communication, March 1993).

Both the Attributions about Unemployment Scale and the Causal Dimension Scale measure causality. By obtaining two measures of causality in this study the researcher created an opportunity for strengthening the research findings about the validity of these instruments for the assessment of causality in unemployed populations (Feather & Barber, 1983).

Implementation Checklist

The implementation checklist (Appendix H) consisted of categories which are descriptive of the interventions implemented by the instructors. The interventions were rated by this instrument to determine whether the treatment program was delivered consistently to all subjects. An intervention was defined as a statement of direction and objectives of each of the program modules. The observing instructor completed this form independently at the end of each module segment. An independent rater sat in on several randomly selected segments. These two ratings were compared for consistency using Cohen's (1960) kappa statistic.
Demographic Questionnaire

The demographic questionnaire (Appendix C) collected information on the following: (a) type of previous employment, (b) type of injury, (c) percentage of disability, (d) age, (e) educational level, (f) length of unemployment, and (g) length of previous employment (employment history). These data were used to accurately describe the sample. This questionnaire was administered before the subjects started treatment.

Follow-up Telephone Interview

The follow-up telephone interview (Appendix I) was used to ascertain whether gains made in the program by the participants were maintained. The program participants were asked if they were employed, newly employed or had other employment status (e.g., school). This interview was conducted eight weeks after the treatment.

Interview Questions

The interview questions (Appendix K) were presented to a random sample of subjects who completed the treatment program. The questions were designed to give the subjects an opportunity to recount their experiences of being disabled, needing to change jobs as a result of their disability, and participating in the treatment program. All but one interview were in-person interviews; the remaining interview was conducted by telephone as the subject lived in a remote community. The interview data were analyzed using a methodology developed by Borgen and Amundson (1984).
Instructors

Two instructors led the treatment program. They were senior VRCs employed at the WCB who had extensive experience in teaching job search programs and in career counselling. One instructor (primary instructor) directed the program activities and the second instructor (observing instructor) ensured that the program was presented as intended by helping the primary instructor stay focused, by clarifying objectives, and by intervening when necessary. At the end of each program module the observing instructor filled out the implementation checklist without consulting with the primary instructor.

Treatment

The treatment program was based on the belief that unemployed individuals will benefit from a group approach to helping them gain employment. Further, the content was based on an assumption that all participants in the program had been employed in the past, had been injured on the job, and needed assistance in finding new, alternative employment. These clients had all been previously employed and had successfully demonstrated job finding skills at some level. Consequently, they needed to focus on their existing skills and on learning to apply them in looking for a new job. Therefore, the emphasis of the treatment program was career redirection not just job search skills. This focus required a client-centered approach to teaching that concentrated on the clients' psychological processes throughout the program.

The treatment program consisted of two parts presented over 14 days. A day consisted of three hours of classroom instruction, either before or after noon, and homework assignments. The first part of the treatment program, called Setting New
Career Pathways, was based on the work of Amundson and Poehnell (1993). Only minor changes, necessary to meet the needs of this study's participants, were made to the content developed by these authors. The second part of the treatment program, entitled Job Search Skills, was based on the work of Amundson, Borgen, Westwood, and Swain (1987). The content of the Job Search Skills section was updated to reflect the general employment histories and geographical orientation of the participants.

The Setting New Career Pathways (Pathways) section was divided into two, five-day segments. The objectives for the Pathways section were that participants would acquire the knowledge and skills for: (a) self-assessment, (b) developing strategies for effective decision making, and (c) developing an action plan to help them access the labour market effectively. The focus of Week 1 was personal career self-assessment. Week 2 centered on career exploration.

Week 1 was divided into five, three-hour sessions which were delivered over five consecutive days in either the morning or the afternoon. Day 1 started with an orientation to the program and an introductory activity designed to provide for personal introductions among the participants and discussion of their expectations. The main focus for Day 1 was the handout The Wheel: Self-Assessment for the Labour Market (Wheel) which was based on the Centric model of career choice (Amundson, 1987, 1989). Amundson depicted the Wheel as three circles: (a) an inner circle labeled career goals, (b) a middle circle specifying personal factors relevant to setting career goals like skills, values, and labour market options, and (c) an outer circle which includes motivating factors for seeking employment like physical needs (food and shelter), emotional needs (self-esteem), and the expectations of other people. The instructor used the Wheel diagram to illustrate all the factors that an individual must consider before setting a career goal. Participants were given the handout My Unique Wheel (Unique Wheel) which contained an inner circle with space to write career goals
and an outer circle divided into eight sections with space to record information relating to: (a) educational background, (b) perceptions of significant others, (c) interests, (d) values, (e) skills, (f) personal style, (g) labour market options, and (h) work experience. The instructor explained that filling in the individual sections on the Unique Wheel would be accomplished as the participants completed the self-assessment activities during Days 2-5. Participants were asked to complete the work experience and educational background sections of their Unique Wheel as their homework task.

During Day 2 the participants discussed their feelings about being unemployed and were introduced to the portfolio of marketable assets that were identified in the sections of the Unique Wheel. Participants completed the skills and competencies section of the Unique Wheel. The instructor defined the concept of skill and explained the concept of transferable skill. Participants were asked to identify and analyze at least two personal successes stories in order to create a list of their transferable skills as their homework assignment. The instructor also discussed the personal style section of the Unique Wheel and distributed the Individual Style Survey (Amundson, 1989) booklets with instructions for completion. Participants were requested to complete the surveys by Day 4.

Day 3 led off with a continuation of the discussion on skills and transferable skills. Participants learned to write skill statements and were asked to write a paragraph describing their personal characteristics and transferable skills. The instructor referred to the Wheel and introduced the next marketable asset of interests. The participants completed The Self-Directed Search (SDS) to determine their interests and recorded their interests on their Unique Wheels.

On Day 4 the instructor introduced the topic of values and explained the role that values play in career decision-making. Participants completed the handouts Work Values Checklist and Prioritizing Work Values. Participants recorded their most
important work values on their Unique Wheel. The instructor led the participants in a review of the self appraisal and three appraisals completed by others in the Individual Style Survey and helped the participants to identify their own personal style. The instructor distributed the handout Using Your Individual Style in Career Decision Making and Job Search.

During Day 5 the participants began to identify potential career options in light of their marketable assets which they had recorded on their Unique Wheels during the previous four days. The instructor distributed the handout Main Considerations for Career Choice. The participants were requested to complete the rank ordering of their main considerations for career choice as their homework assignment.

Day 6 was the start of Week 2 which focused on career exploration. Week 2 was delivered in five, three-hour sessions which were presented over five consecutive days in either the morning or the afternoon. Week 2 was the second section of Setting New Career Pathways.

Day 6 began with a discussion of the current labour market trends in British Columbia and Canada. The instructor distributed the Current Labour Market Trends handout. The instructor outlined a strategy for the participants to use in accessing the labour market: (a) action planning, (b) researching, and (c) decision making and explained that techniques relating to this strategy would be discussed in following program sessions. The instructor led the participants in brainstorming ideas on resources that were available to them for researching the labour market and outlined guidelines for the participants to follow in their labour market research. The instructor distributed the Occupational Assessment and Company Assessment handouts. The participants were asked to complete a library research assignment for homework.

Day 7 began with a review of the participants’ experiences in completing the research assignment. The instructor presented information on the barriers to decision
making and described three typical styles of decision making. The participants were asked to select a decision making style that they felt was appropriate for them and, on an individual basis, to apply the style to their career situation. The participants formed small groups to share their experiences with attempting to apply a decision making style. The instructor then reconvened the entire group to help the participants understand that decision making is a flexible process that proceeds one step at a time and changes with experience. The participants were requested to read the Informational Interviews handout as their homework assignment.

On Day 8 the participants received guidelines for giving feedback to other people and learned about the four communication skills: (a) active listening, (b) paraphrasing, (c) empathy, and (d) clarifying. The instructor distributed the Facilitating Feedback, A Model of Communication, and Communication Skills handouts. The instructor presented the informational interview technique as an effective tool for maneuvering in the labour market. The participants took part in a role-play of an informational interview in order to gain experience in giving and receiving feedback. For homework the participants were asked to complete their selection of career options and main considerations for career decision making.

Day 9 began with a presentation from the instructor on a systematic approach to problem solving which included five steps: (a) locate the problem, (b) assess the problem, (c) generate, examine and choose among alternative solutions, (d) implement a likely solution, and (e) evaluate the result of the implementation of the solution. The instructor led the participants through a review of an example using the problem solving strategy. The instructor distributed the Barriers to Occupational Options handout and asked participants to write down their three top job options and to list the main barriers to each option. Participants then discussed one of their major barriers with other members of the group. The leader reconvened the group to discuss major
barriers and methods for overcoming the barriers. For homework, participants were asked to consider what their next steps should be.

On Day 10 the instructor started with a presentation on the importance of goal setting and action planning. The instructor distributed the Commitment to Action handout and asked the participants to answer the six questions on the handout for homework. Participants were requested to explain their individual action plans to the group and to identify the barriers that they may encounter in following their action plans. The instructor distributed the Contract handout and asked the participants to write down a contract for initiating activity on their action plans. Participants were also requested to list strengths or insights that would assist them in completing their contracts. The session ended with the participants completing an evaluation of the program.

The second part of the treatment program was called Job Search Skills and began on Week 3, Day 11. The general objectives for the Job Search Skills section were: (a) to enable participants to learn the key steps necessary to carry out a job search, (b) to reinforce the self-confidence necessary for an effective job search, and (c) to use the group as support for the participants. The Job Search Skills component of the treatment program was delivered in four consecutive three-hour sessions with homework assignments.

Day 11 began with the instructor leading the participants in developing a list of job search strategies. The instructor organized the strategies identified by the participants under the headings of: (a) developing job leads, (b) job application, and (c) interviews. The instructor helped the participants develop goals for the group based on their needs for information and skill development related to the strategies in these three areas. The instructor divided the participants into two groups to discuss methods for developing job leads. One group was assigned the topic of networking and the other
group was given the topic of direct employer contacts. The instructor distributed handouts relevant to each topic to the appropriate group. Both groups made a presentation to the participants on their topic. The participants were asked to bring their current resumes on Day 12.

On Day 12 the instructor began with a discussion about the participants' experience in using the techniques for developing job leads that were presented on Day 11. Then, the instructor moved on to a presentation on the types of resumes and distributed handouts to illustrate different kinds of resumes. The participants worked in pairs to write their resumes using guidelines in handouts distributed by the instructor. The instructor reviewed the resumes as they were completed. For participants who had difficulty writing a resume the instructor scheduled appointments to provide individual assistance. The instructor explained the importance of covering letters in job search and distributed samples of covering letters. The participants divided into groups and drafted covering letters for sample job advertisements provided by the instructor. The instructor gave the participants guidelines for completing an application form and the participants discussed strategies for completing difficult questions on application forms. The instructor gave the participants application forms which were to be completed as a homework assignment. Participants were also asked to complete their resumes.

Day 13 focused on preparing for and practicing for the job interview. Participants watched and discussed a videotaped model interview featuring the instructor and another staff member. The instructor distributed The Interview Planning Form and Sample of a Completed Interview Planning Form to the participants as a guide for the discussion. The instructor showed the participants two additional videotaped model interviews illustrating actors in an informal and a formal interview. The participants critiqued the interviews commenting on the positive behaviors and attitudes demonstrated by the job seekers and the differences in the structure of the two
interviews. The instructor distributed handouts relating to participating in a job interview, responses to typical interview questions and analyzing a videotaped interview. The participants worked in pairs to create interview scenarios for each member of the pair. The instructor attempted to pair participants with similar job objectives. The participants were requested to complete and practice their interview scenarios for homework so they would be prepared to take part in mock interviews to be taped on Day 14.

Day 14 started with videotaping the mock interviews. Participants signed up for interview times. The instructor functioned as the interviewer and one of the participants, who was not being interviewed at that time, operated the video camera. The interviewer used the participant's resume and completed application form to generate interview questions. Immediately after the mock interviews the participants evaluated their own performance and the other members of the group gave feedback to the participant who has just been interviewed. The instructor ensured that positive feedback was given initially to make the participants more receptive to feedback. The instructor explained the importance of the job seeker maintaining contact with the employer after the interview and initiated a discussion on follow-up techniques. The instructor distributed handouts giving examples of follow-up letters. The day ended with a debriefing with the participants about their experience of taking part in the job search group.

Procedures

Prior to the beginning of the study, VRCs were asked to refer appropriate clients to the Career Redirection and Job Search Program (JSP). A waitlist was created and clients were randomly assigned to one of the four treatment groups. Groups 1 and 3
received the pretest at the outset of the program. Groups 2 and 4 were not pretested. Groups 1 and 2 then proceeded to treatment while Groups 3 and 4 waited. The subjects were not inconvenienced by this delay since they were maintained on WCB benefits during the wait and experienced no undue financial hardship. The researcher set the goal of 15 clients for each group but the final numbers for the individual groups were as follows: (a) 13 clients in Group 1, (b) 13 participants in Group 2, (c) 11 clients in Group 3, and (d) 14 participants in Group 4. The groups were slightly unbalanced because two subjects declined to participate in the program and eight subjects withdrew while the program was in progress for a variety of reasons. Clients were informed of their selection and the requirements of participation in a letter at least 1 week before the commencement of treatment (Appendix A). Receipt of the letters was verified by telephone.

Groups 1 and 2 completed posttests immediately following treatment. Groups 3 and 4 were tested at the same time, just prior to their treatment. This procedure allowed the researcher to assess the effects of the pretest on treatment. Groups 3 and 4 then proceeded to treatment and were tested again upon completion of treatment. This strategy allowed the researcher to assess the effects of the waiting period on the outcomes.

At the end of each section of the treatment program the subjects were asked to complete a short questionnaire to convey their experience of participating in each part of the program. The questionnaires for the first three sections of the program contained the following items (Appendices D, E, and F):

1. Please read the following items and circle a number on the five point scale.

2. Please write down your overall impression of the last five days of the program.

3. Please write down any suggestions you have for changing this part of the
program.

4. If there is anything that I have not asked you about that you think I should know about please write it down below.

The subjects were requested to complete a fourth questionnaire to report their experience of participating in the entire program. The final questionnaire contained the following items (Appendix G):

1. Now that you have completed the program please take a moment to rate the entire program. Before you begin, please think back over the entire length of the program.

2. Please write down your overall impression of the entire program.

3. Please write down any suggestions you have for changing any part of the program.

4. If there is anything that I have not asked you about that you think I should know about please write it down below.

The results of these questionnaires were used to add anecdotal data to the quantitative findings.

Eight weeks after completion of the program each participant was contacted by telephone. Three things occurred during this contact. First, the subjects were asked to answer up to five questions from the following list (Appendix I):

1. Are you currently employed?
2. If yes, are you newly employed?
3. If no, are you currently enrolled in a training program?
4. Are you feeling positive about your job search?
5. To what do you attribute your unemployment?
6. Any comments regarding the JSP?
Questions 4 and 5 were asked of only clients who responded negatively to questions 1, 2, and 3. Second, the subjects were notified that the instruments had been mailed to them. They were asked to complete the instruments and mail them back to the researcher. Third, a number of subjects, previously randomly selected, were asked to participate in an in-depth interview. If they were willing to cooperate, a time and place for the interview was arranged. Everyone was thanked for their participation in the study.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was undertaken prior to the full implementation of the program. A full 14 day cycle was completed with a group of 15 subjects. The subjects completed the questionnaire battery before and after treatment. The participants were asked to complete the feedback questionnaires (Appendices D, E, F, and G) and the observing instructor and the independent rater completed the Implementation Checklist (Appendix H). One of the subjects from the pilot group completed an in-depth interview eight weeks after treatment. The instructors and the investigator refined the program content based on the results of the pilot. Adjustments were made to the How It Feels to be Unemployed and Getting Off the Roller Coaster modules and the order of the modules in the first two days of the Job Search section of the program was altered to give the participants more time to write their resumes.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was performed in several stages: (a) a preliminary analysis involving the reliability of the instruments, sample characteristics, gender and instructor
effects; (b) an analysis of treatment effects, (c) an analysis of the eight week follow-up
data, and (d) an analysis of descriptive data. The SPSS program was used to compute
reliabilities and to calculate inferential statistics.

The data from the interviews were analyzed following the model developed by
Borgen and Amundson (1984), which consists of four steps.

1. Transcribe the taped interviews.

2. (a) List all emotional shift incidents and related situational factors on a rating
   sheet developed by Borgen and Amundson (1984).
   (b) Complete a reliability check of the rating sheet categories and the
   number of incidents recorded. This was computed by having a vocational
   rehabilitation professional, not involved with the research, place a selection of the data
   on the rating sheets and compare it to that done by the researcher. A 90% agreement
   rate was considered acceptable.

3. (a) Sort emotional shift incidents by themes thereby establishing categories of
   these incidents.
   (b) Complete a reliability check of the established categories.
   Another vocational rehabilitation professional was asked to sort through all of the
   rating sheets, placing the incidents into the categories developed by the researcher. A
   90% agreement rate was considered acceptable.

4. (a) Establish a description of the experience by a combination of
   category analysis, rating sheet analysis, and individual question analysis.
   (b) Conduct a validity check of the final outcome by a follow-up
   telephone interview with a selection of respondents. The respondents were
   asked to verify whether or not the description accurately reflected their
   experience. The portion of the rating sheet which describes events or
   behaviours was read to the respondents who were asked to comment on the
accuracy of this summary of their experience.

Hypotheses

Pretest Hypothesis

It was hypothesized that there would be no difference in the mean scores between the pretest and non pretest groups on the following measures: (a) Beck Depression Inventory, (b) Self-esteem Scale, (c) Gurney's (1981) Attribution Scale, and (d) Causal Dimension Scale.

Hypothesis 1

It was hypothesized that the mean scores of all four groups would not differ between the pretest and posttest on the following measures: (a) Beck Depression Inventory, (b) Self-Esteem Scale, (c) Gurney's (1981) Attribution Scale, and (d) Causal Dimension Scale. Based on the review of the literature it was expected that this hypothesis would not be supported. It was expected that the participants would show an improvement on all of the scales.

Hypothesis 2

It was hypothesized that there would be no difference in the mean scores of the: (a) Beck Depression Inventory, (b) Self-Esteem Scale, (c) Gurney's (1981) Attribution Scale, and (d) Causal Dimension Scale between the treatment and control groups at Time 2. It was anticipated that the participants in the treatment group would show
significantly more improvement on these measures than the participants in the control group.

Hypothesis 3

It was hypothesized that gains made during treatment would not be maintained by the eight week follow-up. The literature is relatively silent regarding the maintenance of gains made during treatment. It was expected that this hypothesis would not be supported and that any gains made during treatment would be maintained eight weeks post-treatment.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter opens with a description of the sample and a report on the research procedures. The results of the analyses of the tests of the hypotheses are then presented, followed by the analysis of the participants' evaluation of the treatment program, the analysis of the eight-week telephone interviews and the analysis of the in-depth interviews. The chapter concludes with a summary of the results.

Subject Characteristics

Of the 44 subjects who completed the pretest and posttest measures, 35 (79.5%) were male and 9 (20.5%) were female. This ratio is similar to the gender ratio for the total number of compensation claims accepted by WCB on an annual basis. In 1993, WCB accepted 79,503 claims in total; 60,398 (75.9%) claims were for males and 19,105 (24.1%) were for females. Group 1 consisted of 11 males and two females; Group 2, six males and two females; Group 3, nine males and two females; Group 4, nine males and three females. The subjects ranged in age from 26 to 58 years with an average age of 40.9 years. Group 1 had an average age of 42.2 years; Group 2, 41.4 years; Group 3, 40.5 years; and Group 4, 39.5 years. The education level of the subjects ranged from 6 to 14 years with an average of 10.8 years. Group 1 had an average educational level of 10.4 years; Group 2, 11.5 years; Group 3, 10.7 years; and Group 4, 10.8 years.
The subjects' type of physical disability was coded into the following 11 categories: back (n=19, 43.2%), shoulder (n=3, 6.8%), leg (n=4, 9.1%), knee (n=3, 6.8%), foot (n=4, 9.1%), skin (allergies) (n=3, 6.8%), carpal tunnel (n=3, 6.8%), hand (n=1, 2.3%), head (n=1, 2.3%), elbow (n=2, 4.5%), and hip (n=1, 2.3%). Three levels of disability were possible: severe, medium or mild. Twelve (27.3%) subjects were rated severe; 28 (63.6%) medium, and four (9.1%) as mild.

The types of jobs the subjects were employed in at the time of their injury were coded into the following 11 categories: driver (n=6, 13.6%), logger (n=3, 6.8%), labourer (n=8, 18.3%), service sector (n=6, 13.6%), nurse (n=1, 2.3%), mill worker (n=4, 9.1%), trades person (n=7, 15.9%), mover (n=2, 4.5%), fisher (n=1, 2.3%), supervisor (n=3, 6.8%), and clerical (n=3, 6.8%). The subjects had been in these jobs for an average of 9.3 years, ranging from a low of .1 year to a high of 30 years. They had been out of the workforce for an average of 1.7 years, ranging from .4 years to 5 years.

Experimental Mortality

The experiment began with 15 subjects being invited to attend each of the four groups, for a projected N of 60. Due to the nature of the location of the treatment program, the subjects were given the choice of participating in the research by taking part in the treatment program and completing the instruments, or just taking part in the treatment program. Fifty-three subjects elected to consider participating in the research. Group 1 began with 13 subjects and all 13 completed the instruments. Group 2 also began with 13 subjects, three of whom dropped out early in the program. The remaining eight completed the instruments. Since the instruments were completed confidentially the researcher did not have an opportunity to inquire about the subjects'
reasons for not participating in the research. Group 3 began with 12 subjects, one of whom dropped out. The remaining 11 completed the instruments. Group 4 began with 15 subjects, of which 12 completed the instruments. Therefore, of the 53 subjects who considered participating in the research, 44 completed the instruments.

Reliability of the Instruments

Reliability coefficients were calculated for the four measures used for the pretest and posttest analyses. Internal consistency reliabilities of pretest scores for the three subscales of the Causal Dimension Scale and the total scores of the Attribution about Unemployment Scale, the Self-Esteem Scale and the Beck Depression Inventory are given in Table 1. The combined pretest scores for Groups 1 and 3 were used.

Table 1
Reliabilities for the Test Measures (Cronbach's alpha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>CDS/I</th>
<th>CDS/S</th>
<th>CDS/C</th>
<th>ATTRIB</th>
<th>SELF-EST</th>
<th>BDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's alpha</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of items</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CDS/I = Causal Dimension Scale, internal causation subscale; CDS/S = Causal Dimension Scale, stability subscale; CDS/C = Causal Dimension Scale, controllability subscale; ATTRIB = Attribution about Unemployment Scale; SELF-EST = Self-Esteem Scale; BDI = Beck Depression Inventory.
Analysis of Gender Effects

The possibility of differential effects of treatment on males and females was tested. Independent t-tests were conducted at posttest comparing the pooled results of males with the pooled results of females. The analyses showed no significant differences between males and females in the mean scores on all of the instruments.

Table 2
T-test Results for Gender Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CDS/I</th>
<th>CDS/S</th>
<th>CDS/C</th>
<th>ATTRIB</th>
<th>SELF-EST</th>
<th>BDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Instructor Effects

One person provided the instruction for all four groups. A second observing instructor ensured that the program was delivered consistently to all groups.

An implementation check was conducted to determine if the treatment was implemented according to the program guidelines. Interventions were rated using the implementation checklist (Appendix H). A second observing instructor was present during the entire program and rated the presentation program on the checklist. A third, trained, independent rater was present during two, randomly selected days of each week of the program and rated the implementation of the program on the same
checklist. A total of 424 interventions were evaluated by this rater. These ratings were compared with the observing instructor's ratings for the same period.

Of the 848 (424 X 2) interventions, 13 (1.5%) were coded to reflect disagreement between the raters. The two raters agreed on 835 of the interventions rated (98.5% agreement). Interrater reliability was then calculated at .93 using Cohen's (1960) kappa statistic. This statistic is designed to measure the amount of agreement between two raters and corrects for the proportion of agreement expected by chance alone. These results indicate that the program was implemented with a high degree of conformity.

Analyses of Treatment Effects

In this section, the means and standard deviations for all measures are presented first (Table 3). Results of tests of the hypotheses are then described, followed by the analysis of the subjects' evaluation of the treatment, and analysis of the eight week follow-up interviews. The section concludes with the results of the analysis of the in-depth interviews.

Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations for Dependent Measures (N=44)

Beck Depression Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
<th>Time 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>7.64</th>
<th>8.09</th>
<th>8.00</th>
<th>9.75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>5.50</th>
<th>4.17</th>
<th>2.71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Self-Esteem Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
<th>Time 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>23.25</th>
<th>24.43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>25.36</th>
<th>27.18</th>
<th>25.27</th>
<th>27.75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25.83</td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td>24.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attribution about Unemployment Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
<th>Time 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>30.54</td>
<td>31.31</td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>33.27</td>
<td>32.09</td>
<td>31.91</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>33.17</td>
<td>31.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Causal Dimension Scale (Internal Causation Subscale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
<th>Time 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>13.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Causal Dimension Scale (Stability Subscale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
<th>Time 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Causal Dimension Scale (Controllability Subscale)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 4</th>
<th>Time 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pretest Hypothesis

It was hypothesized that there would be no difference in the mean scores on all of the instruments between pretest and non-pretest groups.

Independent t-tests were conducted for the Time 2 scores between Group 1 (pretested) and Group 2 (no pretest), and between Group 3 (pretested) and Group 4 (no pretest). The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4. Differences between the groups are expressed as effect sizes; that is, as fractions of the pooled standard deviation of the posttest scores.

Table 4

Comparison of Means between Groups at T2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 (n=13) vs. Group 2(n=8)</th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail sig</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/I</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/S</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/C</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above results show that there were no significant differences in the mean scores on any of the measures between the pretest and non-pretest groups. The hypothesis that pretesting did not predispose subjects to react differently to the treatment was therefore accepted.

**Hypothesis 1**

It was hypothesized that the mean scores of all four groups would not differ between pretest and posttest on the following measures:

a) Beck Depression Inventory  
b) Self-esteem Scale  
c) Gurney's (1981) Attribution Scale  
d) Causal Dimension Scale

Dependent t-tests were conducted for Groups 1, 3 and 4 comparing pretest and posttest means. Effect size was calculated by taking the difference of the pooled means.
of posttest scores for each group divided by the pooled standard deviation of these scores. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 5a.

Table 5a
Results of All Measures, Pretest and Posttest

**Beck Depression Inventory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail sig</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Negative effect sizes indicate a lowering of depression after treatment.

**Self-esteem Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail sig</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Positive effect sizes indicate an increase in self-esteem after treatment.
### Attribution Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail sig</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Positive effect sizes indicate more internal attribution after treatment.

### Causal Dimension Scale, Internal Causation Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail sig</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Positive effect sizes indicate explanation of unemployment based more on internal factors after treatment.

### Causal Dimension Scale, Stability Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail sig</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. A negative effect size would indicate less stable attributions.

Causal Dimension Scale. Controllability Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Positive effect sizes indicate more control.

As can be seen from the above results, significant findings were demonstrated for Group 3 on the Self-esteem Scale. However, no significant findings were demonstrated on any of the other measures.

The next step of the analysis was to pool the mean results for all of the groups for each of the scales and conduct t-tests comparing pretest and posttest means. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 5b.

Table 5b

Analysis of Combined Group Means, Pretest and Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail sig</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of each individual's pretest to posttest gains (or losses) revealed three subjects with extreme changes in their scores. Further investigation revealed that all three of these subjects had serious personal crises during the treatment program. When these scores were removed, further t-tests indicated that the difference between the means on this measure was significant (Table 5c).

Table 5c

Adjusted Beck Depression Inventory Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail Sig</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>-2.58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Negative effect size indicates a lowering of depression after treatment.

Hypothesis 1, which stated that the mean scores of all four groups would not differ between pretest and posttest on any of the four instruments, was rejected for all groups on the Beck Depression Inventory. The results of the statistical analysis indicated that the treatment program did have a significant overall impact on this scale.
Hypothesis 1 was not rejected for all groups on the Self-esteem Scale, the Attribution about Unemployment Scale and all subscales of the Causal Dimension Scale.

Given the liberal alpha resulting from comparing six measures it was necessary to guard against the possibility of making a Type 1 error. Consequently, the researcher divided that alpha (.05) by six (the number of measures) to establish a new alpha of .008. As P equaled .015 on the t-test, Hypothesis 1 was not rejected on the BDI for all groups. However, if one had used a one-tailed test, the hypothesis would have been rejected.

The possibility of a Type 2 error exists for these findings, because of the small sample sizes. Changes in pretest to posttest scores on four of the six instruments (the exceptions were Attribution and the CDS/S) were in a favourable direction (e.g., decreased depression and increased self-esteem). However, the effect sizes for these four measures were small, averaging about .20. To adequately guard against making a Type 2 error requires increasing the power of the experiment. With an observed effect size of approximately .20, an N of 50 per group (an overall N of 200) would be required to begin showing statistical significance on these measures (Glass & Hopkins, 1984). An N of this size would be difficult to establish given the problems in accessing a recently unemployed physically disabled population.

Hypothesis 2

It was hypothesized that there would be no difference in the mean scores of all of the instruments between the Treatment and Control groups at Time 2.
Independent t-tests were conducted between the Treatment Group (Groups 1 & 2) and the Control Group (Groups 3 & 4) at Time 2. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 6. Effect sizes were also calculated.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tail sig</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BDI</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-EST</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTRIB</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/I</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/S</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/C</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2 was not rejected for the Beck Depression Inventory, the Self-esteem Scale, the Attributions about Unemployment Scale, and the Internal and Stability subscales of the Causal Dimension Scale.

Hypothesis 2 was rejected for the Controllability subscale of the Causal Dimension Scale. The Treatment Group perceived that they had more control of their lives following treatment than did the Control Group.
Hypothesis 3

It was hypothesized that gains made during treatment would not be maintained at the eight week follow-up.

Dependent t-tests were conducted on all dependent measures at T2 and T4 for Groups 1 and 2, and at T3 and T5 for Groups 3 and 4. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 7.

Table 7
T-test Results for Posttest/Post-posttest Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-Tail Sig</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>-3.33</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/I</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/S</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/C</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-Tail Sig</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/I</td>
<td>-6.29</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/S</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from the above results the lack of significant t-values indicated that most follow-up scores did not vary significantly from posttest scores. However, significant t-values for Group 2 on the Beck Depression Inventory, Self-esteem Scale, and Stability subscale of the Causal Dimension Scale indicated that this group's scores increased significantly on these measures. These results showed that the subjects in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-Tail Sig</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>- .13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/I</td>
<td>-3.75</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>-.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/S</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/C</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-Tail Sig</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>-2.57</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>-.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/I</td>
<td>-3.71</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>-.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/S</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/C</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group 2 became more depressed, felt less worthy, and became less willing to expect their situation to change.

Further analysis was conducted with combined means for all groups on each measure at posttest and post-posttest. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

T-test Results, Combined Means, Posttest and Post-posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-Tail Sig</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beck</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/I</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/S</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS/C</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above results, Hypothesis 3, which stated that gains made during treatment would not be maintained at eight week follow-up, was accepted for the Beck Depression Inventory, the Self-esteem Scale, the Attributions About Unemployment Scale and the Controllability subscale of the Causal Dimension Scale. However, Hypothesis 3 was rejected for the Internal Causation and Stability subscales of the Causal Dimension Scale.
Summary of the Analysis of the Hypotheses

The Pretest Hypothesis predicted that there would be no differences in the mean scores on all of the above instruments between pretest and non-pretest groups. This hypothesis was accepted as no significant differences were found. This confirms that the pretest had no effect on the eventual treatment outcome.

Hypothesis 1 was rejected on one measure. This hypothesis predicted that there would be no differences in the mean scores of all four groups on the Beck Depression Inventory, the Self-esteem Scale, Gurney's (1981) Attribution Scale, and the Causal Dimension Scale from pretest to posttest. Treatment was found to be effective in the reduction of depression. However, there were no significant differences in self-esteem, attribution or causation.

Hypothesis 2 was also rejected on one measure. This hypothesis predicted that there would be no difference in the mean scores of the Treatment and Control Groups on all four measures. Treatment was found to be effective in increasing the subjects' sense of control over their lives.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that the gains made during treatment would not be maintained at the eight week follow-up. Hypothesis 3 was rejected on the Internal Causation and Stability subscales of the Causal Dimension Scale. Significant changes were noted in the scores for the internal causes and stability subscales, but there was no change in the scores for the scale relating to having a sense of control over one's unemployment. The subjects tended to revert to accepting stable, internal reasons for their unemployment. Gains made during treatment on the depression measure were maintained at follow-up. There were no significant changes in the scores on the measures of self-esteem and attributions about unemployment.
Analysis of Feedback Questionnaires

Every participant in the four research groups was asked to complete a feedback questionnaire at the conclusion of each section of the Program. As well, all the participants were requested to fill out a questionnaire to rate the overall program at the end of Week 3. The respondents completed the questionnaires anonymously. The questionnaires were designated Feedback 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively (Appendices D, E, F, & G). The ratings for the program modules and the responses to the open-ended items contained within each questionnaire have been summarized for all four research groups.

Feedback 1

This questionnaire requested ratings on the self-assessment modules that made up the first five days of the treatment program. Full completion of the questionnaire required rating a total of 13 program modules, giving an overall rating of the first five days of the program, and answering three questions relating to overall impression, suggestions for change, and any other relevant information. The rating scale had five options ranging from not helpful (1) to helpful (3) and very helpful (5). Table 9 gives a summary of the respondents' ratings for the 13 program modules and the first five days of the program.

The majority of respondents (80% or higher) rated each of the self-assessment modules in Days 1 to 5 as helpful to very helpful. Four modules were rated as very helpful by more than 25% of the respondents. These four modules were: (a) marketable assets, (b) discovering significant others, (c) discovering personal style, and (d) discovering career options. Overall, 95.4% of the respondents rated the self-assessment section of the program as helpful to very helpful.
Table 9

Summary of Respondents' Ratings for Program Modules in Days 1 to 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3+4+5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory exercises</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms and expectations</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wheel</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job loss cycle</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketable assets</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovering skills</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual style survey</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-directed search</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovering values</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovering significant others</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovering personal style</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovering career options</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art of putting it all together</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days 1 - 5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Open-ended Questions

Overall impression question.

A total of 37 respondents answered the questionnaire item relating to information about each participant's overall impression of Days 1 to 5 of the program. Positive impressions were reported by 29 (78.3%) respondents. The positive impressions
referred to: (a) benefit from specific program topics, (b) motivation and confidence, (c) general overall benefit, and (d) program delivery. Mixed impressions were reported by five respondents and only three respondents gave negative impressions. In general, the respondents had a positive impression of the self-assessment section of the program. They cited increased understanding of their personal experiences and future options and improved motivation and confidence as the reasons for their positive feelings.

**Changes question.**

Thirty of the 45 potential respondents to this question made no suggestions for change in the self-assessment section of the program. Although 14 respondents did identify items for change, there was no pattern to their suggestions and some suggestions were contradictory. For example, one respondent recommended that more time be given to introductions and getting acquainted on the first day but two other respondents suggested that time be devoted to outlining vocational rehabilitation guidelines and personal concerns about the compensation system on the first day. This fact led the researcher to conclude that the changes suggested were indicative of individual ideas that were not shared by the respondents as a group.

**Other information question.**

The final item in this questionnaire gave the respondents the opportunity to report any other information that they wanted to give to the researcher. A total of four respondents answered this item but again there was no pattern to their replies. For instance, one respondent answered that the instructor's effectiveness in meeting participants' needs would be improved by having detailed information about their histories but another respondent simply replied "everything's cool".
Feedback 2

This questionnaire asked for ratings on the nine career exploration modules that constituted Days 6 to 10 of the program. In addition to rating the program modules, respondents were requested to give an overall rating to the second five days of the program and to answer three questions relating to overall impression, suggestions for change, and any other relevant information. The rating scale for Feedback 2 was identical to the scale on Feedback 1. Table 10 gives a summary of the respondents' ratings for the nine modules and the second five days of the program.

Eight of the nine program modules were rated as helpful to very helpful by at least 77% of the respondents. The field trip/library module was rated as helpful to very helpful by 69.8% of the respondents. Three modules were rated as very helpful by 20% of the respondents: (a) decision making, (b) overcoming barriers, and (c) action planning. Overall, 90.9% of the respondents rated the career exploration section of the program as helpful to very helpful.

Table 10

Summary of Respondents' Ratings for Program Modules in Days 6 to 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3+4+5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The changing labour market</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing the labour market</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field trip/library</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Open-ended Questions

Overall impression question.

A total of 19 respondents answered the questionnaire item pertaining to each participant's overall impression of Days 6 to 10 of the program. Positive impressions were reported by 12 (63.2%) of the respondents to this question. The positive impressions referred to (a) benefit from specific topics, and (b) general, overall benefit. Mixed impressions were reported by five respondents and two respondents reported negative impressions. Generally, the respondents had a positive impression of the career exploration section of the program. They reported improvement in their decision making and research skills as the reasons for their positive impressions.

Changes question.

Thirty-seven of the potential 45 respondents to this question made no suggestions for change in the career exploration section of the program. In fact, two respondents specified that no changes be made in Days 6 to 10. The recommendations for change given by eight respondents were random, personal comments that did not fit into any cohesive pattern.
Other information question.

A total of four respondents answered the final item on this questionnaire which gave participants the chance to report any other information that they wanted to give to the researcher. These responses repeated earlier suggestions for change in the program schedule and location. None of these comments referred to the content of the program.

Feedback 3

The third feedback questionnaire solicited ratings on the nine job search modules that made up Days 11 to 14 of the program. As with the previous questionnaires, respondents were also asked to report an overall rating for the third segment of the program and to respond to three questions relating to a general impression of the job search section of the program, suggestions for change, and any other information that the respondent wanted to give to the researcher. This questionnaire contained the same five point rating scale.

The nine modules in Days 11 to 14 were rated helpful to very helpful by a strong majority (84% or higher) of the respondents to this questionnaire. Five modules were given very helpful ratings by 30% or better of the respondents: (a) writing the resume (39.2%), (b) preparing the covering letter (32.6%), (c) preparing for the interview (39.1%), (d) practicing the interview (38.1%), and (e) feedback on the interview (31.8%). Overall, the job search section of the program was rated as helpful to very helpful by 93.2% of the respondents to this questionnaire. Table 11 gives a summary of the ratings for the modules in Days 11 to 14.
Table 11

Summary of Respondents' Ratings for Program Modules in Days 11 to 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3+4+5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting the stage</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting job leads</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing the resume</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing the covering letter</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing the application form</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for the interview</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practising for the interview</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on the interview</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final debriefing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days 11 - 14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Open-ended Questions

Overall impression question.

Eighteen respondents answered this question for Feedback 3. Positive impressions were reported by 15 (83.3%) respondents. The positive impressions referred to: (a) general overall benefit, (b) benefit from specific topics, and (c) motivation. Three respondents reported mixed impressions. The respondents had a positive impression of the job search section of the program. They described the job search section as helpful, educational and beneficial.
Change question.

Thirty-five of the 46 potential respondents to this question on Feedback 3 made no suggestions for change to the job search section of the program. Again, two respondents stated that no changes were necessary in Days 11 to 14. The suggestions for changes made by the remaining nine respondents related to adjustments in program delivery, not content.

Other information question.

A total of seven respondents answered the last item in Feedback 3 which gave the respondents an opportunity to report any additional information to the researcher but their responses had very little in common and did not add any new information.

Feedback 4

The participants were asked to complete Feedback 4 immediately after they answered Feedback 3. On Feedback 4 the respondents were requested to give an overall rating for the complete 14 days of the program and to respond to three questions relating to their overall impression of the entire program, suggestions for change to any part of the program, and any other information that they wanted to give to the researcher. The same five point rating scale was included in this questionnaire.

The full 14 day program was rated as helpful to very helpful by 93.6% of the respondents. A rating of helpful was selected by 15 (32.6%) respondents and a rating of very helpful was assigned by 16 (34.8%) respondents. Table 12 gives a summary of the ratings on the full 14 days of the program.
Table 12

Summary of Respondents' Ratings for Days 1 to 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3+4+5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days 1 - 14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Open-ended Questions

Overall impression question.

In total, 39 respondents answered this question on Feedback 4. Positive impressions were reported by 32 (82.1%) respondents. The positive impressions related to: (a) overall general benefit, (b) specific topics, and (c) program delivery. Although four respondents reported mixed impressions and three respondents answered with negative impressions, the positive impressions of the full 14 day program far outweighed the negative or ambivalent impressions.

Changes question.

Thirty-one of the potential 46 respondents to Feedback 4 made no suggestions for change. Suggestions offered by 13 of the respondents who answered this question were repetitions of ideas from previous questionnaires. Two participants gave new ideas for adjustment. One respondent recommended a reshuffling of the order of presentation for the modules. Another respondent suggested that reviewing course content both at the end of the day and the beginning of the next day was unnecessary.
Other information question.

The final question on Feedback 4 elicited responses from six respondents. The responses given were statements of individual preference, or need, that corresponded generally to other single comments made on earlier questionnaires.

Final Analysis Summary

The respondents found the 14 day Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program helpful, interesting, and informative. Thirty of the 31 specific topic modules in the Program were rated as helpful to very helpful by at least 77.0% of the respondents. Only the field trip/library module was rated slightly lower (69.8%). Some respondents suggested that adjustments be considered in these areas: (a) program location, (b) scheduling of classes, (c) amount of individual consultation between the instructor and participants, (d) adding an explanation of WCB vocational rehabilitation guidelines early in the program, (e) increasing coaching on interviews, and (f) repetition of topics covered both at the end of each class and at the beginning of the subsequent class. The respondents commented on the benefit of effective instruction for their experience of participating in the program.

Eight Week Follow-up

At eight weeks following the conclusion of the treatment program all participants were contacted by telephone. The purpose of this contact was to ask eight employment status and general feedback questions (Appendix I) and to arrange for an in-depth follow-up interview. Of the 46 potential candidates for these questions the researcher were able to contact 42.
Analysis of these questions showed that five (10.9%) were employed; 12 (26.1%) were job searching; nine (19.6%) were in training; eight (17.4%) were undergoing further medical treatment or assessment; five (10.9%) were engaged in further activities with the WCB; and three (6.5%) were not engaged in any return to work activity. There were 4 (8.7%) no comments.

Analysis of the unemployment attribution question revealed that 12 (46%) of the subjects attributed their continued unemployment to the poor economy; 10 (38%) to their disability; 2 (8%) to further medical treatment and; 2 (8%) to non WCB issues.

Responses to the comments question were generally short, often one word. In total 52 responses were received; 31 (59.6%) responses stated that the program was helpful or good and 11 (21.2%) stated that they had learned new skills or increased their level of self-confidence. The value of group support was mentioned twice (3.8%). There were four (7.7%) negative responses focusing on the scheduling or location of the program. There were four (7.7%) no comments. In summary, of the 52 comments made, 44 (85%) were positive, 4 (7.5%) were negative and 4 (7.5%) participants had no comment.

Analysis of the Effect of Disability and Group Career Planning Instruction on Career Redirection

The interview data were analyzed according to the model developed by Borgen and Amundson (1984). From transcripts of the taped interviews, the researcher identified 350 emotional shift incidents and recorded these incidents, with related situational factors, on rating sheets designed by Borgen and Amundson (1984). The researcher sorted the emotional shift incidents into 34 categories.
The reliability of the researcher's identification of the emotional shift incidents was checked. An independent vocational rehabilitation professional, not involved in the research, reviewed a random sample of eight interview transcripts, identified the emotional shift incidents in the transcripts and recorded the incidents on the same rating sheets used by the researcher. The independent vocational rehabilitation professional's rating sheets were compared with the researcher's rating sheets for the same sample of interview transcripts. Comparison of the rating sheets yielded a 99.0% rate of agreement.

A second independent vocational rehabilitation professional was asked to replicate the sort of the emotional shift incidents into the categories created by the researcher. The researcher wrote the emotional shift incidents on file cards and prepared title cards for the 34 categories. The independent vocational rehabilitation professional was instructed to place the emotional shift incident cards under the category title that she decided was appropriate. The vocational rehabilitation professional's resorting of all the emotional shift incident cards in each category achieved a 98.5% agreement rate with the researcher's original sort of the cards.

To facilitate description and discussion of the category analysis the researcher grouped the 34 categories into four time periods: (a) before disability, (b) after disability, (c) before instruction, and (d) after instruction. Within each time period, the researcher separated the categories into positive and negative lists.

**Before Disability**

Six positive categories and one negative category were identified in the before disability time period. The largest positive category related to the importance of the
participants' pre-disability jobs. The negative category dealt with the expectation of a job change sometime in the future held by three participants.

Positive Before Disability Categories

Table 13 gives a rank ordered summary of the six positive categories in the before disability time period. The following descriptions outline the range of experiences reported by the respondents within each category, the number of emotional shift incidents placed in each category, and the number of respondents who reported the incidents. A direct quotation from one respondent is included to illustrate each category.

Table 13
Rank Ordered Summary of Positive Before Disability Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of ESIs</th>
<th>Number of Respondents/ESI Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Liked working in pre-disability job</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Expected to remain in pre-disability job for rest of career</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Enjoyed social aspects of pre-disability job</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Enjoyed benefits of pre-disability job</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expected to advance career with pre-disability employer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pre-disability job was priority in life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ESI = Emotional Shift Incident.
Liked working in pre-disability job.

Included in this category were references to fulfillment from (a) working, enjoyment of specific occupations, (b) the adrenalin rush from managing a busy schedule, (c) the anticipation of heading off to work each day, and (d) the benefits of employment, both concrete (money) and attitudinal (pride, respect, autonomy). A total of 18 (75%) people interviewed mentioned this category. This category contained a total of 33 emotional shift incidents. The following quotation is representative of the incidents that were included in this category: "Working was something I looked forward to. I got out into nature and met some new people, even whether I was logging or tree planting. It was something I really looked forward to and I made good money."

Expected to remain in pre-disability job for rest of career.

This category explored the respondents' orientation to making a job change sometime in the future. The respondents were very consistent in their lack of planning for a job change. Of the people interviewed, 15 (62.5%) stated that they had no expectation of making a change in their jobs during the remainder of their career. A total of 15 emotional shift incidents were included in this category. One respondent explained: "I never thought about going into any other job."

Enjoyed social aspects of pre-disability job.

Included in this category were allusions to: (a) friends at work, (b) being a member of a team, (c) helping people learn, and (d) belonging to a community. This category was mentioned by six (25%) individuals and included eight incidents. A respondent described the social aspects of her pre-disability job in the following manner: "I find now, with not working, I'm off the mainstream because when I was
working you're always in touch with people and what's going on and now, I find with not working, you seem like you're left behind".

**Enjoyed benefits of pre-disability job.**

The majority of respondents in this category mentioned making money as the main benefit of employment. One respondent talked about being his own boss and having a company vehicle. A total of six (25%) people mentioned this category, specifying six incidents. One respondent stated that he had: "a very good paying job, lots of benefits. My family was very well taken care of, both while I was working and if anything did happen to me."

**Expected to advance career with pre-disability employer.**

Only two (8.3%) respondents talked about career progression with their pre-disability employer. Each respondent spoke of one incident each for a total of two emotional shift incidents in this category. One of the respondents in this category stated: "I expected maybe to get into the supervisory part of tree planting."

**Pre-disability job was priority in life.**

Two (8.3%) respondents spoke of their pre-disability jobs as the focus of their lives. Again each respondent mentioned one incident each. One respondent expressed the sentiment of this category clearly: "My job was the focus of my whole life and everything else centered around it."
Negative Before Disability Category

Table 14 lists the one negative emotional shift incident category identified in the before disability time period. Three respondents stated that they planned to make a job change sometime in the future even before they were disabled. The accompanying category description describes the range of incidents included in the category and gives the number of emotional shift incidents and respondents. A quotation illustrates the type of incident that was placed in this category.

Table 14
Details of Negative Before Disability Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of ESI Category</th>
<th>Number of Respondents/ESI Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did not expect to remain in pre-disability job for rest of career</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Did not expect to remain in pre-disability job for rest of career.*

Emotional shift incidents in this category were mentioned by three (16.7%) respondents. Each respondent talked about one incident each. One of the respondents outlined his thoughts for his employment future: "I was starting to think about what I was going to do in the future because I didn't think I would be able to labour for the rest of my life".
After Disability

In the after disability time period, two positive and four negative categories were established. The largest positive category focused on participants learning to cope with their disabilities. The biggest negative category dealt with respondents experiencing a sense of loss of control over their physical health and life activities.

Positive After Disability Categories

Table 15 gives a rank ordered listing of the two positive emotional shift incident categories in the after disability time period. The category descriptions following the table give information about the type of incidents placed in the category with an example, the number of emotional shift incidents in the category and the number of respondents that reported the incidents.

Table 15
Rank Ordered Summary of Positive After Disability Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of ESIs</th>
<th>Number of Respondents/ESI Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Learned to cope with disability and pain</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hoped for recovery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learned to cope with disability and pain.

Emotional shift incidents relating to the realization of the permanency of the disability and the acceptance of the consequences of the disability on employment and life style were placed in this category. Respondents expressed a range of emotions
including: (a) frustration, (b) disappointment, (c) alarm, and (d) hurt. They spoke about their inability to complete tasks that previously they had performed automatically. They talked about coping with the uncertainty of when they would experience pain and realizing that they could no longer tolerate the physical demands of their previous jobs. The common theme in all the incidents in this category was the acceptance of change and the need to understand fully the impact that the change would have on their lives. In this category a total of 14 people (58.3%) reported 25 shifts. As one respondent stated: "I guess you're always going to be a little disappointed with the fact that you do have a bit of a disability but you learn to live with it."

**Hoped for recovery.**

A few respondents persevered in thinking about their disabilities as temporary conditions and maintained hope for a full recovery. One respondent was encouraged by the return of sensation in his leg and took this improvement as an indication that he might be able to return to his former job. A second respondent's spirits improved as his symptoms diminished while a third respondent held on to the hope that he would recover in spite of the fact that his improvement was proceeding more slowly than with previous injuries. A total of three (12.5%) respondents reported three emotional shift incidents in this category. In the words of one respondent: "I was fairly positive through the whole thing, when the injury started to get much better I was in a lot better spirits and I was never really worried about my job that much."
Negative After Disability Categories

Table 16 gives a rank ordered summary of the four negative categories in the after disability time period. The category descriptions give information about the range of emotional shift incidents, including an example, and about the numbers of incidents and respondents.

Table 16  
Rank Ordered Summary of Negative After Disability Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of ESIs</th>
<th>Number of Respondents/ESI Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Experienced a sense of loss of control over physical health and/or life activities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Denied impacts of disability</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Concerned about physical symptoms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>WCB issues before instruction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experienced a sense of loss of control over physical health or life.

Emotional shift incidents that described: (a) fear related to prolonged incapacity, (b) depression resulting from inactivity, (c) helplessness after an injury, and (d) the complete unexpectedness of an injury were included in this category. One respondent reported that she felt that she had no choice but to agree to surgery. Another person talked about deep disappointment after undergoing surgery because of limited improvement in his shoulder. For one respondent, the initial diagnosis of her problem was wrong and the treatment prescribed on the basis of the incorrect diagnosis worsened her condition greatly. The timing of an injury angered a respondent who was
beginning to think about retirement. A total of 24 incidents, reported by 13 (54.2%) people, were grouped in this category. As one respondent explained: "You know you got this job there, everything was doing fine up to that point and then you are cut off, just as if the rug has been pulled out from under you - it's something very unexpected."

Denied impacts of disability.

The common theme in the emotional shift incidents collected together in this category was the reluctance to accept the need for a job change because of altered physical activity tolerances. Respondents stated that they did not want to admit to themselves that their physical activity limitations were permanent. They held on to the hope that they would eventually return to normal again and simply go back to work in their jobs with their former employers. A total of eight (33.3%) people reported eight incidents in this category. The theme of this category was expressed clearly by one respondent: "I still believe if you are able to work you can go back to your job and that's where I am up to today."

Concerned about physical symptoms.

In this category, the emotional shift incidents related to the respondents' reactions to physical symptoms either at the time of the injury or after the disability was acknowledged as permanent. A respondent reported that she was scared when she lost all sensation in her hand and wrist. Another respondent talked about feeling badly that it was too late to correct the improper healing of a fracture in his ankle. A third respondent complained about inadequate care from her family doctor and specialist because she wanted more information about treatment regimes that were helping other dermatitis suffers and her physicians did not give her this information. In all, five (20.8%) individuals discussed a total of seven incidents which were placed in this
category. One respondent described her symptoms: "I started losing feeling in my hand and my wrist and it was scary because I didn't know what was going on and then I started dropping things on people."

**WCB issues prior to instruction.**

Some respondents talked about the problems that they had in communicating with WCB officers and in trusting the information given to them by WCB officers. One respondent related that he accepted that he had to make a change in his job in order to become reemployed and developed a plan on his own for making a job change. However, when he presented his plan to his Vocational Rehabilitation Consultant the plan was rejected. A second respondent said that he had no trust in WCB officers at first because of comments he had heard other claimants make about their problems interacting with WCB officers. A third respondent stated that she agreed to attend the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program in spite of her feeling that she did not need job search training because attendance at the Program was a condition of continued receipt of compensation benefits. For this category a total of four (16.6%) people related six separate incidents. One respondent related an illustrative incident: "I was forever every day explaining to somebody what happened. I said, look - I spent 2 1/2 hours talking to that fellow yesterday. Go ask him, it's all written down. Well, he says,...I need a separate report".

**Before Instruction**

One positive category and two negative categories were identified in the before instruction time period. The positive category related to the participants' eagerness to attend the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program. The larger negative
category contained emotional shift incidents relating to respondents’ concerns about attending the Program.

Positive Before Instruction Category

Table 17 gives information about the positive before instruction category according to the parameters of range and number of emotional shift incidents and number of respondents.

Table 17
Details of Positive Before Instruction Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of ESIs</th>
<th>Number of Respondents/ESI Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eager to attend program</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eager to attend program.

The emotional shift incidents placed in this category described the positive reactions of respondents who wanted to attend the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program. They used words like: (a) eager, (b) excited, (c) happy, and (d) hopeful to convey their reactions. Two respondents stated that they wanted to attend the Program because they needed jobs. Another two respondents looked forward to attending the Program because participating in a career planning and job search skills program would be a novel experience for them. One respondent said that he wanted to attend the Program in order to get an opportunity to talk about personal issues relating to his feelings about being injured and the impact of his disability on his family. This
category was created to include a total of nine incidents reported by six (25%) individuals. One respondent's comment was very representative of this category: "When I was phoned regarding the Program I was happy to go because I thought maybe with all the other people and the teacher, something would come up for me out of it."

**Negative Before Instruction Categories**

Table 18 presents a rank ordered summary of the two negative categories in the before instruction time period. The category descriptions following the table outline the range and number of emotional shift incidents and the number of respondents for each category.

**Table 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of ESIs</th>
<th>Number of Respondents/ESI Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Negative responses to referral to Program</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Concerned about the future before starting Program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Negative responses to referral to program.**

The emotional shift incidents grouped together in this category covered a spectrum of negative responses ranging through: (a) disdain, (b) skepticism and apprehension, (c) incomprehension, (d) surprise, and (e) a waste of time. Two
respondents stated that they felt that attendance at the Program would be a waste of their time. One respondent said that his feeling was based on the fact that he already had a career redirection plan. The second respondent was hoping that a further medical investigative procedure ordered by his doctor would show that he would recover sufficiently to return to his former job and therefore, he would not require assistance with career redirection. Another respondent said that she was disdainful of the Program initially because she felt that almost everybody knew how to find a job. One respondent who was a shipyard worker with 20 years experience talked about his skepticism about what the Program could do for him. A fifth respondent related that she did not understand how important participating in the Program would be for her when she was invited to attend the Program. This category included a total of 10 incidents reported by six (25%) people. As one respondent stated: "Well it was something that I didn't expect. It was nothing I knew anything about. I hadn't been involved in any programs with the WCB before that so I didn't know what to expect."

**Concerned about the future before starting the program.**

The common element in three of the four emotional shift incidents included in this category was uncertainty about a future direction. One respondent was unsure about sorting out some job options for himself when the jobs that he thought would be available in the future were both low-paying and unsuitable for him. A second respondent was confused about what to do in the future and the third respondent was uncertain about the future because his initial plan was not endorsed by his VRC. The fourth respondent stated that he lacked confidence before starting the Program. These four incidents were reported by four (16.6%) individuals. The theme of this category was expressed in the words of one respondent as: "Well, before the Program, before I even knew about the Program I really didn't know what I was going to do."
After Instruction

Eleven positive categories, all referring to the benefits of participating in the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program, were identified in the after instruction time period. Seven negative categories were established for this time period. The largest negative category contained emotional shift incidents relating to participants' issues with the WCB.

Positive After Instruction Categories

Table 19 lists the eleven positive after instruction categories in order of rank. The category descriptions following the table contain facts about the range and number of emotional shift incidents in each category and the number of respondents for each category.

Table 19
Rank Ordered Summary of Positive After Instruction Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of ESIs</th>
<th>Number of Respondents/ESI Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Benefited from participating in program</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Optimistic about the future</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gained confidence from participating in program</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Supported by group during the program</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Helped by instruction on interviews</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefited from participating in the program.

All 26 emotional shift incidents placed in this category referred to the benefits of attending and participating in the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program. A total of 16 respondents (66.6% of the participants interviewed) stated that they found participating in the Program helpful.

The emotional shift incidents placed in this category logically fall into two subcategories: (a) task-related benefits and (b) self-esteem/relationship benefits. The task-related benefits reported by respondents referred to the acquisition of career planning and job search skills. Three respondents reported that they learned new information and skills during the Program. Two respondents explained that the Program gave them direction and energy for job search. Another two respondents stated that they established goals and identified job options.

The self-esteem/relationship benefits reported by the respondents referred to the development of self-awareness and emotional support from the other participants. One respondent reported that he became aware that, prior to attending the Program, he had been feeling sorry for himself and avoiding planning for the future. Another respondent reported that he had enjoyed the brand new experience of getting career planning assistance and being a member of a support group. Three respondents stated that they
found having the opportunity to share their experiences with other individuals in a similar situation helpful. One respondent reported that he liked participating in the development of the norms that guided the group interaction during the Program. A respondent summed up his experience of participating in the Program: "It got me going in the right direction and it also gave me a lot more energy to be able to go out and look for a job".

**Optimistic about the future.**

More than 80% of the participants who were interviewed stated that they were optimistic about the future after completing the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program. Six respondents based their optimism on the fact that they had started following through on a career redirection plan that they were confident would help them become reemployed. Another group of six respondents expected to be successful in their search for a new job. A third group of six respondents were developing career redirection plans that they were sure they would be able to complete. Two respondents stated that they were optimistic about the future because they always have a positive approach to life. One respondent based his optimism on the fact that he liked his new job. In total, 25 emotional shift incidents reported by 20 (83.3%) people were placed in this category. One respondent expressed his overall optimism in the words: "I am generally optimistic about the future. Definitely optimistic and I definitely think there are lots of jobs out there. It's just a matter of finding something that's going to be suitable for me."

**Gained confidence from participating in the program.**

Eleven respondents reported that the Program gave them confidence. There were three factors cited as the source of confidence. Some respondents took
confidence from the fact that they had learned that they did have options for reemployment. Other respondents were encouraged by the realization that they had transferable skills that could be used in new jobs. Four respondents explained that their confidence had grown out of the support they got from the other participants during the Program. One respondent talked about deriving confidence from the message given during the Program that individuals must take control of planning for their employment future. A respondent commented that she had continued to feel confident after the Program had finished. In all, 11 (45.8%) respondents reported 20 emotional shift incidents that were grouped in this category. One respondent expressed confidence in the following statement: "It helped me in setting my goals on a new career and a new direction".

**Supported by group during the program.**

All the emotional shift incidents placed in this category related to the establishment of bonds of friendship and emotional support among the groups of participants. Several respondents talked about how comforting it was to meet and get to know people who were trying to cope with the same kinds of changes that they were attempting to handle. One respondent expressed a wish for a newsletter to help him keep in touch with the people he had met during the Program and to assist him in continuing to access their help and support. Two respondents said that they enjoyed having the opportunity to meet new people and get their perspectives on common issues and concerns. Two respondents used the term friendship to describe the relationship that they felt they had established with other participants in their group. The total number of emotional shift incidents in this category was 15 and these incidents were reported by 10 (41.6%) people. The following statement is representative of the incidents included in this category: "Well, one of the highest
points was when I met everybody in the Program....The second highest point was
talking about your problems with everybody else and everybody else listening and
understanding".

Helped by instruction on interviews.
The emotional shift incidents included in this category all refer to the benefits that
the respondents felt resulted from the instruction on informational interviews and job
interviews during the Program. Some respondents appreciated having the opportunity
to practice job interviews because many years had elapsed since their last interview.
Others valued the improvement in their interview skills and the reduction in their
anxiety about completing interviews. In this category, a total of eight (33.3%) people
reported 11 incidents. One respondent outlined the benefit of instruction on job
interviews: "When we did the job interviews...I found that to be really helpful so
that when I do go now to look for a job I'm more aware of what I need to say
and do".

Helped by instruction on resumes.
All the emotional shift incidents grouped in this category deal with the
respondents' reports on the usefulness of the instruction and assistance on resumes
provided during the Program. There was a range of knowledge about resumes among
the respondents which went from one respondent who had never written a resume to
another respondent who appreciated the opportunity to refine his resume. Seven
respondents (29.2%) reported a total of eight incidents in this category. The general
opinion of the respondents in this category was expressed well by one person who
stated: "I found resumes and the development of resumes very, very helpful. It's
something I had never done before ever, I'd always had a job at one time or another, so I found that very helpful."

**Helped by instruction on transferable skills.**

All the emotional shift incidents placed in this category related to the encouragement that respondents got from learning about the transferability of their skills to alternate occupations. They reported that knowledge of their transferable skills opened up job options for the future and made them feel more hopeful about searching for a job. Five (20.8%) respondents reported a total of six incidents that were included in this category. As one respondent put it: "I realized that I have other skills that I can put in use for my life."

**Helped by instruction on self-assessment.**

The five emotional shift incidents included in this category all referred to the respondents' feelings about the benefits of the self-assessment activities in the Program. The respondents liked receiving confirmation of their knowledge of their personal attributes. The incidents placed in this category were reported by five (20.8%) respondents. One respondent gave the following example: "The wheel that we made up has been very helpful in sort of just determining what my expectations are".

**Supported by instructors.**

In this category, two (8.3%) respondents related a total of three emotional shift incidents which described the support that the respondents got from the Program instructors. The respondents talked about receiving confirmation of plans for the future and being encouraged by the confidence and strength of the instructors. One of the respondents described his experience of support as: "You [instructor] seem to
exude a lot of confidence and I think that rubs off on the people you come in contact with so I thought that was really good."

**Helped by instruction on job leads.**

This category included two emotional shift incidents, each reported by a separate respondent, which described the instruction on job leads as a high point of the Program. In total, two respondents (8.3%) recounted two incidents which were placed in this category. One of the respondents stated: "the sources of job leads. That was good too."

**Settling into a retraining program.**

The two emotional shift incidents placed in this category both related to a respondent's participation in a training course. One respondent explained that she was adjusting to being a student and a second respondent stated that he was enjoying taking upgrading classes. Two respondents (8.3%) related the two incidents included in this category. The following statement is typical of the incidents placed in this category: "Right now I'm doing this course on computers and then probably bookkeeping and accounting and all that stuff so I'm doing okay."

**Negative After Instruction Categories**

Table 20 gives a rank ordered summary of the seven negative after instruction categories. In the category descriptions following the table details of emotional shift incidents range and number and number of respondents is given for each category.
Table 20

Rank Ordered Summary of Negative After Instruction Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of ESIs</th>
<th>Number of Respondents/ESI Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WCB issues after instruction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unsure about the future</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pessimistic about the future</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disliked participants' complaints and negative attitudes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Disliked self-assessment activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Disliked program content</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unsupported by the instructors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WCB issues after instruction.

The emotional shift incidents placed in this category were different from the WCB issues described in the earlier after disability category. These incidents identified issues that arose after the respondents had completed the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program. Several of the incidents in this category had common themes. Five respondents were disgruntled about the location of the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program because they had to commute long distances on a daily basis to attend the Program, or they had to be away from their families for the duration of the Program, or they were exposed to the complaints and grumblings of claimants participating in other programs in the same location. Several respondents complained that they received no help with reemployment planning from their VRC's after the
Program. Another respondent said that he experienced a great deal of stress from trying to meet the requirements for receiving compensation benefits when he felt that he should be in school taking upgrading courses. Three other respondents related that they were overwhelmed by the task of searching for a suitable new job. One respondent was concerned about how to integrate his need for a high salary and his spouse's career with his struggle to find suitable job vacancies for himself. One respondent reported that he wanted an official mechanism for keeping in touch with the colleagues that he met while attending the Program. In all, 13 (54.2%) people related a total of 27 emotional shift incidents which were placed in this category. One respondent expressed his concern in the following statement: "Yes, that's [job search] a big job. Stressful. It is, it's very stressful. It's hard because you need three to five job search [contacts] per day and you know, you just don't know where to go. It's really hard but I'm doing it."

Unsure About the Future

The emotional shift incidents that demonstrated that respondents were unsure or ambivalent about what the future held for them were put in this category. Respondents used words like: (a) frustrated, (b) confused, (c) baffled, (d) scared, (e) unsure, and (f) ambivalent to describe their state of mind in these incidents. One respondent was frustrated with his new job because he was making less money and he had not been able to take his family on a vacation in the past year. Four respondents were unsure about the future because they did not have job options identified or a plan for returning to work. Two respondents were uncertain about the future because they were still resisting the fact that they would have to make a job change in order to be reemployed. Another respondent insisted that it is impossible to predict the future so he concentrates on trying to cope with the present. A total of 11 incidents were identified
words: "I'm definitely unsure about the future. I wouldn't say I'm pessimistic but I'm very unsure. I still don't know what I want to do which for me is bad."

**Pessimistic About the Future.**

The common theme in the seven emotional shift incidents which were placed in this category was the lack of a goal or direction for the future which gave the respondents a pessimistic outlook. All four (16.6%) respondents who recounted incidents that were grouped in this category did not have a clearly articulated goal for the future. One of the four respondents stated: "I don't really see much of a future for myself at this time. Things really just don't look good right now."

**Disliked participants' complaints and negative attitudes.**

Six emotional shift incidents dealing with the negative attitudes and grumblings of some of the participants were placed in this category. The magnitude of the respondents' reactions to other participants' complaints and negativity ranged from being annoyed about complaints interrupting the Program agenda to feelings of not wanting to attend the Program some days because of the negative atmosphere created by the complainers. A total of six (25%) respondents recounted the six incidents that were placed in this category. One respondent described this issue in the statement: "So just by listening to everybody's complaints, that's what the low point, because when we were discussing that we, we had to stop the Program."

**Disliked self assessment activities.**

A few respondents disliked the self assessment activities in the first part of the Program. Two emotional shift incidents related to complaints about the amount of paperwork required in the self assessment activities. One respondent stated that he did
paperwork required in the self assessment activities. One respondent stated that he did not appreciate the value of the self assessment exercises until later in the Program and one respondent said that he did not understand the point of the self assessment activities. Three (12.5%) respondents cited a total of four incidents that were placed in this category. One respondent explained: "Well sometimes when we were filling out some of the graphs and stuff like that, I found it kind of tedious and sort of like school."

**Disliked program content.**

Four emotional shift incidents were recounted by respondents that specified parts of the Program content that the respondents found either surprising or incomprehensible. Two respondents stated that they expected the Program to focus more on the participants' disabilities than on their needs for career planning. One respondent stated that he did not understand the concept of transferable skills fully. Another respondent felt pressured by the expectation of searching for a job even though he did not know how to job search. A total of three (12.5%) respondents described four incidents that were placed in this category. One of the respondents said: "I thought it [Program] should have dealt more with the person being injured and then trying to rejoin the workforce in a new career, not what it dealt with."

**Unsupported by instructors.**

This category contained a total of three emotional shift incidents which described the disappointment that two (8.3%) respondents felt with respect to the Program instructors. One respondent expressed his belief that the instructors could not fully understand the problems that the participants were facing in trying to return to work because the instructors had not suffered an injury. The second respondent stated that
he would have appreciated more personalized help and counselling from the instructors. One respondent explained his perspective in this statement: "I think the low point was not having,...the instructors understand what the people in the classroom were going through. I think until you actually go through it yourself you really don't understand."

**Category Analysis Summary**

Overall, the positive categories (20) outweighed the negative categories (14). There were substantially more positive categories in the before disability time period (6 positive, 1 negative) and the after instruction time period (11 positive, 7 negative). The category analysis demonstrated that the respondents benefited from participating in the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program in terms of confidence building, group support, skill development, and goal setting.

**Content Analysis of Interviews**

A career redirection process was identified as part of the analysis of the categories that the respondents reported during the interviews. The career redirection process was found to contain six stages: (a) strong attachment to pre-disability job, (b) injury or illness accompanied by sense of loss of control, denial of disability, and/or concern about symptoms, (c) acceptance of permanency of disability, (d) commitment to change, (e) development of a return to work plan, and (f) implementation of the plan. The process is depicted in Figure 2.
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Attachment to Pre-disability Job

At the beginning of the interview the respondents were asked to explain the role that working played in their lives. Of the people interviewed, 75% reported that they liked working in their pre-disability jobs. They also spoke about their enjoyment of the social aspects of their jobs and the benefits (medical plans, vacation, etc.) and promotional opportunities associated with their pre-disability jobs. Within the group of respondents, 62.5% stated that they expected to retire from their pre-disability jobs and 25% reported that they hoped to recover sufficiently to return to work in their pre-disability jobs. These responses supported the conclusion that the respondents had strong, positive attachments to their pre-disability jobs. The respondent's vision of the continuation of their employment status quo corresponded to the straight line arrow labeled as working at the beginning of the career redirection process.

Reactions to Injury

When they were asked to tell the story of their injury and disability, 75% of the respondents answered by describing feelings of loss and limitation. They talked about the loss of self-sufficiency, their inability to participate in favourite activities, and their inability to plan for the future. The most significant loss for the majority of respondents was the loss of their valued pre-disability job. These reactions were represented in the first descending mandala of Figure 2.
Acceptance of Disability

The third interview question asked the respondents to identify when they realized that they would not be returning to their pre-disability jobs. The respondents stated that they did not accept the permanency of their disability quickly or easily. Many respondents had lifestyles that were dependent on aspects of their pre-disability jobs like shift schedules that resulted in blocks of time off or personal use of a company vehicle. Accepting the permanency of a disability and the resultant need for a job change was very difficult for these respondents because acceptance of the need for a job change also meant significant lifestyle adjustments. The respondents talked about not accepting their disabilities until many months of treatment had passed with minimal improvement or their doctors told them that they would have to change their jobs. This struggle was represented by the disability arrow and the second descending mandala in Figure 2.

Commitment to Change

The analysis of the emotional shift incident data pointed out clearly that participation in the Career Redirection and Job Search skills Program was instrumental in helping the respondents make a commitment to change jobs and to plan for their reemployment. Before becoming disabled, the respondents had no reason to investigate job options because they were satisfied with their pre-disability jobs. After their disability they felt unprepared to select new job goals and to search for employment. Participating in the program gave the respondents the confidence, knowledge, and skills that they needed to start to plan for their reemployment. They identified their marketable assets by completing the self-assessment activities. The
other participants gave the respondents confidence and emotional support. Combining their knowledge about their transferable skills with information about job opportunities available in the current labour market helped respondents to identify potential job goals. Instruction in writing resumes, information on getting job leads, and practice with interview techniques made the respondents feel more prepared for job search. By the end of the program respondents were progressing along the forward pointing arrows designated as commitment to change, develop a return to work plan and implement the plan shown in Figure 2.

Effect of Compensation on Career Redirection

Several of the respondents expressed an ambivalence about their relationship with WCB. Some respondents talked about their distrust of WCB officers and their problems in establishing rapport with their Vocational Rehabilitation Consultants, but they also expressed a willingness to comply with WCB demands in order to maintain receipt of their compensation benefits. For example, one respondent agreed to attend the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program in order to continue to receive compensation benefits even though he felt unable to compete in the current labour market with his present skills. This respondent confessed that he made many of his contacts with prospective employers by telephone but stated that he felt guilty about not making the contacts in person.

Some respondents related feeling pressured to develop a return to work plan that would be endorsed by WCB. Maintaining the payment of compensation benefits was part of this pressure.

The researcher noted that the availability of income through compensation benefits based on the need for medical treatment may have represented an avenue of
escape for program participants who did not feel ready or able to make a commitment to change.

The Career Redirection Experience

All the themes described in the content analysis are encompassed in a comment made by one respondent: "It's hard enough to be out of a job and to find a job but, being injured as well, I find that very hard to take". The challenge of disability, coupled with unemployment, was a big obstacle for the respondents to overcome.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter begins with a summary of the results followed by a discussion of the findings for each of the measures, the participant's feedback and the findings from the interviews. Implications for career intervention theory, and implications for the design of career redirection programs for both physically disabled and general populations are discussed. The chapter closes with recommendations for future research.

Summary

The researcher undertook this study to investigate the type of job search program that would meet the needs of workers involuntarily displaced from their jobs as a result of an employment-related injury or disease. The subjects in this study represented a group of participants that have not been included in previous investigations of the impact of unemployment or research on the effects of job search programs. However, this study is linked with previous studies on the impact of unemployment on disabled individuals because the subjects shared three of the four characteristics identified by Gower (1988) that are associated with the lower labour force participation rates of disabled people: (a) physical activity limitations, (b) low education level, and (c) frustration with trying to overcome employment barriers. All of the subjects in this study had permanent physical activity limitations. The average educational level for the subjects in this study was 10.8 years. The analysis of the follow-up interviews documented the frustration with having to change jobs that many of this study's
participants expressed. The subjects in this study differed from Gower's subjects in that they all had been employed prior to their participation in the treatment program. This study endeavored to build upon Flynn's (1991) investigation of how to match job search programs to client attributes.

The results of this study showed that physically disabled WCB clients benefited from participating in the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program. The researcher looked at the impact of the treatment program on the four outcome measures of employment, depression, self-esteem, and attribution. Eight weeks after completing the treatment program 60.5% of the participants were working in new jobs, were self-sufficient in job search, or were engaged in training that would lead to employment. The treatment program was found to be effective in the reduction of depression but significant differences were not found between the pretest and posttest mean scores for self-esteem, attribution or causation. However, the direction of the findings suggested that the participants were more in control of their lives following treatment. The analysis of the interview data supported this conclusion. Participants reported that they benefited greatly in areas such as enhanced job search skills, clearer vocational direction, and improved morale. After eight weeks, the levels of scores at posttest were maintained for depression, self-esteem, attribution and the sense of having control over one's unemployment. However, the changes identified on the internal causes and stability subscales at the end of treatment were not maintained eight weeks after treatment. The subjects reverted to giving stable and internal reasons for their unemployment.

The analysis of the feedback questionnaires showed that the participants found the treatment program informative and helpful. The majority (93.5%) of respondents rated the overall program as helpful to very helpful.
The emotional shift incident analysis completed on the transcripts of the follow-up interviews demonstrated that the respondents gained confidence, developed goals, enhanced their job search skills, and derived support from the other participants during the treatment program. A career redirection process was identified from the responses that participants made to the interview questions. The six stages in the career redirection process are: (a) strong attachment to pre-disability job, (b) injury or illness accompanied by sense of loss of control, denial of disability, or concern about symptoms, (c) acceptance of permanency of disability, (d) commitment to change, (e) development of a return to work plan, and (f) implementation of the plan. WCB clients who refused to accept the need for a job change or who developed return to work plans not endorsed by the WCB may get sidetracked from the career redirection process and become involved in fighting to maintain their compensation benefits.

Discussion of Findings

Findings Related to Employment

Subjects in this study were disabled and, as a result of this disability, were unable to return to their former jobs. They entered the treatment program as unemployed, but job ready, which was defined as ready to plan for employment. It was observed that subjects who concluded that they were not ready to plan for employment did not complete the program.

The results of the eight week follow-up showed that 60.5% of the subjects were working, self-sufficient in job search or engaged in training that would lead to employment. The other 39.5% of the sample were either unable to engage in return to
work activities due to a need for further medical treatment or assessment (34.8%) or were not engaged in any form of return to work activity (4.7%).

These results clearly showed that the treatment program was helpful in assisting participants through the career redirection process. The results also identified the need for careful screening of referrals to the program to ensure that participation in the program is not hindered by unresolved medical or compensation issues.

**Findings Related to Depression**

The results of the analysis of the Beck Depression Inventory showed that the subjects were not severely depressed but generally fell into the mildly depressed category. Nevertheless, the treatment program did have a positive impact on the subjects' level of depression. As outlined in Chapter 4 the adjusted pooled mean score dropped from 5.7 to 3.8, a significant difference, moving the mean score from the mild depression range into the no depression range.

The lack of high scores on this measure may be a function of the fact that all subjects were receiving Workers' Compensation benefits for the duration of the study. Unlike subjects of other studies (Kessler, House, & Turner, 1987; Studnicka et al., 1991) they had not yet had to grapple with the loss of their incomes or the loss of stature in their families or communities. Consequently, they were not exhibiting many of the negative effects associated with long-term unemployment.

**Findings Related to Self-esteem**

Participation in the treatment program had a minimal effect on self-esteem. It is important to note that the subjects began the program with fairly high self-esteem and
had not yet experienced the effects of long-term unemployment. As Wells and Marwell (1976) stated, RSE derived scales measure only self-affection and self-affection is only impacted by long-term unemployment (Sheeran & McCarthy, 1990). Therefore, it is not surprising that the subjects in this study did not demonstrate a significant change in self-esteem since they had not experienced financial hardship or a change of status in their families or communities.

**Findings Relating to Attribution**

Two measures of attribution were used in this study: The Attribution about Unemployment Scale (Gurney, 1981) and the Causal Dimension Scale (Russell, 1982).

The results of the analysis of the findings of the Attribution about Unemployment Scale show that the subjects began the treatment program attributing their unemployment to internal causes and maintained this focus up to eight weeks after treatment. This finding is not surprising given that the subjects could explain their unemployment in terms of permanent disability resulting from work-related injuries.

Significant findings were demonstrated from pretest to posttest on the controllability subscale of the Causal Dimension Scale. Scores increased on the internal causation and decreased on the stability subscale over this time frame, but not significantly. The subjects' scores indicated that following treatment they were attributing the cause of their unemployment internally, that it was in their control to do something about it, and that they were unstable enough to consider action. The subjects understood that it was possible to make a career change.

The stability subscale increased significantly, and the internal causation subscale decreased significantly on follow-up indicating that the clients were becoming more stable and less willing to make changes. This may well be attributable to the fact that
they had worked out vocational plans during the program, were now busy implementing them and were not willing to consider changing them at follow-up. This could be interpreted as an indicator that the subjects were more focused or goal directed than at posttest.

Findings Related to Participants' Feedback

The analysis of these questionnaires indicated that the program was very well received since 93.6% of the subjects rated the overall program helpful or above. Thirty of the 31 specific topic modules in the program were rated as helpful to very helpful by at least 77.0% of the respondents. No component of the program was rated as not being helpful.

The majority of responses to the overall impression question on all four questionnaires related positive impressions. These positive impressions were sorted into four subcategories: (a) general benefit, (b) benefit from specific topics, (c) motivation and confidence, and (d) program delivery. Not all subcategories were required for the responses on each questionnaire. Most responses were of the one word variety such as good and were placed in the general benefit subcategory. The benefit from specific topics subcategory contained items like job options, decision-making skills, and other specific components of the program. The motivation and confidence subcategory consisted of items such as confidence building, support from associating with other people in similar circumstances, and fostering of a positive attitude. The program delivery subcategory contained comments on the instruction and instructors as well as course scheduling.

Responses to the question about changes focused on structural concerns such as class schedules, more time for interview practice, more individual attention, more focus
on disability and its impact, more time to discuss Workers' Compensation Board issues, and suggestions to change the venue of the program. There was no agreement amongst the respondents as to scheduling or location except that the program should not be held on Workers' Compensation Board premises.

The question about any other information was answered infrequently, generally repeated the contents of the previous changes question, and did not add to the information already gathered.

Findings Related to the Category Analysis

The analysis of the data on emotional shift incidents demonstrated that the respondents benefited from participating in the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program in terms of confidence building, group support, skill development and goal setting. The career redirection process was evident in the categories of emotional shift incidents. Specific categories of emotional shifts incidents matched individual phases in the career redirection process.

The respondents had a background of strong attachment to their pre-disability jobs with no plans to change their occupations. Four categories pointed to this finding: (a) liked working in pre-disability job, (b) expected to remain in pre-disability job for rest of career, (c) enjoyed social aspects of pre-disability job, and (d) enjoyed benefits of pre-disability job. These four categories corresponded with the working phase of the career redirection process.

After their injuries, the respondents were focused on their physical symptoms, the disruption in their lives, and the prospect of ongoing disability. Three categories supported this finding: (a) experienced a sense of loss of control over physical health or life activities, (b) denied impacts of disability, and (c) concerned about physical
symptoms. These categories paralleled the treatment and disability phases of the career redirection process. The acceptance of disability was documented in the learned to cope with disability and pain category.

The commitment to change and development of a plan phases of the career redirection process were evidenced in four categories: (a) benefited from participating in the program, (b) optimistic about the future, (c) gained confidence from participating in the program, and (d) supported by the group during the program. All the categories that related to specific program topics, such as helped by instruction on interviews and helped by instruction on resumes, also corresponded with the commitment to change and development of a plan phases.

The career redirection process did not proceed from start to finish for all the respondents. Two categories of emotional shift incidents demonstrated that a few respondents resisted making a commitment to change: (a) unsure about the future, and (b) pessimistic about the future.

Implications for Career Intervention Theory

The delineation of the program parameters that contribute to the effectiveness of career interventions has progressed slowly in the last two decades (Flynn, 1991). Agencies set up to assist unemployed adults, both non-disabled and disabled, have tended to rely on the behaviorally-based Job Finding Club model developed by Azrin and other researchers (Azrin, Flores, & Kaplan, 1975; Azrin & Philip, 1979; Azrin, Philip, Thienes-Hontos & Besalel, 1980; Mills, 1983; Cote, 1984, 1985). Keith, Engelkes, and Winborn (1977) investigated the benefits of providing self-help training materials to unemployed job-seekers and found that the materials increased both cognitive and behavioral activities in the experimental group. Borgen and Amundson
(1984) recommended support groups as a means of helping job seekers evaluate their options, improve their job search strategies, and cope with job rejections. Vandergoot (1987) concluded that job-seeking skills training is valuable and can be enhanced by group and peer support methods.

After reviewing career intervention evaluation in the fields of career psychology, educational instruction, and psychotherapy Fretz (1981) found a limited number of studies that dealt inadequately with client attribute and treatment interactions, specification of treatment parameters, and definition of appropriate outcome measures for people attached to the labour force. Following Fretz's (1981) research design strategies, Flynn (1991) evaluated the effectiveness of three self-directed job search methods. The results supported the use of group-based job search strategies.

Fretz (1981) recommended that describing career interventions in terms of the three treatment parameters of: (a) content domain (self-knowledge, decision skills, and occupational information), (b) interpersonal context (one-to-one counselling, group counselling, or self or computer-assisted programs), and (c) degree of structure (highly structured, semi-structured, or unstructured) would increase the specificity of knowledge that would be obtained from career intervention evaluations. Fretz also recommended that evaluators use measures with established reliability and validity, block subjects according to attributes, and utilize several outcome criteria including post-treatment and follow-up criteria.

This study's treatment program included the three elements of content domain specified by Fretz (1981). The self-assessment activities were designed to increase the subjects' self-knowledge. Instruction in decision-making was provided during the program and the subjects were encouraged to set job goals. During the program, the subjects were given labour market information and taught research methods like informational interviews for obtaining occupational information. Both group
counselling and self-directed career planning were incorporated into the treatment program. The subjects were blocked on gender, level of disability and length of time out of work. The four outcome measures of employment, attribution, depression and self-esteem were used. The attribution, depression, and self-esteem scales had proven reliability and validity. Both post-treatment and follow-up measures were taken.

This study's findings suggested that effective career intervention programs should contain all the content elements relevant to the identification of a feasible occupational goal, provide for both self-analysis and group interaction, and be led by a career intervention specialist. In addition, successful career intervention programs should be conceptualized in terms of the three separate, but time-dependent phases of goal setting, action planning, and employment search. The action planning phase is contingent on the goal setting phase because the person's planning needs (skill training, coaching on interview techniques, etc.) result directly from the job goal that the individual chooses. Job search training should be delayed until the individual has identified a job goal and has acquired the qualifications necessary to seek employment in the chosen occupation. Therefore, each phase has a natural outcome measure: (a) job goal for the goal setting phase, (b) a plan for the action planning phase, and (c) a job for the employment phase.

The apparent overlap between the content domain element of self-knowledge and the interpersonal context element of self-directed activities in this study suggests that the further development of career intervention theory would be better served by a focus on the identification of the conditions necessary to produce the outcomes of job goal, action plan, and employment rather than trying to determine the match between an array of personal characteristics and all possible instruction methods and learning environments.
For individuals who did not expect to be unemployed, one of the conditions that may be necessary for the formation of a new job goal is the opportunity to grieve the loss of the former job. In their investigation of the dynamics of unemployment, Borgen and Amundson (1984) described the experience of unemployment as an emotional roller coaster and developed patterns to describe the reactions exhibited by six groups within their experimental population. The career redirection process identified in this study resembled the pattern for Group A in Borgen and Amundson's study. Group A responded to the loss of their jobs with initial shock and anger followed by worry and anxiety. Eventually Group A accepted the job loss and approached job search with anticipation. After their injuries, the subjects in this study focused on their physical symptoms and the prospect of ongoing disability. With time they learned to cope with their disabilities. After participating in the treatment program, the majority of the subjects in this study accepted the need for a job change and looked to the future with optimism and confidence. Both reaction patterns included an initial trough followed by an upswing. The field of trauma counselling may give career intervention evaluators guidelines for determining an individual's readiness to start thinking about a new job goal.

Implications for Career Redirection Programs

Being ready to plan for reemployment was one of the referral criteria for participation in the treatment program but the analysis of the data on the participants' emotional shift incidents indicated that some participants had not adjusted to the change in their employment status. The treatment program did not allow much time for the participants to talk about their feelings about being disabled or the experience of
losing their jobs because of their disabilities. Since their disability was the reason for their unemployment and their need to make a job change, the participants required the opportunity to explore their concerns about their disability in order to incorporate the reality of their physical activity limitations into their vocational construct systems and to use this reality in planning for their employment future.

The subjects developed their vocational construct systems (Neimeyer, 1992; Kortas, Neimeyer & Prichard, 1992) in the context of long and successful work careers in physically demanding, lower education jobs that they planned to stay in for the remainder of their careers. Their vocational construct systems were not highly differentiated. Their perceptions of the world of work were limited to their career experience. While they understood their fields of work well at their own level of participation, they knew little about other occupations or industries. They were accustomed to using these construct systems to organize and understand their work experience, anticipate their future employment experiences and to set job goals. They started the treatment program with vocational construct systems that did not match the reality of their employment situations and were confronted with the task of reorganizing their construct systems to incorporate disability, the experience of being unemployed, and the need for a job change. As a result of their restricted knowledge of occupations and sectors outside their own, the participants were reluctant to trust in the transferability of their skills to other jobs and industries. It appears that improving the level of differentiation in an individual's vocational construct system may enhance their ability to identify job options based on their transferable skills.

Successful career redirection may also require improvement in levels of integration in vocational construct systems, especially for individuals with recently acquired physical activity limitations. The treatment program was designed to assist participants to develop new vocational constructs about physical activity tolerances,
transferable skills, interests, and values, and to combine these new constructs into a coherent pattern to be used as a basis for making rational career decisions. Kortas, Neimeyer and Prichard (1992) found that higher levels of integration in construct systems were associated with a rational decision-making style while lower levels of integration were related to intuitive decision-making styles. Career redirection programs must be structured to give participants all the time they need to integrate their new constructs fully and also provide them with the support and direction that they require to integrate their new vocational constructs into a meaningful pattern. Otherwise, participants will either revert to using their former, inappropriate constructs for identifying job goals or make intuitive career decisions based on inadequate information. Regardless of which strategy they use, participants who do not form sufficiently integrated and differentiated vocational construct systems to make rational career decisions during the treatment program will be unsure or pessimistic about the future at the end of the program and may get sidetracked into a battle to maintain benefits on the basis of further medical treatment.

This study demonstrated that the environment in which participants are challenged to restructure their vocational construct systems is critical. Desmond and Seligman (1977) reported that group-based vocational counselling is effective for rehabilitation clients and, more recently, the job-search group model was confirmed as an effective strategy for building job-search skills, enhancing self-esteem, and providing support (Amundson & Borgen, 1987, 1988; Borgen, Amundson, & Biela, 1987). Rife and Belcher (1993) found that unemployed peers provided the most highly valued supportive messages to the older worker. Amundson (1993) suggested that unemployed clients need the opportunity to express their ideas and needs and to be taken seriously by others. These opportunities arise in group based job search programs. Findings from the analysis of the data on the participants' emotional shift
incidents in this study replicated these earlier findings of the benefits of the support of peers. Although the subjects in this study did not have the opportunity to maintain membership in their treatment program group while job searching, it is reasonable to expect that job seekers would continue to feel supported by a group of their peers while they test the accuracy of their vocational decisions by approaching prospective employers for jobs.

Shulman (1984) stated that a group needs a leader to help the members form a mutual aid system to provide reciprocal help and support. Findings from this study's analysis of emotional shift incidents provided confirmation of the benefit of a group leader. Also, since many of the benefits of participating in the program reported by the participants referred to gaining new information and skills, it is reasonable to conclude that an effective career redirection program requires an expert who can lead the participants through a career planning process and teach job search skills.

The participants held poorly differentiated vocational construct systems at the start of the treatment program. During the program they were encouraged to form new vocational constructs to fit their marketable assets and alternate occupations that would be available to them in the current labour market. The integration of these new constructs required reorganization which took time. Not all the participants were able to complete the reorganization of their construct systems by the end of the career exploration segment of the treatment program.

The results of this study suggested that the needs of Workers' Compensation Board clients may be met more effectively by separating the career planning and job search components of the program into two independent programs. Clients who are ready to plan for reemployment would be able to take the time they require to discuss the impact that their disabilities are having on all spheres of their lives and to identify job options based on a good understanding of their physical activity tolerances,
transferable skills, and labour market opportunities. Clients would not attend the job search component of the program until they had identified a feasible job goal, had completed all necessary assessment or training, and were ready to start an active job search. The results of this study also indicated that clients would benefit from ongoing support from an instructor and a peer group during their job search.

Limitations and Generalizations of the Study

The researcher expected that the findings of this study would have implications for all unemployed adults, both disabled and non-disabled. The fact that the subjects in this study were Worker's Compensation Board clients was not considered to be a limiting factor by the researcher because the majority of physically disabled adults in Canada can access assistance and services from other national, provincial, or private agencies. As well, the researcher argued that claims for the efficacy of the treatment program could be extended to all unemployed adults since the impact of unemployment is no different for disabled or non-disabled adults (Borgen, Amundson, & Biela, 1987).

After analyzing the quantitative and qualitative data from this study, the researcher concluded that this study's subjects represented a different population from the groups studied in earlier research on unemployment and job-search program design. Although they had been out of the workforce for an average of 1.7 years, the subjects in this study did not fit the definition of long-term unemployed. They were experienced workers who recently had become unemployed due to the ongoing effects of their disability and they were receiving financial assistance through compensation benefits. Therefore, the findings of this study can be generalized to individuals who are
unemployed due to a disability, who need or want to return to work, and are receiving financial assistance.

Desired significant findings were demonstrated on the Beck Depression Inventory. Findings on the Self-esteem Scale, and the internal causality and controllability subscales of the Causal Dimension Scale, though not significant, were increasing and therefore heading in the right direction. However, analysis of the findings of the study demonstrated that there was insufficient power and that a larger sample size was necessary to demonstrate statistical significance.

To assess the effect of pretest on treatment the researcher used a Solomon four-group design. There were no significant differences on any of the measures between the pretest and non-pretest groups. The pretest had no effect on the treatment outcome.

Suggestions for Future Research

The identification of one of the unique characteristics of this study's subjects, the newness of their unemployed status, has significant implications for future research on matching job search program design to client attributes. Previous research in this area has used subjects who had been unemployed long enough to become depressed and to begin to attribute their unemployment to factors outside of themselves. Since the subjects in this study were not depressed and retained their internal attributions, the researcher had to look for explanations not offered in previous research.

Based on the literature from research using long-term unemployed subjects, the researcher assumed that the subjects would be depressed, have low self-esteem, and blame their unemployment on external causes. However, at pretest, the subjects were found to have mild depression, self-esteem scores that gave no indication of a threat to
their feelings of self-worth, and explanations for their unemployment that related to an internal cause, their disabilities. The subjects completed the treatment program. At posttest, they had no depression, their self-esteem scores remained stable and they retained their internal explanations for their unemployment. These findings led the researcher to consider the efficacy of using measures associated with long-term unemployed subjects to describe the attributes of recently unemployed subjects.

Suggestions for alternate measures that may be applied in future research were derived from the interview data and analysis of emotional shift incidents. It became apparent that measures of attitudes about life in general, disability, job satisfaction or the subjects' relationships with their pre-disability employers may correlate with their expectations for a successful return to employment. A stress measure may be more useful than depression and self-esteem measures since the respondents in this study reported apprehension about the future based on the limitations caused by their disability or their lack of knowledge about jobs available in the current labour market rather than their loss of self-esteem. Attributions about the reasons for their disability may be related to their readiness to plan for reemployment. The Causal Dimension Scale could be adapted to assess attributions about disability, rather than other internal causes, by instructing respondents to use their disability as the reference point for responding to the items on the scale. The Attributions about Unemployment Scale could be modified to reflect disability rather than unemployment.

In conclusion, future researchers need to move away from thinking about the attributes of clients who need to change their jobs as fixed or predetermined factors. The essential tasks of career redirection are the formation of new vocational constructs and the integration of these constructs into a vocational self-definition that generates new job options. When designing programs researchers should focus on assisting clients to develop and integrate new themes for vocational decision-making.
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Appendix A

Invitation Letter
Dear Mr./Ms. XXXXXXXX

You have been referred to the Job Search Program at the Workers' Compensation Board (WCB) by your Vocational Rehabilitation Consultant. The program is 14 days in length and takes place in the Leslie R. Peterson Rehabilitation Centre at the WCB complex at 6951 Westminster Highway in Richmond.

This program has been designed to assist you in your efforts in finding a job. While the program is sponsored by the WCB the instructors will not be able to answer questions regarding your claim. Please continue to address these questions either to your Vocational Rehabilitation Consultant or Claims Adjudicator.

I would like to make you aware that in an effort to improve the Job Search Program a research project is being undertaken that will help with this. This project is being undertaken jointly with the University of British Columbia and is part of my work as a graduate student of the university. You will be asked to fill out some forms before and after the program. We will also be contacting you 8 weeks after you complete the program to see how you are doing.

You are under no obligation to participate in this research. You may participate in the group without participating in the research. If you do participate in the research, you can withdraw at any time. However, I would like to assure you that the questionnaires are completely anonymous and will not be linked to any participant in the program.

You will be contacted shortly by telephone to ensure that you have received this letter and to give you a chance to ask any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Henry Harder
Appendix B

Consent Form
I understand that I am taking part in a newly designed Job Search Program (JSP) for Physically Disabled Workers. The program is designed to help injured workers overcome the additional challenges they face in becoming employed due to their injury and resulting disability. The design and evaluation of this JSP is part of the requirements of a doctoral program for ______ ______ _______. The supervision for this research is being provided by Dr. ______ ______ _______ Department Head for the Counselling Psychology Department at the University of British Columbia.

As part of the evaluation of the effectiveness of this program I will be asked to fill out some forms before and after the program. I will also be contacted 8 weeks after I have completed the program to see if I have been able to find a job and to see how I am doing.

All information I present will be anonymous. The forms I fill out will be identified by number and the number will not be linked to me. Filling out these forms will take approximately 30 minutes of time at the beginning and end of the program.

I am free to not participate in this research and if I do participate I may withdraw at any time. I acknowledge the receipt of a copy of this consent for my records.

Date:________________________

Signed:______________________

Witnessed:_____________________

If you have any questions regarding the above procedures please contact _________ at ________.
Appendix C

Demographic Information
Demographic Information

Age __________ Phone number ________________

(FOR FOLLOW-UP)

Gender: Male Female

Type of injury: ____________________________

Percentage of disability (if known): ________

Highest level of education achieved: ________

How long have you been out of the workforce: ________

What was your previous job: ____________________

How long were you employed in your previous job: ________
Appendix D

Feedback 1
FEEDBACK 1

Please think back over the last 5 days. Concentrate on what you found helpful and what you found difficult.

Please read the following items and circle a number on the 5 point scale. Please note that **1 IS THE POOREST RATING** you can give and **5 IS THE BEST RATING** you can give.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I found the <em>Introductory Exercises</em></td>
<td>not helpful</td>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I found the section on <em>Norms and Expectations</em></td>
<td>not helpful</td>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I found <em>The Wheel</em></td>
<td>not helpful</td>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I found the section on the <em>Job Loss Cycle</em></td>
<td>not helpful</td>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I found the section on <em>Marketable Assets</em></td>
<td>not helpful</td>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. I found the section on *Discovering Skills*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I found the *Individual Style Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. I found the *Self-Directed Search*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. I found the section on *Discovering Values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. I found the section on *Discovering Significant Others*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. I found the section on *Discovering Personal Styles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. I found the section on *Discovering Career Options*

   - not helpful
   - helpful
   - very helpful

13. I found the section on the *Art of Putting it all Together*

   - not helpful
   - helpful
   - very helpful

14. Overall, I found the *first five days of the program*

   - not helpful
   - helpful
   - very helpful

15. Please write down your overall impression of the last five days of the program.

16. Please write down any suggestions you have for changing this part of the program.

17. If there is anything that I have not asked you about that you think I should know about please write it down below.
Appendix E

Feedback 2
Please think back over the last 5 days. Concentrate on what you found helpful and what you found difficult.

Please read the following items and circle a number on the 5 point scale. Please note that **1 IS THE POOREST RATING** you can give and **5 IS THE BEST RATING** you can give.

1. I found the section on *The Changing Labour Market*
   - not helpful: 1, 2
   - helpful: 3, 4
   - very helpful: 5

2. I found the section on *Accessing the Labour Market*
   - not helpful: 1, 2
   - helpful: 3, 4
   - very helpful: 5

3. I found the section on *Research*
   - not helpful: 1, 2
   - helpful: 3, 4
   - very helpful: 5

4. I found the *field trip* to the *Richmond Public Library*
   - not helpful: 1, 2
   - helpful: 3, 4
   - very helpful: 5

5. I found the section on *Decision Making*
   - not helpful: 1, 2
   - helpful: 3, 4
   - very helpful: 5
6. I found the section on *Communication Skills*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I found the section on *Information Interviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. I found the section on *Overcoming Barriers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. I found the section on *Action Planning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Overall, I found the second five days of the program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Please write down your overall impression of the last five days of the program.
12. Please write down any suggestions you have for changing this part of the program.

13. If there is anything that I have not asked you about that you think I should know about please write it down below.
Appendix F

Feedback 3
Please think back over the last 4 days. Concentrate on what you found helpful and what you found difficult.

Please read the following items and circle a number on the 5 point scale. Please note that **1 IS THE POOREST RATING** you can give and **5 IS THE BEST RATING** you can give.

1. I found the section on *Setting the Stage*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I found the section on *Getting Job Leads*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I found the section on *Writing the Resume*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I found the section on *Preparing the Cover Letter*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I found the section on *Completing the Application Form*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. I found the section on *Preparing for the Interview*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I found *Practicing for the Interview*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. I found getting *feedback on the interview*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. I found the *final debriefing session*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>a little helpful</th>
<th>no opinion</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Overall, I found the *last four days of the program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not helpful</th>
<th>helpful</th>
<th>very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Please write down your overall impression of the last four days of the program.
12. Please write down any suggestions you have for changing this part of the program.

13. If there is anything that I have not asked you about that you think I should know about please write it down below.
Appendix G

Feedback 4
FEEDBACK 4

On the other feedback sheets you have been asked to rate separate parts of the program. Now that you have completed the program please take a moment to rate the entire program. Before you begin, please think back over the entire length of the program.

1. Overall, I found the *entire fourteen day program*

   | not helpful | helpful | very helpful |
   | 1           | 2       | 3           | 4   | 5   |

2. Please write down your overall impression of the entire program.

3. Please write down any suggestions you have for changing any part of the program.

4. If there is anything that I have not asked you about that you think I should know about please write it down below.
Appendix H

Implementation Checklist
Implementation Checklist

WEEK 1 - DAY 1

1. **Orientation**
   a. Instructor introduces program staff
   b. Participants introduce each other to group

2. **Norms and Expectations**
   a. Instructor prepares list of group's expectations
   b. Instructor explains expectations that will be met, expectations that may be met, and expectations that are not likely to be met
   c. Small groups identify 5 guidelines for large group to follow and 5 behaviours for group to avoid
   d. Instructor leads the large group in preparing a final list of group norms

3. **Factors Underlying Occupational Goals**
   a. Instructor distributes The Wheel handout and describes factors included in the handout
   b. Small groups discuss the importance of the eight factors in the inner circle of the Wheel for career planning
   c. Instructor distributes the handout My Unique Wheel and explains that the participants will fill in the Unique Wheel over Days 2 to 5

4. **Closing**
   a. Instructor reviews the activities of Day 1
b. Instructor asks participants to complete Work/Leisure Experience and Education/Training History sections of their Unique Wheel for homework

c. Instructor requests that participants bring their resumes to the program if they have resumes
Implementation Checklist

WEEK 1 - DAY 2

1. Review and Preview
   a. Instructor welcomes the participants back and invites the group to raise any insights they have on the content of Day 1 and to ask any questions they have about the homework assignment
   b. Instructor leads the group in reviewing the names of all the participants
   c. Instructor briefly introduces the activities for Day 2

2. How It Feels To Be Unemployed
   a. Instructor introduces the topic with a short statement about the different emotions people might experience with unemployment
   b. Pairs of participants are asked to discuss their feelings about being unemployed using questions prepared by the instructor
   c. Participants reform into groups of four to prepare a list of the emotions experienced by members
   d. Instructor reconvenes the large group and asks each small group to report their list of emotions
   e. Instructor summarizes the range of emotions reported and leads the group in a discussion of facts that they learned

3. Marketable Assets
   a. Instructor explains that participants need to view themselves as people with many skills and assets and to market themselves
   b. Instructor explains that participants will learn about their marketable assets through self-assessment exercises and
discussions during Week 1.

c. Instructor asks the participants to record their marketable assets on their Unique Wheels as each area is explored in the program.

4. Discovering Skills by Exploring Successes

a. Instructor explains that the first two marketable assets to be explored will be skills and personal characteristics

b. Instructor defines the term skill and explains the concept of transferable skill.

c. Instructor distinguishes between transferable skills and duties.

d. Instructor explains that skills can be developed to different levels of competence and that different jobs can require varying levels of competency.

e. Instructor explains that knowledge of transferable skills can help to generate job alternatives that require these skills.

f. Instructor presents recalling of successes as a method for identifying transferable skills and characteristics.

g. Instructor asks the participants to write at least two paragraphs describing successes from different areas of their lives.

h. Instructor distributes the handouts Transferable Skills List and Personal Characteristics and offers to help people wanting assistance.

5. Closing

a. Instructor reviews the activities of Day 2

b. Instructor asks the participants to complete the writing and analysis of their success stories for homework.

c. Instructor introduces the Individual Style Survey as a marketable asset and explains that the Survey will help
participants to identify their unique personal style.

d. Instructor distributes the Survey, reviews the instructions and asks participants to complete the Self Appraisal and to have up to three people who know them in different areas of their lives to fill out the Other's Appraisal.

e. Instructor distributes the handout Significant Others Questionnaire, connects the Questionnaire with the appropriate section on the Unique Wheel and asks participants to have the Questionnaire completed for Day 4.

f. Instructor invites the participants to share their impressions of Day 2
Implementation Checklist

WEEK 1 - DAY 3

1. Review and Preview
   a. Instructor welcomes the participants back and invites the group to raise any insights they have on the content of Day 2 and to ask any questions they have about the homework assignment.
   b. Instructor briefly introduces the activities for Day 3.

2. Discovering Skills
   a. Instructor reminds the group that the objective for writing success stories is to identify transferable skills and personal characteristics which contributed to their past successes.
   b. Participants form pairs to describe their success stories, clarify the skills and characteristics chosen and suggest additional or related skills that have been overlooked.
   c. Instructor directs the participants to prioritize their transferable skills and characteristics on an individual basis.
   d. Instructor directs the participants to record the top skills and characteristics that they want to prioritize on their Unique Wheels.
   d. While referring to their skills and characteristics list, instructor asks the participants to each write a paragraph describing themselves to an employer.
   e. Instructor directs the participants to use 'I' statements in their paragraphs.
   f. Instructor gives the participants time to write their paragraphs.
   g. Instructor reconvenes the group and asks the participants to state their transferable skills and characteristics as if
they are speaking to an employer.

h. Instructor acknowledges the participants' effort and remarks on the way that the success stories and the discussion of the stories promotes positive feelings in the group.

3. Discovering Interests

a. Instructor displays the Wheel and introduces the next marketable asset of interests.

b. Instructor distributes the *SDS Assessment Booklet* and *Occupations Finder* and asks the participants to complete the Assessment Booklet including the self-scoring section.

c. Instructor assists any participants who require help.

d. Instructor asks participants to record their interests on their Unique Wheels.

e. Instructor invites the participants to describe their three strongest interests and to consider how their interests may affect their career exploration.

4. Closing

a. Instructor reviews the activities of Day 3.

b. Instructor assigns the completion of the Individual Style Survey and the Significant Others Questionnaire for homework.

c. Instructor invites the participants to share their impressions of Day 3 and responds to their comments.
Implementation Checklist

WEEK 1 - DAY 4

1. Review and Preview

a. Instructor welcomes the group back and invites the participants to raise any insights they have on the content of Day 3 and to ask any questions they have about the homework assignment.

b. Instructor responds to insights, comments or questions raised by the participants.

c. Instructor briefly introduces the activities for Day 4.

2. Discovering Values

a. Instructor demonstrates the location of the marketable asset of Values on the Wheel.

b. Instructor asks the participants to give one-sentence definitions of values and illustrate with examples.

c. Instructor explains that values are important in decision making because values represent standards of conduct and strong, prized beliefs.

d. Instructor suggests that job satisfaction and success are more likely to occur if participants' work values match their job duties or choice of occupation.

e. Instructor explains that values influence the selection of job alternatives and therefore, are important in career planning.

f. Instructor points out that values may change through the stages of life.

g. Instructor distributes the handout Work Values Checklist and reviews the instructions for completion, checking for any questions.
h. Instructor directs the participants to complete the form on an individual basis.

i. Instructor distributes the handout Prioritizing Work Values and goes over the instructions for completion, checking for questions.

j. Instructor asks the participants to start completion of the form on an individual basis and to finish the form for home work if necessary.

3. Discovering Significant Others

a. Instructor displays the Wheel and reminds the participants about the importance of making assessments from multiple perspectives.

b. Instructor ensures that all participants have their completed questionnaires with them.

c. Instructor asks the participants to relate their experience of completing the questionnaire.

d. Instructor thanks the participants for their courage in taking part in the assessment and for their honesty in making their responses.

e. Instructor encourages the participants to continue to dialogue with their significant others.

4. Discovering Personal Style

a. Instructor explains that personal style is another factor on the Wheel.

b. Instructor verifies that all participants have completed the "Individual Style Survey".

c. Instructor explains the concepts underlying the Survey.

d. Participants are divided into small groups based on their dominant style determined by the Survey.
e. Instructor cautions participants to not define their personal styles solely in terms of their dominant style.

f. The small groups are asked to discuss how the style used by the members is effective or ineffective in various job functions.

g. Spokesperson for each small group reports on the group discussion to all the participants. Groups report in the order of Dominant, Cautious, Harmonious and Influencing.

h. Instructor concludes the activity by asking participants to consider the interaction between their goals and their personal style.

i. Instructor asks the participants to record their personal style on their Unique Wheel.

j. Instructor distributes the handout Using Your Individual Style in Career Decision Making and Job Search and encourages the participants to read the handout.

5. Closing

a. Instructor reviews the activities of Day 4.

b. Instructor asks the participants to complete the self-assessment activities on skills, personal characteristics, values, the Individual Style Survey and the Significant Others Questionnaire for homework.

c. Instructor asks the participants to complete any sections on their Unique Wheels which still remain blank.

d. Instructor invites the participants to share their impression of Day 4 and responds to their comments.
Implementation Checklist

WEEK 1 - DAY 5

1. Review and Preview

   a. Instructor welcomes the participants back and invites the group to raise any insights about Day 4 and to ask any questions they have about the homework assignment.
   
   Yes  No

   b. Instructor responds to the participants comments and questions.
   
   Yes  No

   c. Instructor briefly introduces the activities for Day 5.
   
   Yes  No

2. Discovering Career Options.

   a. Instructor displays the centre of the Wheel and explains to the participants that career options are an important asset in making career decisions.
   
   Yes  No

   b. Instructor distributes the handout Career Options Worksheet and explains that the list of options is not a comprehensive list but the list is representative of potential occupations.
   
   Yes  No

   c. Instructor asks the participants to read the list and check off the occupations on the list that they would consider as career options.
   
   Yes  No

   d. Instructor encourages the participants to add occupations to list. Instructor distributes the handout Career Option Expansion. Participants form four small groups, discuss their job options and select one option for each member and brainstorm more alternatives related to the option.
   
   Yes  No

   e. Instructor leads the large group in discussing the options identified.
   
   Yes  No

   f. Instructor asks the participants to continue their personal identification of career options outside of program time.
   
   Yes  No
3. The Art of Putting It All Together

a. Instructor reminds the participants of the importance of creating a new view of themselves based on the total of their marketable assets.

b. Instructor directs the participants to look for a pattern in the information they have recorded on their Unique Wheel and to decide the ranking of each asset in terms of importance to them.

c. Instructor asks the participants to review the lists of possible career options and to record on the list their reasons for considering or not considering the occupations.

d. Instructor asks the participants to look over the list of options and reasons they have created to identify patterns.

e. Instructor asks the participants to record the patterns or main considerations they have identified on the handout Main Considerations for Career Choice is distributed.

f. Participants are asked to rank order their main considerations and to complete the rank ordering outside of program time if required. The participants are requested to complete the ranking for Day 6.

5. Closing

a. Instructor reviews the activities of Day 5.

b. Instructor reminds the participants to complete their main consideration for decision making for homework.

c. Instructor asks the participants to review their Unique Wheel while thinking about who they are and all that they have to offer to the labour market.

d. Instructor invites the participants to share their impressions of Day 5 and responds to their comments.
Implementation Checklist

**WEEK 2 - DAY 6**

1. Review and Preview

   a. Instructor welcomes the participants back and asks the group to raise any insights that they have on the content of Day 5 and to ask any questions they have about the homework.  

   b. Instructor responds to their comments and questions.  

   c. Instructor briefly outlines the activities for Day 6.

2. The Changing Labour Market

   a. Instructor explains to the participants that using a new self-definition and taking part in career exploration can make job search more effective.  

   b. Instructor reminds the participants that the objective for Week 1 was to help the participants to see themselves in light of their marketable assets.  

   d. Instructor explains that the focus for Week 2 will be to help participants understand the current labour market and the career exploration process. Instructor points out that much of this information is also useful in job search.  

   e. Instructor explains that the labour market has changed since 1982 and that participants must evaluate their marketable assets in a changed labour market.  

   f. Instructor distributes the handout *Current Labour Market Trends* and explains the current trends.  

   g. Instructor divides the participants into small groups and asks the groups to select the trends that will affect their career exploration and job search.  

   h. Small groups report on the results of their discussion.
i. Instructor concludes the activity by reminding the participants that labour market changes are continuous and therefore, they must keep informed on the changes and remain flexible.

j. Instructor encourages the participants to keep written notes from all Week 2 activities because the information will be an important resource.

3. Accessing the Labour Market

a. Instructor defines the term 'manoeuvring in the market place', describes the conditions that enhance the effectiveness of career exploration and outlines the strategies and techniques for maneuvering in the labour market.

b. Instructor explains that manoeuvring in the labour market is a cyclical process and outlines the steps in the process.

c. Instructor explains that career exploration and job search overlap.

d. Instructor gives an example of manoeuvring in the market place.

e. Instructor concludes the activity by asking the members to explain the information that they have learned during the activity.

4. Researching the Labour Market

a. Instructor explains that research is a key part of effective career planning because it is used for identifying and evaluating job options and also target employers.

b. Instructor points out that job seekers often shift between researching jobs and researching companies.

c. Instructor explains that job seekers must have information about jobs and companies in order to decide if the job or company fits their employment situation.
d. Instructor leads the group in brainstorming ideas about research resources that are available to them.

e. Instructor points out that the same resources are useful for researching companies and helps the group to identify additional resources for researching companies.

f. Instructor distributes the handout Public Library Checklist and explains all the resources available at the local library.

g. Instructor discusses the use of the yellow pages as a resource for career exploration.

h. Instructor explains that people must often limit time spent on research and gives the participants guidelines for focusing research.

i. Instructor distributes the handouts Occupational Assessment and Company Assessment.

j. Instructor concludes the discussion by permitting the participants to express concerns and questions about research and, then answering their questions.

5. Closing

a. Instructor reviews the activities of Day 6.

b. Instructor divides the participants into small groups and directs them to go to the library to complete the research homework assignment which the instructor will review.

c. Instructor invites the participants to share their impressions of Day 6 and responds to their comments.
Implementation Checklist

WEEK 2 - DAY 7

1. Preview and Review

   a. Instructor welcomes the participants back and invites the group to raise any insights they have on the content of Day 6 and to ask any questions about the homework assignment.  

   b. Instructor responds to the participants' comments and questions.

   c. Instructor briefly introduces the activities of Day 7.

2. Decision Making

   a. Instructor explains the importance of decision making in the career search process and identifies barriers to effective decision making.

   b. Instructor presents three models of decision making.

   c. Instructor explains that there are five career paths that are open to them and outlines the barriers to pursuing the right path for them.

   d. Instructor directs the participants to choose a decision making style that is appropriate for their situation and to practice applying the strategy on the personal information they have identified to date.

   e. Instructor reconvenes the group after 20 minutes and asks the participants to discuss their experience in decision making.

   f. Instructor reminds the group that decision making is a process that occurs over time and requires flexibility.

3. Closing

   a. Instructor reviews the activities of Day 7.
b. Instructor distributes the handout Informational Interviewing and asks the participants to read it for homework.

c. Instructor asks the participants to complete the decision making activity for homework if it is not done.

d. Instructor invites the participants to share their impressions Day 7 and responds to their comments.
Implementation Checklist

WEEK 2 - DAY 8

1. Review and Preview
   a. Instructor welcomes the participants back and invites the group to raise any insights they have on the content of Day 7 and to ask any questions they have on the homework assignment.
   b. Instructor responds to any questions and/or comments.
   c. Instructor briefly outlines the activities for Day 8.

2. Feedback and Communication Skills
   a. Instructor explains that communication skills are important for career exploration and job search because people spend a great deal of time talking to people during these activities.
   b. Instructor distributes the handouts Facilitating Feedback, A Model For Communication, and Communication Skills.
   c. Instructor explains that the feedback guidelines will be followed during the next activities.
   d. Instructor explains the communication model to the participants and defines the communication skills.
   e. Instructor reminds the participants about the importance of using 'T' statements during the coming activities.

3. Informational Interviewing
   a. Instructor explains the use of the technique of informational interviews in manoeuvring in the market place.
   b. Instructor explains the purposes of informational interviews, distributes the handout Informational Interviews and leads a discussion of the content of the handout.
   c. Instructor explains the role-play activity on informational
interviews.

d. Instructor demonstrates a role-play of an informational interview.

e. Instructor supervises groups of three participants in role-playing an informational interview.

f. Instructor supports and encourages the participants during the role-play.

g. Instructor reconvenes the group and debriefs the group on the role-play activity.

4. Closing

a. Instructor reviews the activities of Day 8.

b. Instructor asks the participants to try to arrange an informational interview related to one of their job options.

c. Instructor encourages the participants to continue their work on their decision making on job options.

d. Instructor invites the participants to share their impressions of Day 8 and responds to their comments.
Implementation Checklist

WEEK 2 - DAY 9

1. Review and Preview
   a. Instructor welcomes the participants back and invites the group to raise any insights they have on the content of Day 8 and to ask any questions they have about the homework assignment.
   
   b. Instructor responds to their concerns and questions.
   
   c. Instructor briefly introduces the activities of Day 9

2. Overcoming Barriers Through Problem Solving
   a. Instructor points out the inevitability of participants encountering barriers in career planning and states that many people react ineffectively when confronted by barriers, giving examples.
   
   b. Instructor explains that people need to be flexible in looking at problems and responding to problems.
   
   c. Instructor describes a systematic approach to problem solving and outlines an example of the problem solving approach.
   
   d. Instructor asks the participants to share their comments on problem solving and responds to their concerns.

3 Practice in Overcoming Barriers
   a. Instructor distributes the handout Barriers to Occupational Options and asks the participants to write three of their top job options on the form, list at least six barriers to each option and summarize the barriers into one list.
   
   b. Instructor divides the participants into groups of three, and ask each member to describe a barrier to the small group and to seek options for overcoming the barrier.
c. Instructor reconvenes the group to debrief the activity, emphasizing the fact that barriers can be overcome using an effective problem solving strategy.

4. **Closing**

a. Instructor reviews the activities of Day 9.

b. Instructor asks the participants to review the activities of Weeks 1 and 2 and to consider their next steps after Day 10.

c. Instructor invites the participants to share their impressions of Day 9 and responds to their comments.
Implementation Checklist

WEEK 2 - DAY 10

1. Review and Preview
   a. Instructor welcomes the participants back and invites the group to raise any insights they have on Day 9 and to ask any questions they have about the homework assignment.

   b. Instructor responds to their comments and questions.

   c. Instructor briefly introduces the activities for Day 10.

2. The Next Step
   a. Instructor explains the importance of goal setting and action planning and distributes the handout Commitment to Action.

   b. Participants are asked to review the information they have collected in the program and to answer the questions on the handout.

   c. Instructor reconvenes the large group and asks the participants to describe their action plan and possible barriers.

   d. Instructor distributes the handout Contract and asks the participants to write contracts for their action plans, listing three strengths or insights on the back that will help them follow through on their contract.

   e. Instructor asks the participants to comment on the experience of completing a contract.

3. Termination/Closing Activity
   a. Instructor asks the participants to complete the sentence "the most important thing I have learned or gained from this group is......" in writing.
b. Participants take turns in reading their sentence completions to the group.

c. Instructor responds to each participant's sentence and reinforces the accomplishments they have made in the course of the group.

d. Instructor commends the participants for the help they have provided to each other in the group.

e. Instructor thanks the group for their participation and wishes the participants success in their career exploration.

f. Instructor reminds participants that the first 10 days of the program were designed to help them evaluate their marketable assets and identify personal job options.

g. Instructor explains that the next step is to job search, and tells participants that during Days 11-14 they will update their resumes, learn how to find job leads and practice job interviews.

h. Instructor points out that the communication and decision making skills, already discussed in the program, are good background information for the job search skills section.

i. Instructor distributes the handouts 12-1 to 12-6 and asks the participants to read the handouts for homework.

j. Instructor requests that the participants update their current resume, or draft a new resume, using the information in the handouts as a guideline.

k. Instructor asks the participants to bring their new resumes for Day 11.
### Implementation Checklist

#### WEEK 3 - DAY 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Setting the Stage</th>
<th></th>
<th>Writing the Resume</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Setting the Stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Instructor welcomes the participants back and invites the group to raise any insight on Weeks 1 and 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Instructor responds to group's comments and questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Instructor leads the group in generating a list of job search strategies and writes down the strategies as they are identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Instructor organizes the strategies under headings of 'developing job leads', 'applying for jobs', and 'interviews'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Using the lists of strategies the instructor leads the group in a discussion about the goals for the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Instructor debriefs the activity by asking the group members to identify new information, insights, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Writing the Resume</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Instructor discusses the importance of having a good resume, referring to the handout <em>Resumes</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Instructor reviews the two styles of resumes using the handouts <em>Sample Chronological Resume</em> and <em>Sample Functional Resume</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Instructor reviews the participants' resumes individually, and assists in making changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Instructor encourages participants to help each other prepare their resumes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Instructor debriefs the activity by emphasizing the new self-knowledge gained by the participants through writing their resumes. The instructor also acknowledges the help given by partners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Instructor arranges to have resumes typed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Preparing the Covering Letter**

a. Instructor distributes two handouts to assist participants in writing covering letters.

b. Instructor forms the participants into small groups, asks each group to select an ad, preferably related to the job option of a member, and write a covering letter for the ad.

c. When the group has successfully written the first letter, the instructor asks the group to choose a company from the *Yellow Pages* and to write a letter to the company. The instructor distributes a handout of guidelines for using the yellow pages. Instructor reconvenes the small groups to read their letters.

d. Instructor ends the activity by asking the participants to give their insights about writing letters.

4. **Closing**

a. Instructor reviews the activities of Day 11.

b. Instructor asks participants to complete redrafting their resumes.

c. Instructor invites the participants to share their impressions of Day 11 and responds to their comments.
WEEK 3 - DAY 12

1. **Review and Preview**
   a. Instructor welcomes the participants back and invites the group to raise any insights they have about the homework assignment.
   
   2. **Getting Job Leads**
   a. Instructor describes 'networking' and 'direct contacts with employers' as two strategies for acquiring job leads.
   b. Instructor divides the participants into a 'networking' and a 'direct contacts' group and distributes handouts, appropriate to each group's topic, to the groups.
   c. Each group discusses their experience with their topic using the handouts as resources.
   d. Instructor facilitates each group's presentation on their topic and the discussion following their presentation.
   e. Instructor ends the discussion with a summary of the information presented by the groups, suggests additional strategies by means of a handout and commends the members for contributing their own good ideas.

3. **Completing the Application Form**
   a. Instructor leads a discussion on completion of application forms and distributes a handout illustrating how to deal with problem questions.
   b. Instructor distributes a sample application form and asks the participants to complete the application for homework.
4. Closing

a. Instructor reviews the topics discussed on Day 12.

b. Instructor reminds participants to complete the application form for homework

c. Instructor asks the participants to give their comments and insights on the content of Day 12 and responds to their comments.
Implementation Checklist

WEEK 3 - DAY 13

1. Review and Preview

a. Instructor welcomes the participants back and invites the group to share their insights on the content of Day 12 and to ask any questions relating to the homework assignment.

b. Instructor outlines the topics for Day 13 briefly.

c. Instructor asks the participants to distribute a copy of their resume to the other members and to review each other's resume, giving constructive feedback.

2. Preparing for the Interview

a. Instructor distributes a handout First Impressions and plays a videotape of a model interview.

b. Instructor asks the participants to critique the interview using the guidelines on the handout Videotape Checklist.

c. Instructor leads the discussion of the model interview.

d. Instructor distributes the handout The Interview Planning Form and explains each section of the form.

e. Instructor distributes the handouts Appropriate Responses to Typical Interview Questions and Questions an Applicant Can Ask During An Interview and concludes the activity with a summary of the information learned about preparing for an interview.

3. Practicing for the Interview

a. Instructor shows two model interviews illustrating an informal and a structured interview.

b. Instructor leads a discussion of the positive attitudes and behaviours demonstrated in the model interviews and a comparison of the differences in structure between the
two interviews.

c. Instructor directs the participants to prepare individual interview outlines using handout material distributed by the instructor. Participants are requested to create outlines relevant to their job goals.

d. Participants are directed to work in pairs to prepare their interview outlines and to practice their mock interviews after the outlines are prepared.

e. Instructor debriefs the activity by asking the participants to share their questions and apprehensions.

3. Closing

a. Instructor reviews the activities of Day 13.

b. Instructor asks the participants to complete the interview outlines for Day 14 and to practice role-playing their interviews in preparation for the videotaping of their mock interviews on Day 14.

c. Instructor asks the participants to share any concerns they have about the contents of Day 13 or the homework assignments.

d. Instructor responds to their questions and concerns.
Implementation Checklist

WEEK 3 - DAY 14

1. Review and Preview

a. Instructor explains the procedures for participants to videotape a mock interview with the instructor acting as the interviewer.

b. Instructor circulates a sign-up list for interview times and asks the participants to select times.

c. Instructor directs the participants to make notes on their perceptions of their performance during their interviews immediately following the interview using the handout Videotape Checklist.

d. Instructor reminds the participants that the interviews are being taped in separate rooms and that the program room is available for continued work on other program components.

e. Instructor plays back the videotape of all the interviews for the large group and facilitates the group in giving feedback to individual members.

f. Instructor ensures that the first feedback given is positive information in order to make certain the group members remain receptive.

g. Instructor debriefs the interview activity by focusing on new or helpful feedback members have received during the activity.

4. After the Interview

a. Instructor explains the importance of following up after the interview and distributes the handout Follow-up Letter to the Interview.

b. Instructor leads the group in the identification of other follow-up techniques.
c. Instructor ends the activity with a discussion of how participants view follow-up activities and how they will use follow-up activities in their job search.

5. Closing

a. Instructor asks the participants to complete the following statements in turn: "I became aware that...", "I was surprised that..." and "I learned that...".

b. Instructor acknowledges the feeling of loss and/or apprehension which the participants may be feeling at the conclusion of the group.

c. Instructor explains the procedures for obtaining ongoing job search support on an individual basis from a Vocational Rehabilitation Consultant.

d. Instructor suggests that the participants may wish to continue to meet on an informal basis.
Appendix I

Follow-up Telephone Interview
Follow-up Telephone Interview

Are your currently employed? Y N
If yes are you newly employed? Y N
If not are currently enrolled in a training program? Y N
If none of the above then ask:
Are you feeling positive about your job search? Y N
To what do you attribute your unemployment?

Any comments regarding the JSP?

You will be receiving a package of the questionnaires that you completed in the program. Please complete them again and send them back to us.

Are you willing to participate in an in-depth interview? Y N
If so, when would be a good time for me to call you?

Date __________________________
Appendix J

Eight-week Follow-up Letter
Dear «SAL»:

__________ spoke with you recently by telephone to follow up on your participation in the Career Redirection and Job Search Skills Program. ___ told you that you would receive this package of questionnaires by mail. The questionnaires will be familiar to you since they are the same questionnaires that you answered during the Program.

Please read the instructions for completing the questionnaires carefully and answer them as soon as possible. Kindly mail the completed questionnaires back to me in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope. As before, the questionnaires are coded to ensure anonymity.

The information that I obtain from these questionnaires will help me to evaluate the effectiveness of the Program. Thank you for your cooperation in answering the questionnaires.

If you need help with the questionnaires please contact ___ by telephone at ______ Local ___ or toll free at __________, Local ___. If you prefer, you are welcome to call me at _____ or __________, Local ___.

Yours truly,

Henry Harder

HH/cml
Enclos.
Appendix K

Interview Questions
Interview Questions

Before we discuss the details of the Career Redirection and Job Search Program, I'd like to ask you a few general questions.

1. What was working like for you?

2. Were you expecting to stay in the same job all of your life?

3. Becoming more specific now, could you please tell me when it was that you first became aware that you would not be returning to your old job?

4. Turning now to your injury, could you to tell me your own story of your experience of having an injury and not being able to return to your old job. Just like any story there's always a beginning, middle, and end. Could you begin just before you were injured and continue to describe your experience in terms of thoughts, feelings, actions, and what you've done to deal with the situation?

5. Focusing more on the present now, could you tell me about your experience of the Career Redirection and Job Search Program. Just like you did earlier, think of it as a story with a beginning, middle and end. Please start just before you were contacted to come in to the program and describe your experience in terms of thoughts, feelings and actions.
6. Becoming more specific, could you describe what you consider to be your highest points in the program? For example, starting at the first high point you can remember what happened exactly and why was it helpful for you?

7. Now turning to the low points during this experience, start at the first low point you can remember, and explain why it was difficult for you?

8. What are your expectations about the future right now? For example, are you generally optimistic or pessimistic about the future?

9. What is your current job?

10. Is there anything I have not asked you about that you think I should know?
Appendix L

Example of an Interview Transcript
Interview

Interviewer: ____________________

Interviewee: Client 2B

I: Before we discuss the details of the Career Redirection and Job Search Program I would like to ask you a few general questions. First question:

What was working like for you?

C: That's going to be a tough one ______. I enjoyed it, I liked working hard. It was a good job, paid well. It was a dangerous job but I really enjoyed it.

I: Were you expecting to stay in the same job all of your life?

C: That job or an extension of that job. In construction you go up the ladder to supervisory capacity and that's where I expected to end up.

I: Becoming more specific now, could you please tell me when it was that you first became aware that you would not be returning to your old job?

C: You know it's funny. I'm still not really aware of that. I still have it in the back of my mind that I can do that. I know I can't so I guess by becoming aware that I needed something new, I guess it was about a year and a half ago so that's about a year and a half after the injury before it really settled into my mind that no, I'm not going to be able to do it any more than I am.

I: Turning now to your injury, could you tell me your own story of your experience of having an injury and not being able to return to your old job? Just like any story there is always a beginning, middle and end. Could you begin just before you were injured and continue to describe your experience in terms of your thoughts, feelings, actions and what you have done to deal with the situation.

C: Well before the injury I just assumed that I'd continue and carry on with my life in the fashion that I'd been used to. When I got injured I thought it would heal. I thought it was just another injury. I done everything the medical people told me to do. Followed every word closely and made sure that I done what I had to. At that time I just felt that it was going to be possibly a long extended healing period. After trying to go back to work and seeing the limitations I had, and re-injuring again, because of that re-injuring. I pulled muscles because I was trying to do the protection thing, that just made me realize that this thing wasn't going to go away. I kind of realized I was mortal, you know. And then about a year and a half ago I started to try and change my lifestyle and at first I thought everything was working out quite well and I was going to get what I needed.
Then because of a little road block that I felt wasn't called for, the compensation thing, it kind of set me back a little bit because then the plans that I had really carefully thought out all of a sudden didn't seem to be within reach. But now that things, I'm back with a very good worker, we can talk to each other and we know each other. I feel that things are working out and I think we've got things on track.

I: Focusing more on the present now, could you tell me about your experience of the Career Redirection & Job Search Program? Just like you did earlier, think of it as a story with a beginning, middle and end. Please start just before you were contacted to come into the program and describe your experience in terms of your thoughts, feelings and actions.

C: Okay, before the program I was kind of at a loss. I didn't know what would happen because of the situation that I had. After I got asked to come into the program due to the reputation of the Rehab Center I was pretty apprehensive. I didn't know what the hell was going on over there. I was told not to trust anybody in the place. Then I decided I'd go and I got there and I found an extremely bad attitude. Just kind of a defeatist attitude in the whole place. Once I got into the course I realized that I wasn't going to see much that I hadn't seen before. But it was in a different group situation. Any other time that I've been involved in that type of a course or class or whatever you call it group, it wasn't with people that were in the same situation as me and now I'm in this situation and I felt I came away learning some things and I felt that because of my experiences I may have helped some people. I felt good about it and I felt very good about getting it over with.

I: Becoming more specific, could you describe what you consider to be your highest points in the program? For example, starting at the first high point you can remember, what happened exactly and why was it helpful to you?

C: Well the first, I wouldn't say high point but good point that I got out of the course I believe was being able to kind of download with the group on what my problems were. Listening to what their problems were and realizing that we were a group. We weren't just a bunch of people together. The second thing I think was having a little bit of input into the actual operation of the class. For example, the rules that we set down for ourselves which was something that I find is useful in a lot things. That peer group rules have to be adhered to because they are peer groups they aren't something forced on you. Actually the rest of it, I didn't find anything that new to what I had had before. Just the situation it was being brought up in. And of course the highest point of it was getting the hell out of there.
I: You may have already answer the next question but I will ask it. Now turning to the low points during the experience of the program, start at the first low point you can remember and explain why it was difficult for you?

C: Well, as I said the atmosphere of the geographic location I guess I would have to say. It shouldn't be held in there. Anything that is trying to be held in an upscale is dragged completely down in that atmosphere. A very defeatist atmosphere. I think that if the first part of the course had been devoted to explaining the Board workers position and what they could and couldn't do and how decisions were arrived at, it would have changed a lot of this atmosphere and I think just knowing where somebody's coming from, what their parameters are is always easier to accept what is happening. Then also, gives you a chance for argument that is reasonable.

I: What are your expectations about the future right now? For example, are you generally optimistic or pessimistic about the future?

C: Very optimistic. I know there's going to be some difficult times. I'm getting what I wanted. I'm getting what I'm good at. It's something that as a person I can accept and live with. It's going to open up a whole new area for us that we have been kind of fringing around. And it's something that will fit in and extend my actual, how would you word it, useful working years by probably to the age of 70-75.

I: Wow. What is your current job?

C: Student. I'm taking mechanics, marine mechanics because I'm marine based. It fits into our lifestyle and our future plans. It's something that I can use while completing what our plans are and help complete our plans.

I: Is there anything I have not asked you about that you think I should know?

C: Not really _______. I think that might help on this whole program is for people to go through the class or somehow be able to stay in touch with each other on a, I don't know, official type basis. Where, say the compensation sends out something where we could transfer back and forth and it was something that people, I don't want to say forced, but would do on an official basis. Then as we helped each other during the course, I think it would be a little bit of a boost too.

I: Are you thinking about a newsletter?

C: Yes, something like that. A newsletter or comment sheet or something where somebody can write down what their problems are or what their difficulties are and we could write down our solutions. I don't know if that was the right wording but someplace where we could get in touch and I think there's a lot of good friends in my group that could be friends if it wasn't geographically separated. I don't know whether this is getting across what I'm trying to say.
I: Yes. I understand very well.

C: I guess it would be helpful for me and for other people and also reinforces everybody's, confirmation of everybody's expectations in the course and they can see through the eyes of the other people things that we can't see through our own eyes. That's about it.

I: Thank you very much. That brings our interview to a close.