Flexible work arrangements, Work Engagement, Turnover Intentions, and

Psychological Health

Carolyn Timms

James Cook University, Australia

Paula Brough

Griffith University, Australia

Michael O'Driscoll

University of Waikato, Australia

Thomas Kalliath

Australian National University

Oi Ling Siu

Lingnan University, Hong Kong

Cindy Sit

University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

Danny Lo

Shue Yan University, Hong Kong

Corresponding author: Dr Carolyn Timms, Psychology, School of Arts and Social

Sciences, James Cook University, McGregor Road, Smithfield, 4870, Queensland, Australia.

Email: carolyn.timms@jcu.edu.au (timmsy.timms036@gmail.com)

1

Abstract

Flexible work arrangements (FWAs) are often written into company policies to demonstrate organisational sensitivity to potentially difficult interfaces between employees' work and non-work domains. The current research investigated employees' use of FWAs and relationship to work engagement, with turnover intentions and psychological strain also used as criterion variables for comparison purposes. A heterogeneous sample of Australian employees ($n = 823$) responded to two waves of data collection with a twelve month interval. It was expected that supportive aspects of organisational culture would be consistent with increased employee utilization of FWAs, high work engagement, low turnover and low levels of psychological strain, and the opposite would be found for hindering aspects of organisational culture. It was also expected that supportive organisational culture would demonstrate an enduring effect over time. In general, research findings supported these hypotheses. However, the research also identified a negative relationship between use of FWAs and work engagement over time. This suggests that take-up of FWAs is highly dependent on workplace cultural norms. The implications of these results are discussed.

Work-life balance refers to manageability of the different domains of one's life so that they complement rather than compete with each other. Juggling responsibilities to work, family and community, as well as requirements for physical health and psychological well-being such as hobbies, exercise and other personal interests can create competing priorities in people's lives (e.g., Brough, O'Driscoll, & Kalliath, 2005). Unsatisfactory resolution of the tension generated by these competing priorities is referred to as *work-life conflict* (Carlson, Kacmar & Williams, 2000). Work-life conflict is associated with exhaustion and psychological strain (Brough et al., 2005) and leads to deleterious health outcomes, absenteeism and turnover (Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler, & Wethington, 1989).

Kanter (1977) highlighted the interwoven nature of the different aspects of employees' lives and observed that it was inevitable that emotional states would permeate domain boundaries for better or for worse. Positive emotional states that permeate work and non-work domains can augment and expand individuals' feelings of well-being and self efficacy (O'Driscoll & Brough, 2010; Thornthwaite, 2004) thereby creating an *upward spiral* of positive affect. According to Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne and Grzywacz (2006) this leads to a sense of mastery, which in turn empowers individuals and benefits organisations (see also, Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002).

Abbott, De Cieri, and Iverson (1998) found that the organisational costs of ignoring the personal commitments and responsibilities of employees included high absenteeism and turnover (see also Brough, 2005). It follows that policies designed to enhance employees' autonomy and integration of their work and non-work lives will be beneficial to organisations (De Cieri, Holmes, Abbott, & Pettit, 2005). Carless and Wintle (2007) suggested that the provision of flexible solutions such as flexible hours, career paths and telecommuting can make organisations more attractive to prospective employees (see also, Casper & Buffardi, 2004; Cook, 2009). Thus it is in the best interests of organisations to provide the means by

which employees can manage disparate responsibilities, in order to attract and retain skilled personnel.

Flexible Work Arrangements

Flexible work arrangements (FWAs) are strategies by which employees can better balance demands from multiple domains (Allen, 2001; Brough et al., 2005). Examples of FWAs include: *flexitime* (e.g., employees choose their start and finishing times of work), *compressed work week* (e.g., employees choose to work four long days instead of five regular days), *telecommuting* (e.g., employees work from home via information communication technology [ICT]) and finally, *part-time* work. Examples of other flexible employment options that organisations can provide are more family-specific and include parental leave and on-site childcare facilities. The current study focuses on FWAs, as previous research has found that these provisions are also attractive to employees who do not have family responsibilities but who nevertheless desire flexibility between their work and non-work lives (Brough & O'Driscoll, 2010; Carless & Wintle, 2007; Hall, 1990).

Organisational Culture

Articulation of FWA policies in company documents is beneficial for organisations in terms of reputation (as employee friendly workplaces) and attracting potential employees (Carless & Wintle, 2007). However, Dikkers, Geurts, den Dulk, Peper, and Kompier (2004) found that actual access or use of FWAs was influenced by the pre-existing *culture* of a workplace which (because it is usually psychological in nature and informal in implementation), may have little resemblance to official policy (Behsen, 2005; Kirby & Krone, 2002). Consequently once they are employed, workers acquire an insider's understanding of the difference between written policies and unwritten practices embedded in organisational norms (Denison, 1996). Haggerty and Wright (2010) suggested that informal processes within the firm constitute powerful signals that adjust employee behaviour.

According to Denison (1996) this process includes psychological and sociological processes. This has parallels with the literature on psychological climate, which refers to the impact of organisational systems on individuals in the workplace. Parker, Baltes, Young, Huff, Altmann, Lacost, and Roberts (2003) also observed that organisational culture could more accurately be described as 'psychological climate' because it is related to many individual outcomes including psychological well-being and employee performance. Parker and colleagues found that psychological climate is built on relationships (leader, work group and organisation), work role and job requirements. They found that an optimal organisational culture was generated when people worked well together to overcome difficulties and challenges. Bowen and Ostroff (2004) suggested that Human Resource Management (HRM) departments can play an important role in conveying messages that are consistent in both formal and informal organisational systems. This is an important aspect of organisational productivity as complications facing people in the work environment may emanate from outside work and the availability of FWAs could feature as workable solutions to these problems.

Parker et al.'s (2003) optimal organisational culture would be defined by Dikkers et al. (2004) as a *supportive* culture. A supportive culture is one which commonly values non-work aspects of people's lives and seeks to accommodate the multiple needs of workers so that they will be psychologically present for work tasks (i.e., recognition of work-life balance). On the other hand, Dikkers et al. defined a *hindering* organisational culture as requiring workers to prioritise work over their non-work needs. This can take the form of expectations that workers will put extra time into ensuring that work will be done (time expectations) or norms where workers get a clear message that prioritising personal needs will have negative consequences for their career progression (Dikkers et al.). It is therefore observed that because supportive and hindering cultures affect people's responses to their

work and general functioning outside of work; both contribute to psychological climate within an organisation (see Denison, 1996; Parker et al., 2003). Hence, while the present paper refers to organisational culture, overlaps with organisational and psychological climate are also acknowledged.

Behsen (2005) observed that an organisational focus on providing a supportive environment would be rewarded by increases in workers' satisfaction, decreased stress and turnover intentions. Behsen thus emphasized employee *empowerment* via the provision of organisational policies which enabled workers to be autonomous in respect to achieving work goals and performance (see also, Laschinger & Finegan, 2005). Investigations conducted by Casper, Fox, Sitzmann, and Landy (2004) and Laschinger and Finegan (2005) demonstrated that immediate managers (supervisors) assume an important function in the translation of cultural attitudes toward using FWAs within organisations (see also Thompson, Brough & Schmidt, 2006). Hindering organisational cultures convey strong signals to employees that accessing FWAs may have repercussions in terms of their personal career, may create extra burdens (work) for their colleagues, and produce work-group resentment (e.g., McDonald, Pini, & Bradley, 2007; Thompson, Jahn, Kopelman, & Prottas, 2004).

An example of such a culture was provided by Timms, Lankshear, Anderson, and Courtney (2008, p. 156) who described a "*coke and pizza culture*" in the ICT industry (where it was customary for fast food to be brought in to expedite completion of projects after hours). According to Timms et al. this well-established norm was perceived as a major barrier to career advancement by professional women who, because of their non-work responsibilities, were unavailable for frequent late night work. The women observed that their career advancement was stymied by supervisors' negative judgments of their organisational commitment (see also Thornthwaite, 2004).

Kirby and Krone (2002) observed that in some organisations employees are pressured *not* to use policies designed to facilitate their work-life balance and (in reference to telecommuting) suggested that recognition may only be afforded to 'visible' work, rather than that work conducted offsite. McDonald et al. (2007) suggested that actual *reasons* for use of FWAs might moderate supervisory judgements of employee commitment. For example in McDonald's qualitative study, some respondents who used FWAs for the purpose of accommodating tertiary study (rather than caring for children), confidently commented that their personal career options would not be affected because their reasons did not include family responsibilities. Implicit within such a viewpoint is the widely accepted opinion that family commitments dilute employees' commitment to the organisation (e.g. Allen, 2001; Beauregard & Henry, 2009).

Work engagement

According to Salanova and Schaufeli (2008) the presence of work engagement among workers is an indicator of their intrinsic motivation. This is consistent with the theory of self determination (Ryan & Deci, 2000), which emphases the social context in which employees are proactive, empowered and engaged and the psychological climate aspect of organisational culture previously described by Parker et al. (2003). Employees who are engaged in their work find it energising, they experience a sense of pride in what they do, time at work passes quickly and they have a sense of personal fulfilment (Biggs, Brough, & Barbour, in press; Ryan & Deci, 2001; Saks, 2006). However, people's lives inevitably extend beyond their work. Sonnentag, Mojza, Binnewies, and Scholl (2008) observed that a key factor in employee engagement was the ability to 'switch off' or psychologically detach from work during non-work time. Typically psychological detachment involves people's social relationships and activities such as catching up with friends or pursuing hobbies or other interests. In addition, most employees have other responsibilities that must be attended to and

for which they must be psychologically present, such as dependent children and/or other family matters, household tasks, and sport. Sonnentag et al. (2008) found that employees who were unable to achieve detachment from their work experienced a corresponding lowering of their work engagement. It is therefore observed that a long hours work culture described by a number of researchers (McDonald, et al., 2007; O'Driscoll et al. 2004; Peetz & Allan, 2005) could potentially erode employees' engagement with work.

Researchers have previously found that job satisfaction is a good predictor of employees' intentions to stay and it is also associated with low rates of absenteeism (e.g., Allen, 2001; Brough et al., 2005). Therefore it remains a parsimonious outcome measure of the most basic level of overall workplace health. However job satisfaction in and of itself does not sufficiently capture the positive energy that is found in workplaces where workers are thriving (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). Schaufeli and Bakker's description of an upward positive spiral where work engagement and self-efficacy lead to improved performance in both work and family domains is one of synergy and demonstrates some similarity with May, Gilson and Harter's (2004, p. 11) "engagement of the human spirit at work". Similarly, Carlson et al. (2006) suggested that the feeling of mastery gained through personal accomplishment contributed benefits across domains, thus empowering people to rise to challenges. According to Laschinger and Finegan (2005) empowerment of workers provides the means by which organisations can address shortages of skilled workers, by attracting highly qualified applicants and reducing absenteeism and turnover. This echoes a common theme within organisational research that engaged workers are less likely to seek alternative employment (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001; Schaufeli, 2004; Timms & Brough, in press).

According to the Job Demands Resources theory (JD-R, Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), resources within the work environment provide a counterbalance to work demands and

employee mental health. The theoretical linkage between FWAs and work engagement therefore lies in the discretion afforded to employees as to how work is done (Behsen, 2005) and how workers can achieve some mechanisms of control and autonomy..

The Current Research

Empirical investigations of the use of FWAs have primarily included job satisfaction as an outcome variable. Job satisfaction has demonstrated significant utility within studies of the importance of supportive work environments, effective work-life balance policies and work performance (e.g. Allen, 2001; Brough et al., 2005). However these investigations are unable to assess optimal workplace psychological health. Some research has included psychological strain (e.g., Brough, 2005; Brough, Timms, Siu, Kalliath, O'Driscoll, Sit, et al., in press; Lapierre & Allen, 2006) or burnout (e.g., Sonnentag, Kuttler, & Fritz, 2010) as health outcome measures. Schaufeli (2004) previously observed that, just as the absence of disease does not indicate physical health, the absence of strain is not indicative of psychological well-being. Therefore the current study anticipates that the inclusion of a specific psychological health criterion variable (work engagement) will provide more accurate information concerning the impact of FWAs on psychological well-being.

Drawing on these previous findings and extrapolating them to include the complex relationships of work engagement, use of FWAs and organisational culture (supportive and hindering); the following hypotheses are advanced for this research:

H1. Respondents who report that their workplace culture is distinguished by expectations that employees will put in long hours at work and their career will be negatively impacted if they use FWAs, will be unlikely to use them. They will demonstrate (a) lower work engagement, (b) higher turnover intentions and (c) higher psychological strain.

H2. Respondents who report that their workplace culture is supportive will be more likely to use FWAs. They will demonstrate (a) higher work engagement, (b) lower turnover intentions and (c) lower psychological strain.

Finally, there is a contextual component of the current research which introduces an exploratory aspect. Coincidentally the two data collection phases reported here were conducted in Australia in March 2008 (Time 1) and then in March 2009 (Time 2). Australia began to be affected by the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) in September 2008. While Australia's economic situation fared better than some other comparable countries, the Australian government did report declines in both employment figures and consumer confidence (Australian Senate House Committee, 2009). Rafferty, Schutz, and Yu (2010) noted that in such times government and business priorities tend to focus on physical needs rather than human capital and employees tend to be regarded as expendable, leading to staff cutbacks. The current research was directly impacted by the GFC due to restructuring and employee reductions by two participating organisations. Therefore an additional aim of the current study is to investigate any changes in responses between the two phases of the survey that may be attributed to the 2008-2009 Global Financial Crisis.

Method

Sample and Procedure

The sample consisted of employees from eight Australian organisations representing banking, education, public service and community service, who responded to two identical self-report surveys with a twelve month interval between administrations. The primary research sites were located in Queensland and the Australian Capital Territory; however the organizations surveyed included employees in all Eastern States of Australia. Response rates varied, ranging from 10% to 52% across the participating organisations, with an average response rate of 33%. It was found that those organisations who posted individual questionnaires directly to employees achieved higher response rates than those who

distributed surveys sent in a mass mail-out. In the lag between data collections, the GFC

began to have an impact in Australia, leading to the withdrawal of two participating

organisations from this research, therefore missing the Time 2 data collection. A total $N =$

823 (21.5%) workers were matched from the Time 1 and Time 2 survey responses.

Of the 823 matched respondents, the majority (72%) were female ($n = 593$).

Respondents ranged in age from 20 to 70 years, with an average age of 43 years (SD =10.30).

At Time 1, 351 (43%) respondents indicated that they were single (with no commitments to

spouse and/or dependents) and 57% ($n = 472$) indicated they had family commitments. Forty

three percent ($n = 352$) of respondents had a university or college degree and 70% of these (n

$= 248$) had at least one post-graduate qualification. The majority of respondents indicated

they were working in a full-time position ($n = 613$; 75%). The mean tenure reported by

respondents was 11 years (SD = 9.53).

Measures

       Organisational Culture: Eleven items from Dikkers, Geurts, Den Dul, and Kompier's

(Dikkers, Geurts, Den Dulk, B, & Kompier, 2004) organisational culture measure were

included. The measures consist of three subscales: *organisational support* (four-items) "In

general, this company is considerate towards employees' private situation"; *negative career*

consequences (hindrance; three-items) "In this company, employees who [temporarily]

reduce their working hours for private reasons are considered less ambitious" and *time*

expectations (hindrance; four-items) "In order to be taken seriously in this company,

employees should work long days and be available all the time". Respondents reported how

much they agreed with the statements on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 = 'totally

disagree' to 5 = 'totally agree'. High scores are therefore indicative of a supportive or

hindering organisational culture. Each subscale demonstrated adequate internal reliability

(Cronbach's alphas): organisational support = .87 (Time 1) and .88 (Time 2); negative career

consequences = .88 (Time 1) and .90 (Time 2), and time expectations = .86 (Time 1) and .88 (Time 2).

Supervisor Support: The four-item supervisor support scale developed by O'Driscoll, Brough, and Kalliath (O'Driscoll, 2000) was included. The items ask *how often* respondents had received support in relation to work-related problems in the previous three months. Items referred to helpful information or advice (*informational support*), sympathetic understanding and concern (*emotional support*), clear and helpful feedback (*feedback support*) and practical assistance (*practical support*). Respondents answered on a 6-point frequency scale, where 1 = 'never' and 6 = 'all the time'. High scores on the aggregate scale indicated high supervisor support. Internal consistencies (Cronbach's alphas) for supervisor support were .94 (T1) and .95 (T2).

Turnover intention: Brough and Frame's (Brough & Frame, 2004) three-item turnover intentions measure was included. An example item is: "How often have you seriously considered leaving your current job in the past six months?" Respondents answered on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = 'not at all' to 5 ='a great deal'. High scores therefore indicate high turnover intentions. Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) for the current study were .82 (T1) and .84 (T2).

Flexible Work Arrangements: The four-item FWA sub-scale from Allen's (2001) 10-item measure of work-life organisational policies was included. The four items referred to *flexitime, compressed working week, telecommuting,* and *part-time work*. Respondents selected one of four responses for each item: (1) not offered but I don't need it; (2) not offered but I could use it; (3) offered but not used; and (4) offered and I use it. To derive a score for benefit availability, responses (1) and (2) were coded '0' and responses (3) and (4) were coded '1'. Total benefit *availability* was computed by summing availability scores for all four items. The score for *usage* was derived by scoring responses (1), (2), and (3) as '0'

and response (4) as '1'. Total benefit *usage* was computed by summing usage scores across all four items. The categorical nature of FWA availability and usage scores makes the computation of reliability estimates irrelevant.

Work Engagement: Engagement was measured with the nine-item short version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003). An example item is "I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose". Respondents answered on a seven-point Likert-type scale, from 0 ='never' and 6 = 'always'. High scores therefore indicate higher levels of work engagement. Internal consistency for the UWES was .91 (Time 1 and Time 2).

Anxiety/Depression: The four item Anxiety/Depression subscale (Kalliath, O'Driscoll & Brough, 2004) from the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ, Goldberg, 1972) was utilized as a measure of psychological strain. The GHQ is a widely used measure of psychological strain that has consistently reported high levels of internal reliability in previous studies (e.g., Kalliath et al., 2004). Items from the GHQ were prefaced with the stem "Have you recently experienced the following in the past few weeks…" and a sample item from the Anxiety/Depression subscale is "been feeling unhappy or depressed?" The Anxiety/Depression items were measured on a four-point frequency scale with 0 = "more so than usual" and 3 = "much less than usual". In the current study anxiety/depression achieved a Cronbach's alpha of .81 (Time 1) and .80 (Time 2).

<div align="center">Results</div>

Descriptive data and correlations

Table 1 provides information in regard to the reported availability and use of FWAs at Time 1 and Time 2. It is observed that while respondents' *awareness* of the availability increased at Time 2, reported *usage* decreased over time. In regard to reported overall availability and use of FWAs reported in Table 1, these figures represent the creation of

dummy variables where in regard to availability (0 = no FWAs available and 1= at least one

FWA is available) and in regard to use (0= do not use FWAs and 1= use at least one FWA).

-----------------------------INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE------------------------

Table 2 provides descriptive information and mean score difference testing for the

research variables at both Time 1 and Time 2. Mean scores were statistically tested by paired

samples *t* tests with a Bonferroni adjustment probability level of .006 or *t* =3.09 critical value.

At Time 2 respondents reported significantly higher levels of work engagement than at Time

1, more awareness of availability of FWAs and yet reduced use of FWAs. These tests

produced large effect sizes; all other cross-time differences were not statistically significant.

-----------------------------INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE------------------------

The results of bivariate correlations of the research variables are provided in Table 3.

It is noted that most relationship directions are consistent with the study hypotheses. Negative

relationships between hindering elements of organisational culture (time expectations and

negative career consequences) and use of FWAs are consistent with our predictions (H1),

however the relationships are small or non-significant. Surprisingly, a negative relationship

was found between use of FWAs and work engagement (H2). The use of FWAs at Time 1

has a positive relationship with work engagement (Time 1) and a negative relationship with

work engagement at Time 2. Some explanations for this finding will be addressed in the

discussion.

---------------------------INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE------------------------------

Initial data cleaning involving residual scatter-plots associated with the regression

analyses revealed no issues in regard to heteroskedastisity or common method variance. Both

cross-sectional (T1) and longitudinal hierarchical multiple regression analyses were

conducted in order to compare our results with published (mostly cross-sectional) findings

and to also test the research hypotheses over time – a point that is still repeatedly requested

(e.g., Brough & O'Driscoll, 2010). The longitudinal analyses tested the ability of the Time 1 predictor variables to estimate the Time 2 criterion variables. This provides a sense of their capacity to endure over time. Gender, age and single/family status acted as controls in all regression equations. Summaries of these results are presented in Tables 4 and 5. The cross-sectional analyses (Time 1 variables, Table 4) indicated that turnover intentions were associated with being single, experiencing a 'long work hours' culture and a lack of supervisor support. Work engagement was associated with being single, experiencing a supportive supervisor and a supportive organisation. Anxiety/depression was associated with a lack of supervisor support and negative career consequences. The cross sectional regression analyses achieved $F(8, 784) = 24.90$, $p < .001$ for turnover intentions with the model explaining 19% of the variance, $F(8, 786) = 14.89$, $p < .001$ for work engagement with the model explaining 12% of the variance and $F(8, 782) = 11.53$, $p < .001$ for anxiety depression with the model explaining 10% of the variance.

----------------------------INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE----------------------------

Summaries of the longitudinal multiple regression analyses are presented in Table 5. In all cases the Time 1 criterion variables (step 1) were the strongest predictors of their Time 2 equivalents, with R^2 change observations revealing that minimal variance was contributed by the subsequent predictor variables. Similar to the cross-sectional analyses (Table 4), turnover intentions were associated with being single and experiencing a 'long work hours' culture. Work engagement at Time 2 was predicted by being married and/or having children. Most interestingly, *non*-use of FWAs at Time 1 was a significant predictor of work engagement at Time 2. The longitudinal regression analyses achieved $F(9, 779) = 39.91$, $p<.001$ for turnover intentions with the model explaining 31% of the variance, $F(9, 785) = 77.60$, $p<.001$ for work engagement with the model explaining 47% of the variance, and $F(9, 778) = 30.94$, $p<.001$ for anxiety depression with the model explaining 26% of the variance.

15

Discussion

This research assessed relationships between the type of organisational culture (support versus hindrance), employees' use of FWAs and their subsequent experiences of work engagement, turnover intentions and psychological strain. Findings in respect to hypotheses were mixed. Contrary to expectations, use of FWAs appeared to have minimal relationships with both turnover intentions and psychological strain. In addition, contrary to expectations (H2) the use of FWAs contributed to reduced work engagement over time. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, we found negative relationships between the use of FWAs and organisational hindrance. The predictions that employees' intentions to turnover would reflect a lack of supervisor and organisational support was supported in the cross-sectional analysis using T1 data, but was not supported over time (H1). In regard to turnover intentions, organisational time expectations were predictive in both the cross-sectional analysis (T1 data) and over time, whereas negative career consequences only demonstrated significance in the cross-sectional analysis (H1). Negative career consequences were similarly only predictive of anxiety/depression in the cross-sectional analysis but not over time.

The present study highlights the importance of a supportive organisational culture in attenuating employees' intentions to turnover and the development of psychological strain. It also serves to demonstrate that organisational expectations that employees will work long hours have a direct and robust relationship with turnover intentions. The current findings support previous research suggesting that the presence of work engagement among workers is an important signal to management that the organisation is functioning well in terms of communication, support and meeting the expectations of employees (Saks, 2006; Schaufeli,

2004). Therefore it is observed that work engagement provides researchers with a measure of the success, or otherwise, of organisational attempts to combine policies and practice.

FWAs and Organisational Culture.

Literature on the use of FWAs by employees suggests that these policies offer employees opportunities to balance their divergent needs in an autonomous manner (Behson, 2005). However, the current study suggests that employees may not consider that FWAs are real options, due to informal processes within organisations that do not support their use (Kirby & Krone, 2002; Thompson et al., 2004). In terms of the JD-R theoretical perspective (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) FWA provision could ostensibly be seen as an employee resource. On the other hand, it was apparent that without a supportive work environment, their presence within organisational policy may well constitute an extra burden on employees. This is because formal and informal message pathways within organisations may compete with each other, leaving employees in the position where the choice to use FWAs (supposedly in place to assist them in balancing the domains of their life) affects their future career prospects and supervisory judgments on their commitment (see Kirby & Krone, 2002). Peetz and Allan (2005) found that flexitime in particular had contributed to a firm's long hours culture. This had happened as the boundaries of previously standardised working hours had become blurred. Employees compared the perceived commitment of their colleagues (who started work earlier/finished later/skipped rest and meal breaks) to their own commitment and felt compelled to work longer hours. It is possible that some explanation for the current finding that work engagement was negatively associated with the use of FWAs is to be found in such informal message pathways.

This finding is inconsistent with previous literature advocating incorporation of FWAs in company policies. For example, Abbott et al. (1998) suggested that organisations should introduce family-friendly policies (including FWAs) in the interests of raising

employee satisfaction and lowering turnover. Cook (2009) suggested that offering FWAs might well be viewed by employees as a message that their contribution to the organisation is respected and valued (see also Brough et al., 2005). According to Laschinger and Finegan (2005), any message conveying respect for employees will be empowering and will build trust, thus contributing to work engagement. The current findings suggest that FWA provision within company policy has satisfied a requirement that the organisation be seen to be sensitive to the needs of employees. However, this provision is juxtaposed with the grinding reality that successful execution of work necessarily requires physical presence for long hours in the workplace. The presence of FWAs within organisational policy may well constitute an incongruent message that actually *increases* burdens on employees. Therefore, the strong message of the current research is that FWA provision without con-current supportive environments is *unlikely* to provide any of the positive outcomes suggested in previous research.

Organisational Culture, Use of Flexible Solutions and Work Engagement

Dikkers et al. (2004) found that high support (organisational and supervisor) occurred in tandem with high hindrance (time expectations and negative career consequences) and concluded that it was possible these two informal dimensions could co-exist within the experience of employees. Thus, organisations may recognise conflicting inter-domain demands on employees, and provide and encourage the use of flexible solutions to address employee problems. However, they also manage to convey a message of a company perception that those employees who do not work extra hours are not as seriously committed to their job and therefore could not be considered for promotion (e.g., Beauregard & Henry, 2009; Kirby & Krone, 2002). Inevitably this perception must be associated with cynical judgements in regard to organisational integrity and reliability on the part of employees. Our cross-sectional results support this conclusion in that hindrance and support were both

significant predictors of turnover intentions. Furthermore, the finding that the actual use of FWAs was also a predictor of turnover intentions and *non-use* of FWAs was a predictor of work engagement, suggests that respondents did not necessarily find using FWAs a congenial solution to their work-life interface issues.

Behson (2005) noted that informal mechanisms within organisations are far more influential in terms of employee outcomes than are formal mechanisms. In addition, previous research has observed that immediate supervisors are the most visible (Cook, 2009) and influential (McDonald et al., 2007; Thompson et al., 2006) representatives of organisational policies. Casper et al. (2004) commented that supervisors are often poorly informed as to the beneficial nature of FWAs. It is, therefore, possible that respondents who chose *not* to use FWA solutions to their work-life interface problems have ascertained that this non-use of FWA increases the perceived security of their jobs. Consequently individual employees might well be obliged to use FWAs as a *'trade-off'* (to balance work and non-work interests) in full knowledge that this will be damaging to their future career prospects and possibly their job security. It follows that this would be deleterious to their engagement with their work.

Limitations

It is believed that the second phase of our research was influenced by the GFC which occurred in Australia in late 2008. According to a government report (Australian Government, 2009) more than 150,000 full-time jobs were lost during the GFC in Australia. During this time many Australian workers were confronted by fears for their job security (Rafferty et al., 2010). Therefore it is possible that the current finding of reduction in use of FWAs at Time 2 was influenced by the prevailing economic conditions and that further research may demonstrate alternate findings. This point has also been observed elsewhere (Brough et al., in press).

A second limitation of the current research concerns the low response rates; this is a widely recognised problem of research involving self-report surveys, which according to Krosnick (1999) would not necessarily affect substantive conclusions. Sample responses were generally found to be representative of each organisation's general employee profiles in key demographic details. Finally, with the exception of turnover intentions, the current study reveals that only a small (but significant) proportion of variance in work engagement and anxiety/depression is explained by workplace culture, supervisor support and use of FWAs. This serves to highlight the synergistic nature of influences affecting the workplace environment and the difficulties faced by researchers in teasing out those that are most influential. In addition, as substantial proportions of turnover intentions, work engagement and anxiety/depression remain unexplained by the model, it is acknowledged that alternative variables must contribute to these outcomes. However it is also advanced that some variables (such as time expectations in regard to turnover and non-use of FWAs in regard to work engagement) retained their individual influence after controlling for Time one equivalent variables, and are therefore identified as important contributors which cannot be disregarded (see, Rosenthal & DiMatteo, 2001) .

Implications for Organisational Practise

The literature recommends that organisational provision of FWAs will provide employees with an effective tool to manage their work-life balance with autonomy (De Cieri et al., 2005), thereby reducing employee absenteeism, turnover intentions and job satisfaction (Abbott et al., 1998; Allen, 2001; Brough et al., 2005). The current research, using work engagement as a criterion variable, found that this is not necessarily the case. What has been highlighted in the current research is the fact that formal and informal processes within organisations work together. An important implication is that anomalies between these two forms of communication must be addressed in order to achieve well functioning workplaces.

Strategies provided by organisations for employees to gain autonomy in regard to their work-life balance must be combined with two-way communication that is sensitive to the perceptions of employees about the implications of using such policies. In addition, it is necessary for organisations to evaluate the effect of FWAs and educate supervisory personnel on the outcomes of such evaluations so that their tangible influence on employee outcomes is better informed.

Theoretical implications

The current research was conducted at a time where there was a downturn in economic conditions associated with widespread retrenchment (Rafferty et al., 2010). Using a JD-R perspective (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) in periods of difficult/insecure employment the fact that one remains employed could be regarded as a resource that assumes a higher profile than psychosocial features of the work environment. However, an alternative explanation might be that in such times people are more aware of the difficulties facing organisations. In addition, it is possible that organisations become more communicative in regard to conveying their strategies for negotiating altered circumstances to their employees (Rigby, 2003). Therefore, it is possible that the sense of involvement thus afforded may provide employees with emotional and intellectual recognition that encourages best efforts and best thinking (Kim & Mauborgene, 1998), thereby contributing to organisational productivity and contributing to work engagement.

Conclusion

The current research found an inverse relationship between use of FWAs and work engagement. Non-use of FWAs was associated with work engagement. It is possible that the current findings reflect some (temporary) instability in job security as a consequence of the Global Financial Crisis. The observed reduction in use of FWAs may, therefore, represent a sense of reduced job security and consequently a perceived need to be more visible within the

workplace to remind management personnel of employees' value. We also found that organisational hindrance had a positive (in the case of time expectations) relationship with employee turnover intentions, which was sustained over time. It is therefore apparent that both organisations and employees adjust their employment expectations in order to ensure organisational survival through tough economic times. Whether this has a long-term impact upon employees use of FWAs will be of interest to assess further.

This research has demonstrated the need for more extensive investigation of FWAs, and workers' motivations for using (or not using) them. Previous work investigating imbalance between work and life has suggested that use of FWAs would be consistent with work engagement (e.g., Brough et al., 2005; De Cieri et al., 2005). The current study has not found this to be the case. As work engagement is associated with optimal productivity gains (Saks, 2006; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003), it is important that those managing organisations become conversant with the type of workplace environment that facilitates such engagement levels.

References

Abbott, J., De Cieri, H., & Iverson, R.D. (1998). Costing turnover: Implications of

work/family conflict at management level. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources,*

36(1), 25-43.

Allen, T.D. (2001). Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational

perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*(3), 414-435.

Australian Government. (2009). *Keep Australia working.* Canberra: Author. Retrieved 21

May 2009 from

http://www.keepaustraliaworking.gov.au/documents/PDFs_RTFs/KAW_report%20_2

9%20Oct__final.pdf

Australian Senate House Committee into Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development

and Local Government. (2009). *The global financial crisis and regional Australia.*

Retrieved 28 April, 2010 from

http://www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/itrdlg/financialcrisis/report/CH%201%20oct

ober%2009%20version%202.pdf

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art

Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22, 309-328.

Beauregard, A.T., & Henry, L.C. (2009). Making the link between work-life balance

practices and organizational performance. *Human Resource Management Review, 19*,

9-22.

Behson, S.J. (2005). The relative contribution of formal and informal organizational work–

family support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*, 487–500.

Biggs, A., Brough, P., & Barbour, J. (in press). Strategic alignment with organizational

   priorities and work engagement: A multi-wave analysis. *Journal of Organizational*

   Behavior.

Bolger, N., DeLongis, A., Kessler, R.., Wethington, E. (1989). The contagion of stress across

   multiple roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51*(1), 175-183.

Bowen, D. E., & Ostroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM-firm performance linkages: The

   role of the "strength" of the HRM system. *The Academy of Management Review,*

   29(2), 203-221.

Brough, P. (2005). A comparative investigation of the predictors of work-related

   psychological well-being within police, fire and ambulance workers. *New Zealand*

   Journal of Psychology, 34(2), 127-134.

Brough, P., & Frame, R. (2004). Predicting police job satisfaction and turnover intentions:

   The role of social support and police organisational variables. *New Zealand Journal*

   *of Psychology, 33(*1), 8-16.

Brough, P., & O'Driscoll, M. (2010). Organizational interventions for balancing work and

   home demands: An overview. *Work & Stress, 24,* 280-297.

Brough, P., O'Driscoll, M.P., & Kalliath, T.J. (2005). The ability of 'family friendly'

   organizational resources to predict work-family conflict and job and family

   satisfaction. *Stress and Health, 21*, 223–234.

Brough, P., Timms, C., Siu, O.L., Kalliath, T., O'Driscoll, M., Sit, C. Lo. D., & Lu, C.Q. (in

   press). Longitudinal application of the Job Demands-Resources model to

   psychological strain and engagement in cross-national samples. *Human Relations.*

Carless, S.A., & Wintle, J. (2007). Applicant attraction: The role of recruiter function, work-

   life balance policies and career salience. *International Journal of Selection and*

   Assessment, 15(4), 394-404.

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, J. H., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2006). Measuring the

positive side of the work-family interface: Development and validation of a work-

family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(1), 131-164.

Carlson, D.S., Kacmar, K.M., & Williams, K.J., (2000). Construction and initial validation of

a multi-dimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational*

Behavior, 56, 249-276.

Casper, W.J., & Buffardi, L.C. (2004).Work-life benefits and job pursuit intentions: The role

of anticipated organizational support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*, 391-410.

Casper, W.J., Fox, K.E., Sitzmann, T.M., & Landy, A.L. (2004). Supervisor referrals to

work-family programs. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 9*(2), 136-151.

Cook, A. (2009). Connecting work-family policies to supportive work environments. *Group*

& Organization Management, 34 (2), 206-240.

De Cieri, H., Holmes, B., Abbott, J., Pettit, T. (2005). Achievements and challenges for

work/life balance strategies in Australian organisations. *International Journal of*

Human Resource Management, 6(1), 90-103

Denison, D.R. (1996). What *is* the difference between organizational culture and

organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars.

Academy of Management Review, 21(3), 619-654.

Dikkers, J., Geurts, S., den Dulk, L., Peper, B., & Kompier, M. (2004). Relations among

work-home culture, the utilization of work-home arrangements, and work-home

interference. *International Journal of Stress Management, 11*(4), 323-345.

Goldberg, D. P. (1972). *The Detection of Psychiatric Illness by Questionnaire*. Oxford:

Oxford University Press.

Haggerty, J., & Wright, P. (2010). Strong situations and firm performance: A proposed re-

conceptualization of the role of the HR function. In A. Wilkinson, N. Bacon, T.

Redman & S. Snell (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Human Resource Management* (pp. 100-114). London: SAGE Publications.

Hall, D.T. (1990) Promoting Work/Family Balance: An organization-change approach. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*, 5–18.

Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L., & Hayes, T.L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(2), 268-279.

Kalliath, T., O'Driscoll, M., & Brough, P. (2004). Confirmatory factor analysis of the General Health Questionnaire-12. *Stress and Health, 20*(1), 11-20.

Kanter, E.M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Perseus.

Kim, W.C., & Mauborgene, R. (1998). Procedural justice, strategic decision making, and the knowledge economy. *Strategic Management Journal*, *19*, 323-338.

Kirby, E.L. and Krone, K.J. (2002) '"The policy exists but you can't really use it": Communication and the structuration of work-family policies', *Journal of Applied Communication Research,* 30(1): 50-77.

Krosnick, J. A. (1999). Survey research. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50*, 537-567.

Lapierre, L.M., & Allen, T.D. (2006). Work-supportive family, family-supportive supervision, use of organizational benefits, and problem-focused coping: Implications of work-family conflict and employee well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*(2), 169-181.

Laschinger, H.K.S., & Finegan, J. (2005). Using empowerment to build trust and respect in the workplace: A strategy for addressing the nursing shortage. *Nursing Economics, 23*(1) 6-13.

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 397-422.

May, D.R., Gilson, R.L., & Harter, L.M. (2004). The psychological conditions of

    meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at

    work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*(1), 11-37.

McDonald, P., Pini, B., & Bradley, L. (2007). Freedom or fallout in local government? How

    work-life culture impacts employees using flexible work practices. *International*

    Journal of Human Resource Management, 18(4), 602-622.

O'Driscoll, M. (2000). Work and family transactions. In P. Koopman-Boyden, A.

    Dharmalingam, B. Grant, V. Hendy, S. Hillcoat-Nallétamby, D. Mitchell, M.

    O'Driscoll & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Transactions in The Mid-Life Family* (pp. 92-112).

    Hamilton: Population Association of New Zealand.

O'Driscoll, M. & Brough, P. (2010). Work organisation and health. In S. Leka & J.

    Houdmont (Eds). *Occupational health psychology*. (pp. 57-87). Chichester: Wiley-

    Blackwell.

O'Driscoll, M., Brough, P., & Kalliath, T. (2004). Work/family conflict, psychological well-

    being, satisfaction and social support: A longitudinal study in New Zealand. *Equal*

    Opportunities International, 23(1/2), 36-56.

Parker, C. P. Baltes, B. B., Young, S. A., Huff, J. W. Altmann, R. A., Lacost, H. A. &

    Roberts, J. E. (2003). Relationships, psychological climate perceptions and work

    outcomes: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24,* 389-416.

Peetz, D., & Allan, C. (2005). Flexitime and the long-hours culture in the public sector:

    Causes and effects. *The Economic and Labour Relations Review, 15*(2), 159-180.

Rafferty, M., Schutz, H., & Yu, S. (2010). *Staffing cutbacks in the South Australian public*

    sector and their likely effects: Results of a survey of state public sector employees.

    Sydney: Faculty of Economics and Business, Sydney University.

Rigby, D. (2003). Management tools survey 2003: Usage up as companies strive to make headway in tough times. *Strategy and Leadership, 31*(5), 4-11.

Rosenthal, R., & DiMatteo, M.R. (2001). Meta-analysis: Recent developments in quantitative methods for literature reviews. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 59-82

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55,* 68-78.

Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52,* 141-166.

Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2008). A cross-national study of work engagement as a mediator between job resources and proactive behaviour. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 19*, 116-131.

Saks, A.M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(7), 600-619.

Schaufeli, W.B. (2004). The future of occupational health psychology. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53*(4), 502-517.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). *Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Preliminary Manual.* Utrecht: Occupational Health Psychology unit, Utrecht University.

Sonnentag, S., Kuttler, I., & Fritz, C. (2010). Job stressors, emotional exhaustion, and need for recovery: A multi-source study on the benefits of psychological detachment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 76*, 355-365.

Sonnentag, S., Mojza, E.J., Binnewies, C., & Scholl, A. (2008). Being engaged at work and detached at home: A week-level study on work engagement, psychological detachment, and affect. *Work and Stress, 22*(3), 257-276.

Timms, C., & Brough, P. (in press). "I like being a teacher": Career satisfaction, the work environment and psychological health. *Journal of Educational Administration.*

Thompson, B. M., Brough, P., & Schmidt, H. (2006). Supervisor and subordinate work-family values: Does similarity make a difference? *International Journal of Stress Management, 13(1),* 45-63.

Thompson, C. A., Jahn, E. W., Kopelman, R. E., & Prottas, D. J. (2004). Perceived organizational family support: A longitudinal and multilevel analysis. *Journal of Managerial issues*, *16*(4), 545-565

Thornthwaite, L. (2004). Working time and work-family balance: A review of employees' preferences. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 42*(2), 166-184.

Timms, C., Lankshear, C., Anderson, N., & Courtney, L. (2008). Riding a hydra: Women ICT professionals' perceptions of working in the Australian ICT industry. *Information Technology and People, 21*(2), 155-177.

Table 1. Availability and use of FWAs in the two phases of the survey (N=823)

	Time one				Time two			
	Availability		*Use*		*Availability*		*Use*	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*
Flexitime	403	49.0	344	41.8	628	76.3	126	15.3
Part-time work	540	65.6	248	30.1	623	75.7	203	24.7
Compressed work week	137	16.6	115	14.0	464	56.4	70	8.5
Telecommuting	213	26.0	127	15.0	405	49.2	65	8.0
At least one FWA	709	86.1	465	57.0	787	95.6	331	40.0

Table 2. *Means, standard deviations, comparison and effect size of study variables*

	Time 1		Time 2		Paired samples t test	Eta-Squared η^2
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*		
Supervisor Support	3.70	1.32	3.64	1.35	*ns*	
Organisational Support	4.69	1.10	4.61	1.16	*ns*	
Organisational Time Demands	3.15	1.05	3.18	1.09	*ns*	
Negative Career Consequences	3.04	.94	3.06	.98	*ns*	
Turnover Intentions	2.04	1.02	2.08	1.06	*ns*	
Work Engagement	3.25	.88	3.86	.88	21.36***	.12
Anxiety Depression	.75	.66	.82	.69	*ns*	
Use of FWAs	1.00	1.10	.60	.85	-11.68***	.14
Availability of FWAs	1.57	1.10	2.58	1.21	20.64***	.12

Note 1. Probability for paired samples *t* test was set at .006 (Bonferroni adjustment) with a critical value of *t*=3.09 two tailed; *** *p*<.001

Table 3. *Correlations and Cronbach's Alphas of study variables.*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. sex	-														
2. age	-.07	-													
3. Dep/Mar	.13***	.17***	-												
4. Use FWAs	.02	-.05	-.25***	-											
5. Availability of FWAs	.02	-.07*	-.06	.46***	-										
6. Supervisor Support	.15***	-.05	.03	.03	.02	.94									
7. Org. Support	.08*	-.03	.11**	.03	.00	.44***	.87								
8. Org. Time Demands	-.10***	-.04	-.05	-.05	.01	-.33***	-.55***	.86							
9. NCC	-.08*	-.05	-.14***	.05	.06	-.34***	-.59***	.69***	.88						
10. Turnover Intentions T1	-.11**	-.10**	-.17***	.09**	-.02	-.30***	-.33***	.35***	.36***	.83					
11. Turnover Intentions T2	-.09*	-.06	-.19***	.11***	.01	-.17***	-.26***	.30***	.26***	.53***	.84				
12. Work Engagement T1	.07*	.01	-.23***	.12**	.05	.24***	.20***	-.13***	-.14***	-.27***	-.14***	.91			
13. Work Engagement T2	.15***	.11**	.15***	-.16***	-.06	.21***	.25***	-.20***	-.22***	-.27***	-.38***	.57***	.91		
14. Anxiety Depression T1	-.04	-.09*	-.09*	.06	.02	-.20***	-.25***	.23***	.27***	.36***	.24***	-.26***	-.26***	.81	
15. Anxiety Depression T2	-.01	-.11**	-.11**	.08*	.09**	-.14***	-.24***	.23***	.24***	.21***	.38***	-.16***	-.39***	.47***	.80

Note 1. Cronbach's alphas appear on the diagonal in italics.
Note 2. *p <.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001.
Note 3. Dep/Mar = indicates the respondent has dependents *and/or* is married, T1 = Time 1 and T2 = Time 2, Org = Organisational, NCC = Negative Career Consequences

Table 4. *Summary of results for hierarchical regression analyses testing the relationship of study variables in the prediction of turnover intentions, work engagement and anxiety/depression T1 cross-sectional (N = 823)*

		Cross-sectional Analyses (Time 1)										
		Turnover Intentions				*Work Engagement*				*Anxiety-Depression*		
		B	*β*	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	*β*	R^2	ΔR^2	*B*	*β*	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.03	.04***			.05	.06***			.01	.01*
	Gender	-.19	-.08*			.16	.08*			-.03	-.02		
	age	-.01	-.07*			.00	.05			-.01	-.08*		
	Dep/Mar	-.27	-.13***			-.41	-.24***			-.10	-.07*		
Step 2				.19	.17***			.12	.07***			.11	.09***
	Gender	-.08	-.04			.09	.05			.01	.01		
	age	-.01	-.08*			.01	.06			-.01	-.08*		
	Dep/Mar	-.18	-.09**			-.42	-.24***			-.05	-.04		
	Sup Support	-.13	-.17***			.11	.16***			-.04	-.09*		
	Org. Support	-.08	-.09*			.11	.13**			-.07	-.12**		
	Org. Time Dem.	.15	.16**			.01	.01			.03	.05		
	NCC	.12	.11*			-.04	-.04			.09	.13*		
	Use of FWAs	.14	.07*			.06	.06			.07	.05		

Note 1. *p* < .05, **p* < .01, ***p* < .001. Dep/Mar = indicates the respondent has dependents *and/or* is married, T1 = Time 1, Org = Organisational, Sup= Supervisor, NCC = Negative Career Consequences

Table 5. *Summary of results for longitudinal hierarchical regression analyses testing the relationship of study variables Time 1 in the prediction of turnover intentions, work engagement and anxiety/depression Time 2 longitudinal (N = 823)*

	Turnover Intentions T2				Work engagement T2				Anxiety-Depression T2			
	B	β	R^2	ΔR^2	B	β	R^2	ΔR^2	B	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1			.29	.29***			.33	.33***			.23	.23***
T1 criterion	.56	.54***			.58	.58***			.50	.48***		
Step 2			.30	.01**			.44	.11***			.24	.01**
T1 criterion	.54	.51***			.65	.64***			.66	.46***		
Gender	-.07	-.03			.15	.07**			.03	.02		
age	.00	.00			.01	.07*			.00	-.06		
Dep/Mar	-.23	-.11***			.54	.30***			-.11	-.08*		
Step3			.31	.02**			.47	.03***			.26	.03***
T1 criterion	.49	.47***			.64	.63***			.60	.42***		
Gender	-.05	-.02			.14	.07*			.04	.03		
age	.00	.01			.01	.06*			.00	-.06		
Dep/Mar	-.19	-.09**			.41	.23***			-.06	-.04		
Sup Support	.02	.02			.01	.02			.00	.00		
Org. Support	-.04	-.04			.05	.07			-.05	-.08		
Org Time Dem	.12	.12**			-.04	-.05			.05	.08		

NCC	-.03	-.02		.02	.02	.02	.02
Use of FWAs	.05	.06		-. 13	-.17***	.05	.08*

Note 1. Time one equivalent variable is the Time1 equivalent of Time 2 outcome variables (Turnover Intentions, Work Engagement and Anxiety Depression).

Note 2. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Note 3. Dep/Mar = indicates the respondent has dependents _and/or_ is married, T1 = Time 1 and T2 = Time 2, Org = Organisational, NCC = Negative Career Consequences