This article is accepted for publication in the

Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology.

The Impact of Reemployment on Access to the Latent and Manifest Benefits of Employment and Mental Health

P. Nancey Hoare and M. Anthony Machin

University of Southern Queensland.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Associate Professor Tony Machin, Department of Psychology, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, 4350. Australia. Telephone +61 7 46312587. Fax +61 7 46312721. Email: machin@usq.edu.au . An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Work, Stress and Health 2008 Conference, Washington DC, 6-8 March, 2008.

Key words: Reemployment, Access to the Latent Benefits, Financial Hardship, Financial Strain, Mental Health.

Word count: 4,537

Abstract

This study focused on the impact of reemployment on access to both the latent and manifest benefits of employment, and mental health. Existing theories predicted that reemployment would positively affect these variables. One hundred and fifteen unemployed participants in South East Queensland, Australia, completed two paper-and pencil surveys administered 6 months apart that included measures of financial hardship, financial strain, access to the latent benefits (collective purpose, social contact, status, activity, and time structure), and mental health (as measured by the GHQ-12). Participants who gained employment (N = 58) were better off financially, reported greater access to social contact and time structure and had significant improvements in their mental health at Time 2. Participants who remained unemployed showed no change over time. Whilst these results highlight that there is a strong positive impact of reemployment, it is acknowledged that the picture is much more complex than what we have reported here. We recommend that structured programs be available before unemployment is experienced, particularly those that have a beneficial preventive effect on mental health among those participants most at risk of psychological disorders.

The negative impact of unemployment on psychological well-being has been repeatedly demonstrated (see Feather, 1990; Fryer & Payne, 1986; McKee-Ryan, Song, Wanberg, & Kinicki, 2005; Murphy & Athanasou, 1999; Winefield, 1995 for reviews). Compared to their employed counterparts, unemployed individuals report higher levels of depression (Feather & O'Brien, 1986), lower levels of self-esteem and confidence (Goldsmith & Veum, 1996; Goldsmith, Veum, Darity & William, 1996, 1997; Winefield, Tiggemann, & Winefield, 1992), and poorer psychological and physical well-being (McKee-Ryan et al., 2005). The Australian National Survey of Mental Health and Well-Being (NSMHWB) (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1998), conducted in 1997 demonstrated that unemployment was one of the strongest correlates of major depression in the Australian population. After adjusting for age, rates of mental disorder were highest for the unemployed.

There is also evidence of improvements in psychological well-being associated with gaining employment (Claussen, 1999; Ginexi, Howe, & Caplan, 2000; Mean Patterson, 1997; Wanberg, Griffiths, & Gavin, 1997). In a review of 16 longitudinal studies of the effect of unemployment on mental health, Murphy and Athanasou (1999) reported a weighted effect size of .54 for the relationship between gaining employment and improvements in mental health. McKee-Ryan et al. (2005) reported an effect size of d_c = -.89 (p < .01) based on 19 samples and a total of 1,911 participants for the effect of reemployment on mental health, which confirms that gaining employment has a positive effect on mental health. There has been ongoing debate between researchers about whether the reemployment leads to better mental health or whether better mental health leads to reemployment. The former is labelled the “exposure hypothesis” whilst the latter is labelled the “drift hypothesis”. These findings provide empirical support for the exposure hypothesis, indicating that exposure to reemployment is related to improvements in mental health.

Several different theoretical approaches have been proposed to explain how unemployment affects psychological well-being and behaviour, with two major perspectives tending to dominate the literature: The deprivation perspective (Jahoda, 1982; Warr, 1987) and the personal agency perspective (Fryer, 1986).

Jahoda's seminal work in the 1930s explored the experiences of individuals who had lost their jobs due to a factory closure, which led to the notion that unemployed people experience psychological distress because they are deprived of certain consequences of employment that sustain well-being (Jahoda, 1982). Jahoda argued that whilst employment provides *manifest benefits* or deliberately planned consequences, such as a regular income, there are five more important *latent benefits* of employment. The latent benefits include *social contact, time structure, status/identity, collective purpose,* and *enforced activity*. That is, employment provides opportunities for individuals to have contact with people outside of their families (social contact); it imposes some structure to the day and week (time structure); the work people do tends to form part of their identity or sense of status within the community (status/identity) and provides opportunities to work with others towards collective goals that would not be achieved by an individual alone (collective purpose); and employment typically enforces some sort of regular activity (enforced activity). According to Jahoda, these latent benefits of employment fulfill certain psychosocial needs that are important to well-being and, consequently, deprivation of those benefits accounts for the distress experienced by the unemployed.

There is some evidence to support Jahoda's (1982) theory explaining changes in well-being during unemployment. For example, Hepworth (1980) and Kilpatrick and Trew (1985) found that unemployed people who were more active were less psychologically distressed than their less active counterparts. Further, a recent meta-analysis by McKee-Ryan et al. (2005) found that time structure (r = .31) and social support (r = .26) were associated with

better mental health in the unemployed. However, there have not yet been any studies that have tested whether reemployment improves employees' levels of these factors.

Some studies have used scales, such the Access to Categories of Experience scale (ACE; Miles, 1983, as cited in Creed & Macintyre, 2001), that measure access to all five latent benefits of employment. Results have shown that higher well-being is associated with greater access to the latent benefits and that the unemployed are more deprived than the employed of the latent benefits (e.g., Creed & Machin, 2002; Creed & Macintyre, 2001; Creed, Muller, & Machin, 2001; Waters & Moore, 2002).

Jahoda's assumption that employment provides access to the latent benefits was based on retrospective accounts from individuals who had lost their jobs. That is, rather than measuring access to the latent benefits whilst those individuals were employed, again after they had lost their jobs, and then again after they had become reemployed, the assumption was only based on the individuals' experiences during unemployment. Whilst there is research to support the deprivation hypothesis, there is little empirical evidence to support the contention that employment actually provides access to experiences that fulfil those psychosocial needs. Therefore, this study fills that gap by investigating perceived access to the latent benefits during unemployment and reemployment.

Whilst Jahoda considered the manifest benefits of employment, she proposed that the latent benefits were more important to well-being. Fryer (1986), however, considered economic deprivation to be a more important influence on psychological wellbeing than latent deprivation. Whilst Fryer acknowledged the role that the latent benefits played in mental health, he argued that they could not fully account for the reduced well-being experienced by the unemployed individual (Fryer, 1986; Fryer & Payne, 1986). Fryer's (1986) agency theory highlights the importance of the manifest function of employment (i.e., the financial benefits) and proposes that economic deprivation places restrictions on the

unemployed individual's ability to exercise personal agency, making it impossible to plan and organise a meaningful future, with subsequent negative effects on a person's well-being. Therefore, measures of financial hardship and financial strain need to be included to determine whether reemployment primarily impacts on these manifest benefits.

Given that, to date, no studies have examined the impact of reemployment on participants' perceived access to the latent and manifest benefits of employment, the current study proposes two hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Based on the aforementioned lines of research, we expected that reemployment would increase participants' perceived access to both the latent and manifest benefits of employment.

Hypothesis 2: Given the changes we expected in perceived access to both the latent and manifest benefits of employment, we also expected that reemployment would impact positively on the mental health of participants.

Method

Participants

A longitudinal study was carried out with 115 unemployed participants (59 males) with a mean age of 38.81 years (*SD* = 14.49, range 17 – 64) registered with Government-funded employment agencies in South East Queensland, Australia. Fifty-eight participants were employed and 57 were unemployed at Time 2. Approximately 28% of participants had not worked at all in the past. Of the 57 people who were unemployed at the 6-month follow-up, 3 had been employed at Time 1 (i.e., part-time or casually), 7 had been doing volunteer/unpaid work at Time 1, 46 had not been working at Time 1, and 1 person had been studying at Time 1.

The mean fortnightly income for unemployed participants at Time 2 was $406.77 (*SD* = $211.11, range $0 to $1300) and for employed participants it was $686.26 (*SD* = $317.71, range $180 to $1400). Eighteen of the unemployed respondents at Time 2 were participating in training, while 32 were doing volunteer/unpaid work. For 6 of the trainees and 14 of the volunteer workers, participation was a compulsory requirement for the receipt of their welfare payments.

Measures

Demographic questions were asked at Time 1, including age, postcode (which was then recoded into Geographic Locality with 0 = Rural and 1 = Metropolitan), gender, relationship status, number of financial dependants, net fortnightly income, and education level.

Financial Hardship. One item measured the level of perceived financial hardship experienced by participants by asking how easy it was for them to live on their net fortnightly income, with response options ranging from 1 (*extremely easy*) to 6 (*extremely difficult*). Higher scores indicate higher economic hardship.

Financial Strain. The Latent and Manifest Benefits scale (LAMB; Muller, Creed, Waters, & Machin, 2005) includes six items that measure access to the manifest benefit of employment - an indication of a person's level of perceived Financial Strain. The six bipolar items are measured on a 7-point scale, with high scores indicating greater felt strain (e.g., *My income usually/rarely allows me to socialise as often as I like*). Cronbach's alpha was .92 for Time 1 and .96 for Time 2.

Access to the Latent Benefits of Employment. Perceived access to each of the five latent benefits of employment was assessed using the Latent and Manifest Benefits scale (LAMB, Muller, Creed, Waters, & Machin, 2005). The previous section described the measure of financial strain. Each of the remaining five LAMB subcales consists of six bipolar

items measured on a 7-point scale: Time Structure (e.g., *I often/rarely have nothing to do*), Social Contact (e.g., *I often/rarely go out and meet with others*), Collective Purpose (e.g., *I contribute greatly/minimally to my community*), Status (e.g., *I am often/rarely valued by the people around me*), and Activity (e.g., *I usually/rarely do all the things I have to do*). The scales were scored such that a high score on each of the five latent benefits indicates greater perceived access to that benefit. The reliability coefficients for Collective Purpose were .88 at Time 1 and .89 at Time 2; for Social Contact, they were .92 for Time 1 and .89 for Time 2; for Status, they were .89 for Time 1 and .93 for Time 2; for Activity, they were .84 at Time 1 and .89 at Time 2; and for Time Structure, they were .91 at Time 1 and .92 at Time 2.

Mental Health. The 12-item version of the General Health Questionnaire (Goldberg, 1972) was used to measure mental health at Time 1 and Time 2. Responses to the 12 items (e.g., *Have you recently been able to enjoy your normal day-to-day activities?*) are scored on a 4-point scale ranging from 0 (*not at all/much less than usual*) to 3 (*much more than usual*), with higher scores indicating greater psychological distress. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were .91 for Time 1 and .94 for Time 2.

Procedure

Participants were contacted through 15 Job Network sites in Queensland. After being informed about the study, individuals who were willing to participate either completed a survey on site or took it home with them to complete. As an incentive, participants were given the opportunity to enter the Psychology Department raffle for cash prizes ranging from $20 to $200. Of the 711 surveys that were distributed, 372 were completed and returned and 265 of these respondents indicated that they would be willing to take part in the 6-month follow-up study. A total of 115 people returned completed Time 2 surveys. This figure represents approximately 31% of the original 372 survey participants. Whilst this response rate is low, it is quite typical for mail-out surveys (Roth & BeVier, 1998).

Results

The analyses that were undertaken consisted of mixed two-way ANOVAs with Time as a repeated-measures factor (i.e., scores for the variable at Time 1 and Time 2) and T2 Employment Status as a between-groups factor. In order to demonstrate that gaining employment has an effect on a particular variable, such as mental health, the patterns of change in that variable across time should differ depending on whether participants became employed or remained unemployed. Thus, a two-way interaction between Time and T2 Employment Status should be present before the change in that variable can be attributed to gaining employment. When a significant Time x T2 Employment Status interaction is present, it provides evidence that the change in the variable of interest was dependent upon employment status at Time 2. Thus the significance of the interaction term is of particular interest and the main effects become less important.

Prior to reporting the main results, we note that there were significant differences between those who responded at Time 2 and those who did not participate in the follow-up study in terms of age and relationship status. The chi-square difference tests were significant for age, χ^2 (3, N = 371) = 9.59, p < .01, and relationship status, χ^2 (1, N = 369) = 9.30, p = .045, although the magnitude of the differences were fairly weak (*Eta* = .21 and *Eta* = .10, respectively). Participants who took part in the follow-up study were more likely to be partnered and in the older age groups (i.e., 35 years and older).

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations for the latent and manifest benefits and mental health at Time 1 and 2 by employment status groups. The results of the two-way ANOVAs follow in Table 2. To better understand the differences between Time 1 and Time 2 for each group, we have also reported the 95% Confidence Intervals (CIs).

(Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here)

The results in Table 2 demonstrate a number of significant two-way interactions between Time and Employment Status. For Financial Hardship, there was a significant two-way interaction with $F(1,113) = 28.03$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .20$. Analysis of simple main effects showed that the scores for those who were reemployed improved significantly (95% CIs for T1 and T2 scores were 4.19 – 4.81 and 2.93 – 3.59 respectively) whilst the scores for those who remained unemployed remained stable (95% CIs for T1 and T2 scores were 4.11 – 4.74 and 4.07 – 4.73 respectively).

There was a similar result for Financial Strain, which demonstrated a significant two-way interaction with $F(1,113) = 41.06$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .27$. Analysis of simple main effects also showed that the scores for those who were reemployed improved significantly (95% CIs for T1 and T2 scores were 32.92 – 37.08 and 22.03 – 27.11 respectively) whilst the scores for those who remained unemployed remained stable (95% CIs for T1 and T2 scores were 31.27 – 35.46 and 30.90 – 36.02 respectively).

For the measures of access to the latent benefits of employment, there were significant two-way interactions for Social Contact with $F(1,113) = 9.51$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .08$, and Time Structure with $F(1,113) = 22.60$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .17$. Analysis of simple main effects for Social Contact showed that the scores for those who were reemployed improved significantly (95% CIs for T1 and T2 scores were 19.30 – 24.25 and 23.66 – 28.59 respectively) whilst the scores for those who remained unemployed remained stable (95% CIs for T1 and T2 scores were 18.19 – 23.18 and 17.88 – 22.86 respectively). Analysis of simple main effects for Time Structure showed that the scores for those who were reemployed improved significantly (95% CIs for T1 and T2 scores were 20.38 – 25.59 and 29.49 – 34.24 respectively) whilst the scores for those who remained unemployed remained stable (95% CIs for T1 and T2 scores were 24.93 – 30.19 and 25.46 – 30.26 respectively).

Finally, for the measure of Mental Health (GHQ), there was also a significant two-way interaction with $F(1,113) = 22.97$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .17$. Analysis of simple main effects showed that the scores for those who were reemployed improved significantly (95% CIs for T1 and T2 scores were 14.25 – 17.61 and 8.58 – 12.25 respectively) whilst the scores for those who remained unemployed remained stable (95% CIs for T1 and T2 scores were 12.27 – 15.66 and 12.92 – 16.62 respectively).

Overall, the preceding analyses showed that, at Time 2, participants who gained employment had significantly reduced levels of financial hardship and financial strain, better access to social contact, better access to time structure, and better mental health (GHQ scores declined). Scores on all of those variables for the continuously unemployed showed no change over time. There were also no differences at Time 1 between the two groups for any of these measures. Therefore, the positive effects for the reemployed group can be attributed to gaining employment.

Discussion

The results pertaining to changes in perceived access to the latent and manifest benefits of employment as a result of reemployment partially support Hypothesis 1. While access to social contact and time structure improved and both financial hardship and financial strain declined for those who were reemployed at Time 2, the results of the two-way ANOVAs (the two-way interaction terms and the main effects) for the other three measures (collective purpose, status and activity) were not significant. With respect to Hypothesis 2, the results of the two-way ANOVA (specifically the two-way interaction term) were significant confirming that reemployment significantly improves mental health, as expected.

These findings are in line with the exposure hypothesis, which contends that exposure to unemployment causes a decline in mental health, whilst gaining employment leads to an

improvement in mental health (e.g., Dooley, Catalano, & Hough, 1992; Paul & Moser, 2009; Winefield, 1995). However, participants in this study who gained employment showed improvements to only two of the latent benefits of employment (social contact and time structure). These results contradict Jahoda's contention that employment provides access to all five latent benefits. Therefore, we need to consider why collective purpose, status, and activity did not show an improvement.

Perceived access to those three latent benefits for those who gained employment may also depend on the length of time in the new job and the quality of the new job. Starting a new job involves meeting new people and adjusting to an imposed time structure, so it stands to reason that individuals may perceive an almost immediate increase in access to those latent functions. However, it may take longer for individuals to feel an increased sense of collectivity, status, and purposeful activity. It generally takes time to gain a clear understanding of the roles, duties, responsibilities, and goals of the organisation. It may also take time to perceive their work activity as purposeful, particularly if the new job involves learning to master new tasks. Thus, changes in those variables may occur over a longer period of time. Furthermore, job quality may also contribute to perceived access to the latent benefits. If individuals are unhappy with the type of work they are doing, the culture of the organisation, their co-workers or supervisors, their salary, their opportunity for skill use, training, or advancement, their workload, their level of control over their job, and so on, they may not report an increase in access to all of the latent benefits. This also raises a point that not all employment is perceived as "good" and not all unemployment is perceived as "bad". There are many variables that can influence a person's level of satisfaction with respect to their employment status. The picture is also more complicated when we consider that some of those who remained unemployed were engaging in training, while others were doing volunteer/unpaid work and that a proportion of each of these were required to in order to

meet the requirements for receiving welfare. These factors could also impact on the participants' level of satisfaction with their status, their level of activity, and their sense of collective purpose.

Another reason why no change was evident in collective purpose, status, and activity, is that the measures used may have unexpectedly tapped into relatively stable personality characteristics, rather than more transient appraisals of deprivation. The LAMB scale was developed to measure situational-based appraisals of loss during unemployment, but participants may have responded to some of the items in terms of their preferred behavioural styles or values. For example, the collective purpose variable may reflect more stable values related to a person's sense of community and level of desire to contribute to society. Such attributes may be more robust to changes in the environment. Similarly, the measure of activity may represent an individual's generally ability to mobilise themselves into action without the direction of others. It too may be more robust to changes in the environment. Another possible explanation is that, according to the Government's mutual obligation requirements, unemployed individuals who are in receipt of welfare payments are expected to engage in a high level of job-search activity, which may not be that different from the level of activity associated with working. The status variable may also have measured a relatively enduring personal characteristic - one that is more resistant to environmental influences. For many people, the type of work they do forms part of their self-identity (Bigner, 1994; Blustein, 2006). Blustein stated that, "Working functions to provide people with a way to establish an identity and a sense of coherence in their social interactions. In other words, work furnishes at least part of our external identity in the world." (p. 3). Finally, the Status/Identity variable included in the current study was intended to measure an individual's perceived access to that sense of external identity. However, the status/identity construct may not have been adequately operationally defined by the six items of the LAMB scale, which

were: “I am often valued by the people around me”, “My assistance is greatly welcomed by my family and friends”, and “My friends usually value my company” “I often help others”, “I am usually important to my friends”, and “People often rely on me for help”. These items may have tapped into an individual’s perceptions of how much their immediate social group (e.g., friends and family) value them and their assistance, rather than the individual’s perception of their broader position or standing in society.

Future research could observe changes in collective purpose, status, and activity over a longer period of time to determine whether they are indeed relatively stable traits. Whilst collective purpose, status, and activity were not influenced by employment status, other variables, such as gender, age, quality of reemployment, duration of unemployment, and length of time in new job, may affect how those variables perform over time. It was beyond the scope of the current research project to examine moderating effects of demographic variables, but collective purpose, status, and activity cannot be assumed to be stable traits until further tests of possible moderators are carried out.

Limitations

These results do not imply that all individuals will respond in the same way to gaining employment or remaining unemployed. There is the potential for demographic variables (e.g., gender, age, location, or length of unemployment) or work-related characteristics (e.g., reemployment quality, work demands, and level of job security) to interact with the other main variables (time and employment status at Time 2) and it is possible that the impact of reemployment differs across the levels of those variables. For example, Paul and Moser (2009) have shown that there are several moderators of the negative impact of unemployment with those studies which have greater proportions of men, greater proportions of blue-collar workers, and participants with greater length of unemployment showing more negative

effects. The analysis of moderator effects would require larger samples than the one we collected.

One of the difficulties of using surveys to collect data is the potential for common method bias - using the same method to gather data may inflate or deflate relationships among study variables (Shaughnessy, et al., 2009). Whilst there are some complex statistical analyses that test for common method variance, they were not carried out for the current study due to the limited sample size. Therefore, there is no guarantee that participants' responses were not influenced by such factors as the types of scales used, the item characteristics, the order in which the items were presented, or the response formats. This being the case, the potential for method bias is acknowledged.

The participants in the current research project were relatively similar to those of the sample used in the National Survey of Mental Health and Well-Being carried out by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS, 1998) in terms of their age and gender, which enhances the generalizability of the results. However, there may be other factors that limit the generalizability of the results. For example, all of the participants lived in the South East Queensland region of Australia, with some living in the Brisbane metropolitan area, and others living in more rural areas, such as Toowoomba and the Darling Downs. Thus, their circumstances may differ to participants from other regions in Australia, such as remote outback areas or areas with a higher multicultural or Indigenous population. Unfortunately, due to the small sample size at Time 2, separate analyses could not be run for males and females, different age groups, different levels of education, or different geographic locations, to determine whether there were any differences on the variables of interest. Further studies will need to be carried out to address these limitations.

While we found that there were no differences at Time 1 between those who gained employment and those who remained unemployed, there remains the possibility that the two

groups were different in other areas. We argue that, while any differences at Time 1 could contribute to the likelihood of reemployment, that these differences would not undermine our interpretation of the positive effects of gaining employment. At this time, we are satisfied to simply confirm that there is a strong positive impact of reemployment while acknowledging that the picture is much more complex than what we have reported here.

Implications

While becoming employed is associated with improvement in the mental health of the unemployed, we cannot conclude that this is wholly attributable to those who were employed having greater access to the latent benefits of employment, as only access to social contact and time structure improved for employed participants. It is likely that there are viable alternative avenues of accessing these latent benefits, even for the unemployed. Various researchers have focused on leisure activities as one possible avenue. Folkman and Moskowitz (2000) suggested that meaningful activities (such as leisure activities), which turn individuals' attention to their resources and the positive aspects of their lives, can assist them to feel effective and to experience a sense of mastery and control. This may be particularly important for individuals whose self-efficacy has eroded because of continued unsuccessful job hunting. Other opportunities for meaningful activities include volunteer work, whilst care-giving, study, or training courses may be other potentially meaningful pursuits.

Given the trend for more casual or temporary forms of employment, it is important for career development practitioners to encourage individuals to plan ways to sustain their well-being during times when they may find themselves jobless and this involves more than simply replacing the latent benefits of employment. We need to consider the merits of structured interventions which specifically aim to build these resources whilst people are seeking employment, or prior to becoming unemployed. For example, Vouri, Koivisto, Mutanen, Jokisaari and Salmela-Aro (2008) have demonstrated that the Towards Working

Life Group Method has a positive effect on transition outcomes and mental health among ninth graders completing their last year of basic education. A similar program for 17-25 year olds called the School-to-Work Group Method (Koivisto, Vuori & Nykyri, 2007) demonstrated a beneficial preventive effect on mental health among those participants most at risk of psychological disorders. Participants in the group intervention also reported greater control over their future through setting personal and financial goals. Paul and Moser (2009) have confirmed that structured intervention programs for the unemployed are moderately effective at alleviating psychological distress which means that it is now incumbent on policy makers and organisations to ensure that employees are provided the opportunity to prepare for unemployment well before it is experienced.

References

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). (1998). *Mental health and wellbeing: Profile of adults, Australia 1997 (ABS Catalogue No. 4326.0).* Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, 1998.

Bigner, J. J. (1994). *Individual and family development: A life-span interdisciplinary approach*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Blustein, D. L. (2006). *The psychology of working: A new perspective for career development, counseling, and public policy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Claussen, B. (1999). Health and re-employment in a five-year follow-up of long-term unemployed. . *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 27*, 94-100.

Creed, P. A., & Machin, M. A. (2002). Access to the latent benefits of employment for unemployed and underemployed individuals. *Psychological Reports, 90*, 1208-1210.

Creed, P. A., & Macintyre, S. R. (2001). The relative effects of deprivation of the latent and manifest benefits of employment on the well-being of unemployed people. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6*, 324-331.

Creed, P. A., Muller, J., & Machin, M. A. (2001). The role of satisfaction with occupational status, neuroticism, financial strain and categories of experience in predicting mental health in the unemployed. *Personality and Individual Differences, 30*, 435-447.

Dooley, D., Catalano, R., & Hough, R. (1992). Unemployment and alcohol disorder in1910 and 1990: Drift versus social causation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 65*, 277-290.

Feather, N. T. (1990). *The psychological impact of unemployment*. New York: Springer Verlag.

Feather, N. T., & O'Brien, G. E. (1986). A longitudinal study of the effects of employment and unemployment on school-leavers. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 59*, 121-144.

Folkman, S., & Moskowitz, J. T. (2000). Positive affect and the other side of coping. *American Psychologist, 55*, 647-654.

Fryer, D. (1986). Employment deprivation and personal agency during unemployment: A critical discussion of Jahoda's explanation of the psychological effects of unemployment. *Social Behaviour, 1*, 3-23.

Fryer, D., & Payne, R. L. (1986). Being unemployed: A review of the literature on the psychological experience of unemployment. In C. L. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 235-278). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Ginexi, E. M., Howe, G. W., & Caplan, R. D. (2000). Depression and control beliefs in relation to reemployment: What are the directions of effect? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 323-336.

Goldberg, D. P. (1972). *The detection of psychiatric illness by questionnaire.* London: Oxford University Press.

Goldsmith, A. H., & Veum, J. R. (1996). The impact of labor force history on self-esteem and its component parts, anxiety, alienation and. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 17*, 183-219.

Goldsmith, A. H., Veum, J. R., & Darity, J., William. (1996). The psychological impact of unemployment and joblessness. *Journal of Socio-Economics, 25*, 333-358.

Goldsmith, A. H., Veum, J. R., & Darity, J., William. (1997). Unemployment, joblessness, psychological well-being and self-esteem: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Socio-Economics, 26*, 133-158.

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

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

Kilpatrick, R., & Trew, K. (1985). Life-styles and psychological well-being among unemployed men in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 58,* 207-216.

Koivisto, P., Vuori, J., & Nykyri, E. (2007). Effects of the School-to-Work Group Method among young people. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 70,* 277-296.

McKee-Ryan, F. M., Song, Z., Wanberg, C. R., & Kinicki, A. J. (2005). Psychological and physical well-being during unemployment: A meta-analytic study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 53-76.

Mean Patterson, L. J. M. (1997). Long-term unemployment among adolescents: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescence, 20,* 261-280.

Muller, J., Creed, P. A., Waters, L., & Machin, M. A. (2005). The development and preliminary testing of a scale to measure the latent and manifest benefits of employment. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 21,* 191-198.

Murphy, G. C., & Athanasou, J. A. (1999). The effect of unemployment on mental health. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72,* 83-99.

Paul, K.I., & Moser, K. (2009). Unemployment impairs mental health: Meta-analyses. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 74,* 264-282.

Roth, P. L., & BeVier, C. A. (1998). Response rates in HRM/OB survey research: Norms and correlates, 1990-1994. *Journal of Management, 24*, 97-117.

Shaughnessy, J. J., Zechmeister, E. B., & Zechmeister, J. S. (2009). Research methods in psychology (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Vuori, J., Koivisto, P., Mutanen, P., Jokisaari, M., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2008). Towards Working Life: Effects of an intervention on mental health and transition to post-basic education. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72,* 67-80.

Wanberg, C. R., Griffiths, R. F., & Gavin, M. B. (1997). Time structure and unemployment: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 70*, 75-95.

Warr, P. (1987). *Work, unemployment, and mental health*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Waters, L., & Moore, K. (2002). Self-esteem, appraisal and coping: A comparison of unemployed and re-employed people. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 593-604.

Winefield, A. H. (1995). Unemployment: Its psychological costs. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 169-212). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Winefield, A. H., Tiggemann, M., & Winefield, H. R. (1992). Unemployment distress, reasons for job loss and causal attributions for unemployment in young people. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 65*, 213-218.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Coping Variables and Mental Health at Time 1 and Time 2 and by Employment Status at Time 2 (N = 115).

Variable	Employment Status	Time 1		Time 2	
		M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Financial Hardship	Not working	4.42	1.34	4.40	1.31
	Working	4.50	1.06	3.26	1.21
	Total	4.46	1.20	3.83	1.38
Financial Strain	Not working	33.37	9.18	33.46	9.32
	Working	35.00	6.61	24.57	10.18
	Total	34.19	8.00	28.97	10.69
Collective Purpose	Not working	19.14	8.21	19.95	8.05
	Working	18.03	8.22	19.71	8.05
	Total	18.58	8.20	19.83	8.01
Social Contact	Not working	20.68	9.26	20.37	9.48
	Working	21.78	9.75	26.12	9.48
	Total	21.23	9.48	23.27	9.87
Status	Not working	29.79	8.20	29.56	8.44
	Working	32.26	7.53	31.60	7.50
	Total	31.03	7.93	30.59	8.01
Activity	Not working	27.65	6.88	26.40	7.71
	Working	29.26	7.39	29.09	8.01
	Total	28.46	7.16	27.76	7.94
Time Structure	Not working	27.56	9.45	27.86	9.44
	Working	22.98	10.54	31.86	8.82
	Total	25.25	10.23	29.88	9.31
Psychological Distress	Not working	13.96	5.42	14.77	7.89
	Working	15.93	7.33	10.41	6.11
	Total	14.96	6.50	12.57	7.36

Table 2

Main Effects and Interaction for the Latent and Manifest Benefits and Mental Health (N = 115).

Variable	Effect	*df*	*F*	η^2
Financial Hardship	Time	1,113	29.66**	.21
	EStat	1,113	7.20**	.06
	Time x EStat	1,113	28.03**	.20
Financial Strain	Time	1,113	39.71**	.26
	EStat	1,113	6.28*	.05
	Time x EStat	1,113	41.06**	.27
Collective Purpose	Time	1,113	3.26	.03
	EStat	1,113	.25	.00
	Time x EStat	1,113	.40	.00
Social Contact	Time	1,113	7.11**	.06
	EStat	1,113	4.57*	.04
	Time x EStat	1,113	9.51**	.08
Status	Time	1,113	.32	.00
	EStat	1,113	3.23	.03
	Time x EStat	1,113	.08	.00
Activity	Time	1,113	1.05	.01
	EStat	1,113	3.10	.03
	Time x EStat	1,113	.60	.01
Time Structure	Time	1,113	25.85**	.19
	EStat	1,113	.04	.00
	Time x EStat	1,113	22.60**	.17
Psychological Distress	Time	1,113	12.74**	.10
	EStat	1,113	1.24	.01
	Time x EStat	1,113	22.97**	.17

Note. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$; *df* = degrees of freedom, η^2 = partial eta squared; EStat = Employment status at Time 2.