2012

Downsized Survivors: Areas of Loss and Work Behaviors

Cyndi J. Schaeffer
Antioch University - PhD Program in Leadership and Change

Follow this and additional works at: http://aura.antioch.edu/etds

Part of the Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons, Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons, Leadership Studies Commons, and the Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons

DOWNSIZED SURVIVORS:

AREAS OF LOSS AND WORK BEHAVIORS

CYNDI J. SCHAEFFER

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Ph.D. in Leadership and Change Program

of Antioch University

in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

February, 2012

This is to certify that the dissertation entitled:

DOWNSIZED SURVIVORS:
AREAS OF LOSS AND WORK BEHAVIORS

prepared by

Cyndi J. Schaeffer

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in Leadership and Change.

Approved by:

Mitchell Kusy, Ph.D., Chair	date

Carol Baron, Ph.D., Committee Member	date

Kay Devine, Ph.D., Committee Member	date

Tina Kiefer, Ph.D., External Reader	date

Acknowledgements

I want to thank Mitchell Kusy and Carol Baron for their devoted support and amazing

expertise, as well as my committee members.   I want to thank City University and the

Washington Public Employees Association (WPEA) for their support in publishing my

recruitment on their websites. I finally want to thank my husband, Phil McConnell and

my sons, Josh McConnell, Benjamin Schaeffer-McConnell, and Andrew Schaeffer-

McConnell for their tremendous support and love.

Abstract

This research design used factor analysis to develop subscales related to areas of loss, and subscales related to work behaviors of survivors following a downsizing. Five loss subscales were revealed as a result of factor analysis. They were loss of sense of justice and supervisory support; loss of security and support; loss of positive outlook; loss of territory; and loss of control and identity. There were two work behavior components identified through factor analysis. They were lack of productivity and sabotage; and intention for flight .The loss components, sense of justice and supervisory support; security and competence; and territory, were found to have a statistical relationship with the downsized survivors' lack of productivity and inclination to sabotage. The loss components positive outlook, control and identity, and loss of sense of justice and supervisory support were found to have a statistical relationship with the intention for flight. Marginalized populations (i.e. female, disabled, first generation immigrants, and non-Caucasian populations) did not report statistically significant differences in loss or productivity, sabotage or intention for flight work behavior areas. This dissertation is accompanied by a spreadsheet file in .xlsx format, 120 k. The electronic version of this dissertation is at Ohiolink ETD Center, www.ohiolink.edu/etd

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

List of Figures

List of Supplemental Files

File Name	Format	Size
correlationtable	.xslx	120 k.

Chapter I: Introduction

As unfortunate as it is in so many ways, downsizing is a dominant trend taking place today in organizations throughout the United States. Not only have American organizations been implementing downsizing efforts at an increasing rate, but it has become "a dreadful strategy in many developing countries" (Kim, 2008, p. 298) and the layoffs have become the United States' "export to the world" (Pfeffer, 2010, p. 33). While the phenomenon has been particularly pronounced during the recent economic downturn, downsizing has been an increasingly common and accepted part of corporate life, during good times and bad, since the early 1990s.

Organizations are not only cutting back on workers during economic downturn, but are laying workers off during good times as well. "Companies now routinely cut workers, even when profits are rising" (Pfeffer, 2010, p. 32). Most companies that have downsized during the past several decades have gone back for two or more workforce reductions, with only 40% of these companies seeing any increase in profits within the first year and only 46% seeing increased profits in the years after (Winston, 2009). Some reports indicate an increased failure rate of 68% (Obilade, 2009).

Writings (Maertz, Wiley, LeRouge, & Campion, 2010; Pfeffer, 2010) regarding downsizing and layoffs suggest that these efforts do not always work and are not always effective. The costs of layoffs include:

> Severance pay; paying out accrued vacation and sick pay; outplacement costs; higher unemployment-insurance taxes; the cost of rehiring employees when business improves; low morale and risk-adverse survivors; potential lawsuits, sabotage, or even workplace violence from aggrieved employees or former employees; loss of institutional memory and knowledge; diminished trust in management; and reduced productivity. (Pfeffer, 2010, p. 33)

Researchers are recognizing that some of the previously assumed benefits of downsizing (i.e., increased productivity of survivors, lower overall costs, and increased profitability for the company) do not necessarily come to fruition, largely due to management's inattention to the needs of the downsizing survivors. The survivors are those employees who were not laid off and continue their employment with the company. Survivors may experience lowered morale (Armstrong-Stassen, 1993; K. Cameron, Freeman, & Mishra, 1993), feelings of loss of relationships (Amundson, Borgen, Jordan, & Erlebach, 2004; LaMarsh, 2009; Scott & Jaffe, 1995) and competence (LaMarsh, 2009; Scott & Jaffe, 1995), loss of trust in management (Amundson et al., 2004; Armstrong-Stassen, 2002), diminished productivity (Armstrong-Stassen, 2002), and, in some scenarios, might participate in scapegoating (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997) or intentional damage of property (Crino, 1994).

The downsized survivor is responsible for embracing and carrying forward with the downsizing changes, such as increased work load, new tasks, or implementing new processes. Given that it is the employee who typically has the responsibility to implement the change, and that the individual's resistance could subvert the change, critical issues are the survivor's attitude, commitment to the company, and willingness to implement the change. It is the supervisor's responsibility to support that individual. Attention to the relationship between the individual and his or her supervisor, coworkers, and the larger system during and after the change is imperative. Interestingly, research has suggested the downsizing victims fare better than the survivors. In a study conducted by Devine, Reay, Stainton, and Collins-Nakai (2003), the victims perceived "higher levels of control, less stress, and fewer negative job strains than continuing workers or

'survivors'" (p. 109). Yet, it is the survivor that companies are dependent upon to do the work, perform the additional work requirements, and exhibit productivity levels that result in a business profit.

Why are reported loss areas important to consider when talking about organizational change? Downsizing can bring out a variety of inadequately understood work behaviors related to areas of loss. When the effort is not done properly, it can affect employees' values and can result in increased stress that leads to dysfunctional coping strategies (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997) and result in poor performance (Muchinsky, 2000). Emotional symptoms of downsizing survivors include self-reproach and sadness (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997); displacement of anger (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997); fear (Noer, 1990, 1993, 1997), distrust, guilt, and depression (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997), and feelings of moral outrage and resentment (Petzall, Parker, & Stroebert, 2000). Emotions help people make sense of their world (Antonacopoulou & Gabriel, 2001; Lundberg & Young, 2001) and can affect their sense of loyalty to the organization and to positive organizational outcomes.

To an employee, any significant change is a transition. Employees struggle with change when they see change as a loss (Folger & Skarlicki, 1999). Making a proper diagnosis of survivors' reactions and organizational dysfunction is a step forward in making an effective intervention (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997). Considering the "emotional landscape" (Kiefer, 2002, p.47) of the organization and the emotional experiences of employees can help managers better understand the organizational change (Kiefer, 2002). The survivor must identify who is losing what and what it means, and must let go of whatever was lost (Bridges, 2004). The feelings have functions and should

be understood as an opportunity for the process of sensemaking where meanings materialize (Weick, 1979) and meaning-making, where the individual attempts to reconstruct assumptions and make sense of what is happening (Neimeyer, 2000). The survivor and his or her manager need to identify and deal with the losses related to the downsizing efforts.

Managers often complain that survivors do not appreciate they have a job and remark that productivity has decreased following a downsizing event. Employees experience feelings of sadness about missing their coworkers who have been laid off (Scott & Jaffe, 1995), loss of job security (K. Cameron et al., 1993), loss of trust toward the company (Ket de Vries, & Balzs, 1997) and loss of status (Amundson et al., 2004). Managers may believe survivors need to work harder, and do not report the need to care for the remaining employees. Interestingly, managers often blame survivors (Herold, Fedor, & Caldwell, 2007).

It is important to focus on the survivors of a downsizing "because they can either facilitate or impede the desired outcomes of the downsizing" (Kim, 2008, p. 298). The research regarding the areas of loss feelings experienced by downsized survivors is limited. Although there is speculation regarding the various areas of loss survivors might feel, there is no existing research that shows the magnitude of the loss experience, nor its relationship to critical work behaviors, such as the survivors' productivity, intention to leave the organization, motivation, or the likelihood to sabotage the change effort or company.

Researcher Positioning

As an additional assignment as the executive director of the business and industry arm of the community college where this researcher is employed, she has repeatedly been called upon to provide consultation and training to corporations and organizations following a downsizing event. Usually the organization has been leaned out by Lean manufacturing principles where organizational changes are determined by mathematical formulas. Lean production is a "philosophy of managing a process so that everything wasteful is removed, and continually adapting (improving) the process to better meet changing customer and market requirements" (Nicolas & Soni, 2006, p. 308). Following Lean exercises and processes, downsizing solutions are often recommended and facilitated. This researcher has been very interested in downsizing and why it typically does not serve as a successful means of helping a company sustain itself. When she is called in to consult after a downsizing effort, employee morale and productivity are frequently poor. She has been struck by the lack of care or the interest some managers have in their downsized survivors. Investigating what employees feel like they have lost during the downsizing and hearing their perceptions regarding their reactions to their losses would provide useful information to managers. Knowing this information could enable the managers to be more effective in leading the organization after the downsizing event.

Gap in the Literature

While a great deal of research and writings have been generated related to those who have lost their jobs during a downsizing, the impact on the downsizing survivor has been studied little (Amundson et al., 2008). Because downsizing is such a significant

reality in contemporary corporate life, efforts must be made to hire and develop managers who are able to successfully and productively manage survivors in a downsized environment. If managers continue to ignore survivor feelings of loss, they will miss critical opportunities to understand what change interventions might be needed to successfully implement major changes, such as downsizing.

More research is needed to determine the existence and magnitude of the areas of loss, specifically, what kind of losses employees experience as a result of a downsizing event. The literature has not revealed how these particular survivor feelings have affected employees' productivity, motivation, and tendency to sabotage the change event or the survivors' intent to leave the organization.

In addition to needing more research regarding the existence and magnitude of areas of loss and how those areas are related to work behaviors, research is needed to evaluate how marginalized employees' experiences of loss might be different from the experiences of non- marginalized downsized survivors. Marginalized people refer to various non-white ethnicities, cultures, first generation cultures, women, people with disabilities or other groups of people. Bajawa and Woodall (2006) suggested that ethnic minorities and immigrants, for example, are especially vulnerable during layoffs.

To facilitate research and evaluate the areas of loss and worker behaviors, over 50 existing scales were reviewed to investigate the availability of instruments designed to evaluate areas of loss and worker behaviors that result from downsizing. The evaluation of existing surveys appeared to be limited to aspects of loss or worker behaviors, but did not address all of the constructs identified by downsized survivors, human resource

managers, or groups of industry representatives. This researcher determined that an instrument would need to be developed to answer the research questions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to develop and administer an instrument that identifies the areas of loss survivors of organizational downsizing experience, to describe how downsized survivors experience these losses, and to evaluate how these reported losses relate to work behaviors. This is important because if survivors' feelings of loss are not identified, acknowledged, and considered, the organization might experience a loss of employees' motivation to perform work, an increase in turnover, and an increase in the employees' intention to sabotage the organization. Survivors' negative loss reactions to organizational downsizing could represent a failure by the organization to maintain its ability to meet productivity goals, potentially creating a worse predicament than that which existed prior to the downsizing. Research and further study is needed to address this anticipated outcome. Thus, it is important to know and consider if employees do experience loss and, if so, in what areas. It is critical to know if these loss areas are related to work behaviors, such as lack of productivity, intention to leave the organization, or intention to sabotage the organization.

Scope of the Study

The proposed correlational study uses factor analysis to develop subscales related to areas of loss and subscales related to work behaviors following a downsizing. Items with Likert-type response options will be developed to measure the type and magnitude of loss a downsized employee might experience, as well as to report the likelihood of identified downsizing-associated work behaviors.

The validity of the proposed areas of loss and work behavior constructs will be investigated through an exploratory factor analysis using Principle Component Analysis (PCA). Using the factors, or subscales, that emerge from the PCA analysis, the relationship between areas of loss and work behaviors will then be explored through multiple regression analysis. Cronbach's Alpha will be used to evaluate the internal reliability of the factors or subscales.

The instrument will be administered to voluntary participants who respond to various recruitment strategies and who work in organizations that have experienced a downsizing effort in the last 12 months. The study will control for ethnicity, gender, age, type of organization, tenure within the company, work team member or work location changes, and relative proximity to the downsizing within the organization, but will not control for the level of employee position or type of position held. The instrument will be administered after the downsizing, within a year of the downsizing event, so the results may reveal reported loss areas and work behaviors that are already happening.

Definitions of Relevant Terms and Concepts

For initial clarity, the following array of definitions of terms and concepts (see Table 1.1) will help orient the work. A more detailed discussion of theory follows in Chapter II.

Table 1.1

Definitions of Terms and Concepts Used in This Research

Term and Concept	Definition
Downsizing	"The term 'downsizing' describes the contemporary development of permanent job cuts motivated by an effort to improve operating efficiently" (Kim, 2008), not directly

dependent on a decline in business. It is the intentional elimination of jobs (Maertz et al., 2010).

HRD   HRD represents human resource development.

Laid off   Refers to a situation where an employee (s) lost their job as a result of the downsizing event, similar to the definition of a victim.

Lean manufacturing   Lean production is a "philosophy of managing a process so that everything wasteful is removed, and continually adapting (improving) the process to better meet changing customer and market requirements" (Nicolas & Soni, 2006, p. 308). Anything perceived as wasteful is targeted for elimination through analytical observations, including the use of mathematical formulas. "Although not an expressed purpose, the common result of lean efforts is the need for few workers" (Nicolas & Soni, 2006, p. 289). The term "leaned out" is often used to refer to an organization that has undergone lean activities.

Loss of belonging   The employee has feelings of loss in belonging to the organization. Their sense of trust, security, and being valued and included is compromised. "The familiar contact with people like old customers, co-workers, or managers can disappear. People often lose their sense of belonging to a team, a group, or an organization" (Scott & Jaffe, 1995, p. 29).

Loss of control
and security   The employee's feelings of loss in the ability, power, control, or lack of resources to complete his or her job independently. Loss of security or insecurity has been described as where the employee no longer feels in control (Hughes, 2000; Moss Kanter, 1984; Paulsen et al., 2005; Scott & Jaffe, 1995); does not know what the future holds (Bordia, Hobman, Jones, Gallois, & Callan, 2004; Paulsen, et al., 2005; Scott & Jaffe, 1995); does not know where they "stand in the organization" (Scott & Jaffe, 1995, p. 9); feels a potential loss of job (Archibald, 2009; Ito & Brotheridge, 2007; Muchinsky, 2000); realizes the possibility of loss of possible career growth or promotional opportunities (Ito & Brotheridge, 2007).

Loss of identity   The employee has feelings of loss in his or her pride in position or job status. It is a description that provides

contextually relevant answers to the question of "Who am I?" and roots the employee in the organization (Ashforth, Harrison, & Corley, 2008).

Loss of justice and trust — The employee has feelings of loss in trust and justice within the organization and/or a loss of trust and fairness of how the organization interacts with employees. There may be a belief that the organization does not make decisions and does not behave in a manner that creates fairness. Employees may not trust their managers, executive leadership, or their peers.

Loss of relationships — The employee may have feelings of loss in relationships at work where there was a sense of trust, camaraderie, and familiarity.

Loss of self-efficacy — The employee's feelings of loss in his or her ability or competence to learn and/or complete job tasks, new work assignments, or other job requirements. Self-efficacy is the belief in one's ability to be able to execute specific behaviors that produce outcomes (Bandura, 1997).

Loss of territory — The employee has feelings of loss in his/her personal and dedicated work space, possibly feeling his or her work space has been violated and is unfamiliar. Territory is where employees feel comfortable and feel a sense of belonging in a physical space. The space may be specifically theirs or may be shared by selected other employees. When territory or space is violated, it brings a sense of loss that affects individuals. "Territory includes psychological space as well as physical space" (Scott & Jaffe, 1995, p. 29).

Marginalized people — Marginalized people refer to various non-white ethnicities, cultures, first generation cultures, women, people with disabilities or other groups of people that are ignored. "To be marginalized is to be ignored or not taken into account and this result in a failure to achieve potential with the individual and society" (S. Brown, 2006, p. 361).

Motivation and initiative — How the employee views his or her motivation and initiative to seek out work assignments and complete them. Using self-determinant theory as the employee's experiences of engaging in behaviors are "fully endorsed by the self, as opposed to reasons that feel pressured or coerced" (Lam & Gurland, 2008, p. 1109).

PCA	Principal Component Analysis is a type of data analytic technique. "Principle component analysis (PCA) yields one or more composite variables that caputure much of the information originally contained in a larger set of item" (DeVellis, 2003, p. 128).
Productivity	How the employee perceives himself or herself producing and completing work assignments. Productivity may include the quantity and quality of work performed, including absenteeism where the employee did not do any work (Brouwer, van Exel, Koopmanschap, & Rutten, 2002).
Sabotage	The employee's thoughts or behaviors to undermine change efforts, directives, or others. Based on sociological roots, it is defined as deviant behavior that includes rule breaking, cheating, crime, and restriction of output (Farhad, 1995). Farhad (1995) reported there are three categories of workplace sabotage: destruction, inaction and wastage.
Survivors or downsized survivors	Those employees not laid off as a part of the downsizing (Kim, 2008) and remain working in the organization.
Turnover intention	The employee has intentional thoughts of leaving the organization. It is when the employee is thinking about, or acting upon, thoughts to leave current employment and seek employment elsewhere.
Victims	Those who lost their jobs as a result of the downsizing effort where they were terminated due to reasons independent of job competence (Cappelli, 1992)).

The proposed correlational study will address the following research questions:

Research Questions

- Research question 1: What subscales, or reported areas of loss, related to employee experiences with downsizing will result from the PCA?

- Research question 2: What subscales, or reported work behaviors related to employee experiences with downsizing will result from the PCA?

- Research question 3: What areas of loss and work behaviors are the most prevalent?

- Research question 4: Which, if any, control or independent variables influence the work behaviors following a downsizing?

- Research question 5: Are there loss experiences that are unique to marginalized downsized survivors that are different from those of non-marginalized downsized survivors?

Summary

The purpose of the introduction was to show that downsizing is prevalent and that this action does not always have a successful outcome. Downsized survivors may feel losses in a variety of areas that may result in decreased productivity and motivation, increased intention to leave the company, and increased likelihood for sabotaging the change event.

Preview of Upcoming Chapters

Chapter II includes a literature review and explores some of the significant leadership challenges facing companies and organizations undergoing major organizational changes, particularly downsizing events. Managers and supervisors often ignore or deny the downsizing survivors' emotional experiences and responses, such as feelings of loss and grieving, thereby missing critical opportunities to provide interventions with the downsizing survivors that will enhance the company's success and sustainability. Theories and frameworks relating to emotion, grieving, loss, and transition related to organizational change and downsizing are discussed. These issues are particularly pronounced for marginalized employees during downsizing events.

Essential components in paradigm shifts when managing and counseling downsizing survivors and facilitating their adaptation to the change and post-change environment are presented.

Chapter III presents methodology procedures specifically related to scale development and analysis, and the research protocol implemented for this study. Test theory and scale development processes are described. An overview of instrument validation is provided, as well as a description of factor analysis. The research protocol is described, as well as instrument items used to collect data. Data collection and analysis procedures used are described along with a rationale for the use of these procedures.

Chapter IV will include the findings and results of the instrument development and the regression analyses as well as analysis of findings. Chapter V will present the conclusions, a discussion, and the implications for leadership and change management.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Downsizing is a commonly occurring organizational change today. Organizations anticipate cost savings and increased profits as a result of downsizing, but the likelihood of achieving these results is not as certain as one might think. During a downsizing event, individuals, groups, and larger systems within the organization are affected. This research focuses on how downsizing affects individual employees who remain in the organization following a downsizing. These employees, in all likelihood, are expected to implement new processes, work for new managers, team with different groups, and perform additional work or different work than they have done before. These individual survivors will affect the group and larger systems, and will impact the overall success of the downsizing effort.

Downsizing and Survivors

Downsizing is increasingly prevalent in organizations, affecting individuals and systems at all levels. These downsizing events often have a profoundly negative effect on the attitudes and productivity of the ones who are charged with implementing the changes resulting from a downsizing event, the surviving employees.

      Downsizing and its prevalence. Organizational changes brought about by downsizing personnel and redesigning work processes have become increasingly common during the past several decades (Clair & Dufresne, 2004) due to changes in technology, global markets, deregulation, and institutional pressures (Corbett & Lee, 2006; Knudsen, Johnson, Martin, & Roman, 2003). Downsizing is usually thought of as reducing the number of employees, whether it takes the form of laying employees off, offering early retirement, attrition, or redeployment (Shaw & Barrett-Power, 1997).

Downsizing has become widespread at all levels of public and private organizations in the United States (Hutchinson, Murrmann, & Murrmann, 1997) and has been referred to as a "permanent fixture" in the United States (Knudsen et al., 2003, p. 265). Organizations and businesses in other developed countries (Kivimaki, Vahtera, Elovainio, Pentti, & Virtanen, 2003) such as Finland (Vahtera, Kivimaki, Pentti,1997), Canada (Appelbaum & Patton, 2002), Korea (Yu & Park, 2006), Wales (Quinlan, 2007) and others have also experienced this phenomenon. The hospitality industry (Hutchinson et al., 1997), retail (Rogers, 2006), home building (Griswold, 2007), furniture manufacturing (McIntosh, 2010), manufacturing, and many other major industries have experienced downsizing. The approach of being "lean and mean" is an attempt to increase efficiency and reduce costs (Appelbaum, Close, & Klasa, 1999; Hutchinson et al., 1997; Nair, 2008) and remain competitive (Cross & Travaglione, 2004).

Often the downsizing effort is the result of Lean practices. Lean is a production practice used formally since the 1990s. It was used prior to the 1990s, initially by Toyota and, later, by other companies. Eventually, it became known as "lean" and is being used in many countries globally, such as The United Kingdom, Australia, Canada (Holden, 2010), Denmark (Arlbjorn, Freytag, & de Haas, 2010), and others. This practice is commonly used today in manufacturing companies (Katayama & Bennett, 1999), as well as hospitals (Holden, 2010) and the public sector (Arlbjorn et al., 2011) looking for potential waste. Any type of waste related to the end product is targeted for elimination through analytical observations, including the use of mathematical formulas. Although it is not discussed openly, the result of the lean effort is the need for worker reductions (Nicolas & Soni, 2006).

Downsizing is a disturbing phenomenon because it is chosen frequently as the first resort rather than the last, "even though it is futile and even self-destructive if there are underlying problems other than overstaffing" (Mentzer, 2005, p. 996).

> Despite all the research suggesting downsizing hurts companies, managers everywhere continue to do it. That raises an obvious question: why? Part of the answer lies in the immense pressure corporate leaders feel—from the media, from analysts, from peers—to follow the crowd no matter what. (Pfeffer, 2010, p. 33)

The successes and failures of downsizing. Studies and commentaries suggest the financial benefits companies claim for downsizing is uncertain (Cascio & Young, 2003). Estimates of the frequency of successful downsizing efforts vary. It has been speculated that over half of the companies that downsized reported their profit margins were not enhanced and the expected outcomes were not achieved (Hutchinson et al., 1997; Kinnie, Hutchinson, & Purcell, 1997). It was found only a quarter of the companies that downsized achieved improvements in productivity and financial return (Tomasko, 1992); downsizing is not always effective the first time; and two-thirds of the companies who downsized, downsized again a year later (Pearlstein, 1994). In addition, downsizing activities impact individuals and the organization with unintended negative consequences (Shaw & Barret-Power, 1997). Kets de Vries and Balazs (1997) reported downsizing has become overly simplistic in its approach because these efforts do not consider the complicated consequences.

Individuals, groups, and larger systems. Change never affects only one isolated level of an organization. Organizational changes such as downsizing affect all levels of the company: the larger system, group systems, and individual systems (Burke, 2008). These organizational levels interface with each other, overlap, and impact each other, all in some way influencing the degree of success or failure of the implemented change.

Burke (2008) argued that an organizational change should be considered within a systems thinking perspective with interacting parts and it is important to determine how the levels and parts of the system affect each other.

At the individual system level, the individual employees are crucial for implementing the changes brought about by the downsizing effort. These employees implement the new direction, adopt new work processes, increase their workloads, and change job functions. Individual interpretations and perceived disadvantages may result in the employees deciding to sabotage the change event, implementing the change in a fragmented manner, or taking action that will not result in increased productivity to the company.

Not only are individuals' job performances reflected in their direct areas of responsibility, but individuals also have an impact on group systems. Group systems can also have an impact on the individual employees. Group systems such as problem solving, self-directed, and cross-functional teams have significant roles in implementing organizational changes that come as a result of downsizing. Work groups can bridge the individual employee with the organization, provide a social support system for the employee, and provide an employee's perception of the meaning of the changes taking place within the organization, or the new organizational reality (Burke, 2008). Groups can negatively impact the way downsizing plays out in the organization, particularly if the group has a long history of being cohesive and has well-established norms. If group members are added or displaced, groups can find reasons and methods to sabotage changes in processes or strategies. However, if the group includes a member who is

struggling with the downsizing event and misinterprets events and consequences, the group can help that individual in understanding and dealing with the reality.

Larger system-level changes usually involve a change in focus, mission or vision, as well as a significant or total reorganization of the structure of the organization. Large organizations will sometimes resist change because of strong and longstanding organizational structure, culture, or strategic direction. These organizations tend to be self-maintaining with expectations about how people should behave, even though employees have transitioned in and out of the organization. The organizational culture (i.e., values, norms, and beliefs of an organization) may produce a resistance to the change, where members support the status quo. In addition, large systems may not want to risk change because they are heavily invested in a particular business or operational strategy, even though it is not working (Jones, 1998). Jones (1998) referred to Digital Equipment, General Motors, and IBM as organizations that failed to recognize changes in their competitive environments and were surprised with the negative outcomes. Large systems' resistance can play out in the following ways: the organization's old culture is too strong and only pieces of the transformational change are implemented; the organizational members are not convinced the change is justified; several of the key organizational members sabotage the effort; or followers band together to demonstrate the leader's ineffectiveness (Burke, 2008). Although the organization may have recognized the need for downsizing, it is only after the downsizing event has taken place that the culture of the company is reestablished.

Downsizing and social structure. Invariably, downsizing has an impact on the individual employee and the manager who was not laid off. The effects and implications

of downsizing will be discussed with a focus on organizations and companies representing a variety of sizes and industry groups. These organizations employ CEOs, managers, supervisors, and other employees. They have interdependent employees and departments. Of primary interest is the social structure, or the patterns of social interaction, between managers and individual employees who continue to be employed and working at a company following a downsizing event. A healthy social structure, where productive and communicative relationships exist between employees and their managers, becomes critical in ensuring a successful downsizing effort, consequently affecting the larger social system within the company. These relationships or structures on all organizational levels will interface, overlap, and impact each other; all influencing the degree of success or failure of the implemented change in some way.

Regardless of whether organizations are small, medium, or large, or if they are service-driven or product-driven, they share the need to remain sustainable, to manage an increasingly diverse workforce, and to implement changes that will bring about sustainability and/or profitability. Individual employees, teams, and departments need to contribute to the productivity and competitiveness of the services or products their company provides. The relationship and understanding between the managers and their direct reports will affect how the employees do their work, the attitudes they possess, their commitment to the organization, and the quality and quantity of work they produce. The managers' understanding of the downsizing issues will affect their facilitation of coaching sessions, the communication they provide, and the behaviors they demonstrate.

These relationships will carry over to relationships between individuals and their teams, to other departments, and to the larger social structure. The employees who

remain after a downsizing are expected to carry out the changes imposed as a result of the downsizing effort. It is important to evaluate how the survivors' emotions, feelings, fears, and attitudes may impact their productivity and their commitment to the entire downsized organization. If a disgruntled employee is not effectively managed, that employee may sabotage his or her work, the team's work, and the company as a whole. The employee's attitude may be negative and may spread to other team members, resulting in decreased productivity or poor customer service. Cooper and Sawaf (1997) asserted emotions are not only felt by others, but can actually be sensed by others, a phenomenon they call emotional contagion. The loss of productivity or decreased customer service in one department, due to negative emotional contagion, may compromise the bottom line of the company.

The survivor. Typically, downsizing involves a reduction in the numbers of employees, a redesign of work processes, and a change in operational strategy. The most common strategy of downsizing involves the reduction of the size and costs of the organization by laying off workers, termed the headcount tactic (Cross & Traveglione, 2004; Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997). In the literature, employees remaining following a downsizing have been referred to as *stayers* (Kivimaki et al., 2003) or more commonly as *survivors* (Appelbaum et al., 1999; Corbett & Lee, 2006; Knudsen et al., 2003; Paulsen et al., 2005), or retained employees experiencing the survivor syndrome (Fong & Kleiner, 2004).

The survivor is the employee, supervisor, or manager who remains with the organization. Although a lot of attention is focused upon the employees who are laid off or who leave as a result of the company downsizing, it is critical to consider the effects

on the survivor employees. Only by doing so, will the organization be able to take into account surviving employees' insights, understandings (or misunderstandings), and motives in adapting to the new realities of the changed organization.

Importance of the survivor employee, supervisor, or manager. The individual employee who works in a small, medium, or larger size company or organization typically works within several team systems interacting within a larger company system. The employee is responsible for embracing and helping to implement the downsizing changes. Given it is the employee who typically has the responsibility to implement the change and the individual's resistance could subvert the change, a critical issue is looking at the survivor's attitude, commitment to the organization, and willingness to implement the change. Another issue is the supervisor's ability to provide support for that individual in dealing with new responsibilities. Attention to the relationship between the individual and his or her supervisor, coworkers, and the larger system during and after the change is imperative. Interestingly, research has suggested downsizing victims fare better than survivors regarding stress (Devine et al., 2003) and gave credence that stress and control are critical factors in understanding survivors reactions to downsizing (Devine et al., 2003).

Downsizing invariably causes a realignment of organizational structure, altering relationships, work groups, and employee responsibilities. Often, downsizing events also represent a shift in priorities that some may see as conflicting with previously held workplace values, norms, and beliefs. Because of this, each employee is of critical importance in adapting to the new ways to implement the organizational change.

It wouldn't be appropriate or productive for an organization to view employees' feelings and emotions about a downsizing event in the same way that it considers, and make decisions about, more predictable considerations like changes in work space, facilities, transportation, or information technology issues. These considerations can more easily and quickly be mapped out, increasing the chances of making the downsizing event more successful in meeting the goal of strengthening the organization. Employees' emotions, and how they are acknowledged and managed, are perhaps the most significant factor in the success or failure of a downsizing event.

Emotions

   Theoretical frameworks. Discussions about what emotions are, how they originate, and how they affect thought and behaviors vary between theoretical framework perspectives and within each framework. According to Cornelius (1996), there are four theoretical traditions of research on emotion, including Darwinism, Jamesian, cognitive, and social constructivism. The Darwinism framework purports emotions are adaptive functions, and are universal. The Jamesian school of thought asserts emotion is the response of body functions. The cognitive theorists believe emotions are based on a series of appraisals made by the individual. Mandler (1975) asserted the experiences of emotion and behaviors are an intentional result of the sympathetic nervous system and cognitive appraisals, and the result is an emotional experience. Social constructivists believe emotions are social constructions and serve social purposes. With this approach, emotion is strongly shaped by social learning, societal, and political structures (Fineman, 2006) and are the products of culture and its obligations (Cornelius, 1996; Fineman,

2006). Many writers discuss the value of each framework's contribution and refer to the cognitive or biological debate as a "chicken and egg" problem (Reeve, 2001).

With the recent use of magnetic resonance imaging (MRIs) to study neurological activity related to human thought and process, research has suggested the human mind possesses a physiological "wiring . . . [or a] neural circuit specificity" (Reeve, 2001, p. 440) to feel joy, fear, rage, and anxiety. Regardless of whether one subscribes to the belief that emotions are adaptive or are the result of a cognitive appraisal system or are constructed for social purposes, one can assert people are wired for those emotions and emotions interplay with thoughts and affect behaviors. Emotions cannot be discounted.

Basic emotions. Depending on one's discipline, there have been a variety of definitions of emotion (Cornelius, 1996). Emotions are often equated with how one feels. Reeve (2001) described emotions as being multidimensional and existent as subjective, biological, purposive, and part of the social phenomenon. Although he acknowledged emotions are biological reactions, he noted emotions can be mobilizing and agents of purpose. Emotions can motivate an individual and can, likewise, stop the "pursuit of one's present course of action" (Reeve, 2001, p. 405). Callahan and McCollum (2002) described emotions as a myriad of experiences and attributes, combined together in a vague way.

Categorizations of emotions are also varied. Reeve (2001) cited six basic emotions, including fear, anger, disgust, sadness, joy, and interest. He related that sadness is the most negative and aversive emotion. Ekman et al. (1987) categorized emotions to be happiness, surprise, sadness, fear, disgust, and anger; Izard (1977) categorized emotions as interest-excitement, joy, surprise, distress-anguish, anger,

disgust, contempt, fear, shame, and guilt. Pultchik (1982) presented emotions as pairs

and looked at the eight basic emotions being: fear/terror, anger/rage, joy/ecstasy,

sadness/grief, acceptance/trust, disgust/loathing, expectancy/anticipation, and

surprise/astonishment. Pultchik hypothesized that these eight patterns were

"systematically related to one another and that there are prototype sources for all mixed

emotions and other derivative states that may be observed in animals and humans"

(p. 552).

Positive and negative emotions. Positive emotions, according to Darwin (1872)

helped people adapt to their surroundings. Reeve (2001) argued from a functional

framework; there really is not such a thing as a bad or good emotion.

> All emotions are beneficial because they direct attention and channel behavior to
> where it is needed, given the circumstances one faces. . . . From this point of
> view, fear, anger, disgust, sadness, and all specific emotions are good emotions.
> (Reeve, 2001, p. 424)

Some writings suggested positive emotions may help in organizational change (Oreg,

2003) and support good citizenship behaviors (Spector & Fox, 2002), while negative

emotions may create a lack of trust, increase withdrawal (Kiefer, 2005), reduce job

performance (Anderson, Keltner, & John, 2003), block work progress (Brown, 1995),

and jeopardize psychological contracts at work (Blau, 2006).

Reeve (2001) argued the most negative and aversive emotions, such as sadness,

arise from separation and failure such as a loss of circumstance, job position, or job

status. If the employee is unable to change the reality of the loss, he or she may behave

in an inactive or counterproductive manner.

Although emotions can be positive in that they direct attention and channel

behavior to where it is needed, the behavior may not be constructive to the organization.

Emotions can result in negative behaviors such as sabotaging an organizational change effort.

Employee emotions during organizational change. Why are emotions important to consider when talking about organizational change? Downsizing can bring out a variety of inadequately understood emotional reactions. When the effort is not done properly, it can affect employees' values and can result in increased stress that leads to dysfunctional coping strategies (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997) and result in poor performance (Muchinsky, 2000). Emotional symptoms of downsized survivors include self-reproach and sadness (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997); displacement of anger (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997); fear (Noer, 1990, 1993,1997); distrust, guilt, and depression (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997); feelings of moral outrage and resentment (Pezall, Parker, & Stroeberl, 2000). Emotions help people make sense of their world (Antonacopolou & Gabriel, 2001; Lundberg & Young, 2001) and can affect their sense of loyalty to the organization and to positive organizational outcomes.

Emotions and change. The study of emotion has previously focused on such pieces as satisfaction and employee stress, but since the late 1980s, writings have focused on the role of emotion as a phenomenon essential to organizations (Callahan & McCollum, 2002). Kiefer (2002) argued the literature is limited to a focus on emotions being pathological. Emotions are seen as the problems occurring during change implementation rather than an expression of the underlying difficulties of change management. Kiefer asserted that to understand emotions as a part of change, three emotional processes must be explored: "(a) Emotions as an important component of

construction of meaning during change, (b) emotions as an integral part of adaptation and motivation, and (c) emotions as a social phenomenon" (p. 43).

Kiefer (2002) articulated her assumptions concerning the role of individual emotional experiences in the context of organizational change. Her first assumption included the role of emotions for the individual experience of change. She said organizational change can be seen as individual and socially shared interpretations of meaning of the change events and the individual experience of change is a part of a complex set of interdependent emotions. Her second assumption had to do with the social role of emotions during change. She said emotions are expressed and become part of other peoples' experiences of the change event. Kiefer compared traditional and alternative approaches, looking at the assumptions of emotions and implications for change management (see Figure 2.1). With a traditional approach, emotions are viewed as being irrational, with emotions and cognition being opposites. In the alternative approach, emotions are linked with an interpretation of relevant events and guide action and motivation that will help people adapt. According to the traditional approach, emotions are managed away and there is effort to avoid negative emotions. With the alternative approach, the emotional landscape is analyzed to differentiate managerial actions and emotional perspectives are taken seriously. Kiefer argued:

> Different groups are likely to experience change differently—different stages during change and different sorts of organizational change are likely to produce different emotional experiences. To plan interventions, it is thus important to understand the emotional experience of stakeholders. (p. 59)

Ericksson (2004) argued it is not only important to understand the emotional responses to the organization change event, but it is also important to understand the role of the emotional history of previous change efforts. Fineman (2006) said emotions have

emerged "from the shadows to contribute centrally to our understanding of

organizations" (pp. 691-692). Fineman said it is important to take the emotional life

seriously, as a core to what we call "organizational rationality" (p. 692). Emotions and

cognitive thoughts need to regarded as being intertwined, both deserving equal attention

(Carr, 2001; Muchinsky, 2000).

Traditional Approach   **Alternative Approach**

Assumptions about emotions
- Emotions are irrational
- Emotion and cognition are opposites
- (Negative) emotions have negative implications for organization

Assumptions about emotions
- Emotions are connected to interruptions and vital for interpretation and construction of change
- Emotion link with interpretation of relevant events during change
- Emotion auide action/motivation and

Assumptions about emotions and change
- Fear and stress dominate change
- Emotions are equal with resistance
- Emotions evolve in phases

Assumptions about emotions and change
- Emotions are vital part of experience of change and thus
- Give insight into experience of change from a specific perspective in a specific

Assumptions about the role of emotions during change
- Emotions are mainly dysfunctional change process/organization
- Emotions are hindering change

Assumptions about the role of emotions during change
- Emotions constitute individual and social change story (meaning of change)
- Emotions drive individual behavior (e.g., withdrawal, motivation)

Implications for dealing with emotions
- Manage emotions away
- Keep emotional phases short
- Avoid negative emotions

Implications for dealing with emotions
- Analyze emotional landscape to differentiate managerial actions
- Learn from emotions for HRD
- Acknowledge emotions to take perspectives seriously

Figure 2.1. Understanding the Emotional Experience of Organizational Change: Evidence from a Merger, Vol.4 by Tina Kiefer. Copyright 2002 by Sage. Reproduced with permission of Sage via Copyright Clearance Center.

Survivors' possible undesirable consequences. There has been a great deal of discussion regarding the undesirable consequences of transitions involving layoffs. Emotions have an effect on the workplace mood, culture, behaviors, and productivity. Spector and Fox (2002) found negative emotions correlated to counterproductive work behaviors. Emotions experienced by one individual or a collective set of employees can affect others by creating an emotional contagion (Bono & Ilies, 2006; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989); influencing coping behavior (Lundberg & Young, 2001); and can block work progress (Brown, 1995). The survivors reported less involvement in their jobs, less commitment to the organization (Allen, Freeman, Russell, Reinzenstein, & Rentz, 2001; Appelbaum et al., 1999; Fugate, Kinicki, & Scheck, 2002; Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997; Knudsen et al., 2003; Luthans & Sommer, 1999; Nair, 2008); decreased morale (Armstrong-Stassen, 1993; K. Cameron et al.,1993); and a decreased intent to remain with the company (Fugate et al., 2002). Employees' trust for the organization decreases (Armstrong-Stassen, 2002; Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997). Job satisfaction decreases (Allen et al., 2001; Armstrong-Stassen, 1998; S. Cameron, Horsburgh, & Armstrong, 1996; Luthans & Sommer, 1999); and employees report experiencing burn out (Armstrong-Stassen, 1997; Kets de Vries, 1997). Survivor self-blame and scapegoating (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997) have been frequently reported.

In a three-year longitudinal study facilitated by Armstrong-Stassen (2002), survivors reported a significant decline in performance in the early phases of downsizing and in the three years following the downsizing event.

Survivors' illnesses have been well documented, including increased cortisol levels (Grossi, Theorell, Jurisoo, & Setterlind, 1999); cardiovascular complaints (Zeitlin,

1995), and psychosomatic complaints (Burke & Greenglass, 2000). In a study they facilitated, Kivimaki et al. (2003) found after a downsizing effort, deterioration of health was more likely in the stayers working in groups where there had been major staff reductions than among the leavers.

Noer (1997) described the survivor syndrome as the impact downsizing may have on the employees remaining in the organization. He described some of the pantheon of symptoms including fear, insecurity, frustration, resentment, anger, sadness, depression, guilt, feelings of injustice, betrayal, and mistrust. Fong and Kleiner (2004) went on to say if these symptoms are left untreated, they "can have disastrous effects on the downsized firm" (p. 13).

These undesirable consequences can be the result of the employee experiencing transitions related to a loss in a particular area. These transitions may take place in stages, accompanied with strong and compelling feelings. Giving something up, losing relationships, losing that sense of confidence to do the job, or a loss of trust for the organization may create problems after a company has downsized. Grief and loss may detrimentally impact how a survivor behaves in an organizational change and it is important to consider how organizations view emotions and treat survivors.

Organizational perceptions of emotions. Emotions have long been regarded as a hindrance to organizational change. Rationality and cognitive domain are highly regarded (A. Carr, 2001) whereas emotional issues are seen as a reaction to the stress of the change, something to be mediated or dealt with (J. Cox, 1997), or neglected (Eriksson, 2004; Muchinsky, 2000). "Yet, one only has to scratch the surface of organizational life to discover a thick layer of emotions, at times checked, at times

feigned, at times timidly expressed, and at other times bursting out uncontrollably"
(Gabriel, 1998, p. 293). Emotions are not seen as a concern for organizations and the
emphasis is placed upon the employees' job performance rather than the factors that
affect it (Fox & Spector, 2002).

"Rationality becomes so endogenous to modeling of the change process that it is
too easy to overlook emotion and emotionality" (Carr, 2001, p. 422). Efficiency is seen
as the good guy and emotionality is seen as the bad guy (Carr, 2001). Carr (2001) wrote
that the good guy and bad guy dichotomy and binary opposition are very common to
Western societies. These familiar oppositions are used to elevate one term or concept,
while inferring the denigration of the opposite concept. Carr (2001) argued the use of
this binarism thinking places emotionality on the subordinate margin and it leads us
astray from understanding how human behavior plays out, especially during a period of
change.

Business schools perpetuate the emphasis on rationality and demonize
emotionality. Stuart (1995), crediting Iacovini's (1993) work, wrote:

> Business schools seldom teach the human side of change. The human side is not
> logical, rational, or reasonable. It involves feelings of employees—such as fear,
> uncertainty, and doubt—as the attempt to make sense of change and maintain
> their self-esteem. These feelings are intangible. They are difficult to assess and
> manage, and executives may not realize their powerful effect. But if
> organizations are to gain employee commitment, it is crucial for them to
> understand how to deal with these issues. (p. 84)

Responding to Survivors

Organizations often do not seem equipped to deal effectively or productively with
surviving employees' emotions during a downsizing event. Often the organizations
find themselves in a reactive mode, doing damage control to minimize the effect of

behaviors accompanying employees' feelings of loss and lack of control, and their feelings of anxiety about what the future will bring.

Treatment of survivors. Organizations and their managers may ignore and distance themselves from their surviving employees, and are managed by exception (Labib & Appelbaum, 1994). Organizational silence may envelope the company. Employees are not willing to speak up about issues and do not discuss their problems. The managers tend to underestimate the loss the survivors are experiencing and, in doing so, may contribute to a failure of the downsizing effort.

Ignoring and distancing. "Emotional responses are ignored or rejected; even though many an executive has lain awake at night while replaying an emotional situation from work" (Northouse, 2007, p. 256). So, how does industry deal with downsizing survivors or *stayers*? Most organizational researchers and experts agree that organizations do very little for the survivors to address their emotional issues and the resulting unintended consequences (Appelbaum et al., 1999; Armstrong-Stassen, 1993; Kinnie et al., 1997; Nair, 2008); survivors' needs are managed by exception (Labib & Appelbaum, 1994), and managers usually ignore the survivor employees. Consequently, although the organization is effective in cutting jobs, it fails to meet the needs of the employees (Kinnie et al., 1997). Clair and Dufresne (2004) suggested downsizing agents (managers or human resource professionals) react by "cognitively, emotionally, and physically distancing themselves from their roles" (p. 1597) and suggested in doing so, they may contribute to detrimental effects on the organization. The downsizing managers may be using coping methods that entail distancing themselves, but the survivors may

"attribute the behaviors to callousness or being uncaring" (p. 1621). Not only will managers distance themselves, but they may see the survivors as being insignificant in the change process. Jian (2007) suggested many change models emphasize senior managers' roles as the change agents and overlook the employees in the change process. Ironically, popular thinking tends to blame the survivor. Herold, Fedor, and Caldwell (2007) talked about how seminars and popular writings have shifted the responsibility for managing successful organization changes from those managing the organization to blaming the survivors for poor organizational outcomes.

Managers and organizational silence. The literature suggests many organizations experience a phenomenon called *organizational silence* (Morrison, Wolef, & Milliken, 2000; Nemeth, 1997; Ryan & Oestreich, 1991), where direct reports are not willing to speak up about issues, withhold their opinions, and do not discuss the problems. Argyris and Schon (1978) asserted managers fear negative feedback because they might feel embarrassed or see the negative feedback as a threat to their competence. Morrison et al. (2000) believed managers' fear of negative feedback and their belief that employees are untrustworthy and interested primarily in themselves might create organizational silence, a condition that can be a potentially dangerous impediment to organizational change. Three undesirable reactions to organizational silence include employees' feelings are not valued, employees' perceived lack of control, and employees' cognitive dissonance (Morrison et al., 2000). "Subordinate outcomes might include lower internal motivation, dissatisfaction, and even sabotage or other forms of deviance" (Morrison et al., 2000, p. 720). If managers ignore the survivors, protect themselves, and believe employees are untrustworthy and selfish, how can they play

significant roles in helping survivors understand and deal productively with the loss they are feeling?

Underestimating the survivor loss. Scott and Jaffe (1995) reported the most common error that supervisors make during a change is underestimating what transition can do to employees. They believed most managers or supervisors think if they just tell employees to change, they will magically do so. Do these managers not understand the importance of change and loss, or do they just want to avoid the emotional responses? Northouse (2007) argued leaders dismiss the notion that emotional reactions occur toward leaders, followers, and coworkers, saying, "Organizational leaders, in particular, subscribe to the view that management and leadership ought to be as rational as possible" (p.256). Scott and Jaffe (1995) believed if a manager does not acknowledge the employees' losses, that manager cannot lead people in new directions. Bridges (1991) discussed how managers and employees do not have the experience to effectively work through the transitions that industry is facing, such as corporate mergers and restructuring. He believes managers' and employees' acceptance of change is vital to improving corporate performance.

Grief, Loss, and Transitions

To understand the feelings of grief and loss inherent for employees during an organizational change event, grief, loss, and transition theories need to be considered. Grief theories are organized and explained in a variety of frameworks. Goldsworthy (2005) described grief and loss theories categorized as psychodynamic, attachment, task, Kubler-Ross stages, social learning, cognitive behavioral, and constructionism. These

theoretical constructions were developed as a means to understanding how people grieve death or loss.

Psychodynamic theory. Freud (1917), in his paper "Mourning and Melancholia," talked about peoples' reaction to loss. Freud's psychodynamic approach subscribed to the belief grief was a cognitive process whereby loss could be resolved. He believed the person in mourning needed to withdraw energy from the lost person or object and put that energy into another person or object. Utilizing the assumptions of this theory, in managing a company downsizing, the manager might invest time and resources into celebrating the new company configuration and might develop strategies (i.e., training or engaging the survivors in having some control over new procedures) for focusing survivors' energies into the new way. This would leave less time and energy for the survivors to focus on their losses and would help the employee to move on and embrace the challenges that lie ahead.

Attachment theory. Attachment theory made a significant contribution to the field of grief and loss. The basic tenant of Bowlby's (1980) attachment theory was that attachment was "a protective biological mechanism that serves to ensure the survival of the individual" (Goldsworthy, 2005, p. 171). Bowlby said the separation response of adults is comprised of three phases: protest, despair, and detachment. He described the grief reaction as a process of unraveling the emotional bonds of attachment. Bowlby (1980) said sadness "is a normal and healthy response to any misfortune" (p. 245), however, his work in Attachment and Loss: Sadness and Depression focused primarily on death, specifically death of a child or parent, or death due to suicide. In a downsizing, an employee loses a well-liked supervisor and now has a supervisor who is new to the

company. Bowlby's ideas would suggest the separation response of the employee would initially include protesting the change, followed by a sense of despair at the loss and inability to rescue the former supervisor. Finally, the protective qualities of detachment from the previous work realities would take hold, allowing the employee to return to productivity.

Task theory. Task theory was based on Worden's work and was built from the work of Bowlby and Freud (Goldsworthy, 2005). Worden identified tasks the person needed to do to resolve grief. The tasks included "accepting the reality of the loss, working through the pain of the grief, adjusting to an environment where the deceased is missing, and emotionally relocating the deceased and moving on with life" (Goldsworthy, 2005, p.172). Worden's work was in reference to grief after death, but did not require individuals to participate in the linear stages of other theorists. Worden stressed individuality and choice in grief (as cited in Goldsworthy, 2005). In the previous downsizing example where the employee lost her favorite supervisor and now reports to a new supervisor, Worden theorized the employee would experience similar stages of emotions as the ones described by Bowlby, but the sequence of the stages would be unpredictable and not necessarily as linear. The employee might develop strategies that are immediately successful in adapting to new work realities and be able to perform at a high level, only to experience, sometime later, the devastating impact of the loss of the relationship with the former supervisor.

Stages. Kubler-Ross (1969) introduced the concept of stages of grieving. She introduced the five stages of grieving, including denial, anger, bargaining, depression, and acceptance. She noted grief does not always advance consecutively from one stage

to another, and could move back and forth between stages. Kubler-Ross and Kessler (2005) reported the grieving process allows the grieving individual's heart, soul, and mind to be restored. Unfinished grieving will leave the individual feeling overwhelmed and, if there are several losses, the unfinished grieving will leave the individual feeling a cumulative loss, more overwhelming than that which is the result of the immediate loss. Her writings have been applied to transitions other than death, and even to organizational changes. For example, the Kubler-Ross theory, as applied to downsizing, suggests the downsizing survivor may be overwhelmed with the situation at work if the grief is not worked through. The employee may or may not experience not only the feelings of loss related to the immediate downsizing event, but may experience accumulative grief from other losses, such as former job losses or financial losses. Kubler-Ross was criticized about the prescriptive nature of the rigid stages. "People do not pass through stages of grief in an orderly way and some experience more than one stage at a time" (Goldsworthy, 2005, p. 172). While some of this criticism may be valid, Kubler-Ross made a valuable contribution by being the first to recognize grieving as a process.

Social learning theory. Whereas the psychodynamic and other theorists considered the individual internal experiences of loss, the social learning theorists also considered the external environments as affecting the meaning of loss for people. "These theorists emphasized the role that external factors, such as society, culture, and religion, have on the internal experience of loss" (Goldsworthy, 2005, p. 172). The grief process a downsizing survivor might experience using this framework would be affected by perceived society and cultural expectations. Western culture historically has ceded the role of primary family breadwinner to the husband. A downsizing event could very well

significantly elevate the survivor's anxiety level as he considers the shame and humiliation he might feel if he is the victim of future reductions in the company's work force. This fear and anxiety certainly might have a negative impact on his work performance.

Cognitive behavioral theory. The cognitive behavioral theorists view grief as a process that presents many choices and possibilities because those who were feeling the loss could choose to focus attention on their grief (Goldsworthy, 2005). They view grief as an opportunity to use a variety of coping strategies to reduce the grief related to the loss. According to this theory, survivors of downsizing would not necessarily experience the same emotions in the same way and, accordingly, the strategies for confronting and dealing with the loss may vary from individual to individual. A survivor taking a cognitive behavioralist approach to dealing with a downsizing might consciously choose to change negative thoughts to thoughts pertaining to the new opportunities afforded by the organizational change. By incorporating this approach of focusing on the positive thoughts about the reorganization following the downsizing event, the survivor would theoretically begin to experience positive feelings about the event.

Constructivist theory. Constructivists focus on understanding the meaning that each person attributes to loss, both in their internal and external worlds (Goldsworthy, 2005) and see grieving as a process of meaning reconstruction (Neimeyer, 2000). In this approach, loss is perceived as an event that can profoundly shake an individual's assumed constructions about life, sometimes dismantling the very foundation of one's assumptive reality (Neimeyer, 2000).

The argument and challenge to the traditional grief theorists is that people are special and unique, and so is their experience of grief and loss (Goldsworthy, 2005); and that traditional theories are too superficial, simplistic, and universally imposed (Neimeyer, 2000). These theorists construct meaning in relation to many cultural, social, and other influences. Sense making is important to social constructivists by emphasizing the ways in which individuals shape their perception of the world by thinking. Neimeyer (1999) believed that the meanings with which we construct our lives do not typically prepare us for all experiences, such as being faced with a significant loss. He suggested that the process of grieving allows us to reconstruct meaning following loss. Neimeyer (2000) said grief is a personal process that is "idiosyncratic, intimate, and inextricable from our sense of who we are" (p. 89). He said grieving is something people with a loss do, not something that is "done to them," and grieving is the act of reconstructing a personal world of meaning that has been challenged by loss. Neimeyer (2000) said feelings have functions and should be understood as signals "of the state of our meaning-making efforts in the wake of challenges to the adequacy of our constructions" (p. 94). Finally, Neimeyer (2000) offered that people construct and reconstruct their identities as survivors of loss in negotiation with others. He said "'grief work' can be seen as being done at the level of three interdependent and nested systems, corresponding to the self, family, and the broader society, respectively" (pp. 96-97).

Neimeyer (2000) asserted the reconstruction of one's personal world of meaning couched in an instance of loss must consider the person's ongoing relationships with real and symbolic others, as well as the mourner's resources. Neimeyer addressed challenges of those in loss, but stressed that the activities are not to be accomplished in an order, nor

are they linear or rigid. The challenges include acknowledging the reality of the loss, opening up pain, revising the assumptive world, reconstructing the relationship to that which has been lost, and reinventing oneself. Inherent in this theory is that, after a downsizing, the survivors need to make sense of the new work environment and redefine their role and relationships within it. While dealing with the feelings of grieving and loss is important, relieving those feelings is not an end in itself, but rather part of the means to the end of successfully adjusting to the new workplace realities created through the downsizing event.

Transition theory. In addition to the frameworks suggested by Goldsworthy (2005), it is important to discuss the variety of transitional theories suggested by others that describe life transitions, which are not tied to death.

Parkes (1988) introduced the concept of psychosocial transitions where life changes were involved. She said that, in these contexts, individuals need to make major revisions of their assumptions about their world, where there are lasting implications in change that takes place during a short period of time. Many writers have noted loss and grieving should not be limited to situations such as death, but should include diverse life transitions as well (Goldsworthy, 2005; Murray, 2001; Neimeyer, 1999, 2000; Stuart, 1995). Elders (1995) said that for each life transition, there is a loss and that situation requires an internal and external adjustment.

Spencer and Adams (1990) talked about making life changes by transitioning through seven stages of adjustment. The first stage includes "losing focus" (Spencer & Adams, 1990, p. 31) where the individual experiences numbness of unreality. The second stage, minimizing the impact, is where the individual goes through "the motions"

(p. 41), whereas the third stage is "the pit" (p. 49). In the pit, reality is felt and the person may feel powerlessness and they are not experiencing control. Moments of intense sadness or grief are found in this stage. The fourth stage, "letting go of the past" (p. 61), is where the individual has allowed grieving to run its course. The person may experience a pendulum period where he or she experiences dropping back into the pit. "Testing the limits" (p. 75), stage five, is a time to feel more secure, followed by stage six, "searching for meaning" (p. 85). During this stage, one reflects over the transition and tries to figure out the meaning of the change. Finally, Spencer and Adams believed the person ends in stage seven, "integrating" (p. 91), where the transition is complete.

Bridges (1991) described employees' feelings of denial, anger, bargaining, anxiety, sadness, disorientation, and depression during work transitions. His model of transition includes an ending, a neutral zone, and a beginning. Bridges said it is not the "change . . . [that will] do people in" (p. 3), but it is the psychological transition. He argued the change will not happen if the transition does not take place, and the individual has to let go of something. He coined the term *neutral zone* as the place between the old reality and the new. It is the limbo between the old sense of identity and what is to come. It is that time where the old way is gone and the new way does not feel comfortable. He shared that the emotions and the grieving people demonstrate may be mistaken for bad morale, but are actually signs of grieving. This is a phenomenon frequently observed with employees experiencing organizational change—they have yet to find their comfort levels with new co-workers, unfamiliar surroundings, and/or shifting job duties.

Scott and Jaffe (1995) believed there are several types of workplace losses resulting from organizational change, including security, competence, relationships, and

territory. The transitional process, considering these loss areas, includes the employee experiencing denial, resistance, commitment, and exploration. Scott and Jaffe argued that even when a change is perceived as positive, it is not uncommon for a person to feel loss.

Kets de Vries and Balazs (1997) said downsizing victims and survivors need to mourn. They reported that if the employee worked through stages or the state of discontent and subsided, gradual acceptance of the situation occurred and that resulted in a redefinition of the employee's psychic world. They said if employees are unable to mourn, they get stuck and this may result in denial of the situation and a clinging to the past. The employee could withdraw, be aggressive, redirect his or her anger, and experience emotional mismanagement that might result in dissociative thinking where scapegoating occurs.

Given there are unintended consequences and losses survivors' experience, a discussion regarding how industry managers treat and interact with these employees is appropriate. How do managers help employees let go of the old and transition to the new?

Dealing with employees' losses. An integral part of Noer's (1997) model included allowing the employee to grieve. Like Noer, Bridges (1991) recommended supervisors hold people accountable, but also attend to employees' various feelings through sympathizing, understanding, being realistic, and acknowledging employees' feelings. According to Scott and Jaffe (1995), "it is far more common for people to change because of the support, encouragement, caring confrontation, and empathy of a relationship" (p. 31) and employees will then be more likely to trust and follow leaders

during change. Hayes (2007) advised change managers to recognize there will sometimes be a time delay between the announcement of change and the employees' emotional response. Change will have varying effects on individuals and how they will proceed through the cycle. He added that the cycle cannot be sidestepped and reinforced the belief that change managers need to have a role in facilitating their employees' transition cycle.

Marks (2006) proposed a framework that facilitated the process of individual adaptation to transition using two levels, the intellectual and the emotional. On the intellectual level, employees need to understand what is changing, why the changes are happening, and how the changes will bring benefit to the company and to the employee personally. Emotional considerations for facilitating adaptation after transition include empathy, engagement, energy, and enforcement. Empathy lets the employees know the managers acknowledge things have been difficult and may continue to be difficult. Engagement creates understanding of, and support for, the need to end the old organizational ways and to help employees accept new organizational realities. Energy is important in that leaders need to find ways to generate excitement with employees about the benefits of the change. The last element, enforcement, involves the manager solidifying the employee's perceptions, expectations, and behaviors in line with the desired change.

Downsizing agents, managers, and supervisors need to understand that merely telling employees to change will probably not be an effective strategy in implementing a successful change. Human beings have psychological factors, including emotions, which may prevent a successful downsizing implementation if the supervisor or manager does

not support the employees and hold them accountable. The manager must not distance herself during the employee's adjustment to the change, but must possess the basic knowledge and skills to evaluate employees and work with them effectively.

Loss areas and downsizing. Any significant change to an employee is a transition. Employees struggle with change when they see change as a loss (Folger & Skarlicki, 1999). Making a proper diagnosis of survivors' reactions and organizational dysfunction is a step forward in making an effective intervention (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997). Considering the emotional landscape of the organization and the emotional experiences of employees can help managers better understand the organizational change (Kiefer, 2002). Amundson et al. (2004) perceived the model of grieving and bereavement to be relevant for understanding the "emotional upheaval of survivors and their possible stages of adjustment" (p. 257). The survivor must identify who is losing what, what it means, and must let go of whatever was lost (Bridges, 2004). The feelings have functions and should be understood as opportunities for meaning making (Neimeyer, 2000). The survivor and his or her manager need to identify and deal with the emotional responses related to the downsizing efforts.

Loss of control and security. Downsizing can result in a loss of security (K. Cameron et al., 1993; Kalimo, Taris, & Schaufeli, 2003). Loss of security or insecurity has been described as where the employee no longer feels in control (Hughes, 2000; Moss Kanter, 1984; Paulsen et al., 2005; Scott & Jaffe, 1995), does not know what the future holds (Bordia et al., 2004; Paulsen et al., 2005; Scott & Jaffe, 1995), does not know where they stand in the organization (Scott & Jaffe, 1995), feels a potential loss of job (Archibald, 2009; Ito & Brotheridge, 2007; Muchinsky, 2000), and realizes the

possibility of loss of possible career growth or promotional opportunities (Ito &

Brotheridge, 2007).

Paulsen et al. (2005) found job uncertainty was significantly higher and feelings

of personal control were significantly lower at the anticipation of the downsizing event.

Levels of uncertainty and control for employees were similar during implementation and

post-downsizing event; however, the emotional exhaustion levels remained consistent

across each of the downsizing stages. In a study facilitated by Maertz et al. (2010),

survivors of layoffs perceived lower job security within their organizations.

Job insecurity has been linked to psychological distress and burnout (Dekker &

Schaufeli, 1995). When experiencing downsizing, employees are likely to feel

uncertainty and a lack of control (Devine et al., 2003; Hughes, 2000). Lacking control

and security may result in employees feeling powerless (Archibald, 2009; Moss Kanter,

1984), feeling a higher level of stress (Kalimo et al., 2003; Moss Kanter, 1984), and

acting in defensive ways (Moss Kanter, 1984).

Loss of perceived competence and self-efficacy. With the many new duties

taken on by survivors of a downsizing event, employees often lack confidence to carry

out newly assigned job tasks while continuing to successfully complete the job tasks that

comprised their job responsibilities before. Self-efficacy is the belief in one's ability to

be able to execute specific behaviors that produce outcomes (Bandura, 1997). It is

perceived competence to complete existing, changing, or newly assigned work tasks. An

individual's degree of self-efficacy can be strong in one domain but not in all domains.

One can possess a high level of self-efficacy in one area of life, for example, having the

ability to perform accounting tasks, but may possess a lower level of self-efficacy in

another domain, such as using a computer software program. Perceived self-efficacy is a cognitive mechanism underlying behavioral change and ability to execute that change (Cervone, 2000). Schyns (2004) lists four sources of self-efficacy: mastery experience, vicarious experience, social persuasion, and physiological and emotional states. Mastery experience is the result of a person successfully executing a behavior that leads to an increase in self-efficacy. Seeing somebody model the behavior can increase vicarious experience. Social persuasion experiences can support self-efficacy levels when employees are told they can accomplish the behavior and, thus, the employee is more likely to try to execute the behavior (Schyns, 2004). Interestingly, Schyns (2004) discounts employees' emotional states and experiences as having an effect on self-efficacy, citing Bandura's (1980) work in the 1980s.

Self-efficacy and organizational change. Self-efficacy plays out in several ways. It influences our persistence at a task and influences the ways our bodies react while working on a goal (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 2005). "People with high self-efficacy experience less anxiety while working on a difficult task and their immune systems function more optimally" (Aronson et al., 2005, p. 485).

During organizational change, a foundational role of implementing that change is the perception of individual competence on successful organizational change (Jacobs, 2002). Downsizing survivors and other employees undergoing organizational change may experience a loss of self-efficacy and a loss of perceived competence to complete the tasks required in their changing job role. Workers sometimes feel they no longer know what to do or how to manage. People sometimes feel humiliated when they are faced with new tasks because they do not know how to do them (Scott & Jaffe, 1995).

LaMarsh (2009) asserted one of the strongest inhibiters during a downsizing change is an employee's lack of ability or skill to actually implement the change. The survivor may resist the change because of self-confidence issues.

> Can I do it? How will I do it? Will I make it under the new conditions? Do I have the skills to operate in a new way? These concerns may not be expressed out loud, but they can result in finding many reasons why change should be avoided. (Moss Kanter, 1984, p. 680)

Jimmieson, Terry, and Callan (2004) facilitated a longitudinal study of 589 employees during an 18-month process, looking at employees' adaptation to organizational change and the role of change-related information and change-related self-efficacy. They defined change-related self-efficacy as an employee's perceived ability to function well on the job despite the demands of a changing work context. Those employees who possessed higher levels of change-related information and change-related efficacy reported higher levels of psychological well being, client engagement, job satisfaction, and reduced stress during the early phases of the change event. Schyns (2004) explored the relationship between preparedness for organizational change, self-efficacy, and leadership. She asserted, in an organizational change context, job qualifications could increase self-efficacy levels prior to change. Within a context of adequate training, employees can learn how to execute tasks resulting in increased self-efficacy. She stated:

> It is also important for employees' self-efficacy that they are informed about the kinds of changes that are connected to organizational change. Only with a full knowledge of future tasks can employees speculate about the extent to which their competence will meet up to the new demands. (Schyns, 2004, p. 258)

Amundson et al. (2004) found survivors reported significantly increased workloads, decreased autonomy, and difficulty learning new skills without training. Survivors found

they did not receive the support because the organization was "stretched to the limit"

(p. 265).

> Survivors were frequently placed in jobs that required new skills. Although most of the survivors valued the opportunity to develop new skills, some expressed frustration and anxiety when they did not receive adequate training to perform their new jobs competently. (p. 265)

Schyns (2004) argued self-efficacy can be increased through leadership and other efforts prior to and during the organizational change. She argued people with higher levels of self-efficacy should be identified in organizations as they are probably more willing to accept change and could serve as change agents for their colleagues and people they lead.

Loss of relationships and sense of belonging. During or following a downsizing event, the employees' relationships with others and sense of belonging may be impacted, resulting in emotional responses of grief. "The familiar contact with people like old customers, co-workers, or managers can disappear. People often lose their sense of belonging to a team, a group or an organization" (Scott & Jaffe, 1995, p. 29). Employees may feel grief over these losses (LaMarsh, 2009). Given the time each employee spends at work, often employees see their work relationships as their "symbolic families" (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997). As they see co-workers as part of their family and their world, they also see them as part of their well being (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997).

When downsizing results in survivors losing these family members, it is anticipated they will mourn the loss of those downsizing victims. In a downsizing event, the loss of colleagues, "many of whom may also be good friends, disrupts important relationships that may have been in place for years" (LaMarsh, 2009, p. 9). Not only will they mourn the loss of victims, but if they are reassigned to new or different departments or to new supervisors, they may experience additional relationship loss and a loss of their

sense of belonging. Amundson et al. (2004) found most of the survivors interviewed reported negative incidents involving the grieving for their coworker victims who were laid off as part of the downsizing. "Participants expressed feelings of loss and sadness. Survivors who were transferred away from their colleagues experienced isolation and loneliness, and they also expressed guilt and envy" (p. 260). Not only do employees grieve working with their coworkers who lost their jobs, but they sometimes lack trust in the new coworkers they are required to work with (Amundson, et al., 2004).

In addition, there is a sense some employees do not feel like they are a part of the organization, they do not feel safe, conveyed as they don't belong, and they feel that they are not valued. Survivors wonder where they fit in and feelings of sadness are not unusual (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997).

Loss of territory. Territory is where employees feel comfortable and feel a sense of belonging in a physical space. The space may be specifically theirs or may be shared by selected other employees. When territory or space is violated, is brings a sense of loss that affects individuals.

During downsizing or other organizational change events, employees are often required to give up their office, workspace, and/or work in another location. Employees like the certainty of having their own space and their comfort zone. When their territory or work environment changes, one can expect employees will feel uncertainty about the area that previously belonged to them and where they felt comfortable. "Territory includes psychological space as well as physical space" (Scott & Jaffe, 1995, p. 29).

Self-esteem and identity of downsizing survivors may be tied to the loss of familiar surroundings, as is suggested in this account of survivors' reaction to a

downsizing event. "Generally, they felt betrayed by the organization to which they had devoted a considerable part of their lives. With their sense of self-esteem very closely tied to organizational identity, the loss of familiar surroundings caused them to fall apart" (Kets De Vries & Balazs, 1997, p. 25).

Milligan (2003) talked about organizational site moves as organizational deaths. She viewed organizational change as involving loss, including loss of space. She added organizational site moves were not the only type of loss. She thought other spatial changes could be characterized as losses. Disruptions in attachments could also disrupt employees' means for structuring their identities.

> Most apparently, organizations that remodel or otherwise physically alter their existing sites risk disrupting placed attachments, when, for example, a site is rearranged or remodeled to the point that its users perceive the original site as gone or lost. As with organizational moves, the decision makers in such situations may view the changes as an "improvement" and become very frustrated with resistance to them and with the dissatisfactions that arise after the alterations have been made. The potential reactions of organizational members to these situations would be better understood if they were seen as a form of displacement. Attachment can occur on a wide range of scales, so even small changes can significantly disrupt small-scale attachments (by small-scale, I do not mean those of lesser importance but those to smaller areas or objects). (Milligan, 2003, p. 142)

Loss of identity and organizational changes.

> I changed job [sic] over the summer. . . . As the newness wore off after a couple of months, I've been experiencing a sense of loss. The loss of the things I've been doing over the last seven years. . . . The relationships I had built. The feeling of being needed by the students I was working with. Many of the parts of that role fitted with who I am and gave me expression of those gifts, skills, and abilities. The time was right for a change but I loved what I was involved in. Perhaps my identity became wrapped up in my role, so as I changed role, as a new season in life comes, I have begun to question who I am. Had I become what I was doing? (Moore as cited in Ashforth et al., 2008, p. 326)

The construct of organizational identification was discussed early in organizational science writings. Chester Barnard described (as cited in Ashforth et al.,

2008) organizational identification as "a 'coalescence' between the individual and the organization that generates a sense of individual conviction and a willingness to devote increased effort to the organization" (p. 326). Identity is what you think of yourself and how you refer to yourself. It is a description that provides contextually relevant answers to the question of "who am I?" and roots the employee in the organization (Ashforth et al., 2008). Social identity theory is the "essence of people's subjective sense of who they are and is, to an important degree, determined by the manner in which they define themselves socially" (Emler, 2005, p. 200). Social identity is not provided, but is constructed by individuals as they engage in social contexts and interactions (Hotho, 2008). The concept of identity helps capture the essence of who people are, why they do what they do, why people join organizations, why they approach their work the way they do, and why they interact with others the way they do during that work. Identification matters because it is the process by which people come to define themselves, communicate that definition to others, and use that definition to navigate their lives, work-wise or other (Ashforth et al., 2008, p. 334).

Work role transitions may occur during or following a downsizing. Employee's work tasks may be eliminated, workloads escalate (Jimmieson et al., 2004; LaMarsh, 2009), and role ambiguity and stress may be more prevalent (Jimmieson et al., 2004). The employee may have acquired a new job title or job description. Changes in job responsibilities often take place during an organizational downsizing (Allen et al., 2001) and survivors may discover their jobs have been dramatically changed or eliminated (Tombaugh & White, 1990). "These changes may include alterations in job responsibilities, modified reporting relationships, new co-workers, and other environment

differences, such as new policies or procedures" (Tombaugh & White, 1990, p. 147).

There may be a lack of pride, success, and certainty in their job identities, job roles, or

titles, and possibly, even their personal identities. In addition, Amundson et al. (2004)

found although the survivors remained on the job and continued to work for the same

organization, their relation with the company had changed: "Frequently, their sense of

being valued by the organization diminished" (p. 262).

Aquino and Douglas (2003) purported anti-social behaviors resulted from identity

threats experienced. Hotho's (2008) considered script use during organizational change,

suggesting professionals use and rewrite scripts of their professional group, but also draw

upon new scripts as they participate in change. Hotho facilitated interviews of employees

to find out how they saw change as a challenge to their professional identity and an

opportunity to revise or rewrite scripts. Hotho argued:

> Individuals use interpretative schemes to make sense of events and actions and to
> communicate and interact with others within the social system. These scripts
> consist of frames of reference, and scripts of knowledge shared by the respective
> community, constitute the group prototypical of that community. (p. 734)

Employees use scripts or narratives to describe feelings that are socially grounded, not

subjectively generated (Hotho, 2008). These individuals made decisions to use existing

or new scripts.

Loss of justice and trust. During organizational changes such as downsizing,

there may be a belief the organization does not make decisions in a manner that creates

fairness. Employees may not trust their managers, executive leadership, or their peers.

People subjected to downsizing may feel betrayed and depressed (Kets de Vries &

Balazs, 1997) and stuck in grieving process.

Types of justice. Gilliland (2008) talked about four kinds of justice at the workplace: distributive, procedural, interactional-informational, and interactional-interpersonal. Distributive justice reflects the fairness of evaluations and outcomes connected to those evaluations (Gilliland, 2008). From an organizational change context, this type of justice is concerned with perceptions of fairness resulting from the company's allocations and outcomes (Saunders & Thornhill, 2003). Procedural justice considers the fairness of the processes used to make decisions (Gilliland, 2008) and the processes used to arrive at decisions about allocations and outcomes (Saunders & Thornhill, 2003). The degree the decision-making processes demonstrates "consistency, bias suppression, accuracy, correctability, representativeness, and ethicality" (Folger & Skarlicki, 1999, p. 37) are involved in procedural justice. From a downsizing perspective, employees would interpret this type of justice to include ethical decisions in identifying new processes, downsizing victims, assignments to new work units, and new work organizational groups. Interactional informational justice is the fairness in sharing adequate explanations and communication (Saunders & Thornhill, 2003). During downsizing, managers would clearly communicate the direction of the company, changed expectations, and provide appropriate and convincing rationale. Interactional-interpersonal justice includes the respectful and sensitiveness of interactions (Gilliland, 2008) and the perceived fairness of the interpersonal treatment received (Saunders & Thornhill, 2003). Downsizing survivors would determine the degree of this justice by the respect and dignity they thought they received during the downsizing process and the aftermath.

Equity and organizational justice theories. Two types of justice theories discussed in the literature include equity theory (Folger & Skarlicki, 1999; Gilliland, 2008) and organizational justice theory (Paterson & Cary, 2002; Saunders & Thornhill, 2003). Equity theory is one of the earlier frameworks for understanding perceived organizational injustice (Adams, 1965; Folger & Skarlicki, 1999) and looks at the causes and consequences of the equity in human exchange relationships, specifically related to distributive justice. Equity theory asks what employees think is fair and how do they respond when they feel like they deserve more? In this context, the experience of inequity can play out in two ways: the first is where the employee adopts their perception to the reference point of the change and the second is where the employee tries to right the wrong. With the first approach, the employee initially experiences something aversive, but the motivation to reduce the aversiveness leads to resolution. The second approach involves anger and behavioral reactions including attacks on injustice to right the wrong (Folgers & Skarlicki, 1999). "Withdrawing effort is only one behavioral response to inequity. Other behaviors might include theft, sabotage, and even violent revenge" (Folgers & Skarlicki, 1999, p. 37).

Organizational justice theory involves utilizing a cognitive approach to explain the effects of change events in relation to the employees' acceptance of change. With this approach, the employees evaluate situations that have implications for their well-being and respond positively if they believe the situations involve a high degree of distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. "Together, the three justice dimensions are proposed to influence a range of employee responses, including acceptance of change, organizational commitment, trust, quality of work-life,

productivity, and turnover" (Paterson & Cary, 2002, p. 85). LaMarsh (2009) reported if

leadership is seen to behave in a caring and trustworthy manner, making efforts to reduce

the survivor pain, the survivors and their managers will have less anxiety and fear and

will have a higher degree of confidence that the change will be successfully implemented.

Consequently, LaMarsh argued employees will experience less need to resist the changes

and will move forward.

Downsizing and lack of trust and justice. What are the consequences when

employees perceive inequitable situations and unfairness during or following downsizing

efforts? The moment the organization informs their employees they have decided to

downsize, the psychological contract (Rousseau, 1995) between the organization and the

employees is changed (Amundson et al., 2004).

> When distrust is established, the distrusting party may continue to perceive the other party as a threat, making it more difficult to break out of the negative cycle. When this occurs, communication is reduced making it even more difficult to deliver messages that counter that negativity.
> Trust is built over time during multiple interactions between people, whereas distrust may be consequential from one infraction. When coupled with emotional intensity, it may be more difficult to correct distrust in organizations than it is to build trust. . . . This suggests that it may be equally, or more, important for leaders to focus on preventing distrust as it is in building trust. (Keyton & Smith, 2009, p.16)

Kalimo et al. (2003) found employees experiencing downsizing in the past or

anticipating a downsizing reported elevated levels of inequity, which were correlated

with increased psychological strain, cynicism, and absence. Armstrong-Stassen (2002)

found downsizing had a long-term negative effect on morale and organizational trust.

Survivors in minor change workgroups found decreased perceived justice (Armstrong-

Stassen, Wagar, & Cattaneo, 2004). Tsai, Yen, Huang, and Huang (2007) said the

downsizing process violates an employee's psychological contract and the outcomes

harm employees and their families psychologically, economically, physically, and create social instability. With the greater workload and increased pressure, employees experience a breached psychological contract. According to Rousseau (1995), a psychological contract is defined as "people's unconscious expectation of an organization to respond to their psychological needs and support their psychological defenses in exchange for meeting the organization's unstated needs" (p.3). Paterson and Cary (2002) facilitated research using an affective events theory (AET) based model. This model proposed events in the workplace, such as downsizing, will impact the work attitudes and behaviors via their effects on employees' affective reactions. Using this framework, the researchers found both justice cognitions and anxiety emotions had an influence upon how employees accepted downsizing. Procedural justice and change anxiety explained the effects of change management procedures and the acceptance of downsizing while interaction justice and change anxiety explained the effects of change communications on trust in the change managers. Spreitzer and Mishra (2002) found the trustworthiness of management, distributive justice, procedural justice, and four dimensions of empowerment (meaning, competence, impact, self-determination) are found to facilitate more organizational attachment. Wiesenfield, Brockner, and Thibault (2000) found lowered perceptions of downsizing procedural fairness were related to decreased levels of self-esteem among employees with high organization commitment. Mansour-Cole & Scott (1998) found that survivors had reported higher procedural fairness when their managers personally informed them of impending layoffs than when informed by others.

Work Behavior Effects

Acknowledging survivors may experience loss in various areas is not enough. There are many questions that need to be answered. How do the survivors' experiences and feelings of loss impact the implementation of the downsizing change effort and the organization's efficiency and productivity? Do the survivors who experience grief and loss have lower levels of motivation or do they intend to leave, depleting the organization of skills, knowledge, and the relationship networks necessary to perform the work tasks? Are the survivors who experience grief and loss more inclined to sabotage the change effort of the organization?

To answer these questions regarding motivation, productivity, intention for flight, and sabotage, a literature review reveals research in these areas. In the following sections, historical and contemporary frameworks are described, as well as relevant research investigating these concepts. Table 2.1 summarizes the motivational theory discussion.

Motivation. Motivation is defined as a "need or desire that energizes and directs behavior" (Myers, 2007, p. 470). Motivation has been described as being intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation is the desire to engage in a behavior for its own sake. Extrinsic motivation is a desire to engage in a behavior due to promised rewards or threats of punishment (Myers, 2007). The theories of motivation include souls, drives, genes, needs, rational thought, and reinforcements. Interestingly, few theories consider emotional states as a significant part of their frameworks, if they are considered at all.

Historical frameworks of motivation. The study of motivation can be traced from ancient times, especially back to the Greek philosophers, Socrates, Plato, and

Aristotle (Reeve, 2001). Plato proposed motivation flowed from a soul that included

bodily appetites and desires, as well as the soul's decision-making capacities, such as

choosing (Reeve, 2001). Descartes proposed motivational force was the "will" (Reeve,

2001, p. 26), where the will itself initiated the behavior. Charles Darwin's theory of

biological determination added the gene factor to motivational concepts. He said

motivational forces came from human genes that were inherited and were instincts

(Reeve, 2001). The instinct concepts were replaced by Woodworth in 1918. He

introduced the concept of "drive" (Reeve, 2001, p.29). This concept proposed that

peoples' drive motivated behavior.

Skinner took a different twist on motivational concepts, asserting that

motivational behavior was something one could impose on another. His work did not

focus on souls, drives, needs, or genes, but he looked at the impact of reinforcements.

Skinner extended the law of effect that said "rewarded behavior is likely to recur"

(Myers, 2007, p. 324). Skinner used shaping, a procedure where reinforcements

gradually guide toward a desired behavior. Skinner used concepts of positive and

negative reinforcements. A positive reinforcement strengthens the response by offering

pleasurable stimulus after a response, whereas a negative reinforcement strengthens a

response by removing the undesirable stimulus (Myers, 2007). Punishment is the

opposite of reinforcement. "A punisher is any consequence that decreases the frequency

of a preceding behavior, usually by administering an undesirable consequence or

withdrawing a desirable one" (Myers, 2007, p. 329). Using this framework, an employer

could execute positive and negative reinforcements on downsized survivors to motivate

them to perform their work to the organizational standards.

Abraham Maslow did not consider outside reinforcements as the primary motivator of peoples' behavior. He viewed motivation as being driven by a hierarchy of needs. Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory speaks to motivation. "The cornerstone of Maslow's understanding of motivation is the proposition that human beings possess needs at the organismic level" (Reeve, 2001, p. 340). He proposed once individuals' lower-level needs are met, it prompts us to satisfy our higher-level needs (Myers, 2007). Maslow's pyramid of needs begins with physiological needs that must first be satisfied before safety needs and then psychological needs (Myers, 2007).

> The bottom step of Maslow's 5-step hierarchy pyramid includes physiological needs (for food, water, and so on). Then comes safety needs; next, needs for love and intimacy; then self-esteem needs; and finally, at the apex needs of the pyramid, self-actualization (e.g., intellectual and esthetic) needs. (Neher, 1991, p. 90)

According to this framework, during a downsizing event, the survivor most likely will not be motivated to be highly productive by a higher level need such as a feeling of belonging. If the employee fears being next to be laid off and not being able to provide food and shelter for the family, the employee will be more focused on lower survival needs. In this hypothetical situation, the employee would be motivated by a threat of job loss, compromising more basic needs, rather than be motivated by a desire to be part of a new team or be recognized for professional accomplishments (higher level needs). Reeve (2001) reported although the needs hierarchy has been embraced in education, the workplace, and business, there is actually very little empirical support for the need hierarchy.

Cognitive theorists explored the relationship between cognition and behavior. Tolman believed behavior "reeks of purpose" (Reeve, 2001, p. 183). Tolman proposed

behavior was goal directed and people were either approaching or avoiding goals. His terms for purpose and cognition were demand and expectation. The demands came from bodily needs where expectations arose from demand-satisfying objects. "Cognition was the person's acquired 'cognitive map' of 'what leads to what in the environment'" (Reeve, 2001, p. 183). Similarly to Tolman's beliefs, Lewin's view of motivation was that the individual was a goal-seeking organism. What made the individual avoid or approach was a need and the need produced the person's intentions (Reeve, 2001). Lewin focused on the relevant and current influences underlying specific situation motivations and behaviors (Reeve, 2001). "For Lewin, individuals locomote through a psychological space, pushed by intentions and pulled by environmental valences" (Reeve, 2001, p. 184).

Learned helplessness theory also dealt with cognitive thoughts related to behavior execution. Learned helplessness theory was related to attribution theory (Aronson et al., 2005). Attribution theory assumed attitudes and behaviors depend on how you interpret the cause of events. With learned helplessness theory, it is believed there is a state of pessimism that happens from attributing a negative event to "stable, internal, and global factors" (Aronson et al., 2005, p. 486). Learned helplessness is a psychological state that happens when a person expects life's outcomes are not controllable (Hiroto & Seligman, 1975) and where motivation may be compromised. For example, a downsized survivor who perceives the downsizing event and implementation as uncontrollable might become pessimistic and not be motivated to complete work tasks.

Goal theory also related cognitive engagements to motivation and behavior. Goal theory talked about motivational forces being related to the task feedback process or

knowledge of results. Goal theory followed that goals of work should be clear, specific and challenging, but attainable (Katzell & Thompson, 1990). Providing feedback or knowledge of results related to goal attainment is useful for maintaining the motivation toward goals (Locke, Cartledge, & Koeppel, 1968).

Some motivational theories and frameworks were developed specifically for the workplace. The scientific management theory (F. Taylor, 1911), two-factor theory (Herzberg, Mausner,& Snyderman, 1959) , and Job Characteristics (Hackman & Oldham, 1976) had frameworks that hypothesized how to motivate employees.

Taylor initiated the scientific study of tasks movement, where time and motion techniques were used. He did not think employees should learn themselves, but be selected and trained to perform detailed instructions of each specific task they were assigned. Managers were to assign tasks while the workers were supposed to do the tasks (Dean, 1997).

The two-factor theory divided needs into two categories: hygiene factors and motivators. Hygiene factors were related to the environment where the work was performed; including salary, working conditions, interpersonal relations with others, and supervision quality. Motivators were related to the work itself such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, and growth opportunities (Mescon, Albert, & Khedouri, 1985). According to Herzberg et al. (1959), providing employees with a salary, job security, good working conditions, and quality of supervision (hygiene factors) will not motivate them, but would only prevent dissatisfaction. Using this theory, an organization would need to provide the motivators (e.g., achievement, advancement, recognition, responsibility, growth opportunities) to motivate the employee.

The Job Characteristics Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1976) specifies the

conditions under which employees become internally motivated to perform their jobs

effectively.   Five job dimensions (skill variety, task identity, task significance,

autonomy, and feedback) prompt three psychological states, which lead to beneficial

work outcomes (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). "The three psychological states

(experienced meaningfulness of the work, experienced responsibility for the outcomes of

the work and knowledge of the results of the work activities) are the causal core of the

model" (Hackman & Oldham, 1976, p. 255). The personal and work outcomes include

high internal work motivation, high quality work performance, high satisfaction with the

work, and low absenteeism and turnover (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Hackman and

Oldman's (1976) validation study provided "generally strong support for the validity of

the job characteristics model" (p.271).

Motivation has a strong relationship to employee behaviors within any

organization. Understanding what motivates employees is a key to managing behaviors

in the workplace. This is especially important to the current research because during

times of organizational stress, such as before, during, and after a downsizing event,

negative work behaviors are more likely to occur.

Table 2.1

Summary of Motivational Theories

Theory	Assertions
Behavioralism	• Reinforcements impact behavior • Rewarded behavior likely to reoccur • Positive reinforcements strengthens response • Negative reinforcements (administer negative consequence or withdraw positive ones)
Needs	• Motivation driven by hierarchy of needs

	• Physiological needs must be satisfied first; then safety needs; then psychological needs
Cognitive	• Behavior is goal directed • Individuals are goal seeking organisms • People have demands they seek to satisfy • Cognition is what leads to what in the environment • Individuals develop cognitive maps to guide them toward goals
Learned helplessness	• Pessimism that comes from attributing a negative event to uncontrollable systemic factors • Person expects that life's outcomes are not controllable
Goal	• Work goals should be clear, specific, challenging, but attainable • Provide feedback and knowledge of results to employees
Scientific management	• Scientific study of tasks movement • Time/motion techniques utilized • Detailed instructions of each specific task
Two-factor	• Two factors are hygiene factors and motivators • Hygiene = related to environment such as salary, working conditions, relationships and supervision quality • Motivators = achievement, recognition, advancement, growth opportunities • Hygiene factors present dissatisfaction but do not provide motivation; motivators provide motivation for employers
Job Characteristics Model	• Specifies that the conditions under which employees will become internally motivated to perform their job tasks • Focus on psychological states of employees • Psychological states must be present for internally motivated work behaviors to develop

Productivity research. Productivity is discussed by academics, researchers, and

organizations. It has such a wide band of interest because it is vital to the core operations

of any organization and it is critical to organizations' survival and growth. Baines (1997)

wrote a compelling piece about productivity improvement saying most organizations

want to find a "recipe" (p. 49) for the ultimate productivity improvement strategy. She

added that those organizations are unable to take advantage of productivity success. She

defined productivity as "the application of the various resources (inputs) of an

organization, industry, or country, in order to achieve certain planned and desired results

(outputs)" (p. 49). Baines stated the first step in understanding productivity is to

understand the factors that affect components to which the inputs and outputs are related.

She cited another reason for failed productivity programs is they tend to concentrate on

reducing inputs rather than on increasing outputs. Typically, Baines cited the basic

approaches to productivity as including:

- restructuring the organization;
- rationalizing the product/service range;
- introducing financial incentive schemes;
- applying technology to reduce staff;
- redesigning products/and or process;
- outsourcing/sub-contracting;
- implementing quality improvement programmers;
- conducting "productivity audits;" and
- changing the management information system. (Baines, 1997, p. 50)

Baines (1997) suggested a holistic approach must be taken to improve

productivity that includes establishing a clear focus for the productivity strategy, bringing

about culture changes, introducing effective performance measurements systems,

developing a communication program, sharing information, developing

union/management cooperation, establishing focus groups, and recognizing

achievements. However, she did not mention any of the concepts that acknowledged the

peoples' emotional feelings or motives. Increasing productivity was clearly a process,

something management does with rational steps and activities. Increasing productivity included concepts from the goal theory, operant conditioning, but lacked insight as to how to motivate individual employees. Her recommended holistic approach seemed to almost entirely neglect the emotions of humans working at the organization.

Research inquiries have looked at productivity in relation to work demands, organizational change, and downsizing. Alavinia, Molenaar, and Burdorf (2009) conducted a study where they investigated productivity loss in the workforce and its relationships with health, work demands, and individual characteristics. They found nearly half of the workers reported some productivity loss and performed at lower levels. The participants reported the productivity loss was related primarily to health problems and lack of control at work (Alavinia et al., 2009).

Jones (1998) found employees' motivation and attitudes were important factors influencing productivity. Related to downsizing, productivity and/or job performance were found to decrease (Armstrong-Stassen, 1998, 2002; Jalajas & Bommer, 1996; A. Mishra & Mishra, 1994; Nair, 2008;) due to fear of further job cuts and guilt about being a remaining employee (Kinnie et al., 1997). Brockner, Grover, O'Malley, Reed, & Glynn (1993) found that motivation decreased when the threat of layoff increased. Gilson, Hurd, & Wagar (2004) found employees who had been downsized before had increased workplace conflict and lowered workplace performance. In a study facilitated by Armstrong-Stassen (2002), downsized survivors reported a significant decline in performance in the early phases of downsizing and in the three years following the downsizing event. In a study conducted by Maertz et al. (2010) regarding downsizing effects on survivors of layoffs, off shoring, and outsourcing, layoffs generally had more

negative outcomes than off shoring and outsourcing. Survivors of the layoffs perceived lower organizational performance.

Based on the literature review, it appears it is likely for organizations to experience reduced productivity following a downsizing. Not only are there fewer employees performing the work, but those employees remaining perform less work. Reduced productivity is a critical issue to any organization, especially to an organization needing to improve its return on investment. Considering what reinforcements managers can offer, new communication strategies that can be implemented, and so forth; these approaches alone are insufficient in maintaining or increasing productivity.

Intention for flight. Intention for flight, or turnover intention, is an employee's efforts to seek employment outside their current organization. Steers and Mowday (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982) developed a model of turnover. They said that a three variable sequence leads an employee in staying or leaving the organization. First, job expectations are constructed as met expectations and, values influence an employee's affective responses to that employment. Second, those affective responses and desires determine intention to stay or leave, and finally, the intention to leave actually leads to leaving the organization. Intent to turnover constitutes the "final cognitive step in the decision making process" (Park & Kim, 2009, p. 23) in which an employee considers quitting and looking for alternative employment. The literature has examined a variety of issues related to turnover intention including dispositional traits (Chui & Francesco, 2003); identification and job satisfaction (DeMoura, Abrams, Retter, Gunnardsdottir, & Ando, 2009); types of organizational culture (Park & Kim, 2009); as well as professional commitment and job satisfaction (Lu, Lin, Wu, Hsieh, & Chang, 2002).

DeMoura et al. (2009), using the social identity theory (SIT), looked at the relationship of organizational identification, jobs satisfaction, and turnover intention. The SIT looks at how the variables such as attitudes, evaluations, intentions, and behaviors are related to the "identity as a group member" (p. 540). SIT has been used to theorize organizational variables such as productivity, leadership, turnover, as well as others (DeMoura et al., 2009). Group memberships are important because they contribute to the person's identity. The more a person identifies with the group, the more that person applies the characteristics of the group to the personal self. In addition, more outcomes of the group are applied to the employees' personal outcomes. When employees have increased organizational identification, it is anticipated they typically support the organization and are attracted to in-group members, therefore being less inclined to leave the organization (DeMoura et al., 2009). DeMoura et al. (2009) found organizational identification mediated the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention. They found organizational identification had a stronger relationship with turnover intention. "Over and above job satisfaction, organizational identification offers a strong psychological anchor that discourages turnover intention in a range of organization contexts" (DeMoura et al., 2009, p. 540).

Lu et al. (2002) studied the relationships among three variables including turnover intentions, professional commitment, and job satisfaction. Their work suggested there was a strong correlation between job satisfaction and professional commitment. Job satisfaction was negatively correlated with turnover intentions and professional commitment was negatively correlated with intention to leave.

Park and Kim (2009) conducted a study that looked at the relationships between organizational cultures, job satisfaction, and intention for job turnover. The four types of organization cultures included consensual, developmental, hierarchal, and rational. Consensual cultures focus on concern for the people. Rational cultures emphasize the organizational results and getting the work done. Developmental cultures are dynamic and entrepreneurial, whereas hierarchical cultures are formalized and structured environments with procedures governing work (Park & Kim, 2009). Park and Kim found consensual cultures had the highest effect on lowered turnover intention, compared to the other three culture types. Higher job satisfaction associated with consensual organizational cultures is related to lower turnover intention.

Kim (2008) led a study looking at the employees' likelihood of voluntarily seeking employment outside the organization that downsized. He found when the downsized survivors "have communal relationships with their organization they are less likely to voluntarily turnover" (p. 307). He purported when survivors experienced fair communication during the downsizing, they were more likely to have communal relationships and less likely to seek employment outside of the organization. Other research has suggested when survivors feel more attached to the organization, they are more like to stay rather than leave the organization (Spreitzer & Mishra, 2002). Trevor and Nyberg (2008) found that the rate of downsizing was related with employees' voluntary turnover rate, and was mediated by organizational commitment.

Increased intention for turnover following a downsizing could result in very profound negative impacts for the organization. Organizations are dependent on their remaining employees to perform essential work functions following a downsizing.

Losing the skill, knowledge, and abilities of existing staff members could be detrimental to the organization's livelihood.

Increased likelihood to sabotage. Workplace sabotage has been defined as behavior by an employee who intends to inflict a production loss (Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 1987; Taylor & Walton, 1971); subvert the organization's operations (Ambrose, Seabright, & Schminke, 2002; Crino, 1994), and/or create a loss of profit for the organization (Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 1987). It occurs when the employee tries to create negative publicity for the organization, attempts to create delays in work productivity, damages the organization's property, compromises work relationships, or tries to harm the customer (Crino, 1994). Giacalone and Rosenfeld (1987) described four methods of sabotage employees do: "slowdowns, destructiveness, dishonesty, and causing chaos" (p. 367).

The literature offers sources or motives of sabotage including feelings of powerlessness, frustration, boredom, and injustice (Ambrose et al., 2002); as well as toxic behaviors impacting team sabotage (Kusy &Holloway, 2009). Ambrose et al. (2002) looked at the relationship between organizational injustice and sabotage. They found perceived injustice was the most common cause of sabotage. It was discovered that when the injustice was perceived as interactional, employees were more likely to be retaliatory. When the employees perceived the injustice to be distributive, the employees were more likely to engage in "equity restoration" (Ambrose et al., 2002, p. 947). The severity of sabotage increased through an additive effect when employees perceived three injustices: distributive, procedural, and interactional (Ambrose et al., 2002).

Analouli (1995) talked about three sources of sabotage motives to include "individual (personal and unshared), organizational (shared but anti-corporate interest), and external (shared and unshared social motives)" (p. 59). Analouli's research suggested most unconventional practices stemmed from workplace discontent, with management behavior at the "heart of the dispute" (p. 59).

> The inability of the managers to communicate effectively with the employees, not organizing and co-ordinating [sic] their efforts in teams, and generally treating the organization as a "closed system," inevitably resulted in perpetuating the dark side of life in the organization and the emergence of the unconventional, covert practices which it offered to discontented employees. (p. 59)

If indeed, sabotage is more likely after a downsizing event, the organization is compromised. The company cannot afford wasted resources, lowered productivity, retaliation against management, or an undercutting of the change effort. Sabotage alone can be extremely detrimental to the organizational change process.

Marginalized and Privileged Surviving Employees

The literature suggests there are groups of people who do not have a sense of belonging in the workplace even without any significant organizational change. To not acknowledge this reality and to not address this would be remiss. African-American women, for example, may still see themselves as being marginalized work players in their companies. They may feel as though they are not welcome and that they are outsiders (Bell & Nkomo, 2001). Yuval-Davis (2006) wrote about the notion of belonging and the politics of belonging. Belonging is described as the emotional attachment, or that feeling of being safe within an organization. "Belonging is always a dynamic process, not a reified fixity, which is only a naturalized construction of a particular hegemonic form of power relations" (Yuval-Davis, 2006, p. 199). Politics of

belonging is described as the "the dirty work of boundary maintenance" and these boundaries separate the world population into "us and them" (Yuval-Davis, 2006, p. 204).

One might suspect, if non-White ethnicities and other groups do not possess a feeling of belonging even when there have not been any layoffs or significant changes in personnel, that their feelings of belonging to the organization would be further compromised following downsizing. What happens to these individuals during the downsizing layoffs and what kind of feelings might they experience as a downsizing survivor? Bajawa and Woodall (2006) reported there are many groups who are particularly vulnerable as employees who will be laid off. They suggested recent immigrants, ethnic minorities, women, followed by contractors and the newly hired employees are prospects for layoff. So one can expect that during a typical downsizing event, ethnic minorities, older employees, and women will fear termination the most. The literature suggests these groups are often targeted for layoffs, but what happens to these group members when they are the downsizing survivors? It is likely that because they may have never felt on an equal footing of belonging, the feelings of being excluded and being blamed for others' layoffs would heighten.

Downsizing survivors who are angry, feeling loss, and perceive a lack of trust may quickly point an accusatory finger at survivors from the vulnerable groups previously listed. If Northouse's (2007) premise were correct, that managers simply reject emotional reactions between leaders, co-workers, and followers, one might assume managers would be unable to coach marginalized downsized survivors who are experiencing belonging and loss issues; nor could they coach the privileged downsized

survivors to identify the consequences of their us vs. them attitudes. This inability to attend to emotional reactions may result in keeping members of certain groups in a lower status, with fewer opportunities, and perhaps fewer rights.

Proactive Managers' Approach in Dealing with Survivors

Supervisors and managers need to pay attention not only to those who are losing their jobs, but also to those who will remain employed. A manager needs to consider the emotional landscape, including the organization as well as the emotional reactions of individual employees. Emotional temperature taking needs to be continual, prior to the downsizing, during the downsizing, and following the downsizing effort.

Rationality and emotionality must be considered and used when implementing downsizing or any organizational change (Carr, 2001). Understanding the employees' emotional experiences is necessary, taking into consideration both positive and negative feelings (Kiefer, 2002). The employees' voice or expression of feeling cannot be confused with resistance in the workplace. Based on this feedback, change strategies can be developed (Bryant, 2006). Avoiding pain leads to organizational dysfunction (Hughes, 2000).

Managers need to regard emotions as a component of the construction of meaning during change, as an integral part of adaptation and motivation and as a social phenomenon (Kiefer, 2002). "Leaders who manage transition effectively cope with emotions by bringing them to the surface and understanding how they affect work activities and relations as groups face challenges and organizational changes" (Marks & Vansteenkiste, 2008, p. 824).

Acknowledging loss. To plan and implement interventions, the manager must become aware of the loss and what is being let go (Bridges, 2004; Levinson, 2000; Marks, 2003, 2006, 2007; Neimeyer, 2000). Instead of interpreting perceived resistance as something that should be stopped, it should be seen as perhaps an attempt to recover meaning or to preserve what was valuable in the past or what was lost (Antonacopoulou & Gabriel, 2001). "Before people can continue to the upside of a transition, they have to come to terms with what they feel they are losing as a result of it" (Marks, 2003, p. 96). Every employee may experience areas of loss in some area to some degree. Not dealing with the emotional feelings associated with loss and grief could result in the survivor feeling stuck in the past, unable to move forward. Marks and DeMeuse (2005) listed behavioral reactions of resizing to include working harder, not smarter; lack of direction in prioritizing work; avoiding risk; political game playing; poor team playing; and role ambiguity. These behavioral reactions, as well as poor work performance and lack of organizational citizenship and anti-social behaviors, could be detrimental to the implementation of any downsizing effort.

Managers being connected to employees. Corbett and Lee (2006) offered a perspective that those managers who treat downsizing survivors with respect and dignity would likely have employees with an increased commitment to the organization. Managers and supervisors should increase the downsizing survivors' buy in with managers by communicating (McKinley & Scherer, 2000), engaging, and by resisting becoming emotionally distant. Vakola and Nikolaou (2005) studied the linkage between employees' attitudes towards organizational change and found positive and effective relationships were important in transition.

The manager should express empathy to the survivor employees. "This means making it clear that leadership is cognizant of the needs, feelings, problems, and views of those employees who have lived through a merger, acquisition, or downsizing" (Marks, 2003, p. 115). It does not mean managers agree or disagree or legitimize the employees' feelings, but it matters to workers that managers know what they have been through (Marks, 2003). The manager needs to be an effective and active listener to the employee. The manager needs to "listen with a third ear" (Marks & DeMeuse, 2005, p. 30), understanding when there might be implied meanings and hidden agendas and must be able to help the employee understand the meanings as well.

Managers with emotional intelligence. An effective manager during a downsizing effort must have solid emotional intelligence not only to understand the employee, but also to understand the manager's own feelings in the organizational change and during the employee interaction. Salovey and Mayer (1990) coined the term emotional intelligence. They proposed the thinking and feeling processes could work together. Salovey and Mayer described the skills of emotional intelligence as being able to evaluate and use emotion within oneself and in others to motivate, plan, and achieve (Kerr, Garvin, Heaton, & Boyle, 2005). Goleman (1998) suggested emotional intelligence is a multi-dimensional construct made up of five similar components, including self–awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. While the different models vary somewhat, they all emphasize the critical nature of emotions and the need to deal with people.

Cooper and Sawaf (1997) asserted most managers' missing piece is lack of emotional intelligence. Part of their work included the development of the four

cornerstone emotional intelligence model for leaders, with the cornerstones being emotional alchemy, emotional literacy, emotional depth, and emotional fitness. They suggested that, in many organizations, "talented, productive people are being thwarted or sabotaged by gaps in emotional intelligence—in themselves, their bosses, and the others around them" (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997, p. xxxviii).

Writings about emotional intelligence and downsizing support the concept that managers can positively impact the outcome of a downsizing implementation by interacting with, supporting, and coaching their employees. "The emotionally intelligent person can harness emotions, even negative ones, and manage them to achieve intended goals" (Salovey & Grewal, 2005, p. 282).

Analysis of Extant Literature

Predictably, a great deal of professional literature has been dedicated toward managers dealing with surviving employees' resistance to change following a downsizing. This is obviously a key issue as managers are the ones who need to lead the effort of picking up the pieces after a downsizing event, fulfilling the mission/purpose of the organization under sometimes radically altered circumstances. There are fewer writings having to do with the emotional dimensions of manager/employee relationships; managers' reactions toward downsized survivors, and how they deal with these reactions while trying to move the organization forward.

It was interesting and somewhat surprising that the preponderance of the writings about survivors of downsizing centered on justice issues and employees' feelings of lack of control. There were fewer writings dealing with some of the other probable feelings of loss for surviving employees, such as loss of territory, loss of sense of direction, and loss

of important relationships. It is unclear whether these loss areas have not been identified

by other authors as significant issues in downsizing events or if they are too problematic

to deal with.

There were disappointingly few writings having to do with the unique experiences

of downsizing survivors who were members of marginalized groups. It seems that, given

the many workplace issues inherent in marginalized group members' work experiences,

this seemingly important variable would be of interest, especially during the

organizational upheaval of a downsizing event.

Lacking in the professional literature is a comprehensive evaluation of what

losses survivor victims actually experience. There is a need to evaluate if survivors do

indeed experience a loss and if this loss is attached to specific work behaviors. The next

chapter reiterates the research questions, describes the development of a useful tool to

measure areas of loss and work behaviors; and describes the methodology and data

analysis that will be used.

Chapter III: Methodology

Research Study Problem

Downsized survivors are heard to express their sadness over missing their laid off coworkers, loss of job security, loss of trust toward the company, and loss of status. Research regarding the areas of loss experienced by downsized survivors is limited. Although there is speculation regarding various areas of loss survivors might feel, there is no existing research that shows the magnitude of the areas of the loss experience or its relationship to critical work behaviors.

The researcher reviewed numerous existing scales to investigate the availability of instruments that identify and evaluate the areas of loss and worker behaviors related to downsizing. Existing surveys and scales covered some aspects of loss or worker behaviors, but did not address all of the areas of losses identified by downsized survivors, human resource managers, or groups of industry representatives. This study developed scales related to the respondents' reported areas of loss and looked at how those areas relate to work behavior.

Research Design and Justification

Although there are a few qualitative studies that look at individuals' experiences with organizational change (Barner, 2008; Elders, Eilam, & Shamir, 2005; Turnball, 2002), and there are quantitative designs that look at individuals' reactions to organizational change, there is an absence of research that evaluates large numbers of employees' experience related to downsizing. A primary purpose of this study was to conduct analyses with which to establish a tool for measuring and studying areas of loss and their relationship to work behaviors. A quantitative design was chosen to statistically

evaluate the responses of hundreds of downsized survivors to identify patterns of reported feelings and behaviors. A qualitative study, exploring the meanings that individuals ascribe to the problem, would be less likely to apply to the general population. This quantitative inquiry used an exploratory factor analysis, specifically Principal Component Analysis (PCA), to develop a tool to further understand downsized survivors' responses to downsizing. Multiple regression analysis was used to further understand the relationship between areas of loss and work behaviors.

A survey was developed with items that call for Likert type responses ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Likert type responses are used to measure attitudes, opinions, and emotional states (Spector, 1992). They have also been used to measure perceived or intended behavior. Through an online survey survivors of downsizing were asked to respond to statements about their areas of loss and work behaviors following downsizing in their organizations.

Research Questions

There are five research questions:

- Research question 1: What subscales, or reported areas of loss related to employee experiences with downsizing will result from the PCA?

- Research question 2: What subscales, or reported work behaviors related to employee experiences with downsizing will result from the PCA?

- Research question 3: What areas of loss and work behaviors are the most prevalent?

- Research question 4: Which, if any, control or independent variables influence the work behaviors following a downsizing?

- Research question 5: Are there loss experiences that are unique to marginalized downsized survivors that are different from those of non-marginalized downsized survivors?

The research questions were addressed using descriptive statistics, PCA, and multiple regression analysis. The following describes the procedures that were used to address the stated questions.

Research Procedures

This section covers the research procedures were employed in this study. These procedures included survey development, scale development, the sampling and recruitment plan, and data collection and reporting procedures. The methods of statistical analyses will also be described.

Survey. The data collection instrument was an online survey administered through www.SurveyMonkey.com®. It included the introduction, factual questions related to downsized survivors' experience with downsizing, demographic questions, and items designed to reveal areas of loss experienced and work behavior subscales. A convenience sample was used with survivors who have experienced a downsizing in the last year.

Two overarching concepts based on theoretical research were used to develop the proposed areas of loss and work behavior constructs and to develop survey items and control questions (See Figure 3.1). Areas of loss included loss of control and security, loss of self-efficacy, loss of relationships and sense of belonging, loss of territory, loss of identity and role, and loss of trust in the company. Anticipated downsized survivors' reported work behaviors included loss of productivity, job flight behaviors, loss of

initiative, and inclinations to sabotage the change effort. The survey sorted the items and questions based on the theoretical constructs found in the literature. A pilot survey was administered to five colleagues to generate feedback that will provide additional face validity, and provided the researcher with the opportunity to make final revisions to the survey items.

Figure 3.1 *Two Overarching Concepts and Controls*

Four (4) research questions about the effect of the control variables and the areas of loss on: (1) productivity, (2) motivation, (3) intention for flight, and (4) sabotage.

Multiple Linear Regression with Block of Control Variable (s) and One Block of Independent Variables Related to the Research Question

Control Variables

Independent Variables

Dependent Variables

Controls
Gender, age, White or non-White, Disabled or not, and status of immigration
Type of organization
Downsizing occurred in last year
Respondent's tenure
Work team member changes
Work location changes
Perceptions of supervisor coaching

Areas of Loss
Control
Security
Competence and Self-efficacy
Relationships and sense of belonging
Territory
Identity and status

Work Behaviors
(work productivity, motivation, intention for flight; and sabotage)
Each Behavior Separate Regression

A variety of demographic and factual questions qualified respondents as survivors of downsizing and enabled analysis by subgroups and served as control variables in the

multiple regression analyses. The specific questions and the rationale for using the

questions are articulated in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Survey Questions and Rationale Table

Question	Rationale
Are you male or female? • Male • Female	Evaluation of gender responses similarities and differences. Variable was evaluated during the multiple regression analysis.
What age group do you represent? • 18 to 30 • 31 to 46 • 47to • 66 years or older	Evaluation of age group similarities and differences. This variable evaluated during the multiple regression analysis.
What is your ethnicity? • Caucasian • African American • Hispanic • Native American or Alaskan Indian • Asian or Pacific Islander • Other	Evaluation of White to non-White responses similarities and differences. This variable was evaluated during the multiple regression analysis to evaluate the experiences of marginalized populations.
Are you a first generation immigrant to the country you work in? • Yes • No	Evaluation of first generation immigrants. This variable was evaluated during the multiple regression analysis to evaluate the experiences of marginalized populations
Do you have a disability? • Yes • No	This variable was evaluated during the multiple regression analysis to evaluate the experiences of marginalized populations
What type of organization do you work for? • Private company • Non profit organization • Public • Other (specify)	Evaluation of type of organization through multiple regression analysis
Has your organization laid off employees in the last year? • Yes • No (If no, skip to end of survey.)	Evaluation was used to only include those respondents who have experienced organizational layoffs within the last year

If yes, indicate the period of time • 0-3 months ago • 4-6 months ago • 7-9 months ago • 10-12 months ago • Other (Specify)	Evaluation was facilitated through multiple regression analysis to see if the period of time of downsizing affected outcomes
About how many years have you worked for your current organization? • 0 - 2 years • 3-5 years • 6-10 years • 11 years or more	Evaluation of survey item responses by employee tenure similarities and differences was facilitated through multiple regression analysis
As a result of the downsizing… • Did you lose anyone from your immediate work group? • Did you lose anyone from your larger work group? • Did you have to change your physical work location? • Did your work responsibilities change? • Do you feel like you had a demotion? • Do you feel like you had a promotion? • Are you working with new people? • Do you report to a new person? • Comments about changes in work situations	Evaluation of variables was conducted through multiple regression to determine variable affects on outcomes
Thinking about your current employment…, • Do you plan to stay at your company? • Do you plan to look for another job? • Have you started to look for a job with another organization?	Evaluation of employees' intent to remain at the organization or seek other employment.
My supervisor… • Keep me fully informed. • Talks to me when he/she knows that I am upset. • Understands what I have been through with the recent changes • Ignores ne if I speak negatively about the recent changes. • Has retaliated against me for disagreeing with the recent changes.	Evaluation of items through factor analysis to determine if item loading, and evaluate supervisory behavior with factor analysis and multiple regression

Scale development. The first phase of the scale development took place between October 2009 through January 2011 in the process of completing learning achievements for the Antioch University Ph.D. in Leadership and Change program. This included a

review of the literature covering theoretical frameworks, concepts, and existing research

on areas of loss and work behaviors following organizational change and downsizing

events. To evaluate loss areas and worker behaviors, over 50 existing scales were

reviewed. Table 3.2 gives a brief description of the seemingly most closely aligned

scales related to the focus of this study. The other unrelated scales were not described

because they were not related to grief, loss, work, or productivity measures.

Table 3.2

Review of Scales Table

Name of Scale	Source	Description
Strain-Free Negative Affectivity (SFNA) Scale	Fortunato and Stone-Romero (1999)	Assesses negative emotional reactivity.
Reliability and Predictive Validity of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ)	Pintrich, Smith, Garcia, and McKeachie (1993)	Assesses motivation and the use of learning strategies.
Self-Leadership Strategies and Self–Efficacy Perceptions	Prussia, Anderson, and Manz (1998)	Assesses self-leadership and self-efficacy constructs.
Work Skills Series Production	Bolton and Camara (1995)	Assesses three areas: understanding instructions, working with numbers, and checking machine settings.
Connors Comprehensive Behavior Rating Scales	Sullivan and Vacca (2010)	Assesses behaviors, emotions, and academic problems.
Employment Values Inventory	Allison and Ruju (2001)	Assesses personal values related to work.
Work Personality Index	Carlson and Law (2005)	Assesses personality traits related to work performance.
Assessing Specific Competencies	Fitzpatrick and Reinehr (1995)	Assesses student knowledge related to employment skills.
The OAD Survey (Organization Analysis and Design)	Ellen and Jenkins (2007)	Assesses seven personality traits that are work-related and seven work perceptions.
Endicott Work Productivity Scale	A. Cox and Tirre (2001)	Assesses the behaviors, feelings, or attitudes of respondents that may compromise work productivity and efficiency.

Selby MillSmith Values Indices	Berger and Schneck (2001)	Assesses work related attitudes and beliefs.
Employees Screening Questionnaire	Muchinsky and Schmidt (2005)	Assesses personality and dishonesty.
Achievement Motivation Inventory (AMI)	Jenkins and Moore (2007)	Assesses achievement motivation,, including: compensatory effort, competitiveness, confidence in success, dominance, eagerness to learn, engagement, fearlessness, flexibility, flow, goal setting, and independence.
Measuring Motivational Gravity	Carr, Powell, Knezovic, Munro, and MacLachlan (1996)	Assesses reactions to others' encouragement or indifference.
Self-Efficacy and Self-Esteem	Chen, Gully, and Eden (2004)	Evaluates self-efficacy and self-esteem.
Grief Cognitions Questionnaire (GCQ)	Boelen and Lensvelt-Mulders (2005)	Evaluates bereavement-related cognitions: self, world, life, future, self-blame, others, appropriateness of grief, cherish grief, and threatening interpretation of grief.
Corporate Entrepreneurs and Employee Attitudes	Heinonen and Toivonen (2008)	Assesses aspects of management behavior: encouraging management behavior, enabling organizational structures, and individual attitudes.
Students Attitudes toward Work	Maguire, Romaniuk, and MacRury (1982)	Assesses student attitudes toward work.
Inventory of Complicated Grief (ICG): A Scale to Measure Maladaptive Symptoms of Loss	Prigerson et al. (1995)	Assesses maladaptive symptoms of loss.
Organizational Change Questionnaire	B. Mishra, Bhaskar, and Khurana (2007)	Assesses employees' perceptions of change in the organization: Political, competitiveness, corporate governance, market niche, and innovation.
Authentic Leadership Questionaire	Walumbwa, Avolio, Garner, Wernsing,and Peterson (2008)	Assesses areas of leader self-awareness, relational transparency, internalized moral perspective, and balanced processing. Demonstrated predictive validity for work related attitudes and behaviors.

Job Insecurity and Organizational Cynicism	Brandes et al. (2008)	Assesses insecurity and cynicism
Survivor reactions	Allen et al. (2001)	Assesses aspects of survivor reactions
Survivor reactions	Spreitzer and Mishra (2002)	Assesses aspects of survivor reactions
Measure of Workplace Deviance	Bennet and Robinson (2000)	Assesses workplace deviance
Steers and Mowdays Model of Turnover	Lee and Mowday (1987).	Assesses intention for turnover

This review revealed that existing surveys and scales in their entirety would not address the research questions nor proposed loss area definitions or work behavior definitions being investigated, although a number of surveys developed included several items that were used in this research. While there were two instruments that appeared possibly relevant for this study, further exploration revealed that they wouldn't be appropriate. The Endicott Work Productivity Scale (Endicott & Nee, 1997) was designed to assess participants with a wide variety of mental and medical disorders and included items such as "Find you have forgotten to call someone" (p. 14) and, "Find you have forgotten to respond to a request" (p. 14). The Selby Millsmith Values Indices was designed to assess professional values such as innovation, intellectual demands, and risk-taking (Namsbury, 2010). Several items that Brandes et al. (2008) used when looking at job insecurity and organizational cynicism were used as part of the loss of security area: "I'm waiting for the next shoe to fall that I 'm wondering if my job is next to go" and "I am certain that I will be still employed this time next year" (p. 239). An item used by

Walumbwa et al. (2008) was modified: "Take initiative and do whatever is necessary" (Walumbwa et al. (2008, p. 114); and, one item used by Brandes et al. (2008) "When I work, I really exert myself to the fullest" (p. 239) was included in the motivation proposed work behavior. Turnover intention items were created to fit the proposed definition, including the item provided by Allen et al. (2001) regarding individuals thinking about quitting their job and an item to measure the proposed intention for flight. The item "If you happened to learn that a good job was open in another company, how likely is it that you would actively pursue it?" (Lee & Mowday, 1987, p. 743) was modified to a Likert type response and added to the intention for flight area. Several items were modified using Spreitzer and Mishra's work (2002) to measure proposed justice: "I believe that the managers of this organization tell the truth"; and, "I was offered adequate justification from managers for the downsizing decision" were included in the justice loss area. One item developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000) to evaluate workplace deviance was modified in the proposed sabotage work behavior area: falsifying a receipt to get a reimbursement. Although the instrument developed by Bennett and Robinson measured workplace deviance items, the items appeared to be based on poor judgment and poor habits, and appeared to not be intentionally done. Thus more items were not used from this instrument. Additional items were created to evaluate participant responses for all areas to meet the definitions stated through the following activities and reviews.

In the process of completing the learning achievements, draft definitions of work behaviors and loss area constructs related to downsizing were written, as well as potential items pertaining to each category. To consider face validity, the loss area and the work

behavior constructs, as well as the items developed, were reviewed by a variety of individuals and groups. Reviewers were asked to talk about the items that were confusing or unclear, to eliminate or revise them, to identify items they would not be able to rate, and to rate the degree to which the overall content of the group of items measuring loss represented the areas of losses the survivor might experience. That is, they were asked if proposed items represented the universe of possible scale items related to response to downsizing.

The first group of reviewers was comprised of employed human resource managers and supervisors. These participants were enrolled in a leadership training class that the researcher was teaching. They were employed in a variety of industry types including social service, manufacturing, service, and governmental companies and organizations. The group added items and changed definitions to include their perspectives.

The draft survey was then administered to a group of 15 employees following a downsizing event at a community college. These employees were supervised by the researcher. The group was asked to provide feedback regarding the topic of loss areas and the items they felt were missing or difficult to understand. Based on their feedback and input, modifications were made to the set of items.

The draft survey was then reviewed by individuals who had recently managed a downsizing effort or who were survivors themselves. The draft was reviewed by a human resources director at a community college where the researcher is employed. The human resources director had recently facilitated a large downsizing effort and worked with survivors. Her written recommendations for additional items were incorporated in

the survey. Two managers, one representing a medium sized medical device company and the other representing a large aerospace company, reviewed the loss and work behavior items and made verbal suggestions for changes. Finally, an African-American woman, a Hispanic woman, and an Asian man who all worked for a community college and had recently experienced a downsizing event reviewed the draft survey definitions and items. Their additions and changes were provided verbally and incorporated into the final survey draft. Following the reviews by industry groups, the human resources director, the individuals and groups of downsized industry survivors, and several managers who had recently experienced a downsizing event, it was determined that the edited areas of loss and behavior constructs had face and content validity.

Additional items were added to include a minimum of four to ten items for each construct to ensure an adequate item pool. Failure to ensure an adequate number of items for each construct would mean that areas might be underrepresented in the formal scale (Clark & Watson, 1995). The response choices indicated agreement by using six choices: "strongly disagree," "disagree," "somewhat disagree," "somewhat agree," "agree," and "strongly agree." Six possible responses were chosen to provide participants with a range of agreement or disagreement to each item. An even number of response options was chosen rather than an odd number because it eliminated the problems caused by there being a "middle option" (Clark & Watson, 1995, p. 9). By having an even number of response options, respondents are required to "fall on one side of the fence or the other" (Clark & Watson, 1995, p. 9).

The researcher had a concern the survey was too long and that potential respondents would not complete the survey because there were over 130 items. The

survey was reviewed with the methodologist for this dissertation work to evaluate the

items for possible duplication or ambiguity. Subsequently, the number of loss area and

work behavior items was reduced to 59. The researcher's dissertation committee also

recommended that items related to the degree of supervisory support be added. Five

items were constructed and added. The proposed survey items were administered to a

pilot group of five volunteers to generate feedback. Considering the volunteers'

feedback, final changes were made to the survey. Table 3.3 includes the anticipated loss

areas, definitions, and survey items that were included in the survey.

Table 3.3

Anticipated Loss Components and Scale Items Table

Anticipated Loss Components	Scale Items
Loss of Control Definition: How the employee perceives loss in the ability, power, control, or lack of resources to complete his or her job independently.	• I am more empowered than ever to do my job.* • I feel powerless at work. • I have very little control over decisions that affect my work.. • It is almost impossible to keep up with work demands.
Loss of Security Definition: How the employee perceives loss in the security and value of his or her position within the company; and/or may question whether the company is stable and self-sustaining.	• I feel more secure than ever about keeping my job.* • I am worried that this organization might go out of business. • I feel my employer values my work. • My organization has a very promising future.* • I 'm waiting for the next shoe to fall in that I'm wondering if my job is next to go.

- I'm almost certain that I will still be employed by the organization this time next year.

Loss of Competence and Self-efficacy

Definition: How the employee perceives loss in his or her ability or competence to learn and/or complete job tasks, new work assignments, or other job requirements.

- I have concerns about my ability to learn new job tasks.

- I am not given the resources to learn new job tasks.

- My job tasks are extremely overwhelming.

- My opinion matters a great deal at work. *

Loss of Relationships and Sense of Belonging

Definition: How the employee perceives loss in the relationships at work where there was a sense of trust, camaraderie, and familiarity. The employee has feelings of loss in belonging to the organization.

- I feel more isolated at work.

- I feel lost without my support group at work.

- I feel like I am really part of this organization.*

- I feel more included at work. *

- I don't "fit in" anymore at work.

Loss of Territory

Definition: How the employee perceives loss in his/her personal and dedicated workspace. They may feel his or her workspace has been violated and is unfamiliar.

- My work area feels very comfortable.*

- I feel like my work space has been violated.

- My work space feels like "home".*

- I have an increased sense that my work space is "mine".*

Loss of Identity and Status

Definition: How the employee perceives loss in his or her pride in their position or job status.

- I feel good about the work I do.*

- I am ashamed of my job position.

- My job status is too low now.

- I take more pride in my work than I did before.*

Loss of Justice and Trust	
Definition: How the employee perceives loss in trust and justice within the organization and/or a loss of trust and fairness of how the organization interacts with employees.	• This is a fair organization.* • Decisions made by upper management are unjust. • I am treated fairly.* • I trust my supervisor.* • I trust management.* • Hard work is still rewarded.* • I believe the managers of this organization tell the truth.* • I was offered an adequate justification from managers for the downsizing decision.* • The organization is more fair now.*
Loss of supervisory support The level of agreement that survivors report that their supervisor communicated with them, coached them, and supported them.	• My supervisor keeps me fully informed.* • My supervisor talks to me when He/she knows that I am upset.* • My supervisor understands what I have been through with the recent changes.* • My supervisor ignores me if I speak negatively about the recent changes. • My supervisor has retaliated against me for disagreeing with the recent changes.

*items needing to be reversed prior to data analysis

Table 3.4 includes anticipated work behavior areas, definitions, and items that were included in the survey.

Table 3.4
Anticipated Work Behavior Components and Survey Items

Anticipated Work Behavior Components	Survey Items
Productivity	• I work just as hard as I used to.*
Definition: How the employee perceives himself or herself producing and completing work assignments.	• I do the very minimum work necessary.
	• My level of productivity has slipped.
	• I work harder than I did before the downsizing.
Job flight	• I will probably stay at this organization.*
Definition: The degree the employee is thinking about or acting on thoughts to leave the current company and seek employment elsewhere.	• I use work time to find a new job.
	• If I learned that a good job was open in another company, I would pursue it.
	• I am thinking of quitting my job.
Motivation and initiative	• I am more committed to my job than before.
Definition: How the employee views his or her motivation and initiative to seek out work assignments and complete them.	• I do only what it takes to get the job done.
	• I volunteer to do additional work.*
	• I give 100% or more at my job.
	• I am motivated to do a good job.*
	• I rarely feel like going to work.
	• I am more motivated than before.*
Sabotage and undermining	• I am more likely to blame others now.
Definition: The employee's thoughts or behaviors to purposively undermine change efforts, directives or undermine others.	• I'm more committed now to do the "right" thing for the organization.*
	• Sometimes I try to make my boss look bad.
	• I do things that hurt the organization.
	• I call in sick when I'm not.
	• I resist some of the new changes at work
	• I pretend to do what I am told.
	• I sabotage directives sometimes from management.

Selection of participants. Colleges, businesses, and labor organizations were contacted to investigate their willingness to participate in the research. These organizations were asked if they would participate in the research by posting the recruitment notice in an organizational email or website posting. Companies who had recently downsized were contacted by telephone and email. None of the companies or colleges that recently downsized wanted to participate. They told the researcher that they were worried that the results would somehow reflect on their organization. The Washington Public Employees Association, a labor organization, and City University of Seattle both posted the recruitment notice on their websites. The notice invited employees or potential respondents to participate in an online survey: https://www.SurveyMonkey.com./s/survivingdownsizing. Electronic email was also sent to individuals asking them to take the survey, as well as to forward the email on to employees where organizations had recently downsized. Recruitment notices were published in Seattletimes.com and in Craigslist.

Table 3.5

Recruitment Plan and Summary Table

Organization	Rationale	Plan	Status
City University of Seattle	Most of the City University and other college students are working adults in all industry sectors. It is anticipated that students are working in organizations that may have laid off employees in the last year.	The study description and URL will be posted on the colleges' website and faculty may encourage students to participate.	City University posted SurveyMonkey.com®url on the CityU website inviting all staff and students to participate in the survey.

Human Services Executives of Snohomish County	This consortium is comprised of many CEOS representing nonprofit human service organizations. Many of these organizations have downsized in the last year.	This group will be approached to determine which organizations may be interested in participating in the study and would electronically email the URL link to their employees.	A member of this organization sent the recruitment notice via email to members.
Labor Organizations, such as IAM Aerospace, Washington State Federation of State and other labor organizations	IAM Aerospace union group represents the labor contracted aerospace companies in Washington state. Several companies have laid employees off during the last year. State employees, represented by the Federation of State labor group, have undergone many layoffs during the last year.	Optimally, the IAM and Washington Federation would email contingents directly with URL link. Posting a study description and URL on their website and in their newsletters would be sought if a mass email could not be sent.	IAM union did not participate since the aerospace industry was growing and not laying off employees. Washington Public Employees Association agreed to participate and posted url on their website. Other union organizations did not express an interest in posting recruitment notice.
Human service associations	Human service representatives representing various companies participate in these organizations.	Optimally, association members would direct their employees to the study description and URL through employee email or would post the information on their company website.	Human service member forwarded recruitment notice to members in Washington State.
Private companies	The human resource representative or manager would be able to identify if their company has downsized during the last year.	Optimally, the appropriate company representative will direct their employees to the study description and URL through employee email or would post the information on their company website.	The researcher was unable to secure any company in sharing the recruitment notice.
Working employees	Many employees may have experienced an organizational downsizing during the last year and may not be accessed through the other recruitment methods.	Individuals who have received an email with the study description and URL link could forward the link to family, friends, co-workers, and so on. Individuals who have taken the survey would forward the link to others. A recruitment advertisement in newspapers will also be placed.	Posted recruitment notice in Seattletimes.com and Craigslist.

The recruitment advertisement read as follows:

This study is looking for employees who are working in an organization where others have been laid off in the last year. Participants will be asked to take an anonymous and confidential online survey regarding their experiences after others have been laid off. The results will be used to help supervisors and managers understand the effects of layoffs. If you or someone you know would be interested please go to https://www.SurveyMonkey.com./s/survivingdownsizing or email cschaeffer@antioch.edu

The potential respondents were automatically directed to the survey link by

clicking on the URL. The survey instructions read:

Employees often experience changes after at a downsizing at their work. This research is looking at the experiences of employees who are currently working in a company that has laid off other employees in the last year. Responses are confidential and remain anonymous.

As part of the survey you will be asked about your feelings and perceptions since the layoffs. You will be asked to respond to statements indicating your level of agreement or disagreement on each item. Please remember to respond to each item with your perception of your work and work environment since the lay off. You will be asked to provide some demographic information which will be used in aggregate form to analyze the information.

If your organization's name has changed, respond to the following items as it if is the same organization, prior to the name change. Note that "organization" refers to any public, private, nonprofit or other type of employment situation.

This survey is part of a research study being facilitated by a PhD student in the Antioch University Leadership and Change program. For more information, please go to www.downsizingimplementation.com.

At the conclusion of the survey, the participants were told that the aggregate results

would be posted on www.downsizingimplementation.com. They were instructed to

bookmark the site if they were interested in the analysis of data and conclusions.

Ethics approval for the study was obtained from Antioch University Institutional

Review Board. Other organizations, such as City University requested verbal verification

that the Antioch's IRB approved the research.

Data collection procedures. Data results were collected through www.SurveyMonkey.com®. Prior to the availability of the survey, two colleagues were asked to participate in the survey to ensure that the survey was organized appropriately and was understandable. Feedback was considered and editing was completed. The survey was opened up for the actual study participants.

SurveyMonkey.com® reports were checked every two days to review responses. Data was uploaded into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, where data was reviewed and eventually analyzed.

The data file was set up with appropriate variable names, labels, and response categories and data was cleaned prior to analysis of results. Using SurveyMonkey.com®, a total of 298 individuals began the survey. Of the 298, 52 participants responded "no" to Question 1 "Has your organization laid off employees in the last year?" This left 246 individuals that continued to the Likert type items listed in question 3 "Thinking about how you have personally felt since the downsizing, how strongly do you disagree or agree with each of the following statements?" Thirty of these individuals aborted the survey during Question 3, leaving missing data. Those respondent surveys were deleted, leaving the sample size of 216 (N=216).

Some of the respondents marked "other" to Question 12 "What is your ethnicity". The researcher examined the other category responses to determine the best "fit". Some of the respondents responded "other" to Question 17, "What type of organization do you work at?". The data was reviewed and the researcher recoded the respondent narrative to the appropriate code. Finally, some of the items were worded inversely to provide a variety of type of responses, both negative and positive. For example, Question 3.1 was

worded "I am more empowered than ever to do my job". These items needed to be reversed through transforming and recoding these items.

Data analysis. The analysis addressed the five research questions, using descriptive statistics, PCA, and multiple regression analyses. Using SPSS, descriptive statistics summarized factual and demographic responses, as well as loss and behavior items.

A descriptive analysis investigated the existence and magnitude of loss areas that were reported. Mean scores were used, as well as percentages of responses to "agree" and "strongly agree" scale to show measures of central tendency, dispersion, distribution, and the existence and impact of outliers. The descriptive statistics were checked to see if each item included in the PCA analysis and the factor scores used in the multiple regression analysis were close to normally distributed. Measures of kurtosis and skewness were reviewed and items with measures larger than plus or minus 2.0 were to be eliminated. However, no items needed to be eliminated.

Factor analysis. Factor analyses were used to identify the areas of loss and work behavior components (subscales) and were used in deciding whether to exclude any items. "Factor analyses is designed to identify underlying factors or latent variables present in the patterns of correlations among a set of measures" (Blaikie, 2003, p. 220). Construct validity is evaluated through the use of exploratory factor analysis, specifically PCA. Exploratory factor analysis is used when the number of latent variables are explored rather than indicated by a theory in the test development process.

> The factor structure is explored by modeling each item as a function of all common factors, rather than as a function of only a subset of the factors, to see which factor has strong relationships with the item and which factor does not. (Abell, Springer, & Kamata, 2009, p. 134)

Factor analysis identifies items that are not strongly related to an intended common factor and may reveal a surprising factor structure of test items (Abell et al., 2009). PCA reduces the "dimensionality of the original data set" (Dunteman, 1989, p. 7). This analysis was used to answer the following construct validity criterion question: Do variables that should correlate with the subscale do so, and do variables that should not correlate with the subscale not do so?

Prior to running a PCA, bivariate correlations were run between all of the items and the matrix of correlation coefficients was reviewed. Items included in the factor analysis had a correlation of at least => .30 with at least one other item to demonstrate that the items all fit together under the same overarching construct. Items that did not meet this standard were to be eliminated from further analysis. Items were checked to see if they were too highly correlated (.90 or above) with each other. There were no items deleted.

If the sample size were less than 200 participants, the sample size adequacy test, Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin Measure of Sampling Adequacy would be required. While the sample size was larger than this threshold, this tool wasn't required but it was nonetheless utilized. This test measures the sampling adequacy of the survey items. "Its values range from 0 to 1. A value of .70 or more is generally considered sufficiently high, while a value below 0.50 is unsatisfactory and one over 0.90 is outstanding" (Blaikie, 2010, p. 221). It is thought that a sample of over 300 will provide reliable results (Blaikie, 2010).

Decisions about retaining and eliminating items were made based on a .40 cutoff for the component loadings. An initial PCA was run with all the area of loss items,

except for items that would be eliminated due to low or high correlations or extreme measures of skewness or kurtosis.

"If a number of factors emerge from a large set of items, a decision has to be made about how many should be considered. The normal procedure is to use a statistic called the eignevalue" (Blaikie, 2003, p. 223). Components with eigenvalue => 1 were retained because when the eigenvalue is more than 1, the variance is equivalent to at least one item. The scree plots, visual illustrations, were examined to determine the appropriate number of components. The number of factors appropriate for analyses is the number before the plotted line turns sharply right, or the elbow in the scree plot. Varimax rotation concept was used and the rotated component output was reviewed to find items that loaded on more than one component or did not load on any component based on a .40 loading decision rule. Those items were eliminated for the next iteration. Items removed were those that did not load or loaded on more than one factor in as much iteration as needed to achieve components that represented a clearly identifiable construct. These same factor analysis processes were followed for the work behavior items.

Reliability. Reliability is the ability of a measure to produce results that are consistent when the same construct and items are measured under different conditions (Field, 2009). Coefficient alpha is the measure of the internal consistency of the scale. The coefficient alpha can be elevated by increasing the number of items or by raising their intercorrelations. It is an accepted rule that the alpha should be at least .70 for a developed scale to demonstrate internal consistency (Nunnally, 1978). Once components have been identified, internal consistency is determined by calculating Cronbach's alpha

for the items that load on each component. For each component, Cronbach's alpha was

run, requesting the level of alpha if any of the items were deleted. The item creating the

difference was deleted. SPSS was used to calculate component scores for each of the

final components and these scores were added to the data file and used in the regression

analysis.

Multiple regression. Although two overarching concepts, with "x" subareas or

constructs were proposed, the factor analyses showed the number and definition of the

components of areas of loss and work behavior were somewhat different from those

suggested by the literature.   The factors that emerged from the factor analyses were used

as the independent and dependent variables in the multiple regression analyses.   The

multiple regression analyses were used to look at the relationships between loss areas and

reported work behaviors. With these statistical analyses, each predictor, specifically each

of the identified loss areas, had a regression coefficient associated with the value of the

outcome, specifically with the work behaviors.

A hierarchical approach was used for the multiple regression. Independent

variables were entered into the model in blocks, with the control variables entered in the

first block and the areas of loss variables entered in the second block.

Where the control variables are category data, dummy variables were created

where the category of interest was coded as "1" and the other response categories were

coded as "0."

Multicolinearity is a statistical situation in which several or many of the

independent variables in a multiple regression analysis are highly correlated, thus those

variables may be measuring the same thing. Since this research is interested in

understanding how the various variables impact the dependent variables, multicolinearity could be a problem where P values could be misleading. It is important to remove variables that measure essentially the same thing. Prior to running the multiple regression analyses, bivariate correlations for all of the independent variables were run. Again using the cutoff of .90, if two or more independent variables were highly correlated, a new variable combining aspect of both variables was considered or one of the two variables was eliminated from the regression analyses. Tolerance measures were used to check on multicolinearity, looking to see if any of the independent variables exceeded the accepted tolerance levels. Regression findings were shared using R-square, standardized betas, F-tests, and t-tests.

Following the regression analysis, t-test analyses were run comparing the means between private and non private groups, work location changes, team member changes, and genders in relationship to the lack of productivity and inclination to sabotage scale. T-tests were used to report the simple mean comparisons.

Narrative responses. Following the survey, participants were asked an optional open ended question "What, if anything, were the changes that happened as a result of the downsizing that were especially challenging for you?" There were 84 responses. The responses were edited to be free of personal or revealing information about the respondent or the organization where the respondent worked. The researcher identified themes of the narratives and organized the comments into categories. The narratives were then shared with two industry representatives. They were asked to validate the categories and narrative types.

Research Design Limitations

Some of the limitations of this research design included: lack of survey access; participants' needs for social desirability and possible fear of retaliation; lack of a pre-test, and not being able to determine why participants responded to items. In order to participate in the survey, participants needed access to a computer with internet access. Those individuals who did not have internet access were excluded from participation.

Second, participants fearful that their responses may not be held confidential or that results might be "leaked" may not have answered truthfully. In addition, the participants may have responded in a way that was socially desirable or in a manner where they were more likely to be regarded positively.

Third, since there was not a pretest administered prior to the downsizing, the researcher could not compare the responses prior to the downsizing to the aftermath of a downsizing effort. Based on the responses offered by the participants, the researcher was able to identify possible "loss items" or things that the participants were "missing" as a part of their workplace experiences.   The survey respondents were told "As a part of the survey, you will be asked about your feelings and perceptions since the layoffs." In addition, the survey instructed the participants "Thinking about how you personally felt since the downsizing, indicate how strongly you disagree or agree with each of the following statements." However, since the survey was administered only after the downsizing occurred, caution must be taken when explaining the things that respondents reported were identified as "losses," such as loss of sense of justice and supervisory support. It may be that the respondents experienced these losses or missing things prior to the downsizing.

Finally, the reasons people responded could not be determined from the survey results. For the stated reasons, caution needs to be exercised in generalizing results to groups.

Summary

Data was collected through an online survey that included items designed to identify areas of loss and work behaviors experienced by downsized survivors. The research questions were addressed using descriptive statistics, PCA, and multiple regression analysis. Results of the descriptive statistics, factor analyses, multiple regression analyses and narrative responses are shared in Chapter IV: Results.

Chapter IV: Results

Research Questions

This chapter describes the respondents' demographics and examines the existence of subscales of loss and work behaviors through factor analysis. Multiple regressions were run to examine the relationship between loss areas and work behaviors. The results are organized around the five research questions:

- Research question 1: What subscales, or reported areas of loss, related to employee experiences with downsizing resulted from the PCA?

- Research question 2: What subscales, or reported work behaviors related to employee experiences with downsizing resulted from the PCA?

- Research question 3: What areas of loss and work behaviors were the most prevalent?

- Research question 4: Which, if any, control or independent variables influenced the work behaviors following a downsizing?

- Research question 5: Were there loss experiences that are unique to marginalized downsized survivors that are different from those of non-marginalized downsized survivors?

Recruitment of Participants

Participants in this study were individuals who responded to a survey posted on SurveyMonkey.com®. Participants were recruited through notices posted on several websites: City University of Seattle, Washington State Public Employees Association, and newspaper recruitments as described in Chapter III. In addition, emails and face-to-

face recruitment invited individuals to participate. Using SurveyMonkey.com®, a total of 298 individuals began the survey. These data were downloaded to SPSS.

Data Cleaning

Of the 298, 52 participants responded "no" to question one, "Has your organization laid off employees in the last year?" This left 246 individuals that continued to the Likert type items listed in question three, "Thinking about how you have personally felt since the downsizing, how strongly do you disagree or agree with each of the following statements?" Thirty of these 246 individuals aborted the survey during question three, leaving the sample size of 216 (N=216). (see Table 4.1)

Table 4.1.
Loss of Respondents Due to Incomplete Surveys

Issue	Strategy	Action
Respondents indicated that they had not had a downsizing in last year.	Reviewed responses. If respondent indicated no, the respondents were removed.	Removed 52 respondents.
Respondents aborted survey after question two and during question three.	Reviewed and deleted missing surveys if participant did not continue survey after second item.	Deleted 30 survey respondents that were aborted after question two and during question three.

Once the sample size of 216 was established (N=216), the data were cleaned. Some of the respondents marked "other" to question 12, "What is your ethnicity?". The researcher examined the other category responses to determine the best "fit". Some of the respondents responded "other" to question 17, "What type of organization do you work at?" The data were reviewed and the researcher recoded the respondent narrative to the appropriate code. Finally, some of the items were worded inversely to provide a variety of types of responses, both negative and positive. For example, question 3.1 was

worded, "I am more empowered than ever to do my job". These items needed to be reversed through transforming and recoding in SPSS (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2.
Data Cleaning and Methods Strategy

Issue	Strategy	Action
Respondents indicated "other" to type of organization.	Reviewed narrative responses and made a decision to recode.	"Other" narrative responses were re-coded. Most of responses were state held positions and were coded to public.
Respondents indicated a narrative "other" to the ethnicity question.	Reviewed responses and determined if respondents were Caucasian. Coded non Caucasian to closest ethnicity categories.	Coded European "type" responses to Caucasian coding. Coded "mixed" and other ethnicities to closest ethnicity listed.
Items were worded inversely to convey meaning of potential constructs in both negative and positives.	Recoded items to inverse.	33 items were identified and recoded.

Participant Demographics

Prior to testing the five hypotheses, descriptive statistics regarding the survey respondents were run.   More than half of the respondents were female (56.4%). The majority were Caucasian (81.5%), about half (56.0%) were baby boomers in the 47 to 65 years age range, and almost all were working in the United States (97.9%). A few (8.8%) reported having a disability, and 10.8% reported being first generation immigrants.   The majority of the respondents worked for public organizations (63.4%), while 27.3% worked for private organizations. Many of the respondents (41.2%) had worked at the company for 11 or more years.   The period of time since the downsizing varied with 31.9% reporting downsizing activity within the last three months, and 26.4% reporting downsizing activity during the last four to six months.   About one-fourth (28.5%) of the

respondents indicated that they did not plan to stay with the company; slightly more than

half (55.5%) reported that they planned to look for another job, and 55.5% indicated that

they had started to look for another job (see Table 4.3).

Table 4.3.
Respondent Percentages

Category	Percentages
Gender	
Male	43.6%
Female	56.4%
N=195*	
Ethnicity	
White	81.5%
African American	9.2%
Hispanic	4.6%
Native American	1.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.1%
Other	1.5%
N=195*	
Ages	
18 to 30 years old	7.2%
31 to 46 years old	34.9%
47 to 65 years old	56.9%
66 or older	21%
N=195*	
Do you have a disability?	
Yes	8.8%
No	91.2%
N=194*	
Country working in	
United States	97.9%
Canada	1.5%
Other	.5%
N=195*	
What type of organization do you work for?	
Private company	27.3%
Non-profit organization	8.8%
Public	63.4%
Other	.5%
N=194*	
How many years have you worked at company?	

0-2 years	7.2%
3-5 years	24.7%
6-10 years	26.8%
11 years or more	41.2%
N=194*	
Are you a first generation immigrant to the country you currently work	
Yes	10.8%
No	89.2%
N=195*	
Period of time since downsizing	
0-3 months ago	31.9%
4-6 months ago	26.4%
7-9 months ago	9.7%
10-12 months ago	26.4%
Other	5.6%
N=216	
Intention for flight	
Do you plan to stay at your company?	
Yes, definitely	30.1%
Yes, probably	41.5%
No	28.5%
N=194*	
Do you plan to look for another job?	
Yes, definitely	25.4%
Yes, probably	30.1%
No	44.6%
N= 193*	
Have you started to look for a job with another organization?	
Yes, definitely	25.4%
Yes, probably	30.1%
No	44.6%
N=193*	

Note. *Some respondents did not report their demographic characteristics

Analyses

To address the first two research questions, descriptive statistics, bivariate

correlations, and factor and reliability analyses were run. The questions included:

- Research question 1: What subscales, or reported areas of loss, related to employee experiences with downsizing will result from the PCA?

- Research question 2: What subscales, or reported work behaviors related to employee experiences with downsizing, will result from the PCA?

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics including the means, standard deviations, measures of skewness and kurtosis for each of the anticipated loss and work behavior items.   Likert type survey items offered participants choices of how to respond to items, ranging from strongly disagree=1, disagree=2, somewhat disagree=3, somewhat agree=4, agree=5, or strongly agree=6. All items had acceptable levels of skewness and kurtosis of less than, or equal to, plus or minus 1.50 (Kline, 2009). Table 4.4, Descriptive statistics, shows the means, standard deviation, and measure of skewness and kurtosis for each area of loss and behavior item. The items presented indicate the order in which they were presented in the SurveyMonkey.com®survey.

Table 4. 4

Descriptive Statistics

Item	Mean	(SD)	Skewness	Kurtosis
I am more empowered than ever to do my job.*	4.34	1.44	-.719	-.561
I feel powerless at work.	3.93	1.57	-.913	1.436
I have very little control over decisions that affect my work.	4.19	1.62	-.817	-.605
It is almost impossible to keep up with work demands.	4.38	1.58	-.527	-.791

I feel more secure than ever about keeping my job.*	4.57	1.41	-.198	-.862
I am worried that this organization might go out of business.	3.06	1.86	-1.37	.323
I feel my employer values my work. *	3.63	1.62	-1.26	-.048
My organization has a very promising future.*	3.89	1.48	-.863	-.288
I 'm waiting for the next shoe to fall in that I'm wondering if my job is next to go.	4.09	1.67	-1.04	-.452
I'm almost certain that I will still be employed by the organization this time next year.*	3.46	1.50	-1.00	.039
I have concerns about my ability to learn new job tasks.	3.04	1.84	-1.36	.374
I am not given the resources to learn new job tasks.	3.76	1.70	-1.232	-.169
My job tasks are extremely overwhelming.	3.92	1.61	-1.03	-.273
My opinion matters a great deal at work. *	4.11	1.47	-.977	-.96
I feel more isolated at work.	3.75	1.67	-1.29	-.110
I feel lost without my support group at work.	3.40	1.61	-1.08	.243

I feel like I am really part of this organization.*	4.0	1.59	-1.25	-.197
I feel more included at work. *	4.25	1.51	-1.06	-.382
I don't "fit in" anymore at work.	3.20	1.74	-1.19	.457
My work area feels very comfortable.*	3.75	1.58	-1.23	-.024
I feel like my work space has been violated.	3.25	1.66	-1.11	.369
My work space feels like "home".*	4.08	1.55	-1.06	-.279
I have an increased sense that my work space is "mine".*	4.15	1.43	-.746	-.352
I feel good about the work I do.*	3.00	1.68	-1.00	.553
I am ashamed of my job position.	2.34	1.46	.167	1.02
My job status is too low now.	2.98	1.55	-.708	.563
I take more pride in my work than I did before.*	4.41	1.31	-.540	-.529
I spend a lot of work time doing personal things.	2.59	1.59	-.799	.725
I work just as hard as I used to.*	3.06	1.84	-1.33	.640
I do the very minimum work necessary.	2.69	1.83	-.957	.747
My level of productivity has slipped.	3.06	1.83	-1.33	.464

I work harder than I did before the downsizing.*	3.72	1.72	-1.31	-.210
I will probably stay at this organization.*	3.40	1.74	-1.30	.198
I use work time to find a new job.	2.53	1.73	-.817	.784
If I learned that a good job was open in another company, I would pursue it.	4.24	1.61	-.802	-.619
I am thinking of quitting my job.	3.33	1.77	-1.37	-.017
I am more committed to my job than before.*	4.20	1.48	-.652	-.602
I do only what it takes to get the job done.	3.00	1.83	-1.32	.397
I volunteer to do additional work.*	3.94	1.657	-1.375	-.170
I give 100% or more at my job. *	2.97	1.86	-1.24	.527
I am motivated to do a good job.*	3.22	1.83	-1.36	.328
I rarely feel like going to work.	3.60	1.74	-1.366	-.095
I am more motivated than before.*	4.53	1.28	-.125	-.759
I am more likely to blame others now.	2.75	1.77	-1.068	.628
I'm more committed now to do the "right" thing for the organization.*	3.98	1.47	-.870	-.364

Sometimes I try to make my boss look bad.	2.39	1.84	-.624	.993
I do things that hurt the organization.	2.32	1.88	-.556	1.06
I call in sick when I'm not.	2.70	1.93	-1.18	.663
I resist some of the new changes at work.	3.38	1.87	-.486	.102
I pretend to do what I am told.	2.66	1.93	-1.12	.715
I sabotage directives sometimes from management.	2.41	1.89	-.731	.960
This is a fair organization.*	4.12	1.49	-.895	-.428
Decisions made by upper management are unjust.	4.04	1.53	-.865	-.333
I am treated fairly.*	3.61	1.58	-1.244	.133
I trust my supervisor.*	3.51	1.77	-1.403	.087
I trust management.*	4.37	1.51	-.824	-.566
Hard work is still rewarded.*	4.29	1.50	-.708	-.625
I believe the managers of this organization tell the truth.*	4.33	1.54	-.834	-.556
I was offered an adequate justification from managers for the downsizing decision.*	4.22	1.62	-1.155	-.459
The organization is more fair now.*	4.89	1.09	.499	-.885

My supervisor keeps me fully informed.*	4.01	1.67	-1.244	-.342
My supervisor talks to me when he/she knows that I am upset.*	3.85	1.70	-1.288	-.209
My supervisor understands what I have been through with the recent changes.*	3.97	1.68	-1.246	-.273
My supervisor ignores me if I speak negatively about the recent changes.	3.44	1.63	-1.158	.127
My supervisor has retaliated against me for disagreeing with the recent changes.	2.76	1.87	-1.165	.596

Note: * meanings were reversed to ensure that items were in one direction

Factor Analysis

Two different factor models were sought, loss areas and work behaviors, using PCA. To accomplish this, several analyses occurred prior to the PCA, including running bivariate correlations and sampling adequacy tests. Following these analyses, the PCA was run using varimax rotation.

Bivariate correlations of all of the Likert type items were run with every other item to determine if the items represented the same overarching construct. Two separate bivariate analyses were run, one for the areas of loss items and one for the work behavior items. All items had a statistically significant correlation of =>.30 with at least one other item in their construct group, demonstrating that all the items fit under the defined overarching construct. See supplemental file : Correlation Table. The Kaiser-Meyer-

Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was .946, showing that the sample size of 216 was sufficient for correlation and factor analyses. Given the bivariate correlation results and an adequate sample size the data were ready for factor and reliability analysis.

PCA was used to identify the areas of loss and work behavior constructs, by reducing the dimensionality of the data. PCA was run to answer the construct validity criterion question: Do variables that should correlate with the subscale do so, and do variables that should not correlate with the subscale not do so? Using PCA, components were first extracted from the five loss area items. A second PCA was then run to extract components from the two work behavior items. PCA reduced the number of items needed to represent each component through an iterative process. SPSS was used to run PCA with the varimax rotation. Decision rules for item reduction included using .40 as a cutoff for component loadings and eigenvalue => 1. Complex items or those loading on more than one component with more than .40 and items not loading on any component at the .40 level were eliminated for the next iteration of the PCA.

Research questions 1 and 2. Five loss components and two work behavior components were revealed through the PCA process. For the loss areas, after a total of three iterations following the described decision rules (see Appendix A), the five components revealed were: loss of sense of justice and supervisory support (eight items); loss of security and competence (six items); loss of territory (four items); loss of positive outlook (four items), and loss of control and identity (four items). Table 4.5 shows the components and item loadings.

Table 4.5
Areas of Loss Factor Analysis Components with Item Loadings

Item	Loss of sense of justice and supervisory support Total variance=21.698%	Loss of security and competence Total variance=14.824%	Loss of territory Total variance= 11.224%	Loss of positive outlook Total variance=9.872%	Loss of control and identity Total variance= 9.214%
My supervisor keeps me fully informed. *	.857				
My supervisor understands what I have been through with the recent changes. *	.847				
My supervisor ignores me if I speak negatively about the recent changes.	.847				
My supervisor talks to me when he/she knows that I am upset. *	.817				
I trust my supervisor. *	.783				
I was offered an adequate justification from managers for the downsizing decision. *	.718				
I am treated fairly. *	.683				
I trust management.*	.678				
My job tasks are extremely overwhelming.		.795			
I have concerns about my ability to learn new job tasks.		.792			
It's almost impossible to keep up with work demands.		.713			

I am not given the resources to learn new job tasks.		.672			
I am worried this organization might go out of business.		.496			
I feel lost without my support group.		.489			
My work area feels comfortable. *			.777		
My work space feels like home. *			.721		
I feel like my work space has been violated.			.681		
I have an increased sense that my work space is "mine".*			.562		
My organization has a promising future.*				.664	
I feel more secure than ever about keeping my job.*				.658	
I take more pride in my work than I did before. *				.431	
My job status is too low.					.811
I am ashamed of my job position.					.721
I feel powerless at work.					.518
I have little control over decisions that affect my work.					.458

Note. *items reversed coded

The scree plot indicated that five components were a good solution for this data set. The five components included in the solution were plotted on the line before the line turned sharply right, the elbow in the scree plot. Together the five components accounted for 66.6% of the variance. Component one, loss of sense of justice and supervisory

support, accounted for 21.6% of the variance. Component two, loss of security and

competence, accounted for 14.8% of the variance. Component three, loss of territory,

accounted for 11.2% of the variance. Component four, loss of positive outlook, accounted

for 9.8% of the variance. Finally, component five, loss of control and identity, accounted

for 9.2% of the variance (see Table 4.6).

Table 4.6
Areas of Loss Total Variance Explained

Component	Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.641	21.698	21.698
2	3.802	14.624	36.322
3	2.918	11.224	47.546
4	2.567	9.872	57.418
5	2.396	9.214	66.632

Reliability of loss scales. Reliability of these five scales, or Cronbach's alpha of

each component, was at least .70 for all five scales, ranging from loss of sense of justice

and supervisory support (.941) to loss of control and identity (.739); (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.7.
Loss Scale Reliability

Scale Type	Cronbach's Alpha
Scale 1 Loss of sense of justice and supervisory support	.941
Scale 2 Loss of security and competence	.854
Scale 3 Loss of territory	.854
Scale 4 Loss of positive outlook	.854
Scale 5 Loss of control and identity	.739
All scales- 1 through 5	.776

Research question 2. PCA with three iterations of the varimax rotation for the 15

work behavior items (see Appendix B), resulted in two work behavior components, lack

of productivity and inclination to sabotage (11 items), and intention for flight (four

items); (see Table 4.9).

The scree plot indicated that two components were a good solution for this data

set.   The two components included in the solution were plotted on the line before the line

turned sharply right, or the elbow in the scree plot. Together the two components

accounted for 76.3% of the variance. Component one, lack of productivity and

inclination to sabotage, totaled 55.4% of the variance. Component two, intention for

flight, totaled 20.887% of the variance.

Table 4.8
Component Eigenvalues

	Initial Eigenvalues		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9.120	65.144	65.144
2	1.565	11.178	76.323

In summary, the research findings suggested that survivors experience loss

following a downsizing change event. They have a reported loss in positive outlook,

territory, security and competence, sense of justice and supervisory support; and control

and identity. Five components, or subscales, were identified through PCA: loss of sense

of justice and supervisory support; loss of security and competence; loss of positive

outlook; loss of territory; and, loss of control and identity. It was anticipated that

"relationship" would be a component, but factor analyses did not reveal it as an

identifiable component. One of the relationship items was embedded into another

component, loss of security and competence. These findings support previous research

regarding downsizing survivors experiencing diminished control (Archibald, 2009; Moss

Kanter, 1984); loss of security (K. Cameron et al., 1993; Kalimo et al., 2003); lack of

ability and skills to do the work LaMarsh (2009); and decreased perceived justice (

Armstrong-Stassen et al., 2004).

Table 4. 9
Work Behaviors Factor Analysis Components with Item Loadings

Item	Lack of productivity and inclination for sabotage Total variance= 55.436%	Intention for flight Total variance=20.887%
Sometimes I try to make my boss look bad.	.922	
I do things that hurt the organization.	.911	
I pretend to do what I am told.	.909	
I sabotage directives sometimes from management	.906	
I am more likely to blame others now.	.845	
I do the very minimum work necessary.	.831	
I call in sick when I'm not.	.820	
I work just as hard as I used to.*	.751	
I spend a lot of time doing personal things.	.740	
I resist some of the new changes at work.	.732	
I work harder than I did before the downsizing. *	.611	
If I learned that a good job was open in another company, I would pursue it.		.871
I'm thinking of quitting my job.		.810
I will probably stay at this organization. *		.805
I 'm more committed now to do the "right" thing for the organization. *		.486

Note.*items reversed.

Reliability of behavior scales. Reliability of these two scales, Cronbach's alpha, of each component was at least .70 for both scales: Lack of productivity and sabotage (.966); and, inclination for flight (.800).

The item included in the inclination for flight component, "I'm more committed now to do the 'right' thing", did not intuitively "fit" with the other items under intention for flight and without it the scale reliability increased from .80 to .845. Thus, the item was removed, leaving three items in this component.

In summary, it was anticipated that four distinct work behavior components would result from the factor analysis. Lack of productivity and inclination to sabotage loaded as a single component. The anticipated component of motivation was not revealed as a separate component. The motivation items were embedded in other components and dropped through the iteration process. Items loaded together, as expected, into one component, intention to flight.

Proposed definitions of revealed components. These loss areas, as a result of factor analysis, were identified into five subscales or components that were somewhat different than initially proposed. The five scales and their proposed definitions in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10
Loss Component Definitions

Loss Area Component	Definition
Loss of sense of justice and supervisory support	Where the survivor does not believe the supervisor kept the employee informed and does not understand what the employee has experienced, and ignores the employee. Trust and fairness for the supervisor and management has decreased.
Loss of security and competence	Where the survivor believes that job tasks are extremely overwhelming and work demands too

	great to successfully fulfill. The employee does not have the resources to learn the new job and feels insecure without the previous support group and does not feel confident that the organization will survive.
Loss of territory	Where the survivor does not feel ownership of the work space and that, in fact, the personal work space has been violated.
Loss of positive outlook	Where the survivor does not believe that the organization has a positive future, and don't feel secure about continued employment with organization, and less pride is taken in the work.
Loss of control and identity	Where the survivor feels a loss of power, has little control over decisions, and feels ashamed of being employed in the job position.

See work behavior subscales, lack of productivity and inclination for sabotage, and intention for flight and their proposed descriptions in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11
Work Component Definitions

Work Behavior Component	Definition
Lack of productivity and inclination for sabotage	Where the employee intentionally behaves in a way that hurts the organization such as pretending to follow instructions, blaming others, doing the minimum work necessary, calling in sick when not, working less hard than before and resisting the changes at work.
Intention for flight	Where the survivor is thinking of quitting the job and leaving the organization, and is less committed to the organization.

Research question 3. Mean scores and percentage response rates address research question three, "What areas of loss and work behaviors are the most prevalent?" See Appendix C for a complete listing of all Likert type survey items and the valid percent of agreement for each item.

Prevalent loss components. The loss component, loss of positive outlook, had the highest mean score (4.30), indicating strong agreement, with the following components in descending order: loss of territory (3.80); loss of sense of justice and supervisory support (3.78); loss of security and competence (3.57), and loss of control and identity (3.36). These mean scores were based on the participants' responses to level of agreement ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 6= strongly agree (see Table 4. 12).

Table 4.12
Prevalent Loss Behavior Component Areas

Component	Overall mean
Loss of positive outlook	4.30
Loss of territory	3.80
Loss of sense of justice and supervisory support	3.78
Loss of security and competence	3.57
Loss of control and identity	3.36

The component loss of positive outlook individual items that had a mean score of over 4.00 were: "I (do not) feel more secure than ever about keeping my job;" and "I (do not) take more pride in my work than I did before.", and "I am (less) empowered than ever to do my job". This component reflects generally negative outlooks regarding the employees keeping their jobs and having pride in the work they perform. A high 61.6% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they did not feel secure about keeping their jobs; 51.4% agreed or strongly agreed they did not take more pride in their work as before; 53.3% agreed that they were less empowered to do their job, and 40.2% agreed or strongly agreed that they did not think their organization had a promising future (see Table 4.13).

Table 4.13
Prevalent Component Loss of Positive Outlook Items – Mean Scores and Percent Disagree/Agree

Component	Items	Means	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Loss of positive outlook	I feel more secure than ever about keeping my job. *	4.57	3.2	8.8	9.3	17.1	28.7	32.9
	I take more pride in my work than I did before. *	4.41	1.4	9.1	12.5	25.5	26.4	25.0
	I am more empowered than ever to do my job. *	4.34	3.2	10.2	15.3	18.1	26.4	26.9
	My organization has a very promising future. *	3.89	7.4	11.1	21.8	19.4	24.5	15.7

Note. *reversed items; **reversed items-reverse agreement to disagree and strongly disagree

The component loss of territory revealed two items with means of over 4.00, including, "I (do not have) an increased sense that my work is space is mine" (4.15-inversed item); and, "My work space (does not) feel like home" (4.08). The reverse coded item, "My work area (does not) feel very comfortable" (3.75) also had a high mean score. These items speak to the employees' lack of feeling that their physical work space is "theirs" and indicates that they don't feel comfortable working in that space. About one-fourth (27.9%) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they felt their work space had been violated (see Table 4.14).

Table 4.14
Prevalent Component Loss of Territory Items -- Mean Scores and Percent Disagree/Agree

Component	Items	Means	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Loss of Territory	I have an increased sense that my work space is mine. *	4.15	4.3	9.6	18.3	25.0	19.7	23.1
	My work space feels like home. *	4.08	5.3	13.0	19.7	17.8	18.8	25.5
	My work area feels very comfortable.*	3.75	6.7	20.2	21.2	13.5	20.2	18.3
	I feel like my work space has been violated.	3.25	14.4	26.9	20.2	11.1	12.0	15.4

Note. *reversed items, **reversed items-reverse agreement to disagree and strongly disagree

The loss of sense of justice and supervisory support component had several items with mean scores over 4.0 including: "I (do not) trust management"; "I was (not) offered adequate justification from management for the downsizing decision"; and "My supervisor (does not) keep me fully informed". About half (54.5%) of the respondents indicated agreed or strongly agreed that they did not trust management; 53% agreed or strongly agreed that they did not feel like they got an adequate justification for downsizing; 49.4% agreed or strongly agreed that they were not being informed; 43.6% agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisor didn't understand what they had been through, and 29.4% agreed or strongly agreed that their supervisor ignored them if they spoke negatively. This component speaks to a lack of trust that the employees have in management, as well as to the lack of communication and understanding the supervisor offers the employee (see Table 4.15).

Table 4.15
Prevalent Component Loss of Sense of Trust and Supervisory Items

Component	Items	Means	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Loss of sense of justice and supervisory support	I trust management.*	4.37	4.0	10.1	16.2	15.2	22.7	31.8
	I was offered adequate justification from management for the downsizing decision.*	4.22	4.5	18.2	10.6	13.6	23.2	29.8
	My supervisor keeps me fully informed.*	4.01	8.2	17.0	14.4	10.8	24.7	24.7
	My supervisor understands what I've been through with the recent changes.*	3.97	8.2	18.5	11.3	18.5	16.9	26.7
	My supervisor talks to me when he/she knows I am upset.*	3.85	10.3	17.9	13.8	15.4	19.0	23.6
	I am treated fairly.*	3.61	14.4	22.7	19.0	12.5	15.7	15.7
	I trust my supervisor.*	3.51	15.2	22.2	15.2	11.6	15.2	20.7
	My supervisor ignores me if I speak negatively about the recent changes	3.44	13.4	20.6	19.1	17.5	13.9	15.5

Note. *reversed items. **reversed items-reverse agreement to disagree and strongly disagree

The loss of security and competence component had one item over 4.00, "It is almost impossible to keep up with work demands. Over half (58.4%) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that it was almost impossible to keep up with job demands; 38.2% agreed or strongly agreed that their job tasks were overwhelming; 37.8% agreed or strongly agreed that they weren't given the resources to learn new job tasks; 27.3% agreed or strongly agreed that they felt lost without their support group; 29.% agreed or strongly agreed that they were worried the organization would go out of business, and

28.8% agreed or strongly agreed that they had concerns about their ability to learn new job tasks. This component implies that the employees don't feel secure in that they don't have the resources or support necessary to successfully learn new job tasks that may be expected in order to do their jobs (see Table 4.16).

Table 4.16
Prevalent Component Loss of Security and Competence Items

Component	Items	Means	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Loss of security and competence	It is almost impossible to keep up with work demands.	4.08	7.4	10.2	7.9	16.2	27.8	30.6
	My job tasks are extremely overwhelming.	3.92	9.0	14.6	12.7	25.5	15.1	23.1
	I am not given the resources to learn new job tasks.	3.76	12.3	16.5	13.2	20.3	15.6	22.2
	I feel lost without my support group at work.	3.40	11.8	22.6	22.2	16.0	11.3	16.0
	I am worried that this organization might go out of business.	3.25	31.5	15.3	13.4	10.6	13.9	15.3
	I have concerns about my ability to learn new job tasks.	3.04	28.3	23.1	8.0	11.8	13.7	15.1

The component, loss of control and identity, included one item with a mean higher than 4.0, that being "I have very little control over decisions that affect my work." Over half (52.8%) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they had little control over their decisions that affected work; 43.5% agreed or strongly agreed they felt powerless at work; 20.2% agreed or strongly agreed that their job status was too low, and 11.6% agreed or strongly agreed that they were ashamed of their job. The items in this

construct suggest that the surviving employees do not feel like they can control their job

tasks or work that they perform (see Table 4.17).

Table 4.17
Prevalent Component Loss of Control and Identity Items

Component	Items	Means	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Loss of control and identity	I have very little control over decisions that affect my work.	4.19	9.3	9.7	12.5	15.7	25.9	26.9
	I feel powerless at work.	3.93	9.7	13.0	12.0	21.8	26.4	17.1
	My job status is too low now.	2.98	17.8	27.4	24.0	10.6	10.1	10.1
	I am ashamed of my job position.	2.34	38.0	25.0	18.3	7.2	6.3	5.3

In summary, five loss components were identified through factor analysis:

positive outlook; territory; sense of justice and supervisory support; security and

competence; and control and identity. Loss of positive outlook, and sense of justice and

supervisory support were the strongest components revealed.

Prevalent work behavior components. The work behavior component, the lack of

productivity component, and inclination for sabotage had a mean score of 2.78, and there

was a mean score for intention for flight of 3.64. These mean scores were based on the

participants' responses to level of agreement ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 6=

strongly agree (see Table 4.18).

Table 4.18
Prevalent Work Behavior Component Areas

Component	Overall mean
Lack of productivity and inclination for sabotage	2.78
Intention for flight	3.64

The component, lack of productivity and inclination for sabotage, is composed of 11 items, the highest means being, "I work harder (less hard) than I did before the downsizing", followed by "I resist some of the new changes at work." About two-fifths (43.2%) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they do not work harder than before the downsizing; 34.3% agreed or strongly agreed that they resist changes at work; 30% agreed or strongly agreed that they don't work as hard as they used; 25:% agreed or strongly agreed that they pretended to do what they were told, and 23% agreed or strongly agreed that they do the minimum work necessary. With respect to sabotage type items, the respondents indicated agreement (agree or strongly agreed) to the following: 24.4% would call in sick when they weren't; 24.3% would blame others; 21.4% would sabotage directives from management; 21.9% would try to make their boss look bad, and 21.9% would do things that hurt the organization. This component (see Table 4.19) suggests a tendency to decrease productivity and engage in sabotage since the changes, but not to the extent of a universal negative response.

Table 4.19
Component Intent for Lack of Productivity and Inclination for Sabotage Items

Component	Items	Means	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Lack of productivity and sabotage	I work harder than I did before the downsizing. *	3.72	14.1	16.0	14.6	12.1	24.8	18.4
	I resist some of the new changes at work.	3.38	22.9	19.4	9.0	14.4	13.9	20.4
	I work just as hard as I used to.*	3.06	23.8	31.1	7.8	6.8	13.6	17.0
	I am more likely to blame others now.	2.75	33.8	24.4	9.5	8.0	13.4	10.9

	I call in sick when I am not.	2.7	44.3	16.9	3.5	10.9	8.5	15.9
	I do the very minimum work necessary.	2.69	36.9	24.8	8.3	6.3	9.7	14.1
	I pretend to do what I am told.	2.66	44.8	17.9	4.5	7.5	10.0	15.4
	I spend a lot of work time doing personal work things.	2.59	32.0	30.6	7.3	11.7	13.1	5.3
	I sabotage directives sometimes from management.	2.41	54.2	13.9	3.5	7.0	7.5	13.9
	Sometimes I try to make my boss look bad.	2.39	51.7	16.9	5.5	4.0	10.0	11.9
	I do things that hurt the organization.	2.32	56.7	14.4	3.0	4.0	9.0	12.9

Note. * items reversed.

The component, intent for flight, is composed of three items, with the highest mean being the item "If I learned a good job was open, I would pursue it." Over half (52.4%) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that if a good job was open, that they would pursue it; 32% agreed or strongly agreed that they would probably not stay with the organization, and 30.6% of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were thinking of quitting their jobs. This component suggests that one third to one half of the employees tend to agree that they have intent to leave their current organization, and possibly even terminate their employment without first finding another job (see Table 4.20).

Table 4.20
Component Intent for Flight Items

Component	Items	Means	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Intent for flight	If I learned that a good job was open, I would pursue it.	4.24	7.8	12.1	8.7	18.9	23.8	28.6
	I will probably stay at this organization.*	3.4	15.5	22.8	18.0	11.7	13.1	18.9
	I am thinking about quitting my job.	3.30	24.8	13.1	9.7	11.7	13.1	18.9

Note. *reversed items, **reversed items-reverse agreement to disagree and strongly disagree

In summary, two behavior components, lack of productivity and inclination to sabotage, and intention for flight were also identified; with intention for flight being the stronger component.

Research question 4. Multiple regression analysis was used to address research question 4: "Which, if any, control or independent variables influence work behaviors following a downsizing?" Variables such as ethnicity, years worked, work location changes, team member changes, age, type of organization, and when downsizing occurred were transformed to dummy variables to facilitate the multiple regression analysis. Means from the five loss scale components were computed to use in the regression analysis, as well as means for the two work behavior scale components. To ensure there was no evidence of multicollinearity of predictors, a collinearity diagnostics analysis was run inputting the control demographic variables and independent loss scale variables as a part of the regression analysis. Tolerance was close to [1.0] for all variables, indicating that there were no issues with multicolinearity and that the explanatory items in the model were independent of each other.

Two regression models were run to evaluate the relationship between control

factors, areas of loss components, and work behavior components. All regression runs

used the hierarchical multiple regression block by block regression model.

Lack of productivity and inclination for sabotage. The control variables (type of

organization, age, when the organization downsized, employee tenure, whether the work

location of the employee moved, changes in immediate group team members) went into

the first block and the independent variables (all loss components) went into the second

block. For the first analysis, the lack of productivity and inclination for sabotage

component was input as the outcome variable (see Table 4.21).

Table 4.21
Model Regression Loss Areas with Dependent Variable

Analysis	Control variables	Loss areas	Dependent variables
Analysis 1 Control Variables and Areas of Loss Components relationship to Lack of Productivity and Sabotage	Age Type of organization When downsizing occurred in last year Respondent's tenure Work team member changes Work location changes	Loss of justice and support Loss of security and competence Loss of territory Loss of positive outlook Loss of control and security	Lack of productivity and sabotage
Analysis 2 Control Variables and Loss Components relationship to Intention to Flight	Age Type of organization When downsizing occurred in last year Respondent's tenure Work team member changes Work location changes	Loss of justice and support Loss of security and competence Loss of territory Loss of positive outlook Loss of control and security	Intention for flight

The first regression model examined the influence of the control demographic

variables in the first block and the independent loss scale variables in the next block on

the outcome variable of productivity and sabotage. The stepwise method was chosen as

the method for entering the predictive variables. The variables in this model that made a

significant contribution to explaining productivity and sabotage in the final model

included, in descending order of Standardized Betas: private organization ($\beta=.376$); loss

of justice and supervisory support (β=.375); loss of security and competence (β=.341);

work location moved (β=.134); team member changes (β=-.128); and loss of territory

(β= -.154). The Beta shows the relative strength of the variables in the final model (see

Table 4.19). The private organization variable was the strongest, with the loss off sense

of justice and supervisory support and the loss of security and competence variable was

the second and third highest respectively (see Table 4.22). For this model, 74.3% of the

variance was explained, suggesting a high relationship.

Table 4.22
Unstandardized and Standardized Regression Coefficients for Separate
Regression Analyses of Productivity/Sabotage Scale

Variable	B	SE B	β
Productivity/Sabotage Scale			
Private Organizations	1.362	.166	.376***
Loss of Justice and Supervisory	.432	.065	.375***
Loss of Security and Competence	.411	.065	.341***
Location Change	.483	.166	.134**
Team member change	-.432	.139	-.128*
Loss of Territory	-.187	.064	-.154**

Note. Only significant variables are included. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, $R_2 =$
74.3%

Reviewing the R square changes, being in a private organization accounted for

49.4% of the variance in the productivity and sabotage component; work location

moved accounted for 3.4% of variance; team member changes for 1.6% of the variance;

loss of sense of justice and supervisory support for 15.6% of variance; loss of security

and competence for 4.8% of variance, and loss of territory for 1.1% of variance of the

dependent variable, lack of productivity and inclination for sabotage (see Table 4.22).

Following the regression analysis, t-test analyses were run comparing the means

between private and non private groups, work location changes, and team member

changes in relationship to the lack of productivity and inclination to sabotage scale. T-tests were used to report the simple mean comparisons. Some differences were significant without the control variable included in the regression analyses. Response mean for private organizations was 4.57 and response mean for non private organizations (public and non-profit) was 2.14. This sizeable difference was shown to be significant through a test, t(70)= 10.535, p = .000 that revealed private organization employees indicated a higher likelihood to demonstrate a lack of productivity and an increase in sabotage. Response mean for location changes was 4.57 and response mean for no location change was 2.44, This difference was shown to be significant through a t-test, t(76)= 4.806, p=.000 that revealed those employees with work location changes indicated a higher likelihood to demonstrate a lack of productivity and an increase in sabotage. Response mean for team member changes was 2.81 and response mean for no team member changes was 2.80. T-test results, without the benefit of the control variables in the regression run was not significant t(192) =.035, p= .972.   However, the multiple regression analysis resulted in the team member change as a significant predictor when controlling for all variables.

Table 4.23
Model Summary Productivity and Sabotage

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	Df1	Df2	Sig. F Change
1	.703 a	.494	.491	1.16050	.494	173.753	1	178	.000
2	.721 b	.520	.515	1.13347	.026	9.589	1	177	.002
3	.732 c	.536	.528	1.11774	.016	6.019	1	176	.015
4	.832 d	.692	.685	.91244	.156	89.109	1	175	.000
5	.860 e	.740	.732	.84170	.047	31.53	1	174	.000
6	. 867 f	.752	.743	.82430	.012	8.420	1	173	.004

a.   Predictors (constant), private organization
b.   Predictors (constant), private organization, work location moved

c. Predictors (constant), private organization, work location moved, immediate work group changed
d. Predictors (constant), private organization, work location moved, immediate work group changed, loss of sense of justice and supervisory support
e. Predictors (constant), private organization, work location moved, immediate work group changed, loss of sense of justice and supervisory support, loss of security and competence
f. Predictors (constant), private organization, work location moved, immediate work group changed, loss of sense of justice and supervisory support, loss of security and competence, loss of territory

Intention for flight. Analysis two examined the relationship of the control variables in the first block and independent loss area variables in the second block with the outcome variable of intention of flight. The hierarchical multiple regression or a block by block regression model was used. The control variables (type of organization, age, when the organization downsized, employee tenure, whether the work location of the employee moved, changes in immediate group team members) went into the first block and the independent variables (all loss components) went in to the second block. For the second analysis, intention for flight was input as the outcome variable. The stepwise method was chosen as the method for entering the predictive variables. The variables in this model that made a significant contribution to explaining the variance in intention for flight in the final model were, in descending order of standardized betas: loss of positive outlook (β=.433), loss of sense of justice and supervisory support(β =208), loss of control and identity(β=.189), private organization (β=.104), and, downsizing occurring 7 -9 months ago (β=-.011). Standardized Beta shows the relative strength of the variables in the final model. For this model, loss of positive outlook was the strongest, with loss of sense of justice and supervisory support, following (see Table 4.24). Total variance in this model was 57.6%, suggesting a good characterization.

Table 4.24
Unstandardized and Standardized Regression Coefficients for Separate
Regression Analyses of Intention for Flight Scale

Variable	B	SE B	ß
Intent for Flight Scale			
Loss of positive outlook	.606	.092	.433***
Loss of sense of justice and support	.224	.081	.208**
Loss of control and identity	.236	.080	.189***
Private organization	.351	.193	.104***
Downsized 7-9 months	-.053	.257	-.011***

Note. Only significant variables are included. * p < .05, ** p< .01, *** p < .001, R_2 = 57.6%

Reviewing the R square changes, being in a private organization accounted for 16.5% of the variance; downsizing that occurred 7-9 months for 2.5% of variance; loss of positive outlook for 33.5% of the variance; loss of control and identity for 4.5% of variance, and loss of sense of justice and supervisory support for 1.8% of the variance of the dependent variable, intention for flight (see Table 4.25).

Following the regression analysis, t-test analyses were run comparing the means between private and non private groups, and when the downsizing occurred to the intention to flight scale. Response mean for private organizations was 4.62 and response mean for non-private organizations (public and non-profit) was 3.35. This sizable difference was shown to be significant through a t-test, t (121)= 6.309, p=.000 that revealed those employees working in private organizations indicated a higher likelihood for flight. Response means for when the downsizing occurred were analyzed. Response means for downsizing that occurred from seven to nine months was 4.71 and response

mean for other time periods was 3.55, $t(26) = 3.540$, p= .001. These results suggest that

this group of employees where the downsizing occurred 7 to 9 months ago, had a

reported higher intention for flight.

Table 4.25

Model Summary Intention for Flight

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	Df1	Df2	Sig. F Change
1	.406 a	.165	.160	1.39590	.165	35.156	1	178	.000
2	.436 b	.190	.181	1.37854	.025	5.513	1	177	.000
3	.724 c	.525	.516	1.05926	.334	123.784	1	176	.000
4	.755 d	.570	.560	.99138	.046	18.557	1	175	.000
5	.767 e	.588	.576	.99138	.018	7.663	1	174	.006

a. Predictors (Constant), private organization
b. Predictors (Constant), private organization, downsized 7-9 months
c. Predictors (Constant), private organization, downsized 7-9 months, loss of positive outlook
d. Predictors (Constant), private organization, downsized 7-9 months, loss of positive outlook, loss of control and identity
e. Predictors (Constant), private organization, downsized 7-9 months, loss of positive outlook, loss of control and identity, loss of sense of justice and supervisory support

Research question 5. Multiple regression analysis was used to address research

question five: "Are there loss experiences that are unique to marginalized downsized

survivors that are different from those of non-marginalized downsized survivors?" The

hierarchical multiple regression or a block by block regression model was used. The

control variables (type of organization, age, when the organization downsized, employee

tenure, whether the work location of the employee moved, changes in immediate group

team members) went into the first block, while marginalized variables (gender, disability,

non-Caucasian, first generation immigrant) were entered in the second block, and the

independent variables (all loss components) went in to the third block. For this analysis,

lack of productivity and inclination for sabotage was input as the outcome variable.

Model description listed in Table 4.26.

Table 4.26
Model Analysis Marginalized Population

Analysis	Control variables First block	Control variables Second block	Loss areas	Dependent variables
Analysis 1 Control Variables and Areas Loss Components relationship to Lack of Productivity and Sabotage	Type of organization When downsizing occurred in last year Respondent's tenure Work team member changes Work location changes Age	Gender Disabled First generation immigrant Non-Caucasian	Loss of justice and support Loss of security and competence Loss of territory Loss of positive outlook Loss of control and security	Lack of productivity and sabotage
Analysis 2 Control Variables and Areas of Loss Components relationship to Intention to Flight	Type of organization When downsizing occurred in last year Respondent's tenure Work team member changes Work location changes Age	Gender Disabled First generation immigrant Non-Caucasian	Loss of sense of justice and supervisory support Loss of security and competence Loss of territory Loss of positive outlook Loss of control and security	Intention for flight

Marginalized populations: Lack of productivity and inclination for sabotage.

The first regression run was hierarchical multiple regression or a block by block regression model. The control variables (type of organization, age, when the organization downsized, employee tenure, whether the work location of the employee moved, changes in immediate group team members) were converted into dummy variables and were entered into the first block, marginalized variables (gender, disability, non-Caucasian, first generation immigrant) were converted into dummy variables and entered in the second block, and the independent variables (all loss components) went into the third block. For this analysis, lack of productivity and inclination for sabotage

was input as the outcome variable. The stepwise method was chosen as the method for
entering the predictive variables. The variables in this model that make a significant
contribution to the explained variance in intention for flight in the final model were, in
descending order of Standardized Betas: loss of sense of justice and supervisory support
($ß$=.385);　private organization ($ß$=.372): loss of security and competence ($ß$ =330);
work location changes ($ß$=.145); team member changes ($ß$=-.127), and loss of territory $ß$
= (-.158).　Standardized Beta shows the relative strength of the variables in the final
model. Similar to the regression model without the marginalized variables, loss of sense
of justice and supervisory support is the strongest variable, with private organization, and
loss of security and competence following. Thus, there were no differences in the
variables and the components revealed using a second control block of marginalized
populations (see Table 4.27 and Table 4.28). For this model, 74.5% of the variance in the
loss of work productivity and inclination toward sabotage was explained, suggesting a
strong relationship.

Table 4.27
*Marginalized populations: Unstandardized and Standardized Regression Coefficients for
Separate Regression Analyses of Productivity/Sabotage scale*

Variable	B	SE B	$ß$
Productivity/Sabotage Scale			
Loss of sense of justice and supervisory	.441	.065	.385***
Private organization	1.342	.166	.372***
Loss of security and competence	.399	.066	.330***
Work location change	.528	.168	.145***
Team member changes	-. 429	.138	-.127*
Loss of territory	-.191	.065	-.158*

Note. Only significant variables are included. * $p < .05$, ** $p< .01$, *** $p < .001$, $R_2 =$
74.5%

       Reviewing the R square changes, being in a private organization accounted for
49.2% of the variance; work location change for 3.1% of variance; team member change

for 1.6 % of the variance; loss of sense of justice and supervisory support for 1.6% of

variance, and loss of territory for 1.3% of the variance of the dependent variable,

intention for flight (see Table 4.28).

Table 4.28
Model Summary of Marginalization on Productivity and Sabotage

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	Df1	Df2	Sig. F Change
1	.701 a	.492	.489	1.16302	.492	170.366	1	176	.000
2	.723 b	.523	.518	1.12983	.031	11.491	1	175	.001
3	.734 c	.539	.531	1.11447	.016	5.856	1	174	.017
4	.836 d	.699	.692	.90272	.016	92.0204	1	173	.000
5	.861 e	.741	.733	.84005	.042	27.779	1	172	.000
6	.868 f	.753	.745	.82182	.013	8.715	1	171	.004

a. Predictors (constant), private organization
b. Predictors (constant), private organization, work location changed
c. Predictors (constant), private organization, work location changed, team members changed
d. Predictors (constant), private organization, work location changed, team members changed, loss of justice and supervisory support
e. Predictors (constant), private organization, work location changed, team members changed, loss of justice and supervisory support, loss of security and competence
f. Predictors (constant), private organization, work location changed, team members changed, loss of justice and supervisory support, loss of security and competence, loss of territory

Marginalized populations: Intention for flight. The second regression run was

also hierarchical multiple regression or a block by block model. The control variables

(type of organization, age, when the organization downsized, employee tenure, whether

the work location of the employee moved, changes in immediate group team members)

went into the first block, marginalized variables (gender, disability, non-Caucasian, first

generation immigrant) was entered in the second block, and the independent variables (

all loss components) went in to the third block. For this analysis, intention for flight was

input as the outcome variable.   The stepwise method was chosen as the method to enter

the predictive variables carried out. The variables in this model that make a significant

contribution to the explaining variance in intention for flight were, in descending order of

Standardized Betas included: loss of positive outlook (β=.441); loss of sense of justice

and supervisory support (β = .197); loss of control and identity (β =.194); private

organization (β=.081); downsized 7-9 months ago (β=.006); male gender (β=-.152).

The Beta shows the relative strength of the variables in the final model. For this model,

loss of positive outlook is the strongest, with loss of sense of justice and supervisory

support, following. Loss of control and identity, working for a private organization,

downsizing that occurred 7-9 months ago and being male following with less strength,

but still being statistically significant. The marginalization regression analysis was unique

in that gender (male) variable was also as a predictor (see Table 4.29). The variance

explained was good, at 59.7%.

Table 4.29
Marginalized Populations: Unstandardized and Standardized Regression Coefficients for Separate Regression Analyses of Intention for Flight Scale

Variable	B	$SE\ B$	β
Intent for Flight Scale			
Loss of positive outlook	.613	.091	.441*
Loss of sense of justice and supervisory	.210	.081	.197*
Loss of control and identity	.239	.078	.194***
Private organization	.273	.189	.089***
Downsized in 7 -9 months	.030	.250	.006*
Male	-.462	.149	-.152*

Note. Only significant variables are included. * p < .05, ** p< .01, *** p < .001, R^2 = 59.7%

Reviewing the R square changes, being in a private organization accounted for 15.7%

of the variance; downsized 7-9 months ago for 2.5% of variance; male for 2.0 % of the

variance; loss of positive outlook for 34.3% of variance: loss of control and identity for

4.6%, and loss of sense of justice and supervisory support for 1.5% of the variance of the

dependent variable intention for flight (see Table 4.30).

Following the regression analysis, t-test analyses were run comparing the means

between females with males with the output intention for flight. Response mean for

females was 3.48, response mean for males was 3.46 t(193)= -2.431, p=.016 indicating

that males indicated a lower, but insignificant likelihood that they agreed with the

concept they would leave the organization.   Thus, gender by itself was not significantly

correlated with the intention to flight outcome, but when other variables were controlled

for in the regression analysis, males were somewhat more likely than females to intend to

leave their organization.

Table 4.30
Model Summary Marginalized Intention for Flight

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	Df1	Df2	Sig. F Change
1	.402 a	.161	.157	1.39005	.161	33.887	1	176	.000
2	.432 b	.186	.177	1.37310	.025	5.373	1	175	.022
3	.455 c	.207	.193	1.35976	.020	4.451	1	174	.036
4	.741 d	.549	.539	1.02775	.343	1.3135	1	173	.000
5	.771 e	.595	.583	.97729	.046	19.324	1	172	.000
6	.781f	.610	.597	.96126	.015	.6788	1	171	.010

a. Predictors (Constant) private organization
b. Predictors (Constant) private organization, downsized 7-9 months
c. Predictors (Constant) private organization, downsized 7-9 months, male
d. Predictors (Constant) private organization, downsized 7-9 months, male, loss of positive outlook
e. Predictors (Constant) private organization, downsized 7-9 months, male, loss of positive outlook, loss of control and identity

  f. Predictors (Constant) private organization, downsized 7-9 months, male, loss of positive outlook, loss of control and identity, loss of sense of justice and supervisory support

   Summary. In summary, marginalized populations responded to loss and behaviors in similar ways as non-marginalized populations. The only marginalized predictor variable was gender, and it was weak. However, it wasn't the women but the men who were revealed as a variable in the regression analysis evaluating intention for flight.

   Narrative responses. Survey participants were also asked an optional open ended question, "What, if anything, were the changes that happened as a result of the downsizing that were especially challenging for you?" There were 84 responses. The responses were edited or omitted, if necessary, to be free of personal or revealing information about the respondent or the organization where the respondent worked. See Appendix D. Four of the respondents indicated there were no challenges or indicated that they had positive outcomes, including: "There really weren't any challenges I experienced." "As a result of downsizing and subsequent reorganization, I gained positions." "This is my first management responsibility so the only challenge I'm experiencing is that of this new responsibility", and "very little has changed…"

   Four themes emerged from the narrative responses: Supervisory support and injustice; workload; sabotage; and guilt over co-worker losses. Most of the responses involved lack of supervisory support and workload issues.

   Loss of sense of justice and supervisory support and feelings of injustice narratives. Generally, responses regarding supervisory support were negative, and supported the loss of sense of justice and supervisory support and injustice component.

Themes of poor supervisory coaching, lack of supervisory support and empathy, poor communication, and loss of confidence of managers were clearly expressed. Comments included: "change in supervisors' temperament—increasingly hostile and stressed", "total lack of communication coupled with perception that those who were laid off somehow deserved it", "I feel like upper management still doesn't get it…they don't seem to care enough", "Management just thinks we are dumb", "Management doesn't tell the truth….they mislead us and ignore us", "My supervisor ignores me now. Not sure why", "Why can't management talk to us about what is going to change and then let us help with the solution…", "Management told me to work harder and to be happy I have a job. That doesn't help me nor support me", "Senior management did not tell the employees the full and complete truth about the mismanagement and poor decisions that contributed to the need to downsize. They broke the faith…", "We've also seen an attitude shift in agency management- rather than inspiring people to do their best, the message lately is basically 'you should just be glad you have a job'", "Management won't talk to us", "My supervisor won't take the time… when he did talk to me, he told me that I should be happy I am still working", and "Managers get mad if you don't think everything is positive".

Work load narratives. Respondents voiced concerns regarding the increased workload, lowered productivity, the stress related to completing work, and the demoralizing work environment that the work overload created. Comments included: "I'm doing the work of two people", "Additional work load. Morale is down in the office. Tension in office atmosphere. Everyone on edge, waiting for the next layoff to happen", "There are fewer people, who are also less available to provide me assistance

with my job responsibilities. The amount of work I can get done has decreased",

"...People working very hard without much hope of getting caught up- which is

demoralizing", "Work load increased! Other personnel reassigned from within the

organization and have bitter feelings because of what has happened with their change.

Told to do more but with no overtime to go along with the increase of work", "…I was

given much more responsibility and travel time away from home but no change in title or

compensation to make up for it."

Sabotage. Narratives also inferred some type of sabotage, ranging from a

purposeful intent to not get things done, personal revenge, or malicious mischief.

Comments included: "I also do not want to be too successful at getting things

accomplished, because we need to replace the positions as soon as possible, pain must be

felt by the decision makers", "I feel underappreciated…these bastards don't care. I want

to get back at them. I am thinking of ways. Going to overflow the toilets. If they want to

treat us like sh%#, they can clean up the sh%#!..,. "One person defecated on her

supervisor's lawn in a drunken expression of her contempt for the process. We watched,

we laughed and then ran like hell. We are cowards and want to keep our jobs", and,

"Started feeling physically and emotionally sick. Had trouble controlling my bowels, but

I taught those bastards. I saved it for them. Left them several surprises through the

office…Wait until they see what I do next".

Guilt and relationships. Other respondents offered that their challenges included

guilt at the loss of their support group or peers. Comments included: "The feeling of

guilt of helping to make the decision to downsize certain people", "…feeling guilty and

bad for the individuals who were laid off…", "Had to downsize people who worked for

me, based on my forced stack-ranking of my staff. Did not know that my stack-ranking was going to be used for purpose of layoffs", "A co-worker was laid off and reacted with great hostility, blaming me for still having a job and benefits…our relationship can never be the same", "Just one morning , people I worked with for years were gone and everything changed. That's messed up", "Accepting the absence of coworkers that I considered friends", "That important people who did their work with professionalism and enjoyed helping patrons were let go, while other newer employees that have no professionalism, no work ethic, etc.. remain", "What was devastating is that it didn't matter that any one of those employees was an excellent employee, they were gone. This was emotionally challeng[ing] to not only them but to my co-workers and me...morale was very low with little trust left for our employer", "Saying goodbye to the wonderful teammates I've worked with for years. Never before have I worked with such a great team". "We lost people with longstanding knowledge of some systems".

Narrative summary. In summary, the respondents offered a variety of narrative comments that supported the scale development factor analysis. The loss areas, particularly loss of sense of justice and supervisory support and feelings of injustice, control and security were supported by narrative comments.   Some of the narratives supported respondents reported feelings of sabotage, and inclination to reduce productivity.

Summary

Five loss subscales were revealed as a result of factor analysis: sense of justice and supervisory support; security and support; positive outlook, territory, and control and identity. The concepts and themes inherent in these components support previous

research regarding downsizing survivors experiencing diminished control (Archibald, 2009; Moss Kanter, 1984); loss of security (K. Cameron et al., 1993; Kalimo et al., 2003); lack of ability and skills to do the work LaMarsh (2009); and, decreased perceived justice (Armstrong-Stassen et al., 2004). Two work behavior components: lack of productivity and sabotage; and, intention for flight were revealed through factor analysis. The issues and concepts related in these components are supported previous work done suggesting organizational sabotage after organizational restructure sabotage (Ambrose et al., 2002); and reduced productivity following an organizational change (Armstrong-Stassen, 1998, 2002; Jalajas & Bommer, 1996; Mishra & Mishra, 1994; Nair, 2008). The highest prevalent loss components included loss of positive outlook, loss of territory, and loss of sense of justice and supervisory support. The highest prevalent work behavior was intention for flight.

The loss components, sense of justice and supervisory support; security and competence; and territory, were found to have a statistical relationship with the downsized survivors' lack of productivity and inclination to sabotage. The loss components positive outlook, control and identity, and loss of sense of justice and supervisory support were found to have a statistical relationship with the intention to leave the organization. Marginalized populations (i.e. female, disabled, first generation immigrants, and non-Caucasian populations) did not report statistically significant differences in loss or productivity and sabotage, or intention for flight work behavior areas.

The next chapter will discuss the unique contributions of this research, as well as theoretical and practical consequences of the results. Implications for leadership and change are discussed. Future research recommended is offered.

Chapter V: Discussion

This chapter summarizes the findings and the implications, and unique contributions of this study. Theoretical and practical consequences of the results, as well as implications for leadership and change, are discussed. Future research recommended is also described.

Findings Overview

This correlational research design, which included a convenience sample of downsized survivors (N=216) responses to a Likert type survey, was used to conduct a factor analysis to develop subscales related to areas of loss and subscales related to work behaviors of survivors following a downsizing. Descriptive statistics and a review of narratives provided by the respondents were used to identify prevalent loss and work behaviors. The researcher examined the relationship of loss areas with work behaviors, and evaluated whether marginalized populations had a different relationship between experiences of loss and work behaviors after downsizing.

Previous Research

The survey respondents in this study reported loss in positive outlook, territory, security and competence, sense of justice and supervisory support, and control and identity. These research findings supported previous research and writings that suggested that employees experience loss following an organizational change, during a downsizing change event (Folger & Skarlicki, 1999) such as loss in morale (Armstrong-Stassen, 1993; K. Cameron et al., 1993) or positive outlook ; loss of justice or feelings of moral outrage (Pettzall et al., 2000); loss of managerial support (Clair & Dufresne, 2004); and, loss of status (Amundson et al., 2004).

Factor analysis revealed two work behavior components: lack of productivity and intention to sabotage, and intention for flight. These findings supported previous research and writings that suggested that survivors may use dysfunctional coping strategies (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997); have less commitment to the organization (Allen et al., 2001), and demonstrate poor performance or productivity (Armstrong-Stassen, 1998, 2002; Jalajas & Bommer, 1996; A. Mishra & Mishra, 1994; Muchinsky, 2000).

Counterproductive work behaviors such as sabotage were reported in previous research related to intentionally inflicting a production loss (Giacalone & Rosenfeld, 1987; Taylor & Walton, 1971); subverting the organization's operations (Ambrose et al., 1987), and compromising work relationships (Crino, 1994). Ambrose et al. (2002) also found that perceived injustice was a common cause of sabotage. The intention for flight component was supported by previous research linking fair communication (Kim, 2008), more attachment to the organization (Spreitzer & Mishra, 2002), and organizational commitment (Trevor & Nybert, 2008) with being less likely to seek outside employment (Kim, 2008), and intention for flight.

Following a review of existing research that suggested marginalized groups might have increased negative experiences following a lay off (Bajawa & Woodall, 2006), it was surprising that the factor analysis that included variables representing marginalized populations (i.e. female, disabled, first generation immigrants, and non-Caucasian populations) as potential predictors of the work behaviors overall was not significantly different from the general population analysis. Previous writings alluded to marginalized populations having different experiences than non marginalized populations (Bajawa &

Woodall, 2006; Bell & Nkomo, 2001; Yuval-Davis, 2006). For example, African American women may see themselves as not being welcome and being outsiders (Bell & Nkomo, 2001) and marginalized groups may sense boundaries that separate the world into "us and them" (Yuval-Davis, 2006, p. 2004).   One might wonder if following a downsizing event, if their feelings of lack of belonging to the organization would be further compromised. The results indicate that marginalized and non marginalized populations share similar perceptions of experiences related to downsizing. Specifically, marginalized members did not indicate less productivity, more inclination to sabotage, or a desire to leave the organization more than non marginalized employees.

Why would the relationships between loss and work behaviors be similar to non-marginalized groups? Not only did the regression analyses reveal similar experiences, but the narrative remarks also did not show any additional challenges related to disability, race, immigration status, gender, or ethnicity. One possibility is that these groups are treated fairly, feel like they belong to the organization, and do not experience discrimination.   Or, could it be that marginalized groups do experience exclusion and discrimination but do not allow these experiences to increase sabotage, decrease productivity, or increase their intention to leave the organization?

Unique Contributions

There were unique findings of this study. Two scales were developed, one scale for areas of loss with five components and the second scale for work behaviors with two components. The multiple regression analyses results highlighted the effect of private organizations and supervisory concerns. Relationships between loss areas and work

behaviors were explored.   In addition other issues were raised, including the importance of time since downsizing.

Scale development. A unique contribution of this study was the development of a scale that included components of loss, as well as components of lack of productivity and inclination of sabotage, and intention for flight. This is the first scale known to the researcher that produces data to analyze survivors' perceived losses following a downsizing. The scale is internally reliable as determined by Cronbach alpha and cohesive, based on factor analysis. The scale can be used again with similar or different survivor populations to evaluate perceived loss and reported survivor behaviors, as well as for employees in organizations who have experienced other restructuring due to reorganizations resulting from mergers or acquisitions, where downsizing was an element. The scale could also be administered several times following an aftermath of a restructuring event that included downsizing to evaluate positive and negative changes. In addition, confirmatory factor analysis could be facilitated with another sample to support the validity of the scales.

Private organizations. The respondents indicated the type of organization for which they worked: private company; nonprofit organization, or public entity. It is unknown how the respondents selecting the private organization interpreted the category as a privately owned or if that definition included a private, publicly-traded company. It is presumed that respondents chose private organization if their company was not publically governed or was not a nonprofit organization.

Employees working at private organizations were a significant predictor in explaining the variance in work behaviors and determined statistically significant through

multiple regression and the t-tests facilitated. There is a strong correlation between loss areas and work behaviors if the survivors are employed in the private sector, contrasted with non-private sector employees. To the researcher's knowledge, differences between private and public organizational survivors have not been studied before.

It is curious to speculate why the private employee would be more inclined to report loss and counterproductive work behaviors. Previous research suggested that private companies outperform public organizations (Hwang, Liao, & Leonard, 2010) and are tied to incentives, such as pay to performance (Corneo & Rafael, 2003) more than public entities. It is surprising to review findings that suggest that people who work for private companies report lowered productivity, higher likelihood to sabotage, and are more likely to leave the organization following a downsizing.

It is possible that expectations differ between public and private sector employees during the time leading up to a downsizing event. Public sector downsizing events typically take place following very well publicized budget cuts. The media covers the legislative battles preceding the cuts to the point where not only public employees, but the public at large, are aware the cuts are coming well before they actually are implemented. In addition, public employees may have clearer expectations of who will stay and who will go first during a downsizing, possibly making all concerned feel that while unfortunate, downsizing-related personnel decisions follow a well understood protocol and are fair under the circumstances. Another possible reason is that public organizations typically tend to be larger entities than private ones, enabling them to more readily absorb cuts and restructure duties without overloading survivors.

On the other hand, private sector employees may be more caught off guard by the cuts because the decisions may be made behind closed doors and on short notice. Employees may be suspicious of the need for the depth of the cuts, knowing that the reductions may be motivated by the desire to "line the pockets" of the CEO and stockholders. Finally, the employees may feel that lay off decisions are unfair and/or arbitrary.

The researcher speculates that as a result of the downsizing event, pay incentives in private organizations are reduced or eliminated, thus magnifying the sense of loss and increasing counterproductive work behaviors. Or, could public sector employees have a commitment to their organization that is different than private companies? Trevor and Nybert (2008) found that the rate of downsizing turnover was related to the employees' commitment to an organization. Other research has suggested when survivors feel more attached to the organization, they are more likely to stay rather than leave the organization (Spreitzer & Mishra, 2002). Could the attachments or commitments to the purpose of the organization differ between the private and the public sector? And, if so, could they affect workers' perceptions of loss and reports of negative work behaviors? Worts, Fox, and McDonough (2007) talked about the concept of the "public-service ethic" (p. 179), where employees are engaged to an ideal, or their organization's cause, that was core to public sector employment. They suggested that an attachment to this ideal persists among public sector workers. Perhaps the private sector employee attaches his or her ethic to pay incentives or other issues that are more closely related to the areas of loss studied.

Employees' loss experience and resulting work behaviors. This research

identified loss area components and found relationships to several work behavior

components. Although emotions and potential feelings of survivors have been discussed

and researched (Kets de Vries & Balazs, 1997; Noer, 1990, 1993, 1997; Petzall et al.,

2000), a comprehensive study of possible loss component areas and work behavior

components, and their relationships has not been carried out in the past. The findings

show that the following loss areas accounted for the variance in reported lack of

productivity and inclination for sabotage: loss of justice and supervisory support; loss of

security and competence, and loss of territory (see Table5.1 for definitions and

implications).

Table 5.1
Areas of Loss Definitions and Lack of Productivity and Inclination for Sabotage
Employer Implications

Loss Area Component	Definition	Employer Implications for lack of productivity and sabotage
Loss of sense of justice and supervisory support	Where the survivor does not believe the supervisor kept the employee informed and does not understand what the employee has experienced, and ignores the employee. Trust and fairness for the supervisor and management has decreased.	Organization may experience lack of productivity and increase in sabotage if the organization doesn't create trust, fairness, and support their employees.
Loss of security and competence	Where the survivor believes that job tasks are extremely overwhelming and they believe they cannot meet their expectations. The employee does not have resources to learn the new job available. The survivor feels insecure without their previous support group and does not feel confident that the organization will survive.	Organization may experience lack of productivity and increase in sabotage if the organization does not remedy overwhelming workloads, does not help the survivor create effective training development plans, and does not reassure the employee that the organization will sustain.
Loss of territory	Where the survivor does not feel ownership of their work space and that, in fact, the personal work space has been violated.	Organization may experience lack of productivity and increase in sabotage if the employee does not feel like their work space is theirs.

The findings revealed that the following loss areas made up the variance in

reported intent for flight: loss of positive outlook; loss of control and identity, and loss of

sense of justice and support (see Table 5.2 for definitions and implications).

Table 5.2
Areas of Loss Definitions and Implications for Intention for Flight

Loss Area Component	Definition	Employer Implications for Intention for Flight
Loss of positive outlook	Where the survivor does not believe that the organization has a positive future, and doesn't feel secure about continued employment with organization, and less pride is taken in the work.	Organization may experience an increased number of employees leaving the organization if the employee continues to feel insecure with the organization and if the organization doesn't create environments where the employee can take pride in their work.
Loss of control and identity	Where the survivor feels a loss of power, has little control over decisions, and feels ashamed of being employed in the job position.	Organization may experience an increased number of employees leaving the organization if the employee isn't empowered to do their job and if the employee continues to feel ashamed in their position.
Loss of sense of justice and supervisory support	Where the survivor does not believe the supervisor kept the employee informed and does not understand what the employee has experienced, and ignores the employee. Trust and fairness for the supervisor and management has decreased.	Organization may experience an increased number of employees leaving the organization if the organization doesn't create trust, fairness, and support their employees.

Loss and Behavior Relationships

Lack of productivity and inclination for sabotage. Several loss areas were

identified as having a statistically significant relationship with the lack of productivity

and inclination for sabotage outcome: Loss of sense of justice and supervisory support;

security and competence; and territory. Intuitively, it is understandable that survivors who feel that their situation is unjust, that the supervisory support is inadequate; coupled with their perceptions of lack of confidence to learn new tasks, and reported perceptions of territory issues, that survivors may report lowered productivity and being more likely to sabotage.   Curiously, loss of positive outlook; and control and identity were not found to have statistical relationships with this outcome.

One wonders the reasons reported loss of positive outlook did not have a statistical relationship with a lack of productivity and inclination for sabotage behavior. Yet, this loss area did have a relationship with the outcome of intention for flight. Perhaps the survivors who don't believe that the organization has a positive future and don't feel secure, develop the intention to seek employment elsewhere. Understanding that the survivor might leave, he or she may also be working toward a good job recommendation, thus resulting in good productivity, or it may simply be that inclination for flight is a more mature, socially acceptable response than is lack of productivity or sabotage.

Similarly, the control and identity loss component also did not have a significant relationship with the outcome of lack of productivity and inclination for sabotage, but had a relationship with flight. It is conceivable that survivors who have a loss of control and identity, understand that if they produce substandard work, that their supervisor will probably provide more extensive monitoring and control, and the survivor is attempting to avoid this situation. Thus the survivors would want to leave the organization but would not want to engage in sabotage or in lowering their productivity, as it would

probably result in additional supervisory oversight and would not support the larger goal of gaining other employment.

Intention for Flight

Several loss areas were identified as having a statistically significant relationship with the intention for flight behavior: Loss of positive outlook; sense of justice and supervisory support; control and identity. It is understandable that survivors that don't feel secure about keeping their job and doubt the organization has a promising future (loss of positive outlook), would seek employment elsewhere. It is reasonable to surmise that if the survivors do not perceive fairness and do not perceive of their supervisor as being supportive, they may want to leave the organization with hopes of finding a more fair and supportive organization.   With regard to the loss of control and identity, it is comprehensible that employees would want to leave the organization if they believed they were being micromanaged and had little control over her or his decisions. These individuals might want to pursue employment where they have more autonomy and independence to make their own decisions.

Loss of security and competence, and loss of territory were not revealed as having a statistical relationship with intention to leave the organization.   It is logical to speculate that survivors who doubt their abilities to learn new job tasks would be reluctant to gain new employment with a new company. Why would an employee who was questioning his or her abilities to learn want to gain employment in a new organization where most of the job required some learning or relearning?   Survivors experiencing a loss in territory, such as perceiving their work space as being violated, did not appear to have a relationship with flight. Perhaps seeking a new job in a new organization would involve

increased territory changes to an entire new organization. Not only would the survivors need to readjust to some territory issues but would need to establish their own space and presence within an entire organization.

Supervisory behavior. Although previous writings and research have discussed some supervisory reactions such as ignoring and distancing (Clair & Dufresne, 2004; Labib & Appelbaum, 1994; Northouse, 2007), this research explored additional behaviors such as supervisors' communication and degree of emotional support regarding the downsizing justification. Supervisors displayed a range of reactions, including keeping the employee fully informed, understanding what the employee had been "through"; talking to the employee when he or she was upset; ignoring the employee when upset, and retaliating against the employee.

Respondent view of supervisor behavior following a downsizing tended to be negative. As indicated in Tables 5.1 and 5.2, supervisors who are not supportive, who do not offer training plans, who do not coach employees, or who even retaliate against their employees may experience organization inefficiencies and possibly detrimental effects to the company. Although writings have suggested that managers might blame the survivors (Herold et al., 2007), this research revealed that nearly one quarter of the respondents indicated that their supervisor had taken this even further and had actually retaliated against them for disagreeing with organization changes. Keeping in mind that the respondents were self-selecting and some potential respondents declined to participate in the survey because they were satisfied with the downsizing event, caution needs to be used when interpreting these results to all survivors.

The findings were also unique in that specific supervisory support items as part of the loss of sense of justice and supervisory support component were statistically significant predictors of both counterproductive work behaviors (i.e., (lack of productivity and inclination of sabotage, and inclination for flight). Previous research has not been able to establish a relationship between lack of supervisory support with both lack of productivity, sabotage, and intention for flight. When considering that lack of supervisory support and lack of justice can negatively impact work behaviors, the issue of supervisory support and lack of justice becomes more critical to the organization because of the potential detrimental effects on an already ailing organization.

Time to care. Intuitively, one might propose that it is during and shortly following the downsizing event where employees may feel the loss experience more strongly and be more likely to report counterproductive work behaviors. However, the findings in previous research and this research suggest that the effects of downsizing are probably longer than just a few months. According to Armstrong-Stassen (2002), downsized survivors reported a significant decline in performance in the early phases of downsizing and in the three years following the downsizing event. Hayes (2007) advised change managers to recognize there will sometimes be a time delay between the announcement of change and the employees' emotional response. He said that change would have varying effects on individuals and how they will proceed through the cycle. This research suggested that the time period of seven to nine months after a downsizing was predictive in explaining variance in the work behavior and intention for flight outcome variables. Using t-test analyses, the period of seven to twelve months post downsizing event was significant, compared to the less significant zero to six months

following a downsizing. It is critical that supervisors and managers pay attention to survivors and coach them effectively not only during the downsizing but for months, and even years after the event.

Interpretation Through Theoretical Frameworks

The practical applications regarding theories are discussed. Loss, emotional intelligence framework, and constructionist theories are discussed in the context of the research results. The survivor reactions and practical suggestions for managers and supervisors are offered.

Loss theory. In planning and implementing reorganization and/or downsizing events, the supervisor and manager must be aware of what the survivors' losses are and what is being let go (Bridges, 2004; Levinson, 2000; Marks, 2003, 2006, 2007; Neimeyer, 2000). Instead of interpreting perceived resistance as something that should be stopped, it should be seen as perhaps an attempt to recover meaning or to preserve what was valuable in the past or what was lost (Antonacopoulou & Gabriel, 2001). Every employee may experience areas of loss in some area to some degree. Not dealing with the emotional feelings associated with loss and grief could result in the survivor feeling stuck in the past, unable to move forward and perform the work necessary. The manager should express empathy to the survivor employees. "This means making it clear that leadership is cognizant of the needs, feelings, problems, and views of those employees who have lived through a merger, acquisition, or downsizing" (Marks, 2003, p. 115).

Managers with emotional intelligence. An effective manager during a downsizing effort must have solid emotional intelligence not only to understand the

employee, but also to understand the supervisor's or manager's own feelings during the organizational change and during the employee interaction. Salovey and Mayer (1990) defined emotional intelligence as the ability to appraise and express emotion, the ability to generate emotions and feelings when they facilitate cognitive thought, the ability to understand emotion, and the ability to regulate emotions to promote both emotional and intellectual growth. Awareness of the areas of loss components as well as actually measuring employee response in the component areas will help managers raise their awareness and stay to tuned to possible negative (or positive) effects of the downsizing effort.

Writings about emotional intelligence and downsizing support the concept that managers can positively impact the outcome of a downsizing implementation by interacting with, supporting, and coaching their employees. "The emotionally intelligent person can harness emotions, even negative ones, and manage them to achieve intended goals" (Salovey & Grewal, 2005, p. 282). "An emotionally intelligent leader can monitor his or her moods through self-awareness, change them for the better through self-management, understand their impact through empathy, and act in ways that boosts others' moods through relationship management." (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2001, p. 48) An emotionally intelligent leader following a downsizing, can monitor his or her moods, change them for self management, understand their impact empathy, and behave in ways that boost the survivors' moods.

Constructionist theory. Constructivists focus on understanding the meaning that each person attributes to loss, both in their internal and external worlds (Goldsworthy, 2005) and see grieving as a process of meaning reconstruction (Neimeyer, 2000). In this

approach, loss is perceived as an event that can profoundly shake an individual's assumed constructions about life, sometimes dismantling the very foundation of one's assumptive reality (Neimeyer, 2000).

Employing emotional intelligence skills, in particular the supervisor or manager's own self awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills would support the supervisor or manager in understanding the meaning that each employee attributes to the loss due to downsizing. Not only would these skills help the supervisor's or manager's understanding of the meaning of change to that employee, these skills would support the employee in reinventing themselves.

Loss may be perceived as something that can shake an individual's assumed constructions about life, and can be dismantling the employees' assumptive reality. Understanding the employee's perception of the downsizing event can help the supervisor in coaching the survivor. In order to address the survivor's loss, the supervisor or manager should acknowledge the reality of the survivor's loss. The supervisor should understand the emotional pain the survivor is experiencing. Helping the survivor to revise his or her assumptive world, reconstruct the connection to what has been lost in the workplace, and help the survivor in reinventing himself or herself, will support the employee in a more positive transition.

Implications for Leadership and Change

The following includes a discussion regarding the implications for leadership and change. Avoidance of downsizing strategies, supervisory coaching, training, reinvestment, and other ideas are presented.

Alternate strategies to downsizing. Given the potential negative consequences of downsizing, the management and supervisory team need to explore all other strategies before they implement a downsizing event. Given that companies routinely cut workers, even when their profits are increasing and when downsizing has not been documented to result in certain profit generation, downsizing shouldn't be the solution that is implemented without first considering other solutions. One idea is for the organization to revisit its business and strategic plan. The organization may want to consider expanding its product manufacturing as well as increasing its marketing of existing and new products. The organization may want to facilitate a market segmentation study to determine which additional markets should be targeted.   Reducing service and manufacturing costs through prudent purchasing requirements might save the organization money.   Reduction by attrition, the company not filling vacant positions, might be a strategic method of reducing positions without having to lay off employees. Primary use of lean strategies and techniques should be implemented to increase efficiencies to increase product manufacturing, number of clients served, and so on, rather than eliminating job positions.

Supervisory and management behaviors. Feelings of loss of sense of justice and supervisory support resulted from a blend of supervisor behaviors, primarily lack of communication, and lack of coaching and support. Subsequently, downsized survivors reported feelings of loss of fairness and trust. The supervisory support items were added to the survey to consider how the supervisors' behaviors impacted loss areas and work behavior areas.   It was not surprising to see that the items of justice and supervisory behavior fell together in this component.   The behavior of the supervisor, the

communication and coaching provided, or lack of it influences how the employee perceives fairness and impacts trust.

The findings and the narrative remarks suggested that supervisors and managers are failing in their interactions with survivors of a downsizing. The study implies that if supervisors fail to coach and communicate and support their survivors and fail to create a sense of fairness, the organization may experience lack of productivity, possible sabotage, and failure to retain its employees. Not only did the descriptive and inferential statistics show respondents tended to have negative perceptions of supervisory behaviors, the narratives clearly illustrate that supervisors did not communicate, support, nor coach the survivor following the downsizing. Supervisors, instead of providing coaching and encouragement, told them they should be happy to have a job and ignored them, and even possibly blamed them for the downsizing. Again, knowing that the respondents were self-selecting and some potential respondents declined participating in the survey because they were satisfied with the downsizing event, caution needs to be used when generalizing these results to all survivors.

Considering the emotional landscape. Kiefer (2002) indicated that emotional processes should be explored during an organizational change, including: the understanding that emotions are important to employees of an organization; emotions are a critical piece of the construction of the meaning of a change, such as a downsizing event; and, that emotions are a critical component of adaptation and motivation. Managers, supervisors, and team leaders cannot ignore the emotional aspects of the downsizing, whether the downsizing event is pending, in progress, or in its aftermath. The management team needs to evaluate and consider the emotional aspects of the

organization on a continual basis so it can make decisions that are appropriate to the workforce and result in a return on investment. The management team needs to evaluate their department, other departments, and the organization-wide emotional landscape when making decisions regarding new strategy, operations, and other change decisions. Without the acknowledgement of emotional aspects of change, including loss components, the management team is likely to make decisions that will not result in a positive return on investment, such as productivity, lessened sabotage behaviors, and employees committed and staying with the organization.

Although this study attempted to evaluate the perceived losses of survivors, the study may have evaluated perceptions or feelings that the participants had prior to the downsizing. Regardless of whether the participants expressed losses or things that were missing prior to the event, e.g. supervisory support, the statistical results suggested that these "missing" pieces or "losses" had a relationship with counterproductive work behaviors. Thus, considering the emotional aspects and reactions of survivors is critical to ensure a successful change event.

Training and support for supervisors and managers. Prior to the downsizing event, a plan should be developed and revisited that includes the caring of supervisors, managers, and employees. Usually some kind of plan is written that includes operational and organizational changes. In addition to these plans of change, plans must incorporate how the organization intends on dealing with the human aspects of organizational changes, such as emotional responses to loss.

Initially, the company needs to be cognizant of the care needed to support not only employees but the supervisors and managers as well. This care needs to take place

prior to a downsizing, during the downsizing, and following a downsizing. Training should include the essential pieces of how to care for themselves before they attempt to care for their employees. It is intuitive, that if a supervisor is to meet and coach an employee who is upset, that the supervisor must be in a mindset to help that employee. If he or she is overwhelmed and is experiencing loss due to the downsizing event, it is anticipated that the supervisor may withdraw, isolate, and distance themselves from the employees. Although resources are typically less available following a downsizing, a wellness program should be considered, such as an agreement for a discount at a local gym, stress management courses, and so on. Although Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs) may be eliminated as a cost reduction measure, perhaps this decision needs to be revisited. EAP programs provide support and counseling and support services to organizational employees.

Secondly, supervisors and managers need to develop basic coaching, communication and counseling skills that include an understanding of loss theory, active listening and empathy skills, as well as effective problem solving skills. These emotional intelligence skills would help the supervisors and managers communicate, support, and encourage employees more effectively. With increased communication skills, it is anticipated that the management team would create a more trusting and perceived fair environment regarding the rationale for downsizing, and the plan for implementation. When relevant, the supervisor could encourage and reassure employees regarding the organization's future livelihood. The company may also want to develop or revisit its existing policies regarding civility at the work place and bullying. Ethical training to

ensure that supervisors do not engage in behavior that might be perceived as retaliatory may be helpful.

Empowering supervision. If the survivors are excessively managed and directed in the execution of their work, this study suggests the survivors may seek employment elsewhere. Management needs to involve employees from all levels in decision making, providing expected results and empowering employees to make decisions on how they will meet those expectations. If empowerment is not an option, the management should solicit input on necessary changes so the employees continued to feel valued. Management should resist developing such detailed plans of executing work that have little meaning on results.

When possible employees should be empowered to make decisions regarding accomplishment of their workload, they should be involved in the initial planning of the organizational downsizing plan and implementation. Communication regarding changes or modifications to the organizational and operational plan should be provided and should be considered with employee involvement and input. Whenever possible, managers and supervisors should not undermine the decisions made by employees or employee teams.

Future organizational reassurance. The results of the study suggest that if the survivors are not reassured of the organization's sustainability, the company may experience a loss of productivity or an increase in sabotage. Whenever possible and when the company has a foreseeable future, supervisors and managers must convey the security of the organization's future and livelihood. This message needs to be repeated. Supervisors and managers cannot assume that employees in the organizations will assume that the company will sustain. This message should be delivered in a variety of

venues, such as individual, team, department, and organizational wide meetings.

Additional confirmation of the organization's security should be shared through email,

organizational newsletters, and business social networking strategies used by the

organization, such as Facebook® and LinkedIn®.

Skill training. Although skill training might be neglected during a chaotic

downsizing, the findings suggested that ignoring training needs could result in lack of

productivity and sabotage. It is anticipated that survivors are required to pick up the

duties of employees who have been laid off. Survey respondents indicated that they had

concerns about learning new jobs and reported that they were not given the resources to

learn new job tasks. Although the organizational management team and employees may

be experiencing chaos and increased stress loads, it is important that training plans are

developed to ensure that employees are learning the necessary skills. Employee and

employee team involvement in the development of those plans is critical to a successful

training plan development. Individuals and team problem solving will increase the

likelihood that the training plan will be successful and the plan will probably include

creative and innovative ideas that are offered. The supervisor needs to provide

encouragement to the employee, identify training resources, and revisit the progress of

that learning with the employee.

Work area change considerations. Although changing an employee's work area

may seem trivial to supervisors and managers, the effect on the employee may be

significant, based on the results of this study. Changing an employee's work area may

result in a lack of productivity, and an inclination for sabotage. Although it may make

sense to move employee's work space or reconfigure areas, the organization may want to

consider keeping the work location and spaces constant, if possible. The advantages of keeping the location and territory constant may outweigh the anticipated efficiencies the company may experience. If a move is required, it may make sense to hold off on other major changes and supervisory coaching may need to be provided to discuss the work area changes.

Changing or new job position status. Survey respondents reported feeling more ashamed about their job positions and reported feelings that their job status had been lowered. Perhaps these responses were the result of changing job roles or positions, or other factors. The outcomes suggest that these survivors feel ashamed of being in their job position and may leave the company.

Supervisors and managers, as well as employee teams and individuals, need to celebrate the jobs they perform, tied to organizational results, and the organization's security. Survivors should be reminded by their managers and supervisors that the work they perform helps the organization achieve performance goals and maintain sustainability Acknowledgements, awards and other recognitions of performance should be offered to employees, teams, organizational units, and so on. Supervisors or managers need to coach their employees so they can understand the worth they bring to the organization.

Private organizations. Consistent with study findings, private organizations were more likely to agree with the loss components and work behavior components. Private organizations need to increasingly develop strategies to increase work productivity, decrease sabotage, and decrease survivors' intention to flight. In addition to the considerations above, private organizations may want to develop an

increased private work ethic or commitment to the organizational product. A recent television advertisement captured a good example of a private manufacturing company, General Electric-Health Care Division, linking the company's products and workers to enhancing the public good. This particular company manufactures diagnostic imaging devices. The advertisement showed the employees waiting for a busload of cancer survivors who had been screened by the company's device. The advertisement was emotionally charged and inspiring. It was apparent that the manufacturing employees were personally affected and probably experienced an increased commitment to the company product and organizational values. Private organizations may find value in activities or experiences that enhance workers' commitment to the product or services that the organization is involved in manufacturing or delivering.

Implications for Researcher

The research findings were helpful to the researcher in a variety of ways. She frequently provides training and consultation to both private and public organizations internationally. Being able to share the types of survivor emotional losses and their relationships to work behaviors is critical. She will be able to share how survivor loss areas may have bearing on the organizational return on investment (ROI).

It has been this researcher's experience that organizations blame the survivors for the conditions leading to the downsizing event and encourage them only by telling them they should be happy to have their jobs. Any acknowledgement of a survivor's emotional status or supervisors seeing a connection of their own behaviors to a ROI is almost non-existent.

This researcher believes that there are many supervisors and managers who value the human and psychological aspects of employees because this belief respects and values human beings. However, the remaining supervisors and managers may want to understand the emotional aspects of survivors and consider the importance of loss and use emotional intelligence skills because they will see an improved ROI. Thus, if managers and supervisors are more aware of the organization's emotional landscape and understand survivor emotions related to productivity, sabotage, and intention for flight, they will be more inclined to take emotional intelligence seriously. Consequently, they would be more motivated to coach their employees and reap the reward of an increased ROI.

Implications for Future Research

This study had an adequate samples size of 216 respondents. A larger sample of organizational survivors would provide further validation through additional populations and confirmatory factor analysis.

Future analysis evaluating the feelings of participants prior to the downsizing and following the downsizing will provide clarification if what the participant reported were actually "losses." Perhaps the reported "losses" were what the respondents perceived as "missing" prior to the downsizing event; perceptions that would be exacerbated and/or validated by the event. A pre-test and a post-test of the survey items would provide information whether it was actually the downsizing event that shaped the participants perceptions.

Future research regarding downsized survivors needs to continue regarding why some employees do better after the downsizing Does the personality style, culture and

type of the organization, type of supervisory style received, classification of jobs somehow affect participants' feelings and responses? Does the economy affect the participant survivors?

More research needs to be facilitated regarding the private sector. First a clear definition of a private company needs to be made so respondents can more accurately choose the organization type they are employed. Then, further research can be pursued to look at the survivors' emotional responses.

Research is needed to determine the motives and emotions of supervisors and managers. Are supervisors and managers unaware of the loss, behavior and ROI link? Or, do they simply lack the skills necessary to be more emotionally intelligent?

It would be interesting to facilitate a research design where human resource professionals were involved. What are their perspectives regarding survivor issues and supervisory styles?   Would human resource professionals provide additional insights to the emotional landscapes of individuals? What role does human resources have in developing supervisors and managers to be more emotionally intelligent?

Also, different research designs might bring more depth of understanding into the emotional landscape and downsizing issues of organizations. Perhaps a qualitative method that involves interviewing and evaluating thematic concepts would bring additional understanding. Implementing another quantitative study using a company that has not yet downsized would allow the research to facilitate a pre and a post survey, that way evaluating the impact of the downsizing event. A longitudinal study looking at the productivity, sabotage inclination, and intent for flight over a period of three years would provide the business practitioner with information to better manage survivors.

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Loss Areas Removed During Factor Rotation

Item removed	Iteration
I feel my employer values my work.	1
I'm waiting for the next shoe to fall in that I'm wondering if my job is next to go.	1
I'm almost certain that I will still be employed by the organization this time next year.	1
My opinion matters a great deal at work.	1
I feel I am really part of this organization.	1
I feel more included at work.	1
I don't fit in anymore.	1
I feel good about the work I do.	1
This is a fair organization.	1
Decisions made by upper management are unjust.	1
Hard work is still rewarded.	1
I believe the managers of this organization tell the truth.	1
The organization is fairer now.	1
My supervisor retaliated against me for disagreeing with recent changes.	1
I feel more isolated at work	2

Appendix B: Work Behavior Items Removed by Factor Rotation

Items Removed	Iteration
I use work time to find a new job.	1
I am more committed to my job than before.	1
I volunteer to do additional work.	1
I give 100%or more to my job.	1
I'm motivated to do a good job.	1
I rarely feel like going to work.	1
I'm more motivated than before.	1
My level of productivity has slipped.	2
I only do what it takes to get the job done.	2

Appendix C: Survey Items- Valid Percent Responses

Survey Items-Valid Percent Responses						
Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I am [less] empowered than ever to do job. *	3.2	10.2	15.3	18.1	26.4	26.9
I feel powerless at work.	9.7	13.0	12.0	21.8	26.4	17.1
I have very little control over decisions that affect my work.	9.3	9.7	12.5	15.7	25.9	26.9
It is almost impossible to keep up with work demands.	7.4	10.2	7.9	16.2	27.8	30.6
I feel [less] secure than ever about keeping my job. *	3.2	8.8	9.3	17.1	28.7	32.9
I am worried that this organization might go out of business.	31.5	15.3	13.4	10.6	13.9	15.3
I feel my employer [does not] value my work. *	10.2	20.8	17.1	14.4	21.8	15.7
My organization [does not have] a promising future. *	7.4	11.1	21.8	19.4	24.5	15.7
I'm almost certain that I will [not] be still employed by the org. this time next year. *	10.8	18.4	23.6	17.9	19.3	9.9
I have concerns about my ability to learn new job tasks.	28.3	23.1	8.0	11.8	13.7	15.1
I am not given the resources to learn new job tasks.	12.3	16.5	13.2	20.3	15.6	22.2
My job tasks are extremely overwhelming.	9.0	14.6	12.7	25.5	15.1	23.1
My opinion [does not] matter a great deal at work. *	3.8	12.7	19.3	19.3	22.2	22.6
I feel more isolated at work.	9.9	19.3	16.5	14.2	19.8	20.3
I feel lost without my support group at work.	11.8	22.6	22.2	16.0	11.3	16.0
I [do not] feel I am really a part of this organization. *	5.2	17.0	20.3	12.3	20.8	24.5
I [do not] feel more included at work. *	3.3	12.3	19.3	14.6	21.7	28.8
I don't "fit in" anymore at work.	13.9	30.3	20.2	6.7	8.2	20.7
My work are [does not] feel very comfortable. *	6.7	20.2	21.2	13.5	20.2	18.3
I feel like my work space has been violated.	14.4	26.9	20.2	11.1	12.0	15.4
My work space [does not]	5.3	13.0	19.7	17.8	18.8	25.5

feel like home. *						
I have a [decreased] sense that my work space is "mine". *	4.3	9.6	18.3	25.0	19.7	23.1
I [do not] feel good about the work I do. *	20.2	30.3	16.8	7.7	12.0	13.0
I am ashamed of my job position.	38.0	25.0	18.3	7.2	6.3	5.3
My job status is too low now.	17.8	27.4	24.0	10.6	10.1	10.1
I take [less] pride in my work than I did before. *	1.4	9.1	12.5	25.5	26.4	25.0
I spend a lot of work time doing personal things.	32.0	30.6	7.3	11.7	13.1	5.3
I [don't] work just as hard as I used to. *	23.8	31.1	7.8	6.8	13.6	17.0
I do the very minimum work necessary.	36.9	24.8	8.3	6.3	9.7	14.1
My level of productivity has slipped.	26.2	19.4	10.2	13.1	13.1	18.0
I [do not] work harder than I did before the downsizing. *	14.1	16.0	14.6	12.1	24.8	18.4
I will probably [not] stay at this organization. *	15.5	22.8	18.0	11.7	13.1	18.9
I use work time to find a new job.	42.2	19.9	8.3	10.2	10.7	8.7
If I learned that a good job was open in another company, I would pursue it.	7.8	12.1	8.7	18.9	23.8	28.6
I am thinking of quitting my job.	24.8	13.1	9.7	21.8	17.0	13.6
I am [less] committed to my job than before. *	5.3	12.6	10.2	20.9	30.1	20.9
I do only what it takes to get the job done.	29.6	21.4	10.2	10.7	14.1	14.1
This is a fair organization.	5.1	13.1	15.7	18.2	26.8	21.2
Decisions made by upper management are unjust.	7.1	10.6	17.7	23.7	17.7	23.2
I [do not] trust my supervisor. *	15.2	22.2	15.2	11.6	15.2	20.7
I [do not] trust management. *	4.0	10.1	16.2	15.2	22.7	31.8
Hard work is still rewarded.	5.1	11.6	12.6	15.7	29.8	25.3
I believe managers of this organization tell the truth.	4.5	12.1	12.1	19.2	20.7	31.3
I was offered adequate justification from managers for the downsizing decision.	4.5	18.2	10.6	13.6	23.2	29.8
The organization is [less] fair now. *	.5	3.5	4.5	25.8	28.8	36.9

I [do not] volunteer to do additional work. *	6.0	20.4	18.4	8.5	22.4	24.4
I [do not] give 100% or more at my job. *	28.9	25.4	11.4	6.0	10.9	17.4
I am [not] motivated to do a good job. *	21.9	23.9	14.9	8.0	11.9	19.4
I rarely feel like going to work.	15.4	18.4	13.4	13.4	21.9	17.4
I am [less] motivated than before. *	1.5	9.0	8.0	23.9	31.8	25.9
I am more likely to blame others now.	33.8	24.4	9.5	8.0	13.4	10.9
I'm [less] committed now to do the "right" thing. *	6.0	12.9	17.9	19.9	26.9	16.4
Sometimes I try to make my boss look bad.	51.7	16.9	5.5	4.0	10.0	11.9
I do things that hurt the organization.	56.7	14.4	3.0	4.0	9.0	12.9
I call in sick when I'm not.	44.3	16.9	3.5	10.9	8.5	15.9
I resist some of the new changes at work.	22.9	19.4	9.0	14.4	13.9	20.4
I pretend to do what I'm told.	44.8	17.9	4.5	7.5	10.0	15.4
I sabotage directives sometimes from management.	54.2	13.9	3.5	7.0	7.5	13.9
My supervisor [does not] talk to me when he/she knows that I'm upset. *	10.3	17.9	13.8	15.4	19.0	23.6
My supervisor [does not] understand what I have been through with the recent changes. *	8.2	18.5	11.3	18.5	16.9	26.7
My supervisor ignores me if I speak negatively about the recent changes.	13.4	20.6	19.1	17.5	13.9	15.5
My supervisor has retaliated against me for disagreeing with the recent changes.	40.0	16.4	8.7	11.3	9.2	14.4

Note. * indicates reversed items. Bracket insertions [ ] indicate relevant meanings of items after reverse codings.

Appendix D: Narrative Comments

Loss of Supervisory Support and Injustice

- Moving to a new work location, lack of training and absolutely no feedback from supervisors or management about job performance.
- Management just thinks we are dumb. Won't ask us how work should be done.
- Management doesn't tell the truth. I work for a large company. They mislead us and ignore us. This survey asks so many questions about working hard and working 100%. Don't you know how hard it is to work when no one talks to you and you know you are the next to go?
- I feel like upper management still doesn't get it. Their salaries are by far inflated and do not reflect the work that they do. They don't seem to care enough. The power needs to be given back to the principles.
- Seeing how the group leadership team is so quick to cut heads in order to protect their bonuses. I do not believe they value the work that many of the people have put forward in making the cogs turn.
- I was denied my bilingual stipend although I am a native speaker of a second language. Yet an Anglo person who doesn't speak the second language properly gets to keep his pay differential.
- Waiting for the other shoe to fall. No one is safe. Layoffs affect some work groups and not others. All groups should be treated equally. Staff and administration are very distinctly different groups in how they are treated. Leads to distrust when management says there were equal layoffs but we all know how to count. Not equal. On the other hand, they recognized that there may be angst about the whole episode and tried to address it. Not successfully, but I feel they tried. The admin was also under the eight ball so they were having their own issues which made it hard to deal with others.
- Why can't management talk to us about what is going to change and then let us help with the solution? They are totally stupid. I don't care about my job anymore.
- A new manager has no concept of what the sections do for work, or their missions.
- Total lack of communication coupled with perception that those who were laid off somehow deserved it.

- My supervisor won't talk to me. I know he is stressed out but so am I. The time he did talk to me, he told me that I should be happy I am still working.
- I feel alone. Managers get mad if you don't think everything is positive. I don't care what they think. I am no committed anymore and they will have to get used to it.
- Increase in workload, change in supervisor's temperament— increasingly hostile and stressed
- Give out misinformation or don't know what they are doing. Makes more work or others and we look like incompetent fools. It makes me ashamed.
- Management won't talk to us.
- Losing good people, only to get approval to fill their positions again several months later after they were laid off. This was due to an inexperienced management team who had never dealt with significant layoffs before and didn't understand the process well at all. We tried to explain it to them-they summarily dismissed what we were trying to say. We've also seen a real attitude shift in agency management-rather than inspiring people to do their best, the message lately is basically "you should be glad you have a job."
- The continued tolerance of incompetence at the executive level while eliminating worker-bee positions. This not only rewarded incompetence, it punished the competent by creating more work for them with fewer people to accomplish it. Senior management did not tell the employees the full and complete truth about the management and poor decisions that contributed to the need to downsize. They broke faith with the good people of the organization, which is the primary reason I decided to leave.
- How come management doesn't get laid off?
- I don't know what's happening really at my company.
- My supervisor ignores me now. Not sure why.
- Yes, they keep hiring more managers of all kinds and no workers.
- Management told me to work harder and to be happy I have a job. That doesn't help me nor support me.
- After the layoffs, our talented, hard-working employees eventually left voluntarily (for better opportunities) and the more senior, inept employees retained their higher-tier positions, continuing to make poor decisions with degrade the morale, work environment, perks, effectiveness, etc. of people like me in positions below them.

Guilt and Support Group

- The feeling of guilt of helping to make the decision to downsize certain people.
- We lost people with long standing knowledge of some systems. Trouble shooting issues in this area is more challenging.
- Tired of being so stressed out at work. I can't concentrate. People stopped caring.
- It is absurd to try to run an organization with the cascading effects of layoffs due to "bumping" by those with more seniority. Work gets done by individuals who have experience, knowledge, and relationships. Once thrown out these things are not readily replaced. Another effect: young talent is discarded.
- Every year they keep depleting the classified staff at our organization (every year for the past 5 years). It is at the point where there are only one maybe two people in each direct department. They fill lost positions with student workers, which creates confusion.
- Saying good bye to the wonderful team mates I've worked with for years.
- Too many key personnel were released causing chaos and confusion in the days immediately following the event. More consideration should have gone into the process.
- The most challenging thing for me is seeing a 20 plus year employee with the organization let go because of the budget (which we have no control over) and then have the position filled by someone else who isn't as familiar with the duties or needs of the people the position serves. A huge challenge is waiting for a new person to learn the job of a really experienced person who was laid off.
- Once everything was moved, they utilized our staff to train the new staff, and then they were let go. (They did get a severance package and job counseling). What was devastating is that it didn't matter that any one of those employees was an excellent employee, they were gone. This was emotionally challenging to not only them but to my co-workers and me. We all wondered what department or who would be next? Moral was very low with little trust left for our employer. The remaining staff still doesn't fully trust our employer.

- Working with new people who weren't used to working with someone with a disability. Some thinking I kept my job because I was in a "protected" class.
- That important people who did their work with professionalism and enjoyed helping were let go, while other newer employees that have no professionalism, no work ethic, etc. remain. It's very difficult to remain positive while others are undermining co-workers and the company.
- Accepting the absence of coworkers that I considered to be friends.
- Our division/my supervisor took on two programs for which we did not have responsibility before when their director's position was cut. Also, it is evident that support services that we rely on from other divisions are under more stress to provide what we need from them.
- Lack of respect and lack of communication. No one told us what was going on. Just one morning people I had worked with for years were gone and everything changed. That's messed up.
- A co-worker was laid off and reacted with great hostility, blaming me for still having a job and benefits. Then her lay-off was rescinded and she was fully reinstated. Our relationship can never be the same.
- Had to downsize people who worked for me, based on my forced stack-ranking of my staff. Did not know that my stack-ranking was going to be used for purpose of layoffs. Feel forced to stay due to loan taken against my 401K; if I leave I have to pay back in full, and can't afford that.
- At work, increased workload, feeling guilty and bad for the individuals who were laid off, frustration and stress, wondering if I would also lose my job. Generally there were several weeks where morale was pretty low and everyone felt fairly gloomy.

Sabotage

- Started feeling emotionally sick. Had trouble controlling my bowels, but I taught those bastards. I saved it for them. Left them several surprises throughout the office. They had to hire special cleaners to get rid of the smell, but stains are still there. After the cleaning, I waited a week and did it again. That'll teach them. Wait until they see what I do next.
- I have a position description. With the layoffs my position description no longer applies. I am also a supervisor, but I do little

supervisory work now because there is no chance even all the important things can be accomplished with our current staffing levels. I am essentially a front line employee now by my own choice to keep the department functional. I also do not want to be too successful at getting things accomplished, because we need to replace the positions as soon as possible, pain must be felt by the decision makers. By the way in my organization, administration took no cuts.

- Everyone started whispering more…fear of surveillance…not knowing who to trust. One person defecated on her supervisors' lawn in a drunken expression of her contempt for the process. We watched, we laughed and then ran like hell. We are cowards and want to keep or jobs. I am sorry I shard that; my friend and co-worker would be so embarrassed.

- I feel underappreciated. A cog in the system. These bastards don't care. I want to get back at them. I am thinking of ways. Going to overflow the toilets. If they want to treat us like shit, they can clean up the shit. Assholes.

Workload

- Assumed additional responsibilities, did not present additional challenges beyond an increased workload.

- I'm doing the work of two people.

- Additional workload. Morale is down in office. Tension in office atmosphere. Everyone on edge, waiting for the next layoff to happen.

- Taking on more responsibility when a counterpart of mine was laid off. I was given much more responsibility and travel time away from home but no change in title or compensation to make up for it.

- There are fewer people, who are also less available, to provide me assistance with my job responsibilities. The amount of work I can get done has decreased.

- More work for me to pick up for those who left and fewer staff. New people to bring up to speed. Everyone around me more stressed and not much able to help pick up slack for each other. People working very hard without much hope of getting caught up-which is demoralizing.

- Assuming job duties of at least one additional employee while retaining my old job duties. As a result, it's virtually impossible to

get everything completed. When I tell them that I'm overwhelmed, they keep telling me that "we're going to get to it" but nothing has changed in over a year.

- Increased workload-especially cleaning up work inherited from another.
- Have to do three other person's jobs after they were laid off…
- Workload increased! Other personnel reassigned from within the organization and have bitter feelings because of what has happened in their change. Told to do more but no overtime to go along with the increase of work.
- The level of stress for me and co-workers has increased, in addition to tension among my co-workers. We who are left at work have absorbed more duties and responsibilities to make up for a lesser number of employees. Some days we are exhausted when we leave work by the amount of work we accomplished during the work day.
- The increased work load with the increased responsibility and not enough time to be as efficient ad work within deadlines as I'd like. I'm an "almost" perfectionist so not being able to take the extra time to check my work makes me feel like I'm not doing my job.
- Filling in and doing the job duties of the person that left. Already short-staffed and workload was already overwhelming.
- The whole office felt the stress. We lost 8 positions, 1 of those was vacant so no one lost a job but those duties had to be absorbed by others. When the position losses were announced, it was very tense for a while, but our group has come through it.
- Increased work load due to short staff. Same output expected. New tasks not ordinarily assigned, etc.
- Increased work load due to technical requirements.
- We have more people to serve and less coworkers to do that with…we had 3 full time and 4 part time people when I started here and now we have 2 full time and one 1/3 part time, and 1 part time and like I stated above almost twice the amount of people to wait on.
- Taking on more work and the cost of living and everything costs more and no promotions easily so more work, less pay, and the future is not more benefits or money, but just to be able to say "I have a Job" is about all you can get and I am happy to be working. What else can on say. Don't tell me to spend more to help the economy when I don't know if I will ever see sending my child to

school. But some minority besides the white minority and your kids can go to school almost free. But not mine; she is only the daughter of a herd working white single mom.

- Heavier work load
- Losing qualified people who were good with the population we serve. HR is overwhelmed; mostly administration has to do more with less.
- A much higher work load.
- Taking on responsibilities I specifically said I did not want to have because no one thought through how the changes would affect what needs to get done. I now have a new manager and have to start AGAIN with my goals and have to once again reprove myself.

Other

- Looking for a job I love
- Will get resolved, but at this point I don't see that happening. I go to work, with the best attitude I can every day. I actually love what I do. I enjoy the people I work with and I enjoy our customers. I just wish that there was a bit less of it so that I could help my customers, my employer, and me to be more successful.
- Due to rules seeing some of the best people laid off just because they were hired later than others.
- The realization that I might have to start over at 48…this will be the third time. I would love to stay here the rest of my life but the changes taking place are significant enough to make me reconsider. How can I possible ever retire?
- Seeing how the lazy people are protected and not the better employees who got laid off was particularly challenging.
- Less services are offered to our clients.
- I'm not certain what I can do to change this, which is challenging because it adds to a feeling of hopelessness.
- 1. Watching the jobs that we did well be shipped overseas AND being asked to train those people to take our jobs, 2. Watching the company save money by converting full time benefit employees to full or part time temporary employees with no benefits.
- Morale has plummeted. More duties are delegated from the supervisor.
- My department would be more effective and efficient if 4 more people were cut and we changed the way we do business. We

could do so much better and it would cut the budget by modernizing the process.

- No changes!
- Living and working away from family.
- Very little has changed.
- Loss of technical expertise and consolidation of job responsibilities also blow to employee morale.
- There really weren't any challenges that I experienced. As a result of downsizing and subsequent reorganization, I gained 5 positions. This is my first management responsibility so the only challenge I'm experiencing is that of this new responsibility.
- Losing my trust in the company's ability to stay open for business- and worrying that I will lose my job next without warning. We also have had pay cuts in addition to the layoffs, will not get raises this year, and will probably experience ANOTHER pay cut this year.
- I feel that our downsizing was a direct result of our supervisor not being able to handle a personnel problem so the easiest target was selected for having their position eliminated and it was justified by budget cuts and the percentages this person spent on their duties— this person did not do their job well for many years, and it resulted in personnel problems…I just feel the whole thing was not honest.

References

Abell, N., Springer, D. W., & Kamata, A. (2009). *Developing and validating rapid assessment instruments*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 62*, 335-343.

Alivinia, S.M., Molenaar, D., & Burdorf, A. (2009). Productivity loss in the workforce: Associations with health, work demands, and individual characteristics. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine, 521*, 49-56.

Allen, T. D., Freeman, D. M., Russell, J. E. A., Reizenstein, R. C., & Rentz, J. O. (2001). Survivor reactions to organizational downsizing: Does time ease the pain? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology 7*(4), 145-164.

Allison, J. A., & Raju, N. S. (2001). Review of employment values inventory. In *The fourteenth mental measurements yearbook*. Retrieved from http://www.unl.edu/buros/.

Ambrose, M., Seabright, M., A., & Schminke, M. (2002) Sabotage in the workplace: The role of organizational injustice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 89,* (1), 947-965.

Amundson, N. E., Borgen, William, A., Jordan, S., & Erlebach, A. C. (2004). Survivors of downsizing: Helpful and hindering experiences. *The Career Development Quarterly, 54*, 256-271.

Analoui, F. (1995). Workplace sabotage: Its styles, motives and management. *Journal of Management Development, 14* (7), 48-65.

Anderson, C., Keltner, D., & John, O. (2003). Emotional convergence between people over time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84,* 1054-1068.

Antonacopoulou, E. P., & Gabriel, Y. (2001). Emotion, learning and organizational change: Towards an integration of psychoanalytic and other perspectives. *Journal of Organizational Change 14, (*5) 435-451.

Appelbaum, S. H., Close, T., G., & Klasa, S. (1999). Downsizing: An explanation of some successes and more failures. *Management Decisions, 37* (5), 424-436.

Appelbaum, S. H., & Patton, E. (2002). Downsizing the university: bonne chance! *The International Journal of Educational Management,16*(3), 126-136.

Aquino, K., & Douglas, S. (2003). Identity threat and antisocial behavior in organizations: The moderating effects of individual differences, aggressive modeling, and hierarchal status. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 90*, 195-208.

Archibald, W. P. (2009). Globalization, downsizing and insecurity: Do we need to upgrade Marx's theory of alienation? *Critical Sociology, 35*(3), 319-342.

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1978). *Organizational learning*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Arlbjorn, J. S., Freytag, P. V., & de Haas, H. (2011). Service supply chain management: A survey of lean application in the municipal sector. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, 41*(3), 277-295.

Armstrong-Stassen, M. (1993). Survivors reactions to a workforce reduction: A comparison of blue collar workers and their supervisors. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 10*, 334-343.

Armstrong-Stassen, M. (1997). The effect of repeated downsizing and surplus designation on remaining managers: An exploratory study. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping: An International Journal , 10*(4), 377-384.

Armstrong-Stassen, M. (1998). Downsizing and the federal government. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 15,* 310-321.

Armstrong-Stassen, M. (2002). Designated redundant but escaping lay-off: A special group of lay-off survivors. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75*, 1-13.

Armstrong-Stassen, M. A., Wagar, T. H., & Cattaneo, J. (2004). Work-group membership (in) stability and survivors' reactions to organization downsizing. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34,* 2023-2044.

Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert, R. M. (2005). *Social psychology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management, 34* (3), 325-374.

Baines, A. (1997). Productivity improvement. *Work Study, 46*(2), 49-51.

Bajawa, A., & Woodall, J. (2006). Equal opportunity and diversity management meet downsizing. *Employee Relations, 28* (1), 46-61.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman.

Barner, R. (2008). The dark tower: Using visual metaphors to facilitate emotional expression during organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 21*(1), 120-137.

Bell, E., & Nkomo, S. (2001). *Our separate ways: Black and white women and the struggle for identity*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85* (3), 349-360.

Berger, P. M., & Schneck, G. R. (2001). Review of Selby MillSmith Value Indices. In *The fourteenth mental measurements yearbook.* Retrieved from http://www.unl.edu/buros/.

Blaikie, N. (2003). *Analyzing quantitative data.* London, UK: Sage.

Blaikie, N. (2010). *Analyzing quantitative data.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Blau, G. (2006). A process model of understanding victim responses to worksite/function closure. *Human Resource Management Review (16*), 12-28.

Boelen, P. A., & Lensvelt-Mulders, G. J. (2005). Psychometric properties of the grief cognitions questionnaire (GCQ).*Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment,* (27), 4, 291-303.

Bolton, B., & Camara, W. J. (1995). Review of work skills series production. In *The twelfth mental measurements yearbook.* Retrieved from http://www.unl.edu/buros/.

Bono, J. E., & Ilies, R. (2006). Charisma, positive emotions and mood contagion. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17,* 317-334.

Bordia, P., Hobman, E., Jones, E., Gallois, C., & Callan, V. J. (2004). Uncertainty during organizational change: Types, consequences, and management strategies. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 18*(4), 507-532.

Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss: Sadness and depression*. New York, NY: Penguin.

Brockner, J., Grover, S., O'Malley, M. N., Reed, T. F., & Glynn, M. A. (1993). Threat of future layoffs, self-esteem, and survivors' reactions: Evidence from the laboratory and the field. *Strategic Management Journal, 14,* 153-66.

Brandes, P., Castro, S. L., James, M. L., Martinex, A. D. , Matherly, T. A. , & Ferris, G. R. (2008). The interactive effects of job insecurity and organizational cynicism on work effort following a layoff. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 14*, 233-247.

Bridges, W. (1991). *Managing transitions: Making the most of change*. Reading, MA: Perseus Books.

Bridges, W. (2004). *Transitions: Making sense of life's changes*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

Brouwer, W.B.F., van Exel, N.J.A., Koopmanschap, M.A., & Rutten, F.F.H. (2002). Productivity costs before and after absence from work: As important as common? *Health Policy, 61*(2), 173-187.

Brown, S. R. (2006). A match made in heaven: A marginalized methodology for studying the marginalized. *Quality & Quantity, 40*, 361-382.

Brown, T. (1995). The emotional side of management. *Industry Week, 9*, 30-39.

Bryant, M. (2006). Talking about change: Understanding employee responses through qualitative research. *Management Decisions, 44*(2), 246-258.

Burke, R. J. & Greenglass, E. R. (2000). Hospital restructuring and nursing staff well- being: The role of coping. *International Journal of Stress Management, 7*, 49-59.

Burke, W. W. (2008). *Organizational change*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Callahan, J. L., & McCollum, E. E. (2002). Conceptualizations of emotion research in organizational contexts. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 4(*1), 4-21.

Cameron, K. S., Freeman, S. J., & Mishra, A. K. (1993). Organizational downsizing. In G. P. Huber & W. H. Glick (Eds.), *Organizational change and redesign: Ideas and insights for improving performance* (pp 19-65). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cameron, S. J., Horsburgh, M. E., & Armstrong, M. (1996). The impact of organizational downsizing on the job satisfaction of nurses. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Administration, 9*(4), 8-32.

Cappelli, P. (1992). Examining Managerial Displacement. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*(1), 203-217.

Carlson, J. F., & Law, J. (2005). Review of Work Personality Index. In *The sixteenth mental measurements yearbook*. Retrieved from http://www.unl.edu/buros/.

Carr, A. (2001). Understanding emotion and emotionality in a process of change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management (14)* 5, 421-434.

Carr, S. C., Powell, V., Knezovic, M., Munro, D., & MacLachlan, M. (1996). Measuring motivational gravity: Likert or scenario scaling? *Journal of Managerial Psychology (11)*, 5, 43-47.

Cascio, W., F., & Young, C. E. (2003). Financial consequences of employment-change decisions in major U.S. corporations. In K. P. DeMeuse & M. L. Marks (Eds*.), Resizing the organization* (pp. 131-156). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cervone, D. (2000). Thinking about self-efficacy. *Behavioral Modification, 24* (1), 30-56.

Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2004). General self-efficacy and self-esteem: Toward theoretical and empirical distinction between correlated self –evaluations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, (25),* 375-395.

Chiu, R. K., & Francesco, A. (2003). Dispositional traits and turnover intention: Examining the mediating role of job satisfaction and affective commitment. *International Journal of Manpower, 24*3, 284-298.

Clair, J. A., & Dufresne, R. L. (2004**).** Playing the grim reaper: How employees experience carrying out a downsizing. *Human Relations, 57* (12), 1597-1625.

Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment, 7*(3), 309-319.

Cobb, AT, & Wooten, KC (1998). The role social accounts can play in a justice intervention. In W. A. Pasmore and R. W. Woodman (Eds)., *Research in organizational change and development* (pp 243-295). New York, NY: JAI Press.

Cooper, R., K., & Sawaf, A. (1997). *Executive EQ: Emotional intelligence in leadership and organizations*. New York, NY: Grosset Putnam.

Corbett, J., M., & Lee, J. (2006). The impact of downsizing on employee's affective commitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21* (3), 179-199.

Cornelius, R. R. (1996). *The science of emotion: Research and tradition in the psychology of emotion.* Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Corneo, G., & Rafael, R. (2003). Working in public and private firms. *Journal of Public Economics (87),* 1335-1352.

Cox, A. A., & Tirre, W. C. (2001). Review of the Endicott Work Productivity Scale. In *The fourteenth mental measurements yearbook*. Retrieved from http://www.unl.edu/buros/.

Cox, J. (1997). Manufacturing the past: Loss and absence in organizational change. *Organization Studies, 18*(4), 623-654.

Crino, M. D. *(*1994*)*. Employee sabotage: A random or preventable phenomenon. *Journal of Management Issues* 6*(3),* 311-330.

Cross, B., & Travaglione, A. (2004). The times they are – changing: Who will stay and who will go in a downsizing organization? *Personnel Review 33*(3), 275-290.

Darwin, E. A. (1872). The expression of the emotions in man and animals. Londo, UK: John Murray.

Dean, C. C. (1997). The principles of scientific management by Fred Taylor. *Journal of Management History, 3*(1), 4-40.

Dekker, S., & Schaufeli, W. (1995). The effects of job insecurity on psychological health and withdrawal: A longitudinal study. *Australian Psychologist, 30*, 57-63.

DeMoura, G. R., Abrams, D., Retter, C., Gunnardsdottir, S., & Ando, K. (2009). Identification as an organizational anchor: How identification and job satisfaction combine to predict turnover intention. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 3*(4), 540-557.

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Devine, K., Reay, T., Stainton, L., & Collins-Nakai, R. (2003). Downsizing outcomes: Better a victim than a survivor? *Human Resource Management, 42* (2), 109-124.

Dunteman, G. (1989). *Principle component analysis.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ekman, P., Friesen, W. V., O'Sullivan, M., Chan, A., Diacoyanni-Tarlatzis, L., Heider, K., Krause, R., LeCompte, W. A., Pitcairn, T., Ricci-Bitti, P. E., Scherer, K. R., Tomita, M., & Tzavaras, A. (1987). Universals and cultural differences in the judgments of facial expressions of emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*(4), 712-717.

Elders, M. A., Eilam, G., & Shamir, B. (2005). Organizational change and self-concept threats. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 41*(4), 399-421.

Elders, M. M. (1995). Theory and present thing in bereavement. *Issues in Psychoanalytic Psychology, 17*(1), 67-83.

Ellen, A. S., & Jenkins, J. A. (2007). [Review of the OAD Survey]. In *The seventeenth mental measurements yearbook.* Retrieved from http://www.unl.edu/buros/.

Emler, N. (2005). Life course transitions and social identity change. *Advances in Life Course Research, 10,* 197-215.

Endicott, J., & Nee, J. (1997). Endicott Work productivity scale (EWPS): A new measure to assess treatment effects. *Psychopharmacology Bulletin, 33*(1), 13-16.

Eriksson, C. B. (2004). The effects of changes programs on employees' emotions. *Personnel Review, 33, (*1) 110-126.

Farhad, A. (1995). Workplace sabotage: Its styles, motives and management. *Journal of Management Development, 14*, (7) 48-65.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fineman, S. (2006). Emotion and organizing. In S. Clegg & C. Hardy (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (pp. 675-699). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fitzpatrick, R., & Reinehr, R. C. (1995). Review of assessing specific competencies. In *The twelfth mental measurements yearbook.* Retrieved from http://www.unl.edu/buros/.

Folger, R., & Skarlicki, D. P. (1999). Unfairness and resistance to change: Hardship as mistreatment. *Journal of Organizational Change, 12*(1), 35-50.

Fong, K., & Kleiner, B. H. (2004). New development concerning the effect of work overload on employees. *Management Research News, 27*(4), 9-16.

Fortunato, V. J., & Stone-Romero. (1999). Taking the strain out of negative affectivity: Development and initial validation of scores on a strain –free measure of negative affectivity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 59* (1), 77-97.

Fox, S. & Spector, P. E. (2002).Emotions in the workplace: The neglected side of organizational life introduction. *Human Resources Management Review (12*), 167-171.

Fox, S., & Spector, P. E. (2002).Emotions in the workplace: The neglected side of organizational life introduction. *Human Resources Management Review, 12*, 167-171.

Freud, S. (1917). *Mourning and melancholy. In the complete psychological work of Sigmund Fred* (Vol 14). New York, NY: Norton.

Fugate, M. M., Kinicki, A.J., & Scheck, C.L. (2002). Coping with a merger over four stages. *Personnel Psychology, 55,* 905-28.

Gabriel, Y. (1998). Psychoanalytic contributions to the study of the emotional life of organizations. *Administration & Society, 30,* (3), 292-315.

Giacalone, R. A., & Rosenfeld, P. (1987). Justifications and procedures for implementing institutional review boards in business organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 6*(5), 399-411.

Gilliland, S. (2008). The tails of justice: A critical examination of the dimensionality of organizational justice constructs. *Human Resources Management Review, 18*, 271-281.

Gilson, C., Hurd, F., & Wagar, T. (2004). Creating a concession climate. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 15,* 1056-1068.

Goldsworthy, K. K. (2005). Grief and loss theory in social work practice: All changes involve loss, just as all losses require change. *Australian Social Work, 58, (*2), 167-178.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence.* New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2001). Primal Leadership: The hidden driver of great performance. *Harvard Business Review,* 43-51.

Griswold, M. (2007, December 17). CertainTeed downsizing siding. *Plastics News, 19*(42), 3-20.

Grossi, G., Theorell, T., Jurisoo, M, & Setterlind, S. (1999). Psychophysiological correlates of organizational change and threat of unemployment among police inspectors. *Integrative Physiological and Behavioral Science, 34,* 30-42.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through design of work. *Organizational behavior and human performance, 16*, 250-79.

Hayes, J. (2007). *The theory and practice of change management* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Herold, D. M., Fedor, D. B., & Caldwell, S. D. (2007). Beyond change management: A multilevel investigation of contextual and personal influences on employees' commitment to change. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(4), 942-951.

Heinonen, J., & Toivonen, J. (2008). Corporate entrepreneurs or silent followers? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 29, (*7), 583-598.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B.B. (1959), *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). NY, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Hiroto, D.S., & Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). Generality of learned helplessness in man. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31*2, 311-327.

Holden, R. J. (2010). Lean thinking in emergency departments: A critical review. *Annals of Emergency Medicine,57*(3), 265-277.

Hotho, S. (2008). Professional identity- product of structure, product of choice. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 21*(6), 721-742.

Hughes, J. L. (2000). Avoidance of emotional pain during downsizing in a public agency. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 52*(4), 256-268.

Hutchinson, J. C., Murrmann, S. K., & Murrmann, K.F. (1997). Planning and implementing an effective downsizing program. *International Journal of Hospitality Management. 16*(1), 23-58.

Hwang, B., Liao, P., & Leonard, M. P. (2010). Performance and practice use comparisons: Public vs. private owner projects. *KSCE Jouranl of Civil Engineering,(15)6,* 957.

Iacovini, J. (1993). The human side of organization change. *Training and Development, 47*(1), 65-8.

Ito, J. K. & Brotheridge, C. M. (2007). Exploring the predictors and consequences of job insecurity's components. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(1), 40-64.

Izard, D. (1977). *Human emotions*. New York, NY: Plenum.

Jacobs, R. L. (2002). Institutionalizing organizational change through cascade training. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 26*,177-182.

Jalajas, P. S. & Bommer, M. (1996). The effect of downsizing on the behaviors and motivations of survivor. *Organizational Development Journal, 14*(2), 45-54.

Jenkins, J. A., & Moore, E. (2007). Review of the test Achievement Motivation Inventory. In *The seventeenth mental measurements yearbook.* Retrieved from http://www.unl.edu/buros/.

Jian, G. (2007). Unpacking unintended consequences in planned organizational change: A process model. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*(1), 5-28.

Jimmieson, N. L., Terry, D. J., & Callan, V. J. (2004). A longitudinal study of employee adaption to organizational change: The role of change –related information and change-related self efficacy. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 9* (1), 11-27.

Jones, G. R. (1998). *Organizational theory: Text and cases* (2nd ed.). Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley.

Kalimo, R., Taris, T. W., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2003). The effects of past and anticipated future downsizing on survivor well being. *Journal of Organizational Health Psychology, 8*(2), 91-109.

Katayama, H., & Bennett, D. (1999). Agility, adaptability and leanness: A comparison of concepts and a study of practice. *International Journal of Production Economics, 60-61,* 43-51.

Katzell, A., & Thompson, D. (1990). Work motivation theory and practice. *American Psychologist, 45*2, 144-153.

Kerr, R., Garvin, J., Heaton, N., & Boyle, E. (2005). Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 27*(4), 265-279.

Kets de Vries, M.V., & Balazs, K. (1997). The downside of downsizing. *Human Relations, 50*, 11-40.

Keyton, J., & Smith, F. L. (2009). Distrust in leaders: Dimensions, patterns, and emotional intensity. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 16*(1), 6-18.

Kiefer, T. (2002). Understanding the emotional experience of organizational change: Evidence from a merger. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 4* (1), 39-61.

Kiefer, T. (2005). Feeling bad: Antecedents and consequences of negative emotions in ongoing change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior (26)*, 875-897.

Kim, H. (2008). Examining the role of informational justice in the wake of downsizing from an organizational relationship management perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 88*, 297-312.

Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., & Purcell, J. (1997). Downsizing: Is it always lean and mean? *Personnel Review, 27(*4) 296-311.

Kivimaki, M., Vahtera, J., Elovainio, M., Pentti, J., & Virtanen, M. (2003). Human costs of organizational downsizing: Comparing health trends between leavers and stayers. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 32*(1), 57-67.

Knudsen, H. K., Johnson, J.A., Martin, J. K., & Roman, P.M. (2003). Downsizing survival: The experience of work and organizational commitment. *Sociological Inquiry, 73*(2), 265-283.

Kubler-Ross, E. (1969). *On death and dying*. New York, NY: MacMillan.

Kubler-Ross, E., & Kessler, D. (2005). *On grief and grieving.* New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Kusy, M., & Holloway, E. (2009) *Toxic workplace!: Managing toxic personalities and their systems of power.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass.

Labib, N., & Appelbaum, S. H. (1994). The impact of downsizing practices on corporate success. *Journal of Management Development, 13*(7), 59-84.

Lam, C. F., & Gurland, S. T. (2008). Self determined work motivation predicts job outcomes, what predicts self-determined work motivation? *Journal of Research in Personality, 42* (4), 1109-1115.

LaMarsh, J. (2009). How companies reduce the downside of downsizing. *Global Business and Organizational Exellence, 10,* 7-16.

Lee, T. W., & Mowday, R. T. (1987). Voluntarily leaving an organization: An empirical investigation of Steers and Mowday's model of turnover. *Academy of Management Journal, 30,* (4), 721-743.

Levinson, H. (2000, September-October). Easing the pain of personal loss. *Harvard Business Review*, 80-88.

Locke, E. A., Cartledge, N., & Koeppel, J. (1968). Motivational effects of knowledge of results. *Psychological Bulletin, 70* (6), 474-485.

Lu, K., Lin, P., Wu, C., Hsieh, Y., & Chang, Y. (2002). The relationship among turnover intentions, professional commitment, and job satisfaction of hospital nurses. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 18*(4), 214-219.

Lundberg, C. C., & Young, C. A. (2001). A note on emotions and consultancy. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 6*(14), 530-538.

Luthans, B. C., & Sommer, S. M. (1999). The impact of downsizing on workplace attitudes. *Group and Organizational Management, 24,* 46-80.

Maertz, C. P., Wiley, J. W., LeRouge, C., & Campion, M. A. (2010). Downsizing effects on survivors: Layoffs, off shoring, and outsourcing. *Industrial Relations, 49*(2), 275-285.

Mandler, G. (1975). *Mind and emotion*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Mansour-Cole, D. M., & Scott, S. G. (1998). Hearing it through the grapevine: The influence of source, leader-relationsand legitimacy on survivors' fairness perceptions. *Personnel Psychology, 51,* 25-54.

Maquire, T. O., Romaniuk, E. W., & MacRury, K. A. (1982). The development and validation of an instrument to assess student attitudes towards work. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 42,* 643-649.

Marks, M. L. (2003). *Charging back up the hill*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Marks, M. L. (2006). Workplace recovery after mergers, acquisitions, and downsizings: Facilitating individual adaptation to major organizational transitions. *Organizational Dynamics, 35* (4)*,* 384-399.

Marks, M. L. (2007). A framework for facilitating adaption to organizational transition. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 20*(5), 721-739.

Marks, M. L., & De Meuse, K. P. (2005). Resizing the organization: Maximizing the gain while minimizing the pain of layoffs, divestitures, and closings. *Organizational Dynamics*, *34*, 19-35.

Marks, M. L., & Vansteenkiste, R. (2008). Preparing for organizational death: Proactive HR engagement in organizational transition. *Human Resource Management, 47*(4), 809-827.

McIntosh, J. (2010, May 23). Top sources may be done with their downsizing. *Furniture Today*. Retrieved from http://www.furnituretoday.com/article/528778-Top_sources_may_be_done_with_their_downsizing.php?intref=sr

McKinley, W., & Scherer, A., G. (2000). Some unanticipated consequences of organizational restructuring. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(4), 735-752.

Mentzer, M. S. (2005). Toward a psychological and cultural model of downsizing. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26(*1), 993-997.

Mescon, M. H., Albert, M., & Khedouri, F. (1985). Management: Individual and organizational effectiveness. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Milligan, M. J. (2003). Loss of site: Organizational site moves as organizational deaths. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 23* (6, 7), 115-152.

Mishra, A. K., & Mishra, K. E. (1994). The role of mutual trust in effective downsizing strategies. *Uman Resource Management, 33,* 261-279.

Mishra, B., Bhaskar, A. U., & Khurana, A. (2007). Development of organizational change questionnaire. *Global Business Review* (8), 1, 87-97.

Morrison, W. W., Wolef, E., & Milliken F. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(4)*,* 706-725.

Moss Kanter, R. (1984). Managing the human side of change. In *The Organizational Behavior Reader* (pp. 676-682). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee organizational linkages.* San Francisco, CA: Academic Press.

Muchinsky, P. M. (2000). Emotions in the workplace: The neglect of organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior (21*), 801-805.

Muchinsky, P. M., & Schmidt, F. (2005). Review of Employee Screening Questionnaire. In *The sixteenth mental measurements yearbook.* Retrieved from http://www.unl.edu/buros/.

Murray, J. A. (2001). Loss as a universal concept: A review of the literature to identify common aspects of loss in diverse situations. *Journal of Loss and Trauma (6),* 219-241.

Myers, D. G. (2007). *Psychology.* New York: NY: Worth Publishers.

Nair, S., K. (2008). Organizational downsizing: A study of survivor attitudes. *The Icfai Journal of Organizational Behavior, 7*(1), 23-40.

Namsbury, R. S. (2010). Review of the Employment Values Inventory. In *The eighteenth mental measurements yearbook.* Retrieved from http://www.unl.edu/buros/.

Neher, A. (1991). Maslow's theory of motivation: A critique. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology ,31* (3), 89-112.

Neimeyer, R. A. (1999). *Lessons in loss: A guide to coping.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Neimeyer, R. A. (2000). *Lessons of loss: A guide to coping.* Memphis, TN: University of Memphis.

Nemeth, C.J. (1997). Managing innovation: When less is more. *California Management Review, 40,*(1), 59-74.

Nicholas, J., & Soni, A. (2006). *The portal to lean production: Principles and practices for doing more with less.* Boca Raton, FL: Auerbach.

Noer, D. M. (1990, March 3). Layoff survivor sickness: A new challenge for supervisors. *Supervisory Management.*

Noer, D. M. (1993). *Healing the wounds.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Noer, D. M. (1997. Layoff survivor sickness: What it is and what to do about it. In M.K. Gowing, J.D. Kraft, & J. C. Quick (Eds.).*The new organizational reality* (pp. 207-220). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Northouse, P. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice* (4th ed.). London, UK: Sage.

Nunnally, Jr. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Obilade, S. (2009, Winter). Motivating downsizing survivors in small businesses. *Southern Business Review,* 19-35.

Oreg, S. (2003). Resistance to change: Developing an individual differences measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(4), 680-693.

Park, J., & Kim, T. H. (2009). Do types of organizational culture matter in nurse satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Leadership in Health Services, 22*(1), 28-38.

Parkes, C. M. (1988). Bereavement as a psychosocial transition: Process of adaptation to change. *Journal of Social Issues, 44*(3), 53-65.

Paterson, J. M. & Cary, J. (2002). Organizational justice, change anxiety, and acceptance of downsizing: Preliminary tests of an AET-based model. *Motivation and Emotion, 26*(1), 83-102.

Paulsen, N., Callan, V., Grice, T. A., Rooney, D., Gallios, C., Jones, E., Jimmieson, N.L., & Bordia, P. (2005). Job uncertainty and personal control during downsizing: A comparison of survivors and victims. *Human Relations, 58 (*4), 463-496.

Pearlstein, S. (1994). Corporate cutbacks yet to pay off. *The Washington Post*, p. 86.

Petzall, B.J., Parker, G. E., & Stoebert, P. A. (2000). Another side to downsizing: Survivors' behaviors and self-affirmation. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 14*(4), 593-603.

Pfeffer, J. (2010). Lay off the layoffs. *Newsweek, 155*(7), 32-37.

Pintrich, P.R., Smith, D.A.F., Garcia. T., & Mckeachie, W.J. (1993, Autumn*).* Reliability and predictive validity of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ). *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *53*, 801-813.

Prigerson, H. G., Maciejewski, P.K., Reynolds, C. F., Bierhals A. J., Newsom, J. T., Fasiczka, A., Frank, E., Doman, J., & Miller, M. (1995). Inventory of complicated grief: A scale to measure maladaptive symptoms of loss. *Psychiatry Research (59).* 65-79.

Prussia, G.E., Anderson, & J.S., Manz, C.C. (1998, September). Self-leadership and performance outcomes: The mediating influence of self-efficacy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *19*(5), 523-538.

Pultchik, R. (1982). A psychoevolutionary theory of emotions. *Social Science Information*, *21*(4) 529-553.

Quinlan, M. (2007). Organizational restructuring/downsizing, OHS regulation and worker health and wellbeing. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 30,* 385-399.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1989). The expression of emotion in organizational life. *Research in Organizational Behavior (11),* 1-42.

Reeve, J. (2001). Understanding motivation and emotion. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Rogers, D. (2006). Current retail development trends in America. *European Retail Digest, 51*, 54-56.

Rousseau, D. M. (1995*). Psychological contracts in organizations: understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ryan, K. K., & Oestreich, D. K. (1991). *Driving fear out of the workplace: How to overcome the invisible barriers to quality, productivity, and innovation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Salovey, P., & Grewal, D. (2005). The science of emotional intelligence. *American Psychological Society, 14*(6), 281-284.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1990), Emotional intelligence, imagination, cognition, and personality. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9*(3), 185-211.

Saunders, M. N. & Thornhill, A. (2003). Organizational justice, trust and the management of change. *Personnel Review,32*(3) 360-375.

Schyns, B. (2004). The influence of occupational self-efficacy on the relationship of leadership behavior and preparedness for occupational change. *Journal of Career Development,304,* 247-261.

Scott, C., & Jaffe, D. (1995). *Managing change at work: Leading people through organizational transitions*. Menlo Park, CA: Crisp.

Shaw, J. B., & Barrett-Power, E. (1997). A conceptual framework for assessing organization, work group, and individual effectiveness during and after downsizing. *Human Relations, 50*(2), 109-127.

Spector, P.E. (1992). *Summated rating scale construction: An introduction*. Unpublished manuscript, Sage University, Newbury Park, NY.

Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior. *Human Resources Management,12,* 269-292.

Spencer, S. A. & Adams, J. D. (1990). *Life Changes: Growing through personal transitions*. San Luis Obispo, CA: Impact.

Spreitzer, G. M., & Mishra, A. K. (2002). To stay or go: Voluntary survivor turnover following an organizational downsizing. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,23*, 707-729.

Stuart, R. (1995). The research context and change triggers. *Personnel Review,24*(2), 3-88.

Sullivan, J. R., & Vacca, J. J. (2010). Review of the Conners Comprehensive Behavior Rating Scales. In *The eighteenth mental measurements yearbook*. Retrieved from from http://www.unl.edu/buros/.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management.* New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.

Taylor, L., & Walton, P. (1971). Industrial sabotage: Moves and meanings. In S. Cohen (Ed.), *Images of Deviance* (pp. 219-245). London, UK: Penguin.

Tomasko, R. M. (1992). Restructuring: Getting it right. *Management Review, 81*(4), 10-15.

Tombaugh, J. R., & White, I. P. (1990). Downsizing: An empirical assessment of survivors' perceptions in a post layoff environment. *Organizational Development Journal, Summer,* 32-43.

Trevor, C.O., & Nybert, A. J. (2008). Keeping your headcount when all about you are losing theirs; Downsizing voluntary turnover rates and the moderating role of HR practices. *Academy of Management Journal, 51,* 259-276.

Tsai, P. C., Yen, Y., Huang, L., & Huang, I. (2007). A study on motivating employees' learning commitment in the post-downsizing era: Job satisfaction perspective. *Journal of World Business, 42,* 157-169.

Turnbull, S. (2002). The planned and unintended emotions generated by a corporate change program. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 4*(1), 22-38.

Vahtera, J., Kivimaki, M., & Pentti, J. (1997). Effect of organizational downsizing on health of employees. *The Lancet, 35,* 1124-1128.

Vakola, M., & Nikolaou, I. (2005). Attitudes towards organizational change: What is the role of employees' stress and commitment? *Employee Relations, 27*(2), 160-174.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Garner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Developent and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management, 34 (*1), 89-126.

Weick, K. (1979). *The social psychology of organizing*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Wiesenfield, B. M., Brockner, J., & Thibault, V. (2000). Procedural fairness, managers' self-esteem, and managerial behaviors following a layoff. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 83,* 1-32.

Winston, M. G. (2009, July). Cut it out. *Leadership Excellence,*15-16.

Worts, D., Fox, B., & McDonough, P. (2007). Doing something meaningful: Gender and public service during municipal government restructuring. *Gender, Work and Organization 2* (14), 162-184.

Yu, G., & Park, J. (2004). The effect of downsizing on the financial performance and employee productivity of Korean firms. *International Journal of Manpower, 27,* (3), 230-250.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice, 40*(3), 197-214.

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