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The Influence of Internal Control on the Employment Status of German Workers

Abstract

Objective: Using data from the 1994-1996 waves of the German Socio-Economic Panel (GSOEP), this prospective, longitudinal study investigated the influence of perceived control on the employment transitions of German workers. Specifically, this research investigated whether perceived control is predictive of involuntary job loss among high-tenure (≥ 3 years) workers; the experience of job displacement affects subsequent perceived control; and perceived control influences reemployment among the displaced workers.

Methods: Perceived control was measured by an index based on responses to 8 statements from the Questionnaire of Control Beliefs.¹ Job displacement was defined as the loss of a permanent (tenure ≥ 3 years) job due to a plant closing or layoff. The study sample (n = 2539) included 127 displaced workers and a comparison group of 2412 continuously employed workers. Logistic regression models were used to estimate whether perceived control predicted subsequent job loss. Least squares regression was used to analyze the relationship between job displacement and changes in perceived control. Relative risk regression was used to assess the impact of perceived control on reemployment and unemployment duration.

Results: Our results do not indicate a statistically significant association between pre-displacement perceived control and subsequent job loss. We further found perceived control to be relatively stable, and unaffected by the experience of job loss. However, among those who experienced involuntary job loss, higher perceived control was associated with reemployment within 3 months (RR 1.64, 95% CI 1.16, 2.30) and within 6 months (RR 1.39, 95% CI 1.03, 1.86) following job loss.

Conclusion: Understanding the determinants of reemployment can help identify displaced workers who may be at increased risk for prolonged unemployment and related negative health consequences.
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I. Introduction

The negative influence of job loss on mental health is well established.\textsuperscript{2-6} Several studies have also demonstrated that the loss of a job may have a negative impact on physical health and health-related measures, as well.\textsuperscript{4,7-11} Although existing data suggest that reemployment may diminish, or even reverse some of the negative mental health effects of the job loss,\textsuperscript{2-4,13-16} few studies have focused on the factors that predict reemployment. Understanding such factors can help identify unemployed workers who may be at increased risk for prolonged joblessness and its associated adverse health consequences.

The theoretical literature on internal control\textsuperscript{17} supports the hypothesis that those with stronger internal control beliefs are more likely to be reemployed. In the case of job loss, individuals who have more internal control may assess the job loss and potential for reemployment more positively, attributing employment outcomes to their own behavior, and considering the prospect of reemployment to be within their control. Control beliefs may also influence coping activities during unemployment,\textsuperscript{18} and the intensity and persistence with which jobless workers seek new positions.

One factor that has been proposed to influence reemployment is a person’s perceived locus of control. Rotter’s\textsuperscript{19} seminal study of control suggests two ways of perceiving personal control: internal and external. Individuals with an internal perception of control believe that life events are contingent upon their own behavior, skills or efforts, while those with an external sense of control attribute events to luck, chance, or fate.

Earlier research\textsuperscript{20} suggested a cross-sectional relationship between unemployment and external perceived control. Several more recent studies\textsuperscript{3,20-25} have described a relationship between internal control beliefs and the reemployment of jobless workers. Such studies have
reported higher levels of internal control or control-related factors among unemployed
individuals who subsequently become reemployed than among those who remain unemployed.

Despite evidence that is generally suggestive of a link between internal control beliefs
and reemployment, our understanding of this link remains limited for a number of reasons. First,
most previous investigations have studied samples of workers who are already unemployed at
the time of first observation. In this type of design, there is a truncated and potentially biased
view of the phenomenon of interest. This is because it is not known whether the unemployment
experience influences the levels of internal control, or whether those who became reemployed
promptly, and are therefore not included in the study sample, are different in perceived control
from those who are included in the sample. Accordingly, results from these investigations may
not be generalizable to the broader population of unemployed workers. Second, many of the
existing studies are limited by either small sample sizes\textsuperscript{21,22,26} or larger samples restricted to a
single geographical region.\textsuperscript{12,24,25} Finally, we could find no studies that have used data from
German workers, the subjects of this paper. Given individual and institutional differences
between Germany and other countries in which the previous research has been performed, the
results of such studies may not be applicable to German workers.

This study uses data from the German Socioeconomic Panel (GSOEP) to assess the
influence of perceived control in the employment transitions of German workers. There are two
principal advantages of this research. First, this study uses a rich, nationally representative data
source for the study of German workers, which offers a unique combination of economic and
psychological measures, and a large sample of working adults. Second, as we observe study
participants in their transitions from employment to unemployment and unemployment to
reemployment, we may explore the full range of causal relationships. That is, we may
investigate the effect of perceived control on job loss, evaluate the effect of the job loss on changes in control beliefs, and assess the influence of perceived control on reemployment. The reemployment analyses allow us to replicate the longitudinal findings in the German sample. More importantly, taken together, the results of the three analyses will allow us a greater understanding of the cross-sectional relationship between unemployment and perceived control.

In this study, we first consider whether perceived control is predictive of subsequent involuntary job loss. Next, we test whether the experience of job loss influences changes in perceived control. Finally, we explore the influence of perceived control on 3-month and 6-month reemployment. This investigation promotes a fuller understanding the association between internal control and the employment transitions of German workers.

II. Methods

Study design & data source

This study employs a prospective, longitudinal design that uses the 1994, 1995, and 1996 waves of the German Socio-Economic Panel. The GSOEP is a representative sample of German households that was begun in 1984 to investigate stability and changes in living conditions. The GSOEP comprises four subsamples, each of which was selected in a separate multi-step random sampling process. The first two samples (West German residents and Foreigners) were first surveyed in 1984; the third (East Germans) was initially surveyed in 1990; and the final sample (the Immigrant sample) was begun in 1994-1995. In 1996, more than 13500 individuals from over 7000 households were surveyed.

Participants are surveyed annually on a wide range of topics, including labor force participation and earnings, education and training, housing, health, and various personal
attitudes. In principle, paper-and-pencil interviews of all household members 16 years of age and older are conducted by a trained interviewer. There are no proxy interviews. A growing number of participants are, however, completing the questionnaire without the presence of an interviewer. A field representative is assigned to follow up the self-administered survey if there are missing data and/or inconsistencies in survey responses.27

Analysis sample

The analysis sample for this study was constructed by combining the 1994, 1995, and 1996 GSOEP survey waves, three consecutive years in which the perceived control battery was administered. To select the eligible sample, we first identified individuals who were successfully surveyed at each of the three survey dates (n=9453), excluding 1661 respondents from the Foreign sample, who were not asked the perceived control battery in 1994 and 1995. Next, eligible respondents (n=3476) were identified. Eligible participants were respondents who were (a) employed at the 1994 survey, (b) reported working for their current employer for 3 or more years, and (c) were not self-employed. The 3-year tenure condition is consistent with earlier studies of job,4,28 and reduces unobserved sample heterogeneity by omitting seasonal workers and those with unstable work histories. Job displacement is commonly defined as loss of a position held without interruption for 3 years or longer.29

From the group of eligible workers, respondents who either experienced involuntary job loss or were continuously employed over the observation period (n = 2958) were next identified using retrospective information provided at the 1995 and 1996 surveys. The continuously employed workers were used as a comparison group against which the experience of the displaced workers could be compared.
Displaced workers \((n = 225)\) were those who reported a job loss because of a business closing (company closed down) or layoff (business relations ended/laid off). Of the 225 displaced workers, 119 were displaced between 1994 and 1995, and 106 were displaced between 1995 and 1996. As later reemployment was defined as employment within 6 months of the unemployment date, we further limited displaced workers to those whose follow-up interview, in which employment status information was provided, occurred at least 6 months subsequent to the job loss. We thus excluded 64 workers displaced between 1995 and 1996, leaving 161 displaced workers for analysis. Continuously employed workers \((n = 2733)\) comprised individuals who reported no change in their employment status from 1994 to 1996, the entire period of observation. The potential analysis sample was therefore 2894 individuals, composed of 161 displaced workers and a comparison group of 2733 continuously employed individuals.

Excluding individuals with missing data for one of the outcome variables or independent variables \((n = 355)\) left a total of 2539 individuals for the analysis sample. This included 127 displaced workers and a comparison group of 2412 continuously employed workers. Most of the missing data resulted from missing wage information. Moreover, because of missing information on the date of displacement or reemployment, we were unable to calculate the duration of unemployment for 18 of the displaced workers.

Tests of differences of group means were used to explore systematic variation between respondents excluded because of missing data and individuals in our analysis sample. Only two significant differences \((p < .05)\) were detected. Respondents with missing data were more likely to be blue collar and less likely to be from East Germany than were sample members. Description of the primary study variables is included in Figure 1.
Measures

Reemployment

Reemployment among the workers who experienced involuntary job loss was measured with two 0,1 dichotomies: early (3-month) reemployment and later (6-month) reemployment. Early reemployment was coded as a 1 if a displaced worker is reemployed within 3 months of job loss, and 0 otherwise. Later reemployment was coded as a 1 if a displaced worker is reemployed within 6 months of job loss, and 0 otherwise. In both cases, reemployment was defined as the attainment of any position, either full- or part-time.

Job Displacement

Job displacement is defined as loss of a job previously held for at least 3 years. Job displacement was measured by a binary variable that takes the value one if a respondent experienced loss of a job of minimum 3-year duration due to plant closing or layoff between survey waves, and zero otherwise.

Perceived Control

The measure of perceived control was constructed from responses to 8 statements adapted from the Questionnaire of Control Beliefs, based on Rotter's earlier concept. Of the 8 statements, 5 are externally oriented and 3 are internally oriented. The externally oriented statements were: "It is useless to make plans because they seldom work out", "No one can escape their fate, everything in life happens as it must happen", "If I get something that I want then it's mostly due to luck", "There is little sense in planning ahead because something unexpected always comes up", "Things always happen differently, one can't rely on anything". The internally oriented statements were: "I determine what happens to me in life", "Most plans I make are
successful", "My behavior determines my life". Responses were 1 = applies completely; 2 = applies more or less; 3 = does not really apply; 4 = does not apply.

To construct the perceived control measure, we first reverse coded responses to the 3 optimistic statements. Next, we aggregated the responses for the 8 statements, creating a single continuous dimension, which ranges from 8-32, where higher values indicate more internal perceived control.

The internal consistency of the 8-item perceived control score was assessed using the approach suggested by Cronbach. The alpha coefficient on perceived control at the 1994 baseline was .70; at the 1995 follow-up, the coefficient was .72, and in 1996, it was .73. All coefficients suggest adequate consistency.

Since factor analysis conducted in earlier research revealed two distinct factors within the 8-item battery, sensitivity analyses were performed to test the validity of the constructed single-dimension perceived control scale. In these analyses (results not reported), we compared estimation results from the models using the one-dimension control measure with those generated by models in which two separate control measures were used. The individual control measures were created according to the factors reported by. Not surprisingly, one factor comprised the five externally oriented statements; the other, the remaining three internally oriented statements. The results from the one- and two-dimension models were qualitatively similar, suggesting that the 8 items are appropriately combined to a single dimension for this research.

Control Variables

A number of variables were included to adjust for potential confounding of the relationships investigated. Covariates tested for inclusion were measured at the 1994 baseline,
and included age in years, marital status, blue-collar occupation, job tenure, self-assessed health (range: 1-5; higher scores reflect better health), education in years, hourly wages in Deutschmark, and East German residence. Inspection of plots of the dependent variable against each of the continuous covariates revealed a linear association. The continuous covariates were therefore not categorized. A summary of all measures is included in Figure 1.

Standard diagnostics were run to investigate collinearity of independent variables. We examined both pairwise variable correlations and variance inflation factors. The results of these analyses suggested that both age and education were substantially collinear with employment tenure. Education was also strongly related to hourly wage. Sensitivity analyses were performed to determine the best-fitting set of independent variables, which excluded education and tenure as covariates.

Data analysis strategies

The first of our examinations investigated whether perceived control is predictive of job displacement. This question is relevant to the researcher because it addresses the matter of possible selection bias if one uses a design in which the initial observation is of already-unemployed workers, and where those unemployed for a brief time are not included. A statistically significant relationship between perceived control and displacement would have two consequences: first, the results of the reemployment analyses would not be generalizable to all displaced workers; and second, to produce unbiased results, the model of changes in perceived control following job loss would need to be fit with a correction for simultaneity of the two related independent variables. We estimated job displacement as a function of baseline perceived control and a set of covariates. This model was fit with logistic regression, as the
outcome was sufficiently rare. The subsample of continuously employed workers was used as a comparison group.

Our second analysis tested whether the experience of job loss leads to changes in perceived control at the survey following displacement. We used least squares regression to assess the association between displacement and subsequent perceived control, adjusting for baseline perceived control and the set of covariates. Continuously employed workers were included as a comparison group. For all sample members, baseline perceived control was measured at the 1994 survey. For all but the 42 workers displaced between 1995 and 1996 in our sample, follow-up perceived control was measured at the 1995 survey, so that the measurement of control immediately subsequent to the job loss would be used. For the 1995-96 displacement, follow-up control was measured at the 1996 survey. As in the previously described model, the effect of relevant covariates was controlled.

Because it is conceivable that the relative timing of the job loss and the follow-up measurement of perceived control alters the effect of this relationship, in sensitivity analyses we estimated the least squares model with timing controls. The objective was to account for the fact that some individuals lost their jobs soon after the baseline measurement, whereas other workers were displaced much nearer to the follow-up measurement. Presumably, the workers displaced earlier would have had many months to recover from the psychological effects of the job loss, and a greater likelihood of reemployment than those displaced later in the observation frame; in either case, the effect of job loss might be diminished. Several timing control variants were considered. For example, we controlled for the number of months from the job loss to the follow-up observation, and in separate analyses, used various sets of dichotomous controls to
indicate earlier versus later displacement. In none of these analyses did we find significant effects of the timing variables, and thus, the model was therefore fit without the timing variables.

Both of the reemployment models were fit with binomial relative risk regression. Relative risk regression, rather than logistic regression, was used to fit the models since odds ratios from logistic regression estimates of relative risk are inaccurate when the outcome (in our case, reemployment) is not rare.\textsuperscript{32,33} Reemployment was estimated as a function of perceived control and the set of socioeconomic covariates.

All models were estimated with using STATA Release 6. Data were weighted for the longitudinal study design. A longitudinal weight, equal to the product of the individual weight from baseline survey and the probability of remaining in the sample from the relevant follow-up surveys, was calculated and included in the analyses.

III. Results

\textit{Descriptive analysis}

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics on the total sample, as well as the sub-samples of displaced and continuously employed workers. Roughly 5 percent of the analysis sample experienced job displacement over the period studied. This observed percentage is a modest underestimate of the displacement rate. This is because 64 of the total 106 workers displaced between 1995 and 1996 could not be studied because of inadequate follow-up time observed after displacement.

At baseline, sample members averaged 41 years of age, and earned approximately DM25 per hour. About three-quarters of sample members were married, 60% were male, and over one-third worked in blue-collar occupations. Thirty three percent the sample reported living in
Eastern Germany. On average, baseline and follow-up health scores were in the range of "satisfactory" to "good." Of the total number of displaced workers, 35% found work within 3 months, and 43% were reemployed within 6 months. The average unemployment duration for a displaced worker in our sample was just over 9 months.

Displaced workers differed from continuously employed workers in a number of characteristics, as indicated in columns 2 and 3 of Table 1. Displaced workers were more likely than continuously employed workers to be female, have a blue-collar occupation, to have lower wages, and to reside in Eastern Germany.

Multivariate estimation results

Does locus of control predict displacement?

The results reported in Table 2 address the question of whether perceived control predicts subsequent job displacement. Specifically, we are interested in whether people with more externally oriented control beliefs are more likely to experience involuntary job loss than those whose control beliefs are more internally oriented. The findings demonstrate that baseline perceived control is not significantly associated with subsequent job displacement (OR 1.01, 95% CI .91, 1.13). The strongest predictor of displacement is living in Eastern Germany (OR 3.69, 95% CI 1.97, 6.92), while there is a strong trend toward displacement for individuals working in a blue-collar occupation (OR 2.12, 95% CI .98, 4.56). Being male (OR .54, 95% CI .28, 1.04) was negatively suggestive of job displacement.

Does the experience of displacement affect later perceived control?

The results reported in Table 3 relate to the question of whether job displacement is associated with subsequent changes in perceived control. In this model, by adjusting for baseline
perceived control, we create a measure of change in perceived control between baseline and follow-up. The estimated effect is the mean difference in this change between the displaced and continuously employed groups. Our findings indicate that job displacement is not significantly associated with changes in perceived control ($p > .05$).

Is locus of control predictive of reemployment among the displaced workers?

Table 4 reports estimates of the influence of internal control on reemployment of the displaced workers in our sample. The adjusted relative risk of reemployment is provided for early (3 month) reemployment and later (6 month) reemployment. In each of the models, the measure of association (relative risk) was rescaled to reflect the impact of a one-standard-deviation change in perceived control on the associated outcome variable. Such an approach preserves the composition of the continuous control scale, while producing somewhat more interpretable results.

The results indicate that higher levels of internal perceived control are associated with increased likelihood of reemployment at both 3 and 6 months after job loss. More specifically, our estimates suggest that a one-standard-deviation increase in internal control is related to a 64% increased chance of reemployment within 3 months (RR 1.64, 95% CI 1.16, 2.30) and 39% increased chance of reemployment within 6 months of job displacement (RR 1.39, 95% CI 1.03, 1.86). Other strong predictors of reemployment and the jobless duration included male gender (positive) and East German residency (negative). Self-assessed health was predictive of reemployment at 3 months (RR 1.52, 95% CI 1.02, 2.27). However, its effect was not significant for later (6 month) reemployment.

IV. Discussion
The results of this investigation indicate that, in Germany, displaced workers' control beliefs may be an important determinant of their reemployment. Of the workers analyzed in this study, those with greater internal control were significantly more likely to be reemployed within 3 months and within 6 months of job loss than were workers with lower internal control. The somewhat stronger effect observed within 3 months of job loss suggests that the impact on reemployment of internal perceived control is most influential in the period immediately following displacement, and moderately diminishes with time. The results further indicate that perceived control is not predictive of job displacement, and that control beliefs are stable, and are therefore not affected by the experience of unemployment following involuntary job loss.

The mechanism by which control beliefs affect reemployment is not known. However, it seems plausible that unemployed workers with an internal perception of control may pursue more active job search strategies and, thus, are more likely to find work. Such an interpretation is consistent with the literature on coping, which suggests that internal perceived control is associated with a problem-focused approach to dealing with unemployment.

Previous cross-sectional research has found low internal control among unemployed men, who perceived their employment condition to be externally directed, believing that their lives were controlled by environmental forces rather than their own behavior. Three possible interpretations of this cross-sectional evidence are imaginable. One explanation is that workers with lower internal control are more likely to experience job loss. A second explanation is that the job loss influences subsequent control beliefs. Finally, the cross-sectional finding may be due to a selection effect related to reemployment. By this we mean that individuals with greater internal control may be more likely to seek and find new jobs, leaving workers with lower internal control beliefs among the unemployed.
The prospective, longitudinal nature of our study allowed us to test each of the three possible explanations. Our results support the third possible explanation, which suggested that cross-sectional associations between low internal control and unemployment are likely due to a selection effect associated with reemployment. To restate, our findings did not indicate that internal control is associated with subsequent job loss; nor did we find that job loss is associated with subsequent changes in internal control. We did, however, find that internal control is significantly and positively related to reemployment.

Our results may have important policy implications. The findings not only highlight an influential determinant of reemployment, but also identify a group of displaced workers that may be at increased risk for extended joblessness. For example, our analyses indicated that being East German was both a powerful predictor of job loss and was negatively associated with reemployment within 3 and 6 months of displacement. Moreover, we found that East Germans were roughly half as likely to be reemployed within 6 months than were similar West Germans.

The considerable effect of being East German on our analyses motivated further investigation. As part of this research, we tested whether East Germans’ perception of control was more externally oriented than that of West Germans, and whether the relationship between perceived control and reemployment differed for East and West Germans. The analysis detected no differences in perceived control between East and West Germans. Further, when tested with the appropriate interaction term, we found no significant difference in the effect of perceived control on reemployment for the East and West Germans.

This study has two limitations that merit mention. First, the data used in this research lack the broader set of measures, including assertiveness, self esteem, and job-search self-efficacy and intensity, that might attenuate the relationship between perceived control and
reemployment. And second, our results are neither generalizable to Germans as a whole, nor to German workers in general. Our sample selection criteria omitted self-employed individuals and those with short lengths of service, individuals whose labor force attachment may be tenuous or unestablished. In this study, we analyze workers with moderately high tenure in their jobs, and our findings are therefore applicable only to German workers with longer periods of service.

There is extensive evidence of the negative health consequences of unemployment. Workers with low internal control and, thus, reduced likelihood of timely reemployment are likely to suffer such negative effects. Programmatic interventions to support job search performance, through such means as cognitive behavior therapy\textsuperscript{34,35} or motivation and skill acquisition,\textsuperscript{36} may be especially important in assisting dislocated workers make the transition to employment, and thus, in reducing the physical and psychological impact of joblessness.
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**Figure 1. Summary of Measures**

**Dependent Variables**
- Reemployed within 3 months
- Reemployed within 6 months
- Job Displacement
- Follow-up Perceived Control
  - Range (8-32); higher values reflect more internal perceived control

**Independent Variables**
- Job Displacement
- Baseline Perceived Control
  - Range (8-32); higher values reflect more internal perceived control
- Baseline SAH
  - 1=very poor, 2=poor, 3=satis., 4=good, 5=very good
- Age
- Male Gender
  - 1 if gender is male, 0 if female
- Marital Status
  - 1 if married or has partner, else 0
- Blue Collar Occupation
  - 1 if blue-collar occup., 0 if white-collar or civil service
- Education
- Hourly Wage
  - Calculated as monthly earnings/(4*weekly hours worked)
- East German
  - 1 if East German resident, 0 if West German
Table 1. Unweighted Means of Variables: Full Sample and by Displacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Full Sample (N = 2539)</th>
<th>Continuously Employed (N = 2412)</th>
<th>Displaced Workers (N = 127)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Displacement</td>
<td>.05 (Std. Deviation)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reemployed within 3 months</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.35 (.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reemployed within 6 months</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.43 (.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Perceived Control</td>
<td>22.81 (3.49)</td>
<td>22.81 (3.48)</td>
<td>22.72 (3.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up Perceived Control</td>
<td>23.01 (3.54)</td>
<td>23.04 (3.54)</td>
<td>22.44 (3.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Gender</td>
<td>.60 (.49)</td>
<td>.60 (.49)</td>
<td>.52* (.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>40.58 (9.94)</td>
<td>40.57 (9.93)</td>
<td>42.52 (10.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.73 (.45)</td>
<td>.73 (.44)</td>
<td>.71 (.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar Occupation</td>
<td>.35 (.48)</td>
<td>.34 (.47)</td>
<td>.49*** (.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Wage</td>
<td>24.98 (18.35)</td>
<td>25.19 (18.60)</td>
<td>20.81*** (12.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East German</td>
<td>.33 (.47)</td>
<td>.31 (.46)</td>
<td>.64*** (.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Self Assessed Health</td>
<td>3.55 (.83)</td>
<td>3.56 (.82)</td>
<td>3.26 (.93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asterisk indicates difference between continuously employed and displaced subsamples.

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Table 2. Predictors of Job Displacement ($N = 2539$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Odds Ratio (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Perceived Control</td>
<td>1.01 (.91, 1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Gender</td>
<td>.54 (.28, 1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.01 (.99, 1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.76 (.41, 1.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar Occupation</td>
<td>2.12 (0.98, 4.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Wage</td>
<td>.98 (.95, 1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East German</td>
<td>3.69*** (1.97, 6.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Self Assessed Health</td>
<td>.89 (.62, 1.28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***$p < .001$
Table 3. Regression of Follow-up Perceived Control: The Influence of Job Displacement ($N = 2539$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta (Std. Error)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>8.19*** (.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Displacement</td>
<td>-.10 (.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Perceived Control</td>
<td>.60*** (.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Gender</td>
<td>.29 (.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.006 (.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.25 (.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar Occupation</td>
<td>-.57** (.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Wage</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East German</td>
<td>.27 (.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Self Assessed Health</td>
<td>.22* (.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$
Table 4. The Impact of Internal Control on the Reemployment of Displaced Workers (N = 127)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Reemployed within 3 months</th>
<th>Reemployed within 6 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.R. Ratio (95% CI)</td>
<td>R.R. Ratio (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Perceived Controla</td>
<td>1.64** (1.16, 2.30)</td>
<td>1.39* (1.03, 1.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Gender</td>
<td>2.12* (1.03, 4.35)</td>
<td>2.40** (1.23, 4.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.97 (.93, 1.01)</td>
<td>.96** (.92, .99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.54 (.25, 1.15)</td>
<td>.69 (.34, 1.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Collar Occupation</td>
<td>1.10 (.51, 2.37)</td>
<td>.92 (.46, 1.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Wage</td>
<td>.99 (.97, 1.04)</td>
<td>.99 (.96, 1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East German</td>
<td>.32** (.14, .72)</td>
<td>.51* (.26, .99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Self Assessed Health</td>
<td>1.52* (1.02, 2.27)</td>
<td>1.25 (.87, 1.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aThe relative risk/hazard ratios and 95% confidence interval on the Perceived Control variable have been rescaled to reflect the impact on the outcomes of a one-standard-deviation change, rather than a one-unit change.

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001