

A Research Proposal

External Locus of Control As a Moderator Of Unforgiveness after Being Downsized

Submitted: September 14, 2007
Department of Organizational Psychology
Birkbeck College, University of London

Table of Contents

Abstract3

Introduction3

 Downsizing: Impact on stakeholders6

 Unforgiveness9

 External Locus of Control13

Method17

 Testing.....18

 Instrumentation.....19

 Development of the UDIS20

Discussion22

References23

 Secondary References31

Appendices36

 Appendix A (Age)36

 Appendix B (Ethnicity/Race).....36

 Appendix C (Educational Attainment).....37

 Appendix D (Employment Classification).....38

 Appendix E (The Heartland Forgiveness Scale).....39

 Appendix F (The Work Locus of Control Scale)41

 Appendix G (Development of the UDIS).....42

**External Locus of Control
As a Moderator of Unforgiveness after Being Downsized**

Abstract

External locus of control is presented as a predictor variable and also as a moderator variable for investigating how downsized individuals experience unforgiveness toward organizations and accountable individuals. The proposed study is novel in several ways. 1) It extends the parent construct of forgiveness into the workplace. 2) It focuses specifically on being downsized. 3) It isolates “unforgiveness” from its parent construct of “forgiveness.” 4) It examines unforgiveness not only toward individuals but also toward organizations. 5) It extends the association between external locus of control and unforgiveness into the employment context. Although harmful effects on the downsized individual are the focus of this investigation, the greater intent is to discover information that can lead to more humane ways of creating effective organizations.

Introduction

Downsizing has been characterized as “a cancer” in organizational life (Kraemer, 2001), a “one-sided renegotiation” of the psychological contract, (Kalimo, Taris, Schaufeli, 2003) and as a “morally contentious” but “normal” business practice that is now “the major business trend of our era” (Orlando, 1999).

Driven by global economic competition (Kets de Vries, 1997, De Meuse, Bergmann and Vanderheiden, 1997, Petzall, Parker and Stoeberl, 2000), downsizing is expected to continue (Cascio, 1993), perhaps permanently (*The Economist*, 2001; in Farrell, 2003). Now a worldwide phenomenon extending beyond the U.S. (Kets de Vries, 1997; Bluestone and Harrison, 1982, Jahoda, 1982, Kaufman, 1982; in Leana and Ivancevich, 1987); downsizing has gained a culture-changing foothold. In Japan, for example, it is claimed to have deinstitutionalized “the entrenched norm of permanent employment” (Ahmadjian,

2001). The literature confirms its spread to Australia (Littler and Innes, 2004), Finland (Kalimo, Taris and Schaufeli, 2003, Kivimaki, Honkonen, Wahlbeck, Elovainio, Pentti, Klaukka, Virtanen and Vahtera, 2007, Vahtera, Kivimaki, Pentti, Linna, Virtanen, Virtanen and Ferrie, 2004), Germany (Dragano, Verde and Siegrist, 2005), Korea (Corbett, 2006, Edwards, Rust, McKinley and Moon, 2003), the Netherlands (Zwetsloot, Gort, Steijger and Moonen, 2007), Singapore, (Edwards et al., 2003), Sweden, (Torkelson and Muhonen, 2003), and the United Kingdom (Campbell-Jamison, Worrall and Cooper, 2001).

Downsizing as a trend began in the U.S. in the late 1970s (Arroba 1979; in Campbell-Jamison et al., 2001) and early 1980s (Cascio, 1993). It quickly gained momentum (Kets de Vries, 1997); and by the end of the 1980s, it had become intrinsic in American culture (Cascio, 2004).

Early-on, downsizing was characterized as a white-collar phenomenon (Cascio, 1993, Beaumont and Harris, 2002), as opposed to the familiar loss of blue-collar, manufacturing jobs (Shank, 1986; in Leana and Ivancevich, 1987, Kets de Vries, 1997). Invoking the term “cutback democracy,” Kets de Vries (1997) writes that downsizing took white-collar workers completely by surprise. Middle-managers were particularly affected, accounting for 17 percent of all dismissals from 1989 to 1991 but only 4 to 8 percent of the workforce (Cascio, 1993). Yet, downsizing’s collar still had a blue side. Campbell-Jamison et al., (2001) note that the manufacturing industry was hardest hit when more than 220,000 jobs were lost in Great Britain between the springs of 1998 and 1999.

By the 1990s, a “downsizing-is-effective” social construction had become embedded in the employment context (McKinley, Zhao and Rust, 2000), having spread through a cognitive process known as “schema-packing.” McKinley et al. (2000) contend that the construct developed in the absence of evidence to support improved financial or technical performance. In fact, a decline in organizational performance following downsizing was reported (Dorfman, 1991; in Cascio, 1993, De Meuse, Bergmann, Vanderheiden and Roraff, 2004). De Meuse et al. (2004) in their longitudinal analysis of Fortune 100 companies that

downsized from 1989 through 1996, were able to determine that financial recovery did finally occur – but only after a “healing period” of “several years.”

Cascio (1993), Kets de Vries (1997) and De Meuse (De Meuse and Marks, 2003, Mische, 2001; in De Meuse et al., 2004) are firmly in agreement that downsizing can only be effective within a larger process designed to deliver positive systemic transformation. Yet, that may not be happening. McKinley et al. (2000, p. 229) claim that downsizing has become so institutionalized that managers “have lost sight of their own agency.” They further contend that the trend is no longer motivated by declining organizational performance.

For at least three reasons, the extent of job loss associated with downsizing is difficult to measure. First, existing definitions of “downsizing” are not in accord. Ahmadjian (2001) writes that downsizing can include early retirement, transfers and reduced hiring. Shaw and Barrett-Power (1997; in (Kalimo et al., 2003), p. 91) define downsizing as a “constellation of events centering around pressures toward workforce reductions.” Freeman and Cameron (1993) state that it can also include abolishing hierarchical levels, merging units and redesigning tasks.

Second, little congruence is evident between the act of “downsizing” and the experience of “being downsized.” The literature suggests that being downsized is involuntary (Greenhalfh, Lawrence and Sutton, 1988; in Edwards et al., 2003), that it is a “permanent layoff” (Edwards et al., 2003), and that the employee was not terminated “for cause” Cascio (1993).

Third, some terms used synonymously with downsizing are compatible – for example, being “made redundant” or “excessed” (Cascio, 1993). But others are not – for example, the term “laid-off.” At least in the U.S., being “laid-off” suggests that circumstances may be temporary. In fact, the U.S. Department of Labor specifies that “extended mass layoffs” must be of at least 31 days (U.S. Department of Labor, 2007). This implies the possibility of being called back to work and is inconsistent with the use of “lay-off” to mean “permanent lay-off” as it is used in the academic literature (e.g. De Meuse et al., 2004) Using the

Department of Labor definition, 92,849 businesses “laid-off” employees from June of 2002 through 2007 (U.S. Department of Labor, 2007).

Thus, “being downsized” is operationalized here as “becoming involuntarily non-employed for reasons other than cause with the implied or expressed idea that the action is necessary for the greater good of the organization.”

An urgent plea for the investigation of downsizing was made two decades ago by Leana and Ivancevich (1987, p. 310). They write, “The need for management researchers... to study the effects of job loss is extremely important for humanitarian, societal and organizational reasons,” and it “...creates an important opportunity for researchers to make significant contributions that can affect organizational practices now and in the future.”

Twenty years later, a respectable body of literature has begun to emerge.

Most of the research is normative (e.g. Ahmadjian, 2002, Cascio, 2004, De Meuse et al., 2004); but the interpretative paradigm is making a respectable showing (e.g., Amundson, Borgen, Jordan and Erlebach 2004, Campbell-Jamison, 2001, Corbett, 2006). One paper (Orlando, 1990) appears to blend critical theory and post-modernism. By far, the most intriguing contribution is an interpretive-paradigm, critical-theory fence-straddler contributed by Kets de Vries (1997), who conducted more than 200 open-ended interviews with individual downsizing stakeholders. He categorized them as “executioners,” “survivors” and “victims.”

Most studies have been cross-sectional (e.g. Clay-Warner, 2005), but some designs have been longitudinal (e.g. Armstrong-Stassen, 2001). At least one has been both prospective and longitudinal (Vahtera, et al.) and some experimental work has also been done (Edwards et al., 2003).

Impact on stakeholders. Because this proposal focuses on individuals who have been downsized, using Kets de Vries (1997) “victims” for want of a less disempowering term, the unit of analysis is the individual. But because the

individual functions as a member of an organization, which functions as a part of society, the acknowledgment of broader stakeholder impact is both informative and necessary.

From a societal perspective, downsizing-related uncertainty is associated with negative and rising worker class-consciousness (Wallace and Junisbai, 2004) in that families and entire communities are impacted by unemployment (Banks, Ullah, 1988, Beal, Nethercott, 1985, Friedemann, Webb, 1995, Price, 1992; in Cassidy, 2001). Damage to an organization's reputation is also a concern because increased hiring difficulties may follow (Zyglidopoulos, 2003) along with erosion of sustainable competitive advantage (Fombrun, 1996, Hall, 1992, 1993, McMillan and Maheshkumar, 1997, Roberts and Dowling 1997; in Zyglidopoulos, 2003). Large reductions in customer satisfaction (Fornell, Johnson, Anderson, Cha and Everitt, 1996; in Ferrell, 2003) have also been found, possibly due to reduced trust and commitment from surviving employees (Ferrell, 2003). Downsizing can also lead to reduced organizational commitment, trust and morale (Armstrong-Stassen, 2001), reduced loyalty and feelings of security (Campbell-Jamison et al., 2001), disruption of employees' adaptability due to the disruption of informal communication networks (Fisher and White, 2000, Lei and Hitt, 1995; In De Meuse et al., 2004), increased role ambiguity and intent to quit (Moore and Greenberg, 2004).

Survivors and victims share increased health risks associated with stress, which is defined as a biochemical reaction within the body (Kaiser and Polczynski, 1982; in Speck, 1993). Moore et al., (2004) report that, in the context of a stress-vulnerability model, workers whose companies have downsized experienced higher levels of health problems including depression. Concern extends to cardiovascular mortality, as Vahtera et al., (2004) found reports of increased mortality among permanent but not temporary employees after downsizing. In contrast, Torkelson and Muhonen (2003) did not report significant health effects after downsizing among survivors.

Among victims, concerns about depression (Gaylin, 1983, Sartorius and Ban, 1986; in Kets de Vries, 1997), stress-reaction and cardiovascular issues warrant concern. (Zeitlin, 1995; in Kalimo et al., 2000). In a sample of unemployed men, deaths due to cardiovascular dysfunction were more than three times expected levels (Cobb and Kasl, 1977; in Leana and Ivancevich, 1987).

Survivors and victims are also united theoretically in breach of the psychological contract (e.g. Amundson, et al., 2004, Beaumont and Harris, 2002, Kets de Vries, 1997), although organizational justice (e.g., Brennan and Skarlicki, 2004) and alienation (Wallace and Junisbai, 2004) are also theoretically relevant. Psychological contract theory is traced to Argyris (1960; in Latham, 2007), Levinson, (1962; in Kets de Vries, 1997) and Schein (1965; in Robinson and Morrison, 2000). The psychological contract is presented here as “people’s unconscious expectations of an organization to respond to their psychological needs and support their psychological defenses in exchange for meeting the organization’s unstated needs” (Rousseau, 1995; in Kalimo et al., 2003, p. 92). According to Amundson et al. (2004), employees perceive breach of the psychological contract the very moment that an organization announces its intent to downsize. The perception of breach holds among survivors (Kalimo et al., 2003) because they experience a “double-deterioration.” They view breach of victims’ psychological contract as breach of their own contract, while they also cope with increased workload (Burke and Greenglass, 2000a; in Kalimo et al., 2003).

For victims, the psychological contract has not only been breached; it is now broken, and the business of coping begins. From his interviews with victims, Kets de Vries (1997) distilled four coping types: 1) the “adaptable,” who move on to new jobs and may eventually view themselves as better off; 2) those who “do a Gauguin (the artist),” making major life-changes, perhaps in pursuit of a long-held dream; 3) the “depressed,” who become stuck in a mourning process, possibly remaining unemployed or contemplating suicide; and 4) the antagonistic, the

subset that experiences violent impulses toward former employers and even outward aggression, sometimes inflicted upon family members.

Kobasa's (1979) work informs with an examination of how victims experience stress. Drawing upon the work of Selye (1956; in Kobasa, 1979), she introduces the concept of "hardiness." Citing Holmes and Masuda, (1974; in Kobasa, 1979), she explains that some individuals become ill in reaction to perceived stress, while "hardier" individuals do not. Job loss ranks high as a stressor, placing in the upper quartile in degree of stress in relation to other life changes. (Holmes and Rahe, 1967, Paykel, 1971; in Leana and Ivancevich, 1987).

Concern about stress reaction among victims is consistent with the work of Parnes and King (1977), who found that deteriorating health was experienced by men who had lost their jobs. In addition to impact on physical health; victims have also been found to experience a sense of alienation (Parnes and King, 1977), greater vulnerability to re-unemployment, reduced problem-solving coping resources and lower perceived social support (Cassidy, 2001). Pugh, Skarlicki and Passell (2003) found that psychological contraction violation predicted cynicism and a negative trust relationship with the individual's new employer.

Unforgiveness. Many of the ways in which downsized victims have been described or studied are also characteristic of unforgiveness. (See Table 1). Those commonalities include risk of cardiovascular disease. Witvliet, Ludwig and Vander Lann (2001) report that the health implications of forgiveness and unforgiveness may be substantial and that research has associated the unforgiving responses of blame, anger and hostility with impaired health (Affleck, Tennen, Croog and Levine, 1987; Tennen and Affleck, 1990; in Witvliet et al., 2001). Cardiovascular disease and premature death are of grave concern. (Miller, Smith, Turner, Guijarro, and Hallet, 1996; in Witvliet et al., 2001)

"Unforgiveness" rather than "forgiveness" is presented here because it avoids problems that are associated with forgiveness as a construct. Forgiveness

Table 1: Shared Concepts between Being Downsized and Unforgiveness		
	Being Downsized	Unforgiveness
Affect	Decreases in positive affect (Bradburn, 1969; in Leana and Ivancevich, 1987)	Negative affect (Lawler, Younger, Piferi, Jobe, Edmondson, Jones, 2005)
Anger	(Kets de Vries, 1997)	(e.g. Witvliet et al., 2001)
Anxiety	(Donovan and Oddy, 1982; in Leana and Ivancevich, 1987)	(Thompson et al., 2005)
Betrayal	(Kets de Vries, 1997)	(Finkel, Rusbult, Kumashiro and Hannon, 2002)
Bitterness	(Morrison and Robinson, 1997; in Pugh et al., 2003)	(Worthington and Wade, 1999; in Berry and Worthington, 2001)
Blame	(Feldman and Leana, 2003)	(Thompson et al., 2005)
Cardiovascular Disease/Premature Death	More hypertension, heart disease (Cook, Cummings, Bartley and Shaper, 1982; in Leana and Ivancevich, 1987) Increased cardiovascular death risk (Cobb and Kasl, 1977; in Leana and Ivancevich, 1987)	Cardiovascular disease, premature death (Witvliet et al., 2001)
Depression	(e.g. Sartorius & Ban, 1986)	(Thompson et al., 2005)
Distrust	(Kets de Vries, 1997)	(Orr et al., 2005)
Hostility	(Estes, 1973; in Leana and Ivancevich, 1987)	(e.g. Thompson et al., 2005)
Life Satisfaction	Decreased life satisfaction (Hepworth, 1980; in Leana and Ivancevich, 1987)	Life satisfaction (Thompson et al., 2005)
Resentment	(Morrison and Robinson, 1997; in Pugh, Skarlicki and Passell, 2003)	(e.g. Girard, Mullet and Callahan, 2002)
Stress Symptoms	Increased psychophysiological symptoms (e.g. Leana and Ivancevich, 1987) Physiological symptoms (Kets de Vries, 1997)	Stress indicators (Witvliet, et al., 2001)
Violation	(e.g. Zyglidopoulos, 2003)	(Finkel et al., 2002)

has a long history in religious studies (Denton and Martin, 1998; in Orr, Sprague, Goertzen, Cornock and Taylor, 2005) and is now flourishing in the secular domain (Thompson, Snyder, Hoffman, Michael, Rasmussen, Billings, Heinze, Neufeld, Shorey, Roberts, Roberts, 2005). However, it lacks a generally accepted definition (Thompson et al., 2005). Furthermore, the idea is taking hold that “forgiveness” and “unforgiveness” may actually be separate constructs (e.g. Worthington and Wade, 1999; in Toussaint and Webb, 2005). The dissonance centers on the endpoint of forgiveness. McCullough and colleagues define forgiveness as “a suite of prosocial changes in one’s motivations toward an interpersonal transgressor such as one becomes less avoidant of and less vengeful toward that transgressor (and, perhaps, more benevolent as well)” (McCullough, Worthington, Rachal, 1997; in McCullough, Bono and Root, 2007, pg. 491). Some researchers propose that the desired endpoint of forgiveness should be reconciliation (e.g. Fitzgibbons, 1986, Hargrave and Sells, 1994; in Strelan and Covic, 2006). Yet, Govier and Verwoerd (2002) write that forgiveness should stop short of reconciliation when it might expose the victim to further harm. Further complicating intervention issues, Kantz (2000; in Orr et al., 2006) reported the belief among a majority of college-student subjects that reconciliation was a necessary part of forgiveness and that forgiveness could cause emotional problems.

Strelan and Covic (2006, p. 1076) have proposed a new definition of forgiveness as “the process of neutralizing a stressor that has resulted from a perception of an interpersonal hurt.” Others (e.g. Thompson, et al.,) are in agreement that forgiveness can have a neutral endpoint and that it that does not require the cultivation of positive emotions toward the transgressor. Interestingly, a neutral endpoint may also be sufficient from a health-stressor perspective. According to McCullough, Sandage, Brown, Rachal, Worthington and Hight (1998, p. 1660), “any variable that helps people modulate hostility might be an important facilitator of physical health.” Interestingly, the utilization of positive emotions – for example, efforts to empathize with the offender – may still be

necessary in order reach a neutral endpoint (Worthington, 1998; in Witvliet et al., 2001).

Thus, for the sake of clarity and utility, “unforgiveness” is the criterion variable presented here. “Forgiveness,” will henceforth refer only to a parent construct that has “unforgiveness” at its negative pole.

Further examination of the literature suggests the expectation that unforgiveness after being downsized could be related to at least to three predictor variables: dispositional forgiveness, length of time since downsizing, and tenure (length of employment with the organization).

Dispositional forgiveness, which describes an individual’s tendency to forgive, has been found be a unique predictor of positive feelings associated with forgiveness (Wade and Worthington, 2003). Therefore, high dispositional forgiveness should be positively associated with neutralized unforgiveness after downsizing.

The passage of time should matter, as well. The process of forgiving has been compared to bereavement (Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt, 1984, Henkoff, 1994; in Kets De Vries, 1997) in which forgiveness occurs with time (Govier, 2002) but is not necessarily linear (Toussaint and Webb, 2005). Therefore, shorter time-since-downsizing is anticipated to be positively associated with unforgiveness, although a linear relationship is not expected.

Organizational tenure has been found to be a strong predictor of organizational commitment (Trimble, 2006), which can be understood as a bond that links the individual to the organization (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). Therefore, an association between tenure and perceived psychological contract violation after downsizing seems reasonable. However, the limited amount of investigation between the two variables (Barger, 2004, Boes, 2007) argues against a making directional prediction. Based on utility and logic, the suspicion of a positive (but not necessarily linear and possibly U-shaped) association is favored for now.

External Locus of Control. Introduced as a personality variable rather than as a stable personality trait, locus of control originated within the seventh postulate of Rotter's social learning theory (Rotter, 1954) and was further developed by his student Phares (1955; in Lefcourt, 1966). It has also been explored in relation to attribution theory (Levenson and Miller, 1976) and learned helplessness (Hiroto, 1974).

Essentially, "locus of control refers" to differences in how individuals perceive who or what controlled the outcomes that they experience. An internal locus refers to the belief that an outcome was contingent on one's own actions, while an external locus represents the belief that the outcome was due to chance, luck or powerful others (Rotter, 1975). Rotter brought the concept into mainstream psychology with the development of a 29-item, forced-choice scale (Rotter, 1966), on which scores ascend from I to E.

Research suggests a modest heritable component of locus of control (Miller and Rose, 1982) in spite of the fact that it is also learned belief, existing partially as early as the third grade (Crandall, Katkovsky and Crandall, 1965). Locus of control also has also shown sufficient stability to have been characterized as a trait (Judge, van Vianen and De Pater, 2004), in spite of Rotter's insistence that that it is neither a trait nor a typology (Rotter, 1975).

The variable is most interesting and unflattering at its external pole. Table 2 lists characteristics that have been associated with externality and compares them with those of unforgiveness.

Reciprocity also seems to be in play as shifts toward externality have been reported in association with negative life events and circumstances. Rotter (1975) reported that median I-E scores of college students shifted an entire standard deviation in the external direction from the mid 1960s to 1975. Surprisingly, Doherty (1983) found that not only did externality increase as

	External Locus	Unforgiveness
Acceptance of Responsibility	Failure to accept (Davis and Davis, 1972; in Basgall and Snyder, 1988)	
Affect	Negative (Basgall and Snyder, 1988)	Negative (Lawler, 2005)
Anxiety	(Lefcourt, 1976; in Basgall, Snyder, 1988)	(Thompson et al., 2005)
Blame	(Hochreich, 1974)	(Thompson et al., 2005)
Coping	Less task-oriented coping (Anderson, 1977)	
Defensiveness	(Anderson, 1977)	
Defensive Externalization	(e.g. Altmaier, Leary, Forsyth and Ansel, 1979)	
Depression	(e.g. Basgall and Snyder, 1988)	(Thompson et al., 2005)
Distrust	Low trust (Hochreich, 1974)	(Orr et al., 2005)
Enthusiasm	Low enthusiasm (Daniels and Guppy, 1997)	
Ethical intent	Reduced ethical intent (Beu, Buckley, Harvey and 2003)	
Excuse-Making	(Basgall, Snyder, 1988)	
Hostility	(Basgall, Snyder, 1988)	(e.g. Thompson et al., 2005)
Magical Thinking	(Beitel, Ferrer, Cecero and 2004)	
Self-Pity	Self-described self-pity (Hersch and Scheibe, 1967)	
Stress	Higher perceived stress (Anderson, 1977)	Stress indicators (Witvliet et al., 2001)

predicted among divorced women during a five-year period in the 1970s, it also increased in his control group of women who had remained married. He confirmed this shift with a reanalysis (Doherty and Baldwin, 1985), speculating that it might have been related to societal influences. Other studies have confirmed external shifts after negative events (e.g. Lefcourt, Miller, Ware Sherk, 1981). Wendland (1973) found a temporary external shift in men who had become physically disabled. Higher externality has also been found in socio-economically disadvantaged populations (Graves, 1961; in Battle, Rotter, 1963, Lefcourt and Ladwig, 1965). Most recently, Twenge and colleagues (Twenge, Zang, Im, 2004) sounded a call-to-alarm, reporting meta-analysis findings that .80 of a shift in standard deviation occurred among U.S. college students from 1960 to 2002. They argue that the implications are almost universally negative in suggesting a growing sense of alienation and powerlessness. They also allude to the terrorist destruction of the U.S. World Trade Center towers on September 11, 2001.

But one study (Frost, 1991) confounds in that it failed to confirm greater externality among unemployed unionized manufacturing workers. However, since both survivors and victims experience psychological contract breach, it's possible that both groups experienced an external shift. In that case, the cross-sectional measure used would not have shown differences between the two groups.

The use of personality variables as moderator variables is called for in the literature (Näswall, Sverke and Hellgren, 2005) – for locus of control, specifically, (Lefcourt et al., 1981), and also for external locus (Sarason, Johnson and Siegel, 1978).

Only four studies inform this path of investigation. Contrary to one of their hypotheses, Raja et al (Raja, Johns and Ntalianis, 2004) found that external locus not only predicted perceived breach of the psychological contract, it was the strongest predictor among the six personality variables studied. This investigation is unusual in that its sample was Pakistani, and 94 percent of the respondents were male. The authors acknowledge issues of applicability relative

to gender and to whether findings within a collectivist culture (Hofstede, 1980, 1983) can be generalized to Western societies.

Webb (1999) found that a systemic relationship between internal locus of control and aspects of external locus were correlated with the ability to forgive. He writes that the results seemed to indicate something of a balance. A six-dimension locus of control instrument (O'Reilly, 1989) was used to measure internality and externality, and this writer was not able to relate the findings to how externality is assessed compared with more familiar instruments. (Rotter, 1966, Levenson, 1974).

Concerning stress and its health-related consequences, Kobasa (1979) found that hardier executives were more likely to have an internal locus of control.

Other studies are relevant for external locus as a moderator variable. Previously referenced external shifts after negative events suggest that externality might moderate unforgiveness after downsizing. Cassidy (2001) found that unemployment greater than one year correlated with self-descriptions that further correlated with external locus. Relevant for tenure, external and internal locus were associated with different kinds of organizational commitment (Coleman, Irving and Cooper, 1999). Externality was associated with "continuance" commitment, i.e. the "need" to remain with an organization; while internality was associated with "affective commitment," i.e. the "desire" to remain.

Thus, the following alternative hypotheses and their null hypotheses are presented for the downsized individual.

H1: A significant positive correlation will exist between external locus of control and unforgiveness. **Null:** No significant correlation will exist.

H2: Locus of control will moderate the positive relationship between dispositional forgiveness and neutralized unforgiveness such that the relationship will be weaker for those with an external locus of control.

H3: Locus of control will moderate the positive relationship between shorter time-since-downsizing and unforgiveness such that it will be stronger for those with an external locus of control.

H4: Locus of control will moderate the positive relationship between longer tenure and unforgiveness such that the relationship will be stronger for those with an external locus of control.

For H2, H3 and H4, the null hypotheses are the same: Locus of control will not moderate the relationship between the predictor variable and unforgiveness.

Method

This research is situated in the post-positive domain of the normative paradigm, where the truth exists but remains implicitly clouded. The aim of invalidating hypotheses also places this investigation post-positively (Lincoln and Guba, 1994) as does its reliance upon theory. While other paradigms would have value in investigating unforgiveness after downsizing, they do not offer us the ability to predict, which is critical in identifying those who might benefit through forgiveness intervention (e.g. Enright and Fitzgibbons, 2000).

The interpretive paradigm would be useful in revealing how individuals experience downsizing and unforgiveness and, thus, would contribute to an understanding of how their lives have been impacted. Critical theory would help elucidate the societal forces that have created a downsizing employment context. The post-modern paradigm would allow for further exploration of low- and high-power dynamics, giving voice to those who have not been asked or heard.

American Psychological Association guidelines will be reviewed and followed with regard to consent, freedom-to-withdraw, anonymity and debriefing among other factors. E-mails to subjects will be sent as blind copies in order to retain anonymity.

A sample of 1,600 from the United States will be targeted. Inferring from Dewberry, (2004, p. 253) a ball-park estimate of 80 responses will allow for a medium effect at 80 percent power for three predictor variables using hierarchical regression. In accord with established methodology (e.g. Basgall and Snyder, 1988) internal-external classification will require the elimination of the middle quartiles of respondents, increasing the target population to 160. Based on Survey Monkey response rates ranging of 10 to 40 percent (Johnson, 2007, Morgan, 2007), a conservative response rate places the target sample at 1,600.

Sample generation will be done via snowballing as described in Hussey and Hussey (1997). Downsized individuals known by this writer will be asked to participate in the research and also provide linkage to other downsized individuals. During a two-year sample-generation period, subjects' names and contact information will be alphabetized in a binder accessible only to the researcher. Contact will be maintained via monthly e-mail, interest piqued with an entertaining organizational psychology nugget relevant for life at work. During data collection, subjects will be sent a link and password. To reduce the likelihood of response by subjects who do not meet the definition of being downsized, respondents will be funneled through a series three of "yes-no" circumstantial questions that must be answered correctly in order to continue the survey. During the data collection period, reminder e-mails will ask for responses from those who have not yet participated, apologizing for the inconvenience to those who have already complied. E-mails will note that the researcher is unaware of who has responded.

This method is preferred over postal survey because it is expected to generate a higher response rate while being less time-intensive for the researcher, less costly and, potentially, free-of-charge.

Testing. In H1, external locus of control is the independent variable, and unforgiveness is the dependent variable.

H1 will be tested using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The Pearson is appropriate for testing the strength of a positive or negative correlation between variables and for obtaining the statistical significance of the correlation (Dewberry, 2004). An independent samples t-test could be used to show differences in central tendencies between external and internal groups, but the establishment of a correlation is preferred for predictability.

In H2, H3 and H4, dispositional forgiveness, time-since-downsizing and tenure are the predictor variables, respectively. External locus of control is the moderator variable, and unforgiveness is the criterion variable.

H2-H4 will be tested with hierarchical regression, which is appropriate for assessing unique contribution to variance while also controlling for demographic variables that may be confounding (Dewberry, 2004). Control will also address bias issues that may be present among a volunteer sample (Hussey and Hussey, 1997). Though time-since-downsizing and tenure are demographic variables, they will not be controlled because they are also predictor variables.

Subjects will be asked to complete a questionnaire consisting of approximately 60 questions. Following the three funneling questions (Hussey and Hussey, 1997), demographic questions will be presented as a warm-up to more sensitive queries. Demographic variables will be: 1) Gender, 2) Age in years (Appendix A), 3) Ethnicity (Appendix B), 4) Educational attainment (Appendix C), 5) Job classification (Appendix D), 5) Time-since-downsizing in months. If possible, pull-down menus for year and month will be utilized. 6) Tenure with the downsizing organization (rounded to the nearest whole year).

Instrumentation. Dispositional forgiveness will be measured with the Heartland Forgiveness Scale (Thompson et al., 2005) (Appendix E) The Heartland consists of 18 seven-item, Likert-type questions ranging from 1, “almost always false of me” to 7, “almost always true of me.” It can be used in the aggregate as a measure of total dispositional forgiveness, or its three sub-scales can be used

individually. They are “forgiveness of self,” “forgiveness of others” and “forgiveness of situations.” Unfortunately, “forgiveness of situations” refers to situations perceived as beyond “anyone’s” control, such as natural disasters; and being downsized does not meet that definition. The Heartland is preferred over other instruments (e.g. Enright, Rique and Coyle, 2000) for various reasons, including its availability for use within the academic literature, its brevity, its definition of forgiveness as having a neutral endpoint, and its avoidance of the word “forgive.” Cronbach’s alpha showed the Heartland to have an internal consistency of .86 and .87. Test/retest reliability using Pearson’s correlations was .78 for the total scale. The Heartland also demonstrated good psychometric properties. Although the instrument did correlate positively with social responsibility bias, its creators did not believe that its ability to predict dispositional forgiveness was compromised.

Locus of control will be assessed using the Work Locus of Control Scale (Spector, 1988) (Appendix F). The 16-item, Likert-type WLCS is equally divided between externally and internally oriented questions with responses ranging from 1, “disagree very much” to 6, “agree very much.” It was found to have a coefficient alpha of .75 to .85 and has been shown to correlate with Rotter’s scale from .49 to .57. It is also described as unrelated to social response bias. The WLOC was used by Raja et al., (2004) whose work most informs this proposal.

Development of the UDIS. Existing instruments (e.g. McCullough, 1998) examined as potential measures of unforgiveness after downsizing were not suitable. A thorough search of the literature and queries to investigators did not render an instrument that offered a neutral endpoint, was adaptable to unforgiveness of organizations, and also incorporated “grudge-holding,” (Orr, 2005, Kanz, in Orr, 2005, Witvliet et al., 2001),” which may be the most salient component of the unforgiveness construct. Therefore, a new instrument will be created – the Unforgiveness Among Downsized Individuals Scale (UDIS). The item-analysis version of the UDIS (Appendix G) will include 20 unforgiveness-

related constructs identified from the literature. In addition to those already listed in Tables 1 and 2, the following will be included: grudge-holding, avoidance and distress (McCullough, 2007) fear (Berry, Worthington, O'Connor, Parrott, Wade, 2005) victimization (Gorsuch and Hao, 1993), perceived intent-to-harm (Girard and Mullet, 2002), rehearsal of the hurt (Witvliet et al., 2001), rumination (e.g., McCullough, 2007) and vengeance (Orr, 2005).

Item-analysis will be conducted among groups of college students. Reliance on the literature for construct content addresses construct validity. Face validity that is not apparent will be addressed during verbal directions to participants. Reliability will be assessed using Cronbach's alpha to test for internal consistency. Items showing an alpha co-efficient of less than .70 will be eliminated, as will lower-correlating restatements of the same construct. Paralleling the format of the WLOC, the UDIS will consist of six-choice, Likert-style questions. Responses will range from 1 – "disagree very much" to – 6 "agree very much." Social response bias will be assessed using the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne, Marlow, 1960; in Thompson et al., 2005).

Prior to completing the survey, subjects will be asked to recall or imagine a personal experience of being excluded from an organization and invited to share experiences with the group in an attempt to recall and temporarily induce a state of unforgiveness. Ethical concerns will be addressed by establishing a procedure with participants' professors for prior and subtle disqualification of grieving or recently traumatized respondents. All questions will be positively worded in order to sustain a temporary state of unforgiveness. Following item-analysis, a refined version of the UDIS will be piloted, this time using new groups of students. Half of the items that remain will be negatively coded to compensate for response acquiescence (Hussey and Hussey, 1997). An opened-ended question will added at the conclusion to offer an opportunity for additional expression, to emphasize respondents' value as empowered participants, and to

inform future research. Cronbach's alpha will again be used to assess internal consistency.

Following item-analysis and pilot testing, the researcher will acknowledge that subjects may be still experiencing negative emotions because they have been asked to dredge up unpleasant memories. Participants will be told that they can address residual negative emotions, if they wish, by trying to empathize with the object of their unforgiveness (Witvliet et al., 2001). They might also attempt to recall a time when they were grateful that they had been forgiven (Wade and Worthington, 2003). They will also be advised to seek professional guidance if they're unable to return to their pre-participation state of well-being.

Discussion

The major limitation of this design is its cross-sectional time horizon in that longitudinal work would more appropriately address the course of unforgiveness. The inclusion of tenure as a predictor variable in H4 is an attempt to address this concern.

Additional limitations are that design does not consider whether subjects have been multiply downsized or the degree to which some of them, particularly those with an internal locus of control, may believe being downsized was at least partly under their control. However, at least a foundation is laid for exploration in that direction.

The most hopeful application of study results would be education within the employment context that downsizing alone is a counter-productive business strategy – and that necessary reductions in headcount should be done as humanely as possible with high regard for all parties involved. The use of personality tests to discriminate against externally oriented individuals during employee selection and assessment (e.g. Coleman et al., 1999) is a potential concern; but perhaps education could swing that balance in favor of testing to identify downsized employees who might benefit from forgiveness intervention.

Four directions are suggested for future investigation. 1) Cancellation of consequences (Girard and Mullet, 2002) – that is, whether the downsized employee is “better off.” Such research should seek to discover whether the individual’s perception is a reflection of actual circumstances or is moderated by locus of control. 2) A design similar to the one presented here should be done using Levenson’s (1972, 1974) Internal, Powerful Others and Chance Scale, which distinguishes externality according to chance/luck versus powerful others. 3) Findings from this proposed study should be examined for post-hoc analysis opportunities. 4) Finally, this post-positivistic proposal sets the stage for continued expansion into the other paradigms, where meaning, the constructs that define the employment context, and unheard voices can be given a chance to speak.

(5,969 words)

References

- Ahmadjian, C. (2001). Safety in numbers: Downsizing and the deinstitutionalization of permanent employment in Japan. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46, 622-654.
- Altmaier, B, Leary, M, Forsyth, D, Ansel, J. (1979). Attribution therapy: Effects of locus of control and timing of treatment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 26, 481-486.
- Amundson, N, Borgen, W, Jordan, S, Erlebach, A. (2004). Survivors of downsizing: helpful and hindering experiences. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 52, 256-271.
- Anderson, C. (1977). Locus of control, coping behaviors, and performance in a stress setting: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, 446-451.
- Armstrong-Stassen, M. (2001). Reactions of older employees to organizational downsizing; The role of gender, job level, and time. *Journals of Gerontology: Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 56B, 234-243.
- Barger, E. (2004). Empirically based model of psychological contracts. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 65 (2-B), 1058.

- Basgall, J, Snyder, C. (1988). Excuses in waiting: External locus of control and reactions to success-failure feedback. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 656-662.
- Battle, E, Rotter, J. (1963). Children's feelings of personal control as related to social class and ethnic group. *Journal of Personality*, 31, 482-490.
- Beu, D, Buckley, R, Harvey, M. (2003). Ethical decision-making: A multidimensional construct. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 12, 88-107.
- Beaumont, P, Harris, R. (2002). Examining white-collar downsizing as a cause of change in the psychological contract: Some UK evidence. *Employee Relations*, 24, 378-388.
- Beitel, M, Ferrer, E, Cecero, J. (2004). Psychological mindedness and cognitive style. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 60, 567-582.
- Berry, J, Worthington, C. (2001). Forgivingness, relationship quality, stress while imagining relationship events, and physical and mental health. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48, 447-455.
- Berry, J, Worthington, E, O'Connor, L, Parrott, L, Wade, N. (2005). Forgivingness, vengeful rumination and affective traits. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 183-255.
- Boes, K. (2007). Psychological contract violation and organizational change in Thailand. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 67, 3474.
- Brennan, A, Skarlicki, D. (2004). Personality and perceived justice as predictors of survivors' reactions following downsizing. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 1306-1328.
- Campbell-Jamison, F, Worrall, L, Cooper, C. (2001). Downsizing in Britain and its effect on survivors and their organizations. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, 14, 35-58.
- Cascio, W. (1993). Downsizing: what do we know? What have we learned? *Academy of Management Executive*, 7, 95-104.
- Cascio, W. (2004). Managing a downsizing process. *Human Resource Management*, 43, 425-436.

Cassidy, T. (2001). Self-categorization, coping and psychological health among unemployed mid-career executives. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 14, 303-315.

Clay-Warner, J. (2005). Procedural justice, distributive justice: How experiences with downsizing condition their impact on organizational commitment. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68, 89-102.

Coleman, D, Irving, G, Cooper, C. (1999). Another look at the locus of control – organizational commitment relationship: It depends on the form of commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 995-1001.

Corbett, J. (2006). The impact of downsizing on employees' affective commitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 176-199.

Crandall, V, Katkovsky, W, Crandall, V. (1965). Children's beliefs in their own control of reinforcements in intellectual-academic achievement situations. *Child Development*, 36, 91-109.

Daniels, K, Guppy, A. (1997). Stressors, locus of control, and social support as consequences of affective psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 2, 156-174.

De Meuse, K, Bergmann, T, Vanderheiden, P. (1997). Corporate downsizing. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 6, 168-176.

De Meuse, K, Bergmann, T, Vanderheiden, P, Roraff, C. (2004). New evidence regarding organizational downsizing and a firm's financial performance: a long-term analysis. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 16, 155-177.

Dewberry, C. (2004). *Statistical methods for organizational research*. London, New York: Routledge.

Doherty, W. (1983). Impact of divorce on locus of control orientation in adult women: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality*, 44, 834-840.

Doherty, W, Baldwin, C. (1985). Shifts and stability in locus of control during the 1970s: divergence of the sexes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 1048-1053.

Edwards, J, Rust, K, McKinley, W, Moon, G. (2003). Business ideologies and perceived breach of contract during downsizing; the role of the ideology of employee self-reliance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 1-23.

Enright, R., Fitzgibbons, (2000). *Helping clients forgive: An empirical guide for resolving anger and restoring hope*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Enright, R, Rique, J, Coyle, C. (2000). *The Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI) user's manual*. Madison, WI: The International Forgiveness Institute.

Farrell, J. (2003). The effect of downsizing on market orientation: The mediating roles of trust and commitment. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 11, 55-74.

Feldman, D, Leana, C. (2000). What ever happened to laid-off executives? *Organizational Dynamics*, 29, 64-75.

Finkel, E, Rusbult, C, Kumashiro, M, Hannon, P. (2002). Dealing with betrayal in close relationships: Does commitment promote forgiveness? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 956-974.

Freeman, S, Cameron, K. (1993). Organizational downsizing: a convergence and reorientation framework. *Organization Science*, 4, 10-29.

Frost, T. (1991). The measurement of self-esteem, stress-related life events, and locus of control among unemployed and employed blue-collar workers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 1402-1417.

Girard, M, Mullet, E, Callahan, C. (2002). Mathematics of forgiveness. *American Journal of Psychology*, 115, 351-375.

Gorsuch, R, Hao, J. (1993). Forgiveness: An exploratory factor analysis and its relationship to religious variables. *Review of Religious Research*, 34, 333-347.

Govier, T, Verwoerd, W. (2002). Forgiveness: The victim's prerogative. *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 21, 97-111.

Guba, E, Lincoln, Y. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hersch, P, Scheibe, K. (1967). Reliability and validity of internal-external control as a personality dimension. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 31, 609-613.

Hiroto, D. (1974). Locus of control and learned helplessness. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 102, 187-193.

Hochreich, J. (1974). Defensive externality and attribution of responsibility. *Journal of Personality*, 42, 543-557.

- Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, leadership, and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 9, 42-63.
- Hofstede, G. (1983). National cultures in four dimensions: A research-based theory of cultural differences among nations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 13, 46-74.
- Hussey, J, Hussey, R. (1997). Collecting the original data. Chapter 6 in *Business Research*. London: MacMillan.
- Kets de Vries, M. (1997). The downside of downsizing. *Human Relations*, 50, 11-50.
- Latham, G. (2007). *Work motivation: History, theory, research, and practice*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Lawler, K, Younger, J, Piferi, R, Jobe, R, Edmondson, K, Jones, W. (2005). The unique effects of forgiveness on health: An exploration of pathways. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 28, 157-167.
- Leana, C, Ivancevich, J. (1987). Involuntary job loss: Institutional interventions and a research agenda. *Academy of Management Review*, 2, 201-312.
- Lefcourt, H, Ladwig, G. (1965). The American negro: A problem in expectancies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 377-380.
- Lefcourt, H. (1966). Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 65, 206-220.
- Lefcourt, H, Miller, R, Ware, E, Sherk, D. (1981). Locus of control as a modifier of the relationship between stressors and moods. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41, 357-369.
- Levenson, H. (1972). Distinctions within the concept of internal-external control: Development of a new scale. *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association*, 7, 261-262.
- Levenson, H. (1974). Activism and powerful others: Distinctions within the concept of internal-external control. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 38, 377-383.
- Levenson, H, Miller, J. (1976). Multidimensional locus of control in sociopolitical activists of conservative and liberal ideologies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 33, 199-208.

- Littler, C, Innes, P. (2004). The paradox of managerial downsizing. *Organization Studies*, 25, 1159-1184.
- Johnson, C. (2007). A survey of audiologists and continuing education. *Seminars in Hearing*, 28, 003-016.
- Judge, T, Van Vianen, A, De Pater, I. (2004). Emotional stability, core self-evaluations, and job outcomes; A review of the evidence and an agenda for future research. *Human Performance*, 17, 325-346.
- Kalimo, J, Taris, T, Schaufeli, W. (2003). The effects of past and anticipated future downsizing on survivor well-being: an equity perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8, 91-109.
- Kivimaki, M, Honkonen, T, Wahlbeck, K, Elovainio, M, Pentti, J, Klaukka, T, Virtanen, M, Vahtera, J. (2007). Organisational downsizing and increased use of psychotropic drugs among employees who remain in employment. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 61, 154-158.
- Kobasa, S. (1979). Stressful life events, personality, and health: An inquiry into hardiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1-11.
- Mathieu, J, Zajac, D. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.
- McCullough, M, Sandage, S, Brown, S, Rachal, K, Worthington, E, Hight, T. (1998). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships: II. Theoretical elaboration and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 1586-1603.
- McCullough, M, Giacomo, B, Root, L. (2007). Rumination, emotion, and forgiveness: Three longitudinal studies, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 490-505.
- McKinley, W, Zhao, J, Rust, K. (2000). A sociocognitive interpretation of organizational downsizing. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 227-24.
- Miller, J, Rose, R. (1982). Familial Resemblance in locus of control: A twin-family study of the internal-external scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 535-540.
- Moore, S, Grunberg, L, Greenberg, E. (2004). Repeated downsizing contact: The effects of similar and dissimilar layoff experiences on work and well-being outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9, 247-257.

Morgan, S. (2007). Personal correspondence.

Näswall, K, Sverke, M, Hellgren, J. (2005). The moderating role of personality characteristics on the relationship between job insecurity and strain. *Work & Stress*, 19, 37-49.

O'Reilly, T. (1989). The Zelen-O'Reilly Locus of Control Scale. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49, 5029.

Orlando, J. (1999). The fourth wave: the ethics of corporate downsizing. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 9, 295-314.

Orr, R, Sprague, A, Goertzen, L, Cornock, B, Taylor, D. (2005). Forgiveness in a counselling context: Definition and Process. *Guidance & Counseling*, 20, 70-71.

Parnes, H, King, R. (1977). Middle-aged job-losers. *Industrial Gerontology*, 4, 77-96.

Petzall, B, Parker, G, Stoeberl, P. (2000). Another side to downsizing: survivors' behavior and self-affirmation. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 14, 593-603.

Pugh, D, Skarlicki, D, Passell, B. (2003). After the fall: Layoff victims' trust and cynicism in re-employment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76, 201-212.

Raja, U, Johns, G, Ntalianis, F. (2004). The impact of personality on psychological contracts. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 350-367.

Robinson, S, Morrison, E. (2000). The development of psychological contract breach and violation: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 525-546.

Rotter, J. (1954). *Social learning and clinical psychology*. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Rotter, J. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, 1-28.

Rotter, J. (1975). Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 43, 56-67.

Sarason, I, Johnson, J, Siegel, J. (1978). Assessing the impact of life changes: Development of the life experiences survey. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46, 932-946.

Speck, B. (1993). Defining Stress as Ethical Conflict. *The Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication*, 56, 34-38.

Spector, P. (1988). Development of the work locus of control scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61, 335-340.

Strelan, P, Covic, T. (2006). A review of forgiveness process models and a coping framework to guide future research. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 25, 1059-1085.

Thompson, L, Snyder, C, Hoffman, L, Michael, S, Rasmussen, H, Billings, L, Heinze, L, Neufeld J, Shorey, H, Roberts, J, Roberts, D. (2005). Dispositional forgiveness of self, others, and situations. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 313-359.

Torkelson, E, Muhonen, T. (2003). Coping strategies and health symptoms among women and men in a downsizing organization. *Psychological Reports*, 92, 899-907.

Toussaint, I, Webb, J. (2005). Gender difference in the relationship between empathy and forgiveness. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 145, 673-685.

Trimble, D. (2006). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention of missionaries. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 34, 349-360.

Twenge, Zang, Im. (2004). It's beyond my control: a cross-temporal meta-analysis of increasing externality in locus of control – 1960-2002. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8, 308-319.

U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2007). What are the differences between mass layoffs and extended mass layoffs? <http://www.bls.gov/mls/> (accessed: August 2007).

Vahtera, J, Kivimaki, M, Pentti, J, Linna, A, Virtanen, M, Virtanen, P, Ferrie, J. (2004). Organisational downsizing, sickness, absence, and mortality: 10-town prospective cohort study. *British Medical Journal*, 328, 555-559.

Wade, N, Worthington, E. (2003). Overcoming interpersonal offences: Is forgiveness the only way to deal with unforgiveness? *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 81, 343-353.

Wallace, M, Junisbai, A. (2004). Finding class consciousness in the new economy. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 20, 385-421.

Webb, J. (1999). Forgiveness and control: Toward an understanding of the dynamics of forgiveness. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 60(1-B), 0379.

Wendland, C. (1973). Internal-external control expectancies of institutionalized physically disabled. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 20, 180-186.

Witvliet, C, Ludwig, T, Vander Laan, K. (2001). Granting forgiveness or harbouring grudges: Implications for emotion, physiology, and health. *Psychological Science*, 12, 117-123.

Zwetsloot, G, Gort, J, Steijger, N, Moonen, C. (2007). Management of change: Lessons learned from staff reductions in the chemical process industry. *Safety Science*, 45, 769-789.

Zyglidopoulos, S. (2003). The impact of downsizing on the corporate reputation for social performance. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 4, 11-25.

Secondary References

Argyris, C. (1960). *Understanding organizational behaviour*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Arroba, T. (1979). The social and psychological aspects of redundancy. *Personnel Review*, 8, 26-29.

Banks, M, Ullah, P. (1988). *Youth unemployment: Social and psychological perspective, research paper 61*. London, Department of Employment.

Beale, N, Nethercott, S. (1985). Job loss and family morbidity: a study of a factory closure. *Journal of the Royal College of General Practitioners*, 35, 510-514.

Bluestone, B, Harrison B. (1982). *The deindustrialization of America plant closing, community abandonment, and the dismantling of basic industry*. New York: Basic Books.

Bradburn, M. (1969). *The structure of psychological well-being*. Chicago: Aldine.

Burke, R, Greenglass, E. (2000). Effects of hospital restructuring on full time and part time nursing staff in Ontario. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 37, 163-171.

Cobb, S, Kasl, S. (1977). Termination: *The consequences of job loss* (Report No. 76-1261). Cincinnati, OH. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health Research.

Cook, D, Cummings, R, Bartley, M, Shaper, A. (1982). Health of unemployed middle-aged men in Great Britain. *Lancet*, 5, 1290-1294.

Crowne, D, Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24, 349-354.

Davis, W, Davis, D. (1972). Internal and external control and attribution of responsibility for success and failure. *Journal of Personality*, 40, 123-126.

De Meuse, K, Marks, M. (2003). *Resizing the organization: Managing layoffs, divestitures, and closings*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dentin, R, Martin, M. (1998). The process of forgiveness in marriage and the family. In Enright, R, and North, J. (eds.) *Exploring forgiveness*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Donovan, A, Oddy, M. (1982). Psychological aspects of unemployment. An investigation into the emotional and social adjustment of school leavers. *Journal of Adolescence*, 5, 15-30.

Dorfman, J. (1991). Stocks of companies announcing layoffs fire up investors, but prices often wilt. *The Wall Street Journal*, December 10, C1-C2.

Estes, R. (1973). *Emotional consequences of job loss*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Fisher, S, White, M. (2000). Downsizing in a learning organization: Are there hidden costs? *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 244-251.

Fitzgibbons, R. (1986). The cognitive and emotive uses for forgiveness in the treatment of anger. *Psychotherapy*, 23, 629-633.

Fombrun, C. (1996). *Reputation*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Fornell, C, Johnson, M, Anderson, E, Cha, J, Everitt, B. (1996). The American customer satisfaction index: nature, purpose and findings. *Journal of Marketing*, 60, 7-18.

Friedemann, M, Webb, A. (1995). Family health and mental health six years after economic stress and unemployment. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 16, 51-66.

Gaylin, W. (1983). (ed.) *Psychodynamic understanding of depression*. New York: Aronson, 1983.

Graves, T. (1961). Time perspective and the deferred gratification pattern in a tri-ethnic community. Research report No. 5. *Tri-Ethnic Research Project*. University of Colorado, Institute of Behavioral Science.

Greenhalgh, I, Rosenblatt, Z. (1984). Job insecurity: Toward conceptual clarity. *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 438-448.

Greenhalgh, L, Lawrence, A, Sutton, R. (1988). Determinants of work force reduction strategies in declining organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 241-254.

Hall, R. (1992). The strategic analysis of intangible resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13, 135-44.

Hall, R. (1993). A framework linking intangible resources and capabilities to sustainable competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14, 607-18.

Hargrave, T, Sells, J. (1997). The development of a forgiveness scale. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 23, 41-63.

Henkoff, R. (1990). Cost cutting: How to do it right. *Fortune*, 12, 40-49.

Hepworth, S. (1980). Moderating factors of the psychological impact of unemployment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53, 139-145.

Holmes, T, Rahe, R. (1967). The social readjustment rating scale. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 11, 213-218.

Holmes, T, Masuda, M. (1974). Life change and illness susceptibility. In B.S. Dohrenwend, B. and Dohrenwend, B (eds), *Stressful life events: Their nature and effects*. New York: Wiley, 1974.

Jahoda, M. (1982). *Employment and unemployment: A social-psychological analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaiser, J, Polczyniski, J. (1982). Educational stress: Sources, reactions, preventions. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 59, 127-136.

- Kanz, J. (2000). How do people conceptualize and use forgiveness? The Forgiveness Attitudes Questionnaire. *Counselling and Values*, 44, 174-188.
- Kaufman, H. (1982). *Professionals in search of work: Coping with the stress of job loss and unemployment*. New York: Wiley.
- Lefcourt, H. (1976). *Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lei, D, Hitt, M. (1995). Strategic restructuring and outsourcing: The effect of mergers and acquisitions and LBOs on building firm skills and capabilities. *Journal of Management*, 21, 835-859.
- Levinson, H. (1962). *Organizational diagnosis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- McCullough, M, Worthington, E, Rachal, K. (1997). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 321-336.
- McMillan, S. (1997). Sustainable competitive advantage and firm performance: The role of intangible resources. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 1, 81-5.
- Mische, M. (2001). *Strategic Renewal: Becoming a high-performance organization*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Morrison, E, Robinson, S. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 226-256.
- Paykel, E. (1971). *Scaling of life events*. Archives of General Psychiatry, 25, 340-347.
- Phares, E. *Changes in expectancy in skill and chance situations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1955.
- Price, R. (1992). Psychosocial impact of job loss on individuals and families. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 1, 9-11.
- Roberts, P, Dowling, G. (1997). The value of a firm's corporate reputation: How reputation helps attain and sustain superior performance. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 1, 72-76.
- Rousseau, D. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Sartorius, N, Ban, T. (1986) (eds). *Assessment of depression*. New York: Springer Verlag.

Schein, E. (1965). *Organizational Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Selye, H. (1956). *The stress of life*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Shank, S. (1986). Employment up, unemployment stable in the first half of 1986. *Monthly Labor Review*, 109, 3-8.

Shaw, J, Barrett-Power, E. (1997). A conceptual framework for assessing organization, work group, and individual effectiveness during and after downsizing. *Human Relations*, 50, 109-127.

The Economist (2001). The jobs challenge: how to reduce labour costs without doing more harm than good remains top of the agenda in America's boardrooms. *The Economist*, 58-59.

Worthington, E, Wade, N. (1999). The psychology of unforgiveness and forgiveness and implications for clinical practice. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 18, 385-418.

Zeitlin, L. (1995). Organizational downsizing and stress-related illness. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 2, 207-219.

Appendix A

Age in Years

(Check only one)

- 18 to 24 years
- 25 to 34 years
- 35 to 44 years
- 45 to 64 years
- 65 years and over

Age categories are excerpted from age groups as classified for reporting population data by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Homepage

<http://www.census.gov/>

Example

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=86000US47715&-qr_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U_DP1&-ds_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U&-lang=en&-sse=on

Appendix B

Ethnicity/Race

(Check only one)

- Caucasian
- African-American
- American Indian or Eskimo
- Asian and Pacific Islander
- Hispanic/Latino
- More than one race

Ethnicity categories are adapted from those used by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Homepage

<http://www.census.gov/>

Example

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=86000US47715&-qr_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U_DP1&-ds_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U&-lang=en&-sse=on

Appendix C

Educational Attainment

(Check only one)

- High school graduate/includes general equivalency diploma (GED)
- Some college, no degree
- Associate's degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Professional degree (for example, MD, JD, CPA)
- Doctoral degree

Educational attainment categories are adapted from those used by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Homepage

<http://www.census.gov/>

Example

http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=86000US47715&-qr_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U_DP1&-ds_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U&-lang=en&-sse=on

Appendix D

Job Classification

(Check only one)

- Management
- Business and financial operations
- Computer and mathematical
- Architecture and engineering
- Life, physical and social sciences
- Community and social services
- Legal
- Education, training and library
- Arts, design, entertainment, sports and media
- Healthcare practitioners and technical
- Healthcare support
- Protective service
- Food preparation and serving-related
- Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance
- Personal care and service
- Sales and related occupations
- Office and administrative support
- Farming, fishing and forestry
- Construction and extraction
- Installation, maintenance and repair
- Production
- Transportation and material moving
- Military/military-specific

U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics Standard Occupational Classification. http://www.bls.gov/soc/soc_majo.htm

Appendix E

The Heartland Forgiveness Scale

(Thompson et al., 2005, p. 358)

Directions: In the course of our lives, negative things may occur because of our own actions, the actions of others or circumstances beyond our control. For some time after these events, we may have negative thoughts or feelings about ourselves, others or the situation. Think about how you **typically** respond to such negative events. Next to each of the following items write the number (from the 7-point scale below) that best describes how you **typically** respond to the type of negative situation described. There are no right or wrong answers. Please be as open as possible in your answers.

- | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Almost /Always
False of Me | More Often
False of Me | More Often
True of Me | More Often
True of Me | More Often
True of Me | More Often
True of Me | Almost /Always
True of Me |
-
- ___ 1. Although I feel bad at first when I mess up, over time I can give myself some slack.
- ___ 2. I hold grudges against myself for negative things I've done.
- ___ 3. Learning from bad things that I've done helps me get over them.
- ___ 4. It is really hard for me to accept myself once I've messed up.
- ___ 5. With time I am understanding of myself for mistakes I've made.
- ___ 6. I don't stop criticizing myself for negative things I've felt, thought, said, or done.
- ___ 7. I continue to punish a person who has done something that I think is wrong.
- ___ 8. With time I am understanding of others for the mistakes they've made.
- ___ 9. I continue to be hard on others who have hurt me.
- ___ 10. Although others have hurt me in the past, I have eventually been able to see them as good people.
- ___ 11. If others mistreat me, I continue to think badly of them.

- 12. When someone disappoints me, I can eventually move past it.
- 13. When things go wrong for reasons that can't be controlled, I get stuck in negative thoughts about it.
- 14. With time I can be understanding of bad circumstance in my life.
- 15. If I am disappointed by uncontrollable circumstances in my life, I continue to think negatively about them.
- 16. I eventually make peace with bad situations in my life.
- 17. It's really hard for me to accept negative situations that aren't anybody's fault.
- 18. Eventually I let go of negative thoughts about bad circumstances that are beyond anyone's control.

Scoring Instructions:

To calculate the scores for the HFS total and its three subscales, first reverse score items 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 and 17. Then, sum the values for the items that compose each subscale (with appropriate items being reverse scored): HFS Total (items 1-18), HFS Self sub-scale (items 1-6), HFS Other subscale (items 7-12), HFS Situation subscale (items 13-18).

Appendix F

The Work Locus of Control Scale

(Spector 1988, p. 340)

1 – Disagree very much, 2 – Disagree moderately, 3 – Disagree slightly,
4 – Agree slightly, 5 – Agree moderately, 6 – Agree very much.

* indicates reverse scoring.

- 1.* A job is what you make of it.
- 2.* On most jobs, people can pretty much accomplish whatever they set out to accomplish.
- 3.* If you know what you want out of a job, you can find a job that gives it to you.
- 4.* If employees are unhappy with a decision made by their boss, they should do something about it.
5. Getting the job you want is mostly a matter of luck.
6. Making money is primarily a matter of good fortune.
- 7.* Most people are capable of doing their jobs well if they make the effort.
8. In order to get a really good job, you need to have family members or friends in high places.
9. Promotions usually a matter of good fortune.
10. When it comes to landing a really good job, who you know is more important than what you know.
- 11.* Promotions are given to employees who perform well on the job.
12. To make a lot of money, you have to know the right people.
13. It takes a lot of luck to be an outstanding employee on most jobs.
- 14.* People who perform their jobs well generally get rewarded for it.
- 15.* Most employees have more influence on their supervisors than they think they do.
16. The main difference between people who make a lot of money and people who make a little money is luck.

Appendix G

The Unforgiveness Among Downsized Individuals Scale

Questions will be re-arranged randomly in order to minimize response acquiescence. They are presented here by construct for ease-of-illustration. All remain positively coded during item-analysis in an effort to sustain a temporary state of unforgiveness among participants.

1 – Disagree very much, 2 – Disagree moderately, 3 – Disagree slightly, 4 – Agree slightly, 5 – Agree moderately, 6 – Agree very much.

Anger

Ang 1. I am angry with the organization.

Ang 2. I am angry with one or more individuals who are part of the organization because they played a role in my being excluded.

Anxiety

Anx 1. I feel anxious.

Anx 2. I feel nervous.

Avoidance

Av 1. I am avoiding contact with places that are associated with the organization.

Av 2. I am avoiding contact with one or more individuals who are associated with the organization.

Av 3. I would change important plans to avoid going to a place that is associated with the organization.

Av 4. I would change important plans to avoid contact with one or more individuals who are associated with the organization.

Betrayal

Be 1. I feel betrayed by the organization.

Be 2. I feel betrayed by one or more individuals who are part of the organization because they played a role in my being excluded.

Bitterness

Bi 1. I feel bitter toward the organization.

Bi 2. I feel bitter toward one or more individuals who are part of the organization because they played a role in my being excluded.

Blame

- Bl 1. I blame the organization for excluding me.
Bl 2. I blame one or more individuals who are part of the organization because they played a role in my being excluded.

Depression

- De 1. I feel sad.
De 2. I have not been able to eat very much since being excluded from the organization.
De 3. I have not slept well since being excluded from the organization.
De 4. I have not felt like doing the things I normally enjoy doing since being excluded from the organization.

Distress

- Di 1. I am in a state of distress.
Di 2. I am in a state of uncertainty about the future.
Di 3. I am upset.
Di 4. I am so upset I sometimes don't know what to do next.

Distrust

- Du 1. I no longer trust the organization.
Du 2. I no longer trust one or more individuals who are part of the organization because they played a role in my being excluded.

Fear

- Fr 1. I'm afraid as a result of changes in my circumstances – changes that have occurred because I was excluded from the organization.
Fr 2. I am terrified as a result of changes in my circumstances – changes that have occurred because I was excluded from the organization.

Grudge-holding

- Gh 1. I hold a grudge against the organization.
Gh 2. I hold a grudge against one or more individuals who are part of the organization because they played a role in my being excluded.

Hostility

- Ho 1. I have hostile feeling toward the organization.
Ho 2. I have hostile feelings toward one or more individuals who are part of the organization because they played a role in my being excluded.

Life satisfaction

- Ls 1. I am unhappier with my life as a result of being excluded from the organization.

Perceived intent-to-harm

- Ph 1. I believe that the organization intended to cause me harm by excluding me.
- Ph 2. I believe that one or more individuals who are part of the organization intended to cause me harm by excluding me.
- Ph 3. I believe that the organization did not intend to harm me but knew that I would be harmed as a result of being excluded by the organization.
- Ph 4. I believe that one or more individuals who are part of the organization did not intend to harm me but knew that I would be harmed as a result of being excluded from the organization.

Rehearsal of the hurt

- Rh 1. I keep replaying the events of being excluded over and over again in my mind.
- Rh 2. I keep remembering what was said and how I felt when I was told that I was being excluded from the organization.
- Rh 3. I keep going over again and again in my mind what was said and how I felt when I learned that I was being excluded from the organization.

Resentment

- Rs 1. I resent the organization for excluding me.
- Rs 2. I feel resentment toward one or more individuals who are part of the organization because they played a role in my being excluded.

Rumination

- Ru 1. I can't stop thinking about being excluded from the organization.
- Ru 2. I can't concentrate on anything else because I keep thinking about being excluded from the organization.
- Ru 3. I can't keep my mind on what I'm doing because I keep thinking about being excluded from the organization.

Vengeance

- Vn 1. I would like to get even with the organization.
- Vn 2. I would like to get even with one or more individuals who are part of the organization because they played a role in my being excluded.
- Vn 3. It would be nice to see the organization get what it deserves for excluding me.
- Vn 4. It would be nice to see one or more individuals who are part of the organization get what they deserve because they played a role in my being excluded.

Victimization

- Vc 1. I feel that the organization has victimized me.
- Vc 2. I feel that the organization has turned me into a victim.
- Vc 3. I feel that I have been victimized by one or more individuals who are part of the organization because they played a role in my being excluded.
- Vc 4. I feel that one or more individuals who are part of the organization have victimized me because they played a role in my being excluded.
- Vc 5. I feel like a victim.
- Vc 6. I feel that I have been taken advantage of.

Violation

- Vi 1. I feel violated.
- Vi 2. I feel like something that was part of me has been taken away.
- Vi 3. I feel like who I am has been violated.
- Vi 4. I feel like my personal worth as a human being has been violated.
- Vi 5. I feel that I have been disrespected as a human being.

Open-ended question

This question is voluntary – and has been included so that you can provide additional comments if you wish. For example, was there a particular question that was confusing – and, if so, why? What important questions were not asked? Are there other feelings you would like to express about being excluded from the organization? Thank you for your participation.

Procedure

The researcher will explain that the students' participation will assist in the development of a scale that measures the way people feel after they've been excluded from an organization.

In an effort to address ethical concerns and avoid re-traumatizing individuals who may still be working through a grief process, the researcher will state:

“In arranging this exercise, your professor (name) and I discussed the fact that you would be asked to re-live or imagine a situation that, while not life-threatening, might still be unpleasant. We also discussed the fact that, as a result of a recent or even long-ago experience, some of you might still be working through a grief process – due to the loss of a loved one or recent difficult experience. If that's the case, we do not want to ask you to experience further

negative emotions, even minor ones, that may develop as you participate in this exercise. So, if that point has not been understood until now, please feel free to excuse yourself and use the time to catch up on your coursework.

Allotting 10 to 15 minutes, the researcher will ask for volunteers who may wish to share individual accounts of exclusion experiences.

She will set the stage as follows, “I’d like for you to think back to a time when you were associated with an organization... But then, you were told that your relationship with the organization was over, even though you believed you did nothing to cause it. If you’ve never had an experience like that, try to imagine what it might be like. Perhaps you were excluded from a club or team even though you tried your best to be a good member. Or maybe you were on a volunteer committee but were not invited to attend its annual fundraiser. Or perhaps you were an employee of a company that told you that your job had been eliminated because the company needed to become more profitable.

“Try to remember the thoughts that went through your mind at the time. Was it going to be embarrassing for others to find out this had happened to you? Were you going to lose something that was important to you – either an activity or a pursuit that you enjoyed very much? Was there someone very important in your life who would be very disappointed to hear or upset to learn that this had happened to you? Did the end of this association leave you without financial or other necessary resources? Were you afraid that you might have new problems as a result of no longer being with the organization? Did you feel like you’d been treated unfairly and not been given a chance to speak or act on your own behalf in a way that might have prevented your being excluded?”

The researcher will then ask if anyone would like to share a personal experience with the class. Allotting 10 to 15 minutes, she will instruct as follows or will proceed if there are no volunteers: “Now, I would like for you to imagine that it’s the next day. You’ve had a bit of time to think about what happened and how you feel about it.

“So keeping those thoughts and feelings in mind, here is a questionnaire that you can use to rate the levels of your feelings.”

The researcher will explain the directionality of the questions and how to answer them correctly. Subjects will complete the item-analysis phase of the pilot survey.

Debriefing

Some of you may have recalled unpleasant memories during this experience. If that’s the case, I hope that they will subside quickly. You might be surprised to learn that there are researchers who study ways of helping people to forgive – in an effort to help reduce the negative emotions related to unforgiveness. That’s because the negative emotions associated with unforgiveness can be unhealthy, especially if they continue for a long period of time (Witvliet et al., 2001).

One of the techniques that counselors use to reduce feelings of unforgiveness is to ask an individual to imagine a situation in which she or he was the one who needed to be forgiven (Wade and Worthington, 2003). Another exercise is to imagine the person or situation that you are trying to forgive as imperfect and, like yourself (Witvliet et al., 2001), someone who makes mistakes sometimes because he or she is human.

Finally, please don’t hesitate to seek a counseling referral from someone you trust, for example, an academic adviser or member of the clergy, if you have unforgiveness emotions that you feel should be addressed.

Thank you for helping me with this exercise.

Further Development: The Pilot Instrument

After item analysis, a pilot version of the UDIS will be created. In addition to demographic and construct questions. The final version, to be taken via Survey Monkey, will begin with three funneling questioned presented to assure

that individuals completing the survey meet the researchers' definition of "being downsized."

Funneling Questions

Funneling questions will undergo face validity only as they will be posed informally to individuals who are asked to imagine that they have been downsized.

- 1) Have you ever been involuntarily separated from your job? 2) (If yes, continue).
- 2) Were you told that this happen for reasons that were related to your job performance or your failure to meet job-related expectations in general? (If no, continue).
- 3) Was it stated or implied that this action was being taken for greater profitability or the greater good of the employing organization in some way? (If, yes, continue).