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ABSTRACT

Older adults are the fastest growing segment of the United States population. As a result, there is a concurrent demographic shift to an older workforce. Therefore, organizations need to increasingly focus their employment selection on older workers in order to maintain and enhance their human resources. In this research project, the differences between four subgroups (midlife career changers less than 55 years old, displaced workers under age 62 not receiving pension benefits, retirees age 62-69 receiving Social Security benefits, and retirees age 70 or older receiving Social Security benefits) of older adults seeking employment were examined. The underlying assumption of this thesis was that different subgroups of older adults have different motivations for seeking employment. In order to test the assumption above regarding the subgroups, a 71-item survey measuring motivation to work, the extent to which a person wants to engage in work and the need for satisfaction and achievement through work, was conducted at the Department of Aging and Adult Services located in San Bernardino, California, and the Riverside, California and San Bernardino, California One Stop Centers. One hundred and twenty eight older adults volunteered to
participate in the study. Results of a one-way Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) showed that older adults in the different subgroups can be differentiated by Financial and Schedule factors. The implications of the results for organizations and older adults seeking employment are discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction
In some cultures, such as in Japan, people believe that with age comes wisdom and insight, but in other cultures, such as in America, youth is more valued. For example, Bennett-Alexander and Pincus (1998) stated that, generally, the perception of youth is one of energy, imagination and innovation (positive statements), while the perception of aging is one of decreasing interest, lack of innovation and imagination and a decrease of the quality of the person (negative statements). As a result, older workers often suffer from these negative stereotypes from management and coworkers in the workplace.

Definition of Older Worker
According to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA), individuals who are at least 40 years old are protected from being discriminated against on the basis of their age in regards to employment. Therefore, 40 years old was the age for considering an individual to be an older worker in this research. In addition, Winn (1999) indicated in his study that the U.S. Federal Government (USFG)
classifies older workers to be of age 40 years old and above. Winn (1999) also found that by the year 2000, the aging of the U.S. population has divided the work force evenly between those individuals classified by the USFG as older workers (i.e., 40 years of age and above) and those classified as younger workers (i.e., less than 40 years of age). As a result of the shortage of younger workers and the demographic shift to an older workforce (Winn, 1999), organizations need to increasingly focus their employment selection on older workers in order to maintain and enhance their human resources. By providing job opportunities for older workers, organizations may improve their labor market efficiency and competitiveness because of the experiences and skills that older adults bring to the job.

Current Demographics of Older Workers

In addition to the above findings by Winn (1999), Hudson Institute's Workforce 2000 reported that there is an estimate of two million individuals from 50 to 74 years old who are willing, able, and are currently seeking employment (Sullivan, & Duplaga, 1997). In addition, the Committee for Economic Development (1999) found that in 1950, there were seven working age persons for every one older adults age 65
and above. However by the year 2030, the number of working age persons will decrease to three for every one older adult age 65 and above. The diminishing number of working age persons, that is, younger people in the labor market, presents organizations with an impending shortage of available workers. The Committee for Economic Development (1999) predicted that by the year 2030, 20 percent of the overall population will be 65 years old and above. In addition, Barber, Crouch, and Merker (1992) predicted that between the years 2000 and 2010, the age group experiencing the greatest growth will be those aged 55-64; by 2005, people aged 55 and over are projected to be nearly 22 percent of the working age population, compared to 12.5 percent in 1990.

Similarly, Warr (1994) found that in the United States, there would be a decline in the number of people between the ages of 20 and 39 due to many younger people who delay parenthood. Johnson and Packer (1987) also found that the reduced number of younger people entering the workforce is a result of lower birth rates (cited in Mor-Barak, 1995). In 1990, the largest age group was between 30 and 39 and these individuals will remain as the largest cohort in subsequent years. This group was age 40 to 49 in
the year 2000 and will be 50 to 59 in the year 2010. In addition, Fullerton (1999) predicted that by the year 2008, the baby-boom cohort will show significant growth over the 1998 to 2008 period and this group will be between the ages of 44 to 62. Thus, organizations may need to shift their employment strategies and utilize the availability of older adults in the labor market. Older adults' experiences and skills will be an important asset for organizations to attain in the competitive labor market in the future (Forteza & Prieto, 1994).

The U.S. Bureau of Census reported that due to the aging of the population, there has been a major increase of older adults. In 1986 there were 51 million older adults aged 55 and over. However they projected that in the year 2000 there would have been an anticipated 59 million of them (Mor-Barak, 1995). Based on the most recent projection supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (1999), 66 percent of the total population will be 40 years and older in the year 2008 and they are projected to comprise 53.4 percent of the total labor force.

In addition, a study conducted by the AARP (1998) found that 80% of baby boomers (persons born between 1946 and 1964) plan to continue working (at least part-time)
until the age of 65. They also found that older workers find satisfaction in work and that retirement is considered to be an unattractive alternative. Therefore, employers need to develop more positive perceptions of older workers. As stated by Doverspike, Taylor, Shultz and McKay (2000), many industries feel pressured to find skilled workers. Therefore, it is to their benefit to seek out non traditional groups, including older workers.

Misperceptions of Older Workers

Even though there is an increasing availability of older adults seeking employment, many firms choose not to recruit, hire or train them because of their misperceptions about aging. These misperceptions have been around for a long time and many are still prevalent today. For example, Sheblak (1969) provided four major reasons that were given by employers in his study for not hiring older workers. They were, 1) the concern that there is a significant physical decline which lowers older workers' productivity, 2) older workers are more difficult to train, 3) employers may suffer high penalty and insurance costs, and 4) older workers are not as adaptable and flexible to the changing job environment.
In addition, Rosen and Jerdee (1976) reviewed past research and found that employers often perceive older workers as slow, uncreative, untrainable, and resistant to change. More recently, Reio and Sanders (1999) found that the current misperceptions of older workers are that they are less energetic, technically outdated, slow, less productive, rigid, unwilling to change, uninterested in learning, less innovative, technology and computer phobic, susceptible to physical ailments and less able to learn. Thus, the misperceptions of older workers appear to have not changed much in the last 30 years.

The misperception of older workers noted above could lead to age discrimination such as refused employment, dismissal from jobs, lower pay and denied promotions, training or other benefits based on age (Warr, 1994). Forteza and Prieto (1994) found that three out of every four older workers believed that they have been the victim of age discrimination at some point in time. Rix (1990) found that age discrimination complaints filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) rose from 1000 in 1969 to 17,000 in 1986 (cited in Mor-Barak, 1995). More recently, Shultz, Sirotnik and Bockman (2000) found that in 1992, there were 19,573 age discrimination claims
filed with the EEOC. In the following year the number rose to 19,809. However, there was a relatively steady decline in the number of claims filed from 1994 to 1999. For example, the claims filed were reduced to: 19,618 in 1994, 17,416 in 1995, 15,719 in 1996, 15,785 in 1997, 15,191 in 1998 and 14,141 in 1999. In spite of this decreasing trend, the most recent figures show an increase. For example, the claims filed increased to 16,008 in 2000. This clearly indicates that age discrimination is a serious issue in the workplace today. Even though there is evidence that the number of age discrimination complaints filed with the EEOC is reducing, the number of claims is still substantial. In addition, state claims continue to rise (Shultz et al, 2000), as do civil law suits related to age discrimination (Sharf & Jones, 2000). Hence, organizations need to be more sensitive to this issue or they could become involved in lawsuits that would place financial burden on the organization.

In general, many researchers have found that younger workers have been rated as more desirable employees than older workers (Hansson, Dekoekkoek, Neece, & Patterson, 1997; Waldman & Avolio, 1993). Reio and Sanders (1999) found that, in a study conducted by the National Council of
Aging, more than 50 percent of the employers surveyed believed that older workers could not perform as well as younger workers. They found that in a scenario where the job candidates were viewed as older, they were most likely not hired or given advancement but the younger job candidates were either employed or promoted even though they possessed identical qualifications with the older workers. They also found that participants in their study (business students in their 20s) denied the request for training when dealing with older workers, but allowed the younger workers to attend training. Similarly, they also found that in a scenario where a computer programmer whose skills had become obsolete and therefore needed to be retrained or replaced was portrayed as older, the students unanimously opted for termination of the employee. When this employee was portrayed as younger however, the students chose retraining.

Reio and Sanders (1999) argued that even though the study was conducted using students, the results found are in fact a reflection of reality in the workplace. Namely, older workers are less preferred than younger workers. Similarly, Haefner (1977) also found that younger workers are preferred in comparison to older workers. He
interviewed 286 employers from the state of Illinois and used a hypothetical job and varied the characteristics of applicants' age, sex and race. He found that even at similar competency levels, the 25-year-old worker was consistently preferred over the 55-year-old worker. However, there are studies that have found positive results regarding the perception of older workers. For example, the Society for Human Resource Management supported by AARP (1998) found human resource professionals generally perceive that older workers excel or perform as well as their younger counterparts on a number of work-related measures by using the Older Workers Survey. In addition, Wagner (1998) reported that negative stereotypes of older workers were not widely held by the participants in her study (U.S. employers). The majority of the participants in her study reported having more positive attitudes and beliefs about older workers. In addition, they also displayed a largely positive attitude towards older workers. Thus, while it appears some organizations attitudes toward older workers are improving, others need to be more aware of research findings that indicated that older workers are perceived as capable as younger workers in performing their job.
Older Workers, Job Performance, and Job Satisfaction

Contrary to some employers' misperceptions, several meta-analyses have demonstrated that age and job performance are unrelated (McEvoy & Cascio, 1989; Waldman & Avolio, 1986). For example, the mean correlation coefficient between age and job performance that was found by McEvoy and Cascio (1989) was 0.06. In addition, many researchers also found that the performance levels of older and younger workers are not significantly different. For example, Johnson (1988) found that organizations failed to acknowledge that research and experience showed that older workers are as physically and mentally able to perform their duties as younger workers and are capable of being retrained.

Therefore, as suggested by Salthouse and Maurer (1996), careful consideration is needed before making any final decisions in regards to any work-related issues that are age specific. They indicated that there are other variables that should be taken into consideration as more relevant instead of age; other variables such as, knowledge, skills, abilities and other characteristics (KSAOs). Salthouse and Maurer (1996) predicted that age and
job performance relations are mediated through KSAOs. As a result, age on its own is not a good predictor of job performance.

As noted above, there is abundant research that has found that younger applicants are preferred because of beliefs that older workers have lower job performance, are less motivated and satisfied, and are more difficult to train. In fact, older workers may actually have higher motivation and job satisfaction than younger workers. As found by Doering (1983), Glenn and Weaver (1977), and Rhodes (1983), overall job satisfaction is typically found to be significantly higher among older workers with correlation coefficients between age and job satisfaction ranging from 0.10 to 0.20 (cited in Warr, 1994).

In addition, Griffiths (1999) found that there is evidence to date that appears to suggest that older workers are already generally more satisfied than middle-aged workers and as satisfied in comparison to younger workers. It is generally believed that job satisfaction increases linearly with age. However, Clark, Oswald, and Warr (1996) found that many published studies have repeatedly revealed a U-shaped relationship between age and overall job satisfaction. This means that job satisfaction declines
from a moderate level in the early years of employment and then increases steadily up to retirement. Similarly, Rhodes (1983) examined 185 research studies and found that internal work motivations, overall job satisfaction, and job involvement were positively associated with age (cited in Sullivan & Duplaga, 1997).

Overall we see that older workers are often perceived more negatively than younger workers, despite their comparable job performance and generally higher levels of job satisfaction. Given this pessimistic environment, what would motivate older workers to seek employment? In addition, if an employer was to seek out older workers, as encouraged to earlier, what incentives should be used to attract and retain older workers?

**Obstacles in Obtaining Jobs For Older Workers**

Many researchers indicated that older workers are hired only in specific industries. Hutchens (1988) for example, found that newly hired older workers were clustered in a smaller set of industries and occupations (e.g., manufacturing, finance, insurance, and real estate) than newly hired younger workers. There also appear to be
some organizations that employ older workers but do not hire older workers, suggesting that job opportunities for workers are diminishing with age.

There are jobs that older workers cannot obtain that are due to reasons other than those mentioned above. Hirsch, MacPherson, and Hardy (2000) for example, found that older workers (both men and women) are faced with substantial entry barriers in occupations with steep wage profiles, pension benefits, and computer usage. In addition, union coverage is associated with limited access for older men, while older female hires are concentrated in occupations where flextime, part-time work, and daytime shifts are common.

Segregation across occupations among older new hires also exceeds that for younger workers. Scott and Berger (1995) found that the probability that a new hire was aged 55-64 was significantly lower in firms with health care plans than in those without, and was also significantly lower in firms with relatively costly plans than in those with less costly plans. Therefore, organizations may need to look beyond the limitations mentioned above and consider older workers' more beneficial characteristics.
Attractive Employment
Characteristics of
Older Workers

There are organizations that do hire older workers. What then are the characteristics that make older workers attractive to these employers? The U.S. Department of Labor (1989) reported that the shortage in the labor force stems from declining standards of education, a lack of affordable housing in places where jobs are plentiful, costly child care, and limited transportation to suburban plants and offices. However, educational deficiencies are not the key concern when dealing with older workers. This is because older workers are not the most likely candidates for retraining, transportation problems are not crucial with this group, and child-care is seldom an issue (Andrews, 1992). As a result, older workers may experience less conflict and may be more committed in their jobs than younger workers.

Similarly, an article by the American Association of Retired Persons (1993) found that employers who do hire older adults discover that older workers possess a vast resource of talent and experience. They indicated that the attractive characteristics of older workers include: 1) their experience, knowledge and skills, 2) efficiency and
productivity, 3) cost effectiveness and low turnover, 4) commitment to the work ethic: interest in doing the job well, punctuality, low absenteeism, 5) loyalty and commitment to the company's goal, 6) stability and as role models for younger workers, 7) high potential for success in retraining, 8) good "people" skills such as empathy, courtesy, patience, and helpfulness, 9) maturity, and 10) fewer on the job accidents.

For example, McNaught and Barth (1992) conducted a study that compared older workers and younger workers at a Days Inns' reservation center and found that older workers were more successful in comparison to younger workers in booking reservations. The older workers remained on the job longer and were found to be a valuable source of labor that helped solve significant human resource problems. In addition, older workers were more able to handle the social aspect in comparison to younger workers. Similarly, Hassell and Perrewé (1995) found that older workers in comparison with younger workers have lower absenteeism and turnover. In addition to having positive work attitudes and motivation, older workers have the relevant job skills and loyalty that organizations seek in an employee. As a
result, older workers can help to foster a more productive and positive environment in organizations.

Classification of Older Job Seekers and Motives to Work

Organizations that acknowledge the above characteristics of older workers do benefit from hiring them. The key to increasing the supply of older workers is making the workplace attractive to their needs. In order to identify what attracts older workers, organizations need to acknowledge that there are many subgroups of older workers.

For example, a publication by the American Association of Retired Persons (1993) hypothesized that there are six different subgroups of older adults seeking employment. By identifying these subgroups, organizations will be able to plan their recruitment strategy effectively to target older workers (Doverspike et al., 2000). The subgroups include:
1) midlife career changers (less than 55 years old), 2) displaced workers under age 62 (55 to 61 years old and not receiving pension benefits), 3) retirees under age 62 (55 to 61 and receiving pension benefits), 4) retirees age 62-69 receiving Social Security benefits, 5) retirees age 70 or older receiving Social Security benefits, and 6) those
who have not worked outside the home for the past 10 years.  
(More detail on these categories is provided in Appendix  
A).

By identifying which subgroup an older adult seeking  
employment occupies, organizations may also be able to  
better meet older adults’ employment needs by identifying  
their primary motivators or meaning of work. For example,  
one group may need to work in a full-time position that  
offers full benefits and opportunity for advancement.  
Another group may need to work for basic financial needs,  
while another group may desire to work primarily for the  
purpose of meeting people. As Forteza and Prieto (1994)  
stated, many of the incentives that motivate older workers  
are not viewed as important to younger workers; that is,  
each group may have different motives to work. This  
information is valuable for organizations, because it can  
help direct their recruitment efforts. By identifying the  
motivations of the various subgroups of older workers,  
organizations will be able to determine the fit between  
what the organization has to offer and what a particular  
subgroup needs and wants. Unfortunately, no empirical  
evidence currently exists in support of these proposed  
subgroups and their motives to seek employment.
However, a publication by the American Association of Retired Persons (1993) indicates that older workers want to continue working because they want to make money. Other reasons are to obtain health insurance and other benefits, develop new skills to improve themselves, use their time productively and to feel useful and needed. Older adults also continue working not only to make new friends and to stay in touch with current events, but also to provide structure to their daily lives and a reason for getting up in the morning, and last but not least, they want to have a sense of personal achievement and growth.

Similarly, Mor-Barak (1995) found in her study of older adults seeking employment that there exists four factors that can explain the motives or meaning of work for older adults. She utilized the Meaning of Work Scale (MWS) that was originally developed by Florian (1982) called Florain's three-factor model consisting of economic, social and psychological factors. However, Mor-Barak (1995) added an additional factor that is known as ‘The Generativity Factor.’

The MWS consists of: the Social Contact Factor (receiving respect, status, and prestige as well as socializing); the Personal Factor (self-esteem, personal
satisfaction, and a sense of pride in oneself); the
Financial Factor (income and benefit associated with work);
and the Generativity Factor (teaching and training and
passing knowledge and skills to the younger generation).
The four factors above accounted for 70 percent of the
variance in the MWS. As can be seen, the four factors above
are similar to those reasons indicated in the publication
by the American Association of Retired Persons (1993) above
that encompasses the social, personal and financial
aspects.

The Generativity Factor can be of great benefit to
organizations. Older workers have the knowledge and skills
that younger workers can learn from. Older workers are
often willing to share their knowledge and experiences with
younger workers. In addition, they are able to transmit
ideas and values to the younger workers by being role
models (Lindbo & Shultz, 1998).

Research Questions

The six subgroups of older workers proposed by the
American Association of Retired Persons (1993) and the four
dimensions of MWS theory proposed by Mor-Barak (1995)
served as a framework for the present study. Specifically, the three research questions that guide this study include:

1. To determine what work-related factors differentiate six subgroups (see Appendix A) of older adults seeking employment by using the 33-items in Section A of Appendix D, derived from the American Association of Retired Persons (1993) descriptions in Appendix A.

2. To determine whether the six subgroups differ on the four Meaning of Work subscales (MWS) developed by Mor-Barak (1995). In addition, the relative importance of each subscale for each group was also examined.

3. To determine whether the six subgroups differ on other measures such as the Work Involvement scale and the Higher Order Need Strength Survey, both developed by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979).
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants

Volunteers (N = 128) from the One Stop employment centers at San Bernardino and Riverside, California and from the County of San Bernardino, California Department of Aging and Adult Services were asked to participate in this research. Twenty-seven participants from One Stop centers at San Bernardino and Riverside were dropped from the analysis because they did not meet the age requirement for the study, that is, 40 years old and above. After exclusion of the 27 participants, there were 101 participants remaining.

The volunteers for this study were those older adults aged 40 and above who were currently seeking employment. The person in charge of each of the departments was contacted to gain their consent to conduct the research. The sample was predominantly older women (61.4%). The mean age of the participants was 59 years with a range from 40 to 82. A detailed demographic breakdown is included in Appendix B. Participants were treated in accordance with

Materials/Measures

A questionnaire consisting of 71 questions was used. Other materials such as the consent form, debriefing statement, pencils and folders were provided. Examples of the informed consent form (see Appendix C), questionnaire (see Appendix D) and debriefing statement (see Appendix E) are included.

The questionnaire consisted of five sections. Section A was designed by the researcher and thesis advisor. It was based on the six subgroups identified by the American Association of Retired Persons (1993) that are described in Appendix A. Participants were presented with 33 brief statements using a 5-point Likert scale (from 1 = Inaccurate to 5 = Very accurate). These items were factor analyzed and scales created as described in the result section.

Section B was taken from Mor-Barak's (1995) Meaning of Work Scale (MWS) consisting of 16-items. It was subdivided into four factors (consisting of the Social Contact Factor, the Personal Factor, the Financial Factor, and the
Generativity Factor) with a 5-point Likert scale indicating their level of agreement with each statement (from 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree). Questions 1 to 5 are related to the Social Contact Factor (minimum score of 5 and maximum score of 25), 6 to 9 are related to the Personal Factor (minimum score of 4 and maximum score of 20), 10 to 12 are related to the Financial Factor (minimum score of 3 and maximum score of 15) and 13 to 16 are related to the Generativity Factor (minimum score of 4 and maximum score of 20). The total minimum score for the scale is 16 and the maximum score is 80. The higher the individual score on each of the subscales, the greater that subscale means to the individual regarding work. As reported by Mor-Barak (1995), the Cronbach’s Alpha indicated a high internal consistency for the total scale (Alpha = 0.92). The four subscales, indicated adequate to high reliability: Social Contact (Alpha = 0.81), Personal (Alpha = 0.81), Financial (Alpha = 0.70), and Generativity (Alpha = 0.85).

Section C is the Work Involvement survey developed by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979) which was included in the questionnaire to measure the extent to which a person wants to engage in work. This survey obtained from Cook,
Hepworth, Wall and Warr (1981) consisted of 6-items using a 7-point Likert scale (from 1 = Strongly disagree to 7 = Strongly agree). As reported by Cook, Hepworth, Wall and Warr (1981), the Work Involvement scale was found to have an Alpha coefficient of .64. A test-retest correlation of .56 was recorded for a sample of 60 male blue-collar employees from manufacturing industries over a period of six months. The minimum score an individual could obtain is 6 and maximum is 42. The higher the individual score the greater the extent to which a person wants to engage in work.

Section D is the Higher Order Need Strength survey developed by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979). It was included in the questionnaire to measure the need for satisfaction and achievement through work. This survey obtained from Cook, Hepworth, Wall and Warr (1981) consisted of 6-items using a 7-point Likert scale (from 1 = Not at all important to 7 = Extremely important). The minimum score an individual could obtain is 6 and maximum is 42. The higher the individual score the greater the need for satisfaction and achievement through work. As reported by Cook, Hepworth, Wall and Warr (1981), the Higher Order Need Strength scale was found to
have an Alpha coefficient of .91 for a sample of 200 and .82 for a sample of 390 male blue-collar employees from manufacturing industries.

Section E was designed by the researcher and the thesis advisor to gather demographic information of the participants. It consisted of 8-items to test the research questions above.

Based on the six subgroups identified by the American Association of Retired Persons (1993), Meaning of Work Scale (MWS) developed by Mor-Barak (1995), Work Involvement survey and Higher Order Need Strength survey developed by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979), 10 dependent variables were identified. Four of the dependent variables were based on the six subgroups identified by the American Association of Retired Persons (1993) that are described in Appendix A (i.e., Meaning, Challenge, Schedule and Skill Obsolescence), 4 dependent variables were from the Meaning of Work Scale (MWS) by Mor-Barak (1995), (i.e. Social Contact Factor, the Personal Factor, the Financial Factor, and the Generativity Factor), and the other two dependent variables were from Work Involvement survey and Higher Order Need Strength survey developed by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979).
Procedure

Three groups of volunteers were asked to participate in this research. One of the group was drawn from the San Bernardino County, California Department of Aging and Adult Services, Senior Employment Program which is a federally funded program that trains and places older adults in private and public sector jobs. The second group was selected from individuals who frequent the One Stop center located in Riverside, California. The third group was selected from individuals who attended a work seminar at the One Stop employment center located in San Bernardino, California.

Participation was purely voluntary. After reading the informed consent form and agreeing to participate, the questionnaire was either handed out to them or was placed in their packet. There was no set time limit for completing the questionnaire. Once they completed the questionnaire, it was placed in a folder provided by the researcher. The researcher then handed them a debriefing statement which the participants kept. The researcher was present at the locations throughout the entire administration of the survey.
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Principle Components Analysis

The initially proposed analysis (i.e., discriminant function analysis) was not performed due to the insufficient number of participants \((N = 101)\), in particular, the small numbers of retirees under age 62 receiving pension benefits and those who have not worked outside the home for the past 10 years \((N = 2\) each). Therefore, we instead conducted a principle components analysis (PCA) and found four principle components (factors). With this we were able to include the factors derived into a one-way MANOVA, which allowed us to use multivariate statistics in order to test all three research questions at the same time.

In order to address research question 1, the 33 items in section A were factor analyzed to create subscales. To answer research questions 1, 2, and 3 a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to test for group differences on the subscales created from the 33 items, the four MWS subscales, the Work Involvement and the Higher Order Need Strength scales. Individual ANOVAs and
Post-hoc comparisons were also conducted. In addition, effect size estimates (i.e., eta-square) were able to provide us with the variance accounted for by group membership for each subscale.

PCA with varimax rotation was performed through SPSS FACTOR on the 33-items in Section A of Appendix D derived from the American Association of Retired Persons (1993) descriptions in Appendix A for a sample of 101 individuals (men, n = 39; women, n = 62). There were eight components with Eigenvalue greater than 1. However, the 33-items loaded on four primary components, as evidenced by the scree plot (see Appendix F), and rotated component matrix loading (see Appendix G). In order to maximize the interpretability of each of the component, the fifth component was excluded due to its ambiguity. Items were retained based on their factor loading, the extent to which alpha was maximized, and each item's ability to contribute to an interpretable scale. Eight items were retained on component 1, with rotated factor loadings ranging from .449 to .842. Seven items were retained on component 2, with rotated factor loadings ranging from .585 to .764. Six items were retained on component 3, with rotated factor loadings ranging from .474 to .740. Two items were retained
on component 4, with rotated factor loadings ranging from .545 to .583. Based on the type of items on each of the components, component one was named Skill Obsolescence, component two was named Schedule, component three was named Meaning and component four was named Challenge.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Of the 101 participants who volunteered, 26 were considered midlife career changers less than 55 years old (midlifers), 24 were considered displaced workers under age 62 not receiving pension benefits, 2 were considered retirees under age 62 receiving pension benefits (displaced workers), 27 were considered retirees age 62-69 receiving Social Security benefits (younger retirees), 17 were considered retirees age 70 or older receiving Social Security benefits (older retirees), and 2 were considered those who have not worked outside the home for the past 10 years. There are four participants who did not indicate which subgroup they belong to. Two groups (retirees under age 62 receiving pension benefits [55 to 61 years old], and those who have not worked outside of the home for pay in the past 10 years) were excluded from further analysis due to inadequate sample sizes (N = 2 each). A one-way MANOVA
was performed on the ten dependent variables: Social Contact Factor, Personal Factor, Financial Factor, Generativity Factor, Meaning, Schedule, Skill Obsolescence, Challenge, Work Involvement and Higher Order Need Strength. The four levels of the independent variable were the groups described above (i.e. midlifers, displaced workers, younger retirees and older retirees).

SPSS GLM was used for the analysis with the sequential adjustment for nonorthogonality. Total N of 101 was reduced to 94 with the deletion of seven missing cases. There were no univariate outliers found using a criterion $z = 3.3$ ($\alpha = .001$). Results of evaluation of assumptions of normality, linearity, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices and multicollinearity were satisfactory.

With the use of Wilks' Lambda criterion, the combined DVs were significantly affected by the subgroups, $F(30, 228.43) = 2.128$, $p = .001$. The result reflected a modest association between subgroups and the combined DVs, partial $\eta^2 = .207$.

To investigate the impact of each main effect on the individual DVs, a Roy Bargmann stepdown analysis was performed on the prioritized DVs. All DVs were judged to be
sufficiently reliable to warrant stepdown analysis. In stepdown analysis each DV was analyzed, in turn with highest-priority DVs treated as covariates and with the highest-priority DVs tested as univariate ANOVA. Homogeneity of regression was achieved for all the components of the stepdown analysis and the highest priority DV was tested in a univariate ANOVA.

A unique contribution in predicting differences between the four subgroups was made by the Financial factor, stepdown $F(3, 90) = 10.32, p < .001$. After the pattern of differences measured by Financial was entered, a difference was also found on Schedule, stepdown $F(3, 89) = 3.58, p < .05$. Although a univariate comparison revealed that the Challenge, univariate $F(3, 90) = 5.22, p = .002, \eta^2 = .148$, and Skill Obsolescence, univariate $F(3, 90) = 3.40, p = .021, \eta^2 = .102$, were also significantly able to predict differences in the four subgroups, this difference were already represented in the stepdown analysis by higher priority DVs. However, the Social factor, Personal factor, Generativity factor, Work Involvement, Higher Order Need Strength, and Meaning, were not found to be statistically significant (see Appendix H).
The Financial factor was able to differentiate among the subgroups. The first in order of importance was the midlifers ($M = 4.26$), the second, displaced workers ($M = 3.76$), the third, younger retirees ($M = 3.05$), and the fourth, older retirees ($M = 2.76$) (see Appendix I).

The Schedule factor was also able to differentiate among the subgroups. The first in order of importance was the displaced workers ($M = 3.38$), the second, midlifers ($M = 3.26$), the third, younger retirees ($M = 2.95$), and the fourth, older retirees ($M = 2.40$) (see Appendix I).

After conducting the MANOVA, and individual ANOVAs, Post Hoc analysis were carried out. The Tukey HSD tests indicated that for the Financial factor, midlifers and younger retirees were significantly different ($M_1 - M_2 = 1.20$), midlifers and older retirees were significantly different ($M_1 - M_2 = 1.50$), and displaced workers and older retirees were significantly different ($M_1 - M_2 = 1.00$) (see Appendix J).

With respect to the Schedule factor, midlifers and older retirees were significantly different ($M_1 - M_2 = .85$), and displaced workers and older retirees were significantly different ($M_1 - M_2 = .98$) (see Appendix J).
Pooled within-cell Correlations among DVs are shown in Appendix K.
CHAPTER FOUR
DISCUSSION

Research Findings

The overarching purpose of this study was to determine what differentiates subgroups of older adults seeking employment by using the four scales (Meaning, Schedule, Skill Obsolescence and Challenge) that resulted from the 33-items in Section A of Appendix D derived from the American Association of Retired Persons (1993) descriptions. In addition, other measures: Meaning of Work Scale (MWS) by Mor-Barak (1995), Work Involvement scale and Higher Order Need Strength survey by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979) which were thought to be able to differentiate among subgroups of older adults were also investigated. Unfortunately, two groups (retirees under age 55 to 61 years old receiving pension benefits, and those who have not worked outside of the home for pay in the past 10 years) were excluded from further analysis due to inadequate sample sizes (N = 2) for each group. The remaining groups were: midlife career changers (midlifers) 40 to 55 years old, displaced workers 50 to 62 years old not receiving pension benefits (displaced workers),
retirees age 62-69 receiving Social Security benefits (younger retirees), and retirees age 70 or older receiving Social Security benefits (older retirees).

The Meaning of Work Scale (MWS) by Mor-Barak (1995), specifically the Financial factor, was able to differentiate among the subgroups. This factor was most important to the midlifers in comparison to the other three groups. This may be due to midlifers still having children (adolescents and/or teenagers) whom they need to support. That is, they have children who are about to begin their college education or already are doing so. In addition, they may also still have house payments and possibly need to continue accruing pension benefits and savings. The Schedule factor was most important to the displaced workers in comparison to the other three groups. Displaced workers are most probably concerned with the Schedule factor since they seek full-time positions in order to receive full benefits (health insurance coverage and Social Security). This is most probably due to displaced workers feeling insecure about their jobs and not having pension benefits. Based on The Bureau of Labor Statistics, displaced workers are those individuals who have been laid off due to their company closing down, moving abroad, or when their position
is abolished. Due to this, displaced workers may be more concerned with the Schedule factor in comparison to the other three groups for a more stable work schedule such as having a full-time position. In contrast, older retirees are least concerned with this factor due to their flexibility (i.e., seeking full-time, part-time or temporary work) and most likely have already accrued Social Security benefits (see Appendix H).

As Forteza and Prieto (1994) state, each group of older workers may have different motives to work. This appears to have been at least partially supported by our results.

Research question one was partially supported. The Schedule factor differentiated among the four subgroups of older adults. This can be important to organizations when handling their recruitment. Organizations will be able to attract older adults by providing the factor that attract and motivate different subgroups of older adults. For example, by offering full-time employment to displaced workers and part-time employment to older retirees.

Research question two was also partially supported, in that the Financial factor was able to differentiate among the four subgroups. As anticipated, the Financial factor
was most important to midlifers and least important to older retirees. As indicated by the publication of the American Association of Retired Persons (1993), older workers want to continue working because they want to make money. However, the strength of this motive significantly differed by subgroup.

As anticipated, midlifers and displaced workers were more concerned with Financial, and Schedule. As for the older retirees, we expected them to be higher on social and generativity. However, our results showed that the two factors were not significant. This may be due to the fact that the participants in this research were from the lower income group, especially those participants from the County of San Bernardino, California Department of Aging and Adult Services. In order to obtain assistance from the above department, participants from this department have to be in the lower income group. Therefore, participants here were most likely working due to financial factor and not for social or generativity purposes. As found by Sterns and Sterns (1995), people continue to work into late life because they need the additional income (cited in Sterns and Huyck, 2001). Sterns and Huyck (2001) also found that eighty percent of people aged 40 to 59, seventy six percent
of people aged 51 to 59 and twenty five percent of people aged 60 and over are employed. However, they found that the major predictor for older adults remaining in the workforce was due to one’s attitude towards work and the motivation to be current and competitive. However, our result was not able to support their findings.

Research question three was not supported, in that the subgroups of older workers did not differ significantly on the Work Involvement scale nor the Higher Order Need Strength survey.

Implications of the study

The implications for this study are that organizations will be made aware that there are different subgroups of older adults seeking employment. In addition, the different subgroups appear to have different needs or motivations in seeking employment. As such, the research findings will help organizations identify the important and unique work motivations for each subgroup of older adults. As found here, the Financial, and Schedule factors were found to be significant differentiators among subgroups of older adults in terms of their motivation to work. Organizations may be
able to attract older adults by adjusting pay and benefits and work schedules (i.e., full-time or part-time job).

For example, some older adults may require more benefits. Therefore, organizations may be able to increase benefits and reduce pay. As for those older adults who have already accrued benefits, organizations can then increase pay and reduce benefits. This is similar to the idea of using a Cafeteria pay plan whereby employees are given a choice that suits their specific needs and purposes. As for work schedules, employers may be able to be more flexible with the work schedule depending on the subgroups they are trying to recruit. For example, if employers are interested in attracting older retirees, they might need to provide an alternative work schedule (for example, four-day-work week) in contrast to the traditional work schedule of nine-to-five, five days a week. As a result, employers may be able to attract older adults by being flexible with the work schedule.

By identifying the differences in motivations for different subgroups of older workers, organizations will be able to improve their recruitment strategies and methods for employing older adults. In doing so, organizations may be able to attract specific types of older workers to its
workforce, thereby increasing their ability to attract the right candidate for the position. As the American Association of Retired Persons (1993) clearly suggested to organizations in regards to hiring older adults, "Identifying the primary motivators for your targeted group is crucial to your successful recruitment campaign" (p. 7).

Organizations need to acknowledge that younger workers typically have less work experience. Therefore, it may be more beneficial to hire older workers for certain jobs. The Committee for Economic Development (1999) found that when work experience declines, as seen from 1963 to 1992, productivity suffers. Declining work experience due to a younger workforce had a negative impact that reduced productivity by six percent between those years. This shows the importance for organizations that have negative attitudes and misperceptions of older workers to change in order for their organization to function productively, efficiently and competitively. As can be seen from all of the above, older workers have a lot to offer to organizations. Older workers can be considered an important asset to organizations. Thus, with the impending growth of
qualified workers in general, it is critical that organizations fully understand what motivates older adults to seek employment.

Limitations of Study

A limitation of the study was that participants from the One Stop centers and the Department of Aging and Adult Services from Southern California tend to be from the lower income levels. The One Stop centers offer services to all individuals seeking employment. The Department of Aging and Adult Services offers similar services as the One Stop centers with the exception that those individuals seeking help need to qualify for the program. That is, they need to be above 55 years old and classified under the lower income level group. Therefore, the results may only be applicable to the lower income level group.

In addition, the sample size was smaller than anticipated. As a result, two groups were dropped, thus we were unable to fully test the proposed research questions. Results might be different with more participants such as gathering participants from a wider demographic area. This would help to increase generalizability of findings.
Recommendations for Future Research

From the present findings, several recommendations for future research can be suggested. Future research could include both older adults seeking employment and older workers who are currently working, as participants in the study. This is to determine whether both groups have similar or different motivations to work. Future research should include research conducted through mailing questionnaires out to participants instead of only collecting them on-site. This would help generate a wider sample of participants. In addition, a wider range of geographical regions as well as a wide range of older adults would help to increase generalizability of findings. A wider range of variables such as income level and marital status, as well as a larger sample that would allow for more extensive multivariate analyses should be considered. Lastly, personality characteristics should be examined as further predictors of motivations to work.
APPENDIX A:

THE SIX DIFFERENT SUBGROUPS OF OLDER ADULTS SEEKING EMPLOYMENT
### The Six Different Subgroups of Older Adults Seeking Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Midlife career changers (40 to 54 years old) | - consists of younger older workers  
- they are burned out in their job  
- have a strong need to work  
- seek full-time positions with full benefits  
- need to maintain health insurance coverage and continue building up pension and Social Security benefits  
- looking for a chance to develop new skills and new challenges, and  
- they are looking for advancement opportunities and more money. |
| Displaced workers under age 62 (55 to 61 years old) | - have recent work experiences  
- they are not receiving Social Security benefits and probably not getting pension benefits either  
- looking for full-time positions and full benefits,  
- need to maintain health insurance and continue building up Social Security credits, and  
- they may identify strongly with their former job titles and therefore limit other job possibilities or may be told that their skills are no longer in use and their work experience is irrelevant to available job |
| Retirees under age 62 (55 to 61 years old)   | - they are not receiving Social Security benefits but may be receiving pension benefits as part of an early retirement incentive package  
- they are bored with retirement  
- interested in full-time or part-time positions  
- motivated to seek structure in their lives and need a sense of belonging and something meaningful to do, and |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retirees ages 62-69 receiving Social Security benefits</th>
<th>Retirees age 70 or older receiving Social Security benefits</th>
<th>Those who have not worked outside the home the past 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• they may identify strongly with former job titles which limit other possibilities</td>
<td>• interested in part-time work and flexible hours</td>
<td>• interested in part-time positions, flexible hours or work at home for supplementary income to Social Security benefits or spouse’s pension,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they are eligible for Medicare but may still be interested in group health insurance as a fringe benefit</td>
<td>• receiving small benefits due to lower income, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they perceive that employers are not interested in them due to their skills being obsolete, and therefore unable to compete and fit in with the younger workers, and</td>
<td>• they are also responsible for the care of one of more elderly parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• they are concerned with their own health limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B:

PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHIC BREAKDOWN
## Participant Demographic Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>59.47</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Incomplete</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certifications</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate (2 Years)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate (4 Years)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate / Professional Degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most Recent Position in the Last Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial and Administrative</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professional and Technical</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and Secretarial</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft and Related</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Protective Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and Machine Operative</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous Work Experience in the Last 10 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial and Administrative</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Midlife Career Changer (&lt;55 Years old)</td>
<td>Displaced Workers under Age 62</td>
<td>Retiree Under Age 62</td>
<td>Retiree age 62 - 69</td>
<td>Retiree age 70 or older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Leaving Previous Position</th>
<th>Terminated</th>
<th>Layoff</th>
<th>Quit</th>
<th>Need a Change</th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>Seek New Challenges</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C:

INFORMED CONSENT
Why older adults seek employment:
An examination of the differing motivations among subgroups

The research that you are about to participate in is being conducted by a graduate student who is supervised by a psychology professor in order for the student to graduate from the Industrial/Organizational Psychology Program at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB). This research has been approved by the Psychology Department Human Subjects Review Committee of CSUSB. You are selected as a participant because you are an adult seeking employment.

The purpose of this research is to find the motivational factors within different subgroups of job seekers. If you choose to be a participant, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire about this topic. The survey will take approximately fifteen to twenty minutes to complete.

After you have completed the questionnaire, please place it in a folder provided by the researcher. If you are unclear about the instructions, please do not hesitate to ask the researcher before the survey is completed.

We do not foresee any immediate or long-term risks associated with this research. There are also no direct benefits to be gained. However, organizations may be able to use the results from this research to improve their recruitment effort toward older job seekers. As a result, organizations may be able to attract the best candidate for their positions. Your participation in this survey is voluntary and you have the right to refuse to participate. Returning the questionnaire will indicate your willingness to participate but in no way obligates you to complete the survey.

Anonymity of your records will be maintained because no personal identification will be asked from you on either the consent form or the questionnaire. However, you are asked to place an X in the box provided at the bottom right of the page indicating your agreement to participate in this survey. The researcher’s advisor will store the information collected.

If you wish to quit at any time, please feel free to do so by handing in the questionnaire and the consent form. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits for doing so. A copy of a debriefing statement will be provided when you hand in the questionnaire and the consent form. Please keep a copy of the debriefing statement for your records in order for you to contact the researcher or her advisor if the need arises.

Principal Researcher: Jasmin Loi Lui Ping
Advisor: Dr. Kenneth Schultz
Contact Person: Dr. Kenneth Schultz
Psychology Department, California State University, San Bernardino
5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407.
(909) 880-5484

Please place an X here

DATE: ___/___/___
APPENDIX D:

QUESTIONNAIRE
**Section A**

Please indicate the level of accuracy with each statement below by placing a number in the blank before it. Use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inaccurate</td>
<td>Somewhat accurate</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Accurate</td>
<td>Very accurate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. _____ I felt burned out in my previous job
2. _____ I am looking for a full time position
3. _____ I am looking for full benefits
4. _____ I need to maintain health insurance coverage
5. _____ I need to continue building up pension and Social Security credits
6. _____ I am looking for a chance to develop new skills and new challenges
7. _____ I am looking for advancement opportunity
8. _____ I am looking for a position that offers more money
9. _____ I have recent (within the last year) work experience
10. _____ I am not currently receiving social security benefits
11. _____ I am not currently receiving pension benefits
12. _____ I identify strongly with my former job title
13. _____ I have been told by employers that my skills are obsolete
14. _____ I have been told that my work experience is irrelevant to available jobs
15. _____ I am receiving pension benefits as part of an early retirement incentive package
16. _____ I am bored with retirement
17. _____ I am looking for part-time and/or flextime position
18. _____ I have a need for more structure in my life
19. _____ I believe a job will provide me with a sense of belonging
20. _____ I need something meaningful to do
21. _____ I am currently receiving Social Security benefits
22. _____ I am interested in group health insurance even though I am eligible for Medicare
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers are not interested in me due to my skills being obsolete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel that I am not able to compete or fit in with younger workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned with my own health limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in working at home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am looking for positions that would give me social and psychological benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to work in order to make new friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned about my lack of skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned about my lack of recent work experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am looking to supplement my income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for the care of an elderly person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never worked before outside of the home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section B**

Please indicate your degree of agreement with each statement below by placing a number in the blank before it. Use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For me, paid work…

1. ____ Gives me respect from relatives and friends
2. ____ Keeps me from feeling alone
3. ____ Gives me status and prestige
4. ____ Gives me respect and esteem from other people
5. ____ Pleases relatives or friends who expect me to work
6. ____ Gives me personal satisfaction
7. ____ Helps me feel worthwhile
1. ____ Provides me with an interest in life
2. ____ Gives me a feeling of pride in my work and in myself
3. ____ Provides me with enough money to live
4. ____ Gives me benefits such as health care
5. ____ Is my major source of income
6. ____ Gives me an opportunity to share my skills with younger people
7. ____ Gives me a chance to teach and train others
8. ____ Gives me a chance to use and demonstrate my skills and abilities
9. ____ Allow me to pass my knowledge to the next generation

**Section C**

Please indicate your degree of agreement with each statement below by placing a number in the blank before it. Use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ____ Even if I won a great deal of money in the lottery I would continue to work somewhere
2. ____ Having a job is very important to me
3. ____ I should hate to be on welfare
4. ____ I would soon get very bored if I had no work to do
5. ____ The most important things that happen to me involve work
6. ____ Even if the unemployment benefit was really high, I would still prefer to work
**Section D**

Please indicate how important you believe each statement below is by placing a number in the blank before it. Use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>Not particularly important</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Moderately important</td>
<td>Fairly important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ____ Using your skills to the maximum
2. ____ Achieving something that you personally value
3. ____ The opportunity to make your own decisions
4. ____ The opportunity to learn new things
5. ____ Challenging work
6. ____ Extending your range of abilities

**Section E**

The questions in this section are intended for the sole purpose of gathering demographic information. It will only be used collectively as a group. It will not be used to identify any participants in this research. Please state or check one choice for each question below unless otherwise indicated.

1. Age: _______ years old

2. Sex:
   - □ Male  □ Female

3. Race:
   - □ African American  □ Hispanic  □ White
   - □ Asian/Pacific Islander  □ Native American  □ Other, please specify: ____________________________
4. Education Level:

- High school (incomplete)
- High school graduate
- Vocational
- Certifications
- Some college
- College Graduate (2 Year)
- College Graduate (4 Year)
- Graduate / Professional Degree

5. Most recent position in the last year?

- Managerial and administrative
- Professional
- Associate professional and technical
- Clerical and secretarial
- Craft and related
- Personal and protective service
- Sales
- Plant and machine operative
- Other: Please specify ____________________
- Not applicable
6. Previous work experience in the last 10 years in: (Please check all that apply)

☐ Managerial and administrative
☐ Professional
☐ Associate professional and technical
☐ Clerical and secretarial
☐ Craft and related
☐ Personal and protective service
☐ Sales
☐ Plant and machine operative
☐ Other: Please specify ________________
☐ Not applicable

7. Desired future position(s) in: (Please check all that apply)

☐ Managerial and administrative
☐ Professional
☐ Associate professional and technical
☐ Clerical and secretarial
☐ Craft and related
☐ Personal and protective service
☐ Sales
☐ Plant and machine operative
☐ Other: Please specify ________________
8. Which category best describes you? (choose only one)

☐ midlife career changer (less than 55 years old)

☐ displaced worker under age 62 not receiving pension benefits (55 to 61 years old)

☐ retiree under age 62 receiving pension benefits (55 to 61 years old)

☐ retiree age 62-69 receiving Social Security benefits,

☐ retiree age 70 or older receiving Social Security benefits,

☐ those who have not worked outside of the home for pay in the past 10 years

9. Why did you leave your previous position?

☐ Terminated

☐ Layoff

☐ Quit

☐ Needed a change

☐ Retired

☐ Seek new challenges

☐ Other: Please specify ______________

Thank you for your participation
APPENDIX E:

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT
Why older adults seek employment:
An examination of the differing motivations among subgroups

Thank you for your participation in this survey. The information collected will be valuable to organizations for their recruitment purposes.

The purpose of this research is to find the motivational factors within different subgroups of older adults seeking employment. According to research, there exist four different motivational factors. They are: the Social Contact Factor, the Personal Factor, the Financial Factor and the Generativity Factor. These factors are used to differentiate between the six subgroups in this research study. The six subgroups are: midlife career changers (less than 55 years old), displaced workers under age 62 (55 to 61 years old and not receiving pension benefits), retirees under age 62 (55 to 61 years old and receiving pension benefits), retirees ages 62-69 receiving Social Security benefits, retirees age 70 or older receiving Social Security benefits, and those who have not worked outside the home for the past 10 years. The six subgroups identified above were proposed by American Association of Retired Persons (1993) but have not been empirically tested. Therefore, this research seeks to validate the six subgroups and the motivational differences among them. This information if found to be significant can be of value to organizations when handling their recruitment strategies. They may be able to strategically target those individuals whom they seek to hire. That is, they will be able to attract the right candidate for the position.

Please be assured that any information you provide will be held in strict confidence by the researchers. All data will be reported in group form only. The results will be available on June 20, 2001.

Please keep this copy for your record in order for you to contact the researcher or her advisor if you wish to find out more details about the study or would like a report of its results. Please do not discuss this survey with others as this may influence their response. We appreciate your cooperation.

Principal Researcher: Jasmin Loi Lui Ping
Advisor: Dr. Kenneth Shultz
Contact Person: Dr. Kenneth Shultz
Psychology Department,
California State University, San Bernardino
5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407.
(909) 880-5484
APPENDIX F:
SCREE PLOT DERIVED FROM PRINCIPLE COMPONENT ANALYSIS
Scree Plot Derived From Principle Component Analysis
APPENDIX G:

ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>Skill Obsolescence</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. I have been told by employers that my skills are obsolete</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I am concerned about my lack of recent work experience</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I have been told that my work experience is irrelevant to available jobs</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Employers are not interested in me due to my skills being obsolete</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I am concerned with my own health limitations</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I am concerned about my lack of skills</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I felt burned out in my previous job</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I often feel that I am not able to compete or fit in with younger workers</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I have never worked before outside of the home</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am looking for full benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I am currently receiving Social Security benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am looking for a full time position</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I need to maintain health insurance coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I need to continue building up pension and Social Security credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I am looking for part-time and/or flextime position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am not currently receiving social security benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I am looking to supplement my income</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am not currently receiving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pension benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I believe a job will provide me with a sense of belonging</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I need something meaningful to do</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I am looking for positions that would give me social and psychological benefits</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I have a need for more structure in my life</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I am interested in group health insurance even though I am eligible for Medicare</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I would like to work in order to make new friends</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am bored with retirement</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I am responsible for the care of an elderly person</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am looking for a position that offers more money</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am looking for a chance to develop new skills and new challenges</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have recent (within the last year) work experience</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am looking for advancement opportunity</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.497  .545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I identify strongly with my former job title</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am receiving pension benefits as part of an early retirement incentive package</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I am interested in working at home</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalue | 7.083  | 3.495  | 2.666  | 2.001  |
| Percentage of variance explained | 21.462 | 10.590 | 8.080  | 6.063  |
| Number of items on scale (n) | 8      | 7      | 6      | 2      |

Underlined loadings are items that make up a given scale for the purpose of alpha reliabilities.
APPENDIX H:

UNIVARIATE AND STEPDOWN ANALYSIS
## Univariate and Stepdown Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV Variables</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Stepdown F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.32*</td>
<td>3/90</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>10.32*</td>
<td>3/90</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.72*</td>
<td>3/90</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>3.58**</td>
<td>3/89</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.22**</td>
<td>3/90</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>3/88</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>Obsolescence</td>
<td>3.40**</td>
<td>3/90</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>3/87</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generativity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>3/90</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>3/86</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Order</td>
<td>Need</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3/90</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3/85</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3/90</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3/84</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3/90</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3/83</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3/90</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3/82</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>3/90</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>3/81</td>
<td>.899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** P < .05  
* P < .001
APPENDIX I:
GROUPS MEAN DIFFERENCES ON FINANCIAL
AND SCHEDULE FACTORS
Groups Mean Differences on the Financial

midlifers: 4.26
displaced workers: 3.76
younger retirees: 3.05
older retirees: 2.76
Groups Mean Differences on the Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>midlifers</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>displaced</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>younger</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older retirees</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J:
MULTIPLE COMPARISONS FOR FINANCIAL
AND SCHEDULE FACTORS
### Multiple Comparisons for Financial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Midlifers</th>
<th>Displaced Workers</th>
<th>Younger Retirees</th>
<th>Older Retirees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midlifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaced Workers</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Retirees</td>
<td>1.21*</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Retirees</td>
<td>1.50*</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** * P < .05  
** ** P < .01

### Multiple Comparisons for Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Midlifers</th>
<th>Displaced Workers</th>
<th>Younger Retirees</th>
<th>Older Retirees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midlifers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaced Workers</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Retirees</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Retirees</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.98*</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** * P < .05  
** ** P < .001
APPENDIX K:

POOLED WITHIN-CELL CORRELATIONS WITH

STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON DIAGONAL
### Pooled Within-Cell Correlations with Standard Deviations on Diagonal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FINANCIA</th>
<th>SCHEDULE</th>
<th>CHALLENG</th>
<th>SKILLOBS</th>
<th>GENERATI</th>
<th>HIGHEROR</th>
<th>PERSONAL</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>WORKINVO</th>
<th>SOCIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIA</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULE</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHALLENG</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILLOBS</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERATI</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHEROR</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEANING</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKINVO</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>1.634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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