

Job Seeking: The Process and Experience of Looking for a Job

Connie R. Wanberg, Abdifatah A. Ali,
and Borbala Csillag

Department of Work and Organizations, Carlson School of Management, University of
Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455, USA; email: wanbe001@umn.edu,
alixx463@umn.edu, csill001@umn.edu

**ANNUAL
REVIEWS CONNECT**

www.annualreviews.org

- Download figures
- Navigate cited references
- Keyword search
- Explore related articles
- Share via email or social media

Annu. Rev. Organ. Psychol. Organ. Behav. 2020.
7:315–37

First published as a Review in Advance on
November 1, 2019

The *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and
Organizational Behavior* is online at
orgpsych.annualreviews.org

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044939>

Copyright © 2020 by Annual Reviews.
All rights reserved

Keywords

job search, job loss, job change, unemployment

Abstract

This review distills available empirical research about the process and experience of looking for a job. Job search varies according to several dimensions, including intensity, content, and temporality/persistence. Our review examines how these dimensions relate to job search success, which involves job finding as well as job quality. Because social networking and interviewing behavior have attracted significant research attention, we describe findings with respect to these two job search methods in greater detail. We provide examples of the relevance of context to job search (i.e., the job seeker's geographical region, country, and culture; the economy; the job seeker's current or past employment situation; and employer behaviors and preferences) and review research on bias in the job search. Finally, we survey work on job search interventions and conclude with an overview of pressing job search issues in need of future research.

INTRODUCTION

Millions of individuals engage in job search every year. Employed individuals look for new jobs to improve their working conditions. Students engage in job search after finishing their education. Unemployed individuals search for work after being terminated, laid off, or quitting. Caregivers need jobs after finishing their caregiving roles. Most individuals engage in job search multiple times in their life span (Direnzo & Greenhaus 2011). Median employee tenure in the United States is only approximately 4.2 years (US Bur. Labor Stat. 2018a). Separation rates in other countries are similarly high (Hobijn & Sahin 2009).

This review delineates what we know, from an empirical standpoint, about the process and experience of looking for a job from the perspective of the job seeker. We describe job search as a self-regulatory process. We delineate the major dimensions of job search that have been studied and how these dimensions relate to job search success (i.e., finding employment, finding it within the time frame desired, salary in the new job, and other indicators of job quality such as person-job fit; Saks 2005). We describe research on two aspects of job search behavior that have received focused attention, social networking and interviewing. We then delineate contextual factors that may shape the job search experience or outcomes, including geographical region, country, and culture; the economy; the job seeker's current or past employment situation; and employer behaviors and preferences. We devote a special section to the role of bias in job search, given the substantial number of studies in this area. We describe results of interventions to help job seekers and conclude with suggestions for future research.

JOB SEARCH AS A SELF-REGULATORY PROCESS

Job search involves a series of activities aimed at finding a (new) job. These activities can include clarifying one's goals (e.g., what type of job do I want?), preparing/revising a résumé, researching companies and job search engines, networking, identifying and applying to open positions, and preparing for interviews with interested employers. For most, job search is a highly autonomous, self-regulated, goal-directed, and proactive process. Especially under conditions of extended search, looking for work may involve a range of emotions for individuals as they cope with uncertainty, difficulty locating appropriate positions, the pain of rejection, and other challenges. Job search encompasses strategy and decision making, with substantial implications for one's career. Individuals have to develop daily plans for their search activities, self-motivate and initiate those activities, and modify their behaviors or goals based on feedback from the environment.

Several theoretical perspectives have been used to study the goal-directed aspects of job search, including the theory of planned behavior, social cognitive career theory, goal-setting theory, control theory, self-efficacy theory, self-determination theory, affective events theory, economic job search theory, and expectancy-value theory. For a review of these theories in relation to job loss and job search, see Klehe & van Hooft (2018). Most prominently, researchers have studied the goal-striving aspects of the job search process from self-regulation frameworks (Kanfer & Bufton 2018). From this latter perspective, the differences in how individuals engage in job search activity have been delineated with three dimensions relevant to self-regulated goal striving: job search intensity/effort (how much time or effort a job seeker puts into job search), job search content (the activities and quality of activities the individual engages in), and temporality/persistence (continuity or change in the job search over time) (Kanfer et al. 2001). These dimensions have inspired research to clarify how each dimension relates to the search experience and employment outcomes.

Job Search Intensity/Effort

Job search intensity refers to how much effort or activity an individual is engaging in with respect to his or her job search. In order to study job search intensity and the extent to which it matters for employment outcomes, researchers ask job seekers to indicate how many times they have engaged in several job search activities (e.g., prepared or revised your résumé, sent out your résumé, filled out a job application, spoke with previous employers) in a specific period. A modified version of the job search intensity scale developed by Blau (1994) is frequently used for this purpose. Job search has changed a great deal since the scale was written, so revised items are typically used to capture contemporary job search methods such as using online job search engines. Alternative measures of job search activity include assessments of job search effort, or how much time individuals have put into their job search in a specified period (Van Hoye 2018).

Meta-analytic data show that higher job search intensity is related to receiving more job offers ($k = 18, r_c = 0.12$) and having found a job by the end of a study's duration ($k = 67, r_c = 0.18$), but not new job quality ($k = 28, r_c = 0.02$) (van Hooff et al. 2015). The small effect sizes between job search intensity and reemployment outcomes suggest that although the time and effort individuals put into job search matter, there are additional considerations that explain job search success. Additional factors relevant to job search success include other dimensions of job search (such as those outlined below), job seeker human capital, job seeker social capital, reemployment constraints (e.g., lacking transportation or child care, or having to work certain hours or in a certain location), job seeker economic need to work, and employer discrimination (Wanberg et al. 2002).

Because there is a relationship between the amount of effort individuals put into their job searches and job search success, a substantial amount of research has examined predictors of job search intensity. Meta-analytic data show that individuals who put more time and effort into their job searches tend to have higher levels of openness to experience ($k = 15, r_c = 0.13$), agreeableness ($k = 10, r_c = 0.09$), trait self-regulation ($k = 22, r_c = 0.25$), employment commitment ($k = 41, r_c = 0.30$), better attitudes toward job search ($k = 23, r_c = 0.32$), higher job search self-efficacy ($k = 52, r_c = 0.29$), financial need ($k = 46, r_c = 0.12$), social pressure to search from others ($k = 26, r_c = 0.24$), and better physical health ($k = 8, r_c = 0.18$) (van Hooff et al. 2015).

Job Search Content

Job search content refers to the pattern and quality of activities the job seeker engages in during his or her job search. For example, job search behaviors may be preparatory (e.g., getting oneself ready to be a strong applicant, such as by revising one's résumé or reading a book about job search) or active (e.g., mobilizing the search, such as by submitting an application) (Blau 1994). These activities were proposed as sequential, with preparatory activities completed before active search behaviors. Supporting this premise in a sample of student job seekers, individuals showed higher use of active search behaviors in a later stage of job search than they did in an earlier stage (Saks & Ashforth 2000). Yet, preparatory activities are still used in later stages of job search—individuals cycle back to preparatory activities as needed. Active job search has a stronger relationship to job finding and employment quality than preparatory job search (van Hooff et al. 2015), likely because this dimension involves actually applying for positions.

The sources that individuals use in their job search can be distinguished as informal (e.g., friends, family, acquaintances) versus formal (e.g., online job postings). Although both informal and formal sources are important for job seekers, informal sources can impart several advantages to job seekers, including advice about job search and inside information about job opportunities. Given several studies have focused on the use of informal sources in job search, we describe the role of social networks in job search in a separate section.

Individuals engage in different job search strategies, including focused (i.e., targeting one's job search around specific goals), exploratory (i.e., conducting a broader job search; being open to several possibilities), and haphazard (i.e., not having a clear plan; applying to a variety of positions) (Crossley & Highhouse 2005). In a study examining the use of these methods, individuals who reported engaging in a focused job search were more satisfied with the jobs they found, whereas individuals using exploratory approaches received more offers. Haphazard search is negatively related to satisfaction with one's job search and number of offers (Crossley & Highhouse 2005).

More broadly, the quality of the job search process and products are important (van Hooft et al. 2013). According to these authors, in order for a job search process to be of high quality, it should include four important components. First, the job seeker must have clear goals and be committed to these goals. Second, the job seeker should adopt a focused or exploratory search strategy, use a wide range of job search activities including informal sources, and plan how and when to engage in search activities. Third, the job seeker must exert self-control of his or her attention, emotions, and motivation. Finally, the job search should involve reflection (e.g., regularly assessing one's progress, trying to learn from failures, and administering self-rewards at key points of performance). High-quality products refer to the polished nature of the behaviors and materials used within the job search (e.g., individuals may differ in their ability to conduct informative Internet searches, identify appropriate job openings, develop a good résumé, and sell themselves in the employment interview) (van Hooft et al. 2013). The authors propose a self-regulatory, cyclical process model whereby (a) job seekers cycle through the components described above multiple times as needed and (b) a higher quality process facilitates higher quality products and subsequently job search success (including locating more job opportunities, having more interviews, finding a job faster, and higher job quality).

Due to the difficulty of assessing the quality of job seekers' activities, job search quality is less frequently studied than the other dimensions of job search. Yet, some empirical work has ventured in this direction. Consistent with the van Hooft et al. (2013) conceptualization of job search quality within a self-regulatory framework, scholars have attempted to explore quality job search processes using self-regulatory constructs. Job seekers exercising motivation control, which refers to "skillful goal setting, environmental management, and sustaining search efforts over time" (Wanberg et al. 1999, p. 899), engage in higher job search intensity both week to week (Wanberg et al. 2012b) and during the job search as a whole (Creed et al. 2009, Turban et al. 2013, Wanberg et al. 1999). Other studies have found that graduating student job seekers who engaged in more metacognitive strategies such as planning, monitoring their progress, and evaluating their interview performance also reported higher job search intensity (Chawla et al. 2019, da Motta Veiga & Gabriel 2016) and submitted more résumés and received more interviews (Turban et al. 2009). Higher levels of career planning or career goal clarity are furthermore related to higher levels of person-job fit in the new job (Saks & Ashforth 2002, Wanberg et al. 2002).

Job Search Temporality/Persistence

The temporality/persistence dimension of job search refers to the evolution of the job search over time—what happens over the duration of the job search. A growing number of studies have examined job search from a dynamic perspective, collecting data from primarily unemployed and college student job seekers at multiple time periods. Within-person approaches assess changes in job search, affect, and/or motivational constructs over time (for a recent review of job search from a dynamic perspective, see Song et al. 2018). Studies have also integrated within-person approaches with between-person approaches to examine changes in the job search over time as well as how stable individual differences predict such changes (da Motta Veiga et al. 2018).

Over the duration of job search, job seekers display vacillations in job search intensity and affect, as well as declines in autonomous motivation (i.e., looking for a job for intrinsic reasons) (da Motta Veiga & Gabriel 2016, Sun et al. 2013). For unemployed individuals, job search intensity may decline over the duration of the unemployment spell (Wanberg et al. 2012b), perhaps because individuals begin with high hopes but become apathetic, frustrated, or have fewer leads to follow as time passes (Amundson & Borgen 1982). For unemployed individuals covered by unemployment insurance, job search intensity tends to increase as they near exhaustion of their benefits (Krueger & Mueller 2010). Job search intensity may also increase for college student job seekers as they near graduation (Saks & Ashforth 2000).

Individuals with higher levels of approach motivation (a proactive interest in achieving desirable results, personal growth, and mastery, rather than being driven to avoid aversive results) and core self-evaluations (involving higher self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability) show higher levels of job search intensity across time (Wanberg et al. 2005, 2012b). Unemployed job seekers with higher levels of approach motivation are also less likely to show a decline in their mental health over time (Wanberg et al. 2012b). Individuals with high learning goal orientation (reflecting a focus on learning, as opposed to an inclination toward demonstrating competence) are more likely to sustain higher levels of job search intensity when they experience stress, in comparison to individuals with lower learning goal orientation (da Motta Veiga & Turban 2014). Furthermore, job seekers higher (versus lower) in the trait feedback self-efficacy (ability to accurately interpret and action feedback received) are better able to respond to ambiguous (i.e., low quality) feedback by keeping momentary negative affect in check, allowing them to persist in their job search (Chawla et al. 2019).

Studies have also examined affective and behavioral consequences of job seekers perceiving higher or lower perceived progress in their job search on a daily or weekly basis. A daily within-person analysis of unemployed job seekers over three weeks showed that on days where job seekers made less progress in their job search they experienced higher negative affect and lower positive affect (Wanberg et al. 2010). Perceived progress in any given day was negatively related to levels of job search in the next day. For example, individuals who perceived lower progress in any given day engaged in higher levels of job search the next day. A study of career starters surveyed every four days over two weeks revealed job seeker self-compassion as a buffer between a lack of job search progress and activating (e.g., distressed) as well as deactivating (e.g., feeling down) negative affect (Kreemers et al. 2018). Lower perceived progress stimulates job search the most when individuals are nearer to the deadline they had in mind to find employment (Lopez-Kidwell et al. 2013).

An additional study of the consequences of perceived progress in the job search suggests that as job seekers perceive higher levels of progress, they experience higher job search self-efficacy (confidence in executing their job search) and employment self-efficacy (confidence in getting a job) (Liu et al. 2014b). Increases in job search self-efficacy are associated with increases in job search behavior, but increases in employment self-efficacy are associated with decreases in job search behavior (Liu et al. 2014b). When job seekers made internal attributions about their search progress (i.e., attributing their progress to their own ability or effort), these relationships were stronger.

Finally, as job search continues over time without a job being secured, job seekers may begin to feel envious of, or resentful toward, other job seekers, especially if these other individuals get interviews or positions before them (Dineen et al. 2017). These authors examined the relationship between job search envy and résumé fraud across the duration of the search. Although the overall incidence of reported résumé fraud was low, some job seekers admitted to embellishing or providing false information on their résumés. Job search envy was more likely to be related to résumé fraud as the duration of job search or the criticality of the search increased (Dineen et al. 2017).

THE ROLE OF SOCIAL NETWORKS

Several studies have focused unique attention on social networking during job search, probably because of the large numbers of job seekers who find jobs through this method. In an examination of networking across several countries, job finding via social networks ranged from a high of 83% in the Philippines to a low of 26% in Finland and Austria (Franzen & Hangartner 2006). Nearly 44% of US respondents in Franzen & Hangartner's study attributed their job placements to social contacts. For theoretical grounding, scholarship in this realm has drawn on structural approaches (i.e., theories of social capital; Lin 2008) as well as behavioral approaches (i.e., networking theory; Wolff & Moser 2009).

Research on the use of networks during job search suggests that job seekers can benefit from connecting with both strong (i.e., friends and family members) and weak (i.e., acquaintances and referrals) ties. For example, job seekers benefit from the informational value associated with weak ties for generating job leads and interviews (Barbulescu 2015), but it is strong ties that produce more job offers (Barbulescu 2015, Obukhova 2012). Garg & Telang (2018) extended these findings to online social networks (e.g., LinkedIn) showing that weak ties had a small effect on job leads whereas strong ties resulted in more job leads, interviews, and offers for unemployed job seekers. Research, however, is not entirely clear about whether job seekers benefit from spending more time in networking. Some studies show that networking intensity is positively associated with more job offers (Van Hove et al. 2009) and employment attainment (Wanberg et al. 2000), whereas others have reported null and even negative relationships between networking and job search success (McArdle et al. 2007, Saks 2006).

Research has also examined whether the benefits of using social contacts extend beyond finding a job. There is little consistent evidence that using contacts directly affects wages (Mouw 2003). Recent research suggests measuring the network resources that are provided by social contacts may help elucidate this relationship. For example, Bian et al. (2015) examined the effects of two types of network resources—information and favoritism—on entry-level wages. They found that the use of weak ties generated job-specific information for job seekers, whereas strong ties mobilized favor exchanges. Both types of network resources increased entry-level wages. Considering other indicators of job quality, Wanberg et al. (2000) found no difference in job satisfaction and turnover intentions between people who found their jobs through networking versus those who did not. Given the information provisions associated with weak ties, however, individuals who find jobs through weak ties report better fit with their job (Van Hove et al. 2009).

A nascent but promising area of scholarship considers the process through which networking enables job search success. Conceptual work in the general networking literature distinguishes between primary (e.g., work-related support) and secondary (e.g., career success) resources that may be obtained through networking (Wolff et al. 2008). These authors propose that proximal networking benefits such as emotional and instrumental support can be extracted during dyadic interactions but outcomes such as career success (or, in the case of job seekers, reemployment) require broader, and more difficult to capture, engagement of one's web of relationships. Qualitative work based on interview data from a managerial sample (not job seekers) has delineated five components of proximal networking benefits: solutions provided by others, referrals to other sources of information, problem reformulation, validation/reassurance, and legitimation (Cross & Sproull 2004). Drawing on this typology, a study of job search networking found that proximal networking benefits were predictive of reemployment quality, although not when also accounting for networking self-efficacy (Wanberg et al. 2019b).

Other research has considered the role of individual differences in explaining networking behavior. Consistent across these studies is that job seekers who are more extraverted, conscientious,

and have a proactive personality engage in more networking during the job search (Lambert et al. 2006, Van Hoye et al. 2009, Wanberg et al. 2000). Recent work suggests it is possible to help job seekers improve their networking intensity, as well as improving dimensions of networking quality, namely networking self-efficacy and proximal networking benefits (solutions, referrals, problem reformulation, and validation) (Wanberg et al. 2019b).

INTERVIEW BEHAVIORS

Job seeker behavior within the interview has been a prominent area of research. Most of this research has focused on ways in which candidates employ impression management during the interview and the effectiveness of these tactics. Additional research has examined the relationships between interviewee nonverbal and verbal behavior and interview ratings (McCarthy & Cheng 2018).

Impression Management

Job seekers engage in three primary types of impression management techniques in interviews: self-focused (i.e., self-promotion), other-focused (i.e., ingratiation), and defensive (i.e., using excuses, justifications, or apologies) (Ellis et al. 2002). Candidate use of self-promotion and ingratiation impression management tactics is associated with higher interviewer ratings, although to a lesser extent when the interviewer uses a structured interview format (Barrick et al. 2009, Ellis et al. 2002). Deceptive forms of self-promotion may also potentially backfire for candidates (Swider et al. 2011).

Deceptive forms of self-promotion include slight image creation (e.g., small distortions of one's previous experience), extensive image creation (e.g., lying in order to give a good answer), image protection (e.g., omitting information in order to look good), or ingratiation that is insincere (Levashina & Campion 2007). In their wide-ranging study of job seeker interview behaviors, Levashina & Campion's (2007) largest sample of data (Study 3) indicated that 99% of undergraduates used slight image creation and 92% used extensive image creation during employment interviews. Individuals who are lower (versus higher) in honesty/humility and conscientiousness, and higher (versus lower) in narcissism, tend to use image creation to a greater extent when interviewing (Roulin & Bourdage 2017). Whereas extensive image creation is positively related to receiving a follow-up interview or job offer, the relationship is negative between image protection and these outcomes (Levashina & Campion 2007).

The use of impression management to overcome stigmas, such as if the job seeker has a criminal record or disability, has also been examined. For example, a three-study investigation found that individuals with a criminal background received higher hiring evaluations if they used an apology (took responsibility for their behavior and admitted it was wrong) or justification (took responsibility for the behavior and provided reasoning for why they did what they did) in comparison to using an excuse (admitted the behavior without taking responsibility) (Ali et al. 2017). Confederates acting as applicants with a disability in video-taped interviews were rated as a more favorable hire when they disclosed a disability at the beginning of an interview compared to at the end, or compared to not disclosing at all (Hebl & Skorinko 2005). Perceptions of disability disclosures may depend on how the disability is perceived with respect to controllability (Lyons et al. 2017).

Older workers use several techniques to proactively respond to fears about age bias in the job search process, including skill maintenance, lowering their expectations, modifying their résumé to conceal their age, improving their appearance so that they seem younger, and using buzz words

to illustrate they are up-to-date (Berger 2009, Lyons et al. 2014). A hiring simulation with undergraduate raters suggested that older applicants may benefit from building in evidence that they do not fit common stereotypes of older people into their interview responses (Gioaba & Krings 2017).

Nonverbal Behavior

Nonverbal behavior refers to aspects of communication that are not represented by the actual words the candidate is saying (Nguyen et al. 2014). A variety of aspects of interviewee nonverbal behavior, including eye contact, smiles, gestures, time talked, extent to which the candidate leans forward versus reclines back, vocal characteristics, and formality of dress, may be influential in how the candidate is perceived (Gifford et al. 1985). For example, handshake scores (including grip completeness, strength, duration, vigor, and eye contact during the shake) are related to more positive interviewer assessments (Stewart et al. 2008). Candidates who spend a greater percentage of their time smiling are perceived as more likeable (Levine & Feldman 2002) and motivated (Gifford et al. 1985). Verbal errors such as eliminating a word in a response, needing to have a question restated, having a long delay in responding, bringing up self-deprecating information, and run-on responses are related to lower ratings of hirability (Riggio & Throckmorton 1988). Similarly, interviewee vocal components including lower pitch and volume variability, higher pitch variability and rate of speech, and fewer pauses are related to more positive rater reactions (DeGroot & Motowidlo 1999).

Methods to study nonverbal behavior in the interview have become more sophisticated. For example, a computational approach combined with manual coding from video-taped interviews was used by Nguyen et al. (2014) to code candidate vocal behaviors (pauses, speaking time, speech fluency, pitch, speaking rate, and energy), visual cues (head nods, head and body movement, smiling, eye contact, and physical attractiveness), and relational cues (nodding while speaking, nodding while interviewer spoke). Most of these nonverbal behaviors were related to the criterion variable “hiring decision,” which was based on an evaluation of the candidate’s responses to questions such as motivation to apply for the job; past experience involving communication, persuasion, conscientiousness, and stress management; and strong/weak aspects of self. Among other significant results, applicants who spoke faster, longer, and with longer speaking turns were rated as more hireable. Applicants with several short utterances in their replies to the interviewer were rated lower. The authors explained that candidates who did this tended to ask the interviewer quick clarifications about the questions, such as “In my private life?” (p. 6).

CONTEXT AND JOB SEARCH

Early micro-level research on job search focused on the role of job seeker characteristics in predicting factors such as job search intensity, with few studies examining broader environmental factors (situational factors, or factors outside of the job seeker) relevant to the process and experience of job search (Wanberg et al. 2012a). A growing number of studies, however, have attended to the role of the contextual environment in which job search takes place, showing the relevance of the search context to job seeker behavior, emotions, and job search success. For example, the geographical region, country, or broader culture within which the job search occurs is relevant for the experience of job search. Job seekers in rural settings may need to rely more on social capital than job seekers in urban settings (Matthews et al. 2009). Individuals in the United States spend more time in their job search than in several other countries, including Belgium, Bulgaria, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom (Krueger &

Mueller 2010). The differences in time put into job search may be due, in part, to differences in unemployment insurance systems between countries. Higher perceived unemployment insurance generosity is related directly or indirectly to lower job search intensity and slower reemployment speed, but higher mental health (Wanberg et al. 2019a). As another example of the role of culture in job search, social pressure to find work is a stronger predictor of job search intentions in collectivist cultures than in individualistic cultures (van Hooft et al. 2004).

The health of the economy is another important contextual factor that affects the process and experience of job search. Job search is especially trying during times of high unemployment, or when one works in a highly specialized field. Under these conditions, job seekers take longer to find jobs and often accept jobs below their skill or pay level (Manroop & Richardson 2016). When unemployment rates are low, it is much easier for job seekers to find positions. In the past few years, labor market shortages in the United States have led employers to tap into populations of job seekers that have traditionally had an especially hard time finding positions, such as individuals with disabilities (Paquette 2018). Interestingly, research suggests that job seekers tend to be most satisfied with the jobs they find during challenging economic times (Bianchi 2013). Job seekers are more likely to ruminate about how they might have found better jobs when economic conditions are good (Bianchi 2013).

The employment situation of the job seeker also matters (e.g., if the job seeker is employed, unemployed, a current or graduating student, returning to the workforce after a career gap or military service, etc.). Job search has differential challenges across these situations (Boswell et al. 2012). Employed job seekers have to fulfill current job responsibilities while conducting a quality job search and may sometimes need to hide their job search from their employer (Wanberg et al. 2012a). Graduating student job seekers often engage in job search while taking classes, making their search behavior potentially erratic and based on the timing of their other obligations. Researchers examining job search within graduating student samples should account for individuals who go into higher education rather than pursuing a job (Boswell et al. 2012). Unemployed job seekers may be more isolated socially than employed or student job seekers, meaning loneliness and lack of access to others' perspectives may present a challenge. Unemployed individuals also tend to face issues of identity loss and financial uncertainty, making the job search especially urgent and stressful for this category of job seekers (Wanberg 2012). Less research has focused on the job search experience for individuals returning to the workforce after a career gap or military service. Furthermore, little research has examined the experience and employment outcomes of job seekers who have been fired from their previous jobs.

In an interview study of employed and unemployed job seekers during a very high unemployment rate in the United States (9.9%), Wanberg et al. (2012a) identified four employer-related contextual factors that affect both employed and unemployed job seekers' job search experience and emotions. First, employers may insist on a perfect match between applicant characteristics and the job posting, meaning individuals may be rejected for issues such as having too much experience or not having direct industry experience, even if they are otherwise well-qualified. Employers are more likely to insist on a perfect match between applicant characteristics and the job opening when the economy is poor. Such insistence makes it difficult for job seekers who wish to change to a new industry or type of position. Second, employers may at times be rude or unprofessional to job seekers, with examples being canceling interviews or failing to reply to job seekers. Few studies have examined incivility experienced by job seekers, but one exception is Ali et al. (2016). Third, job seekers may encounter inaccurate or misleading job postings (or jobs that are posted but do not really exist), leading to frustration and wasted time in applying for some jobs. Finally, job seekers reported their experiences with demographic discrimination, or their feeling that some companies and recruiters were biased against them for issues such as their gender, age, or ethnic backgrounds.

Although job seekers were typically able to manage their mood and motivation following such encounters, such experiences still led to (fleeting or less fleeting) feelings of helplessness, frustration, discouragement, and reduced self-worth. Because a substantial amount of research has examined the potential role of bias in job search (including considerations of whether employer preferences constitute discrimination as opposed to being based on job relevant considerations), we review empirical research on this topic further in the next section.

THE ROLE OF BIAS IN JOB SEARCH

Job seekers may face a disadvantage in job search (e.g., being less likely to be invited for interviews or have higher levels of unemployment) due to their gender, race/ethnicity, age, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, weight, appearance, or being pregnant (for reviews see Baert 2017, Deros & Ryan 2018, McCarthy & Cheng 2018). In addition, individuals with a criminal record have an exceedingly hard time getting an interview (Pager 2003, Pager et al. 2009), and unemployed and long-term unemployed job seekers receive fewer responses to applications than employed job seekers (Eriksson & Lagerström 2006). To advance research on the role of bias in job search, scholars have applied theoretical lenses spanning social categorization/identity, impression formation, stereotype, ego-depletion, signaling, and cognitive interference theories (Deros & Ryan 2018, McCarthy & Cheng 2018).

The most common approach used to examine whether these disadvantages represent employer discrimination is the résumé correspondence methodology (Baert 2017), although some other approaches have been used, including field experiments where matched applicants inquire about a job in person (King & Ahmad 2010, Pager et al. 2009). The résumé correspondence method involves sending fictitious résumés that are equal with respect to experience and education, but different with respect to one or more conditions that signal a group identity (such as race/ethnicity), to a large number of real job openings. We highlight findings in two of the most studied areas (race/ethnicity and age) below and then discuss research regarding criminal record and unemployment status, given these areas have led to recent legislation for employers.

Race/Ethnicity

Unemployment rates are higher for racial and ethnic minorities in contrast to majority groups across the globe (Deros & Ryan 2018). For example, in the United States, unemployment rates in 2017 were the highest for American Indians (7.8%), Blacks (7.5%), and Hispanic/Latinos (5.1%), contrasting with 3.8% for Whites and 3.4% for Asians (US Bur. Labor Stat. 2018b). Major explanations for race/ethnic differences in unemployment rates include the human capital hypothesis (i.e., differences resulting from discrepant education and experience levels), the hiring discrimination hypothesis (i.e., differences resulting from both taste-based and statistical discrimination against minority groups), and differences between groups on other factors such as social networks or transportation (Deros & Ryan 2018, Gobillon et al. 2014). The human capital hypothesis and nondiscrimination reasons can explain some, but not all, of the differences in racial/ethnic employment rates (Hiemstra et al. 2013). An extensive number of résumé correspondence studies have been conducted, with a meta-analysis of 28 correspondence studies based in the United States showing fewer interview requests are received for equally qualified African Americans and Latinos versus Whites (Quillian et al. 2017). Other European-based samples indicate lower employer preference for individuals with darker versus lighter skin (Deros et al. 2017) and individuals with Arab names and affiliations (Deros et al. 2009). Correspondence studies in other countries have similarly documented employer preference for race/ethnic

majority groups (De Beijl 2000). For example, applications with an Arab name received more rejections than applications with a Dutch name in the Netherlands (Deros et al. 2012) and a Swedish name in Sweden (Agerström et al. 2012).

Research has begun to examine factors that may reduce or exacerbate employer racial/ethnic discrimination. For example, individuals with a dark skin tone were especially likely to receive lower recruiter ratings than individuals with a lighter skin tone when being considered for low status positions with high client contact in contrast to high status positions with low client contact (Deros et al. 2017). Another correspondence study manipulated only surnames (i.e., using Jefferson and Anderson to indicate an African American and White applicant, respectively) as opposed to manipulating both first and last name, arguing that more typical African American first names might signal lower socioeconomic status (Darolia et al. 2016). Results of this study showed employer preferences did not vary by race/ethnicity, but it is possible that the names used in the study were not strong enough signals of race/ethnicity.

Some applicants respond to fear of discrimination in the application process by practicing “résumé whitening.” One example of this is an applicant changing her Chinese name to an American sounding name. Another is changing the name of an experience such as “National Society for Black Engineers” to omit the racial/ethnic identifier (Kang et al. 2016, p. 475). In a résumé correspondence study, whitened résumés resulted in higher callback rates than unwhitened résumés for both Black and Asian applicants (Kang et al. 2016). Some job seekers, however, object to résumé whitening under moral grounds, feeling it is important to be proud of one’s identity, or want to leave identity information on their résumé to screen out discriminatory employers (Kang et al. 2016). Some research also challenges the efficacy of strategies to erase racial/ethnic markers from job applications in reducing discrimination. Such tactics may amplify the role of bias in selection because they inadvertently invite more unconscious speculation or assumptions than approaches integrating fuller information (Deros & Ryan 2018, Holzer et al. 2006).

Age

A meta-analysis showed age is negatively associated with job offers ($k = 5, \rho = -.11$) and reemployment speed ($k = 18, \rho = -.17$), and an analysis of the U.S. Displaced Workers Survey showed individuals over 50 were unemployed 10.6 weeks longer than individuals ages 20–29 (Wanberg et al. 2016). Several factors that do not involve discrimination affect employment prospects of older job seekers including age-related changes in abilities, health, motives, and social networks (Wanberg et al. 2016). A study of 647 unemployed job seekers in Belgium, for example, found that individuals over 50 searched less intensively for work, had higher reservation wages, and had lower education, factors that partially explained their slower reemployment rate in comparison to individuals under 50 (Vansteenkiste et al. 2015).

At the same time, age discrimination is a common concern expressed by job seekers (Wanberg et al. 2012a), and employers hold stereotypes about older workers that influence their hiring decisions (Klehe et al. 2012). Employers often state their preference for younger workers (Bendick et al. 1999), and prior to the passage of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, employers frequently stated upper age limits for positions. This practice has recurred recently in the form of an employer advertising for job applicants with less than seven years of work experience, gaining legal attention and debate (Stempel 2019). All 11 of the age-related correspondence studies that Baert (2017) identified found that younger applicants have an advantage over older applicants in the application process. Recent work has aimed to resolve methodological limitations specific to age-related correspondence studies (Baert et al. 2016). Specifically, in age-related correspondence studies it is difficult to hold experience constant for younger and older applicants.

If older applicants are given the same amount of relevant work experience as younger applicants in the submitted résumés, it is possible that employer preference for younger applicants is due to employers disliking employment gaps (or out-of-field experience) rather than due to age discrimination. When accounting for this methodological issue in a Belgium correspondence study, older age was a disadvantage when the applicant displayed out-of-field experience but not when the applicant displayed additional in-field experience (Baert et al. 2016).

Criminal Record

Individuals with criminal justice involvement face significant challenges in finding work. Representing a growing population, recent estimates suggest that 8% of the total US adult population, and 33% of African American adult males, have been convicted of a felony at some point in their lives (Shannon et al. 2017). Up to three-fourths of ex-offenders¹ in the United States do not find jobs in the year after release (Pager 2007). Several factors are involved. On the average, ex-offenders have lower levels of education and work experience, and higher levels of substance abuse and mental health problems, than the general population (Holzer et al. 2003). In addition, employers do not want to hire individuals with a criminal record, even those with good qualifications. Field experiments suggest individuals with a criminal record receive fewer interview requests than those without a criminal record (Pager 2003, Pager et al. 2009). Complicating matters, the disadvantage of a criminal record is stronger for applicants from racial/ethnic minority groups in comparison to majority groups (Pager 2003, Pager et al. 2009), and racial/ethnic minority groups are overrepresented with respect to having a criminal record (Shannon et al. 2017). For those who have served prison time, the subsequent difficulty in finding a job makes it exceedingly hard to start over. The role of bias may be especially pronounced in the absence of clear and consistent guidelines for handling applicants' criminal histories in selection decisions (Lageson et al. 2015).

Ban the Box is a new law, passed by several states to prevent employers from asking applicants about criminal convictions until later in the hiring process. The goal of Ban the Box is to give individuals a foot in the door, so that individuals with a criminal record have a chance to be considered by the employer in person. A few studies have examined the consequences of Ban the Box (Agan & Starr 2018, Doleac & Hansen 2017). The authors of both studies conclude that minority/majority gaps in interview requests increased after the legislation, presumably because employers rely more heavily on statistical discrimination to presume Whites do not have a criminal record or that minorities do have a criminal record. Paradoxically, whereas Ban the Box may buffer against the stigma of a criminal record, it simultaneously seems to disadvantage racial/ethnic minorities without a criminal record (Agan & Starr 2018).

Unemployment Status

During the past recession, another employer preference became known—that of preferring employed job applicants over those who are unemployed. Some employers even noted in their job postings that unemployed individuals should not apply (Nat. Employ. Law Proj. 2011).

¹Although an individual can obtain a criminal record due to many different reasons [e.g., from an arrest record to a felony conviction paired with either nonincarcerated correctional supervision or a prison sentence (e.g., Shannon et al. 2017)], the mass incarceration trend in the United States has prompted research interest in the role of such institutionalization in employment prospects. Following other scholars, we use the term ex-offender to refer to individuals with a past felony conviction that resulted in a prison sentence. In addition, although the influence of criminal record on employment is of international concern, the nascent literature on this topic has mostly been in the United States.

Correspondence studies have found that applicants without jobs, in comparison to employed applicants, are less likely to receive an interview from an employer (Eriksson & Lagerström 2006, Ghayad 2014), although Farber et al. (2017) and Nunley et al. (2017) did not replicate these results.

Given extensive concern among unemployed job seekers, as well as a concern that this trend would lead to further adverse impact against minorities and other groups impacted by bias in job search, some states (i.e., New Jersey and Oregon) and cities (i.e., New York City, New York; Madison, Wisconsin; Chicago, Illinois; Washington, DC) have passed legislation meant to protect unemployed job seekers. A correspondence study comparing responses of employers to unemployed and employed applicants in New York City (a location with unemployment status discrimination legislation) versus Los Angeles (a location without unemployment status discrimination legislation) contributed initial insight into the effectiveness of this legislation, showing poorer outcomes for long-term unemployed applicants in Los Angeles but not in New York City (Trzebiatowski et al. 2019).

INTERVENTIONS

Up to this point, we have described many challenges that job seekers may face when looking for work. Research has also examined the usefulness of interventions designed to assist job seekers (especially unemployed job seekers) in gaining employment. The JOBS program, developed at the University of Michigan, is one especially well-researched example of an intervention focused on helping job seekers find their way back to employment. The program targets skills acquisition (e.g., how to effectively search for a job) along with building job seeker's social and emotional resources (Price & Vinokur 2018). Using a randomized trial design, the JOBS intervention results showed that those in the treatment group were more likely to be employed, receive higher earnings, and experience better well-being (Caplan et al. 1989). A second JOBS intervention with a two-year follow-up solidified the long-term impact of the intervention in that the treatment group had higher levels of employment, monthly income, and overall well-being (Vinokur et al. 2000). The efficacy of the JOBS program has been replicated in Finland (Vuori et al. 2002), Ireland (Barry et al. 2006), and the Netherlands (Brennkmeijer & Blonk 2011).

Liu et al.'s (2014a) recent meta-analytic summary provides a significant advancement in our understanding of the effectiveness of job search interventions. They identified 47 job search interventions evaluated with either experimental or quasi-experimental research designs. Overall, their findings are encouraging in that they found the odds of gaining employment (as indicated by a calculated odds ratio, or OR) were 2.67 times higher for job seekers in treatment groups compared to control groups. Their findings also indicated specific features of the intervention that can enhance overall effectiveness. Specifically, job search interventions that included teaching job search skills (OR = 3.32), self-presentation (OR = 3.40), self-efficacy (OR = 3.25), proactivity (OR = 5.88), goal-setting (OR = 4.67), and enlisting social support (OR = 4.26) were more effective compared to interventions without such components. Additional analysis revealed job seekers who either were young or older (compared to middle-aged), with a disability, or experienced short-term unemployment (less than six months) greatly benefitted from the intervention. Job search skills, job search self-efficacy, and job search behaviors were identified in this meta-analysis as partially explaining the relationship between job search intervention and higher likelihood of employment.

PROGRESS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

A tremendous amount of progress has been made in understanding the job search process in the (more than) two decades following an early review on this topic (Schwab et al. 1987). Theory,

Table 1 Future directions for job search scholarship

Topic area	Potential research questions
Job search behaviors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ What job search behaviors do job seekers engage in online and what are their outcomes? What factors could improve online job search for job seekers? ■ How do different combinations of online and offline searches influence job search motivation and success? ■ How and to what extent does job search quality make a difference in achieving job search success?
Clarifying predictors of job search success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ How do different aspects of job search (e.g., behaviors, contextual factors, etc.) determine salary improvement during job search? ■ How can contextual variables be used to develop a deeper and richer explanation of multiple dimensions of job search success? ■ How can theory be used to organize the contextual variables that are relevant to job search? ■ How can economic and sociological perspectives be used to strengthen the prediction of job search success criteria?
Networking quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Can individuals be taught to improve their receipt of proximal networking benefits (e.g., gaining support or solutions)? ■ What characteristics should job seekers prioritize in selecting networking partners? ■ How can the networking process be elucidated further?
Dark side of job search	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ How might networking backfire for job seekers? ■ Can interventions help job seekers overcome structural social network disadvantages? ■ What more can we learn about résumé fraud and dishonesty in the interview?
Unique samples of job seekers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ In what ways does our understanding about job search extend to unique samples, such as gig workers, refugee job seekers, and individuals returning to the workforce after a career gap or military service? ■ Are refugee job seekers more or less resilient during job search as compared to native job seekers? ■ In what ways do employment regulation and policy shape job search success for those with a criminal record across countries? ■ How does the social class of the job seeker affect job search and interview processes?
Individual experience of discrimination and incivility in job search	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ How do different forms of discrimination influence mood, motivation to look for work, and job search success? ■ How do job seekers manage their social identities in response to subtle and overt forms of discrimination?

methodological advancements, and the sheer volume of attention this topic has received have been valuable in providing insight into questions such as “What are the components of job search, and what does the job search process involve?”; “What dimensions and methods of job search predict success in finding a job?”; “How does job search change over time?”; and “What barriers do individuals face in their job search?” Yet, many research needs remain. In the following, we describe potential future research directions. We provide a more concise summary of potential research directions in **Table 1**.

The use of self-regulatory frameworks, as well as other theories, has facilitated a strong understanding of job search as a goal-directed process. Within this stream of research, it would be valuable to develop a stronger understanding of the use and utility of job search behaviors other than job search intensity, social networks, and interview behaviors. This is not to say that research on job search intensity, social networks, or interview behaviors should not continue (we provide some suggestions below). However, job search intensity has been studied quite extensively, and there is more to be learned about topics such as job search on the Internet, the role of job search quality, and how the job search unfolds over time. Several interesting directions for research on job search from a self-regulatory, process perspective are provided by da Motta Veiga et al.

(2018), and for expanding our understanding of job search quality specifically by van Hooff et al. (2013).

A comprehensive and deeper focus on predictors of the job search success criterion space is desirable. Researchers have frequently examined reemployment status (e.g., “in a new job” versus “not in a new job”) as a dichotomous outcome variable, with fewer studies examining other outcomes such as number of offers, number of interviews, reemployment speed, or quality. In addition, researchers in this domain have often studied the specific roles of job search dimensions (or aspects of the search process) rather than trying to fully explain the more distal job search success criterion space. The percent variance accounted for in the job search success criterion space is typically low. A more extensive focus on predictors of salary improvement would be especially valuable for some job seeker groups, such as those with minimum wage incomes. However, researchers should also consider reemployment quality indices that go beyond salary in the new job. Comprehensive examinations of predictors of reemployment speed and quality may benefit from drawing on theoretical frameworks beyond self-regulation, given the importance of human capital and other variables to job search success. Researchers are encouraged to complete broad literature searches when studying job search, to incorporate not only psychological but also sociological and economic literature and perspectives.

Although several studies have focused on social networks during job search, there is still more to learn that can inform the use of networking by job seekers. Research has shown an unclear relationship between networking intensity and job search success, meaning it may not necessarily benefit all individuals to network, or to network more. Future research should attend to how the relationship between networking intensity and job search success outcomes depends on characteristics of the social network. Characteristics of the social network can include size, composition (e.g., gender, prestige), and patterns of social connections (e.g., structural holes); these characteristics have been studied in the broader networking literature, but have only scarcely been applied to the examination of job search success (e.g., Belliveau 2005, Van Hoye et al. 2009).

The quality of job seekers’ networking behaviors is also important to consider. It will be useful for future research to study more about how job seekers present themselves to others during networking and who they choose to network with. Research may attend to how individuals can be taught to achieve more from networking, including more distal outcomes such as job leads, interviews, job offers, and higher reemployment quality. Research has also delineated more proximal benefits of networking, which include gaining solutions, referrals, problem reformation, validation, and legitimation (Cross & Sproull 2004). Can individuals be taught to improve their receipt of these proximal benefits, and what specific networking behaviors enable job seekers to derive proximal networking benefits? What networking partner characteristics should job seekers prioritize in deciding whom to network with? We offer these questions and call for further explication of the networking process (Marsden & Gorman 2001, Mouw 2003).

Additional research might explore the dark side of networking (Forret 2018, Wolff et al. 2008). Regarding job search success, how might networking backfire for job seekers and their employers if the use of social networks gave them an advantage over candidates with higher human capital (Forret 2018)? Finally, because of evidence of the benefits of social networks as upward spirals of privilege (Fernandez & Fernandez-Mateo 2006), we encourage future work on improving networking quality and helping to close the gap between those who can and those who cannot benefit from social network use.

Our review highlighted several contextual factors that are relevant to the process and experience of job search. More research including these factors should be helpful in providing deeper and richer insight into the predictors and moderators involved in job search success. Theoretical work to explicate and organize contextual factors involved in job search would be valuable.

In expanding the examination of contextual variables, researchers should consider the changing workplace, and how type of work or worker may moderate the job search process.

As one example, given the now substantial presence of gig work (i.e., working sequential and/or simultaneous short-term projects or jobs; Ashford et al. 2018) in the world economy, it would be useful to examine job search within this context. Evidence suggests that most people engaged in gig work are doing so as a supplement to more stable work (Katz & Krueger 2019). Research is needed to investigate the similarities and differences between the job search process for gig work and the process of searching for traditional employment when already employed. Qualitative work on securing gigs among contingent workers suggests the prominence of informal methods (O'Mahony & Bechky 2006, Reilly 2017). Do individuals who engage in gig work undertake haphazard searches and potentially sacrifice a more focused or (systematically) exploratory search, and how does this influence employment quality for the new job? Might a haphazard strategy—typically seen as limiting for traditional job seekers—facilitate job search success in the gig economy? Because some workers are making careers out of gig work (Ashford et al. 2018, Caza et al. 2018), research should explore the intensity and content of behaviors entailed in continually replenishing expiring projects with new ones, as well as examine the nature and predictors of emotional trajectories during such a process.

An additional unique contextual condition to consider is the job search experiences of refugee job seekers. Refugees or displaced persons face numerous hardships starting with being forced out of their country to barriers around integrating into the host country (Wehrle et al. 2018). When considering integrating refugees into the labor market, in what ways does our understanding about predictors of job search success translate to this population? For instance, the benefits associated with networking and the use of social contacts may depend on whether a refugee is resettled into an environment rich in socioeconomic resources such as an ethnic enclave. The job search goals between native and refugee job seekers may be different and result in varying job search outcomes. Typically, native job seekers actively search for jobs that fit with their knowledge, skills, and abilities. Refugee job seekers may not have access to such jobs (due to host country not accepting professional credentials from home country), which could shift their priority to pursue jobs that increase contact with similar others to facilitate social integration. Key determinants of successful career transition for refugees include the generation and use of social networks along with education and relevant work experience (Campion 2018). Finally, due to the general hardships experienced by refugees, one question to explore is whether refugee job seekers are more (or less) resilient (e.g., temporal persistence, lower vacillation in well-being) during the job search as compared to native job seekers.

Socioeconomic status, or level of job, is another important contextual factor in job search that has rarely been studied. Given the increasing wage gaps present in society, it is valuable to understand the job search process for the working poor. Although little work has examined the role of social class in job search, Elliott (1999) theorized and found that individuals of higher social class engaged in slightly different job search strategies (i.e., more informal search) and were able to realize greater job search success from the same job search strategies (i.e., combined formal and informal) as compared to individuals of lower social class. Drawing on self-regulatory frameworks, it would be valuable to document how social class affects goal choice and aspirations, such as the jobs one applies for. Research might also explore whether and how social class signals, which are subtle and ubiquitous (Kraus et al. 2017), influence how interaction partners respond to job seekers during job search.

Much of the studies reviewed on bias during the job search emphasized the presence of employer discrimination across numerous demographic categories. Future research on bias would benefit from considering the individual experience of discrimination and its proximal and distal

consequences. To this end, studies might consider how different forms of discrimination (e.g., overt versus subtle forms such as selective incivility or microaggressions) differentially influence mood, motivation to look for work, and job search success. Research can examine job seekers' coping strategies by considering how the experience is appraised (e.g., challenge versus hindrance) and how it is managed (e.g., withdrawal behavior, increased persistence). A social identity lens can be incorporated into our understanding of how job seekers manage their social identities in response to subtle and overt forms of discrimination. Given the self-regulatory nature of job search, questions around the benefits and costs of devoting cognitive and emotional resources to manage one's social identity (e.g., affirm identity versus distance from identity) offer interesting lines of inquiry.

As a final note, as with most other areas of organizational behavior scholarship, we encourage authors to value the richness that theory can bring to the study of job search. It is especially beneficial when authors provide a deep application of theory to the study focus prior to study design, so that they can develop arguments, measures, and design based on the theory. Such applications can lead to deeper and richer insights to the literature. Strong applications of self-regulation frameworks and other theories have guided important distinctions between job search dimensions and mediators and moderators involved in the search process. At the same time, researchers should concurrently aim to answer questions that have practical importance. Job search is a highly prevalent career behavior, and one that is especially stressful in weak economies. Research that can inform job seekers, counselors, and interventions is of major value. A good starting point for job search research, as has been recommended for impactful research in general, is to consider if the study contributes to a question that is useful to understand from both the perspective of the phenomenon and practice of job search. Although this seems obvious, significance, novelty, curiosity, scope, and actionability are key issues that distinguish excellent from less impactful research (Colquitt & George 2011).

Although it is difficult to condense the topics discussed in this article, we have provided a few major takeaways in the Summary Points, below. Overall, there is a substantial amount that we know from an empirical standpoint about job search. Our review only covers samples of the wealth of work that has been done in this area. At the same time, there are still many questions to explore in this literature. We encourage researchers to forge on in developing a deeper understanding of the job search process, experience, and outcomes.

SUMMARY POINTS

1. Many recent advances in the understanding of job search have drawn on self-regulation theories that view the job search as a highly autonomous, goal-directed process.
2. Three dimensions of job search are job search intensity/effort (how much time or effort a job seeker puts into job search), job search content (the activities and quality of activities the individual engages in), and temporality/persistence (continuity or change in the job search over time).
3. Individuals who engage in higher job search intensity tend to have higher job search self-efficacy, financial need, employment commitment, positive attitudes toward job search, and social pressure from others. Job search intensity is related to receiving more job offers and finding jobs faster.
4. Mobilizing social networks can play an important role in job search success (finding employment, finding it within the time frame desired, and employment quality).

5. Job seeker self-promotion and ingratiation are associated with higher interviewer ratings, although less so when interviewers use structured interviews.
6. Geographical region, economic conditions, job seekers' employment situation, and employer behaviors and preferences influence the individual experience of job search, and we need further insight into these factors.
7. Experimental methods have elucidated bias faced by job seekers based on gender, gender identity, race/ethnicity, age, religion, sexual orientation, disability, weight, appearance, being pregnant, having a criminal background, and unemployment status.
8. Interventions that include components focused on job search skills, self-presentation, self-efficacy, proactivity, goal-setting, and enlisting social support are most effective in facilitating reemployment.
9. Job search scholarship will benefit from interdisciplinary investigations that integrate psychological, sociological, and economic theoretical perspectives.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors are not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

LITERATURE CITED

- Agan AY, Starr SB. 2018. Ban the box, criminal records, and racial discrimination: a field experiment. *Q. J. Econ.* 133:191–235
- Agerström J, Björklund F, Carlsson R, Rooth DO. 2012. Warm and competent Hassan = cold and incompetent Eric: a harsh equation of real-life hiring discrimination. *Bas. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 34:359–66
- Ali AA, Lyons BJ, Ryan AM. 2017. Managing a perilous stigma: ex-offenders' use of reparative impression management tactics in hiring contexts. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 102:1271–85
- Ali AA, Ryan AM, Lyons BJ, Ehrhart MG, Wessel JL. 2016. The long road to employment: incivility experienced by job seekers. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 101:333–49
- Amundson NE, Borgen WA. 1982. The dynamics of unemployment: job loss and job search. *Pers. Guid. J.* 60:562–64
- Ashford SJ, Caza BB, Reid EM. 2018. From surviving to thriving in the gig economy: a research agenda for individuals in the new world of work. *Res. Organ. Behav.* 38:23–41
- Baert S. 2017. *Hiring discrimination: an overview of (almost) all correspondence experiments since 2005*. Discuss. Pap. 10738, IZA, Inst. Labor Econ., Bonn, Ger. <http://ftp.iza.org/dp10738.pdf>
- Baert S, Norga J, Thuy Y, Van Hecke M. 2016. Getting grey hairs in the labour market: an alternative experiment on age discrimination. *J. Econ. Psychol.* 57:86–101
- Barbulescu R. 2015. The strength of many kinds of ties: unpacking the role of social contacts across stages of the job search process. *Organ. Sci.* 26:1040–58
- Barrick MR, Shaffer JA, DeGrassi SW. 2009. What you see may not be what you get: relationships among self-presentation tactics and ratings of interview and job performance. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 94:1394–411
- Barry M, Reynolds C, Sheridan A, Egenton R. 2006. Implementation of the JOBS programme in Ireland. *J. Publ. Ment. Health* 5:10–25
- Belliveau MA. 2005. Blind ambition? The effects of social networks and institutional sex composition on the job search outcomes of elite coeducational and women's college graduates. *Organ. Sci.* 16:134–50
- Bendick M, Brown LE, Wall K. 1999. No foot in the door: an experimental study of employment discrimination against older workers. *J. Aging Soc. Policy* 10:5–23

- Berger ED. 2009. Managing age discrimination: an examination of the techniques used when seeking employment. *Gerontologist* 49:317–32
- Bian Y, Huang X, Zhang L. 2015. Information and favoritism: the network effect on wage income in China. *Soc. Netw.* 40:129–38
- Bianchi E. 2013. The bright side of bad times: the affective advantages of entering the workforce in a recession. *Ad. Sci. Q.* 58:587–623
- Blau G. 1994. Testing a two-dimensional measure of job search behavior. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* 59:288–312
- Boswell WR, Zimmerman RD, Swider BW. 2012. Employee job search: toward an understanding of search context and search objectives. *J. Manag.* 38:129–63
- Brenninkmeijer V, Blonk RW. 2011. The effectiveness of the JOBS program among the long-term unemployed: a randomized experiment in the Netherlands. *Heal. Prom. Int.* 27:220–29
- Campion ED. 2018. The career adaptive refugee: exploring the structural and personal barriers to refugee resettlement. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 105:6–16
- Caplan RD, Vinokur AD, Price RH, Van Ryn M. 1989. Job seeking, reemployment, and mental health: a randomized field experiment in coping with job loss. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 74:759–69
- Caza BB, Moss S, Vough H. 2018. From synchronizing to harmonizing: the process of authenticating multiple identities. *Ad. Sci. Q.* 63:703–45
- Chawla N, Gabriel AS, da Motta Veiga SP, Slaughter JE. 2019. Does feedback matter for job search self-regulation? It depends on the feedback quality. *Pers. Psychol.* 72:513–41
- Colquitt J, George G. 2011. Publishing in *AMJ*—Part 1: Topic choice. *Acad. Manag. J.* 54:432–35
- Creed PA, King V, Hood M, McKenzie R. 2009. Goal orientation, self-regulation strategies, and job-seeking intensity in unemployed adults. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 94:806–13
- Cross R, Sproull L. 2004. More than an answer: information relationships for actionable knowledge. *Organ. Sci.* 15:446–62
- Crossley CD, Highhouse S. 2005. Relation of job search and choice process with subsequent satisfaction. *J. Econ. Psychol.* 26:255–68
- da Motta Veiga SP, Gabriel AS. 2016. The role of self-determined motivation in job search: a dynamic approach. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 101:350–61
- da Motta Veiga SP, Turban DB. 2014. Are affect and perceived stress detrimental or beneficial to job seekers? The role of learning goal orientation in job search self-regulation. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* 125:193–203
- da Motta Veiga SP, Turban DB, Gabriel AS, Chawla N. 2018. From the unfolding process to self-regulation in job search: integrating between-and within-person approaches. *Res. Pers. Hum. Resour. Manag.* 36:243–74
- Darolia R, Koedel C, Martorell P, Wilson K, Perez-Arce F. 2016. Race and gender effects on employer interest in job applicants: new evidence from a resume field experiment. *Appl. Econ. Let.* 23:853–56
- De Beijl RZ, ed. 2000. *Documenting discrimination against migrant workers in the labour market: A comparative study of four European countries*. Geneva: Int. Lab. Org.
- DeGroot T, Motowidlo SJ. 1999. Why visual and vocal interview cues can affect interviewers' judgments and predict job performance. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 84:986–93
- Derous E, Nguyen HH, Ryan AM. 2009. Hiring discrimination against Arab minorities: interactions between prejudice and job characteristics. *Hum. Perf.* 22:297–320
- Derous E, Pepermans R, Ryan AM. 2017. Ethnic discrimination during résumé screening: interactive effects of applicants' ethnic salience with job context. *Hum. Relat.* 70:860–82
- Derous E, Ryan AM. 2018. By any other name: discrimination in resume screening. In *The Oxford Handbook of Job Loss and Job Search*, ed. UC Klehe, EAJ van Hooft, pp. 501–24. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Derous E, Ryan AM, Nguyen HHD. 2012. Multiple categorization in resume screening: examining effects on hiring discrimination against Arab applicants in field and lab settings. *J. Organ. Behav.* 33:544–70
- Dineen BR, Duffy MK, Henle CA, Lee K. 2017. Green by comparison: deviant and normative transmigrations of job search envy in a temporal context. *Acad. Manag. J.* 60:295–320
- Direnzo MS, Greenhaus JH. 2011. Job search and voluntary turnover in a boundaryless world: a control theory perspective. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 36:567–89

- Doleac JL, Hansen B. 2017. Moving to job opportunities? The effect of “Ban the Box” on the composition of cities. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 107:556–59
- Ellis AP, West BJ, Ryan AM, DeShon RP. 2002. The use of impression management tactics in structured interviews: A function of question type? *J. Appl. Psychol.* 87:1200–8
- Elliott JR. 1999. Social isolation and labor market insulation: network and neighborhood effects on less-educated urban workers. *Soc. Quart.* 40:199–216
- Eriksson S, Lagerström J. 2006. Competition between employed and unemployed job applicants: Swedish evidence. *Scandi. J. Econ.* 108:373–96
- Farber HS, Silverman D, Von Wachter T. 2017. Factors determining callbacks to job applications by the unemployed: an audit study. *RSP: Russell Sage Found. J. Soc. Sci.* 3:168–201
- Fernandez RM, Fernandez-Mateo I. 2006. Networks, race, and hiring. *Am. Soc. Rev.* 71:42–71
- Forret ML. 2018. Networking as a job-search behavior and career management strategy. In *The Oxford Handbook of Job Loss and Job Search*, ed. UC Klehe, EAJ van Hooft, pp. 275–92. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Franzen A, Hangartner D. 2006. Social networks and labour market outcomes: the non-monetary benefits of social capital. *Eur. Soc. Rev.* 22:353–68
- Garg R, Telang R. 2018. To be or not to be linked: online social networks and job search by unemployed workforce. *Manag. Sci.* 64:3469–70
- Ghayad R. 2014. *The jobless trap*. Work. Pap., Northeast. Univ., Boston, MA. http://www.lexissecuritiesmosaic.com/gateway/FEDRES/SPEECHES/ugd_576e9a_f6cf3b6661e44621ad26547112f66691.pdf
- Gifford R, Ng CF, Wilkinson M. 1985. Nonverbal cues in the employment interview: links between applicant qualities and interviewer judgments. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 70:729–36
- Gioaba I, Krings F. 2017. Impression management in the job interview: an effective way of mitigating discrimination against older applicants? *Front. Psychol.* 8(770):1–12
- Gobillon L, Rupert P, Wasmer E. 2014. Ethnic unemployment rates and frictional markets. *J. Urban Econ.* 79:108–20
- Hebl MR, Skorinko JL. 2005. Acknowledging one’s physical disability in the interview: Does “when” make a difference? *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 35:2477–92
- Hiemstra AMF, Deros E, Serlie AW, Born M. 2013. Ethnicity effects in graduates’ résumé content. *Appl. Psychol.* 62:427–53
- Hobijn B, Sahin A. 2009. Job-finding and separation rates in the OECD. *Econ. Lett.* 104:107–11
- Holzer HJ, Raphael S, Stoll MA. 2003. *Employment barriers facing ex-offenders*. Urban Institute, Washington, DC. <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/59416/410855-Employment-Barriers-Facing-Ex-Offenders.PDF>
- Holzer HJ, Raphael S, Stoll MA. 2006. Perceived criminality, criminal background checks, and the racial hiring practices of employers. *J. Law Econ.* 49:451–80
- Kanfer R, Bufton GM. 2018. Job loss and job search: a social-cognitive and self-regulation perspective. In *The Oxford Handbook of Job Loss and Job Search*, ed. UC Klehe, EAJ van Hooft, pp. 143–58. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Kanfer R, Wanberg CR, Kantrowitz TM. 2001. Job search and employment: a personality-motivational analysis and meta-analytic review. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 86:837–55
- Kang SK, DeCelles KA, Tilcsik A, Jun S. 2016. Whitened résumés: race and self-presentation in the labor market. *Ad. Sci. Q.* 61:469–502
- Katz LF, Krueger AB. 2019. *Understanding trends in alternative work arrangements in the United States*. Work. Pap. 25425, Nat. Bur. Econ. Res., Cambridge, MA. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w25425.pdf>
- King EB, Ahmad AS. 2010. An experimental field study of interpersonal discrimination toward Muslim job applicants. *Pers. Psychol.* 63:881–906
- Klehe UC, Koen J, De Pater IE. 2012. Ending on the scrap heap? The experience of job loss and job search among older workers. *The Oxford Handbook of Work and Aging*, ed. WC Borman, JW Hedge, pp. 313–40. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Klehe UC, van Hooft E. 2018. *The Oxford Handbook of Job Loss and Job Search*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Kraus MW, Park J, Tan JJJ. 2017. Signs of social class: the experience of economic inequality in everyday life. *Persp. Psychol. Sci.* 12:422–35

- Kreemers LM, van Hooft EAJ, van Vianen AEM. 2018. Dealing with negative job search experiences: the beneficial role of self-compassion for job seekers' affective responses. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 106:165–79
- Krueger AB, Mueller A. 2010. Job search and unemployment insurance: new evidence from time use data. *J. Pub. Econ.* 94:298–307
- Lageson SE, Vuolo M, Uggen C. 2015. Legal ambiguity in managerial assessments of criminal records. *Law Soc. Inq.* 40:175–204
- Lambert TA, Eby LT, Reeves MP. 2006. Predictors of networking intensity and network quality among white-collar job seekers. *J. Career Dev.* 32:351–65
- Levashina J, Campion MA. 2007. Measuring faking in the employment interview: development and validation of an interview faking behavior scale. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 92:1638–56
- Levine SP, Feldman RS. 2002. Women and men's nonverbal behavior and self-monitoring in a job interview setting. *Appl. HRM Res.* 7:1–14
- Lin N. 2008. A network theory of social capital. In *The Handbook of Social Capital*, ed. D Castiglione, JW Van Deth, G Wolleb, pp. 50–69. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Liu S, Huang JL, Wang M. 2014a. Effectiveness of job search interventions: a meta-analytic review. *Psychol. Bull.* 140:1009–41
- Liu S, Wang M, Liao H, Shi J. 2014b. Self-regulation during job search: the opposing effects of employment self-efficacy and job search behavior self-efficacy. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 99:1159–72
- Lopez-Kidwell V, Grosser TJ, Dineen BR, Borgatti SP. 2013. What matters when: a multistage model and empirical examination of job search effort. *Acad. Manag. J.* 56:1655–78
- Lyons BJ, Volpone SD, Wessel JL, Alonso NM. 2017. Disclosing a disability: Do strategy type and onset controllability make a difference? *J. Appl. Psychol.* 102:1375–83
- Lyons BJ, Wessel JL, Chiew Tai Y, Marie Ryan A. 2014. Strategies of job seekers related to age-related stereotypes. *J. Manag. Psychol.* 29:1009–27
- Manroop L, Richardson J. 2016. Job search: a multidisciplinary review and research agenda. *Int. J. Manag. Rev.* 18:206–27
- Marsden PV, Gorman EH. 2001. Social networks, job changes, and recruitment. In *Sourcebook of Labor Markets: Evolving Structures and Processes*, ed. I Berg, AL Kalleberg, pp. 467–502. New York: Springer
- Matthews R, Pendakur R, Young N. 2009. Social capital, labour markets, and job finding in urban and rural regions: comparing paths to employment in prosperous cities and stressed rural communities in Canada. *Sociol. Rev.* 57:306–30
- McArdle S, Waters L, Briscoe JP, Hall DTT. 2007. Employability during unemployment: adaptability, career identity and human and social capital. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 71:247–64
- McCarthy JM, Cheng BH. 2018. Through the looking glass: employment interviews from the lens of job candidates. In *The Oxford Handbook of Job Loss and Job Search*, ed. UC Klehe, EAJ van Hooft, pp. 329–58. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Mouw T. 2003. Social capital and finding a job: do contacts matter? *Am. Soc. Rev.* 68:868–98
- Nat. Employ. Law Proj. 2011. *Hiring discrimination against the unemployed: Federal bill outlaws excluding the unemployed from job opportunities, as discriminatory ads persist*. Briefing paper, July 12, Nat. Employ. Law Proj., New York, NY. https://s27147.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/unemployed_discrimination.7.12.2011.pdf
- Nguyen LS, Frauendorfer D, Mast MS, Gatica-Perez D. 2014. Hire me: computational inference of hirability in employment interviews based on nonverbal behavior. *IEEE Trans. Multim.* 16:1018–31
- Nunley JM, Pugh A, Romero N, Seals RA. 2017. The effects of unemployment and underemployment on employment opportunities: results from a correspondence audit of the labor market for college graduates. *Ind. Labor Relat. Rev.* 70:642–69
- Obukhova E. 2012. Motivation versus relevance: using strong ties to find a job in urban China. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 41:570–80
- O'Mahony S, Bechky BA. 2006. Stretchwork: managing the career progression paradox in external labor markets. *Acad. Manag. J.* 49:918–41

- Paquette D. 2018. She cleaned for \$3.49 an hour. A gas station just offered her \$11.25. *Washington Post*, June 21. https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/she-landed-her-dream-job-at-a-gas-station-and-1125-an-hour/2018/06/21/0cb8a760-5558-11e8-a551-5b648abe29ef_story.html?utm_term=.4586a930d03a
- Pager D. 2003. The mark of a criminal record. *Am. J. Soc.* 108:937–75
- Pager D. 2007. *Marked: Race, Crime, and Finding Work in an Era of Mass Incarceration*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
- Pager D, Bonikowski B, Western B. 2009. Discrimination in a low-wage labor market: a field experiment. *Am. Soc. Rev.* 74:777–99
- Price RH, Vinokur AD. 2018. The JOBS program: impact on job seeker motivation, reemployment, and mental health. In *The Oxford Handbook of Job Loss and Job Search*, ed. UC Klehe, EAJ van Hooft, pp. 575–90. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Quillian L, Pager D, Hexel O, Midtbøen AH. 2017. Meta-analysis of field experiments shows no change in racial discrimination in hiring over time. *PNAS* 114:10870–75
- Reilly P. 2017. Layers of a clown: career development in cultural production industries. *Acad. Manag. Disc.* 3:145–64
- Riggio RE, Throckmorton B. 1988. The relative effects of verbal and nonverbal behavior, appearance, and social skills on evaluations made in hiring interviews. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 18:331–48
- Roulin N, Bourdage JS. 2017. Once an impression manager, always an impression manager? Antecedents of honest and deceptive impression management use and variability across multiple job interviews. *Front. Psychol.* 8(29):1–13
- Saks AM. 2005. Job search success: a review and integration of the predictors, behaviors, and outcomes. In *Career Development and Counseling: Putting Theory and Research to Work*, ed. SD Brown, RW Lent, pp. 155–79. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley
- Saks AM. 2006. Multiple predictors and criteria of job search success. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 68:400–15
- Saks AM, Ashforth BE. 2000. Change in job search behaviors and employment outcomes. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 56:277–87
- Saks AM, Ashforth BE. 2002. Is job search related to employment quality? It all depends on the fit. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 87:646–54
- Schwab DP, Rynes SL, Aldag RJ. 1987. Theories and research on job search and choice. *Res. Pers. Hum. Resour. Manag.* 5:129–66
- Shannon SKS, Uggen C, Schnittker J, Thompson M, Wakefield S, Massoglia M. 2017. The growth, scope, and spatial distribution of people with felony records in the United States, 1948–2010. *Demography* 54:1795–818
- Song Z, Sun SH, Li X. 2018. Job-search behavior of the unemployed: a dynamic perspective. In *The Oxford Handbook of Job Loss and Job Search*, ed. UC Klehe, EAJ van Hooft, pp. 417–30. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Stempel J. 2019. Age bias law does not cover job applicants: U.S. appeals court. *Reuters*, January 23. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-labor-age-bias/age-bias-law-does-not-cover-job-applicants-u-s-appeals-court-idUSKCN1PI02N>
- Stewart GL, Dustin SL, Barrick MR, Darnold TC. 2008. Exploring the handshake in employment interviews. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 93:1139–46
- Sun S, Song Z, Lim VK. 2013. Dynamics of the job search process: developing and testing a mediated moderation model. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 98:771–84
- Swider BW, Barrick MR, Harris TB, Stoverink AC. 2011. Managing and creating an image in the interview: the role of interviewee initial impressions. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 96:1275–88
- Trzebiatowski T, Wanberg C, Dossinger K. 2019. Unemployed needn't apply: unemployment status, legislation, and interview requests. *J. Manag.* In press. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318823952>
- Turban DB, Lee FK, da Motta Veiga SP, Haggard DL, Wu SY. 2013. Be happy, don't wait: the role of trait affect in job search. *Pers. Psychol.* 66:483–514
- Turban DB, Stevens CK, Lee FK. 2009. Effects of conscientiousness and extraversion on new labor market entrants' job search: the mediating role of metacognitive activities and positive emotions. *Pers. Psychol.* 62:553–73

- US Bur. Labor Stat. 2018a. *Employee tenure summary*. News release, Sept. 20. <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/tenure.nr0.htm>
- US Bur. Labor Stat. 2018b. *Labor force characteristics by race and ethnicity, 2017*. Rep. 1076. <https://www.bls.gov/opub/reports/race-and-ethnicity/2017/home.htm>
- van Hooft EAJ, Born MP, Taris TW, Van der Flier H. 2004. Job search and the theory of planned behavior: minority-majority group differences in The Netherlands. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 65:366–90
- van Hooft EAJ, Wanberg C, Kanfer R, Kammeyer-Mueller J, Basbug G. 2015. *Job search and employment success predictors: A meta-analytic test of motivation and self-regulation*. Presented at Unemployment and Reemployment: Job Search, Outcomes, and Intervention Efforts Symp. Annu. Meet. Acad. Manag., 75th, Aug. 7–11, Vancouver, BC, Can.
- van Hooft EAJ, Wanberg CR, Van Hove G. 2013. Moving beyond job search quantity: towards a conceptualization and self-regulatory framework of job search quality. *Organ. Psychol. Rev.* 3:3–40
- Van Hove G. 2018. Job search behavior as a multidimensional construct: a review of different job search behaviors and sources. In *The Oxford Handbook of Job Loss and Job Search*, ed. UC Klehe, EAJ van Hooft, pp. 259–74. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
- Van Hove G, van Hooft EAJ, Lievens F. 2009. Networking as a job search behaviour: a social network perspective. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 82:661–82
- Vansteenkiste S, Deschacht N, Sels L. 2015. Why are unemployed aged fifty and over less likely to find a job? A decomposition analysis. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 90:55–65
- Vinokur AD, Schul Y, Vuori J, Price RH. 2000. Two years after a job loss: long-term impact of the JOBS program on reemployment and mental health. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* 5:32–47
- Vuori J, Silvonen J, Vinokur AD, Price RH. 2002. The Työhoön Job Search Program in Finland: benefits for the unemployed with risk of depression or discouragement. *J. Occup. Health Psychol.* 7:5–19
- Wanberg C, Basbug G, van Hooft EAJ, Samtani A. 2012a. Navigating the black hole: explicating layers of job search context and adaptational responses. *Pers. Psychol.* 65:887–926
- Wanberg CR. 2012. The individual experience of unemployment. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 63:369–96
- Wanberg CR, Glomb TM, Song Z, Sorenson S, 2005. Job-search persistence during unemployment: a 10-wave longitudinal study. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 90:411–30
- Wanberg CR, Hough LM, Song Z. 2002. Predictive validity of a multidisciplinary model of reemployment success. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 87:1100–20
- Wanberg CR, Kanfer R, Banas JT. 2000. Predictors and outcomes of networking intensity among unemployed job seekers. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 85:491–503
- Wanberg CR, Kanfer R, Hamann DJ, Zhang Z. 2016. Age and reemployment success after job loss: an integrative model and meta-analysis. *Psychol. Bull.* 142:400–26
- Wanberg CR, Kanfer R, Rotundo M. 1999. Unemployed individuals: motives, job-search competencies, and job-search constraints as predictors of job seeking and reemployment. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 84:897–910
- Wanberg CR, van Hooft EAJ, Dossinger K, van Vianen AEM, Klehe UC. 2019a. How strong is my safety net? Perceived unemployment insurance generosity and implications for job search, mental health, and reemployment. *J. Appl. Psychol.* In press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000435>
- Wanberg CR, van Hooft EAJ, Liu S, Csillag B. 2019b. Can job seekers achieve more through networking? The role of networking intensity, self-efficacy, and proximal benefits. *Pers. Psychol.* In press
- Wanberg CR, Zhu J, Kanfer R, Zhang Z. 2012b. After the pink slip: applying dynamic motivation frameworks to the job search experience. *Acad. Manag. J.* 55:261–84
- Wanberg CR, Zhu J, van Hooft EAJ. 2010. The job search grind: perceived progress, self-reactions, and self-regulation of search effort. *Acad. Manag. J.* 53:788–807
- Wehrle K, Klehe UC, Kira M, Zikic J. 2018. Can I come as I am? Refugees' vocational identity threats, coping, and growth. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 105:83–101
- Wolff HG, Moser K. 2009. Effects of networking on career success: a longitudinal study. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 94:196–206
- Wolff HG, Moser K, Grau A. 2008. Networking: theoretical foundations and construct validity. In *Readings in Applied Organizational Behavior from the Lüneburg Symposium*, ed. J Deller, pp. 101–18. Mering, Ger: Hampp



Contents

Becoming an Organizational Scholar <i>Denise M. Rousseau</i>	1
Regulatory Focus and Fit Effects in Organizations <i>E. Tory Higgins and Federica Pinelli</i>	25
Implicit Leadership Theories, Implicit Followership Theories, and Dynamic Processing of Leadership Information <i>Robert G. Lord, Olga Epitropaki, Roseanne J. Foti, and Tiffany Keller Hansbrough</i>	49
The Psychology of Workplace Mentoring Relationships <i>Lillian T. Eby and Melissa M. Robertson</i>	75
Perceived Organizational Support: Why Caring About Employees Counts <i>Robert Eisenberger, Linda Rhoades Shanock, and Xueqi Wen</i>	101
Beyond Meta-Analysis: Secondary Uses of Meta-Analytic Data <i>In-Sue Oh</i>	125
The Integration of People and Networks <i>Martin Kilduff and Jung Won Lee</i>	155
Discharges, Poor-Performer Quits, and Layoffs as Valued Exits: Is It Really Addition by Subtraction? <i>Charlie O. Trevor and Rakoon Piyanontalee</i>	181
Measurement Development and Evaluation <i>Michael J. Zickar</i>	213
Asian Conceptualizations of Leadership: Progresses and Challenges <i>R. Takeuchi, A.C. Wang, and J.L. Farh</i>	233
Modern Discrimination in Organizations <i>Mikki Hebl, Shannon K. Cheng, and Linnea C. Ng</i>	257
Can Teamwork Promote Safety in Organizations? <i>Eduardo Salas, Tiffany M. Bisbey, Allison M. Traylor, and Michael A. Rosen</i>	283
Job Seeking: The Process and Experience of Looking for a Job <i>Connie R. Wanberg, Abdifatah A. Ali, and Borbala Csillag</i>	315

Assessing the Control Literature: Looking Back and Looking Forward <i>Sim B. Sitkin, Chris P. Long, and Laura B. Cardinal</i>	339
Toward a Better Understanding of Behavioral Ethics in the Workplace <i>David De Cremer and Celia Moore</i>	369
Posttraumatic Growth at Work <i>Sally Maitlis</i>	395
Within-Person Job Performance Variability Over Short Timeframes: Theory, Empirical Research, and Practice <i>Reeshad S. Dalal, Balca Alaybek, and Filip Lievens</i>	421
Positive Emotions at Work <i>Ed Diener, Stuti Thapa, and Louis Tay</i>	451
Multiteam Systems: An Integrated Review and Comparison of Different Forms <i>Stephen J. Zaccaro, Samantha Dubrow, Elisa M. Torres, and Lauren N.P. Campbell</i>	479
Big Data in Industrial-Organizational Psychology and Human Resource Management: Forward Progress for Organizational Research and Practice <i>Frederick L. Oswald, Tara S. Behrend, Dan J. Putka, and Evan Sinar</i>	505

Errata

An online log of corrections to *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* articles may be found at <http://www.annualreviews.org/errata/orgpsych>