

A Contextual Account for Worker Engagement and Burnout

Carolyn May Timms
BA (Ed). B Psych (Hons).

Psychology, School of Arts and Social Sciences
James Cook University
Cairns Campus

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of PhD in Psychology.

(December, 2007)

A Contextual Account for Worker Engagement and Burnout

Carolyn May Timms

PhD Thesis

STATEMENT OF ACCESS

I, the undersigned, author of this work, understand that James Cook University will make this thesis available for use within the University Library and, via the Australian Digital Theses network, for use elsewhere.

I understand that, as an unpublished work, a thesis has significant protection under the Copyright Act and I do not wish to place any further restriction on access to this work.

Signature

10.04.08
Date

ELECTRONIC COPY OF THESIS FOR LIBRARY DEPOSIT

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, the author of this work, declare that the electronic copy of this thesis provided to the James Cook University Library is an accurate copy of the print thesis submitted, within the limits of the technology available.

Signature

10.04.08
Date

STATEMENT OF SOURCES

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education. Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.

10.04.08

Signature

Date

DECLARATION ON ETHICS

The research presented and reported in this thesis was conducted within the guidelines for research ethics outlined in the *National Statement on Ethics Conduct in Research Involving Human* (1999), the *Joint NHMRC/AVCC Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice* (1997), the *James Cook University Policy on Experimentation Ethics. Standard Practices and Guidelines* (2001), and the *James Cook University Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice* (2001). The proposed research methodology received clearance from the James Cook University Experimentation Ethics Review Committee (Stage 1 approval number H2205; Stage 2 approval number H2207; Stage 3 approval number H2593).

10.04.08

Signature

Date

Statement on the contribution of others including financial and editorial help

Declaration of collaboration with and assistance from others

The design of the research reported in this thesis was developed by me in consultation with my supervisor Dr Deborah Graham. All data was collected and analysed by me, however my supervisors Dr Deborah Graham and Dr David Cottrell played an essential advisory role in my data analysis.

I was assisted by the Queensland Independent Education Union who duplicated 1,000 copies of the survey for the teachers' phase in 2006. Participants were selected in a computer generated random draw of union members and received the surveys with accompanying stamped addressed envelopes in a bulk mail out of union documents. Several other organisations, including a large insurance company, provided a link to the online phase of the survey on their websites.

I received a small grant from James Cook University's Graduate Research School to attend a Structural Equation modelling course run by The Australian Consortium for Social and Political Research Incorporated (ACSPRI) in January 2007. This course provided me with additional expertise in data analysis. The university has assisted my work by providing generic thesis writing skills and advanced statistics workshops at various times throughout my candidature.

My two supervisors have been listed as co-authors on some publications arising from this thesis (Chapter 3, and Appendix B). Their contribution to these works was editorial and advisory in nature.

10.04.08

Carolyn Timms

Date

Abstract

Worker engagement is an emergent area of organisational psychology and is thought to contribute to worker well being as well as organisational productivity. Previous research has demonstrated that worker burnout has more to do with the workplace environment than the characteristics of individual workers. It was therefore extrapolated that the same would apply to worker engagement. The current research sought to expand previous findings and tease out some commonalities in respondent experiences of engagement and burnout in the workplace.

The workplace context for respondent experience was defined by the Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS) which includes the areas of workload, control, reward, community, fairness and values. It was thought that matches or mismatches on the AWS would provide a sense of respondents' understandings of their psychological contract. Further information about the workplace was provided by responses in regard to the factors of management trustworthiness and procedural justice. A model of projected relationships of the variables predicted that favourable responses on those variables describing work context would be predictive of worker engagement, as defined by the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) and unfavourable responses would predict worker burnout, as defined by the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI). It was also predicted that management trustworthiness, procedural justice and fairness (AWS) measures would demonstrate a great deal of overlap.

The research plan involved three stages. Firstly, as most previous research had been conducted within larger organisational settings, small group interviews were conducted for people working within small and micro business settings. The second stage of the research included two phases of the same workplace survey, a pen and paper edition that surveyed teachers working in independent schools; and an online version that surveyed people representing 28 different occupational groups. Telephone interviews with 20 respondents to the survey comprised the third stage of the research.

Data analysis found that the interviews from small and micro business fitted AWS parameters well, with participants indicating that their businesses operated within very fine lines in terms of economics and staffing, yet they were rewarded in terms of control, community, and a sense of achievement. The inclusion of small and micro business categories within the subsequent survey instrument found that there were no significant differences between categories of business in regard to any of the study variables.

Statistical analyses of the data included a K-means cluster analysis of a subgroup of the combined survey respondents. This identified five groups of survey respondents based on their levels of response to burnout and engagement. The groups were: The Empowered Group; the Under Pressure Group; The Unengaged Group; The Burnout Experience 1 Group and The Severe Burnout Group. As well as demonstrating distinctive profiles in regard to the burnout and engagement measures, subsequent analyses involving the workplace context variables provided support for the research

model. A three factor confirmatory analysis of the management trustworthiness, procedural justice and fairness (AWS) variables that confirmed these measures covered considerable common ground.

In addition, path analyses found that the AWS variables worked as predictors for engagement and burnout for three of the cluster groups, but other factors must be sought for an explanation of engagement in The Under Pressure Group and the Unengaged Group. In addition, The Unengaged Group, members of which reported ambivalence on the UWES and were not experiencing burnout, was found to consist of two subgroups: one of which reported matches on the AWS variables and the other reported mismatches. Data from participant interviews were also organised within the cluster groups. These supported the previous findings within this research and provided a great deal of insight into particular patterns of participant response, leading to refinement of the research model.

The current research found that AWS variables are important predictors of burnout and engagement and emphasises the substantial role played by management in promoting employee well being. The original contribution made by this research lay in the definition and detailed description of a middle group which represented 30% of respondents. Some of these people reported experiencing disillusionment with their chosen career paths. Others of this group were experiencing some discomfort within their work environments that had not translated into a burnout experience for them. This would indicate that further research might investigate the experiences of those that fall between the two extremes of burnout and engagement in order to better differentiate these variables in the interest of providing organisations with skills for promoting the engagement of employees.

Table of Contents

STATEMENT OF ACCESS.....	ii
STATEMENT OF SOURCES.....	iii
DECLARATION	iii
Abstract.....	v
Table of Contents	vii
List of Figures.....	xiii
List of Tables	xv
Acknowledgements.....	xvii
Chapter 1	19
Literature Review.....	19
Section 1: Job Burnout and Engagement	19
1.1 Stress and Burnout in the Workplace.....	19
1.2 The Burnout Syndrome.....	20
1.2.1 Emotional Exhaustion	21
1.2.2 Cynicism and Disengagement.....	22
1.2.3 Inefficacy or Lack of Personal Accomplishment.....	23
1.3 Determining the Presence of Burnout	24
1.3.1 Burnout as a Robust Construct.....	24
1.3.2 Responses to Burnout: Individual or Organisational?	25
1.3.3 Is there a Predictable Pattern in the Development of Burnout?	26
1.4 Work Engagement	27
1.5 Burnout and Engagement: Opposite ends of one construct or negatively correlated?.	29
<i>Section 2. Psycho-social contexts in the development of burnout and engagement:</i>	30
1.6 Theoretical perspectives.....	30
1.6.1 The Job Demand-Control model.....	30
1.6.2 The Effort- Reward imbalance model.....	31
1.6.3 The Job Demand-Resources model.....	32
1.6.4 The Six Areas of worklife model.	34
1.7 Burnout and Engagement develops in an Organisational Context.....	53
<i>Section 3: Fairness, Procedural Justice, Trust, Management Trustworthiness: Overview, Scope, Research Aim and Hypotheses</i>	54
1.8 Trust and the Psychological Contract	54
1.9 Perceptions of Management Trustworthiness	56

1.9.1 Ability	56
1.9.2 Benevolence	56
1.9.3 Integrity	57
1.10 Trust and Mistrust	57
1.11 Organisational Commitment	58
1.12 Fairness and Procedural Justice.....	59
1.13 Procedural Justice and Management Trustworthiness.....	64
1.13.1 How Workers respond to Unjust Treatment in the Workplace	65
1.14 How Procedural Justice and Management Trustworthiness research can inform Managements	66
1.14.1 Scope of the Current Research	68
1.14.2 Research Design.....	68
1.15 Model of Proposed Variable Relationships in the current research	69
1.16 Aim of the Research	70
1.17 Hypotheses	70
Chapter 2	73
‘I’m hopeful that the phone will keep ringing and keep me out of mischief’: Regional Small Business ‘On the Edge’	73
2.1.1 Aim	77
2.2 Methodology	77
2.2.1 Participants:.....	77
2.2.2 Procedure.....	78
2.3 Analysis and Results	80
2.4 Data presentation and relevant literature	81
2.4.1 Theme 1. A sense that the business is, “on the edge”	81
2.4.2 Theme 2. A sense that running one’s own business can provide satisfaction and that it is personally rewarding.	89
2.5 Theme 3. Manifestations of burnout	94
2.6 Conclusion.....	97
Chapter 3	99
‘I just want to teach’. Queensland independent school teachers and their workload	99
3.1 Method	104
3.1.1 Participants	104
3.1.2 Materials	106
3.1.3 Distribution.....	108

3.2 Results.....	108
3.2.1 Quantitative Results	108
3.2.2 Work Hours.....	112
3.3 Discussion and qualitative results.....	114
3.3.1 Workload.....	115
3.3.2 Refusing to do the extra	122
3.3.3 Unsustainable workloads	123
3.3.4 Limitations	124
3.3.5 Implications and future directions.....	125
Chapter 4.....	129
‘Walking the Talk’: Management Trustworthiness, Procedural Justice, Areas of Worklife and the Development of Worker Burnout or Engagement.....	129
4.1 Abstract.....	130
4.2 Introduction.....	130
4.3 Method	136
4.3.1 Participants.....	136
4.3.2 Materials	138
4.4 Results.....	140
4.4.1 K-means cluster Analysis.....	142
4.4.2 Distribution of management trustworthiness, trust and workplace justice in cluster groups.....	145
4.4.3 The areas of worklife and cluster groups	148
4.5 Discussion and Qualitative Results.....	150
4.5.1 En2 (cluster two) ‘at risk’	153
4.5.2 Bu1 (cluster three) “the unengaged’	154
4.5.3 Bu2 and Bu3 (clusters four and five) ‘the burnout experience’	155
4.5.4 Burnout and Engagement: ‘Polar Opposites’?.....	156
4.5.5 Limitations	157
4.5.6 Conclusion	157
Chapter 5.....	161
Different Names - Same Paradigm? Fairness, Procedural Justice and Management Trustworthiness.....	161
5.1.1 Expectations, Reciprocity and The Psychological Contract	162
5.1.2 How people respond to fair procedures	164
5.1.3 Workplace justice scales	165

5.1.4 Aim and hypothesis of the current study.....	169
5.2 Method	170
5.2.1 Participants	170
5.2.2 Materials	170
5.2.3 Procedure.....	172
5.3 Results.	175
5.3.1 Missing Values Analyses	175
5.3.2 One factor Congeneric Tests of Constructs	176
5.4 Discussion	194
Chapter 6	199
Factor analyses, Recalculation of Variables and K-means Cluster Analysis revisited	199
6.1 Introduction	199
6.1.1 Combined Justice and Management Trustworthiness measure (CJMT)	203
6.1.2 Exploratory Factor Analyses	203
6.2 Cluster analysis revisited.....	212
6.2.1 Points of Comparison between the two K-means Cluster Analyses in the Current Research Project	218
Chapter 7	219
Path Analyses and Hours of work	219
7.1 The combined data set (n=515)	220
7.2 Groups identified in the New Cluster Analysis	222
7.2.1 The Empowered Group (NC1, $n = 73$)	223
7.2.2 The Under Pressure Group (NC2, $n = 110$).....	225
7.2.3 The Unengaged Group (NC3, $n = 158$).....	227
7.2.4 The Burnout Experience 1 Group (NC4, $n = 95$).	234
7.2.5 The Severe Burnout Group (NC5, $n = 79$).	236
7.3 Comparison of path analyses in the new clusters	238
7.4 Hours of work per week and the new cluster groups.	244
7.5 Discussion of findings in Chapters 6 and 7	246
7.5.1 Role Conflict	247
7.5.2 The Unengaged Group	249
7.5.3 Interaction of the areas of worklife within the new cluster groups	250
7.5.4 Workload and absorption	250
7.5.5 Engagement	250
7.5.6 Fairness and CJMT	251

7.5.7 The CJMT variable	252
7.5.8 Limitations and Recommendations for future research	253
Chapter 8.....	257
Respondent interviews.....	257
8.1 The Interview Stage of the Research Project.....	257
8.1.1 The Empowered Group.....	258
8.1.2 Discussion of insights from The Empowered Group interviews	265
8.2 The Under Pressure Group.....	267
8.2.1 Discussion of insights from The Under Pressure Group interviews	279
8.3 The Unengaged Group.....	284
8.3.1 The Unengaged Match subgroup	284
8.3.2 The Unengaged Mismatch subgroup	293
8.4 The Burnout Experience 1 Group (NC4).....	307
8.4.1 Discussion of insights from The Burnout Experience 1 Group interviews.....	317
8.5 The Severe Burnout Group	320
8.5.1 Discussion of insights from The Severe Burnout Group interviews.....	333
8.6 Summary of Interview Data.....	337
8.6.1 The use of the K-means Cluster Analysis Categories to Organize Qualitative Data	337
8.6.2 The Middle Group.....	338
8.6.3 Work Engagement.....	339
8.6.4 Work Burnout	341
8.6.5 Conclusion	342
Chapter 9.....	345
Conclusions.....	345
9.1 Overview.....	345
9.1.1 Chapter One	345
9.1.2 Chapter Two.....	346
9.1.3 Chapter Three.....	346
9.1.4 Chapter Four	347
9.1.5 Chapter Five.....	348
9.1.6 Chapters Six and Seven.....	349
9.1.7 Chapter Eight	350
9.2 The research model and hypotheses.....	350
9.2.1 The Psychological Contract	353

9.2.2 Trust and Communication	355
9.2.3 Other Research Hypotheses	355
9.2.4 Limitations of the current research	357
9.2.5 Implications of the current research	358
9.2.6 Recommendation for Future Research	359
References	361
Appendix A: Survey Instrument (key)	373
Appendix B: 'I'm just a cog in the wheel'	382
Appendix C: Maximum Likelihood Factor Analyses of AWS, OLBI and UWES items	388
Appendix D: Path Analyses - Tables	397
Appendix F: Respondents' expectations of their work	405

List of Figures

<i>Figure 1.1.</i> Model of Variables and their Relationship to Employee Engagement and Burnout.....	69
<i>Figure 3.1.</i> Hours worked by respondents (permanent full time and ‘on contract’, (n = 251) using QDIR report (2003) categories.....	113
<i>Figure 4.1.</i> Cluster Distribution of Standardized Engagement (UWES) and Burnout (OLBI) Variables.....	144
<i>Figure 4.2.</i> Distribution of Standardized Management Trustworthiness, Trust and Workplace Justice Measures within Cluster Groups.....	147
<i>Figure 4.3.</i> Distribution of Standardized AWS Variables within Cluster Groups	149
<i>Figure 5.1.</i> One factor congeneric model for fairness, teachers’ data (n=255) and online data (n=260).....	178
<i>Figure 5.2.</i> One Factor Congeneric Model for Procedural Justice, Teachers’ Data (n=255) and Online Data (n=260).....	181
<i>Figure 5.3.</i> Scree plots for teachers’ data (left) and online data (right) for Management Trustworthiness items.....	184
<i>Figure 5.4.</i> One Factor Congeneric Model for Management Trustworthiness, Teachers’ Data (n=255) and Online Data (n=260).....	187
<i>Figure 5.5.</i> One Factor Congeneric Model, Trust in Management, Teachers’ Data (n= 255) and Online Data (n=260).....	188
<i>Figure 5.6.</i> Three factor model, teachers’ data sets (n=255) and online data set (n=260)	191
<i>Figure 5.7.</i> Final one factor congeneric models for combined management trustworthiness, procedural justice and fairness (AWS) variables.....	194
<i>Figure 6.1.</i> Projected relationship of AWS to OLBI and UWES variables, extrapolated from Leiter and Maslach (2004).....	202
<i>Figure 6.2.</i> Original cluster profiles (a) compared visually to the new profiles (b) developed after recalibration of UWES and OLBI variables.....	215
<i>Figure 6.3.</i> Distribution of the AWS variables within the original (a) and new (b) clusters (N.B. the CJMT variable also appears in the new cluster diagram).....	217
<i>Figure 7.1.</i> Path Analysis of combined data (n=515).....	222
<i>Figure 7.2.</i> Path Analysis of The Empowered Group (NC1).....	224
<i>Figure 7.3.</i> Path Analysis for The Under Pressure Group (NC2).....	226
<i>Figure 7.4.</i> Path Analysis of The Unengaged Match subgroup (NC3a)	230
<i>Figure 7.5.</i> Path Analysis of The Unengaged Mismatch subgroup (NC3b)	233
<i>Figure 7.6.</i> Path Analysis, The Burnout Experience 1 Group (NC4).....	235
<i>Figure 7.7.</i> Path Analysis for The Severe Burnout Group (NC5).....	237
<i>Figure 7.8.</i> Established patterns of relationships between AWS variables in Path Analyses	243

<i>Figure 8.1.</i> Kate's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	259
<i>Figure 8.2.</i> Maggie's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables.	261
<i>Figure 8.3.</i> Ed's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables.	267
<i>Figure 8.4.</i> Susan's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	272
<i>Figure 8.5.</i> Alex's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables.	275
<i>Figure 8.6.</i> Nick's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	278
<i>Figure 8.7.</i> Philippa's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	285
<i>Figure 8.8.</i> Gemma's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	287
<i>Figure 8.9.</i> Roger's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	293
<i>Figure 8.10.</i> Amanda's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables.	296
<i>Figure 8.11.</i> Laura's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	298
<i>Figure 8.12.</i> Alan's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	300
<i>Figure 8.13.</i> Robert's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	308
<i>Figure 8.14.</i> Alice's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	310
<i>Figure 8.15.</i> Julie's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	314
<i>Figure 8.16.</i> Rose's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	321
<i>Figure 8.17.</i> Sarah's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	325
<i>Figure 8.18.</i> Amy's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	327
<i>Figure 8.19.</i> Eva's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables	330
<i>Figure 8.20.</i> Samantha's scores on OLBI and UWES (left), AWS and CJMT (right) variables.	332
<i>Figure 9.1.</i> Revised model of the relationships between study variables.	351

List of Tables

<i>Table 2.1.</i> Words used in card sort for small group interviews.....	79
<i>Table 3.1.</i> Employment status of participants by School.....	106
<i>Table 3.2.</i> Measures used in the survey instrument.....	107
<i>Table 3.3.</i> Means, SD, and alphas of survey variables compared to previously normed data.....	109
<i>Table 3.4.</i> Significant differences between Primary and High School teachers on Dedication and Absorption.....	110
<i>Table 3.5.</i> Pearson’s correlations indicating relationships between main study variables	111
<i>Table 3.6.</i> Work roles played by permanent full time and contract respondents (n=251) within their schools.....	113
<i>Table 4.1.</i> Measures used in Survey.....	139
<i>Table 4.2.</i> Correlation Table of Main Study Variables.....	141
<i>Table 4.3.</i> Variable Means at Final Cluster Centres.....	143
<i>Table 4.4.</i> Euclidean Distances between Final Cluster Centres.....	144
<i>Table 4.5.</i> Means and SDs for Management Trustworthiness, Trust and Procedural Justice in Cluster Groups (z scores).....	146
<i>Table 4.6.</i> Means and SDs for AWS variables (z scores).....	148
<i>Table 5.1.</i> Cronbach’s alphas of Justice and Management Trustworthiness Variables as Originally Reported and in the Two Phases of the Current Study.....	172
<i>Table 5.2.</i> Correlations between Fairness (AWS), Procedural Justice Measures and Management Trustworthiness Measures.....	173
<i>Table 5.3.</i> Procedural Justice Items and Modifications made to achieve Fit with the Calibration Sample (teachers) data (n=255).....	179
<i>Table 5.4.</i> Pattern matrices showing factor loadings from the two data sets.....	182
<i>Table 5.5.</i> Structure matrices for teachers and online data, demonstrating item and factor correlations.....	183
<i>Table 5.6.</i> Management Trustworthiness Items and Modifications made to achieve Fit with the Data, Calibration sample (teachers) data (n=255).....	186
<i>Table 5.7.</i> Comparison of factor score weights between teachers and online datasets in regard to the trust for management scale.....	189
<i>Table 5.8.</i> Confirmatory Factor Analysis Items and Modifications made to achieve Fit with the Calibration sample (teachers) data (n=255).....	190
<i>Table 5.9.</i> Progress of One Factor Congeneric Model for Combined Variables, Calibration sample (teachers) data (n=255).....	192
<i>Table 6.1.</i> Combined Justice and Management Trustworthiness (CJMT) items.....	203
<i>Table 6.2.</i> Individual items in each of the AWS, OLBI and UWES variables	206

Table 6.3. Individual items Composite Justice Management Trustworthiness (CJMT)	209
Table 6.4. Descriptive statistics weighted variables (n=515).....	210
Table 6.5. Tests for invariance between the two phases of the research on study variables.....	211
Table 6.6. Euclidean distances between final new cluster centres.....	213
Table 6.7. Standardised scores at cluster centres.....	213
Table 6.8. Comparison of cluster memberships.....	214
Table 6.9. Means and SD of AWS and CJMT variables in Cluster Groups (z scores)	217
Table 7.1. Demographic information about groups identified in the second cluster analysis.....	223
Table 7.2. z scores at cluster centres for the two subgroups within The Unengaged Group.....	228
Table 7.3. Variable R ² values in the various clusters and combined group model	238
Table 7.4. Comparisons of pathways and probabilities in the different clusters.....	240
Table 7.5. Regression analyses of AWS predictor and mediator variables on values as per Baron and Kenny (1986).....	242
Table 7.6. Cluster groups and hours of work per week based on QDIR (2003) report categories	245

Acknowledgements

My PhD candidature was well beyond ‘the bend in the road’ when, as a High School history and geography teacher, I began to study psychology by distance education through Monash University simply because I wanted to learn something new. From those early years my husband Jim has been there, initially humouring me and explaining to me ‘what the hell a standard deviation is and why the hell it is important’. Later he whole-heartedly encouraged me to continue in what has become, apart from raising my two children, the most absorbing project in my life. I have many people to thank for their assistance and encouragement on my journey. These include my family and friends who were somewhat bewildered as to what could possibly motivate a middle aged woman to forsake secure employment and undertake PhD candidature, but who nevertheless provided considerable encouragement and support. I must especially acknowledge Traylea and Tim, my precious kids and (now that they are adults) my best friends, who have been phenomenal ‘cheerleaders’ with heartwarming pride in their mum’s achievements.

My last few years as a teacher provided an invaluable encounter with workplace breakdown that happened to coincide with my undergraduate study of organisational psychology and became the inspiration for my choice of subject. While this experience was extremely uncomfortable, it was a time of powerful learning and revelation. My extraordinary luck, after the decision to transfer to James Cook University and embark on the uncertainties that are associated with honours and then PhD, was to score Dr Deborah Graham as my supervisor. I came to her with an idea for my research and she was unreservedly enthusiastic. Deborah has continued to impart support, oomph and academic rigour throughout my candidature, making it a very happy and fulfilling experience.

I am also indebted to Dr Marie Caltabiano, my second honours supervisor and to Dr David Cottrell, my second supervisor during my PhD candidature. Marie urged me to submit a poster of my honours research to the Industrial and Organisational Psychology conference in 2005, which eventually led to chapter seven in the book ‘*Advances in Organisational Psychology*’ in 2007. David’s crystal clear thinking and

somewhat ‘direct’ red ink comments have alerted me to ‘wobbles’ in my written communication. While the comments were not always welcome, they were always appropriate, well spotted, to my benefit, and therefore much appreciated. In addition, participants in all stages of this project generously shared their insights and willingly provided me with a snapshot of their experiences in their workplaces; without them the project would not have been possible.

One very constructive aspect of my candidature has been the opportunity for part-time work as a Senior Research Officer with Professors Neil Anderson and Colin Lankshear on the ‘Girls and ICT’ Australian Research Council project through the School of Education at JCU. This has enabled me to hone my research and writing skills within a different context. Concurrent work on another project was at times chaotic as my poor brain coped with analyses of two different data sets. It was, at times, extremely difficult to switch concentration to my own project when work hours ended. But the experience confirmed my love of research and academic writing and I can only thank Neil and Colin for providing me with a superlative opportunity and for their belief in me.

Other ‘companions on my journey’ have been my fellow students, Jane and Denise. I have enjoyed their company, support and endurance, and the ‘wacky’ moments we have had. Indeed, it is almost a shame finally to hand ‘this thing in’ as I confront yet another bend in the road.