

JOB INSECURITY AND FATHERHOOD: HEALTH, ANGER,
AND JOB SECURITY SATISFACTION
OUTCOMES FOR PARENTING AND
NON-PARENTING MEN

by

GINGER LEA WELCH

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
May, 1994

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
July, 1996

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
December, 2004

JOB INSECURITY AND FATHERHOOD: HEALTH, ANGER,
AND JOB SECURITY SATISFACTION
OUTCOMES FOR PARENTING AND
NON-PARENTING MEN

by

GINGER LEA WELCH

Dissertation Approved:

Dr. John Romans

Dissertation Advisor

Dr. Carrie Winterowd

Dr. Don Boswell

Dr. Patricia Self

Dr. Al Carlozzi

Dr. A. Gordon Emslie

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is by no small measure a true community effort, and even though I still believe it aged me by dog years, the number of people responsible for this project from inception to completion is countless. First, I want to thank my committee: Don Boswell, Al Carlozzi, Patti Self, and Carrie Winterowd. They participated with me in this venture and bore out lengthy meetings, revisions, and sat patiently through all of my “but why’s?” Special thanks must also go to my advisor and committee chair, John Romans, who particularly bore the brunt of each and every time I decided I just wasn’t going to do this. If it weren’t for him, I have little doubt I’d be a caterer somewhere today. I don’t know if psychology will thank you, but my parents do! You’ve tried to teach me the values of hanging in there, having a sense of humor, and most importantly, that sometimes a phone call is worth answering. Thanks.

I also want to thank the many men who took the time to participate in this study, and therefore allowed me to do what I really wanted to do. To all of you, and to your friends and spouses who helped convince you it was worth it, thank you for letting me study something I was passionate about. Thanks also to my parents, Paul and Clara Welch, and my brother, Johnny Welch, who were ready at a call to make copies, run errands, and be the greatest un-official research assistants on the planet. You have no idea how close you all came to being forced to learn SPSS! You deserve this degree far more than I ever will.

Finally, I want to thank my grad school family who made this entire trip worthwhile. To Jenny, Lauren, Melissa, Ken, Chad, Lahoma, and Paula: I can't imagine doing any of this without you. The next reunion is at Ken's! As for the official best intern class ever, Laura, Vicky, Wendi, Lonnie, Scott, and Mike, there are no better people I'd rather spend a year in the middle of Missouri with. I'm even starting to miss Laura's GP's! Laura W., you can throw your party now!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose of Study.....	2
Sample Compilation.....	6
Parenthood	8
Dependent Variables.....	8
Terms and Definitions.....	10
Research Question	12
Summary	12
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
General Overview of U.S. Employment.....	14
Outcomes of Job Insecurity	16
Organizational Outcomes.....	19
Anger.....	21
Age and Job Tenure	24
Gender.....	25
Manual vs. Nonmanual Workers	28
Buffers and Treatment	29
Fathers and Employment	31
Summary	38
III. METHODOLOGY	
Participants.....	40
Measures	41
Procedure	46
Data Analysis.....	46
IV. RESULTS	
Descriptives.....	48
Multivariate Tests	48
Correlations.....	49

V. DISCUSSION

Sampling Issues 52
Alternate Model Support..... 54
Recommendations for Future Research..... 56
Implications for Practitioners..... 58

BIBLIOGRAPHY 60

APPENDICES 59

 APPENDIX A--IN PERSON SOLICITATION SCRIPT 68

 APPENDIX B--RECRUITMENT LETTER 69

 APPENDIX C--DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE 70

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4.1 Descriptive Statistics	49
4.2 Multivariate Tests.....	49
4.3 Test of Between Group Subjects	49
4.4 Correlation Matrix	66

Chapter I: Introduction

We do what we are and we are what we do. --Abraham Maslow

The supreme accomplishment is to blur the line between work and play.

--Arnold Toynbee

Overview

Ask any adult to describe him or herself, and you are likely to get responses that include age, gender, family status, and occupation. These concepts are central to our perceptions of ourselves and our self-worth, and we use them to explain who we are to the world around us. Age and gender identity are concepts we carry with us as labels from birth. Two others, parenthood and employment, typically occur in young adulthood, and we spend the remainder of our years acquiring, refining, and transitioning through these roles. This study examines possible outcomes of one intersection of these roles for employed men: job security and parenting status.

Job insecurity is the personal perception that one's job or any aspect of that job may be at risk for involuntary loss. While some environments are thought to produce more perceptions of job insecurity than others (companies experiencing lay-offs, for example), it is truly the judgment of the individual that verifies whether or not job insecurity is present. In this study, participants' recorded perceptions of individual job security will be utilized as descriptors to identify the security perceptions of the sample in relation to the norming sample. Fathers and non-fathers as groups will be identified as insecure based upon their self-judgments, and the two groups will be compared in terms of their affective reactions to their personal perceptions of job insecurity (job security satisfaction), state anger, and self-rated health. It cannot be overemphasized that the

definition of job insecurity is unique: it is *entirely* defined by *individual perception*; therefore, job insecurity can only be assessed on an individual level (ie. an entire company cannot be classified as “insecure” based upon global judgments). Thus, to identify the sample as “insecure” for the purposes of group comparison, each individual will contribute personal opinion about his own security level which will then be viewed as a group to identify the sample as “insecure.”

To best study the demands on “working fathers,” it is imperative not only that we comprehend some key elements of modern fatherhood, but that we also have an explicit understanding of the world in which fathers work. The concept of “employment” is not only pervasive in most men’s lives but is also complex with an almost endless number of job types, skills, environments, and monetary rewards. Therefore, some degree of refinement is needed. For the purposes of this study, we are interested in fathers’ perceptions of and feelings about their job security. That is, for men acting as fathers (with self-reported domestic responsibilities to minor children), what unique physical and psychological responses do they have with regards to their perceptions of job security?

Purpose of Study

Due to the pervasive nature of job loss and insecurity among workers, many studies over the last several decades have examined the outcomes of job security/insecurity on workers including physical and psychological health disturbances (see Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002 for a comprehensive review). A trend in the most recent American research has focused on the importance not only of job security for workers but also their affective reactions to perceived insecurity, commonly called job security satisfaction (Probst, 2002). It is only within the last five years that job insecurity research has truly begun to encompass both workers’ cognitive and affective appraisals of their employment situations as distinct processes. In both the tradition of previous

research and current trends, this study is designed to further inform researchers about the needs of job-insecure workers, and particularly those which may exist for working men who are also fathers. Among the most practical reasons to conduct this line of research is to recognize possible implications for services that may be useful for ensuring psychological and physical health of workers experiencing job distress.

What is the experience of a male worker in America? The most obvious answers may relate to the enormous time commitment to one's employer. For instance, a full-time employee in America may expect to spend at minimum one-quarter of his or her week in direct employment, above and beyond commuting time, family responsibilities, or leisure activities. Additionally, the average number of hours a full-time employee works in a week continues to rise well above the standard 40 hour work week. With the sheer volume of time commitment involved in working for pay, individuals can face a tremendous crisis when this significant segment of their identities, "self as employee," is threatened. In the last twenty years, American workers have faced such a crisis as there are now fewer workers performing more work and receiving less security and personal control in their jobs (Sparks, Faragher, & Cooper, 2001).

This lack of security, also known as *job insecurity*, is actually an employee's perception that he or she may not be able to have his or her job with all of its various elements, as long as it is desired. When this perception exists, it also serves to violate a traditional but unspoken agreement between employees and their employers. In the past, workers anticipated finding a "good" job and remaining until retirement. An implied agreement that good work equated to permanent employment existed in an unwritten and unspoken form; this is known as a type of *psychological contract*. However, the end of the twentieth century brought about the concept of downsizing as well as economic downturn, and the psychological contract began to be unexpectedly broken resulting in increased levels of job insecurity and other negative outcomes for employees.

Downsizing, or reduction in workforce, was originally conceived as an economic strategy to conserve employer expenditures and other resources. However, it seems to often produce less-than-expected results including often lackluster financial benefits for companies and negative personal and professional outcomes for employees and their families (DeMeuse, Vanderheiden, & Bergmann, 1994). The failure of such policies to produce substantial benefits for the majority of workers has not escaped public notice. Indeed, an increasing amount of critical attention has been paid recently to several American corporations who have been revealed to have engaged in ethically questionable acts in order to maintain profits for upper-echelon employees while downsizing other workers. Both empirical research and popular press are ripe with indications that modern employees may demonstrate different needs and preferences for work than the workers before them, and that employers are routinely failing to meet those needs. Clear identification of corporate and workers' needs is an essential step in order to achieve a useful discourse on mutually beneficial policies.

It is also crucial to understand what is mutually beneficial on the side of the employee. Corporations are fairly clear in their goals to increase profit and productivity, and eliminate unnecessary costs. However, what do the data tell us about what men as parents want and need from work? The research on men's multiple roles (ie. fatherhood and employee) has been increasing; however, we still lack much empirical evidence as to if or how fathers cope differently than other men with certain job factors, such as perceived job insecurity. What we do know about men and their affective reactions to job insecurity, however, reveals that job insecure men in general have been shown to have emotional experiences including organizational withdrawal, depression, and anxiety, as well as related difficulties including on-the-job performance problems, strained family relationships, and declined physical health. Job insecurity globally appears to take an emotional toll on men; therefore, understanding what factors may affect who suffers

could be important as corporate and community services are designed to meet the needs of the job insecure worker. The widespread nature of this type of emotional suffering also supports the importance of including a reactional (affective) component to research on men in addition to a strictly judgmental (cognitive) aspect. In this study, the Job Security Index (JSI) will function as the traditional measure to assess what men think about their job insecurity and identify the sample as insecure, while the Job Security Satisfaction Scale (JSS) will contribute the affective measure.

We know that bi-directional influence exists between men's lives as fathers and men's lives as employees. Men with children typically find that their investment in work and work hours increases (Kaufman & Uhlenberg, 2000), and the quality of men's work experience (such as working in a stressful environment) also impacts parenting style and experience (Grimm-Thomas & Perry-Jenkins, 1994). This study is designed to contribute specifically to the knowledge base about the physical and psychological health needs of working fathers.

So why another study about men? First, we hope to foster the trend of viewing men within their multiple contexts (ie. father, employee) to create a more dimensional picture of the interaction of two of those roles (parenthood and employee). Often, the nuances of parenthood for men fail to receive the research consideration that parenthood does for employed women. If it's worthy of investigation in women's lives, might it also be interesting in men's? It is unlikely that working men completely fail to experience significant changes after transitioning to parenthood, and we believe it is important to investigate this very basic event as it impacts the common workplace experience of job insecurity.

Some simple changes that accompany parenthood are obvious, such as increased responsibility or increased financial burden. By obtaining a sample of men from a variety

of careers, ages, and income brackets, we are encompassing diversity in lifestyle and identifying parenting status as a unilateral factor in the employment experience for most men. A few basic facts about work and men act as the foundation for this study: First, we know that job insecurity (along with job loss and displacement) creates negative effects for workers including poor mental and physical outcomes and family relational difficulties (Sverke, Hallgren, & Naswall, 2002)). We also know that most men are going to work, and with over 60 million fathers in the U. S. population at any given time, most will become working fathers at some point (U.S. Census Bureau). Additionally, the ongoing tenuous environment of the U.S. and global labor markets forecast that the majority of employed men will experience job insecurity at some point in their career. Finally, we also know that when difficulties strike, men are far less likely than women to seek support or help to cope with troubles (Jones, 1996). These basic truisms hopefully emphasize that we are interested in investigating events that occur to the majority of men, and have simply been understudied in the proposed manner.

Men lose jobs or aspects of their jobs daily all across America, and are extremely unlikely to seek professional help in coping with this life changing event and the potential accompanying physical (increased somatic complaints) and psychological (depression, anger) consequences. Information needs to be gathered on how men's affective assessments of their job security differs for these parenting men and their non-parenting counterparts. Findings also need to be extrapolated to intervention development as needed. Certainly, parenting men are not the only group who suffer from an unstable economic experience, and although men's representation in the job insecurity literature is well established, the links between insecurity and fatherhood, and the knowledge base for establishing the needs of men experiencing insecurity are less well known. However, that group is large enough, and substantially underrepresented in the literature to justify a focus in this study.

Sample Compilation

Much of the research on the interactions of work/parenting has focused on mothers (Greenberger & Goldberg, 1988), and until recently has focused on simple definitions of work habits such as employed or unemployed and full or part time work (Grimm-Thomas & Perry-Jenkins, 1994). Men have traditionally been represented as receiving primary fulfillment from the role of breadwinner within the family, while women's development has been examined from the perspective of multiple role balance and the effects of maternal employment upon children's development (Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001). Research recommendations stemming from recent literature reviews indicate a need for increased departure from the traditional framework, and investigations of how men are experiencing family/work conflicts (Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001). Wholistic views of men's development and men's changing roles within the family of procreation are increasingly recommended by family researchers; these recommendations strongly influenced the design of this study to include only adult male subjects.

Additionally, the inclusion of men with children seemed a logical step in increasing the boundaries of research on men and work, and avoiding duplication of the traditional and singular view of working men's lives. By including men in parenting roles as a critical component in this study, men's identities as "breadwinner" or "employee" are expanded to include an additional factor. Most men become parents at some point in their lives, either through procreation, adoption, or a blended family, and therefore the construct of "fatherhood" is dominant enough in men's lives to warrant further investigation. The transition to fatherhood has been firmly established as a globally life-changing event for men, and researchers have indicated that it should be expected to have an impact on men's work lives, as well (Kauffman, 2000). Previous research has indicated that fathers' positive experiences at work are related to higher personal self esteem and more accepting parenting styles (Grimm-Thomas & Perry-Jenkins, 1994).

The current study should be viewed as a potential contribution to understanding the varying needs of working men balancing lives with and without children.

Parenthood

In the parenthood literature, motherhood and employment is examined more often than fatherhood, and the research in that area calls for increased examination of the demands of “new” fatherhood, including the work-family exchange and negotiation of multiple roles for men (Cooksey & Fondell, 1996; Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001). In addition to recommendations from fatherhood researchers, the job insecurity research field has also identified critical needs. A recent meta-analysis of the job insecurity literature resulted in several suggestions for future research including the identification of additional moderators in the insecurity-health relationship and the use of multi-item measurement sources to aid in creating a more full understanding of the needs of job-insecure workers (Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002). While several moderators have previously been hypothesized and tested (ie. personality, perceptions of procedural justice, social support), a dearth of multi-item measures have been identified for use in research with many studies collecting data based primarily upon answers to only 1 to 3 item measures (Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002). The current study includes two multi-item job security measures in an effort to address this recommendation. Ultimately, the combination of the needs from these three primary areas of research (job insecurity, fatherhood, and counseling men) drove the present study to include only males as subjects.

Dependent Variables

In order to best understand the sample of employed men, three dependent variables were selected from the literature. First, *job security satisfaction* was selected as an important variable because it emphasizes the importance of personal perception and

affective appraisal in job insecurity outcome research (Probst, 1998). Identifying which participants, if any, may be functioning in a job-insecure environment but fail to express dissatisfaction with their situation could be a crucial issue in clarifying differences between the two groups of men. It is vital to note here that this variable reflects the prediction that fathers are not necessarily more likely to perceive a threat to their jobs than non-fathers, but that they will be more distressed by the same level of threat. All participants, however, will rate themselves on a continuum of job security to insecurity for purposes of assessing the insecurity of the sample. However, only men's reactions to insecurity ratings are of interest for analysis.

The second critical component selected for this study is psychological distress operationalized as *anger*. Anger was chosen to represent psychological health outcomes because of its links to such workplace-home connections as workplace violence and parent-child discipline issues. Individuals who experience an event that may result in a loss of self-esteem, such as a lay off or being fired, may be at an increased likelihood to engage in a violent act or acts (Blair, 1991). Indeed, small increases in community layoff rates have been found to be associated with increased incidence of violent behavior (Catalano, Novaco, & McConnell, 1997), and there is some evidence that individuals victimized at home may be at increased risk for becoming victims of violence in the workplace, lending credence to the idea that violence permeates the home-work boundary (Mighty, 1997). A variety of negative workplace environments have also been associated with increased parent-child hostility, decreased parent & child self-esteem, decreases in the amount of supportive parenting, and increases in punitive parenting styles (Mayhew & Lempers, 1998; Corwyn & Bradley, 1999).

The final variable of interest in this study is self-rated physical health which has been a standard in the job insecurity outcome literature . The World Health Organization

(WHO) has made the bold statement that job insecurity is even more harmful to health than being unemployed (www.who.dk). Decline in health status is one of four types of job insecurity outcomes identified, and impacts the individual directly and the organization indirectly (Figure 1.1).

Figure 1.1

		Focus of Reaction	
		<i>Individual</i>	<i>Organizational</i>
Type of Reaction	<i>Immediate</i>	Job Attitudes Satisfaction Involvement	Organizational Att. Commitment Trust
	<i>Long Term</i>	Health Mental Physical	Work Related Bhvior Performance Turnover Intention

(Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002)

Like any stressor, job insecurity can result in strain leading to reduced wellbeing and negative emotions toward the source of the stress (Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002). Both mental and physical health have been shown to decline with the presence of job insecurity and include such factors as longterm illnesses, dysfunctional sleeping patterns, increased symptoms of illness endorsement, increased psychiatric morbidity, increased body mass index, and poorer self-rated health (De Witte, 1999; Ferrie, Shipley, Marmot, Stansfeld, and Smith, 1998; Reynolds & Gilbert, 1991; Isaksson & Johansson, 2000; Dooley, Prause, & Ham-Rowbottom, 2000). Health problems related to job insecurity are not only well-established as fact in the literature, but current trends show increasing research demanding policy attention to this quality-of-life issue (Ferrie, et al, 1998). The potential effect of fatherhood upon the established health outcomes of job insecurity for men is a primary factor of interest for this study.

Terms and Definitions

Several terms are recurrent in the literature on men and employment and need to be

clarified for the purposes of this study.

Job insecurity: perception that current job status is in jeopardy, or elements of a current position may be at risk for loss. Employment insecurity reflects the idea that one's livelihood, beyond a specific job, is in danger. For the purposes of this study, job insecurity is measured by the Job Security Index (JSI) which will be used to identify the overall security perceptions of the sample. Information about participants' job insecurity beliefs provides a framework on which to assure that the sample of fathers and non-fathers are experiencing perceptions of threat to their jobs. In order to understand the impact of job insecurity on health, anger, and job security satisfaction *and* how it differs for fathers and non-fathers, it is necessary to have data indicating that the sample is expressing the desired baseline quality (job insecurity). The JSI will provide this information.

Job security satisfaction: affective reaction to one's cognitive appraisal of current job status. This element will be measured by the Job Security Satisfaction Scale (JSS) which seeks information from participants about their affective reactions to their perceptions of their individual job security. Job security satisfaction functions as a dependent variable in this study, and is predicted to be affected differently by job-insecure fathers and job-insecure non-fathers.

Unemployment: individuals without current employment but still available to the job market

Displaced workers: individuals with at least three years of tenure on the job, having had reasonable expectations to remain on that job until retirement, and experiencing separation from their jobs via external sources (ie. plant closing or layoff).

Underemployed individuals: those engaged in work in which their training or other qualifications surpass the ability requirements of the current position, including individuals who have been forced to take part-time work instead of the full-time positions

they seek.

While the focus of this study is particularly on individuals experiencing job insecurity while employed, current research has revealed that employed individuals who are job-insecure suffer very similar consequences as do individuals who have suffered actual job loss. Additionally, it is likely that some individuals approached for this study may fall into more than one of these categories as individuals may co-exist in underemployment and job insecurity, for example. In addition to employment-related variables, health and parenting outcome issues may also require some definition.

Anger: an outward behavioral expression of displeasure as well as degrees of control over that expression. Expressed anger is defined and evaluated through the use of the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory-2 (STAXI-2).

Physical Well-being: general health perceptions of individuals including self-reported ratings of well-being and health status.

Fatherhood: operationally defined through participant report (ie. reports having children) including information about resident and non-resident children.

Research Question

What is the relationship of fatherhood status and level of perceived job security to satisfaction with job security, health and anger?

Three hypotheses were written to examine this question.

- a. Fathers will experience more negative levels of job security satisfaction, health, and anger than will non-fathers.
- b. Participants exhibiting high levels of job insecurity will report more negative levels of satisfaction with job security, health, and anger than will participants who report low levels of job insecurity.
- c. The interaction between fatherhood status and job security will result in decreased satisfaction with job security, decreased health , and increased

anger for high insecurity/parenting participants.

Summary

The current study is designed to contribute to the body of empirical knowledge about physical health outcomes (self-reported health), emotional health outcomes (state anger), and affective reactions to job insecurity (job security satisfaction) for men experiencing job insecurity, and how those outcomes may be affected by the role of fatherhood. This study follows up on current research recommendations in the literature by examining an additional variable (fatherhood), including a diverse sample of employment and employee profiles, and using multiple-item measures to assess job insecurity and insecurity outcomes.

Chapter II: Review of Literature

General Overview of U.S. Employment

Job insecurity has become a prominent factor for U.S. workers for a number of reasons including prolonged economic downturn, increased mergers, the change from a manufacturing society to a service society, and decreased union representation (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984). The most recent employment statistics provided by the United States Bureau of Labor (www.stats.bls.gov) reveal that the American workforce consists of approximately 146.7 million workers which represents about 65.9 percent of adults aged 16 and older. The current U.S. unemployment rate is estimated at 5.7 percent or about 8.4 million unwillingly unemployed workers. These data reveal an overall employment increase of 308,000 workers within the last year, which is primarily due to a rise in construction employment and additional jobs in service-providing industries. Unemployment rates for adult men were about 5.2 percent, with unemployment rates adjusted for ethnic identity showing Blacks unemployed at a rate of 10.2 percent, Hispanics or Latinos at 7.4 percent, and Whites at 5.1 percent.

Approximately 4.7 million persons reported unwillingly working part-time instead of full-time because their work hours had been cut by their employers or because they had been unable to secure full-time employment. Estimates also indicate that approximately 1.6 million unemployed individuals who had sought work over the last year failed to do so in the most recent month with approximately 514,000 of these workers “giving up” because they no longer believed that jobs were available to them.

More historical statistics related to turn-of-the-century trends in employment indicate that approximately 36 million jobs were eliminated between 1979 and 1993, leading to an overall increase in involuntary job loss over the last twenty years.

The American workforce is changing. A significant percent of the population shifts not only in and out of work, but changes job types, amount of hours worked, and industry. Within this change, research has revealed that workers do face a variety of particular crises after involuntary unemployment, including relationship difficulties, economic difficulties, underemployment, and emotional and mental health issues. Job insecurity research has revealed many of the same negative personal outcomes exist with only the threat of job loss; therefore, not only is it likely that 8.4 million unemployed Americans are suffering physically and mentally debilitating outcomes, but that many, many more currently employed workers are suffering similar fates. One survey which investigated workers' self-perceptions of security revealed 18% of men rated themselves as having at least “relatively insecure” feelings about their future economic security (Dominitz & Manski, 1997). When extrapolated to the larger working world, this accounts for nearly one-fifth of the working population who may be experiencing mental and physical health difficulties in addition to those suffered by their previously employed colleagues.

One critical fact about job insecurity is that it does not necessarily dissipate with new employment or the removal of the insecure situation (Ferrie, Shipley, Stansfeld, & Marmot, 2002); whereas job loss is considered to be an event, job insecurity is a process that can exist perpetually in any type of employment and its effects can last even after an individual begins to perceive employment security. These negative effects are especially

pervasive if the intent of the employee (ie. to become re-employed) remains at odds with reality (ie. failing to become employed) (Hamilton, Hoffman, Broman, & Rauma, 1993).

The existence of job loss and insecurity has been established as fact in a variety of countries, employment types, and individuals. Studies have found that job insecurity may involve job loss or threat to job components, and that individuals previously thought to be less vulnerable to security threats are now subject to job insecurity outcomes. Thus as the existence of job security as a factor in modern employment is sound, the next segment of information necessary in this investigation is to better understand the specific outcomes for individuals afflicted with job insecurity.

Outcomes of Job Insecurity

The outcomes of job insecurity have been predominantly investigated by examining white, male workers who have been threatened with job loss due to exogenous factors (ie. downsizing). While types of measurement strategies have been nearly as diverse as the studies themselves (Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002), a fairly standard set of outcomes have been established as essential variables for study within the literature. These are predominantly health factors which include physical health (self-ratings) as well as psychological health consisting primarily of depression and family relationship functioning. An additional avenue of research has investigated outcomes of worker insecurity upon the organization itself, considering such factors as workplace violence and monetary gains and losses. While each of these research strategies offers excellent opportunities for investigating the global impact of job insecurity, the focus of this study remains the impact of insecurity upon the well-being of the individual.

Therefore, global physical health (self-rated) and psychological health (anger) have been

selected as the most pertinent measures for the research questions posed.

Reactions to job insecurity have been conceptualized as varying from the immediate to the long term and ranging from individual to organizational outcomes (Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002). Individual outcomes include job satisfaction & involvement (immediate) as well as physical and mental health (long-term). Organizational outcomes include immediate effects such as organizational trust and commitment as well as long term outcomes such as performance and intent to leave.

While an overwhelming amount of research on job insecurity has demonstrated decreases in physical and psychological health, differences have been found in the strength of these relationships (Isaksson, Hellgren, & Pettersson, 2000; Lim, 1996; DeWitte, 1996; Wilson, Larsen, & Stone, 1993; Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002). Significant increases in levels of depression have been found for individuals experiencing transition to inadequate employment or total job loss, despite such mediating effects as income, job satisfaction, and marriage (Dooley, Prause, & Ham-Rowbottom, 2000).

One of the most valuable pieces of research in job insecurity is from a longitudinal investigation of the involuntary transition of British civil servants to the private sector (Ferrie, Shipley, Marmot, Stansfeld, & Smith, 1998). The study was part of a larger investigation which collected data from both blue & white collar employees prior to rumor of possible job loss, and after the transition to privatization had begun. The sample consisted of 6,895 men and 3,413 women representing a wide variety of job grades, and data was collected at three periods between the years of 1985 and 1993. At the time of the third collection period, the average age of male respondents was 43 years, and over 80% reported currently being married. No information about dependent children

was obtained. Information was collected from participants in which they were asked to report transfer and employment status, demographic information, health & health-related behaviors, and minor psychiatric morbidity. Results of the phase 3 questionnaire revealed that over half (53%) of the men surveyed reported that they did not anticipate a forced transfer, while 25% and 21.7% reported possible or completed job transfer, respectively. Sleep disturbances (less than five hours per night or more than nine hours per night) were revealed for men who were anticipating change as well as those who had already experienced job transition. Additionally, men who either anticipated or experienced change demonstrated significant increases in both body mass index and blood pressure.

In a continuation of this study, Ferrie, Shipley, Stansfeld, & Marmot (2002) investigated outcomes for individuals who experienced a variety of employment across the security/insecurity spectrum (continuous job security, continuous job insecurity, transition from secure to insecure, and transition from insecure to secure). The majority of participants were white collar workers and the sample included 2429 men and 931 women surveyed in 1995/96 and again in 1997/99. Overall results indicated that job insecurity related to poorer health outcomes, both physiologically and psychologically, for workers experiencing that stressor than for secure workers. Insecure workers in particular demonstrated significantly poorer health (self-rated), higher levels of depression, and higher scores of non-psychiatric psychological morbidity on the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) compared to the consistently secure subjects in the sample. Additionally, some negative outcomes (depression and GHQ rating) remained even though the threat of job loss had been removed (i.e.. when employees had moved from insecure to secure status). Health related outcomes were even more negative for those

who were exposed to chronic job insecurity versus those with limited exposure to threat. One significant United States study demonstrated the chronic and debilitating health effects of job insecurity. In an investigation of 207 auto workers, longitudinal responses showed that physical symptomology increased over a 13 month period of job insecurity, while job satisfaction decreased (Heaney, Israel, & House, 1994).

Organizational Outcomes

In addition to personal outcomes (those effecting employees), organizational outcomes have also been investigated in the literature and one of those outcomes in particular may be relevant to the current study. Many organizational changes resulting in job insecurity for employees are often undertaken in order to preserve the financial well-being of the organization; however, studies continue to advise that organizational actions that place employees at risk for job insecurity places employers at risk for financial loss (Sparks, Faragher, & Cooper, 2001). These types of losses are largely seen in compensatory efforts by the employee to deal with a loss of security, such as needing to take increased sick leave due to stress related health issues, therefore making a connection between personal & organizational outcomes dependent upon employee health.

Downsizing, which includes layoffs, failure to replace former employees, and failure to provide replacements for employees on approved leave, has been investigated as a common stressor predictive of perceived job insecurity (Kivimaki, Vahtera, Pentti, Thomson, Griffiths, & Cox, 2001). In this recent study, a Finnish sample of 550 municipal employees (132 men) participated in a three wave study which took place prior to downsizing (1990), just after downsizing (1993), and four years after downsizing

(1997). Utilizing the Job Insecurity Scale, The Job Control Scale, The Conflicts with Supervisor Scale, and a physical demands questionnaire, investigators discovered that self-rated health declined for employees after downsizing and was still significantly lower even at time 3 (1997). In fact, researchers found that job insecurity, job control, and physical demands were all significantly predicted by experiencing downsizing, with the three mediators together being more powerful than any single factor. Only conflict with supervisor ratings appeared insignificant.

Another study investigated the impact of various types of contact with layoffs upon physical and psychological well-being. Four levels of exposure to layoffs, ranging from direct contact (being laid off and rehired), indirect contact (receiving a warning but not having been laid off or knowing friends or coworkers who have been laid off) to no contact, have been identified in the literature, and examined for relevance to job insecurity, health, and depression (Grunberg, Moore, & Greenberg, 2001). The subjects in this investigation were 2,279 blue and white collar workers employed during a five year period of intensive layoffs in a U. S. manufacturing plant. The majority of participants were male (76%) and Caucasian (86%) and were reflective of the overall plant population. Tests for between group differences revealed that individuals who have no contact with victims of a layoff fare significantly better with regard to perception of job security, levels of depression, and general health than any of those who have been laid off and rehired, have experienced a warning of possible layoff, or who survived a layoff at their place of employment without threat. Similarly, individuals who have had indirect contact fare still better than those in the direct contact group.

Other studies have also supported the connection between job insecurity and poor

health outcomes. In a 1996 study, Barling & Kelloway investigated the relationship between perceived job insecurity and various personal and organizational outcomes. Utilizing a sample of 187 South African gold miners, researchers found that job insecurity was positively associated with workers intentions to leave their jobs as well as negative mood and blood pressure. Additionally, the interaction between job insecurity and workplace control was found to be significantly associated with blood pressure. The authors use their study to caution readers that job insecurity appears to have negative outcomes for both employees and employers.

While much of the current study has been designed to follow the research premises set forth by previous investigations (i.e.. physical health outcomes for insecure employees), two relatively new variables to the known literature are introduced. The first is an investigation of the possible moderating effects of fatherhood, which will be discussed later. The second is an investigation of anger in men with job insecurity. No current studies were found that included anger as a factor in job insecurity outcomes, yet the implications for anger as a potential outcome of insecurity seem worthy of investigation.

Anger

One source of difficulties for workers in any state of employment has been the traditional viewpoint of corporate America which reflects employers demands that employees' personal lives remain separate from their work life, and that no personal problems should be allowed to interfere with "getting the job done." However, employers have regularly expected that professional duties will impinge on one's personal life, and that it is the employee's duty to put the organization first. This

corporate attitude is obvious in job trends that include workers taking on more duties for less pay, working under the constant threat of lay-offs and downsizing, controlling/authoritarian managerial styles, and intense competition for jobs and promotions (Paul & Townsend, 1998). Indeed, Robert Reich, Labor Secretary, has previously deemed modern employees “the anxious class” as committed hard work may never earn them “the American dream” (Barrett et al., 1996). This type of high demand workplace combined with an uncertain future may result in increased anger for employees.

Violation of the psychological contract, as previously discussed, is another source of potential anger for employees. Although technically not a contractual violation at all, it is merely the *perception* of wrongdoing that may lead an employee to feel betrayed or violated, and that is perhaps the most critical factor in employee relations. The belief that one has been damaged by an employer, even if there are no written promises or guarantees, is received in the same manner as a contractual betrayal. Thus aggression, anger, or even violence on the part of an employee may come as a surprise to an employer, but could be the result of isolated or repeated violations of the employee’s psychological contract.

By definition, state anger is “the psychobiological emotional state or condition marked by subjective feelings that vary in intensity from mild irritation or annoyance to intense fury and rage.” (Speilbarger, 2001). Anger became a construct of interest in this investigation due to its known repercussions for difficulties in parenting and other personal interactions which could be relevant for employed fathers (Conger, Neppel, Kim, & Scaramella, 2003). Previous job insecurity studies have focused on depressive

outcomes and have been quite successful in establishing causal relationships between insecurity and increased depression; therefore, the current study made the decision to depart from the primary established psychological outcome of depression and turn to an investigation of anger which has established connections to the personal experiences of unemployment and work difficulties as well as having significant implications for life-away-from-work (Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002). Anger's relationship to such events as workplace difficulties (ie. violence) and personal difficulties (ie. relationships with partners or children) has been well-documented, but has not generally been investigated in relation to job insecurity outcomes (Catalano, Novaco, & McConnell, 1997). Therefore, it seems reasonable that anger as a psychological outcome individually related to each core component of the study (employees and fathers) would be investigated for potential links between those roles.

Differences in employee perceptions regarding unwritten promises of continued employment (a psychological contract) have also been hypothesized to differ by employee age. A recent study examined the status of the psychological contract after several years of relatively global job insecurity (Smithson & Lewis, 2000). Results indicated that younger workers (aged 18-30) recognize both job and employment insecurity as factual, but fail to expect employer fulfillment of a psychological contract in the manner in which older employees may. That is, although job insecurity continues to be a concern for workers at all stages of employment, the youngest workers appear to perhaps best recognize the volatility of the employment market.

Another potential flaw in employee-employer relations that may incite anger in employees is that of the employee performance appraisal (Pearson, 1998). Theoretically,

appraisals could be used to document an employee's difficulties and offer early intervention. In reality, appraisals have been found to be largely inflated evaluations and are not typically reflective of an employee's performance. They also may possibly serve as reinforcers of an employee's psychological contract with the company, lulling him or her into believing that he or she is doing excellent work and would not be fired or laid off; often, this is false security. Again, when that assurance is violated, angry feelings may emerge.

These events are examples of organizational factors that may result in employee anger. When violence is incited by and/or perpetuated by the structure itself, and not by an individual or group within the structure, this is known as structural or indirect violence (Schwebel, 1997). Structural violence often occurs in the forms of unemployment, underemployment, temporary jobs, and job insecurity; it is also exacerbated by employment environments in which upper echelons of the corporation get more rewards from workers' efforts and the workers themselves continually get fewer. Additionally, corporations routinely deflect attention from this disparity by turning working groups against each other. One author has described this pattern of growing separation between the social classes as "World War III" and warns that these environments are ripe for violence (Schwebel, 1997). Because of the potentially hazardous outcomes for employees who perceive themselves as wronged, it is interesting to know whether or not job insecure employees experience greater levels of anger than securely employed workers and how this may differ by parenting status.

Age & Job Tenure

What is the importance of worker age as it relates to job insecurity? Primarily, age

has been investigated in the job insecurity and unemployment literature as it contributes to reemployment difficulties following a job loss. Trends in increasing displacement and underemployment seem to reveal the worst employment news for professionals, managers, and older workers (Polsky, 1999). Individuals employed in “young” industries, those employed in industries performing more poorly than others, workers with below-average educational attainment, and workers with lengthy job tenure may also be among the most vulnerable for potential displacement (Carrington, 1993; Carrington & Zaman, 1994; Fallick, 1996).

A displaced worker who experiences job loss at age 50 has only a 70-75% chance of finding *any* type of re-employment within the following two years (Chan & Stevens, 2001). Additionally, while 82% of workers aged 25-54 in this study were able to find reemployment, only 60% of workers aged 55-64 became reemployed, and a mere 35% of those 64 and older regained employment. The jobs that follow displacement tend to be short term and at increased risk for leading to additional unemployment. One study revealed that individuals experiencing job insecurity and those experiencing unemployment do not significantly differ from each other in terms of in terms of distress (De Witte, 1999). These statistics on displacement effects for workers over fifty are maintained when earning patterns are examined. Research has shown that most displaced workers suffer earnings reductions of up to 25% that may persist for up to six years following displacement (Jacobsen, LaLonde, & Sullivan, 1993). This said, the relationship between job insecurity and worker age is not entirely clear.

Gender

Relatively few studies have been conducted to examine the nature of gender

differences upon the impact of job insecurity, with the majority of existing studies focusing on men. One innovative study investigated whether men and women may hold different preferences for having secure jobs (Tolbert & Moen, 1998). Subjects were divided into early career (aged 18-35), mid career (36-50) and late career (51 +) groups. Over time, male workers consistently showed more preferences for job security than did their female counterparts and the number of men demonstrating this preference increased from early to mid career status and from mid to late career status, perhaps also indicating age-related changes for men. An additional study indicated that men may also show preferences for job security related to financial outcomes whereas female workers demonstrate concern over both financial aspects and other elements of the job, such as benefits or work environment (Rosenblatt, Talmud, & Ruvio, 1999).

In a 1998 publication, Fox & Chancey examined six measures of economic insecurity including financial adequacy, perceived economic well-being, personal job insecurity/partner's job insecurity, and personal job stability/partner's job stability. Instability was defined as current unemployment, having been laid off from work in the previous three years, or forced early retirement. Job insecurity referred to the employee's belief that he/she would be likely to keep his or her current position as well as beliefs about whether or not he or she would be likely to find a comparable or improved job situation in the future. Findings indicated that male workers were more likely than female workers to rate their chances of becoming unemployed through layoff as "certain." Forty percent of the workers in this study felt it was more likely than not that they would be unemployed, and every respondent in the study (N=366) knew at least one person who had been laid off in the last three years with a median response of four persons.

Among parenting workers, mothers and fathers report equivalent levels of family stress, work stress, and family-work conflict, but mothers report less sharing of tasks with fathers. Additionally, fathers' stress levels in the study significantly increased when others were dependent upon them at work, but a personal perception that one was unimportant at work was correlated to lowered self-esteem (Schwartzberg & Dytell, 1996). In a similar vein, another study investigated outcomes for early retirees and remaining employees following downsizing (Isaksson & Johansson, 2000). Voluntary choice in work situation (either continued work or retirement) was positively associated with satisfaction, physical, and psychological health functioning. Females tended to generally be more satisfied with outcomes and were more likely to take early retirement as a viable alternative.

In a recent study of married professionals, couples who were parenting a child under the age of 18 demonstrated higher scores (more stress) on a measure of work to home stress than non-parents or parents of grown children (Swanson, Power, & Simpson, 1998). Parents with a child under the age of 5 scored the highest in that group. Work-to-home stress is that which originates in the workplace and carries into the home environment; this process appears to be more strongly related to child factors (such as age) than gender factors, as mothers and fathers scored similarly. As this was an all white-collar sample, however, differences that may exist for blue-collar workers are not known, as the stress of household & childcare duties typically assumed by a female partner may be more evenly distributed among this professional sample. Health outcomes related to employment stress, however, also tend to show convergence in the experiences of men and women. For example, similarities in health declines have been found for both

male and female white collar workers experiencing job insecurity including patterns of excessive sleep increased body mass index, and other increased physiological risk factors (Ferrie, Shipley, Marmot, Stansfeld, & Smith, 1998).

Manual vs. Nonmanual Workers

Variations within the literature exist as to how blue collar workers (manual) fare in the face of job insecurity compared to white collar workers (non-manual). Typically, manual workers have been characterized as having less education and less job security overall compared to white collar colleagues, and it has been hypothesized that white collar workers facing job insecurity are actually more likely to suffer from “status inconsistency” which is the strain that exists from the inconsistency of a high level of education and unemployment (Schaufeli, 1992; Sverke, Hellgren, Naswall, 2002; Frese, 1985). However, previous assumptions that job insecurity is the exclusive domain of blue collar workers have not borne out in the face of recent research.

These assumptions about how manual and non-manual workers experience employment changes have received serious challenges in recent years (Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002). Worrall & Cooper (1998) found that restructuring has led to increases in perceived job insecurity, particularly for white collar workers, indicating that perhaps white collar workers are becoming increasingly aware of their own employment frailty. An earlier study failed to find significant differences in depression, social support, or activity level between the manual & nonmanual laborers, although both types of workers demonstrated higher depression levels than the general population (Reynolds & Gilbert (1991). An additional noteworthy finding is that many manual workers are often lower echelon employees at their places of employment and tend to be from lower classes,

which is associated with poorer health. Therefore, they may be the most affected by changes at work regarding employment and benefit status (Chandola & Jenkinson, 2000). Recent studies have investigated the impact of job insecurity on a variety of white collar occupations including college faculty (Wilson, Larson, & Stone, 1993). Additionally, empirical researchers have noted that the two types of workers (blue and white collar) have begun to approximate each other significantly in terms of job security and job autonomy (Kupers, 1996). For these reasons, the parameters of this study were expanded to include both blue and white collar workers in anticipation that separation of the two for research purposes has become an archaic tradition.

Buffers and Treatment

Several studies have attempted to examine buffers (factors that may mediate a negative impact) and treatment opportunities (post-event intervention) for workers experiencing displacement, unemployment, or job insecurity. These factors have been examined from a number of approaches including counseling, workplace supports, and family connections. In a 1996 article, criticism is offered to counselors who are out of touch with the physically and psychologically dangerous world of employment (Jones, 1996). Citing a 1988 National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health study, he lists job security among seven critical factors of employment that can increase the risk of psychological disorders among employed individuals, and further details meaningful steps that can help counselors understand their clients. Professionals working with job-insecure or unemployed clients are cautioned to facilitate a further understanding of work as a part of a greater life instead of being perceived as so central to one's self-concept.

Another author examining intervention and counseling strategies to help job-

insecure individuals has proposed a cycle of failure, shame, withdrawal, and depression which may prevent men from effectively being able to reach out and seek help upon a job loss (Kupers, 1996). The article posits that a man may more often perceive his difficulties as revolving around work, and may be more inclined to take credit for both successes and failures (including job loss) which can result in harsh self-judgments. The self-blame for job loss or other perceived failures may make a visit to a counselor for help seem counterintuitive to the problem.

Available support systems at both work & home have also been examined as potential buffers for individuals experiencing job insecurity. One study found that individuals who received support from colleagues and supervisors received buffering from such job insecurity outcomes as job dissatisfaction and beginning a search for another job (Lim, 1996). Support from home also provided some buffering from general life dissatisfaction, and marriage in particular has been identified as a source of support, with marital role quality acting as a significant predictor of men's psychological distress (Barnett, Marshall, & Pleck 1992).

Dooley, Prause, & Ham-Rowbottom (2000) examined the effects of transitioning from adequate employment to either involuntary part time or low wage employment, both conceptualized as inadequate employment. Both types of inadequate employment resulted in increased depression regardless of predicted buffers (job dissatisfaction and education), although marital status buffered the impact of this change. Recommendations from current literature on job insecurity treatment have included strategies such as support groups, marriage & family therapy, programs for younger employees, and prevention programs (Wilson, Larson, & Stone, 1993). However, relationships other than

marriage also appear to have benefits as potential buffers.

Fathers and Employment

Fatherhood has been related to increased marital satisfaction and stability (Cowan & Cowan, 1992). Barnett, Marshall, & Pleck (1992) found that men who had greater emotional involvement with their children experienced that relationship as a buffer against stress stemming from their paid-work lives. Fathers also appear to demonstrate a greater sense of attachment to their careers than do non-fathers (Snareyk, 1993) and have been found to work increased hours in the workplace (Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001). Some recent studies have focused on the meaning of fathering for men, and found that men who are fathers typically report fewer instances of unemployment, and may actually have increased social support through their roles as fathers.

Fathers are often overlooked when credit is given for maintaining multiple roles in personal and work domains; in fact, it is only in recent years that fatherhood has been examined as a separate and distinct construct from mothering (Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001). While men have long been viewed as breadwinners in the family system, new research has started to reveal the complexity of male development in addition to their provider roles (Marsiglio, 1999). Current societal demands reflect a desire for men to take greater roles in child caregiving and greater responsibility for children they have fathered. Knowing how the changing demands of fatherhood impact and are impacted by other important roles for men, such as that of traditional breadwinner or employee, may be central to facilitating men's increased participation in parenting which has become a central goal of many parenting programs.

Much parenting research has been unidirectional in nature; that is, examining the

effects of parenting upon children, while the parenting and employment literature is often heavily weighted on the idea of the outcomes of having a “working” mother (Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001). The transition to fatherhood has received recent empirical attention in the literature, with identification of both positive and negative aspects of fatherhood resulting (Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001). The National Fatherhood Institute advocates the position that fatherhood is a unique and irreplaceable element that should be fostered to create “responsible, committed, and loving” fathers (Dowd, 2000). With this type of increased attention on the responsibilities of fatherhood, it seems necessary to understand how fathers are playing these “new” roles, the types of support necessary to engage in fatherhood, and how fatherhood is impacting the lives of men.

That fatherhood status does effect men is a given in the world of work. Of today’s working adults, 85% report having daily family responsibilities, and 46% of workers are parents of juvenile children with at least half time physical custody (Dowd, 2000). One in five working parents is a single parent, and of those, 27% are single fathers.

Overwhelmingly, modern workers continue to have significant family commitments that co-exist with workplace requirements in addition to other daily survival requirements and personal activities. Because individuals have these multiple components to their lives, researching possible interactions between work and home continues to be a much needed area of investigation.

Two disparate models have been developed to explain the impact of fatherhood on men’s work lives. The first is the “good provider” model by Bernard (1981). In this model, men are viewed as demonstrating competence and commitment by providing a good living for their families. Studies supporting this model have shown that male

parents work more hours and more weeks per year after becoming fathers than before, and that they are more likely to be on the “career track” (Nock, 1998; Cooney & Uhlenberg, 1991).

The competing model, then, examines the “new fatherhood;” that is, a fatherhood role in which parenting duties are increasingly egalitarian between partners, and fathers are more directly involved in child-related tasks (Wilkie, 1993). This model would be indicative of men who receive some fulfillment through their parenting role and may not pursue extra paid work to meet parenting expectations.

The impact of job loss (and of reduction in income) upon children is primarily mediated by the way in which fathers cope with such a loss (McLoyd, 1989). Factors that are known to mediate fathers’ parenting responses to job loss include child’s temperament, child’s physical attractiveness, degree of economic hardship, and the type of contact the father has with the child. Fathers who express pessimism and irritability as a result of job loss tend to display fathering behaviors that correlate with children’s socioemotional problems, lowered expectations for their own future, and socially deviant behaviors (McLoyd, 1989). Children are also at risk for adopting fathers’ somatic complaints and experiencing indirect negative outcomes (ie. marital problems or divorce).

Researchers who have examined the impact of the emotional work climate have found that high stress and high work load employment often tend to be related to more withdrawn behaviors of men at home. Additionally, the quality of father’s employment (operationalized as work stress) has been found to have a negative influence on paternal responsiveness and acceptance of children (Corwyn & Bradley, 1999). Negative social

interactions at the workplace, too, tend to correlate with increased expressions of anger and increased discipline use with children among fathers (Perry-Jenkins & Repetti, 1997). Positive work experiences have been associated with higher levels of support for young children's autonomy by fathers, but have also been shown to have a negative relationship to the amount of time fathers engage with children (Grossman, 1999). Men who are employed in jobs that encourage independence and autonomy tend to value these characteristics in their children; similarly, men who work in highly supervised positions demonstrated tendencies to value conformity and obedience in their children (Parke, 1996). This distinction often falls along socioeconomic lines, as well, with middle income parents and lower income parents valuing these same child qualities respectively.

One study of 30 parenting and non-parenting men found surprisingly low levels of financial worries associated with becoming a father despite the increased costs associated with prenatal care, birthing, and child rearing (Cohen, 1993). However, this same study found that work related concerns heightened after the birth of a first child related to possible job loss or being forced to stay in an unsatisfactory position. Other studies have found that men and women report significant stress in work-family balance in roughly equal amounts, and that men are increasingly interested in taking time off from work to care for sick children, newborns, and to spend more time with their children in general (Pleck, 1993). The value of parent and family support programs in the workplace has also been examined, with trends indicating that families with young children and multiple children as well as those who perceive that family and work are often in conflict value these programs more than other types of families (Frone & Yardley, 1996).

Another study has demonstrated the impact of fathers' long work hours on their

relationships with their adolescent children (Crouter, Bumpus, Head, & McHale, 2001). In a study of 190 dual-earner families, men's relationships with spouses and children were examined for various elements of quality. Fathers who scored high on measures of work overload and overwork were perceived more negatively by their adolescent children than other fathers in the sample. However, neither perceptions of work overload nor long hours alone mattered significantly for parent-child relationships.

A recent qualitative study investigated the idealization of and preparation for fatherhood with a sample of 16-30 year old childless men (Marsiglio, Hutchison, & Cohan, 2000). When participants were asked to talk about their ideas of a "good" father and their hopes for their own fatherhood experience, a theme of emotional connectiveness emerged, with many subjects emphasizing their own emotional connection with their father or their hopes for an increased closeness with their own children. One participant in particular emphasized how a father can be a good provider and father even while unemployed.

The current wealth of studies on fatherhood truly represent diverse pathways toward a primary end: to encourage a more productive, more involved, and better equipped father for today's children. The studies represent a variety of men and children in multiple life-stages and focus on both individual and whole-family factors and effects. Based upon known research, scientists and practitioners can safely validate the need for involved fathers. Perhaps the next step, and the one in which this study is involved, is to then explore the valuable concept of fatherhood as it impacts other life events. Instead of viewing male functioning as a composite of a variety of individual roles, fatherhood is conceptualized as a state which exists throughout all other roles. In this study, we

endeavor to differentiate between the job-insecure man and the job-insecure father.

Job Insecurity & Marriage

Spillover theory in job insecurity postulates that an emotionally hostile work environment will translate into difficulties at home for the affected worker (Kanter, 1977). This is an important concept to review, as the marriage-to-work continuum could have a buffering effect on the experience of job insecurity. Attention to spillover has found roots in the job insecurity literature as an increasing number of researchers have discovered a reciprocal relationship between work and family stress (Larson, Wilson, & Beely, 1994; Crouter, Huston, & Robbins, 1983; Piotrkowski, 1979; Pleck, Staines, & Lang, 1980). Research has demonstrated that husbands' job stresses adversely affect the emotional health of their wives (Rook, Dooley, & Catalano, 1991), and that job insecurity stress is significantly related to a number of negative family outcomes including “lower marital adjustment, poorer overall family functioning, poorer family communication, poorer family problem solving, less family role clarity, less affective involvement, less effective behavior control and more marital and family problems” (Larson, Wilson, & Beely, 1994).

Additional studies have revealed that burnout (consisting of feelings of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduced sense of personal accomplishment) was found to be associated with feelings of job insecurity (Westman, Etzion, & Danon, 2001). Men experiencing job insecurity may also engage in additional work efforts which are related to a perceived overload of men's roles. This in turn is related to less time spent with spouse, but not children (Crouter, Bumpas, Head, & McHale, 2001). Probably one of the most significant findings in the marriage and job insecurity literature, however, is a

1993 study that examined emotional and physical health outcomes for employees directly experiencing job insecurity *and* the outcomes for their spouses. The data indicated that the impact of job insecurity is as great for the employee's spouse as it is for the employee (Wilson, Larson, & Stone, 1993).

The literature examining the buffering effect of a spouse on job insecurity appears to be nearly as negative as the literature investigating spousal stressors. One study investigating the usefulness of a supportive partner while experiencing actual job loss found that women received the greatest benefits from a supportive partner and the greatest detriments from existing unsupported (Walsh & Jackson, 1995). The findings for men echoed those for the women, but to a lesser extent indicated that men did not receive the full impact of supportive partnerships that women did.

Given the nature of the marital support literature, the idea that job insecurity easily transmits detrimental effects to the spouse of a worker without substantial evidence for the opposite seems to indicate that including married and single participants would not positively skew results. Thus both participants with and without spouses were allowed into the current study for both design and practical reasons. As the construct of interest is an individual one (health) and not a systems concept (marital quality), it seemed unwieldy to include measures of marital quality and burden an already measure-laden study. Additionally, current evidence does not support the idea that a spouse, even a supportive one, would significantly change the job insecurity ratings and outcomes for men in the study. While this is a worthy topic of investigation, it was ultimately not selected for this study. Recruitment restraints in assembling a matched population of early, mid, and late career employed men who were all either unmarried or married also

appeared unnecessary and complicated. Again, future investigations may wish to reconsider these decisions, and they will be further addressed in results and limitations.

Summary

Research continues to indicate that the men of the latter 20th and early 21st centuries are becoming more interested in family and childcare involvement, and are redefining themselves in terms of spousal, parenting, and employee duties. Evidence also indicates however, that employed men are routinely losing control over their personal job security and are subject to a number of stressors not present in the working past.

As men become more involved in multiple roles, they may experience multiple role strain which is exacerbated by the lack of security present in the role of employee. Previous studies have demonstrated the potential hazards of this combination, and the present study endeavors to continue this line of research by further informing our knowledge of men's job insecurity and health outcomes. The current study also attempts to investigate the relationship between job insecurity and anger which may have implications for workplace relationships, safety, and parenting. The final goal of this study is to identify implications which could have value for workplace policies and counseling recruitment strategies for men experiencing job insecurity independent of or in conjunction with parenthood.

By better understanding fatherhood as an important variable for working men, better interventions and preventive measures can be developed for men and families experiencing the volatile climate of modern employment. There is little doubt as to the pervasive nature of job insecurity across virtually all types of employment, all ages, and all regions of the United States. Young, single workers are just as vulnerable to

uncontrollable job loss as are grandfathers with years of job tenure. There is no longer an illusion of security to comfort workers who fear for their jobs or the well-being of their families. Though recent social and economic events have turned a critical eye toward corporate America, change is not guaranteed. However, if change does occur, progress should be guided by empirically sound data that can not only provide information about workers, but also give birth to measures that will protect workers and their families.

Chapter III: Methodology

A sample of 74 employed men aged 24-65 were recruited for this study. Participants completed a series of five questionnaires including a demographic worksheet, a measure of general health, an anger measure, and two job security measures. While early career status is generally defined as beginning at age 18, the beginning age for this study was raised in order to meet criteria set forth by O'Brien (1986) which delineate that young adults may differ too greatly in prior work experience and financial responsibilities from their older counterparts to be meaningfully included in the same sample. Other adjustments were made to the sample solicitation in an effort to try to include both manual and non-manual workers (known also as white and blue-collar workers) which have been now been shown to fail to differ significantly from each other in terms of job-insecurity outcomes (Sverke, Hellgren, & Naswall, 2002). Potential subjects were recruited by in-person solicitations via personal contacts at regional businesses including caregiving facilities, manufacturing plants, and places of civil service employment. One-hundred thirty surveys were distributed. Seventy-nine were returned, with five rejected for incomplete data. An overall response rate of 60% was achieved, with the highest percentage of respondents being those solicited from civil service.

The men in this study had been employed at their current positions from less than one year to over 25 years, and identified themselves predominantly as Caucasian (84%),

although Native Americans (6.8%), Latinos (4.1%), African Americans (1.4%), and Asian Americans (1.4%) were also represented. Of parenting men, the modal number of children in the home was 2.0 (range 1-4). The average age of fathers was 43, and for non-fathers was 33. Of the parenting sample, 96% of the sample were married with children, and 4% were single with children. Of the non-parenting sample, 60% were single and 40% were married. No significant differences were found on dependent variables between married and unmarried participants, and an insufficient sample was gathered to search for meaningful differences between participants with employed wives and those whose wives worked in the home (86% of participants reported a working spouse). The average household earnings for parents with and without spouses were \$4,592.00 per month, and the average earnings for married and unmarried non-parents were \$3,937.00 per month. Parenting men had an average of 10 years at their current jobs, while non-parenting men had an average of 6 years of job tenure. The men in the sample were primarily employed in civil service occupations and local government jobs (45%), counseling and education (9%), technology-based jobs (8%), and various managerial positions (8%).

Table 3.1

Means and Standard Deviations for Measures

Variable	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation
Health	10.0-100.0	70.608	19.2843
Job Security Satisfaction	.45-3.0	2.56	.579
Job Insecurity Scale	.16-3.0	2.55	.656
Anger	24.0-80.0	46.73	7.618

Measures

RAND-36 Health Status Inventory (R-36 HSI)

The RAND-36 Health Status Inventory (R-36 HSI) is a 36 item questionnaire designed to assess self-reported health status with regard to both physical and mental well-being. It was originally developed by Ron Hays and published by The Psychological Corporation in 1998. Ten scores are derived from the inventory which include physical functioning, role limitations due to physical health problems, pain, general health perceptions, emotional well-being, role limitations due to emotional problems, social functioning, energy/fatigue/physical health composite, mental health composite, and global health composite. Internal consistency data indicate that all scales meet the criteria for group comparison in the norming sample (.71-.90). Although the entire questionnaire was administered, only the General Health Subscale was used to assess participant health ratings. This subscale consists of five questions on a five point likert-type scale.

Participants respond to questions such as “I get sick more easily than most people I know.” Responses are converted to a 100 point scale, with higher scores indicating the highest levels of health. The mean of the five individual scores are taken to obtain a general health score. The norming sample for the General Health Scale of the RAND-36 ($r=.78$; $M=56.99$; $SD=21.11$) appears similar to and appropriate for comparison with the current sample ($r=.80$; $M=70.61$; $SD=19.28$). Although mean differences reflect that the current sample reports higher quality of health than the norming sample, these differences are not significant.

State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory-2 (STAXI-2)

The State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory-2 (STAXI-2) is designed to provide a measure of both the experience and expression of anger. It was developed by Charles Spielberger and published in 1999. The STAXI-2 is comprised of 57 total items divided into 6 scales, 5 subscales, and an Anger Expression Index. The scales are State Anger, Trait Anger, Anger Expression-Out, Anger Expression-In, Anger Control-Out, and Anger Control-In. This study utilized the State Anger scale to assess the feelings participants were currently experiencing in relation to job security status which was judged to be more meaningful than assessing trait anger. The State Anger Scale offers a possible score range from 15-60 with lower scores reflecting lesser amounts of anger. Scores are converted to T-scores for reporting purposes, and different norms are used according to sex and age group (16-19 years; 20-29 years; 30+ years). The scale consists of three subscales (feeling angry, verbal expression of anger, and physical expression of anger). The STAXI-2 was normed on both normal and psychiatric patients (N=1,644), and sex, age, and employment data appear consistent with participants in this sample. Internal consistency was high across all subscales for the norming group (.84 and higher). Scores for the STAXI-2 non-psychiatric state anger norming population (M=19.25) were consistent with the sample taken in this study (fathers M=18.04; non-fathers M=17.11). Reliability estimates for this sample revealed a Cronbach's alpha of .90 with a mean of 46.73 (SD=7.618).

Job Security Index (JSI)

The Job Security Index (JSI) (Probst, 1998) is an 18-item questionnaire designed to assess an individual's perceptions about the future of his/her job with regards to job stability and likelihood of continuance. Participants are provided with a series of

descriptors or statements about their current beliefs about personal job security and asked to circle “yes” if the statement is accurate for their situation, “no” if it is not accurate, or “?” if they cannot decide. Sample statements include “can depend on being here” and “well established.” Higher scores on the JSI reflect more job security, and scores can range from 0 to 3, with zero points assigned to answers indicating a lack of security, 3 points assigned for endorsing statements of security, and 1 point assigned for selecting “?” as this response has been shown to be statistically more similar to a “0” point response than a “3” point response. Some items are reverse scored. The norming sample for the JSI demonstrated a Cronbach’s alpha of .97, with a mean of 1.51, and standard deviation of 1.05. Current participants’ scores on the JSI demonstrated a range of .16-3.0 with a mean of 2.55 (SD=.6564) and a Cronbach’s alpha of .86. The two groups of subjects demonstrated strikingly similar means on this scale (non-fathers=2.56; fathers=2.55), both of which reflected higher scores (more security) than the norming sample. It is important to note that this presentation was not anticipated from the sample, and therefore affects the interpretation of results in Chapter V as hypotheses were based upon an insecure sample.

Job Security Satisfaction Index (JSS)

The Job Security Satisfaction Index (JSS) (Probst, 1998) is designed to measure an individual’s attitude about his/her job security. Like the JSI, it features a series of 20 descriptors including “never been more secure” and “unacceptably low.” These statements are designed to allow the participants to express evaluative judgments about personal job security. Response modes are identical to the JSI with a “yes,” “no,” or “?” While the JSI is used, however, to determine whether or not an individual is experiencing

job insecurity, the JSS is used to measure one of the job insecurity outcomes, job satisfaction. Again, scores can range from 0 to 3, with identical scoring instructions to the JSI. Research on the JSS has demonstrated a high level of reliability (Cronbach's alpha of .96) for this instrument, and the norming sample achieved a mean of 1.71 and standard deviation of .95. The current sample achieved a Cronbach's alpha of .91 with a mean of 2.56 (SD=.579).

Both the JSI and JSS were normed on a population of government employees, similar in nature to the sample of this study with the exception that the norming sample included women (46% male; modal age 45-49 years; 70% White; average education "some college," average job tenure=13.06 years). The sample for this study was 100% male with multi-modal age ranges of 25-29 and 40-44 and an average age of 39, 84% White, an average educational level of 17.85, and 8.93 years averaged on the current job.

Demographic Questionnaire

A demographic questionnaire was designed for this study in order to obtain age, ethnic, parenting, employment, and income data for participants (Appendix E). Four questions were added to the established demographic questionnaire to assess to what extent participants endorsed beliefs about traditional fatherhood roles such as "breadwinner." Participants responded to each of four statements using a seven point Likert scale in which higher scores reflected stronger endorsements of traditional fathering practices. The first question measured to what degree men believed themselves to be the primary breadwinner in their families at the time of the survey. Simple comparison of means revealed that men without children rated themselves only slightly more likely to be the primary household breadwinner (M=5.68; n=28; SD=2.04) than

men with children ($M=5.17$; $n=46$; $SD=1.72$). Three questions inquired as to men's perceptions of their traditional or non-traditional upbringing. On these questions, men without children reported having slightly less traditional experiences with their fathers ($M=4.56$; $SD=1.38$) than men with children ($M=5.08$; $SD=1.27$).

Procedure

Participants were recruited from a convenience sample of men from the Midwestern United States. Recruitment methods included only in person solicitations and personal contacts resulting primarily in a sample of city employees and civil servants.(Appendix A). Assistants were trained and employed to aid in the recruitment process. Participants completed questionnaires privately, and packets were assembled to reflect counterbalancing of scales with only the informed consent letters always presented first. Materials were then returned to a designated research representative or returned by mail in postage-paid envelopes.

Data Analysis

The following research question was addressed by data analysis:

Do non-parenting men cope more effectively with job insecure status in terms of their health, anger, and job security satisfaction than do parenting men? Because this research question focuses on examining the combination of three dependent variables upon two independent variables, a 2 x 2 multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used. In order to obtain one of the independent variables (high and low job insecurity), participants' total scores on the measure "Job Security Index (JSI)" were subjected to a median split (JSI3) in order to obtain approximately equal groups of men reporting relatively high and low levels of job insecurity. This split occurred at score 2.77, and

resulted in 38 men in the “low insecurity” group (2.77 or over) and 36 men in the “high insecurity” group (scores 0 –2.76). Following this procedure, the MANOVA was tested with the following hypotheses:

- a. Fathers will experience more negative levels of job security satisfaction, health, and anger than will non-fathers.
- b. Participants exhibiting high levels of job insecurity will report more negative levels of satisfaction with job security, health, and anger than will participants who report low levels of job insecurity.
- c. The interaction between fatherhood status and job security will result in decreased satisfaction with job security, decreased health , and increased anger for high insecurity/parenting participants.

Chapter IV: Results

Data were collected and analyzed from two groups of employed men, fathers and non-fathers, in an effort to explore the impact of job insecurity on personal health factors. The primary research question anticipated support for a traditional “good provider” model of fatherhood reflecting beliefs that men responsible for supporting children will experience exacerbation of emotional physical complications that accompany job insecurity. This research question is best expressed as “What is the relationship of fatherhood status and level of perceived job security to job security satisfaction, health and anger?”

A 2x2 MANOVA was performed to investigate parenting status x job security level on the experience of job security satisfaction, self-rated health status, and state anger. The independent variables were fatherhood status (fathers vs. nonfathers) and high or low level of job insecurity (Table 4.1). Results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences on the dependent variables between fathers and non-fathers [$F(3,68) = .710, p = .549$] or between high/low insecure fathers and high/low insecure non-fathers on the combined dependent variables [$F(3,68) = 1.498, p = .223$]. However, analyses did reveal significant differences between high and low insecure groups [$F(3, 68) = 6.536, p = .001$] (Table 4.2). This was further explored with a between-subjects analyses using a Bonferroni Correction which indicated that the two groups significantly differed solely on job security satisfaction ($p = .002$) (Table 4.3).

Table 4.1

Descriptive Statistics

Variable		High Insecurity (1)			Low Insecurity (2)		
		Mean	Standard Dev.	N	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Fathers (1)	Health	64.0476	20.77372	21	74.6000	20.7123	25
	Anger	49.5238	12.82037	21	44.1600	.55377	25
	JSS	2.1667	.33532	21	2.8160	.33532	25
Non-Fathers (0)	Health	67.3333	12.2279	15	77.3077	18.4408	13
	Anger	47.7333	5.70046	15	46.0000	3.36650	13
	JSS	2.5627	.58406	15	2.7231	.17153	13

Table 4.2

Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	F	DF	Error df	Sig.
CHILDREN	Hotelling's Trace	.031	.710	3.000	68.000	.549
JSI3	Hotelling's Trace	.288	6.536	3.000	68.000	.001*
CHILDREN * JSI3	Hotelling's Trace	.066	1.498	3.000	68.000	.223

*Significant at .05

Table 4.3

Test of Between-Subjects Effects for JSI3

Effect	Type III SOS	Df	Mean Sq.	F	Sig
Health	1822.366	1	1822.366	5.082	.027
JSS	2.836	1	2.836	10.318	.002*
Anger	217.853	1	217.853	3.925	.052

*Significant at .017

Table 4.4

Intercorrelations Between Dependent Variables

Variable		HEALTHSC	JSS	ANGER	FUTURE
HEALTHSC	Pearson Correlation	1	-.011	-.158	.303(**)
	Sig.	.	.925	.179	.009
	N	74	74	74	73
JSS	Pearson Correlation	-.011	1	-.181	.676(**)
	Sig.	.925	.	.123	.000
	N	74	74	74	73
ANGER	Pearson Correlation	-.158	-.181	1	-.288(*)
	Sig.	.179	.123	.	.013
	N	74	74	74	73
FUTURE	Pearson Correlation	.303(**)	.676(**)	-.288(*)	1
	Sig.	.009	.000	.013	.
	N	73	73	73	73

**significant at the 0.01 level.

*significant at the 0.05 level.

Chapter V: Discussion

Job insecurity, or the perceived threat of job or benefit loss, has been well documented in the literature as negatively affecting employee and employee support system well-being (Sverke & Hellgren, 2002). Previous research has found that neither economic class, education, gender, job tenure, or marital status effectively mediates the negative impact of job insecurity (Ferrie, Shipley, Marmot, Stansfeld, & Smith, 1998). Building upon the literature in both unemployment and parenthood research, the current investigation was structured to incorporate overlapping factors in both areas to address how levels of job insecurity may differ for fathers and non-fathers.

The present study specifically attempted to build upon the job insecurity literature by examining outcomes on a specific population of workers (employed fathers). The results of this study did not reveal significant effect or interaction differences between groups of men who were fathers and men who were not fathers, however, which would have supported the hypothesis that fathers experience negative outcomes of job insecurity in an exacerbated manner. Nonetheless, there was one significant finding which bears review, as well as a number of possible explanations for the lack of significance found for fathers..

The one significant finding in the study indicated that men who rated themselves such that they were placed in the “highly insecure” group were significantly different

than men who were self-rated into the “low insecure” group. These differences were apparent only on a measure of job security satisfaction, and did not continue into the health and anger outcome ratings. As indicated by the means on table 4.1, men who rated themselves as “low insecure” (the most job security) had higher job security satisfaction means than did the men who rated themselves with the least security or “high insecurity.” This finding is not terribly surprising given the high degree of correlation between the Job Security Index (JSI) and the Job Security Satisfaction Scale (JSS) ($p=.676 @ .05$). Therefore, it does seem that individual perception of job security affects men’s satisfaction with security while parenting status, at least for this study, does not significantly do so.

With both the parent effect and parent/insecurity interaction hypotheses failing to achieve their predicted outcomes, the data seem to indicate that childrearing responsibilities for men were uncorrelated to any significant negative outcomes as defined in this study. If these findings are taken at face value, they may seem to endorse a parenthood as a non-entity in the job security and job security satisfaction literature. However, while it is possible that men are faring better in terms of parenthood and work than this study predicted, other factors of this investigation may change the interpretation of the findings. These additional factors are discussed below.

Sampling Issues

First, the sample failed to present in a manner demonstrating a great deal of variety in self-ratings of job insecurity. That is, men did not neatly fall into high/low insecurity groups, and a median split had to be performed at a score of 2.77 on a 3.0 scale

to accomplish two distinct groups. Men scores were highly clustered toward the 3.0 score (highest possible job security perceptions), which is higher than that of the norming population. While it is possible that the current sample represents a somewhat “protected” group that has not yet experienced job insecurity, many of the men work in a geographic area that has lost a large number of jobs in the last two years due to layoffs. Of the two primary counties from which the sample was drawn, one county had an unemployment rate at the conclusion of the study (2.6%) which was below that of the state average for the same period (4.7%) and far below that of the neighboring county (7.9%) (www.oesc.state.ok.us). Even with this variation, it seems unlikely that such a significant number of men would have all avoided perceptions of job insecurity even if they were not all bothered by it. Since a majority of the men worked in civil service occupations (e.g., law enforcement and fire protection), it is also possible that this subgroup remains outside those significantly impacted by job insecurity at this time and therefore possibly skewed the sample.

Alternatively, the men participating in the sample may have adjusted their scores to reflect positive feelings and outcomes due to the sensitive nature of the subject despite efforts to assure anonymity. This is a risk inherent in this type of invasive research. It is also a possible coping mechanism for subjects since job insecurity is built on individual perception; that is, denial of any perception could be a maintenance strategy for individuals coping with an insecure environment. However, scores on all instruments offered individual variation and did not reflect “perfect” reporting save a few cases. Therefore, while participants may have adjusted their scores, they failed to globally endorse the “best” answer in all cases therefore lending some credibility to group

responses.

Alternate Model Support

This study was partially formulated by implementing the “good provider” model of fatherhood (Bernard, 1981); that is, the idea that men’s identities are significantly imbedded in their abilities to perform as caretakers. This model is thought to represent the more “traditional” type of fathering role in which men wishing to act as “good” fathers will invest themselves more heavily in work-for-pay in an effort to meet the needs and wants of family members. This model is important to the study in that the sample was globally predicted to be functioning along these lines of thought. Prior to sampling, men were predicted to be likely to hold beliefs reflecting the idea that they must perform in the workplace in order to serve their families. This prediction in itself should be reflective of a sample in which men may be pressured to be successful and secure in their work, demonstrate increased effort in time and energy put into workplace pursuits, and therefore may be in line to receive negative outcomes when workplace expectations were not met and thus duty to the family may be failed. Each of these items are of course merely detailed assumptions stemming from the broad ideas that “traditional” fathers hold according to the model. If the model truly represents the sample, then these job insecure fathers for whom work is such a central component of identity and worth should demonstrate discomfort when job security is threatened.

Indeed, on questions designed to assess men’s levels of “good provider beliefs” in both their families of origin and families of procreation, means for both groups indicated moderate and similar levels of traditional rearing and current behavior. Although parents tended, on average, to report somewhat traditional beliefs about providing for their family

that were very consistent between family of origin and family of procreation, non-parents appeared to be functioning slightly more traditionally now than in their past. Both groups, however, scored more closely to traditional concepts of fatherhood than non-traditional concepts. This would appear consistent with a model of traditional “good provider” fatherhood and seems to validate pre-study predictions about the beliefs held by the sample.

Also consistent with the “good provider” model of fatherhood was the finding that men without children tended to work slightly less than men with children (minimum work week of 35 hours and 40 hours on average, respectively). This type of employment pattern fits most well with the good provider model in which fathers take on additional hours in order to benefit their families. This was not a primary point of investigation for this study, however, and should be interpreted with caution. Nonetheless, these findings present a heterogeneous picture of rural mid-western parenting and could be worthy of future investigation.

However, all remaining data from the primary hypotheses must also be addressed. Quite simply, the current study did not find support for significantly increased physical and psychological symptoms of stress due to providing for family. In terms of theoretical models, this may indicate that men are not functioning with a “good provider” mentality, and could also be indicative of the fact that men’s roles are changing. While this is just one explanation, the alternate model does account for findings that are not explained by the guiding model.

The alternate model is naturally a model of non-traditional or “new” fatherhood (Wilkie, 1993). If this model truly represents the study then we would expect to see men

who are defining their fatherhood role by their relationship directly to their children and perhaps who would be at less risk for negative impact of job insecurity. We would expect these men to be a bit more impervious to job insecurity as it may threaten their livelihood but does not necessarily impact their core beliefs about their worth as fathers. Certainly this interpretation fits for the fathers in the sample who did not show vulnerability to job insecurity although admittedly the sample as a whole did not truly demonstrate low levels of job security. Additionally, the study did not include a component which directly assessed men's parenting esteem and therefore any firm conclusions about model fit are not appropriate to make at this time.

Recommendations for Future Research

Although the findings of the current study did not offer clear support for the hypothesis that parenting men are at particular risk for physical and psychological health problems due to job insecurity, a number of findings may still be valuable to other researchers wishing to investigate the impact of job insecurity on individual and family functioning. First, while the current study purposefully undertook a diverse sample of job types and ages in order to investigate the potential outcomes of job insecurity, this may not globally be advised given the nature of the results. Although job insecurity is believed to be pervasive across a number of demographic factors, it appears that research may still be needed that includes attention to a number of factors related to cultural geography and employment type. Many job insecurity studies have been performed in large North American cities and in Europe. This study focused on employment in the rural Mid-Western United States. It is quite possible that cultural differences may have influenced the results of this study, and therefore future researchers are encouraged to not only

pursue the global nature of job insecurity across populations but to also return to and maintain interest in identified unique populations such as the rural U.S. There is much that is unknown about the nuances of job insecurity functioning and it may be best investigated in a more segmented than holistic manner.

Despite the lack of significance from this study, a number of factors seem to emphasize the importance of continuing this line of research. For example, the ever-shifting economic picture in the United States and public recognition of the long-term evolution of fatherhood and family life are facts, and it would seem unreasonable to abandon further investigation of the outcomes of the intersection of family and work life. In fact, given the nature of the current findings, further investigation seems necessary to understand the needs of fathers in the workplace and the role of the workplace in fathers' lives. Future studies wishing to investigate factors impacting and exacerbating job insecurity effects may wish to attend to a more industry-specific sample. While this is counterintuitive to known research, the use of a Midwest sample may have impacted the results and future research may benefit from "backing up" and performing more job-specific research.

In addition to more homogeneous studies of industry and participant age, long held advice in the job insecurity literature is to investigate security over time. Therefore, future researchers may wish to partner with local and regional companies and gather research over time from a sample set of employees. Researchers able to offer return benefits to the company, such as seminars, counseling, or relevant classes, may be in the best position to do so. Another wise consideration may be to continue to hold steady employment factors and instead vary participants more purposefully by family structure.

An unmarried matched sample of adult men with or without children is highly unlikely to occur in time-pressured research in an American social climate. Since most adult men are married and many are fathers by the end of early career status, it seems most logical to work within variations of this population. Therefore, future researchers may wish to consider investigating outcomes by fathering type (i.e. biological/adoptive, custodial, or step-parenting), child gender, or child age.

Implications for Practitioners

Despite results which failed to indicate significant differences in health outcomes for men who are in fathering roles and those who are not, data did present in the anticipated direction. That is, fathering men did exhibit slight but insignificant exacerbations of health and anger symptoms given relatively equal levels of job security satisfaction. This remains important data for psychological consultants and clinicians who work with employed men either directly or via the family system.

First, psychologists should be aware of the general course of job insecurity and its pervasive and long lasting nature. Prior research has indicated that the mere *perception* of potential job loss or loss of any element of one's job can have devastating results for employed men. It is not necessary that clinician's observe validation of these perceptions, only recognition that one's client labors under said beliefs. It is the *belief*, therefore, that determines the presence of job insecurity. Whether and how one is bothered by job insecurity then determines the potential negative impact for an individual. Negative outcomes of job insecurity are not thought to effectively be mediated by the presence of a spouse. The current study also fails to indicate that the presence of minor children either exacerbates or insulates one against this particular stressor.

Secondly, clinicians need to recognize the general reticence of men to seek counseling as indicated by prior research. They should also recognize that fathers' stressors often reveal themselves in the family system, and that insecurity is often a hidden culprit in this stress. Merely checking for unemployment will not reveal long-standing problems associated with stressful but continuous or even re-engaged employment.

Finally, practitioners need to aware that men today are potentially functioning in between two contrasting models of fatherhood which may also draw past and present behavior in to conflict. Since job insecurity is based upon the meaning one assigns to events as well as one's perceptions of past, present, and anticipated events, models of counseling sensitive to meaning-making behaviors may be especially useful. Job insecurity does not dissipate automatically with re-employment or increasingly positive circumstances. It requires that a man's definition of himself and his role as a father be melded into congruence with his reality; that is, for a man to successfully combat the rigors of job insecurity, he must find some degree of meaning and confidence in what he is doing and how it is providing for him and his family. While a great deal more investigation is necessary to understand the role children play in this endeavor, it is most likely, given the input of all other work-family research, that some level of bi-directional influence exists. It is the mission of job insecurity and family researchers to identify how a man's family can and does impact his meaning-making role of working father.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barling, J., & Kelloway, K. (1996). *Job insecurity and health: The moderating role of workplace control*. *Stress Medicine*, 12, 253-259.
- Barnett, R., Marshall, N., & Pleck, J.(1992). *Men's multiple roles and their relationship to men's psychological distress*. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, Vol 54(2), 358-367.
- Barrett, K., Riggart, T., & Flowers, C. (1996). *Violence in the workplace: Examining the risk*. *Journal of Rehabilitation Administration*, 2 (2), 95-114.
- Bernard, J. (1981). *The good-provider role: Its rise and fall*. *American Psychologist*, Vol 36(1), 1-12.
- Blair, S. & Lichter, D. (1991). *Measuring the division of household labour*. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12 (1), 91-113.
- Campbell-Jamison, F., Worrall, L., & Cooper, C. (2001). *Downsizing in Britain and its effects on survivors and their organizations*. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping: An International Journal*, Vol 14(1), 35-58.
- Catalano, R., Novaco, R., & McConnell, W. (1997). *A model of the net effect of job loss on violence*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72 (6), 1440-1447.
- Chan, S., & Huff Stevens, A. (1999). *Employment and retirement following a late-career job loss*. *American Economic Review*, 89 (2), 211-216.
- Chandola, T., & Jenkinson, C. (2000). The new UK national statistics socio-economic classification (NS-SEC): Investigating social class differences in self-reported health status. *Journal of Public Health Medicine*, 22, 182-190.
- Cohen, T. (1993). What do fathers provide? Reconsidering the economic and nurturant dimensions of men as parents. In Jane C. Hood (Ed.), *Men, work, and family* (pp. 1-22). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Conger, R., Neppl, T., Kim, K. & Scaramella, L. (2003). *Angry and aggressive behaviors*

- across three generations: A prospective, longitudinal study of parents and children.* Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, Vol 31(2), 143-160.
- Cooksey, E., & Fondell, M. (1996). *Spending time with his kids: Effects of family structure on fathers' and children's lives.* Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58 (3), 693-707.
- Cooney, T. & Uhlenberg, P. (1991) *Changes in work-family connections among highly educated men and women 1970-1980.* Journal of Family Issues, Vol 12(1), 69-90.
- Corwyn, R., & Bradley, R. (1999). *Determinants of paternal and maternal investment in children.* Infant Mental Health Journal, 20 (3), 238-256.
- Cowan, C., & Cowan, P. (1992). *When partners become parents: The big life change for couples.* New York, NY, US: Basic Books, Inc.
- Crouter, A. (1984). *Spillover from family to work: The neglected side of the work-family interface.* Human Relations, Vol 37(6), 425-441.
- Crouter, A., Head, M., Bumpus, M., & McHale, S. (2001). *Implications of overwork and overload for the quality of men's family relationships.* Journal of Marriage and Family, 63 (2), 404-416.
- DeMeuse, K., Vanderheiden, P. & Bergmann, T. (1994). *Announced layoffs: Their effect on corporate financial performance.* Human Resource Management, 33, 509-530.
- DeWitte, H. (1996). *Job insecurity and psychological well-being: Review of the literature and exploration of some unresolved issues.* European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8 (2), 155-177.
- Dominitz, J., & Manski, C. (1997). *Perceptions of economic insecurity: Evidence from the survey of economic expectations.* Public Opinion Quarterly, 61, 261-287.
- Dooley, D., Prause, J., Ham-Rowbottom, K. (2000). *Underemployment and depression: Longitudinal relationships.* Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 41 (4), 421-436.
- Dowd, N. (2000). *Redefining Fatherhood.* New York: New York University Press

- Eggebeen, D., & Knoester, C. (2001). *Does fatherhood matter for men?* Journal of Marriage and Family, 63 (2), 381-393.
- Fallick, B. (1996). *A review of the recent empirical literature on displaced workers.* Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 50 (1), 5-16.
- Ferrie, J., Shipley, M., Marmot, M., Martikainen, P., Stansfeld, S., & Smith, G. (2001). *Job insecurity in white-collar workers: Toward an explanation of associations with health.* Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6 (1), 26-42.
- Ferrie, J., Shipley, M., Marmot, M., Stansfeld, S., & Smith, G. (1998). *The health effects of major organisational change and job insecurity.* Social Science Medicine, 46 (2), 243-254.
- Ferrie, J., Shipley, M., Stansfeld, S., & Marmot, M. (2002). *Effects of chronic job insecurity and change in job security on self reported health, minor psychiatric morbidity, physiological measures, and health related behaviours in British civil servants: The Whitehall II study.* Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 56, 450-454.
- Ferrie, J., Shipley, M., Marmot, M., Stansfeld, S., & Smith, G. (1998). *An uncertain future: The health effects of threats to employment security in white-collar men and women.* American Journal of Public Health, 88 (7), 1030-1036.
- Frese, M. (1985). *Stress at work and psychosomatic complaints: A causal interpretation.* Journal of Applied Psychology, 70, 314-328.
- Frone, M., Yardley, J. (1996). *Workplace family-supportive programmes: Predictors of employed parents' importance ratings.* Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 69 (4), 351-366.
- Greenberger, E., Goldberg, W., & Crawford, T. (1988). *Beliefs about the consequences of maternal employment for children.* Psychology of Women Quarterly, Vol 12(1), 35-59.
- Greenhalgh, L. & Rosenblatt, Z. (1984). *Job insecurity: Toward conceptual clarity.* Academy of Management Review, Vol 9(3), 438-448.
- Grimm-Thomas, K., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (1994). *All in a day's work: Job experiences,*

- self-esteem, and fathering in working class families.* Family Relations: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, Vol 43(2), 174-181.
- Grossman, F., Pollack, W., & Golding, E. (1988). *Fathers and children: Predicting the quality and quantity of fathering.* Developmental Psychology, Vol 24(1), 82-91.
- Grunberg, L, Moore, S., & Greenberg, E. (2001). *Differences in psychological and physical health among layoff survivors: The effect of layoff contact.* Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6 (1), 15-25.
- Hamilton, V., Hoffman, W., & Broman, C. (1993). *Unemployment, distress, and coping: A panel study of autoworkers.* Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, Vol 65(2), 234-247.
- Hanisch, K. (1999). *Job loss and unemployment research from 1994 to 1998: A review and recommendations for research and intervention.* Journal of Vocational Behavior, 55, 188-220.
- Heaney, C., Israel, B., & House, J. (1994). *Chronic job insecurity among automobile workers: Effects on job satisfaction and health.* Social Science & Medicine, Vol 38(10), 1431-1437.
- Isaksson, K. & Johansson, G. (2000). *Adaption to continued work and early retirement following downsizing: Long term effects and gender differences.* Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, Vol 73(2), pp. 241-256.
- Jacobsen, L., LaLonde, R., & Sullivan, D. (1993). *Earnings losses of displaced workers.* American Economic Review, 83 (4), 685-709.
- Jones, L. (1996). *A harsh and challenging world of work: Implications for counselors.* Journal of Counseling & Development, 74 (5), 453-459.
- Kanter, R. (1977). *Work and Family in the United States: A critical review and agenda for research and policy.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kaufman, G. & Uhlenberg, P. (2000). *The influence of parenthood on the work effort of*

- married men and women.* Social Forces, Vol 78(3), 931-947.
- Kivimaki, M., Vahtera, J., Pentti, J., Thomson, L., Griffiths, A., & Cox, T. (2001). *Downsizing, changes in work, and self-rated health of employees: A 7-year, 3-wave panel study.* Anxiety, Stress, and Coping, 14, 59-73.
- Kupers, T. (1996). *Men at work and out of work.* Psychiatric Annals, 26 (1), 29-32.
- Larson, J., Wilson, S., & Beley, R. (1994). *The impact of job insecurity on marital and family relationships.* Family Relations: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, Vol 43(2), 138-143.
- Lim, V. (1996). *Job insecurity and its outcomes: Moderating effects of work-based and nonwork-based social support.* Human Relations, 49 (2), 171-186.
- Marsiglio, W., Hutchison, S., & Cohen, M. (2000). *Envisioning fatherhood: A social psychological perspective on young men without kids.* Family Relations, 49, 133-142.
- Mayhew, K. & Lempers, J. (1998). *The relation among financial strain, parenting, parent self-esteem, and adolescent self-esteem.* Journal of Early Adolescence, 18(2), 145-172.
- McLoyd, V. (1989). *Socialization and development in a changing economy The effects of paternal job and income loss on children.* American Psychologist, 44 (2), 293-302.
- Mighty, E. (1997). *Conceptualizing family violence as a workplace issue: A framework for research and practice.* Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 10 (4), 249-262.
- Nock, S. (1998). *Marriage in men's lives.* In Alan Booth & Ann Crouter (Eds.) *Men in families: When do they get involved? What difference does it make?* (pp. 227-237). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- O'Brien, G. (1986). *Psychology of work and unemployment.* Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

- Parke, R. (1996). *Fatherhood*. Cambridge, MA, US: Harvard University Press.
- Paul, R., & Townsend, J. (1998). *Violence in the workplace--A review with recommendations*. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 11 (1), 1-14.
- Pearson, C. (1998). *Organizations as targets and triggers of aggression and violence: Framing rational explanations for dramatic organizational deviance*. Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 15, 197-223.
- Perry-Jenkins, M., Repetti, R., & Crouter, A (2000). *Work and family in the 1990s*. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62, 27-63.
- Piotrkowski, C. S. (1979). *Work and the family system: A naturalistic study of the working class and lower-middle class families*. New York: Free Press.
- Pleck, J. Are “family supportive” employer policies relevant to men? In Jane C. Hood (Ed.) *Men, work, and family* (pp. 217-237). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Pleck, J., Staines, G., & Lang, L. (1980). *Conflicts between work and family life*. Monthly Labor Review, 103 (3), 29-32.
- Polsky, D. (1999). Changing consequences of job separation in the United States. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review* 52 (4), 565-580.
- Probst, T. (2000). *Wedded to the job: Moderating effects of job involvement on hte consequences of job insecurity*. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, Vol 5(1), pp. 63-73.
- Probst, T. (2003). *The impact of job insecurity on employee work attitudes, job adaptation, and organizational withdrawal behaviors*. In Probst, T. (2003). Development and validation of the Job Security Index and the Job Security Satisfaction scale: A classical test theory and IRT approach. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76, 451-467.
- Reynolds, S., & Gilbert, P. (1991). *Psychological impact of unemployment Interactive effects of vulnerability and protective factors on depression*. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38 (1), 76-84.
- Rook, K., Dooley, D., & Catalano, R. (1991). *Stress transmission: The effects of*

- husbands' job stressors on the emotional health of their wives.* Journal of Marriage & the Family, Vol 53(1), 165-177.
- Rosenblatt, Z., Talmud, I., & Ruvio, A. (1999). *A gender-based framework on the experience of job insecurity and its effect on work attitudes.* European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology, Vol 8(2), Special issue: Job insecurity, 197-217.
- Schaufeli, W. (1992). *Unemployment and mental health in well and poorly educated school-leavers.* In C. Verhaar & L. Jansma (Eds), *On the mysteries of unemployment: Causes, consequences and policies*, 253-271. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Schwartzberg, N., & Dytell, R. (1996). *Dual-earner families: The importance of work stress and family stress for psychological well-being.* Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1 (2), 211-223.
- Schwebel, M. (1997). *Job insecurity as structural violence: Implications for destructive intergroup conflict.* Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 3 (4), 333-351.
- Smithson, J., & Lewis, S. (2000). *Is job insecurity changing the psychological contract?* Personnel Review, 29 (6), 680-702.
- Snarey, J. (1993). *How Fathers Care for the Next Generation: A Four Decade Study.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sparks, K., Faragher, B., & Cooper, C. (2001). *Well-being and occupational health in the 21st century workplace.* Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74 (4), 489-509.
- Spielberger, C. (1999). *State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory-2.* PAR Assessment Resources
- Sverke, M., & Hellgren, J. (2002). *The nature of job insecurity: Understanding employment uncertainty on the brink of a new millenium.* Applied Psychology: An International Review, 51 (1), 23-42.
- Swanson, V. Power, K., & Simpson, R. *Occupational stress and family life: A*

- comparison of male and female doctors.* Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, Vol 71(3), 237-260.
- Tolbert, P., & Moen, P. (1998). *Men's and women's definitions of "good" jobs: Similarities and differences by age and across time.* Work and Occupations, 25 (2), 168-194.
- United States Bureau of the Census (2004). Retrieved March 4, 2004 from www.census.gov.
- United States Bureau of Labor Statistics (2004). Retrieved June 23, 2004 from www.stats.bls.gov.
- Westman, M., Etzion, D., & Danon, E. (2001). *Job insecurity and crossover of burnout in married couples.* Journal of Organizational Behavior, Vol 22(5), 467-481.
- Wilson, S., Larson, J., & Stone, K. (1993). *Stress among job insecure workers and their spouses.* Family Relations, 42, 74-80.
- World Health Organization, European Branch (1999). Retrieved June 23, 2004 from

Appendix A
In Person Solicitation Script

Hello, My name is Ginger Welch & I am a doctoral student in counseling psychology at Oklahoma State University. I am currently looking for men to participate in a study I am conducting titled “Health Outcomes of Job Insecurity for Parenting & Non-Parenting Men.” I am interested in men between the ages of 24-65 who are employed to completed a series of short questionnaires. The entire process should take approximately 40 minutes, and your participation will only be required one time. Your participation is completely voluntary, and you may choose to withdraw your participation at any point before, during, or after completing the questionnaires.

You will be asked to sign the attached informed consent, and to select whether or not you would like the results of the study mailed to you upon the completion of the research project. These forms will be returned to me. There is an additional form that lists my name, the name of my major advisor, and contact information for me. This page is for you to keep so that you can contact me with any questions you may have at a later time. It is important for you to know that your participation in this project will be completely confidential, as you will be assigned a code number when you fill out the questionnaires. The only place your name will appear is on the informed consent sheet which I will remove from your questionnaires today. I am ethically prevented from revealing your participation in this study to anyone including employers, spouses, or colleagues.

Please know that you are welcome to contact me at any time with questions you may have, and again, that your participation is entirely voluntary. Thank you for allowing me to speak to you today.

Appendix B: Recruitment Letter

Dear <insert name> or Potential Participant:

This letter is to invite you to participate in a research project from Oklahoma State University about employment. I am currently a doctoral student at Oklahoma State University completing research about men and work in today's economic environment. I am interested in hearing from men with a variety of jobs and who have various types of experiences as fathers (including not being a father). It is my hope that this research may help companies in the future provide better services their employees even during times of economic hardship. There are a few things you need to know about this study:

1. At this time, this study is only open to men over the age of 24. To participate, you may be employed or unemployed and may or may not have children.
2. All information you provide will be completely confidential. NO information of any kind (including whether or not you participate) will be provided to your employer, even if you are employed by Oklahoma State University.
3. If you wish to participate, please complete the enclosed questionnaires and send them back to me in the pre-paid envelope. If you do not wish to participate, do nothing. You will not be contacted further.
4. If you would like to learn the results of this study, you may check the option below for me to send you a letter with the results approximately one year from now.

Thank you for considering participation in this study; your help is a valuable contribution to what we know about men, fatherhood, and employment in today's economic environment. Please feel free to contact me, my advisor Dr. John Romans (744-9506), or the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Oklahoma State Univeristy (744-xxxx) if you have any questions at all regarding this study. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Ginger Welch
Doctoral Student,
Oklahoma State University
405-624-6652
gwelch@okstate.edu

Dr. John Romans, Associate Professor
Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies
College of Education
325 E Willard Hall
Oklahoma State University

Return this portion with your questionnaires:

YES; please send me the results of this study at the following address or email address:

Appendix C
Demographic Questionnaire

Please complete each of the following items. All information will be kept confidential.

1. Date of Birth /
 month year

2. Your marital status:

- married, first time
- single, never married
- single, separated
- single, divorced
- single, widowed
- remarried
- living with partner
- other (please specify): _____

3. Your personal current gross income per month before taxes and other deductions (please check one):

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 0-100 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 2000-2499 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 101-499 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 2500-2999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 500-999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3000-3499 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 1000-1499 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3500-3599 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 1500-1999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 4000 or more |

4. The income of your current spouse or partner per month before taxes and other deductions (please check one):

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 0-100 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 2000-2499 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 101-499 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 2500-2999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 500-999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3000-3499 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 1000-1499 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 3500-3599 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 1500-1999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 4000 or more |

5. Your own ethnic group:

- African American
- Asian
- Latino
- Multiethnic (Please describe: _____)
- Native American (Tribe: _____)
- White
- Other (please specify: _____)

6. Your occupation (Please describe your job. Consult the list below for examples of specific occupations):

Accountant	Dishwasher	Nursing Aide
Actor	Electrician	Postal Clerk
Aeronautical Engineer	Farm Laborer	Public Relations
Assembly Line Worker	Forester	Professor
Bank Teller	Garbage Collector	Receptionist
Busboy	Guard/Watchman	Secretary
Carpenter	Hairdresser	Security Guard
Cashier	Health Administrator	Sheriff/Baliff
Clergy	Homemaker	Shoe Repair
Clerical Supervisor	Janitor	Surveyor
Child Care Worker	Key Punch Operator	Teacher, Secondary
Cook	Manger	Waiter
Dentist	Musician	

7. Are you currently employed or unemployed in this occupation?

employed unemployed

8. If employed in this occupation, how many paid hours per week do you currently work?

1-10 11-19 20-29 30-40 40-50 50+

9. How many months/years have you been employed in this occupation?

less than six months
 six months - one year
 one year - three years
 three-five years
 five-ten years
 ten - fifteen years
 fifteen - twenty years
 twenty - twenty five years
 more than twenty-five years

10. How many months/years have you been employed at your present company?

- less than six months
- six months - one year
- one year - three years
- three-five years
- five-ten years
- ten - fifteen years
- fifteen - twenty years
- twenty - twenty five years
- more than twenty-five years

11. What was your job prior to the one in which you are currently employed?

12. How long were you employed at your previous job?

- less than six months
- six months - one year
- one year - three years
- three-five years
- five-ten years
- ten - fifteen years
- fifteen - twenty years
- twenty - twenty five years
- more than twenty-five years

13. What was your reason for leaving your last job?

14. Please place a check mark next to the highest grade you completed in school:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6th grade | <input type="checkbox"/> 12th grade | <input type="checkbox"/> some post graduate work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 7th grade | <input type="checkbox"/> some vo-tech | <input type="checkbox"/> graduate degree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 8th grade | <input type="checkbox"/> vo-tech graduate | (specify: _____) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 9th grade | <input type="checkbox"/> some college | <input type="checkbox"/> professional degree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 10th grade | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 year college degree | (specify: _____) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 11th grade | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 year college degree | |

15. Who currently resides in your home with you (ie. brother, daughter, spouse). We do not need their names.

Relation to you	Gender	Occupation	Age
	M F		
	M F		
	M F		
	M F		
	M F		
	M F		
	M F		
	M F		
	M F		
	M F		
	M F		

16. What is the current occupation of your spouse/partner?

17. Is your spouse/partner currently employed or unemployed in this occupation?

employed unemployed

18. Do you have biological children who do NOT currently reside with you?

yes no

19. If yes, how often do you see non-resident biological children?

daily weekly monthly

6-11 times per year 3-5 times per year twice a year

once per year less than once per year no contact

Using the following scale, please rate yourself on the statements below:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all true		Somewhat		Mostly		100%

How true are the following statements for you?

20. I am the primary breadwinner in my family right now.

rating: _____

21. My father was the primary breadwinner in my family when I was growing up.

rating: _____

22. I was raised to believe that men should financially support their families.

rating: _____

23. I was raised to believe that a mother should stay at home with her children.

rating: _____

VITA

Ginger Lea Welch

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Dissertation: Job Insecurity and Fatherhood: Health, Anger, and Job Security
Satisfaction Outcomes for Parenting and Non-Parenting Men

Major Field: Counseling Psychology

Biographical:

Born in Cushing, Oklahoma on October 5, 1971, the daughter of Paul and Clara Welch.

Educational: Graduated from Yale High School, Yale, Oklahoma in May 1989; received Bachelor of Science in Family Relations and Child Development and a minor in English from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in May 1994; received Master of Science in Family Relations and Child Development from Oklahoma State University in July 1996; completed the requirements for Doctor of Philosophy in Counseling Psychology at Oklahoma State University in December 2004.

Experience: Supervisory instructor in Child Development and Early Childhood Education at Oklahoma State University, 1996-1998; Child Development Specialist for the Oklahoma State Department of Health, 1998-2000; Adjunct Instructor in Child Development, Northern Oklahoma College, 2001-2003; Psychology Intern, Missouri Health Sciences Psychology Consortium, Columbia, Missouri, 2003-2004.

Professional Memberships: American Psychological Association, National Association for the Education of Young Children, Society for Research in Child Development

Name: Ginger Lea Welch

Date of Degree: December, 2004

Institution: Oklahoma State University

Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: JOB INSECURITY AND FATHERHOOD: HEALTH, ANGER, AND JOB SECURITY SATISFACTION OUTCOMES FOR PARENTING AND NON-PARENTING MEN

Pages in Study: 74

Candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major Field: Counseling Psychology

Scope and Method of Study: Job insecurity universally has negative effects for employees in terms of both personal and organizational outcomes. These outcomes include depression, work safety, employee morale, and health. This study investigated whether certain personal outcomes (emotional and physical health) may be exacerbated for men who have children. Current models of fatherhood draw not only upon the concept of fathers as good providers, but as active participants in parenting. This multi-tasking conceptualization of fatherhood is used to explore how fatherhood may impact the manner in which men experience job insecurity. Seventy-four men, primarily from civil service occupations, participated in this study.

Findings and Conclusions: A 2x2 MANOVA was performed to investigate parenting status by level of job insecurity effects on men's anger, health, and job security satisfaction. Results indicated that while men's levels of job insecurity (high or low) were negatively correlated with job security satisfaction, no other statistically significant relationships emerged. Parenting and non-parenting men, therefore, demonstrated no significant differences in reported symptoms of coping with job insecurity.

ADVISOR'S APPROVAL: _____