



Careers after COVID-19: challenges and changes

Linda M. Hite & Kimberly S. McDonald

To cite this article: Linda M. Hite & Kimberly S. McDonald (2020) Careers after COVID-19: challenges and changes, Human Resource Development International, 23:4, 427-437, DOI: [10.1080/13678868.2020.1779576](https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2020.1779576)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2020.1779576>



Published online: 13 Jul 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 6112



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

ARTICLE



Careers after COVID-19: challenges and changes

Linda M. Hite and Kimberly S. McDonald

Purdue University Fort Wayne

ABSTRACT

There are few certainties in our visions of post-COVID-19 careers, but change is inevitable. This article will explore how HRD can be proactive in addressing the immediate needs of the post-pandemic workforce and workplaces, as they strive to recover and resume a productive future. Uncertainties about employment and employability, how workplaces will be configured, the future of some careers and the possibilities for new opportunities will weigh heavily on individuals as they navigate these challenges. Drawing on the career shock, resilience, and sustainable careers literature, we consider how both individual and contextual factors will impact people and their occupations moving forward.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 4 June 2020
Accepted 4 June 2020

KEYWORDS

careers; COVID-19; HRD;
career resilience; career
shocks

The COVID-19 pandemic has been widely determined to be both a health and an economic crisis, with updates of progression addressing losses of lives and of jobs. As countries and organizations begin their evolution from initial reactive surprise at the scope and depth of the crisis to strategies for recovery, opportunities arise for change. McKinsey Institute, which tracks global economic trends, suggests that COVID-19 has moved the conversation about the future of work into the present (Lund et al. 2020), accentuating the need for a long-term perspective that does not just rebuild from past models, but develops strategies that create resilience for future crises. At this point, there is much we do not know about our future following COVID-19, but we can expect change in how, where, and even when work is accomplished.

How will the coronavirus experience affect the future of careers? Will there be a rush of people choosing to be health care providers, wanting to be of service, just as 9/11 boosted military enlistment? Or, will the sights of stressed medical personnel, working long hours and risking their lives make potential doctors, nurses, and allied health workers reconsider their options? Will more students seek careers in biological science or pharmaceuticals to create medical tests and vaccines for future pandemics? Or, will the scientifically-minded take their skills into a tech world that looms larger as we become more on-line dependent? Will harried parents, weary of struggling with their children's on-line classes, advocate for better pay and benefits for K-12 and special education teachers, boosting the ranks of educators? Or, will the rise of on-line learning reduce the need for teachers? While we do not yet know what types of jobs will thrive, survive, or become obsolete, we can speculate on what we might expect from a recovery by observing data and trends.

Early adaptations for returning to worksites have already revealed changes in brick and mortar facilities and in interaction patterns for service as well as manufacturing sector jobs. Workplaces are revamping interiors to accommodate social distancing, even when working directly with the public is part of the job. After years of studies proposing flexitime and working from home options, COVID-19 reinforced that some jobs can be done from home, and that people can meet on-line more cost effectively and safely than travelling to other parts of the country or world (Friedman 2020). Knowing that, it is likely telecommuting for all or part of the work-week will continue for safety, convenience, and financial savings. The increasing interface of work and technology will inevitably include automation, as organizations seek options that would let them remain productive when the next pandemic strikes. A renewed push to automate will have short and long term ramifications for the future of work and the economic security of workers.

Speculative or not, COVID-19 has and will continue to impact careers. Fortunately, many career scholars and practitioners have gradually recognized the chaos that has surrounded careers for the past 35 years, so there is a body of literature that may help as we work to navigate post-pandemic work. Using research about career shocks, resilience, and sustainable careers, this paper explores how individuals and organizations might evolve as they adapt to this new world of work. Implications for HRD specifically will be addressed as well.

Relevant career literature

Career shocks

Recognition of the impact of context on career development, a foundational aspect of sustainable careers, also is reflected in the career shocks literature. Although originally discussed in the mid-nineties (e.g. Lee and Mitchell 1994), the concept of career shocks has resurfaced as individuals negotiate unpredictable events in a rapidly changing career environment. A career shock is defined as

... a disruptive and extraordinary event that is, at least to some degree, caused by factors outside the focal individual's control and that triggers a deliberate thought process concerning one's career. The occurrence of a career shock can vary in terms of predictability, and can be either positively or negatively valenced (Akkermans, Seibert, and Mol 2018, 4).

The key elements in this definition are often referred to as: frequency, intensity, controllability and predictability, valence, and duration (Akkermans, Richardson, and Kraimer 2020; Akkermans, Seibert, and Mol 2018). Each of those factors are relevant to COVID-19. The concepts of frequency and intensity are evident in the 'infrequent and extraordinary' (Akkermans, Seibert, and Mol 2018, 4) nature of the event. In its global scope and voracity, COVID-19 has proven to be strikingly different from health-related events in recent memory. Bringing some workplaces to a standstill while pushing others to the limits of their capacity, it has significantly altered the work environment and profoundly affected employees in multiple industries. It also meets the criteria of being both largely unpredictable and outside the control of the general population, who were surprised and unprepared for the impact this event would have on careers in the present and potentially in the future. As a result, some jobs and career plans will disappear and

others will likely be revised to accommodate new ways of working. While on first review, the valence of the coronavirus might appear to be wholly negative; positive elements may yet emerge. Although some jobs and sectors of work will inevitably disappear in the aftermath of this pandemic; others will experience growth and new industries will emerge as we move forward. Individually, job loss might ultimately lead to re-evaluation of goals or a position that is a better fit (Akkermans, Richardson, and Kraimer 2020). Duration provides another significant dimension. As weeks move into potential months of curtailed work and social activity, risks rise for small businesses without deep reserves of financial capital; while all employers face revisions in work protocols to keep employees safe. Individually, those out of work or on reduced work deplete savings and must seek other avenues for income, and those still employed may review their short and long term career options following their COVID-19 experience. As Akkermans, Richardson, and Kraimer (2020) noted, the pandemic and the future recovery scenarios clearly illustrate how closely career shocks are influenced by the interconnection of the individual and context.

The personal, systemic, and global effects of this pandemic are certainly contextually-dependent, unanticipated by many, requiring some to re-consider their work lives, and substantive in outcome. While often addressed from the perspective of the employee, the ramifications of career shocks have ripple effects within organizations. That is particularly so when an unexpected and paradigm-crashing event, like this pandemic, has a global reach, making the shock itself and its aftermath a shared experience. So, while career shocks are defined from an individual perspective; the concepts are apt for organizations as they reconsider their own futures and that of their employees.

Career resilience

Resilience, as a topic of conversation or as a research focus, has been prevalent in recent years due to a variety of contextual factors:

- The rise of job insecurity and precarious work;
- The intensification of work;
- The increased use of technology and its impact on currency of skills, how work gets completed, when it gets completed, etc.;
- The blurring of work-nonwork boundaries;
- Work-life conflicts (Kossek and Perrigino 2016);

and now COVID-19. Almost daily we hear stories of how individuals' resilience has been tested or how individuals have demonstrated resilience due to this disease. Whether it is people navigating remote work, front line employees risking their lives by continuing to do their jobs in close contact with others, or those facing unemployment, resilience and work are an inevitable part of the coronavirus conversation.

Career resilience (CR) has been defined a variety of ways with scholars often debating whether it is a trait, a capacity or a process (Caza and Milton 2012; Kossek and Perrigino 2016; Mishra and McDonald 2017). Yet most recognize that it is about adapting and persisting when faced with disruptions or adversity and acknowledge its importance in considering careers in today's turbulent economic environment. Rochat, Masdonati, and

Dauwalder (2017) described a process of identifying the ‘essential ingredients of career resilience’ which includes: 1). Assessing situations that may result in risks to careers – in this case, COVID-19; 2). Identifying associated ‘risk and protective factors’ and 3). Determining successful, adaptive outcomes (130). They assert that CR serves as a mediator between adverse career circumstances and positive outcomes (e.g. employability, decent work, career success).

Most of the studies focused on CR recognize that both individual and contextual factors influence one’s career resilience (Kossek and Perrigino 2016; Lengelle, Van der Heijden, and Meijers 2017; Mishra and McDonald 2017). Individual characteristics such as traits, skills, attitudes and behaviours have been found to positively or negatively impact one’s resilience. Contextual factors such as supportive workplaces, job characteristics and supportive family also are important influences of CR (Mishra and McDonald 2017). These individual and contextual factors are those ‘risk and protective factors’ that Rochat, Masdonati, and Dauwalder (2017) suggested are so important in career resilience. So a lack of resources (e.g. material, human capital, social support) puts individuals at risk and can negatively influence their ability to be resilient; whereas protective factors (e.g. strong social support, variety of skills) can lead to positive outcomes.

While the value of CR is clear, one of the major criticisms of the push to encourage employee resilience is the focus on changing the individual, rather than changing the environment which often is the root cause of the problem (Adler 2013; Britt et al. 2016; Rochat, Masdonati, and Dauwalder 2017). Unfortunately, lack of resilience is often perceived as a ‘character flaw’ (Britt et al., 398) and organizations would prefer to hire for resilience and offer resilience training rather than changing those conditions within an organization that may be causing the adversity. This is a critical point as workplaces strategize a post-pandemic future of work. How can systems invested in retaining a talented workforce build cultures that foster resilience and how can HRD help?

Sustainability and post COVID-19 careers

Definitions of sustainable careers address four aspects, time, social space, agency, and meaning. Operationally, this means that sustainable careers encompass the entire life-span, incorporating the past, investing in the present and innovating for the future, including paid and unpaid work. They recognize the intersection of multiple life contexts, including social, work, and family, accommodating the needs of each. Finally, they are guided by individually crafted career decisions that value meaning as well as employability (Lawrence, Hall, and Arthur 2017; Van der Heijden and DeVos 2017). Key to this concept is the further acknowledgement of shared responsibility between individuals and the organizations that employ them. While not created for this COVID-19 era, these elements fit well as we delve into the future of careers.

Unintended benefits of sheltering in place have included opportunities for reflection on work life, past, present and future, perhaps reconsidering career and personal goals. It has fostered a renewed recognition of community interconnectivity, highlighting the greater context in which we live and work; and reinforced the links among work, social, and family life on an unprecedented scale. As individuals and organizations move out of this first phase of COVID-19 adaptation, all have been changed by the experience, and that will be reflected in the way we think about and approach work going forward.

A key aspect of building a sustainable post-coronavirus career will be learning from this experience and applying that knowledge. Heslin, Keating, and Ashford (2020) explained that for individuals being in a learning mode is a ‘meta-competency in the quest for career sustainability’ (11). The McKinsey Institute (Lund et al. 2020) echoed that view, but from a systems perspective, noting that successfully moving beyond this crisis will likely require” ... innovation, learning and adaptation” (2). Chudzikowski, Gustafsson, and Tams (2020) added another dimension to the sustainability connection to post-COVID work, suggesting additional layers of complexity regarding how context influences the career decision making process. They asserted that individuals make career choices based on how they prioritize their needs in conjunction with the needs of their communities and their organizations, and that these priorities may vary by career phase, with choices changing at different stages. Organizations invested in retaining talent and fostering a sustainable culture can assist in this process by offering support and exploring options to keep employees engaged and growing over time (Chudzikowski, Gustafsson, and Tams 2020). As we move forward, there is an opportunity to create and reinforce sustainable workplaces that adhere to the triple bottom line of profits, planet, and people. This is a re-set opportunity.

Conservation of resources (COR) theory

All three of these career constructs have used Hobfoll’s Conservation of Resources (COR) theory as a theoretical framework to help explain how careers are sustained, the potential effects of career shocks, and how resources can impact career resilience (Akkermans, Seibert, and Mol 2018; De Vos, Van der Heijden, and Akkermans 2020; Kossek and Perrigino 2016). COR theory was developed to help explain what happens when individuals are confronted with stress. According to Hobfoll (1989), people work to build and preserve resources (e.g. objects, personal characteristics, conditions, energies) and will try to reduce the loss of these resources when stress occurs. While many stress theories focus on the individual and how individuals respond and cope, COR theory emphasizes the importance of the environment in the stress process and how it can deplete or enhance people’s resources (Hobfoll 2001). So this notion of building and conserving resources can explain and be helpful in managing career shocks, developing resilience, and sustaining careers. However, what happens to those with very few resources to draw upon? As Hobfoll (1989) noted: ‘... resources are not distributed equally, and those people who lack resources are most vulnerable to additional losses’ (519). Additionally, Hobfoll (2001) theorized that events can threaten one’s ‘resource capacity’ and these events can pose greater problems for those ‘less resource-endowed members of economically developed nations and for underdeveloped and economically challenged nations’ (340).

While growing divides between those that have and those that do not have worsened in the past few years, this event, COVID-19, has exacerbated those divides. Inequalities among populations within countries (e.g. low income, marginalized individuals) and inequalities between countries have become more pronounced due to COVID-19 (Ren 2020). Many people will not have the resources needed to be resilient in dealing with this career shock. So what can be done to ensure individuals have the resources and protective factors to help build their resilience to weather this crisis? Clearly, this requires more than

a single, short term remedy. Rather it involves a sustained effort on the part of organizations, governments, and communities to consider a variety of ways to help individuals build and retain resources. A systemic approach that acknowledges the interconnectedness of business, government, and society is necessary. The coronavirus has reinforced these linkages, extending across boundaries and requiring concerted efforts to work together or fail. Our recovery will require the same kind of commitment not to leave large segments of society behind as we move forward.

Implications for HRD

Helping individuals within organizations

There are ways individuals can recover from shocks and build their resilience. Seibert, Kraimer, and Heslin (2016) provided specific psychological and behavioural strategies individuals can use during this process. Included in their strategies are ways to develop a growth mindset, reconsider and/or reframe career goals, seek out training and development opportunities, and build strong career networks. Clearly these strategies are within HRD professionals' wheelhouse, indicating HRD can play an important role in helping individuals recover and sustain their careers post COVID-19. It may involve providing training to assist employees in developing additional skills or to retool for other jobs, as well as helping individuals with their future career plans, including explorations of realistic options that help build sustainable careers. While the idea of HRD practitioners being well versed in career guidance is not new (e.g. McDonald and Hite 2016), the process of reclaiming workplaces after COVID-19 will make career development an essential part of HRD for organizations interested in not just recovering, but in creating workplaces that will be better prepared to address future disruptive events.

All of the strategies we have discussed involve learning, that meta-competency that Heslin, Keating, and Ashford (2020) identified as key to sustainable careers. Learning will be critical as we all adapt to new ways of working. Even before the pandemic prompted reconsideration of employment places and processes, alternative approaches to work were being explored. One of those involves moving from job specialization into more generalization (Epstein 2019). An example of this perspective appeared in *The Atlantic* last year. The author described life on a technologically advanced Navy ship with 'hybrid sailors,' rather than specialists, where each person is capable of doing multiple jobs, as needed, and where constant learning is the norm in a fluid work environment (Useem 2019). While the author could not have foreseen the coronavirus, the ideas of the article were starkly demonstrated by health care professionals who could step outside their respective specialties to assist in fighting the virus, improvise in the moment, and respond to multiple needs with flexibility and speed. We saw a similar, if not as urgent, response when schools abruptly closed and educators on multiple levels were required to develop on-line lessons with little guidance or preparation time. Like the health care professionals, they needed to be creative and able to adapt in the moment, calling on a myriad of skills. It is not a stretch to imagine a model of well-prepared, constantly learning, generalists as a potential template for post-COVID-19 careers.

Fortunately, HRD practitioners are well equipped to both develop and implement learning-focused activities that will be essential if organizations move towards

a generalist work environment. This process may involve more cross training, formal and informal learning, job sharing, coaching, consulting, and fostering a culture that promotes agile learning and rewards innovation in work processes.

A critical part of creating and sustaining a learning culture is recognizing how differently employees have experienced this crisis, and what they might need to return to work and be successful. Treating each employee on an individual basis will be important because for some, this pandemic has not been a career shock, but rather a minor distraction or an opportunity to spend more time with family. For others, all outward appearances might suggest it has had little effect on their careers, but for a variety of reasons (e.g. fears, health concerns, impact on loved ones) the influence could be great. For many, the pandemic has and will continue to have profound consequences regarding career plans and livelihood due to job elimination, drastic changes in how work gets done, and/or businesses shuttered.

Concerns on all levels are likely to span both the health and economic aspects of the pandemic, from immediate fears about safety for self and family to apprehensions about future job security. These alarms will be most acute for workers who have been furloughed or displaced. While gig workers and those in tenuous jobs have long faced these anxieties, others who might have taken a steady job for granted are now left wondering and worried as we all face an uncertain future. Reactions may also differ depending on where people are in their lives. Choices, decisions, and strategies will vary whether individuals are in the early, mid or later stages of their careers (Akkermans, Seibert, and Mol 2018). HRD needs to be cognizant of the differences in valence and individual responses to this crisis and work to help employees depending on their specific needs. Practitioners also can play a critical part in fostering employees' ability to recover resources and manage career shocks in the role of advocate (McDonald and Hite 2018).

Advocating within organizations and communities

Often relegated to the periphery of HRD, advocacy might feel like a stretch for practitioners already straining to balance employees' career development goals with supporting the financial success of their organizations. It also may pose a challenge, since HRD, while well positioned to suggest changes for the well-being of the workforce, might be constrained by organizational plans and priorities. Admittedly, there may be hurdles and risks; but advocacy can be strategic and measured, working within the existing climate to lay the groundwork for assessing options and introducing ideas with mutual employee-employer benefits. As systems begin to ramp up work again, many already are reconsidering protocols and processes, making this an ideal time for HRD to encourage change. A timely target for HRD advocacy could be a review of salary and health benefit disparities among employees. COVID-19 has emphasized the growing global financial and resources gap. Even prior to this crisis, experts expressed grave concerns about the risk expanding inequality posed to overall economic growth and political stability (ILO 2016; Keeley 2015). The pandemic induced job losses in the informal and formal economy and reports of a slow recovery, with some jobs never returning, have exacerbated these concerns. This complex issue plays out on a smaller scale in many organizations, where change could begin.

Robust and accessible mental health services are another potential advocacy point as the pandemic recovery continues. HRD practitioners may find the literature on stress and post traumatic growth to be helpful as they prepare to lobby for additional mental health resources within their organizations, train supervisors and managers to be more aware of mental health challenges, and work with employees to ensure they are aware of these resources and know how to access them. Organizations, along with government agencies, can partner in developing innovative ways to help those most impacted by COVID-19. Efforts at the systems level would be strengthened with additional HRD support for community and governmental policies and practices that foster more equitable pay structures and healthy workplaces.

HRD also can exert influence on developing more humane organizational cultures that foster a greater sense of altruism, empathy, and prosocial values, ‘enhancing societal well-being through one’s work experiences’ (Dik, Duffy, and Steger 2012, 32; Florea, Cheung, and Herndon 2013). The timing is good to reinforce that approach in systems, as companies consider how to keep those working from home engaged, how to mesh staggered work schedules, or possibly how to implement a generalist approach to their workplaces. HRD is well positioned to teach, model and advocate for adopting prosocial values in organizations.

Practicing self-care

Given the many responsibilities a post-pandemic workplace will place on practitioners, it will also be important for HRD professionals to engage in self-care. While we believe HRD should be valued now more than ever, some practitioners may find themselves vulnerable to job loss or additional stress in their efforts to assist employees and their organizations in this complicated and difficult time. Building one’s own resources to ensure resilience might include focusing on learning and expanding and enhancing personal skill sets. Seeking the support of others such as friends, family, colleagues, and on-line communities can help with emotional and social needs, as well as with learning (Bimrose et al. 2019). Additionally, attending to one’s physical and spiritual needs during this time can help with coping and burnout (Skovholt, Grier, and Hanson 2001).

Conclusion

It is human nature to want to know, to seek answers, even to look into that crystal ball for a glimpse to the future. Times of uncertainty increase that need. COVID-19 has prompted a global sense of uncertainty, but its legacy remains to be seen. So, the questions posed in our introduction remain rhetorical, because we do not yet know the full impact of the pandemic on careers. The data regarding increasing unemployment numbers and relative gains and losses change as the pandemic progresses. Although there is some consensus that the most vulnerable workers during this crisis have been those already in insecure positions, in the informal economy, or in low wage, or part-time work, and that many of those jobs are not likely to be reinstated (ILO 2016; U.S. Private Sector Job Quality Index 2020). One estimate indicates 42% of all jobs lost will not return. However, the same study suggests work reallocation will ameliorate some of the damage. They found three new hires for every ten positions lost to the coronavirus, as companies

like Amazon and Walmart experienced surges while other businesses declined (Barrero, Bloom and Davis 2020). What is still unknown is the speed of the recovery and how particular job sectors will be affected over time. The variables are too much in flux for definitive numbers at this point. Historically, careers and work are always in a state of change, with some jobs becoming obsolete and others emerging to meet the needs of each new era (e.g. the first industrial revolution, the information age, and now the fourth industrial revolution). So, while COVID-19 has been a wrenching experience, and, as noted earlier, has thrust choices about the future of work into the present, we can recover; but it will take time and effort.

HRD has an opportunity in this moment to play a significant role in helping individuals and organizations find and support resilience, manage the shocks, replenish reduced resources, and build more sustainable career cultures. How will we respond?

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

References

- Adler, A. B. 2013. "Resilience in a Military Occupational Health Context: Directions for Future Research." In *Building Psychological Resilience in Military Personnel: Theory and Practice*, edited by R. R. Sinclair and T. W. Britt, 223–235. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Akkermans, J., J. Richardson, and M. Kraimer. 2020. "The COVID-19 Crisis as a Career Shock: Implications for Careers and Vocational Behaviors." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103434.
- Akkermans, J., S. E. Seibert, and S. T. Mol. 2018. "Tales of the Unexpected: Integrating Career Shocks in the Contemporary Careers Literature." *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology* 44: a1503. doi:10.4102/sajip.v44i0.1503.
- Barrero, J. M., N. Bloom, and S. J. Davis. 2020. "COVID-19 Is Also a Reallocation Shock." *Working paper No. 2020-59*, May 5. The Becker Friedman Institute website https://bfi.uchicago.edu/wp-content/uploads/BFI_WP_202059.pdf
- Bimrose, J., A. Brown, R. Mulvey, B. Kieslinger, C. M. Fabian, T. Schaefer, S. Kinkel, T. Kopp, and R. T. Dewanti. 2019. "Transforming Identities and Co-constructing Careers of Career Counselors." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 111: 7–23. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2018.07.008.
- Britt, T. W., W. Shen, R. R. Sinclair, M. R. Grossman, and D. M. Klieger. 2016. "How Muchdo We Really Know about Employee Resilience?" *Industrial and Organizational Psychology* 9: 378–404. doi:10.1017/iop.2015.107.
- Caza, B. B., and L. P. Milton. 2012. "Resilience at Work: Building Capability in the Face of Adversity." In *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Scholarship*, edited by K. S. Cameron and G. M. Spreitzer, 895–908. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chudzikowski, K., S. Gustafsson, and S. Tams. 2020. "Constructing Alignment for Sustainable Careers: Insights from the Career Narratives of Management Consultants." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 117. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2019.05.009.
- De Vos, A., B. I. J. M. Van der Heijden, and J. Akkermans. 2020. "Sustainable Careers: Towards a Conceptual Model." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 117. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2018.06.011.
- Dik, B. J., R. D. Duffy, and M. F. Steger. 2012. "Enhancing Social Justice by Promoting Prosocial Values in Career Development Interventions." *Counseling and Values* 57: 31–37. doi:10.1002/j.2161-007X.2012.00005.x.

- Epstein, D. 2019. *Range: Why Generalists Triumph in a Specialized World*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Florea, L., Y. H. Cheung, and N. C. Herndon. 2013. "For All Good Reasons: Role of Values in Organizational Sustainability." *Journal of Business Ethics* 114: 393–408. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1355-x.
- Friedman, Z. 2020. "How COVID-19 Will Change the Future of Work." *Forbes*, May 6. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/zackfriedman/2020/05/06/covid-19-future-of-work-coronavirus/#5b1320a273b2>
- Heslin, P. A., L. A. Keating, and S. J. Ashford. 2020. "How Being in Learning Mode May Enable a Sustainable Career across the Lifespan." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 117. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2019.103324.
- Hobfoll, S. E. 1989. "Conservation of Resources: A New Attempt at Conceptualizing Stress." *American Psychologist* 44 (3): 513–524. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513.
- Hobfoll, S. E. 2001. "The Influence of Culture, Community, and the Nested-self in the Stress Process: Advancing Conservation of Resources Theory." *Applied Psychology* 50 (3): 337–421. doi:10.1111/1464-0597.00062.
- ILO (International Labour Organization). 2016. *Global Wage Report 2016/17: Wage Inequality in the Workplace*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Keeley, B. 2015. *Income Inequality: The Gap between Rich and Poor*. Paris: OECD.
- Kossek, E. E., and M. B. Perrigino. 2016. "Resilience: A Review Using A Grounded Integrated Occupational Approach." *The Academy of Management Annals* 10 (1): 729–797. doi:10.5465/19416520.2016.1159878.
- Lawrence, B. S., D. T. Hall, and M. B. Arthur. 2017. "Sustainable Careers Then and Now." In *Handbook of Research on Sustainable Careers*, edited by A. DeVos and B. I. J. M. Van der Heijden, 432–449. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Lee, T. W., and T. R. Mitchell. 1994. "An Alternative Approach: The Unfolding Model of Voluntary Employee Turnover." *Academy of Management Review* 19 (1): 51–89. doi:10.5465/amr.1994.9410122008.
- Lengelle, R., B. I. J. M. Van der Heijden, and F. Meijers. 2017. "The Foundations of Career Resilience." In *Psychology of Career Adaptability, Employability, and Resilience*, edited by K. Maree, 29–47. Switzerland: Springer.
- Lund, S., K. Ellingrud, B. Hancock, and J. Manyika 2020, April. "COVID-19 and Jobs: Monitoring the US Impact on People and Places." McKinsey Global Institute website. <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/public-sector/our-insights/covid-19-and-jobs-monitoring-the-us-impact-on-people-and-places>
- McDonald, K., and L. Hite. 2016. *Career Development: A Human Resource Development Perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- McDonald, K. S., and L. M. Hite. 2018. "Conceptualizing and Creating Sustainable Careers." *Human Resource Development Review* 17 (4): 349–373. doi:10.1177/1534484318796318.
- Mishra, P., and K. McDonald. 2017. "Career Resilience: An Integrated Review of the Empirical Literature." *Human Resource Development Review* 16: 207–234. doi:10.1177/1534484317719622.
- Ren, G. 2020, April. "COVID-19: Exposing & Exacerbating Global Inequality." Health Policy Watch website. <https://healthpolicy-watch.org/covid-19-exposing-worsening-global-inequality/>
- Rochat, S., J. Masdonati, and J. P. Dauwalder. 2017. "Determining Career Resilience." In *Psychology of Career Adaptability, Employability, and Resilience*, edited by K. Maree, 125–141. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Seibert, S. E., M. L. Kraimer, and P. A. Heslin. 2016. "Developing Career Resilience and Adaptability." *Organizational Dynamics* 45:: 245–257. doi:10.1016/j.orgdyn.2016.07.009.
- Skovholt, T. M., T. L. Grier, and M. R. Hanson. 2001. "Career Counseling for Longevity: Self-care and Burnout Prevention Strategies for Counselor Resilience." *Journal of Career Development* 27 (3): 167–176. doi:10.1177/089484530102700303.

- U.S. Private Sector Job Quality Index. 2020. "Statement #3 from the U.S. Private Sector Job Quality Index ("JQI") Team on Economic Impacts of COVID-19 Related Unemployment." June 1. <https://www.jobqualityindex.com/#flashsection>
- Useem, J. 2019, July. "At Work, Expertise Is Falling Out of Favor." *The Atlantic* 324: 56–65.
- Van der Heijden, B. I. J. M., and A. DeVos. 2017. "Sustainable Careers: Introductory Chapter." In *Handbook of Research on Sustainable Careers*, edited by A. DeVos and B. I. J. M. Van der Heijden, 1–19. Cheltenham, Glos, UK: Edward Elgar.