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Job centers aid businesses seeking qualified employees and assist job seekers to select and contact employment and training services. Job seekers are also offered the opportunity to assess their skills, abilities, qualifications, and readiness. Furthermore, job centers ensure that job seekers are complying with requirements that they must meet to benefit from job assistance programs such as unemployment insurance. Yet, claimants often procrastinate and/or suspend their job search efforts even though such actions can make them lose their free time and entitlements, and more importantly they may lose the opportunity to take advantage of free information, services, training, and financial assistance for getting a job to which they have already made a claim. The current work looks to Chatman’s “small worlds” work, Johnson’s comprehensive model of information seeking, and Wilson’s “costly ignorance” construct for contributions to understanding such behavior. Identification of a particular trait or set of traits of job seekers during periods of unemployment will inform a new job seeking activities model (JSAM). This study purposely examines job seeker information behavior and the factors which influence job seekers’ behavior, in particular, family tangible support as a social norm effect. A mixed method, using questionnaires for job hunting completers and non-completers and interviews for experts, was employed for data collection. Quantitative data analysis was conducted to provide the Cronbach α coefficient, Pearson’s product moment correlation, an independent-sample t-test, effect size, and binary Logit regression. The qualitative data generated from the interview transcript for each section of the themes and subthemes were color coded. Finally, simultaneous triangulation was carried out to confirm or contradict the results from each
method. The findings show that social norms, particularly uncontrolled social support provided by their families, are more likely to make job seekers ignore the relevant information about jobs available to them in favor of doing other things. Finally, this research presents a form of data and the development of a workable model that are useful in more clearly and better defining the complex world of job seekers.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Elfreda Chatman (1991) explored why some members of a society may have little or no use for existing information resource services that may be beneficial to them. In other words, why theoretically beneficial sources might be ignored by some people. Even before her study, Patrick Wilson (1973) stated that “we may neglect or avoid information that is of concern but no interest” (p. 465). Therefore, why would, in our case, some unemployed people turn down or away free information, services, training, and financial assistance for getting a job. This is a troubling question for Human Resource Developing Fund in Saudi Arabia.

The services and resources provided by job search centers can be very helpful and supportive for workers, job seekers, and businesses. Job search centers have a number of goals, for example, to aid businesses seeking qualified employees and to assist job seekers to select and contact employment and training services. Job seekers are also offered the opportunity to assess their skills, abilities, qualifications, readiness, efficiencies, and needs (Benefits.gov, n.d.; U.S. Department of Labor, n.d.; HRDF, 2016b). Furthermore, job search centers ensure that job seekers or claimants are complying with the requirements and procedures that need to be met in order for them to benefit from job assistance programs such as unemployment insurance programs. In theory, these centers and resources are very helpful and supportive for workers, job seekers, and businesses (O’Leary, 2004). However, the services, resources and programs provided by job centers, in reality, involve some challenging issues. For example, most unemployment insurance benefit recipients go through their entitlement period without accepting offered jobs, according to a recent study on the constraints in the area of Saudi employment and job creation carried out by Harvard Kennedy School and the Human Resources Development
Fund in Saudi Arabia ("Evidence for Policy Design," 2015). In addition to that problem, unemployment claimants procrastinate and/or suspend their job search efforts even though it is commonsensically “against their own, long-run self-interest” (Babcock, Congdon, Katz, & Mullainathan, 2012, p. 4). Thus, the current study aims to provide a means of understanding such behavior by exploring the world experienced by job seekers. In addition, this study presents an innovative Job Seeking Activities Model (JSAM), which takes into account the activities of job seekers during unemployment periods and emphasizes the impact of antecedent factors, particularly, social norms.

Background

The observational research that led to this investigation regarding why unemployment claimants procrastinate and/or suspend their job search efforts began following the author’s long experience with the Technical and Vocational Training Corporation (TVTC), conversations with Dr. Mansoor Almansoor (Former Deputy Direct General of Employment Support—Human Resources Development Fund (HRDF)), and an examination of unpublished statistical data (that is provided by Dr. Almansoor and is summarized in Table 1) of an unemployment assistance program provided by the HRDF in Saudi Arabia. That experience and examination of data led to the following concept. Individuals show the salient anomalous behavior of becoming disengaged from the job seeking process at some point due to unknown antecedent factors that reduce the efficiency and success of job seeking services (Dervin, 1983; Chatman, 1991, 1996, 1999, 2000; Johnson, 1993, 1996, 1997; Case, Andrews, Johnson, & Allard, 2005; Evidence for policy design, 2015).
Table 1

Saudi Job Seekers Conversion Rate from Jan 2014 to Jun 2015 (unpublished data-HRDF,2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>JS Type</th>
<th>Referred</th>
<th>Successfully contacted to Referred</th>
<th>Attached</th>
<th>Attached to Successful Contact</th>
<th>Placed</th>
<th>Placed to Attached</th>
<th>Sustained</th>
<th>Sustained to Placed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2014 to Jun 2015</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>141,641</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>23,630</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4,118</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk-In</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17,030</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>10,252</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>114,716</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>16,869</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7,759</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6,607</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk-In</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25,735</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>15,344</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>256,357</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>40,499</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11,877</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>9,816</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk-In</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>42,765</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>25,596</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problem Statement

The International Labour Organization defines an unemployed person as a person with a required age (15 or above) who during the reference period is characterized by three criteria: a) being without work; b) being currently available for work; c) and seeking work. ILO describes the third criterion as seeking for paid employment. Unemployed job seekers are eligible for using unemployment assistance programs if the latter are available in their country. It is assumed that beneficiaries and claimants of unemployment assistance programs are in need of the support financially and/or otherwise (International Labour Organization, n.d.; “Evidence for Policy Design, 2015”; HRDF, 2016b). Need is defined as existing when the lack of such programs and/or unavailability of such support could harm potential claimants. For example, without such support, the claimants could become homeless, unable to feed themselves, etc. Surprisingly, in
Saudi Arabia, numerous unemployment assistance claimants start the claim process but soon suspend their unemployment benefits process by voluntarily ceasing to comply with the program’s requirements, i.e., stopping the process right before beginning of their job searching activities. As a result of such actions (behavior), they lose the benefits of the program at some point of the unemployment period.

Such aforementioned behavior can be seen from Table 1: the percentage of job seeker attachment to the job seeking process after successful contacting of the job seekers from the Saudi’s unemployment insurance referral database declines to nearly 18% for both genders - see the Attached to Successful Contact column. Strictly speaking, only 20% of females and 16% of males attach to (follow up with) the services after they have been contacted. This means that approximately 18% have made the decision to engage in job searching activities, while 82% of job seekers have made the decision to not remain engaged in the job seeking activities or processes. Such behavior means that claimants are not complying with the HRDF requirements necessary to ensure their eligibility to receive government financial aid. In other words, such behavior means that unemployment claimants are willing to lose their government financial aid. These statistical data are nearly similar to the results of the Harvard Kennedy School study that only 20% of unemployment benefit recipients have left the program before the end of their entitlement period and have been placed in jobs; where here is only 31.5% have been placed in jobs. Additionally, the Harvard Kennedy School study implies that Saudi claimants are interested in receiving the financial benefits but are willing to sacrifice such benefits by not continuing with the job seeking process or activities. When they do not comply and/or receive benefits, what is their source of support (financial and otherwise)? This study examines and models why job seekers in Saudi Arabia who get government assistance for job seeking do not persist in their job
seeking activities using the services of the Human Resource Development Fund by investigating the impact of antecedent factors that may influence Saudi job seekers when they make their employment decisions. Particularly, this study examines family tangible support as one of the aspects of social norms.

*A Job Seeking Activities Model (JSAM)*

Researchers often use models as “simplified version(s) of reality” (Case, 2012, p. 134). Most information seeking models depict situations that predict the actions of individuals in order to find the needed information. In response to the lack of models and research on information seeking and gathering behavior in the job seeking environment, and after considering all relevant aspects of the job seeking world, the author will present a job seeking activities model (JSAM) which will take into account the activities of job seekers, including their information seeking behavior during periods of unemployment (see Figure 1 for an early design of the JSAM). In addition, the JSAM will elucidate the pre- and post-job seeking process activities, including the antecedent factors. These antecedent factors may contribute to the lack of sufficient functional engagement between job seekers and the relevant information and services provided through job search centers. The JSAM integrates several different information seeking models and theories, and it is employed here primarily to show the impacts of antecedent factors. In other words, the purpose for the creation and use of the JSAM is to determine whether standard information seeking models are adequate to explain the problem of denial of relevance by Saudi job seekers within the Saudi Arabian environment.
Figure 1. An early design of the job seeking activities model (JSAM).

The JSAM will be used as a framework to identify the antecedent factors which may help to provide answers to the question of why job seekers do not engage in relevant job search activities for their particular situation by seeking the job resources, job services, and relevant information sources available to them. In addition, the JSAM is a system model for a very long-term job seeking activity state that cannot easily be measured explicitly because of the complexity of actions, comparisons, communications, and decisions among the main players (seekers, employers, and regulators) occurring at one time. In other words, the main reason for the creation of the JSAM is the lack of literature employing models that study the impact of
antecedent factors on the information-acquiring behavior of job seekers in cases where the functional engagement does not occur.

Research Questions

1. Why do job seekers not complete and/or continue their job-hunting process by complying with HRDF requirements in Saudi Arabia?
2. What would be the negative impacts on job seekers if they completed the journey of job hunting?
3. What would be the impact of social support (financial or otherwise) on job seekers using the government job resource services (e.g., HRDF)?
4. Do answers to the above questions provide us with enough understanding to model the termination of job seeking activities by unemployed individuals?

Objective of the Study

The immediate objective of this study is to uncover the reasons that lead job seekers who are receiving government funds to end their job-hunting journey. Strictly speaking, the study explains the impact of family tangible support as an influenced social norm on job seekers during periods of unemployment. The larger objective is to refine a model of job seeking activities including information seeking behavior that explains the influence of antecedent factors on job seekers when they make employment decisions.

Purpose of the Study

The immediate purpose of this research is to facilitate the emergence of a functional relationship between job information services and job seekers. Additionally, demonstration of how effective is the utilization of job information services as a positive influence for job seekers working against their subconscious desire to deny or ignore salient job information that may be
relevant to them is another justification for conducting such a study. Denying or ignoring salient job information appears to be a peculiar problem that should be modeled, and for this reason the current study takes this as its fundamental purpose. Last but not least, the study is a response to the lack of in-depth studies examining the reasons behind the low level of success of job seeking services. Finally, this study can also contribute to the information science field by investigating family support as one of the social norms (antecedent factors) that may prevent job seekers from completing their job hunting journey.

Delimitations

On one hand, the current study’s area of focus is only on Saudi’s job seekers who are claiming benefits via the unemployment assistance program that is provided by the HRDF. Furthermore, it delimits the claimants under consideration to non-completers who procrastinate or disengage from the job seeking activities and completers who finish the job seeking activities and accept offered jobs. Finally, the study’s recruited experts are Saudis who are working and have excellent experience with job training and recruitment within the Saudi Arabian environment.

Limitations

The emphasis of this study is on the phenomenon of job seekers’ disengagement from the job hunting process for placing them with private sector jobs; thus, as an indication of information seeking behavior during job seeking activities, the findings might not be generalizable to public sector or governmental job seekers. This study was limited to large cities in Saudi Arabia where many job offers can be found, so it may not be applicable to job seekers in small and rural cities. The current study surveyed job seekers in one group (private sector job seekers), one society (Saudis), and one organization (the Human Resources Development Fund);
thus, the results may not be generalizable to other groups and non-governmental agencies in Saudi Arabia, or to societies and organizations elsewhere in the world. Furthermore, an analogous limitation also applies to the contribution of job recruiter experts (as opposed to those of other potential experts) as a second source for validating the current study.

Definitions

*Job seeker:* A job seeker is a person who has a new job or mission and is focused only on professionally and ethically searching for a well-suited job for him/herself (Sharone, 2007)

*Claimant:* A claimant is an unemployed individual or an individual who has become unemployed after being employed and who is seeking acceptance in an unemployment insurance assistance program (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015)

*Recruitment expert or specialist:* A recruitment expert or specialist is a person who provides a service to job seekers by seeking, screening, interviewing, and placing job seekers with the most suitable jobs available. Additionally, s/he can provide some tips about upskilling job seekers or employed individuals to accelerate suitable training programs (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015; HRDF, 2016a)

*Job seeking:* Job seeking is a job-hunting journey and is the individual behavior of looking for work opportunity and achieving a suitable recruitment (Van Hooft, Born, Taris & Van Der Flier, 2006; ILO, 2013).

*Job seeking activities:* These activities are the job seeker’s behavior actions including accessing job ads, talking with friends, neighbors, and/or relatives about job opportunities, directly contacting employment agencies, centers, and/or employers, browsing the Internet for available jobs, making inquiries to employers, sending out application letters, matching and selecting suitable jobs, seeking more skills and training, having interviews, and making
employment decisions (Vesalainen & Vuori, 1999; Van Hooft, Born, Taris & Van Der Flier, 2006)

Unemployment insurance benefit: Unemployment insurance benefit is a financial assistance program temporary provided by a government to an eligible job seeker who is unemployed at no fault of his/her own and who meets some other requirements (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015)

Procrastination: Procrastination is an individual’s tendency to postpone the achievement of his/her goal at the beginning and/or completion of a mission (Lay, 1986)

Disengagement: According to Freudenberger (as cited in Bakker, Demerouti & Verbeke, 2004) disengagement is a form of an emotional, cognitive, and/or behavioral practice to express a deniable reaction to an incident.

Tangible family support: Tangible family support is concrete aid including the providing of money, transportation, a place to stay, and needed items such as clothes and food (Tracy, Munson, Peterson & Floersch, 2010).

Summary

Our concerns with job center services not being totally beneficial to some job seekers, job seekers’ going through entitlement periods without accepting offered jobs, their procrastination and/or suspension of job search efforts, and their behavior of voluntarily ceasing to comply with the program’s requirements and then losing their government financial aid has led to this effort to apprehend such behavior through an exploration of the world of job seekers. In addition to the mentioned concerns, current information seeking models may not be adequate to provide an understanding of the world of job seekers. As a result, an innovative Job Seeking Activities Model (JSAM) will be presented to take into account the job seekers’ activities during periods of
unemployment, emphasizing the impact of antecedent factors, particularly social norms. Furthermore, this model demonstrates the influences that may have an impact on the functional relationship between job information services and job seekers.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

A few authors provide guidance for establishing the nature of the problem and to model it in a way that provides a path to understanding. Unemployment assistance programs require several procedures on the part of claimants, such as complying with job search activities (e.g. hunting for jobs, attending training sessions, applying for jobs, and going to interviews); these may be real or mock activities. Failure to comply with the requirements, such as making weekly or biweekly claims, could result in the forfeiture of benefits (financial or otherwise).

Additionally, unemployment assistance programs usually have a set of requirements that need to be met in order for claimants to benefit from such programs. Some claimants will not be accepted into these programs if they do not meet the basic requirements for each individual program. For instance, if a potential claimant has a small enterprise or financial investment that earns monthly income, s/he may not be eligible to receive financial benefits, or s/he may be required by her or his government to meet a predefined level of earned wages or worked time during an established period of time (U.S. Department of Labor, 2015; Benefits.gov, n.d.; HRDF, 2016b).

Starting the claim process and then soon suspending the unemployment benefits process by voluntarily ceasing to comply with the program’s requirements is an example of salient anomalous behavior within the job seeker’s world. For instance, a job seeker may become disengaged from the seeking process, at some point right before the commencement of job search activities, due to unknown antecedent factors that reduce the efficiency and success of job seeking services. Understanding such behavior requires exploring the claimants’ world. Elfreda Chatman’s works on frameworks and theories are relevant here as they support the idea that
some members of a society may have little or no use for existing information resource services that may be beneficial to them.

Chatman: The Small World Conceptualization/Theory

Elfreda Chatman’s works present a way of “framing social life in theory and research” (Chatman, 2000, p. 3) for the purpose of understanding human information behavior. She conducted a variety of studies with many different groups and societies, with the intention of examining how members of particular groups or societies behave regarding the seeking and receiving of information, as well as why some community members of a given society were not profiting from the services of information sources maintained by the government and other public service agencies. Her continued research on human information behavior led her to a central theme or concept called “the small world” on which her three theories, information poverty, life in the round, and normative behavior, are based. Her use of this concept involves “a world in which everyday happenings occur with some degree of predictability” (Chatman, 2000, p. 3). In other words, expectedness is possible, especially when people share physical space, social norms, and cultural meanings. Chatman looked for and examined the information behavior of the participants of that small world to see how the information was being shaped, exchanged, modified, accepted, rejected, or ignored when they entered that small world. She also observed the worldview of members of that small world concerning the information entering it. However, her testing of theoretical notions such as diffusion, gratification, alienation, and social network theory revealed some anomalies when she tried to apply them to human information behavior (Chatman, 1996). No single theory could satisfy her investigations, thus, she developed a theoretical framework regarding people who seek or do not seek information within particular social contexts.
A very early work by Chatman (Chatman, 1986) used diffusion theory to examine the exchange of information, particularly job opening information, among fifty women in a Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) program, with results that showed that there was only a minimal exchange of information most of the time (Chatman, 1986). She determined that the occurrence of such information behavior was an empirical rarity, especially as job openings quickly lose their relevance and value. The search for the factors that kept the women of that particular small world from freely exchanging information led Chatman to continue testing and investigating other theories of information behavior. For example, she used gratification and information need theory to examine “why a disadvantaged person would fail to invest time, effort, or interest in a future endeavor that could address a problematic situation” (Chatman, 1991, p. 438). She began to assume several theoretical propositions in order to explain her observations regarding the information behavior of university janitors. Chatman determined that low-income people look for immediate informational gratification due to behavioral factors that are not found with other types of employees. Such people, for instance, do not easily become attached to a long range plan as their beliefs in their own eventual failure are very strong. Furthermore, it is the shared experience among the participants of that small world that is the information truly trusted as coming from a valid source. Searching for information that serves their immediate needs is another characteristic behavior of this type of participant.

The results of her research led to one of her most valuable theoretical propositions regarding “life in a small world,” the formulation of the small world concept. As she used this concept and tested the social network theory, numerous theoretical frameworks that would be essential to Chatman’s work and her human information behavior model started to emerge. The study of the information world of aging women attracted her attention because it revealed some
anomalies, leading her to develop the four concepts of secrecy, deception, risk-taking, and situational relevance, a concept derived from the work of her mentor Patrick Wilson. These concepts are the foundations of her information poverty theory. Furthermore, these concepts helped to explain why some community members of a given society did not profit from the services of information sources maintained by the government and other public service agencies. Engaging in secrecy and deception of others occurs when individuals of that small world see information seeking as too costly and as hazardous to their life or status (Chatman, 2000). Thus, levels of trust play a very significant role in their small world. Additionally, individuals see the solution of problems as resulting from luck rather than from their efforts of looking for other recourses located beyond their small world.

Recognition of the significance of the concepts of social norms and self-protection from information poverty theory led to the theory of life in the round. The import of this theory is that without a demanding need that information be sought, a person will not seek it. In other words, if a member of a social world can survive without this information, s/he will not take action to acquire it (Chatman, 1999). In addition, the perception of insiders that the larger world is different than their small world and is designed for or defined by outsiders is widely dominant. Since this dominant idea is ingrained as a belief, Chatman suspected that participants in that small world will go against the social norms that impel people to seek information unless the information is defined by them as important information to seek.

The theory of normative behavior is the third theory and is considered to be the fullest picture of her conceptualization of the small world; it is, thus, more broadly applicable across various situations (Burnett & Jaeger, 2008). The theory involves four concepts: social norms, worldview, social type, and information behavior. Fundamentally, social norms show
participants of that small world what the acceptable standards and codes of behavior are. To illustrate this, people from two different worlds may see activities and appearances in different ways (e.g., normal or abnormal, usual or unusual, right or wrong, acceptable or taboo). As individuals do not attempt to cross their world’s boundaries, one can say that social norms may provide guidance for individuals’ information seeking behavior by determining what is appropriate and inappropriate to search for (Chatman, 2000).

While social norms correlate with individual decisions regarding whether to seek information or not, the worldview is concerned with the individual perception of whether particular things are important or not. In other words, a worldview is the collective belief configuration of the members of the small world regarding everything around them. Thus, the worldview provides a sense of belonging for members and maintains the perception of the idea of an outsider who does not belong to them or who has no normative value or effective role in their life (Chatman, 2000). The social type is the taxonomy of all members of a social world. Chatman (2000) asserted that social type allows for the creating of “a typology of persons based on predictable behavior,” and this typology provides members of the world with role types such as those referred to as student, parents, liar, gatekeeper, leader, and so on (p. 12). A trusted source of information (e.g. persons, libraries, job centers) can be distinguished from another within the larger society when the members of that small world feel no violation of their social norms. Thus, social type can be a measure of the reliability of an information resource. Human information behavior is strongly dependent on understanding the need for information and the context that generates the needed information (Chatman, 2000). Overall, Chatman concluded that the social norms, the worldview, and the social type within the small world govern the information behavior of the members.
Applying Chatman’s Small World conceptualization to the information behavior of the Saudi job seekers, requires an investigation into the small world of which they are members. This conceptualization provides the information environment in a natural context which allows for observing or surveying Saudi job seekers in the midst of their systematical social life. The job seekers share a similar social life that involves their own social norms, worldview, and social type as part of their own culture. Being a male or female, a parent, the oldest or the youngest in the family, a relative, etc., gives each individual a role to play within the small world and gives each individual great credibility as a source. For instance, job seekers may perceive job information services and resources as outsiders to their small world with not enough credibility to allow them to engage in the job search process. In addition, a member’s decision about whether or not to engage in the job hunting process is influenced by the social types of other members. Job seeking decisions by most women, for example, are influenced by their parents, husbands, and/or brothers’ acceptance of their having jobs or of the type of jobs and location of jobs they might have (Alicia, 2014). Such considerations can also sometimes be applicable to some men’s job-seeking decisions. Just as they do regarding social types, job seekers, as members of their small world, have a sense of belonging and maintain the collective belief configuration of their small world regarding everything around them. In other words, worldviews are ways that values, beliefs, and perceptions of job seekers may influence their behavior. For instance, it is uncommon to find family members encouraging their female family members to work in jobs other than teaching. The idea of male/female segregation is widely dominant as part of the worldview in the Saudi job-seeking small world (Alicia, 2014).

Social norms are believed to be the factor with the highest impact within the Saudi job seekers’ small world (Fakeeh, 2009). Thus, members from two different worlds may see
activities and appearances in divergent ways (such as usual or unusual, right or wrong). Saudi job seekers usually do not attempt to cross their world’s boundaries and predominantly follow their small world’s guidance. For example, the following attitude towards government and family support within the job-seeking small world is broadly acceptable, while it may not be accepted in another community due to some strong or weak social norms (Stutzer & Lalive, 2004). On one hand, the Saudi government support services and structures are easily noticeable and are available to all members; these include services such as free health care, education in all levels including college, public services, financial assistance, etc. On the other hand, family support includes free food, shelter, transportation, life accessories, financial resources, etc., for all members. Job seeking skills are not intuitive and are seldom acquired before an individual finishes college unless the individual has failed to continue his or her studies. In addition, Saudi families are unlikely to stop supporting (financially or otherwise) a member before the member finds a job (Fakeeh, 2009). Such families, which follow their culture and support their unemployed members that live with them without making them look for work, may expose the member to unwanted effects such as the experience of a procrastination spell. Families’ not helping their members learn to live responsibly through employment and independence may initially result in harmless ignorance, but it may ultimately become harmful ignorance if the family member continues to receive or gives up the support of their family or if circumstances change in other ways.

Johnson: The Comprehensive Model of Information Seeking (CMIS)

Johnson’s model of information seeking has strong relation to the current study because it demonstrates how antecedent factors have an impact when people seek and/ or encounter with source of information (see Figure 2). This information model seeks to explain such affecting
factors (antecedent factors) that help to clarify the behavior of seekers toward information resources or services and may explain what prevents job seekers from benefitting from job-seeking services. The CMIS model has three primary classes of variables or factors (Johnson & Meischke, 1993). The three classes are antecedents, information carrier factors, and information seeking actions, and all contain sub-variables. Antecedents to information seeking, according to Johnson (1996), are important factors that motivate a person to seek or inhibit a person from seeking information or services for a certain need (p. 59). In other words, when a person hunts for information and/or services, his/her inclinations are previously indicated and affirmed by these antecedent factors. Johnson divides and clusters the antecedents’ factors into four groups: demographics, direct experience, salience, and beliefs.

![Diagram of the Comprehensive model of information seeking](image)

*Figure 2. The Comprehensive model of information seeking. Adapted from Johnson (1996, p. 60).*

*Demographics* consists of many related factors such as gender, age, education, wealth, and so on. The capabilities of individuals depend greatly on demographic factors, especially education, when it comes to seeking information or services and selecting the most effective seeking strategies to achieve their needs. In order to discover patterns among the behaviors, beliefs, and attitudes of individuals, most social researchers correlate them with demographic
variables because those variables are the backbone of such studies (Case, 2012). The term direct experience refers to the type of other knowledge an individual holds that s/he cannot get from education, but rather obtains from the surrounding environment and his/her life experience. For instance, when it comes to knowing what to do in a period of job-seeking, a person who has prior experience from having taken a similar journey of job-hunting, or even knowing someone who has gone through a similar journey, may have different behavior towards seeking information or services (Vansteenkiste, Lens, De Witte, De Witte & Deci, 2004). Furthermore, Johnson emphasized that knowledge of situations similar to one’s own problem plays a significant part in the research process, having an effect on the way one avoids, browses, or analyzes the information or services resource. According to Johnson (1996), the term salience refers to the extent to which information is relevant and applicable to a specific problem. In other words, he saw salience as a key motivator for taking immediate action to seek missing information or services. Beliefs can prevent or suppress individuals from confronting their problem, especially if there are no information sources, they are very costly to use, and they take time and effort.

Information Carrier Factors consist of two elements: characteristics and utility. Both elements are determined by antecedent factors. The perceptions of information carrier characteristics and utility by individuals are critical and are “related to exposure and evaluation decisions across many communication channels” (Johnson, 1996, p. 63). Thus, seekers determine the utility when selecting channels based on their best match with their “needs and expectations regarding likely satisfactions to be obtained” (Case, et al. 2005, p. 384). In other words, the utility of an information channel is determined by the use and satisfaction of individuals. Finally, Information Seeking Actions are shaped by information carrier factors. When individuals perceive that a channel is credible and accurate, they will likely seek it multiple times.
The aforementioned antecedent factors are personal factors that depend mainly on an individual’s perception. In addition, these factors are considered to be personal intrinsic factors (Johnson, 1996). Therefore, the antecedent factors describe people based on their perceptions of their own efficacy and are of personal relevance in that they may motivate or inhibit the seeking of needed information or services. Johnson’s model provides a good fit for personal antecedent factors that may alter the individual’s decisions or lead to the behaviors of anxiety, denial, avoidance, and ignoring in relation to the seeking of information or services by job seekers. Furthermore, antecedent factors personify information carrier factors, which can lead to the development of information seeking actions that are significant to this study. Thus, these individual decisions may contribute to the understanding of and may link to the antecedent factors or elements that may prevent job seekers from engaging in the job searching domain. Ultimately, the model focuses on the inclusion of influencing factors that are related to individuals rather than factors that are related to communities as in the above-mentioned discussed theories.

Wilson: The Concept of Costly Ignorance

Patrick Wilson’s (1973) concept of “Situational Relevance” provides a comprehensive to analyzing just why and how people avoid or ignore some information that seems relevant. Salience and situational relevance characterize information that may answer or help to answer an individual’s question. In other words, people’s sense of situational control or informational relevance is a motivational factor for seeking or avoiding information. Johnson revealed a significant dissimilarity between “ignorance” and “ignoring” (p.69). He reported that ignorance, in itself, has nothing to do with motivating an individual to seek or gather information unless the need for the salient information is recognized and the missing knowledge is in great demand.
While ignorance may be known or unknown to an individual, ignoring occurs when the information needed to solve a problem is known to the individual but s/he purposely elects not to engage with it. For example, an individual will deny things that are painful or that involve social taboos.

Even before Johnson, Wilson (1977) illuminated the concept of ignorance by dividing it into harmless and harmful ignorance as seen with regard to habitual behavior. Harmful ignorance is costly ignorance about which a person should be worried (Wilson, 1977). For instance, when a person is about to make a decision, pieces of information are critical regardless of the outcome. In addition, a costly decision based on misinformation is the worst result of costly ignorance because the correct information would have resulted in a better outcome. The way of behavior or habit of a person seeking or gathering information is sometimes one of the causes of costly ignorance when only one source of information, such as families and/or friends, is used.

Wilson (1977) stated that harmless ignorance cannot affect a person’s life (e.g., decisions) and occurs in everyday life without causing significant disadvantages. However, it might be the case that the habitual behavior of harmless ignorance could develop over time within a job seeker’s small world and have the potential to be costly. For example, job seekers who are raised in societies where there is an insistence on accepting only information about military jobs will subconsciously continue to avoid non-military jobs provided by job center services, friends, or other sources that may be helpful to them. Another example of the effect of harmful ignorance which may have started as harmless ignorance is the impact of a culture that indirectly affects its young generation by providing uncontrolled supports (financial or otherwise); this may lead to a lack of situational relevance of any information regarding the need for jobs or for opportunities to find jobs. Uncontrolled social support from parents, friends, and/
or government agencies that is provided regardless of a person’s behavior or desire to change may lead to subconscious conditioning for job seekers that might not be easily repaired if the antecedent factor or factors continue to exist and impact the individual’s thoughts and actions.

Understanding of social support as a precursory factor which begins as harmless ignorance but leads to harmful ignorance when an individual avoids or is not interested in searching for a job is the main focus of this research. Furthermore, the above literature raises the question of how social norms, specifically norms surrounding social support, impact the job-hunting process via Saudi job resource services such that a very small percentage of active job seekers use the services. Understanding the job seeker’s behavior based on social norm roles as described in Chatman’s works may help to determine the impact of antecedent factors that are related to the job seeker’s practices in relation to useful or helpful job resource services. The small world concept provides the useful idea of controlled behaviors that are influenced by extrinsic factors and shared via physical and conceptual spaces.

The Job Seeking Activities Model (JSAM)

The JSAM situate the concept of Chatman, Johnson, and Wilson within general model of information seeking adapted from the work of O’Connor, Copeland, and Kearns (2003), modified to include economics terms. Job centers provide many services, including job information, assistance in job-seeking, job training, and unemployment insurance, to their current and prospective customers. Their ultimate goal is to facilitate matches between qualified job seekers and employers wanting to fill specific job vacancies, which will result in faster expansion of the level of economic activity and employment (O’Leary, 2004). Since some job seekers prefer to live in an impoverished information world that is a somewhat exact image of their world, the newly developed Job Seeking Activities Model (JSAM) will be used to show the
impact of antecedent factors or elements that may contribute to preventing job seekers from functional engagement with job searching services or activities. Moreover, it is a system model for a very long-term job seeking activity state that cannot easily be explicitly measured because of the complexity of action, comparisons, trainings, communications, and decisions among the main players (seekers, employers, and regulators) at the same time.

Figure 3. The proposed job seeking activities model

The JSAM incorporates many activities (Figure 3) to illustrate the job seeking process from initiation to completion. Starting from left to right, the activities are the seeking process, matching, building, testing or interview, and making a decision (Figure 3). The precursory factors of individuals and communities emerge long before the activities of job seeking or hunting. These types of activities can be provided and accessed, for example, through job
assistance programs in most job-seeking resource services. Personal intrinsic factors are related to the individual and can motivate job seekers to use such services and to engage in the seeking process of hunting for jobs (Johnson, 1996). These factors can also inhibit individuals from engaging in the job search domain too. For example, personal networks can play a very significant role in job seeking activities (Chatman, 1991; Marquez & Ruiz-Tagle, 2004). On one hand, the lack of personal network connections may contribute to an individual’s not knowing about the availability of a good job or not being able to find someone who has the answer to a his or her concern about jobs and employment services. On the other hand, maintaining a reasonable personal network connection will expand the sources of information available for answering questions and locating suitable jobs for the seeker. In addition, networking will act as a motivating factor for the seeker while helping him/her maintain relationships with family members and friends who are successfully employed.

While the precursory factors relating to individuals are personal intrinsic factors, the precursory factors relating to communities are extrinsic factors that are developed and possessed as community standards, principals, and/or rules. Extrinsic factors have significant impacts and are diverse from community to community. Social norms, on one hand, are a perfect example of extrinsic factors: it may be acceptable to live off a government fund in one community, while it is not accepted in another community due to some strong or weak social norms, such as particular attitudes towards government support (Stutzer & Lalive, 2004). Therefore, extrinsic factors, especially social norms, may solve the puzzle of what prevents job seekers from using job assistance programs and why they do not engage in the job hunting domain. In addition, the model may illustrate the cause and effect of these extrinsic factors. An example of such cause and effect is what some studies (e.g. Addison and Pedro 2001; O’Leary, 2004) have revealed
about job seekers who live off public funds (such as unemployment insurance program). The field of economy has widely studied beneficiaries of unemployment insurance programs and has deemed such social support “as a disincentive for fast reemployment” (Kanfer et al., 2001, p. 841). Furthermore, researchers have noticed that job seekers who are not eligible for unemployment insurance are more active job seekers than unemployment insurance claimants (Addison and Pedro 2001; O’Leary, 2004). On the other hand, worldviews consisting of job seekers’ values, beliefs, and perceptions may influence their behavior. For instance, parents who follow the norms of their culture and support their unemployed children that live with them without making the children look for work, and thus learn to live responsibly, may expose the children to harmful ignorance although it may have started as harmless ignorance.

The JSAM can be seen as a problem solving activity that may lead to a satisfactory solution for a seeker hunting for a job. Problem solving, decision making, and choice or selection are to a degree related to one another (Case, 2012). Decisions and choices that are based on ill-defined problems are part of the JSAM and may occur at every step of the model. However, for better clarity in representing information behavior, they are segregated here. The search for alternatives and selection among alternatives that require attention are the key factors shared between information seeking and decision making according to March (1994). Poorly defined problem states, one may encounter in the job seeking world, are based on information that is sometimes “lacking or unreliable, unclear goal, inadequate measure of success, and short supplies of time, money, and attention” (Case, 2012, p. 97). Moreover, choice or selection is based on job seekers’ values, beliefs, and perceptions of where a selected choice may take them. Thus, the relevant information available to a job seeker alters the outcome of every decision. When job seekers come across information services (e.g. job assistance programs), as shown in
Figure 3, with a poorly structured or uncertain information problem that may be impacted by antecedent factors, their information behavior (decisions) may cause them to stop using such services. These type of decisions may be costly to job seekers.

The job seeking activities model is a way of illustrating the impact of antecedent factors on job seekers. Although the model currently includes only three intrinsic precursory factors, demographic, experience, and network; and two community (extrinsic) precursory factors, social norms and worldview, it is able to show the impact of precursory factors on job seekers during their job seeking activities. In addition, the discussion above of three relevant areas, namely the human information behavior concept, the CMIS model, and Chatman’s theories, along with the developed concept of habitual costly ignorance, sets the stage for the JSAM. These are key to demonstrating the impact of precursory factors that may contribute to the high percentage of job seekers that do not engage with the job hunting domain.

Social Norms: Social Support

Lapinski and Rimal (2005) stated that social norms are created by people acting as a group and “serve as prevailing codes of conduct that either prescribe or proscribe behaviors that members of a group can enact” (p. 129). A member of a community surrounds his/her life-world with boundaries pre-defined by the community when s/he shares norms with the community (Chatman, 2000). Moreover, the community members’ experience can be determined and developed via shared norms. Chatman (2000) revealed that the community’s members will engage in seeking information or services only if the needed services and/or information are relevant or “the life lived in the round is no longer functioning” (p. 10). Thus, social norms play very significant roles in determining or impacting community members’ behavior toward, for
example, information and/or services for job hunting. Social support is one type of the social norms in which this study is interested.

Job hunting and job seeking behavior can be understood through an assessing of social support (Holmstrom, Russell & Clare, 2015). Additionally, job seekers’ behaviors are affected by the absence or availability of social support, for example, when these influence job seekers to positively or negatively cope with an unemployment spell. An understanding of the impact of social support, specifically family tangible support, on job seekers is of great importance even though the social support has been acknowledged in the job-hunting literature to have a generally positive impact. According to Leana and Feldman (1995), job seeking behavior is likely to be influenced by the job seekers’ motives to hunt for jobs (p. 1383). In other words, the absence of needs may cause the hunting for information and/or services about jobs to cease. Therefore, it is of great importance to measure the impact of received family tangible support. For instance, the financial need of job seekers can be included with or be a part of received family tangible support measurement. Additionally, Kanfer, Wanberg and Kantrowitz (2001) see financial need as an obvious motive to provoke job hunting effort and intensity. For the purpose of measuring received family tangible support by job seekers, the study adapts items from the Inventory of Socially Supportive Behaviors (ISSB) and the Latent and Manifest Benefits (LAMB) scale.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The intent of this study is to address the impact of social norms, particularly that of family tangible support, that divert job seekers from becoming engaged in the job seeking process. Furthermore, it presents a model to demonstrate how precursory factors have an impact when people seek and/or encounter a source of information or services. Determining the precise nature of the impact of the social norm and determining the extent of its impact requires a mixed method for comparing perspectives drawn from quantitative (survey) and qualitative (interview) data, then merging the results from the two sets of findings to illustrate how the data confirm or contradict each other (Morse, 1991; Creswell & Clark, 2011). A convergent parallel design methodology is applied in this study. According to Morse (1991), the use of quantitative and qualitative datasets at the same time makes possible simultaneous triangulation where the findings, in the end, complement one another (p. 120). Creswell and Clark (2011) describe this type of method as concurrent quantitative and qualitative data collection, separated analysis, and finally the integration of the two strands. This method allows for the collection and analysis of two independent strands at the same time in a single phase. In other words, it is a comparison and an integration of the user survey with the user interview instruments in an effort to discover convergence, divergence, contradictions, or relationships. Furthermore, the method is robust in providing a more complete understanding of the phenomena under study and in providing validation or substantiation for the used scale (Creswell & Clark, 2011).
Survey Methods

The parallel design variant of quantitative and qualitative methods in which two parallel strands are conducted independently is used here to examine facets of the phenomenon under study. Two types of instrument are used: questionnaires and interviews.

*Questionnaires*

In order to confirm whether or not job seekers receive tangible support from their families or other close relatives, a combination of two subscales from two different instruments was implemented. The researcher also added 3 newly created family tangible support items that are commonly provided by the Saudi Arabian society. The study made use of 7 items from the Inventory of Socially Supportive Behaviors (ISSB; Barrera, Sandler & Ramsay, 1981), which presents respondents with a list of transactions in which support may have been given to them by their families and close relatives. Since the ISSB can be used to measure the amount of social support received, it also can be a measure of the informal social support system and an appropriate measure of support supplied (Barrera, 1981; Barrera et al., 1981; Finch, Barrera, Okun, Bryant, Pool & Snow-Turek, 1997). Moreover, the current study incorporates 5 items from the Latent and Manifest Benefits scale (LAMB: Muller, Creed, Waters & Machin, 2005), which measures the availability of latent and manifest benefits. According to Muller and Waters (2012), researchers have used the scale to gain a greater understanding of how the privation of latent and manifest benefits leads to various types of distress in a society, for example, reductions in wellbeing and quality of life (p. 33). Furthermore, they note that some researchers have looked at LAMB as a measurement for the negative effects of unemployment.

The 15 items from the two different scales and the newly created items are intended to provide a measure of family tangible support (see Appendix A). Participants were asked to report
their strength of agreement on a symmetric agree-disagree scale for a number of statements. Specifically, they were asked to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed that they were receiving family tangible support from people including parents, brothers, sisters, and close relatives, using a 5-point rating scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

Furthermore, the items are divided into two subgroups: basic and premium family tangible support. Each item was given a descriptive name to explicitly represent its import. The basic family tangible support is comprised of 6 items: housing, food, transportation, communication, money, and family items; while the premium family tangible support is comprised of 9 items: family loans, traveling expenses, pitching in, inviting one’s friends, socializing, treating themselves, doing, living like their friends, and saving money.

Interviews

Two rounds of interviews were conducted for the purpose of collecting data from a panel of selected subjects in order to develop a consensus view of the activities of job seekers during periods of unemployment and to determine the impact of antecedent factors, particularly, the impact of the social norm/family tangible support that may be diverting job seekers from becoming fully engaged in the job seeking process. This process is known as the modified Delphi technique (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963; Dalkey, 1969; Linstone & Turoff, 1975; Martino, 1983; Cramer, 1991; Adler & Ziglio, 1996; Schmidt et al., 2001, Hsu & Sandford, 2007; Skulmoski, Hartman, & Krahn, 2007). This type of flexible technique is well suited as a means and method for collecting data for this kind of study because of 1) “its wide applicability for fast data collection,” 2) “its inherent rigor in data collection,” and 3) its effective analysis practices (Mursu, Lyytinen, Soriyan & Korpela, 2003). In addition, the Delphi Method can be used in many different ways: as a single or combined quantitative, qualitative or/and mixed research
method (Skulmoski, Hartman, & Krahn, 2007). The method used here is a modified Delphi approach based on two round of questionnaires. Typically, a three-round Delphi is a standard technique and is sufficient to gather the needed information for reaching a consensus in a case; however, single- and double-round Delphi studies have also been successfully used (Hsu & Sandford, 2007; Skulmoski et al., 2007). In the brainstorming stage of creating the interview questionnaires, the researcher has several options: co-developing them with mentors, developing them by relying on long personal experience with the situation, and building a questionnaire after reviewing the existing literature (Skulmoski et al., 2007). The questionnaire used here is the result of all three approaches (see Appendix B).

The Sampling Population

The number of unemployed Saudis in the potential labor force, according to the Labour Force Survey, 2016-2nd Quarter (2016) is \( N = 650,936 \), including both genders (Central Authority for Statistics, 2016, p. 18). Therefore, the necessary sample size, or the number of unemployed Saudi participants responding to the questionnaires, with a 95% level of confidence, must be \( N = 384 \) subjects or more. The subjects were divided into two groups: job seekers who have completed the job-hunting process and have started to work (group one) and job seekers who have not begun the job-hunting process (group two). Selection criteria for each of the groups are as follows. First, during the study participants must be registered with Hafiz program—the Saudi unemployment assistance program—and must have been registered for less than six months. Six months, according to the policy of the Hafiz program, is a sufficient time to determine the eligibility of beneficiaries for receiving government financial support. Being eligible to receive government financial support means that beneficiaries have no income, welfare benefits, small enterprise, or financial investment that provides monthly support. In
addition, for classification in group one, participants must have kept their jobs for more than six weeks. Second, the Human Resource Development Fund, in order to guarantee attachment, must contact job seekers so they engage in the job hunting process through its online service, email system, and/or over the phone. Third, the participants are randomly selected from the pool of individuals meeting the criteria. Participants from group one were contacted more than three times for the attachment while participants from group two had been placed in jobs and had kept them for six weeks or longer. It should be noted that the Saudi HRDF has agreed to connect the researcher with active job seekers who have found jobs, but they are not entirely optimistic regarding the first group, members of which tend to be difficult to reach.

Because of the HRDF’s doubt regarding members of group two (the non-completers), the total randomly selected subjects for this group was \( N = 5850 \) participants, while group one (the completer) was \( N = 3700 \) subjects; this was done to ensure that the necessary sample size of \( N = 384 \) respondents would be reached. The total received responses from group one was \( n = 550 \), including 110 participants who did not complete the survey, 12 participants who refused to participate, and 428 participants who completed the survey. While group one surprisingly exceeded the needed sample size, members of group two took longer to respond, and the final number was 3 responses short of the required number. The total received responses for this group was \( n = 481 \), including 111 participants who did not complete the survey, 9 participants who refused to participate, and 381 participants who completed the survey.

For interviews, there is no consensus regarding the sample size for the modified Delphi method. Various studies have used sample sizes ranging from 4 to 171 participants (Skulmoski et al., 2007). Ludwig (1997) additionally stated the “majority of Delphi studies have used between 15 and 20 respondents” (p. 2). Since the interviews are for triangulation with the quantitative
data gathered from the questionnaires, essentially any number of interviews is useful; interviews were conducted with as many expert Saudi job recruiters working with HRDF as possible; and snowballing—the technique of requesting leads to interviewees from those already interviewed—was implemented. The total interviewees were \( n = 4 \) expert Saudi job recruiters working with HRDF, including 2 males and 2 females.

**Data Collection**

The online survey was distributed via the HRDF email system after subjects had been randomly selected. The same questionnaires for each group were translated into Arabic (see Appendix C), verified by three Arabic-English linguistics experts, and made accessible via different links to the Qualtrics site; the actual questions were available only after each subject had electronically signed an informed consent form (see Appendix E). The questionnaire was kept open for two months in order to obtain a suitable number of responses from both groups as recommended by Creswell (2014). Six weeks following the filling out of the online questionnaires by group one, and after group two members had kept sustained employment for six weeks, selected members of group two filled out the questionnaires.

Relying on an outside agent to send the survey links to participants was not an effective strategy. The survey had to be sent again to participants because HRDF’s IT representative had mistakenly sent the same survey link to both groups. This accident did not allow us to record the responses from each group independently. After becoming aware of the mistake, the researcher requested that the agent resend the correct link for each group. Thereupon, the responses of each group were recorded separately.

At the same time that job seeking participants were taking the survey, HRDF’s expert recruiters electronically signed an informed consent form regarding participation in responding
to the interview questions (see Appendix E). This is a double round Delphi study, and thus two rounds of data collection were conducted. The round one interview questions, for HRDF’s expert recruiters who were working at their local branches, were sent via their email. After the responses had been received, an initial analysis prior to the presentation of the round two questions was conducted. At stage two, an in-person interview and discussion regarding the first round analysis was conducted with HRDF’s expert recruiters at their local branches for the purpose of selecting statements and forming a new composite of their contributions. The experts were then “asked to rewrite their opinion based on the new knowledge contributed by the other experts” as recommended by Watson (1982, p. 3). The success of first and second round response rates were 100%. The ethical guidelines and procedural norms for ensuring the privacy of the participants, as assured by the approval given by the Institutional Review Board (IRB)—human subjects protection—at the University of North Texas, were observed at all times (see Appendix D for more details).

Validity and Reliability

Establishing criteria for choosing participants and selecting participants randomly improved internal and external validity of this study. External validity enables generalization of the findings of the study. External validity can be achieved through the use of natural settings, randomized selection of the participants, and keeping a low rate of attrition of participants (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). This study has no controlled groups, interventions, or treatments (there was one condition, required by HRDF policy that the group one participants are called three times or more by the HRDF representatives as discussed earlier). Group two participants have kept their jobs for six weeks or more. Thus, one can say that the study ensures natural settings and that its findings can be generalized to the total population for the members of each
group. The internal consistency reliability for the ISSB scale has been reliably above 0.9 (Barrera, 1981; Barrera et al., 1981; Finch et al., 1997). In addition, the LAMB scale has a range, for each group of factors, from a 0.76 to a 0.93 score of internal consistency reliability. The Cronbach α coefficients as a measure of internal consistency reliability was used to measure the current study’s 15-item scale.

The potential threat to the modified Delphi analysis method is limited by “member checking”—“further construct validation by asking participants [expert job recruiters] to validate the researcher’s interpretation and categorization of the variables” (Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004, p. 5). In other words, this study used member checking to see if its findings were accurate, following Creswell (2014). In addition, the researcher was able to examine the causes of dropping out on the part of participants by talking to them. The Delphi method is a robust tool for ensuring validity in this way. Although reliability plays a minor role in qualitative analysis of the interview method, the reliability was ensured by using “multiple coders to reach agreement on codes for passages in text” (Creswell & Clark, 2011, p. 211). Finally, triangulation of different datasets from questionnaires and interviews, allowing for the examination of evidence from the two methods of data gathering as indicated in this convergent parallel design methodology, added to the validity of both methods. The qualitative reliability of the study was ensured through the conducting of the coding with the participation of multiple coders to reach agreement on codes (Creswell & Clark, 2011; Saldaña, 2013).

Analysis

For its quantitative analysis, the current study utilized the SPSS predictive analytics software version 20 to provide descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Strictly speaking, the quantitative analysis aimed to test for frequency distribution, as well as to determine the
Cronbach $\alpha$ coefficient, Pearson’s product moment Correlation, independent-sample t-test, effect size and binary Logit regression. The study frequency data are summarized showing the percentages for each group including gender, marital status, and education level. The Cronbach $\alpha$ coefficient as a measure of internal consistency reliability was computed, and an independent-sample t-test was used to measure the tangible family support received by the two job seeker groups: the completers and the non-completers of the job hunting process. In particular, the t-test was conducted to determine whether the two groups had different average values. The test of means was performed for each item, and the means of the two groups were reported, along with the difference in the means, the p-value of the t-test showing that the difference was not zero, and the effect size. Furthermore, the sample was split into two subsamples: by gender and then again by marital status. In both the gender and marital status subsamples, the tests of means were performed for each item.

With each age subsample, a Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient or Pearson’s $r$ was used to test “the degree and direction of linear relationship between two variables” (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2013, p. 514). In other words, this test tells only the strength of the relationship between two variables. In order to know the magnitude of the correlation between any two variables, computation of the effect size is required. Furthermore, the aim of determining statistical significance is to indicate whether the scores are likely to be due to chance, while determining effect size supports the study by specifying the magnitude of the differences found (Sullivan & Feinn, 2012). This study also interpreted the effect size following Cohen’s (1988) convention and Hattie’s (2009) guideline (as cited in Lenhard & Lenhard, 2016) for the absolute value for $r$. The researcher is interested in how explanatory variables such as gender, age, marital status, education level, and basic and premium support explain the
dependent variable (completion indicator) of the job hunting process on the part of Saudi job seekers. For conducting this test, a binary Logit regression was used to assess the probability of completion while other variables were controlled for (Hilbe, 2009). In the current study, the binary Logit regression was used to estimate the relationship between one or more continuous independent variables and the dependent variable (Hoetker, 2007). In addition, the binary Logit regression model can find the variable’s marginal effect, for instance, how much a variation in the independent variables increases or decreases the probability of the focal outcome of a dependent variable (Hoetker, 2007; Hilbe, 2009). While descriptive statistics are presented in percentages, inferential statistics are offered in tables.

For qualitative analysis, every classic Delphi study is initiated with open-ended questions in order to solicit experts’ opinions regarding an issue of study. Furthermore, a qualitative method can be utilized in each round (Hsu and Sandford, 2007). Watson (1982) and Kincaid (2003) used a purely qualitative analysis in order to develop a consensus view regarding their topics of study. The current study outlines, in the first round, the main themes and sub-themes after utilizing interview research questions for the purpose of providing a convenient and efficient way to make the interview instrument’s findings easier to understand. The transcripts of interviewees’ responses for each section of the themes and subthemes were color coded. After the color coding, the data were studied to facilitate the extraction of quotations that best demonstrated both themes and subthemes (Saldaña, 2013). The experts were asked to again rewrite their opinions about the collected statements, and a composite newly formed by the researcher and other experts was implemented in the second round to achieve a cohesive convention. Finally, simultaneous triangulation was carried out to confirm or contradict the results from each method as suggested by Morse (1991).
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The aim of the current study is to explore job seekers’ worlds in an effort to understand unemployment claimants’ behavior when procrastinating and/or suspending their job search efforts. Furthermore, the study presents an innovative Job Seeking Activities Model (JSAM) which illustrates the activities of job seekers during periods of unemployment, emphasizing the impact of antecedent factors, particularly, social norms and received tangible family support. This chapter commences by presenting first the quantitative results and then the qualitative results. Within the quantitative results, descriptive statistics are presented in frequency and percentages, whereas inferential statistics are offered in tables, as are the qualitative results. The aim of using statistical significance is to determine whether the scores are likely to be due to chance, while effect size is used to support the aims of this study by showing the magnitude of differences found (Sullivan & Feinn, 2012).

Quantitative Results

Descriptive Results

The questionnaire was distributed to selected samples of job seekers in the non-completer group \( (N = 5850) \) and the completer group \( (N = 3700) \). The number of participants who completed the questionnaire in the completer group was \( n = 381 \), and the number of those in the non-completer groups was \( n = 428 \). Table 2 shows demographic data for the two groups of job seekers. Overall, the majority of respondents were singles in both group 1 \( (n = 223, 58.5\%) \) and group 2 \( (n = 234, 54.7\%) \). In addition, the number of highly educated respondents who held baccalaureate, master, and doctorate degrees was higher than that of holders of other degrees for
both groups: the completers \( (n = 203, 53.8\%) \) and the non-completers \( (n = 254, 59.3\%) \). The number of females in the non-completer group was 20\% higher than that of males, while males and females in the completer group were almost equal in number.

Table 2

*Demographic Data of the Two Groups of Job Seekers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group 1/Completer</th>
<th>Group 2/Non-completer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School or Less</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master or Higher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Inferential Results*

Following the guideline proposed by DeVellis (1991), in measuring the 15 selected, created, and combined items, the score of the Cronbach \( \alpha \) coefficient as a measure of internal consistency reliability was reliable \( (\alpha = .877) \), exceeding the common threshold value of 0.70 (see Table 3).

Table 3

*The Cronbach \( \alpha \) Coefficient as a Measure of Internal Consistency Reliability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
<td>0.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Items</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the full sample, the results shown in Table 4 include some significant indications that completers received less family tangible support than non-completers. The items that show significant differences include traveling expenses, socialization, treating, live as my friends, and money saving. Precisely, statistically significant differences were found between completers and non-completers who received family tangible support for the traveling expenses item (completers: M= 1.99, SD= 1.08; non-completers: M= 2.66, SD= 1.27; t(807)= -8.09, p= .000, d= 0.57); the socialization item (completers: M= 2.21, SD= 1.28; non-completers: M= 2.87, SD= 1.22; t(807)= -7.53, p= .000, d= 0.53); the treating item (completers: M= 2.19, SD= 1.21; non-completers: M= 2.54, SD= 1.23; t(807)= -4.07, p= .000, d= 0.29); the living as my friends item (completers: M= 2.25, SD= 1.27; non-completers: M= 2.81, SD= 1.23; t(807)= -6.35, p= .000, d= 0.45); and the living as my friends item (completers: M= 2.25, SD= 1.27; non-completers: M= 2.81, SD= 1.23; t(807)= -6.35, p= .000, d= 0.45). Unexpectedly, the food item showed a nearly but not quite significant difference between completers (M= 3.28, SD= 1.35) and non-completers (M= 3.02, SD= 1.36) who received family tangible support; t(807)= 2.78, p= .006, d= -0.20.

In relation to the significant results discussed below, bear in mind the division of items into two subgroups of basic and premium family tangible support. Thus, the basic family tangible support category has 6 items, housing, food, transportation, communication, money, and family items; while the premium family tangible support category has 9 items, family loans, traveling expenses, pitching in, inviting their friends, socializing, treating themselves, doing what they want, living like their friends, and saving money. When it came to premium support, there was a statistically significant deference between completers (M= 2.54, SD= 0.55) and non-completers (M= 2.84, SD= 0.94) who received family tangible support; t(807)= -5.53, p= .000,
\( d = 0.40 \) (see Table 4). Overall, the t-tests suggest that non-completers received significantly more premium family tangible support than completers. More specifically, non-completers received more support for travel expenses, were able to socialize more, had more money to treat themselves, were more able to live as their friends lived, and were able to save more money. On the other hand, completers reported that they received more food support.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean of completers</th>
<th>Mean of non-completers</th>
<th>Difference in means</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>( d )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Housing</td>
<td>3.215</td>
<td>3.203</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>-0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Food</td>
<td>3.281</td>
<td>3.016</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Transportation</td>
<td>3.171</td>
<td>3.016</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Communication</td>
<td>2.727</td>
<td>2.707</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Money</td>
<td>2.580</td>
<td>2.584</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Family’s Loan</td>
<td>3.087</td>
<td>3.030</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Family's Items</td>
<td>3.241</td>
<td>3.189</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Traveling Expenses</td>
<td>1.987</td>
<td>2.644</td>
<td>-0.677</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Pitch in</td>
<td>3.291</td>
<td>3.273</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Invite my Friends</td>
<td>3.181</td>
<td>3.077</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Socialization</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>2.869</td>
<td>-0.662</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Treating</td>
<td>2.192</td>
<td>2.542</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Doing</td>
<td>2.601</td>
<td>2.661</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Live as my Friends</td>
<td>2.252</td>
<td>2.811</td>
<td>-0.559</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Money Saving</td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td>2.673</td>
<td>-0.613</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>3.036</td>
<td>3.002</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium</td>
<td>2.540</td>
<td>2.844</td>
<td>-0.305</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following Cohen’s (1988) convention (as cited in Lenhard & Lenhard, 2016) for the absolute value for \( r \), the effect size shown in Table 4 for the traveling expenses (\( d = 0.57 \)), socialization (\( d = 0.53 \)), and money saving (\( d = 0.50 \)) items between completer and non-completer
job seekers was found to be an intermediate effect size, and also it was in the “zone of desired effects” according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline (see Appendix A). Furthermore, Cohen’s effect size value for the living as my friends’ item ($d = 0.45$) was found to be on the border line between the small and the intermediate effect sizes; it was also in the “zone of desired effects” according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline. Furthermore, Cohen’s effect size value for the treating item ($d = 0.29$) between completer and non-completer job seekers was found to be a small effect size; it was also in the “teacher effects” according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline. While the effect size for the living as my friends’ item was on the border line, the effect size for premium support ($d = 0.40$) was found to be a small effect size, just 5% below the intermediate effect size border line; it was also in the “zone of desired effects” according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline.

After the sample had been split into two subsamples by gender, the t-test of means for each item was computed as well as the effect size (see Table 5). Similar to the results for the full sample, non-completers received more support for travel expenses, were able to socialize more, had more money to treat themselves, were more able to live as their friends, and were able to save more money. Precisely, statistically significant differences were found between female completers and female non-completers who received family tangible support for the traveling expenses item (completers: $M= 2.09$, $SD= 1.15$; non-completers: $M= 2.66$, $SD= 1.30$; $t(441)=-4.74$, $p=.000$, $d= 0.46$); the socialization item (completers: $M= 2.26$, $SD= 1.29$; non-completers: $M= 2.81$, $SD= 1.30$; $t(441)=-4.57$, $p=.000$, $d= 0.44$); the treating item (completers: $M= 2.16$, $SD= 1.23$; non-completers: $M= 2.60$, $SD= 1.26$; $t(441)=-3.66$, $p=.000$, $d= 0.35$); the living as my friends’ item (completers: $M= 2.20$, $SD= 1.22$; non-completers: $M= 2.82$, $SD= 1.24$; $t(441)=-5.25$, $p=.000$, $d= 0.51$); and the money saving item (completers: $M= 2.03$, $SD= 1.20$; non-completers: $M= 2.69$, $SD= 1.30$; $t(441)=-5.47$, $p=.000$, $d= 0.53$).
In a result different from that found for the full sample, the food item for the female subsample showed a significant difference between completers (M= 3.45, SD= 1.35) and non-completers (M= 3.08, SD= 1.38) who received family tangible support; t(441)= -3.30, p= .005, $d= -0.27$. The family items item showed a nearly but not quite significant difference between completers (M= 3.44, SD= 1.15) and non-completers (M= 3.24, SD= 1.19) who received family tangible support; t(441)= 1.75, p=.082, $d= -0.17$. The last two items mean that female completers received more food support and were more able to use physical objects when needed. For premium support, the female subsample showed a statistically significant deference between completers (M= 2.62, SD= 0.53) and non-completers (M= 2.88, SD= 0.97) who received premium family tangible support; t(441)= -3.30, p=.001, $d= 0.33$. In other words, the t-tests suggest that female non-completers received significantly more premium family tangible support than female completers.

The effect size values among females shown in Table 5 for the traveling expenses ($d= 0.46$), living as my friends ($d= 0.51$), and money saving ($d= 0.53$) items were found to be intermediate Cohen’s effect sizes; they were also in the “zone of desired effects” according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline. The sizes of the treating effect ($d= 0.35$) and the socialization effect ($d= 0.44$) items were found to be small Cohen’s effect sizes; they were also in the “zone of desired effects” according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline. In addition, the family items ($d= -0.17$) and food ($d= -0.27$) items were found to be small Cohen’s effect sizes; however, according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline, they were in the “teacher effects” category. Similar to the family items and food items, the effect size for female premium support ($d= 0.33$) was found to be a small effect size; it was also in the “teacher effects” according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline.
Furthermore, the effect size for female premium support was just 3% below the “zone of desired effects” border line.

Table 5

*The Female Subsample with t-tests of the Two Groups of Job Seekers, and the Difference in the Means, P-value, and Effect Size*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean of completers</th>
<th>Mean of non-completers</th>
<th>Difference in means</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Housing</td>
<td>3.476</td>
<td>3.353</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Food</td>
<td>3.449</td>
<td>3.078</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Transportation</td>
<td>3.492</td>
<td>3.391</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Communication</td>
<td>2.995</td>
<td>3.050</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Money</td>
<td>2.784</td>
<td>2.717</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Family’s Loan</td>
<td>3.184</td>
<td>3.047</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Family's Items</td>
<td>3.438</td>
<td>3.240</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Traveling Expenses</td>
<td>2.092</td>
<td>2.659</td>
<td>-0.567</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Pitch in</td>
<td>3.465</td>
<td>3.345</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Invite my Friends</td>
<td>3.378</td>
<td>3.240</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Socialization</td>
<td>2.265</td>
<td>2.814</td>
<td>-0.549</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Treating</td>
<td>2.162</td>
<td>2.601</td>
<td>-0.439</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Doing</td>
<td>2.789</td>
<td>2.674</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Live as my Friends</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>2.822</td>
<td>-0.622</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Money Saving</td>
<td>2.027</td>
<td>2.690</td>
<td>-0.663</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>3.272</td>
<td>3.138</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium</td>
<td>2.618</td>
<td>2.877</td>
<td>-0.259</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among members of the male subsample, the results were similar to those of the full sample in that the t-tests suggest that non-completers received more support for travel expenses, were able to socialize more, had more money to treat themselves, were more empowered to do the things they wanted, were more enabled to live as their friends, and were able to save more money. However, male completers surprisingly did not receive more support in any of the items (see Table 6). To elaborate, statistically significant differences were found between male
completers and male non-completers who received family tangible support for the traveling expenses item (completers: $M=1.89$, $SD=1.00$; non-completers: $M=2.67$, $SD=1.24$; $t(364)=-6.68$, $p=.000$, $d=0.70$); the socialization item (completers: $M=2.15$, $SD=1.27$; non-completers: $M=2.95$, $SD=1.23$; $t(364)=-6.12$, $p=.000$, $d=0.64$); the living as my friends item (completers: $M=2.30$, $SD=1.32$; non-completers: $M=2.79$, $SD=1.23$; $t(364)=-3.69$, $p=.000$, $d=0.39$); and the money saving item (completers: $M=2.09$, $SD=1.17$; non-completers: $M=2.65$, $SD=1.28$; $t(364)=-4.34$, $p=.000$, $d=0.45$).

Table 6

The Male Subsample with t-test of the Two Groups of Job Seekers, the Difference in the Means, P-value, and the Effect Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean of completers</th>
<th>Mean of non-completers</th>
<th>Difference in means</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Housing</td>
<td>2.969</td>
<td>2.976</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Food</td>
<td>3.122</td>
<td>2.924</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Transportation</td>
<td>2.867</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Communication</td>
<td>2.474</td>
<td>2.453</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Money</td>
<td>2.388</td>
<td>2.382</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Family’s Loan</td>
<td>2.995</td>
<td>3.006</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Family’s Items</td>
<td>3.056</td>
<td>3.112</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Traveling Expenses</td>
<td>1.888</td>
<td>2.671</td>
<td>-0.783</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Pitch in</td>
<td>3.128</td>
<td>3.165</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Invite my Friends</td>
<td>2.995</td>
<td>2.829</td>
<td>0.1655</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Socialization</td>
<td>2.153</td>
<td>2.953</td>
<td>-0.800</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Treating</td>
<td>2.219</td>
<td>2.453</td>
<td>-0.234</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Doing</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.641</td>
<td>-0.218</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Live as my Friends</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td>2.794</td>
<td>-0.493</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Money Saving</td>
<td>2.092</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>-0.555</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>2.813</td>
<td>2.796</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium</td>
<td>2.466</td>
<td>2.795</td>
<td>-0.329</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a result different from that for the full sample, the doing item for the male subsample showed a nearly but not quite significant difference between completers (M= 2.42, SD= 1.20) and non-completers (M= 2.64, SD= 1.17) who received family tangible support; t(364)= -1.75, p= .080, d= -0.18. In addition, the treating item showed a nearly but not quite significant difference between completers (M= 2.22, SD= 1.20) and non-completers (M= 2.45, SD= 1.19) receiving family tangible support; t(364)= -1.87, p= .063, d= 0.20. Regarding premium support, the male subsample showed a statistically significant difference between completers (M= 2.47, SD= 0.55) and non-completers (M= 2.65, SD= 0.91) who received premium family tangible support; t(364)= -4.24, p= .000, d= 0.44. In other words, the t-tests suggest that male non-completers received significantly more premium family tangible support than male completers.

The effect size values among males shown in Table 6 for the traveling expenses (d= 0.70), socialization (d= 0.64), and money saving (d= 0.45) items were found to be intermediate Cohen’s effect sizes; they were also in the “zone of desired effects” according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline. The size of the living as my friends (d= 0.39) item was found to be a small Cohen’s effect size; it was also in the “zone of desired effects” according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline. In addition, the treating (d=-0.20) and doing (d= -0.18) items were found to be a small Cohen’s effect sizes; however, according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline they were in the “teacher effects” category. Similar to that of the living as my friends’ item, the effect size for male premium support (d= 0.44) was found to be a small effect size; it was also in the “zone of desired effects” in Hattie’s (2009) guideline. Furthermore, the effect size for male premium support was just 1% below the “intermediate” border line.
A binary Logit regression was estimated to predict the completion of \((n = 809)\) Saudi job hunting processes using independent variables (basic, premium, gender, age, marital status, and education level) as predictors (see Table 7).

Table 7

The Binary Logit Regression Results, Variable in the Equation, Wald Results, and Exp Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables in the Equation</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95% C.I.for EXP(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>28.836</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.754</td>
<td>1.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium</td>
<td>-.888</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>50.736</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.601</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>13.976</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LevelofEducation</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.578</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>7.778</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>4.846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Basic, Premium, Gender, Age, Marital Status, Level of Education

The Exp(B) value indicates that when basic support is raised by one unit (Likert scale, from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree), the odds of completing the process of hunting for a job increases by a ratio of 1.754 to one (see Table 7). On the other hand, when premium support increases by one unit, the odds of not completing the job hunting process increases by 2.433 \((1/0.411)\) to one. To be more clear, the regression suggests that job seekers who receive more premium support are less likely to complete the job hunting process (see Table 7). On the other hand, those who receive more basic support are more likely to complete the job hunting process. The regression also suggests that males are more likely to complete the job hunting process. Age, marital status, and education were not significant predictors.

Table 8 shows the result for a test of the full model against a constant only model that was statistically significant, indicating that the predictors as set reliably distinguished between
completers and non-completers of the job hunting process (chi square = 69.773, p = <.000 with df = 6). In other words, the Omnibus tests show that the explanatory variables are statistically significant as a group in explaining the dependent variable (completion indicator).

Table 8

The Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>69.773</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Block</td>
<td>69.773</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>69.773</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cox and Snell’s pseudo R-Square statistic estimates that the model explains approximately 8.3% of the variation in the dependent variable or the prediction (see Table 9). Furthermore, Nagelkerke’s pseudo R 2 of .110 estimates about 11.0% of the relationship between the predictors (basic, premium, gender, age, marital status, and education level) and the prediction (the job seekers’ completions of the job hunting process).

Table 9

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step -2 Log likelihood Cox &amp; Snell R Square Nagelkerke R Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1049.007a .083 .110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.

The prediction success overall was 62% (69.9% for non-completers and 53.8% for completers (see Table 10). This is a considerable improvement on the 52.9% correct classification with the constant model, so we can conclude that the model with predictors is a
significantly better model. The Wald criterion demonstrated that the basic \( (p = .000) \), premium \( (p = .000) \), and gender \( (p = .000) \) variables made significant contributions to prediction (see Table 7), meaning that the null hypothesis must be rejected.

Table 10

The Classification Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Table⁷</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Percentage Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The cut value is .500

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between age and each item for each group. On one hand, there was no correlation between age and any of the 15 items for the completer group. This means that the family tangible support does not linearly change with age among completers. On the other hand, there was a negative correlation between age and some of the 15 items (housing, food, transportation, loans, family items, and living as my friends) for the non-completer group (see Table 11). This means that when age increases, the family tangible support received by non-completers of the job hunting process decreases. Although there was a negative correlation between age and some of the 15 items \( (r = -.115, -.139, -.106, -.119, \) and -.099), the effect size for each negative correlation value is considered a small negative correlation following Cohen’s \( d \) (1988) convention that he suggests for the absolute value of \( r \); it was also in the “developmental effect” category according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline. Although the effect size of the transportation
item \((r = -0.173)\) is considered a small negative correlation following Cohen’s \(d\) (1988) convention, according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline, it is in the “teacher effects” category.

Table 11

*The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient Scores for the Non-Completer Group Indicating the Relationship Between Age and Each Item*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age for Sample No 2/ Non-Completer</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Housing</td>
<td>-0.115*</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Food</td>
<td>-0.139**</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Transportation</td>
<td>-0.173**</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Communication</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Money</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Family's Loan</td>
<td>-0.106*</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Family's items</td>
<td>-0.119*</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Traveling Expenses</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Pitch in</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Invite my Friends</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Socialization</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Treating</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Doing</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Live as my Friends</td>
<td>-0.099*</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Money Savings</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

a sample = 2
Qualitative Results

The current study used the Delphi method/interview to develop a consensus view of the activities of job seekers during periods of unemployment and to determine the impact of antecedent factors, particularly, the impact of the social norm/family tangible support that may divert job seekers from becoming attached to the job seeking process. After interview research questions had been used for the purpose of providing a convenient and efficient way to approach the issue, this method outlined, in the first round, the main themes and sub-themes. Specifically, the transcripts of responses of the interviewees (job recruiting experts) were color coded for each section of the themes and subthemes. After the color coding had been done, the data were studied to extract quotations that best demonstrated both themes and subthemes (Saldaña, 2013). In the second round, the researcher asked the experts to again rewrite their opinions about collected statements and a newly formed composite instrument in order to arrive at a cohesive convention.

The First Round

Beginning with the first round, the response rate of feedback from the experts reached 100%. In addition, 100% of them agreed on the Job Seeking Activities Model (JSAM), saying that it “covers most of the activities” job hunters follow (see Appendix B). On one hand, some experts (around 50%) stated that although the model covered most of the activities, it was still “not clear” in some parts; they felt that something was missing in the model. On the other hand, other experts (around 50%) affirmed that the JSAM model was “very clear” to them. The experts were asked to provide suggestions for any missing activities in the process of job hunting, and 50% of them suggested, for example, including Internet activity and the use of resources such as online applications. This means that 50% of the experts thought that there were no activities missing from the model. The opinion held by half of the experts that the model was not entirely
clear and missed some activities led to carrying the issues of disagreement into the second round with some newly formed statements and composites.

When the experts were asked whether the precursory factors related to individuals and communities were mostly covered by the model, 100% of them agreed that the model covered “good points” and reflected the factors playing “a huge role in the job seeking activity.” However, around 75% of the experts suggested that the category of precursory factors related to individuals and communities “needed more” factors. The sub-question under this question was about providing suggestions for any missing precursory factors related to individuals and communities. A suggested statement and factor list from the experts was formed and carried into the second round, including factors such as “family and government supports, class of communities, and criminal convictions.” Surprisingly, when the experts were asked whether or not social norms influenced job seekers when they were making life decisions about employment, they essentially all agreed that that was the case and suggested only negative additional points about what prevented them from doing their job of supporting job seekers. Furthermore, they claimed that most job seekers had specific desires for their potential jobs such as being able to “work from their houses, work at schools, transportation, or tele-work.” Since these examples and negative statements were not mostly agreed upon and were not clearly explained, they were carried into the second round so that the social norms behind these desires of job seekers could be investigated.

Experts were asked additional questions to facilitate a deeper investigation of the impact of families’ social support. When the experts were asked about that most of them elaborated about their work as governmental job hunting support agents and about how important social support is. However, they mentioned that some unemployment insurance program claimants
unfortunately “interact with us only for the purpose of receiving their entitlements.” Moreover, the experts stated that although family social support is “good for a limited [category of] job seekers,” for the majority it may cause “a dependent society,” and eventually job seekers “will not be able to get on their feet.” Some experts claimed that some job hunters do not “even think of having a job at all”. This question was followed by a sub-question about whether the experts think that family social support has something to do with job seekers not completing their job hunting process. One hundred percent of them agreed that family social support may be diverting job seekers from becoming committed to the job seeking process. However, when they were asked why, 50% recommended “increased the support that is given by families” to help them commit to the job seeking process, and 50% recommended “reducing the support that is given by families” for the same reason of helping them commit to the job seeking process. Although the question was about family social support in general, the provided statements imply family tangible support. This disagreement was taken into the second round for settlement and cohesive convention. A final question was asked about whether social support has something to do with job seekers ignoring relevant information about some of the jobs available to them. About 50% of the experts agreed that job seekers intentionally ignore relevant information about some available jobs, linking that idea to the job seekers not being “interested in the first place.” This last statement needed more expansion since it raised the question of why they were not interested in the information about some available jobs when they were claiming that they had no money and wanted their entitlement via the unemployment insurance program. Thus, the disagreement and claims were taken into the next round.
The Second Round

The purpose of this round was to ask the experts again to rewrite their opinion about some collected statements and to create a newly formed composite using ideas from other experts and the researcher. This round’s response rate was also 100%, meaning that the dropout rate was 0% for both rounds. This round began by following up on the experts’ opinions about question one and three regarding job seeking activities and what was missing from the model and by presenting some agreements about changing and adding to the JSAM model. The experts could not agree on the process of the seeking activity. They suggested that the “seeking process needs more details and should be in sequenced steps.” Because this requirement is beyond the scope of this research and this model provides general steps or points without going more deeply inside each activity, this point was deferred for further study in the future. About 75% of the experts suggested that adding “Yes” and “No” to arrows in the model could provide better understanding of the flow of the activities. The experts could not agree on what should come first between the matching/Choice/Selection activity and the Building skills/Training/Preparing activity. The reason was that some job seekers are not ready for matching unless they are prepared and trained. Thus, an agreement was reached to reposition the two activities on top of each other in a horizontal way rather that in a vertical way as they had been originally (see Figure 4).

The disagreement on question two regarding the missing precursory factors relating to individuals and communities was discussed in an effort to discover whether it would be preferable to have a long list of precursory factors or to merge as many factors as possible into one factor capable of representing them all, for example, merging “health/medical conditions, living circumstances, training, and criminal convictions” with background and “family and
government supports” with social norms. The experts finally agreed (100%) with merging precursory factors “as much as possible” to make the JSAM model more understandable. Question four also was discussed in an effort to discover what social norms were causing the specific desires for job features. The experts’ agreement showed that the Saudi society has some social norms forcing its members to not cross boundaries, norms such as “working in some kinds of jobs or some areas around Saudi Arabia is not acceptable for some people.” Furthermore, they mentioned that “some accumulated ideas specify job seeker decisions, for instance, looking for desk or teaching jobs.” The experts went further to reveal that some job seekers sometimes complain about how the private sector seems to be lacking “emotional supports” and so is “hard for women” because they have more “family responsibilities” than men do, and they cannot drive or take public “transportation.”

Question five inquires into the impact of family social support when people have it. In this round, the experts revealed some issues over which they did not have control such as knowing of “other supportive resources” for the job hunters. In addition, they believed that “if such support is below the average person’s needs, job seekers will accept the minimum wage.” This question continued with a sub-question concerning whether family social support has something to do with job seekers not completing their job hunting process. The conclusions agreed upon by the experts were to “stop supporting them more than they need, encourage job seekers to work,” and to let them “be familiar with the idea of having a job.” Finally, they agreed that the reason job seekers were not interested in the information about some available jobs was that some job seekers seemed “rich,” and some others seemed “poor.” They also mentioned that “norms and values are different from region to region” regarding people having or not having jobs.
The use of a convergent parallel design methodology involves simultaneous triangulation where the findings ultimately, according to Morse (1991), complement one another (p. 120). In other words, it is a comparison and an integration of the user survey with the user interview instruments in an effort to discover convergence, divergence, contradictions, or relationships regarding the impacts of social norms, particularly family tangible support, which divert job seekers from becoming attached to the job seeking process. Furthermore, this methodology seeks to answer the same question with its presented model in order to demonstrate how precursory factors have an impact when people seek and/or encounter a source of information or services. The results from both instruments have revealed similarity and convergence in many points. There are differences between job seekers who receive less or more family tangible support. Some Saudi job seekers, for example, receive basic family tangible support, while others receive premium support. Moreover, job seekers who receive more premium support are less likely to complete the job hunting process; this is well matched with the experts’ opinions about controlling the family tangible support by not giving job seekers more than they need. This study found some job seekers to not be interested in having jobs, they are interested in receiving their entitlements and sometimes display intentional ignorance as a result. Specifically, they intentionally ignore relevant information about some available jobs due to the amount of family tangible support they have, which is related to differences such as being poor or rich, or being from different regions. These findings from both instruments suggest that family tangible support diverts job seekers from becoming attached to the job seeking process as well as impacting job seekers when they seek and/or encounter a source of information or services.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has explored the world experienced by Saudi job seekers in order to investigate the impact of antecedent factors that may influence them when they make their employment decisions, especially when those factors divert job seekers from attaching to the job seeking process. Particularly, this study examines family tangible support as one of the aspects of the collection of social norms. Likewise, the presented model presents an account of how precursory factors have an impact when people seek and/or encounter a source of information or services. The study is based on responses by Saudi’s job seekers who make a claim for entitlements through the unemployment insurance program provided by the Human Resource Developing Fund in Saudi Arabia. It also sought job recruiter experts’ responses regarding the activities of job seekers during periods of unemployment, and it emphasizes the impact of antecedent factors, particularly, social norms/family tangible support. This study interprets these responses in terms of Chatman’s small world conceptualization/theory, Johnson’s comprehensive model of information seeking, and Wilson’s concept of costly ignorance, all of which demonstrate the ways in which job hunters decide to disengage from the job seeking process at some points. This disengagement reduces the efficiency and success of job seeking services.

The results of the current study will help information seeking behavior researchers, job recruiters, job centers, and private and state employment agencies to better understand the causes of the phenomenon under study. Furthermore, this study endeavors to achieve an understanding of the world experienced by job seekers through the application of the Job Seeking Activities Model (JSAM). The results could contribute to an enhancement of the services available through private and state employment agencies. This chapter begins its discussion and interpretation of
the findings by addressing each research question individually and then moves to its conclusion and, finally, its recommendations for future research.

Interpretation of the Findings

Q1. Why do job seekers not complete and/or continue their job-hunting process by complying with HRDF requirements in Saudi Arabia?

The results related to the extent to which Saudi job seekers receive family tangible support suggest that job seekers who receive more premium support are less likely to complete the job hunting process. On the other hand, those who receive more basic support are more likely to complete the job hunting process. In other words, non-completers who receive more support for travel expenses, are able to socialize more, have more money to treat themselves, are more able to live like their friends live, and are able to save more money than the completers procrastinate their attachment while they possess more than they need as a result of family tangible support. This result also confirms the interview findings that job hunters have other supportive resources of which no one is aware and which have not been noted. It also suggests the existence of other social norms hindering the efforts of job seekers such as those which prevent its members, especially women, from crossing boundaries (in the sense of Chatman’s small world theory) when they select their jobs or the locations of their jobs around Saudi Arabia. Furthermore, the result indicates that some ideas which have become prominent following the development of the Saudi society determine certain job seeker decisions, for instance, whether they look for desk, government, or teaching jobs. As a result, the experts emphasize psychological supports or helps rather than tangible ones.

Stutzer’s and Lalive’s (2004) study of the role of social work norms in job hunting found that if a society has a stronger social norm regarding the importance of work, its people will have
shorter duration of unemployment. By contrast, the social norm most relevant for this study, family tangible support received by Saudi job seekers, is of somewhat high importance and causes the job seekers to delay their attachment to the job hunting processes, to not accept job offers, and to prefer doing other things. The studies by Alromahi (1977), Saad (1989), and Alotabi (2011) revealed that the discovery of oil in Saudi Arabia has impacted the social life of Saudi society in certain ways. For example, Alromahi (1977) discovered that as the discovery of oil has transitioned the lifestyle of Saudi people from old fashioned to modern society and increased their economic status, especially their income, the rapid change in the economic status of the Arabian Gulf region has led to a new social norm where people prioritize personal interest over public interest, and this has led people to depend totally on government and welfare services. He concluded that this social norm may lead to a dependence for income on others without the need for work. Moreover, Alotabi’s (2005) study of the role of family in teaching children about modern development values has revealed a serious difficulty for families in raising their children with new modern development values or norms such as strong job commitment. Her study also implied that the lifestyle and social norms of Saudi’s families may prevent them from succeeding in helping their children learn desired values concerning time, production, spending, and work. She emphasizes that members of the young generation should be independent and should work from an early age.

The results also suggest that males are more likely to complete the job hunting process than women due to the fact that women receive more basic and premium supports than men do. This may indeed explain why the unemployment rate of Saudi women is 64.1% \((N = 421,786)\), higher than that of men, 35.9% \((N = 236,150)\) according to the *Labour Force Survey, 2016- 2nd Quarter” (2016)*. This finding may also lead the Saudi government to consider efforts to create
more jobs for men because men are more likely to complete the job hunting process. In the total sample, the effect size for premium support ($d= 0.40$) was found to be small, just 5% below the intermediate effect size border line; it was also in the “zone of desired effects” according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline. This effect size indicates a future problem for most supportive families when they will not be able to provide support anymore, especially in a country like Saudi Arabia which, according to Yusuf (2014), depends primarily on oil as the single economic resource rather than on its human resources. Alrashed (2004) stated that unemployed people in general will cause a decrease in the level of their families’ lifestyles, and this will then impact the whole society. Since the effect size of premium support falls in the “zone of desired effects” according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline, the Saudi government is encouraged to spend more money on enhancing technical and vocational training schools and colleges. Furthermore, it should add to its education curricula courses about work values and benefits and teach these values to students at all educational stages. These efforts will also be appropriate responses to the call for such actions in the International Monetary Fund report (2014).

Q2. What would be the negative impacts on job seekers if they completed the journey of job hunting?

The results related to whether completers of the job hunting process have had basic or premium family tangible support suggest that job seekers who receive only basic support are more likely to complete the journey of the job hunting process and keep an offered job. Furthermore, the difference between basic and premium support also confirms the experts’ conclusion that non-completers look first to the amount of family tangible support received, and if it is below the average needs, they will attach to job seeking processes. Thus, the prospect of losing this type of easily obtained support, when they consider prospective jobs, may prevent
their attachment to the job seeking process. Furthermore, Addison’s and Pedro’s (2001) and O’Leary’s (2004) studies regarding the evaluation of job seekers’ search methods and outcomes suggested that job seekers who have certain kinds of financial resources are less active than job seekers who have less support, as discussed in Chapter 2. Being less active means that job seekers prefer doing other things or maybe waiting for the “bigger fish” (a more favored job) to fall into their laps. Regarding the bigger fish concept, Osberg’s (1993) study about job-search strategies and job-finding success implied that some job seekers prefer to wait for the suitable fish in order to keep it if they possess decent resources such as financial, information, and network resources. He also implied that job seekers who possess decent resources (or who are not in great need) may discredit free government services believing the bigger fish may be captured in other ways.

Q3. What would be the impact of social support (financial or otherwise) on job seekers using the government job resource services (e.g., HRDF)?

Taking Harvard Kennedy School’s (2015) study about evaluating the Saudi labor market as an indicator of willingness to forego the financial benefits from the Saudi Hafiz program (an unemployment insurance program) as a result of not attaching to job seeking activities can partially answer this question. However, according to this study, the results related to the correlation between age and family tangible support for each group similarly suggest that when age increases the family tangible support received by non-completers of the job hunting process decreases. This means a negative correlation between age and some of the 15 items (housing: $r = -.115$; food: $r = -.139$; transportation: $r = -.173$; loans: $r = -.106$; family items: $r = -.119$; and living as my friends: $r = -.099$) for the non-completer group. Although there was a negative correlation between age and some of the family tangible support items, the effect size for each
negative correlation value is considered a small negative correlation following Cohen’s $d$ (1988) convention which he suggests for the absolute value of $r$; it was also in the “developmental effect” category according to Hattie’s (2009) guideline, with the exception of the effect size of the transportation item ($r = -.173$), in the “teacher effects” category. Since transportation is in the “teacher effects” category, the Saudi government’s largest spending project (the Metro) in transportation can be justified by this finding. Although the rest of the effect sizes fall in the “developmental effect” category, the majority of them are considered basic support items, meaning that losing them when job seekers get older may jeopardize their current living standards, resulting in their becoming homeless without houses to live in, food to eat, means of transportation, ability to get loans, family items to use, and the ability to live like their friends live.

Alotabi’s (2005) study indicated that depending on others as a source of income (government, family, etc.,) is a new social norm which has been entirely developed in Saudi Arabia since the discovery of oil and then the increase in oil sales. This social norm has become a habitual behavior and is largely practiced by the members of the Saudi society. Alotabi was concerned about the impact of this norm on generations in the near future. Her prediction can be clarified in terms of the following definition. Alrashed (2004) defined optional unemployment as a selective state where a capable person chooses to not work without being forced to for various personal reasons including the unwillingness to work, preference for leisure time, and the desire for better wages or work. Therefore, the findings regarding received premium family tangible support can explain why antecedent factors/social norms and social support (financial or otherwise) impact job seekers when they use the government job resource services (e.g., HRDF). This situation could become even worse if job seekers lose their available free time and the free
support is expended without their learning new skills and knowledge that would help them when they want to settle into new jobs. As a result, teaching job seekers to fish is better than feeding them every day whether by the government, family, friends, or close relatives.

Q4 Do the answers to the above questions provide us with enough understanding to model the termination of job seeking activities by unemployed individuals?

This question is best answered with reference to the Job Seeking Activities Model using the impact of precursory community factors/social norms as well as using information science terminology. The JSAM model demonstrates the effects of social support/family tangible support in modeling the termination of job seeking by unemployed individuals. Moreover, findings from the convergent parallel design methodology used in this study have resulted in further development in the JSAM model (see Figure 4). Job seekers encounter information resources, but their interaction with them depends on whether the information seems situationally relevant to them or not. For example, if the available information from friends and relatives, newspapers and ads, private and state employment agencies, and other sources about jobs is in great need (as is clearly the case), job seekers will interact with the source of information. The decision to interact with these resources (the YES decision in Figure 4) will bring job seekers into the job-search process. If they decide not to interact with the resources (i.e., they make the NO decision), seeing no information relevance, job seekers will finally terminate their job hunting journey.
What makes job seekers decide to interact or not interact with the resources is the influence that has been recognized as coming from the precursory individual and community factors. These factors lead to two states: situational relevance or the absence of situational relevance. The influence of the precursory factors can be shown by the result of an odds ratio in logistic regression. The Exp(B) value predicts that when basic support is raised by one unit, the odds of making the YES decision or completing the process of hunting for a job increases by a ratio of 1.754 to one. On the other hand, when premium support increases by one unit, the odds of making the NO decision or not completing the job hunting process increases by 2.433 (1/0.411) to one. The JSAM model successfully demonstrates a lack of situational relevance of
any information relating to jobs or opportunities to find jobs arising from a culture that indirectly affects its young generation by providing uncontrolled family tangible support (financial or otherwise). The habitual behavior of young generation job seekers who ignore relevant information about jobs can also be described as the result of harmful ignorance which may have started as harmless ignorance.

Contributions and Limitation

The concept of the situational relevance proposed by Wilson (1973) is a key focus of scientific information behavior research. Many studies on this topic have contributed to an understanding of the behavior of information seekers while interacting with information resources that are available to them. However, they have not explained, regarding this phenomenon, the interaction between job seekers and the information resources including all activities of the job hunting journey as well as the extrinsic or intrinsic factors of job seekers that may influence their information seeking behavior. For a better resolution of these issues, the JSAM model has been built based on the concepts of Chatman, Johnson, and Wilson within the general model of information seeking adapted from the work of O’Connor, Copeland, and Kearns (2003), modified to include economics terms. More generally, the present study takes into account the activities of job seekers during periods of unemployment and emphasizes the impact of antecedent factors, particularly, social norms/family tangible support. Furthermore, very little is known about the job seekers’ information behavior in non-Western, non-English-speaking developed societies such as Saudi Arabia, the Arabian Gulf Cooperation Council, or the Middle East. This study provides a considerable theoretical contribution to knowledge in the information science arena by taking into account these information gaps, seeking job recruiters’ opinions, and gathering job seekers’ information regarding their social support in Saudi Arabia.
Despite the contribution of this study to the research information science arena, the study has limitations in its methods and in the interpretation of its results. The focus of this study is on the phenomenon of the reduction of the efficiency and success of governmental job seeking services or centers. Therefore, the findings might not be generalizable to private job seeking services or centers. The study surveys private sector job seekers in Saudi Arabia; thus, the findings may not be generalizable to the government sector. Additionally, the population of the current study is Saudi job seekers who have made claims to the unemployment insurance program; therefore, the findings may not be applicable to other non-Saudi job seekers and individuals who are not eligible for the unemployment insurance program.

Conclusions

The theoretical implications of this study can be applied to current information for assessing the findings’ applicability to small world theory, the costly ignorance concept, and the JSAM model of job seekers. Specifically, while the current study suggests that job seekers who have received premium family tangible support will not likely complete the job hunting process, more data need to be gathered to assess whether or not the job seekers have other jobs that cannot be registered with the Saudi government such as those of auctioneer, ring man, self-employed position, informal catering, etc. One of the main objectives of this study has been to build the JSAM on the basis of Chatman’s small world conceptualization/theory, Johnson’s comprehensive model of information seeking, and Wilson’s concept of costly ignorance within the general model of information seeking adapted from the work of O’Connor, Copeland, and Kearns, which demonstrate the ways in which job hunters decide to disengage from the job seeking process. The model was also modified to include economics terms in order to cover the overlap with interdisciplinary information sciences.
Most previous information seeking behavior studies have examined human information behavior in general, whereas this study purposely examined job seeker information behavior and the factors which influence job seekers’ behavior. Strictly speaking, the study examined received family tangible support as a social norm effect; as well, it sought job recruiter experts’ agreement on the JSAM model’s applicability to the job seeking journey and the impact of social norms that job seekers may be faced with. To my knowledge, this study is the first to demonstrate and model job seeking activities and to survey the impact of social norms, particularly, social support, on job seeking activities. It was shown in the data analysis that all components of the job seeking activities model were necessary and that the overall structure of the model is accurate. The findings of this study show that job seekers who receive premium family tangible support are less likely to complete the job hunting process, whereas job seekers who receive basic family tangible support are likely to complete the job hunting process. This means that social norms, particularly uncontrolled social support provided by family, are more likely to make job seekers ignore the relevant information about jobs available to them in favor of doing other things. Thus, this dissertation presents a form of data and the development of a workable model to more clearly and better define the complex world of job seekers.

Recommendation

The current study findings suggest a deeper examination of other tangible support provided by still unknown resources related to job seekers. Further examination of families’ experiences in providing their job seeker members with tangible support is recommended. This study has set the stage for researchers to adapt the job seeking activities model (JSAM) for a better understanding of job seekers’ information seeking behavior, better model development, and better instrument development in future research. These developments can provide for the
testing of elements for other parts of the JSAM model and of the influence of other precursory
individual and community factors. Future studies might be conducted with whatever the best
available methodology is even though information science scholars predominantly recommend
mixed-method studies. It is also recommended that future researchers conduct comparative
research using the JSAM on different types of job seekers, with different types of job centers or
service providers, and in other countries; as well, research should be conducted with different
types of job seekers from different countries. These comparative studies might discover more
detailed information regarding the issues related to job seeker information seeking behavior.
APPENDIX A

ENGLISH VERSION OF THE SURVEY
* START of Questionnaire *

Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this study. The study assists for providing enough understanding to model the job seeking activities; specifically, the influence of antecedent factors on job seekers terminating their job hunting. The immediate purpose of this research is to enable a functional relationship between job information services and job seekers.

This questionnaire consists of 15 questions that divided into two sections. First, demographic information, second the tangible support provided by family including parents, brothers, sisters, and closed relatives.

Please make a response to every question (incomplete responses will significantly compromise the validity of this study).

If the [Next] button doesn't take you anywhere, check on the page for an indication that you have missed a response.

The questionnaire should take you around 8-10 minutes to complete. Thanks very much for your time and input.

Before beginning this survey, we wish to gain your consent.

By clicking yes below you consent to participating in this study. Data collected will be accessible only by the researcher at University of North Texas, (Badr Alahmad). All data will be anonymised prior to publication and participants will not be identified (or identifiable). You are free to withdraw from the study at any time.

- I consent to participating in this study and have read the guidance above.
  - Yes
  - No

- **Gender:**
  - Male
  - Female

- **Age:**

- **Marital Status:**
  - Single
  - Married

- **Level of Education:**
  - High school or less
  - Associate degree
  - Baccalaureate
  - Master or higher
Thinking about tangible support provided by (family including parents, brothers, sisters, and closed relatives), how much do you agree with the following statement?

1. My family provides or supports me with a place to stay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. My family provides me with a way of transportation such as (family’s cars, chauffeur, taxi and others).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. My family gives me $67 per month at a minimum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. My family loans me money when I need it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. When a physical object is needed, I can use/utilize a car, a watch, clothing, or similar items from my family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. My family provides me with some travel expenses so that I can get away for a while.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. My family pitches in to help me do something that needed to be done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. My family’s tangible support usually allows me to socialize as often as I like.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. From my family’s financial support, I often have enough money to buy treats for myself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. My family’s tangible support usually allows me to do the things I want.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
11. My family’s tangible support enables me to live as well as my friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. From the family’s financial support, I have some money left for savings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. My family provides me with a minimum one meal per week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. My family supports me financially, either partially or fully, to cover the cost of my telecommunication devices and services (phone, Internet, computer, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Family’s support allows me to invite my friend(s) at home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* END of Questionnaire *
APPENDIX B

ARABIC VERSION OF THE SURVEY
المقدمة

نشكر لك قبولك المشاركة في هذه الدراسة، التي تسعى إلى المساعدة في تقديم فهم كافي لعمل نموذج تصويري لمراحل أنشطة البحث عن العمل. وخصوصاً، تأتي العوامل السابقة (الشخصية أو المجتمعية) لإلغاء أو تأخير مرحلة البحث عن العمل من قبل طالبين العمل. وتشمل هذه الدراسة إلى فهم أحد المؤثرات على تفعيل العلاقة العملية بين خدمات مراكز التأهيل والتوظيف وطالبين العمل. تكون الاستبان من (١٥) سؤال بالإضافة إلى أسئلة عن الخلفية الشخصية. تتمحور الأسئلة حول الدعم المادي الأسري (والوالدين أو الأخ أو الأقرب أو الأقارب) المقدم لطالبين العمل.

سوف تحتاج إلى حوالي ١٠ دقائق للإجابة على الأسئلة. كما نرجو منك الإجابة على جميع الأسئلة حيث أن عدم إكمال الأسئلة سوف يقلل من مصداقية الدراسة. في حالة الضغط على التالي لست متفقد للصفحة التالية، نرجو منك التأكد من عدم ترك الإجابة لأحد الأسئلة. قبل البدء في إجابة الاستبان نرجو منك تأكيد الموافقة على تعبئته.

عند اختيارك كلمة تعم بالأسفل تعلقي الموافقة على المشاركة بالدراسة. حسباً أن جميع البيانات المجمعة سوف تكون تحت تصرف البحث (بدر الأحمد) لأغراض هذه الدراسة البحثية المرتبطة بجامعة شمال تكساس. كما سوف تكون جميع البيانات المستخدمة لهذه الدراسة مجهولة المصدر حيث لا يمكن تحديد هوية المشاركين. لك الحرية المطلقة في أي وقت لرفض المشاركة أو عدم إكمالها.

- أنا أوافق على المشاركة في هذه الدراسة وأقر بقراءة الإرشادات السابقة.

الجنس: 

- ذكر.
- أنثى.

العمر:

- المدرسة الثانوية: 
  - إنهroducil
  - متوسط.

- المرحلة الدراسية: 
  - ثانوي أو أقل.
  - دروم بعد الثاني.
  - جامعي.
  - ماجستير أو أعلى.

العمرات التالية:

- أسرتي توفر لي السكن أو تدعمي في توفير مبلغ السكن.

العمرات التالية:

1. عائلتي توفر لي على الأقل وجبة واحدة في الأسبوع.

2. عائلتي توفر لي على الأقل وجبة واحدة في الأسبوع.
3. أسرتي توفر لي وسيلة الاتصال عن طريق استخدام أحد سيارات الأسرة أو السائق أو قيمة الاتصالات، أو بأي طريقة أخرى.

4. جزئياً أو كلياً، أسرتي تدعمي بالمال لتغطية تكاليف وسائل واسه واتصالات الانترنت، الحاسب الآلي، وغيرها.

5. أسرتي تقدم لي على الأقل 250 ريال شهرياً.

6. أسرتي تقرضني المال متي ما احتاجت إليه.

7. استطيع استخدام أغراض عائلتي عند الاحتياج لأغراض عينية (السيارة، الساعات، الملابس، أن شاء ذلك).

8. أسرتي تقدم لي بعض مصاريف السفر عندما احتاج إلى السفر.

9. تقوم أسرتي بمساعدتي لإنجاز بعض الأعمال التي يجب أن أقوم بها وتحتاج أكثر من شخص لإتمامها.

10. الدعم الأسري يمنحني القدرة على استضافة أصدقاء في المنزل.

11. مساعدات أسرتي المادية تسمح لي أن أجمع وأرتقي مع الأخرين كلما احبت.

12. من خلال مساعدات أسرتي المالية، استطيع الحصول غالباً على مال كافي لشراء بعض الهدايا والاغراض الممتعة.
13. مساعدات أسرتي المادية تسمح لي في العادة أن أفعل الأشياء التي اريدها.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا أوافق بشده</th>
<th>أوافق بشده</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طبيعية</td>
<td>أداة</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. مساعدة أسرتي المادية تجعلني قادر على الحصول على حياة معيشية كافية لأصدقاءي.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا أوافق بشده</th>
<th>أوافق بشده</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طبيعية</td>
<td>أداة</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. من خلال مساعدة أسرتي المالية، استطيع توفير بعض المال.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>لا أوافق بشده</th>
<th>أوافق بشده</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>طبيعية</td>
<td>أداة</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
The Denial of Relevance by Job Seekers, A Case Study in Saudi Arabia

Interview Questions

The Interview Guide

Introduction
The purpose of this study is to provide enough understanding to model the job seeking activities; specifically, the influence of antecedent factors on job seekers terminating their job hunting. The immediate purpose of this research is to enable a functional relationship between job information services and job seekers.

The interview should take you around 30-40 minutes to complete. Thanks very much for your time and input.

Before beginning this Interview, we wish to gain your consent.

By signing below, you consent to participating in this study. Data collected will be accessible only by the investigator at University of North Texas, (Badr Alahmad). All data will be anonymized prior to publication and participants will not be identified (or identifiable). You are free to withdraw from the study at any time or send an email to Badr Alahmad att (badralahmad@my.unt.edu).

Printed Name of Participant

________________________________

Signature of Participant

________________________________ Date
Question for building rapport with participants:
Q1. Tell me about your job as an expert recruiter?
   Q1.1 Tell me what you enjoy most about your job?
Q2. Talk about your opinions and thoughts regarding the types of job seekers you recruit?
   Q2.1 Talk about the most interesting thing you found about job seekers?

Question for making a transition from establishing rapport to asking the main questions:
Q3. Think for a moment while seeing this model; and then tell me how well, in general, it represents the job seeking activities a job seeker goes through hunting for a job?
Q4. Think for a moment and tell me how well the precursory factors of individuals and communities are being mostly covered?
   Q4.1 Tell me at least one missing precursory factor that is not being covered here?

Question for providing enough understanding to model the job seeking activities; specifically, the influence of antecedent factors on job seekers terminating their job hunting:
Q5. Look again to the model and tell me if there is any missing activity a job seeker can go through?

Q6. Going back to the model, specifically; the SOCIAL NORMS. Can you tell whether or not it influences job seekers when making life decision about employment?

Q7. Speaking about culture, tell me exhaustively; Do you think social support provided by Saudi’s families has potential impact on job seekers when making life decision about employment? Why?
   Q7.1. If so; Do you think it has something to do with job seekers not completing the job hunting process? Why?
   Q7.2. Does it also have something to do with job seekers ignoring relevant information about some available jobs to them? Why?
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LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE BY UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
April 28, 2016

Dr. Brian O’Connor
Student Investigator: Badr Alahmad
Department of Library & Information Services
University of North Texas

RE: Human Subjects Application No. 16-219

Dear Dr. O’Connor:

In accordance with 45 CFR Part 46 Section 46.101, your study titled “The Denial of Relevance by Job Seekers: A Case Study in Saudi Arabia” has been determined to qualify for an exemption from further review by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Enclosed are the consent documents with stamped IRB approval. Since you are conducting an online study, please copy the approved language and paste onto the first page of your online survey.

No changes may be made to your study’s procedures or forms without prior written approval from the UNT IRB. Please contact The Office of Research Integrity and Compliance at 940-565-4643 if you wish to make any such changes. Any changes to your procedures or forms after 3 years will require completion of a new IRB application.

We wish you success with your study.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Chad Trulson, Ph.D.
Professor
Chair, Institutional Review Board
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INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO JOB RECRUITER EXPERTS OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT FUND
University of North Texas Institutional Review Board
Informed Consent Form

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose, benefits and risks of the study and how it will be conducted.

Title of Study: The Denial of Relevance by Job Seekers, A Case Study in Saudi Arabia.

Investigator: Badr Alahmad, University of North Texas, Department of Library and Information science.

Purpose of the Study: You are being asked to participate in a research study about providing enough understanding to model the job seeking activities; specifically, the influence of antecedent factors on job seekers terminating their job hunting. While the immediate purpose of this research is to enable a functional relationship between job information services and job seekers, the fundamental purpose is to model what seems like a peculiar problem: ignoring salient information about job information by job seekers. In other words, the investigator is expecting to uncover the reasons that are causing job seekers who are receiving government funds to end their job-hunting journey. Specifically, the investigator is seeking to answer the following questions:

1. Why do job seekers not complete and/or continue their job-hunting process by complying with HRDF requirements in Saudi Arabia?
2. What would be the negative impacts on job seekers if they complete the journey of job hunting?
3. What would be the impact of social support (financial or otherwise) on job seekers using the government job resource services (e.g., HRDF)?
4. Do answers to the above questions provide us with enough understanding to model the termination of job seeking?

Study Procedures: As a job recruiter’s expert, in this study, you will be asked to agree for participating in the study and to be interviewed. The interviewee will be contacted for one round face-to-face semi-structured interview. In addition, participation in the interview will last approximately 30-40 minutes. Each interviewee will be interviewed at the HRDF main location. In this interview, a model will be presented to you about job seeking activities and will be asked some questions about it, hoping to provide enough understanding to the highly termination of job seeking. The interview conversation will be written down by the interviewee. If interviewee’s input is not clear, the investigator might ask for clarification. After the interview, the data records will be analyzed by the investigator and with the informed consent forms they will be securely stored on the UNT campus.

Foreseeable Risks: There are no foreseeable risks involved in this study. The only potential discomfort involved in this study is filling out the interview questions. If this is the case, then let us know and we will take notes instead.
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If you wish to discuss the information above or any other risks you may experience, you may ask questions now.

**Benefits to the Subjects or Others:** This study is not expected to be of any direct benefit to you, but we hope to learn more about the influence of antecedent factors when job seekers make their working decisions. The study’s model may suggest some understanding of how job seekers make life decision about employment. In addition, it may provide some significant knowledge to policy makers about the influence of antecedent factors when a job seekers make their working decisions. In other words, the immediate purpose of this research is expected to enable a functional relationship between job information services and job seekers. Particularly, the study will try to deeply explore the influence of antecedent factors when job seekers ignore relevant information about some available jobs to them. This exploration may help job center providers in enhancing their services. The study will strongly tie its relation with the information science filed by aiming to explore the influence of antecedent factors job seekers may have when encountering with information provided by the job information services.

**Compensation for Participants:** There is no compensation for participation.

**Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records:** Confidentiality will be protected by not including any identifying information about participants. Experts who are willing to participate when they are asked will be assigned numbers such as “Interviewee (#)” and this will be used to name subjects anonymously. The confidentiality of your individual information will be maintained when it be used with the publication and/or presentation of this study.

**Questions about the Study:** If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Badr Alahmad at badralahmad@my.unt.edu or Dr. Brian O’Connor at Brian.OConnor@unt.edu.

**Review for the Protection of Participants:** This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-4643 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

**Research Participants’ Rights:**
Your signature below indicates that you have read or have had read to you all of the above and that you confirm all of the following:

- Badr Alahmad has explained the study to you and answered all of your questions. You have been told the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study.
- You understand that you do not have to take part in this study, and your refusal to participate or your decision to withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop your participation at any time.
• Your decision whether to participate or to withdraw from the study will have no effect on your rights, benefits, and/or services with Human Resource Development Fund.
• You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.
• You understand your rights as a research participant and you voluntarily consent to participate in this study.
• You have been told you will receive a copy of this form.

______________
Printed Name of Participant

__________________________
Signature of Participant

__________________________
Date

	For the Investigator or Designee:
I certify that I have reviewed the contents of this form with the subject signing above. I have explained the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study. It is my opinion that the participant understood the explanation.

__________________________
Signature of Investigator or Designee

__________________________
Date
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Informed Consent Notice

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the purpose, benefits and risks of the study and how it will be conducted.

**Title of Study:** The Denial of Relevance by Job Seekers, a Case Study in Saudi Arabia.

**Student Investigator:** Badr Alahmad, University of North Texas, Department of Library and Information science.

**Supervising Investigator:** Dr. Brian O’Connor, University of North Texas, Department of Library and Information science.

**Purpose of the Study:** You are being asked to participate in a research study about providing enough understanding to model the job seeking activities; specifically, the influence of antecedent factors on job seekers terminating their job hunting. While the immediate purpose of this research is to enable a functional relationship between job information services and job seekers, the fundamental purpose is to model what seems like a peculiar problem: ignoring salient information about job information by job seekers. In other words, the investigator is expecting to uncover some reasons that are causing job seekers who are receiving government funds to end their job-hunting journey. Specifically, the investigator is seeking to answer the following questions:

1. Why do job seekers not complete and/or continue their job-hunting process by complying with HRDF requirements in Saudi Arabia?
2. What would be the negative impacts on job seekers if they complete the journey of job hunting?
3. What would be the impact of social support (financial or otherwise) on job seekers using the government job resource services (e.g., HRDF)?
4. Do answers to the above questions provide us with enough understanding to model the termination of job seeking?

**Study Procedures:** As a job seekers participant in this study you will be asked to: complete the online survey. This survey should take 8-10 minutes to finish. The information will securely reside in UNT Qualtrics survey system.

**Foreseeable Risks:** There are no foreseeable risks involved in this study. The investigator will do everything possible to maintain your confidential information.

**Benefits to the Subjects or Others:** This study is not expected to be of any direct benefit to you, but we hope to learn more about the influence of antecedent factors when job seekers make their working decisions. The study’s model may suggest some understanding of how job seekers make life decision about employment. In addition, it may provide some significant knowledge to
policy makers about the influence of antecedent factors when a job seekers make their working decisions. In other words, the immediate purpose of this research is expected to enable a functional relationship between job information services and job seekers. Particularly, the study will try to deeply explore the influence of antecedent factors when job seekers ignore relevant information about some available jobs to them. This exploration may help job center providers in enhancing their services. The study will strongly tie its relation with the information science filed by aiming to explore the influence of antecedent factors job seekers may have when encountering with information provided by the job information services.

Compensation for Participants: There is no compensation for participation.

Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records: Confidentiality will be protected by not including any identifying information in the data. The survey will not have any name on it and each participant will be assigned a number when he or she started the survey. The confidentiality of your individual information will be maintained when it be used with the publication and/or presentation of this study.

Questions about the Study: If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Badr Alahmad at badralahmad@my.unt.edu or Dr. Brian O'Connor at Brian.OConnor@unt.edu.

Review for the Protection of Participants: This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-4643 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

Research Participants’ Rights:
Your acceptance to take this survey indicates that you have read or have had read to you all of the above and that you confirm all of the following:

- Badr Alahmad has explained the study to you and answered all of your questions. You have been told the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study.
- You understand that you do not have to take part in this study, and your refusal to participate or your decision to withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop your participation at any time.
- Your decision whether to participate or to withdraw from the study will have no effect on your rights, benefits, and/or services with Human Resource Development Fund.
- You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.
- You understand your rights as a research participant and you voluntarily consent to participate in this study.
APPENDIX F

TABLE OF INTERPRETATION FOR DIFFERENT EFFECT SIZES
13. Table of interpretation for different effect sizes

Here, you can see the suggestions of Cohen (1988) and Hattie (2009 S. 97) for interpreting the magnitude of effect sizes. Hattie refers to real educational contexts and therefore uses a more benignant classification, compared to Cohen. We slightly adjusted the intervals, in case, the interpretation did not exactly match the categories of the original authors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( d )</th>
<th>( r^* )</th>
<th>( \eta^2 )</th>
<th>Interpretation sensu Cohen (1988)</th>
<th>Interpretation sensu Hattie (2007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 0</td>
<td>&lt; 0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Adverse Effect</td>
<td>Developmental effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>Teacher effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Small Effect</td>
<td>Zone of desired effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 1.0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Cohen (1988) reports the following intervals for \( r \): .1 to .3: small effect; .3 to .5: intermediate effect; .5 and higher: strong effect
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THE CODING SCHEME
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Coding Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frist Round</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main themes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered most of the activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion for any missing activity of the job seekers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers good points of the precursory factors of individuals and communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion for any missing precursory factors of individuals and communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Coding Scheme, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frist Round</th>
<th>Second Round</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main themes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sub-themes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social norms’ influences on job seekers.</td>
<td>Negatively (100%) . only work from their houses, work at schools, transportation, or tele-work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family social support/ impact</td>
<td>Interact with us only for the reason of receiving their entitlements. Good for limited job seekers. Will not even think of having a job at all, Will not be able to get on their feet, and raises a dependent society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family social support/not completing the job hunting Process.</td>
<td>Reduce the support that’s given by families (50% of the experts) Increase the support that’s given by families (50% of the experts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family social support/ ignoring relevant information about some available jobs.</td>
<td>Intentional. Not really interested from the first place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations | -- | -- |
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THE PERMISSION LETTERS
For your own personal research use only.

JS Journey Reported
Numbers.xlsx
You have my permission.

I would appreciated a report on your results.

Best,

David

J. David Johnson
Professor
Department of Communication
U. of Kentucky

From: Alahmad, Badr <BadrAlahmad@my.unt.edu>
Sent: Friday, September 2, 2016 1:11:47 PM
To: Johnson, J D
Subject: Using the Comprehensive Model of Information Seeking

Dear Dr. Johnson,

My name is Badr Alahmad. I am Ph.D candidate at University of North Texas. I am conducting a research study about social support. I kindly request your permission to use the comprehensive model of information seeking (CMIS). Thank you for your support.

Regards,

Bad Alahmad
Bad Alahmad--

you have my permission to use items from the ISSB. That measure is in the public domain and may be used or modified for research approved by a human subjects committee.

Dr. Manuel Barrera

On Mon, May 9, 2016 at 3:25 PM, Alahmad, Badr <BadrAlahmad@my.unt.edu> wrote:

Dear Dr. Barrera,

My name is Badr Alahmad. I am Ph.D candidate at University of North Taxes. I am conducting a research study about social support. I kindly request your permission to use some items from the 40-item self-report measure of the Inventory of Social Supportive Behaviors (ISSB). Thank you for your support.

Regards,

Bad Alahmad

---

Manuel Barrera Jr.
Professor and Honors Faculty
Psychology Department
Box 871104
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-1104
Hi Badr,
I am happy for you to use it for your research. Please keep me updated on how it goes.
Cheers,
Juanita Muller
On 28/05/2016, at 1.02 AM, "Alahmad, Badr" <Badr@lahmad@my.unt.edu> wrote:

Dear Dr. Muller

My name is Badr Alahmad. I am Ph.D candidate at University of North Texas. I am conducting a research study about social support. I kindly request your permission to use some items from the 36-item measurement of the Latent and Manifest Benefits scale (LAMB). Thank you for your support.

Regards,

Badr Alahmad
Dear researcher, Mr. Badr Alahmad

We would like to thank you for your interest in including our beneficiaries (job seekers) in your research study. The Human Resources Development Fund (HRDF) welcomes you and would like to support you with your research directly or indirectly via our partners. Please do not hesitate to contact us at 011-288-7937, when support is needed for conducting your research survey via our system or partners branches.

Sincerely,

Employment Channels Director (TAQAT)

Ahmed Saud Aljujaish
Dear Mr. Alahmad,

Please feel free to cite from our Web site whatever you want. However, please adhere to the scientific standards of citing. For example, Cohen and Hattie have to be cited as secondary sources from our web site.

Thank you very much and good luck for your dissertation.

Alexandra Lenhard

Am 21.08.2016 um 20:20 schrieb Alahmad, Badr:

Dear Dr. Lenhard

My name is Badr Alahmad. I am Ph.D candidate at University of North Taxes. I am conducting a research study about social support. I kindly request your permission to use the table of interpretation for different effect sizes (Cohen, 1988; Hattie, 2007) in my dissertation as an appendix. Thank you for your support.

Regards,

Bad Alahmad

___

Psychometrica –
Institut für psychologische Diagnostik

Dr. Alexandra Lenhard
Am Kreuz 14
97337 Dettelbach

Tel.: +49 (0)9324 – 68 48 25 1
Fax: +49 (0)9324 – 68 48 25 2
URL: http://www.psychometrica.de
Steuer-IdNr: 227/244/68848
USt-IdNr: DE 258/116/135
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