

Department of Psychology

Report no 1

Job insecurity from a gender perspective: Data collection and psychometric properties

Katharina Näswall, Lena Låstad, Tom-Stian Vetting, Regina Larsson,
Anne Richter & Magnus Sverke

Stockholm 2010



Reports from the Department of Psychology

Ansvarig utgivare: Åke Wahlin, prefekt

ISBN 978-91-633-7455-5

2010: 1 Näswall, Låstad, Vetting, Larsson, Richter & Sverke, *Job insecurity from a gender perspective: Data collection and psychometric properties*

Job insecurity from a gender perspective:

*Technical report on the data collection and
psychometric properties*

Katharina Näswall, Lena Låstad, Tom-Stian Vetting, Regina Larsson,
Anne Richter & Magnus Sverke

Department of Psychology

Stockholm University

Technical report 2010

Report No 1

Acknowledgements

The research reported here was collected as part of the project “Job insecurity from a gender perspective” and made possible by a grant to Professor Magnus Sverke, Department of Psychology, Stockholm University, from the Swedish Council for Working Life and Social Research (FAS grant no 2006-1139).

Table of contents

Introduction.....	2
Method.....	3
<i>Data collection procedure</i>	3
<i>Participants</i>	3
Measures.....	6
<i>The questionnaire</i>	6
<i>Block 1 Demographics</i>	7
Age Bb01.....	7
Gender Bb02.....	7
Children at home Bb03.....	7
Household/Partner Bb04.....	8
Education Bb05.....	8
Work hours Ab03a.....	8
Office location Lgt01.....	8
Closest manager Lgt02.....	8
Union membership Ab07.....	8
Salary Lb08.....	8
Contribution to total income Fa01.....	8
Work centrality Wc01.....	8
<i>Block 2 Work Climate</i>	8
Lkr Competency demands.....	8
Mk Goal clarity.....	8
Rf Role conflict.....	9
Be Role overload, quantitative.....	9
Kb Role overload, qualitative.....	9
Pk Interpersonal conflicts.....	9
Au Job autonomy.....	9
Pf Task completion ambiguity.....	9
Qk Task quality ambiguity.....	9
Lk Job challenge.....	10
Kr Feedback.....	10
Lri Communication with the manager.....	10
Kru Feedback from project manager.....	10
Lriu Communication with project manager.....	10
<i>Block 3 Organizational characteristics</i>	10
Ko Job insecurity (quantitative).....	10
Ka Job insecurity (qualitative).....	10
Jm Gender equality.....	10
Ce Centralization.....	11
Ha Work-related health attributions.....	11
Tr Trust.....	11
Oj Overall justice.....	11
Sjd Subjective job dependency.....	11
<i>Block 4 Absenteeism/Presenteeism</i>	11
Fr01 Absenteeism.....	11

Fr03 Presenteeism.....	11
<i>Block 5 Work-related attitudes and behaviors</i>	12
Js Job satisfaction	12
Oc Affective organizational commitment.....	12
Pp Perceived performance.....	12
It Turnover intention	12
Wi Work involvement	12
Ae Employability (external)	12
Wli Work-life imbalance.....	12
Lwi Life-work imbalance.....	13
Ovc Over-commitment	13
En Work engagement	13
Db Demands for billable hours.....	13
<i>Block 6.1 Coping strategies</i>	13
CCS Coping strategies	13
<i>Block 6.2 Social support</i>	13
Ssc, Sss, Ssf, Social support	13
<i>Block 7 Core self-evaluations</i>	14
Lo Locus of control	14
Ne Neuroticism	14
<i>Block 8 Mental health complaints</i>	14
Gh General health questionnaire	14
<i>Block 9 Somatic health complaints</i>	14
Hb Health complaints	14
<i>Extra Open-ended question</i>	14
Ex 01	14
Results	15
<i>Block 2 Work climate</i>	15
<i>Block 3 Organizational characteristics</i>	16
<i>Block 4 Absenteeism/Presenteeism</i>	17
<i>Block 5 Work-related attitudes and behaviors</i>	18
<i>Block 6.1 Coping strategies</i>	19
<i>Block 6.2 Social support</i>	20
<i>Block 7 Core self-evaluations</i>	20
<i>Block 8 Mental health complaints</i>	21
<i>Block 9 Somatic health complains</i>	21
Concluding remarks.....	21
References.....	23
Appendix	26
<i>Block 1</i>	26
<i>Block 2: Work-climate</i>	27
<i>Block 3: Organizational characteristics</i>	34
<i>Block 4: Absenteeism/Presenteeism</i>	38
<i>Block 5: Work-related attitudes and behaviors</i>	42
<i>Block 6.1: Coping strategies</i>	48
<i>Block 6.2. Social support</i>	50
<i>Block 7: Core self-evaluations</i>	52
<i>Block 8: Mental health complaints</i>	54
<i>Block 9: Somatic health complaints</i>	55

Introduction

The objective of this report is to describe the data collection in the project “Job insecurity from a gender perspective,” and to document the measurement properties of the scales used in the questionnaire. The data collection process is described, as well as response rates and sample characteristics for all four time points.

The project originates from the idea that job insecurity is a salient and important aspect of contemporary working life. The turbulence characterizing the 1990s and 2000s has contributed to a perception among individuals that the situation has become more uncertain. When jobs are eliminated due to negative economic trends there are fewer alternatives for each individual, should they be laid off. This in turn makes it more important for the individual to keep their current job, as the changes of obtaining new employment are seen as slim. Since having a job is obviously connected to economic well-being and allows the individual to be independent and active agents (cf. Fryer & Payne, 1986), as well as provides the individual with latent benefits such as social network and time structure (cf. Jahoda, 1982). The fear of losing one’s job then becomes a fear of losing both economic and social benefits. The economic benefits are of course more immediate, and will impact on individuals and their families. The degree of the severity of this lack of income may to some extent depend on the individual’s role as breadwinner in the family, which may vary depending on a person’s gender.

The concept of job insecurity has been defined as a perceived threat towards one’s employment (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984). This threat may be related to objective conditions, but is essentially an interpretation made by the individual of situational cues. Job insecurity is very common during times of economic turbulence, but arises during relatively stable times as well. This makes it very important to study this stressor, as it has been shown to have rather severe and widespread consequences for individuals and organizations (see, for example, the two meta-analyses by Cheng & Chan, 2008; Sverke et al., 2002). These consequences range from mental and physical health complaints, to dissatisfaction with the job and lowered commitment to the organization, to decreased performance and involvement in the job, and to individuals actually quitting their jobs.

As the perception of job insecurity prompts negative reactions, a few studies have investigated factors which may moderate such reactions. The evidence to date is sparse, but there is some indication that social support may buffer some of the negative reactions. There is also some research on how job insecurity arises, and what factors that may contribute to stronger perceptions of job insecurity, which indicates that communication (Kinnunen, Mauno, Nätti, & Happonen, 2000) and participation in decision making (Probst, 2005) lessen the degree of job insecurity.

Because of the recent developments in working life job insecurity will be a major factor in the close future. Employees can no longer rely on predictable working conditions. Despite of job insecurity being the focus of a large number of research studies, there is a lack of research on how this phenomenon relates to a number of individual outcomes, such as life outside work, work-life balance, sickness absence and sick-leave rates, as well as performance and other behavioral indicators.

Previous research has found some support for gender differences (e.g., Kinnunen et al., 2000; Näswall & DeWitte, 2003), and these gender differences vary between studies, making it difficult to draw any comprehensive conclusions regarding the influence of gender on job insecurity reactions and coping strategies. There is some evidence that men and women use different strategies to cope with stress (for a meta-analytic review, see Tamres, Janicki, & Helgeson, 2002), which may lead to different types of reactions.

The overall aim of the project is to contribute to an increased understanding of the phenomenon of job insecurity, and its antecedents and consequences, but focusing on gender differences. The questionnaire reported in the present study will allow for the testing of a number of hypotheses regarding how men and women differ in their experiencing of, reactions to, and coping with job insecurity.

Method

The data presented here can be considered an extension of the project “The salaried employee in the modern working life: Threats and challenges” (Näswall, Baraldi, Richter, Hellgren, & Sverke, 2006). In that project, two waves of data, (named in A1 and A2 in Näswall et al., 2006), were collected. In both waves employees of four Swedish organizations took part. The four waves of data collection presented here are based on the respondents of sample 2 in waves A1 and A2. Thus, a total of 6 waves have been collected for the group presented in this report.

Data collection procedure

The first data collection (Time 1) started in September 2007, when the first batch of questionnaires was sent out. All questionnaires were accompanied by two cover letters; one from the organization and one from the research group. The latter contained a description of the objective of the study, information on how to fill out the questionnaire, and information about confidentiality and data treatment. A postcard reminding those who had not replied was sent out after approximately two weeks. There was almost a month’s interval between the first and second reminder, which consisted of a new copy of the questionnaire. The data collection was concluded in October 2007.

In early May 2008 the second data collection (Time 2) started, following the same procedure as at Time 1 and with completion in July 2008. This time a postcard was sent out as a third reminder two and a half weeks after the second one.

The third data collection started in September 2008 (Time 3) and was concluded in late October 2008. The fourth data collection (Time 4) started in August 2009 and was completed in November 2009. Both followed the same procedure as in Time 1 and Time 2.

At the initiative of the company the questionnaires were accompanied with a movie ticket at Time 1. At Times 2 and 3 a voucher for a paperback book was included, and at Time 4 a scratch-ticket was sent as a “thank you for participating”.

Participants

The participants work at an accounting firm serving both organizations and small companies with financial consulting and advising. Their headquarters are located in

Stockholm, but there are offices all over Sweden. We were given access to all employees in the organization.

Table 1. Summary of response statistics

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	All waves
Sample	720	799	782	806	545 ^a
Usable responses	576	579	567	579	282 ^b
Response rate	79%	73%	73%	72 %	52 % ^c

^a Number of persons who were sent the questionnaire at all four times

^b Number of persons who returned the filled in questionnaire at all four times

^c Longitudinal response rate – proportion of eligible participants who actually chose to do so

For each wave, the employees who had left the organization since the last time were excluded, and employees who had joined the company since the last time were included. Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for the participants of the four waves, presenting both personal information and work-related background variables.

Table 2. Demographics for the sample at Time 1, 2, 3 and 4

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Bb01	Age M (SD)	43 (11)	43 (11)	43 (11)	42 (12)
Bb02	Women (%)	56	63	62	61
Bb03	Do you have children under the age of 12 living at home (% yes)	53	53	52	54
Bb04	Household (%)				
	Single	16.0	15.4	15.2	13.8
	Married/cohabitating	79.8	80.8	80.8	81
	Partner, not living together	4.0	3.3	3.7	4.8
	Living with parents	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.3
Bb05	Highest level of education completed (%)				
	Compulsory school	1.9	1	0.5	1
	Vocational school	2.3	3.3	3.4	3.6
	High-school	20.9	22.3	21.9	21.6
	University/college	71.8	69.9	71.6	70.8
	Other	3.2	3.5	2.6	2.9
Lb08	Monthly salary, including any extras M(SD)	34 281 (15 822)	35 857 (16 186)	37 804 (20 484)	35 578 (16 759)

Table 2 cont'd

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Ab03	Full-time work (%)	77.5	78.2	79.5	78.8
Ab03b	If part-time, how many percent of full-time?				73
Ab05	Organizational tenure M(SD)	7.3 (7.2)	8.4 (7.5)	8.4 (7.2)	6.7 (6.8)
Ab07	Are you a member of a union organization? (% yes)	31.0	31.8	32.2	36.1
Fa01	To what extent does your income contribute (%)				
	I do not contribute at all	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
	I contribute partially	18.6	18.6	19.7	19.1
	I contribute about 50 %	32.5	35.9	32.1	37.7
	I am the main contributor	27.9	26.9	29.3	25.6
	I am the sole contributor	21	18.2	19	17.7
Wc01	How important is work in your life (%)				
	Not at all	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.4
	Rather unimportant	1.8	2.1	2.5	2.6
	Rather important	96.1	95.5	95.6	94.9
	Most important in my life	2.1	2.3	1.8	2.1

Measures

The questionnaire

The questionnaire was originally developed in 2004 (Näswall et al., 2006), and its aim was to capture a number of different aspects of the working situation. All variables included are listed in Appendix A. With a few exceptions, the same measures were used every time the questionnaire was handed out. Table 3 presents the measures used in the questionnaire and in which version each measure appeared. The table also presents the abbreviation for each variable, as well as how many items each measure consisted of.

At Time 2 one scale was added measuring Centralization (Ce). At Time 3 an additional scale concerning Work-related health attributions (Ha) was included. A Work engagement (En) scale was included at Time 4, together with two questions asking about Presence at work while ill (Fr02).

Table 3. Measures used in the questionnaire

	Items	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
<i>Block 1 Demographics</i>					
Bb Demographics	5	X	X	X	X
Ab Work demographics	3	X	X	X	X
Fa01 Contribution to the total income	1	X	X	X	X
Wc01 Work centrality	1	X	X	X	X
<i>Block 2 Work Climate</i>					
Lkr Competency demands	3	X	X	X	X
Mk Goal clarity	4	X	X	X	X
Rf Role conflict	5	X	X	X	X
Be Role overload, quantitative	3	X	X	X	X
Kb Role overload, qualitative	4	X	X	X	X
Pk Interpersonal conflicts	3	X	X	X	X
Au Job autonomy	4	X	X	X	X
Pf Task completion ambiguity	4	X	X	X	X
Qk Task quality ambiguity	4	X	X	X	X
Lk Job challenge	4	X	X	X	X
Kr Feedback	4	X	X	X	X
Lri Communication with the manager	5	X	X	X	X
Kru Feedback project manager	4	X	X	X	X
Lriu Communication with the project manager	5	X	X	X	X
<i>Block 3 Organizational characteristics</i>					
Ko Job insecurity (quantitative)	3	X	X	X	X
Ka Job insecurity (qualitative)	4	X	X	X	X
Jm Gender equality	4	X	X	X	X
Ce Centralization	3		X	X	X
Ha Work-related health attributions	3			X	X
Tr Trust	5	X	X	X	X
Oj Overall justice	3	X	X	X	X

Table 3 cont'd

	Items	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Sjd Subjective job dependency	4	X	X	X	X
<i>Block 4 Absenteeism/Presenteeism</i>					
Fr01 Absenteeism	2	X	X	X	X
Fr03 Presenteeism	2				X
<i>Block 5 Work-related attitudes and behaviors</i>					
Js Job satisfaction	3	X	X	X	X
Oc Organizational commitment	4	X	X	X	X
Pp Perceived performance	5	X	X	X	X
It Turnover intention	3	X	X	X	X
Wi Work involvement/work centrality	4	X	X	X	X
Ae Employability (external)	5	X	X	X	X
Wli Work-life imbalance	4	X	X	X	X
Lwi Life-work imbalance	4	X	X	X	X
Ovc Over commitment	6	X	X	X	X
En Work engagement	9				X
Db Demands for billable hours	4	X	X	X	X
<i>Block 6.1 Coping</i>					
Ccs Coping (4 dimensions)	12	X	X	X	X
<i>Block 6.2 Social support</i>					
Ssc Social support co-workers	3	X	X	X	X
Sss Social support supervisor	3	X	X	X	X
Ssf Social support family	4	X	X	X	X
<i>Block 7 Core self evaluation</i>					
Lo Locus of control	8	X	X	X	X
Ne Neuroticism	12	X	X	X	X
<i>Block 8 Mental health</i>					
Gh General health questionnaire	12	X	X	X	X
<i>Block 9 Somatic health</i>					
Hb Health complaints	10	X	X	X	X
Total number of items	214				

Block 1 Demographics

Age Bb01

Measured as year of birth

Gender Bb02

1=woman, 2=man

Children at home Bb03

Children under the age of 12 living at home, 1=yes, 2=no

Household/Partner Bb04

1=single, 2=married/cohabitating, 3=partner but not cohabitating, 4=still living with parents

Education Bb05

Highest level of education completed

1=compulsory school, 2=vocational school, 3=high school or equivalent, 4=academic studies, university level, 5=other

Work hours Ab03a

1=full-time, 2=part-time (percentage of full-time Ab03b)

Office location Lgt01

A number signifying each of the offices in Sweden (see Appendix Table A.1.1)

Closest manager Lgt02

Listing which manager the respondent reports to (see Appendix Table A.1.2)

Union membership Ab07

1=yes, 2=no

Salary Lb08

Average monthly salary, including any extras

Contribution to total income Fa01

To what extent does your income contribute to the household's total income?

1=I do not contribute at all, 2=I contribute partially, 3=I contribute about 50 %, 4=I am the main contributor, 5=I am the sole contributor

Work centrality Wc01

How important is work in your life? 1=Not at all, 2=Rather unimportant, 3=Rather important, 4=Most important in my life

Block 2 Work Climate

Lkr Competency demands

The scale consists of three items developed by van der Vliet & Hellgren (2002). The scale captures the sense that work tasks demand learning of new knowledge, and that the nature of work requires continuous training. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), where a high score indicates higher competency demands.

Mk Goal clarity

The scale is a combination of items from the scale developed by Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman (1970) and Caplan (1971). The original was reversed to reflect goal ambiguity, but here it reflects goal clarity. The four items measures the extent to which

the purpose of one's work tasks is clear. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), where a high score indicates higher goal clarity.

Rf Role conflict

This scale is modified and adapted based on the scale by Rizzo, House & Lirtzman (1970). The four items are intended to capture a discrepancy between how the employee thinks the work should be done and how he or she is told to do it by supervisors or others. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), where a high score indicates more role conflict.

Be Role overload, quantitative

This scale consists of three items from Beehr, Walsh, & Taber (1976), and measures the feeling of having too much to do in too little time. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree); a high score represents a heavier workload.

Kb Role overload, qualitative

This four-item scale was developed by was developed by Sverke, Hellgren & Öhrming (1997), based on Ivancevich & Matteson (1980) and captures a sense of work as being too difficult or demanding. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree); a high score representing more difficult or demanding tasks.

Pk Interpersonal conflicts

To measure the extent to which work is negatively affected by conflicts between employees, three items developed by Hovmark & Thomsson (1995) were used. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree); a high score indicating a more negative impact of interpersonal conflicts.

Au Job autonomy

This four item scale was adapted by Sverke & Sjöberg (1994), based on Hackman & Oldham (1975) and Walsh, Taber, & Beehr (1980), and measures the extent of autonomy and influence over how the work is carried out. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree); a high score indicates a stronger sense of autonomy.

Pf Task completion ambiguity

Four items developed by Hellgren, Sverke, and Näswall (2008) were used to capture to what extent the employees themselves can, or have to, determine when their tasks are completed. A high score on this scale reflects that the individual feels she has a sense of what her tasks entail, and when the tasks can be considered completed. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree). The scale is reversed to reflect ambiguity.

Qk Task quality ambiguity

Four items developed by Hellgren, Sverke, and Näswall (2008) were used to capture to what extent the individual feels she can determine when her job is well, or adequately, done. A high score on this scale is supposed to reflect whether the individual can determine the quality of her work herself. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree). The scale is reversed to reflect ambiguity.

Lk Job challenge

This four-item scale was developed by Hellgren, Sjöberg & Sverke (1997), and a high score captures to what extent the work contributes to new knowledge and learning. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree).

Kr Feedback

To measure knowledge of results, four items developed by Hackman & Oldham (1975) were used. This measure captures to what extent respondents get feedback from their supervisor on how they have carried out their work. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), where a high score indicates that the supervisor gives feedback.

Lri Communication with the manager

This scale was based on Colquitt (2001), and measures the degree to which the supervisor employs clear and open communication in relation to the employee. A high score indicates clear and ample communication, and the response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree).

Kru Feedback from project manager

Feedback from project manager was measured using the same four-item scale as for Kr Feedback, only replacing “manager” with “project manager”.

Lriu Communication with project manager

Communication with project manager was measured using the same five-item scale as for Lri Communication with manager, only replacing “manager” with “project manager”.

Block 3 Organizational characteristics

Ko Job insecurity (quantitative)

This scale consists of three items developed by Hellgren, Sverke & Isaksson (1999), and measures a worry and uncertainty regarding the future existence of the employment. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score on this scale represents a strong sense of quantitative job insecurity.

Ka Job insecurity (qualitative)

This scale consists of four items developed for the purpose of the study, largely based on Hellgren, Sverke & Isaksson (1999), and measures a worry about losing valued features of the job. A high score indicates a high level of qualitative job insecurity, and the response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree).

Jm Gender equality

These four items developed by van der Vliet & Hellgren (2002) measure to what extent there are differences between employees based on gender. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score represents a high level of equality.

Ce Centralization

This scale consists of three items adapted from Mellor, Mathieu, & Swim (1994), and measure to what extent the staff is encouraged or allowed to participate in decision making processes. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score represents a more centralized decision making process.

Ha Work-related health attributions

This three-item scale was developed by Göransson, Näswall & Sverke (2009). It measures to what extent the employee considers that working conditions affects his or her health status. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score indicates that working conditions are considered as a strong contributing factor to ill-health.

Tr Trust

Trust was measured with four items based on Robinson (1996), reflecting perceptions of the employer's trustworthiness. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score indicates that the employer is deemed trustworthy.

Oj Overall justice

This three-item scale was developed by van der Vliet & Hellgren (2002) and measures a general sense of fair treatment by the employer. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score reflects feelings of fairness.

Sjd Subjective job dependency

This four-item scale developed by Clark (2005) measures to what degree the respondents believe that they and their family are dependent on the respondent's income in order to maintain their current standard of living. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), with a high score representing a high degree of subjective dependency.

Block 4 Absenteeism/Presenteeism

Two items were developed for the purpose of this study. Both questions utilize a write-in response mode.

Fr01 Absenteeism

Fr01 asks how many times (fr01a), and total number of days (fr01b), the respondent has been home from work due to illness.

Fr03 Presenteeism

Fr03 asks how many times (fr03a), and total number of days (fr03b), the respondent has been present at work despite illness.

Block 5 Work-related attitudes and behaviors

Js Job satisfaction

The three items comprising the scale measuring satisfaction with the job were developed by Hellgren, Sjöberg, & Sverke (1997), based on Brayfield & Rothe (1951). The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score reflects satisfaction with the job.

Oc Affective organizational commitment

This scale is the short version of the scale developed by Allen & Meyer (1990) measuring affective commitment to the organization. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score reflects strong commitment to the organization.

Pp Perceived performance

This five-item scale was developed by Hall & Hall (1976) and measures self-rated performance. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score reflects the perception that one's own performance is good.

It Turnover intention

This scale, consisting of three items, was developed by Sjöberg & Sverke (2000) and measures the strength of the respondent's intentions to leave the present position. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score reflects a strong intention to leave the job.

Wi Work involvement

The four items were selected from a scale developed by Kanungo (1982), measuring to what extent work is an important part of the respondent's life. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score reflects that work is considered a very important aspect of life.

Ae Employability (external)

This scale was developed by van der Vliet & Hellgren (2002), and consists of five items measuring the respondent's sense of being attractive to other employers, and the ability to find work outside the present organization. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score reflects a strong sense of external employability.

Wli Work-life imbalance

This scale, based on Netemeyer, McMurrian, & Boles (1996), consists of four items measuring to what extent working life affects life outside work. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score reflects a negative effect of work on life outside work.

Lwi Life-work imbalance

This scale, based on Netemeyer, McMurrian, & Boles (1996), consists of four items (based on recommendations by Boyar, Carson, Mosley, & Pearson, 2006) measuring to what extent life outside work affects work tasks. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score reflects a negative effect of life outside work on the carrying out of work tasks.

Ovc Over-commitment

This scale was developed for the purposes of the study and consists of six items measuring to what extent work issues are on the respondent's mind outside of work. The scale captures a perception of work spreading into other areas of life, not in terms of actual time spent on work tasks, but time thinking about work. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score reflects greater degree of over commitment.

En Work engagement

This nine-item short version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli, Taris, Le Blanc, Peeters, Bakker & De Jonge, 2002) was developed by Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova (2006). The Swedish translation of the scale has previously been tested by Hallberg, Johansson, & Schaufeli (2007). The scale measures to what extent the employee experiences a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score reflects a high degree of work engagement.

Db Demands for billable hours

This four-item scale was developed for the purposes of this study, and captures to what extent demands for invoice-time are experienced as stressful. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score reflects a high level of stress because of the invoice-time ratio.

Block 6.1 Coping strategies

CCS Coping strategies

Coping strategies was measured with a five-factor scale developed by Guppy, Edwards, Brough, Peters-Bean, Sale, & Short (2004). A 15-item version of their scale, initially consisting 21 items, was used. Each factor represents an aspect of the coping process: Changing the situation, Accommodation, Devaluation, Avoidance, and Symptom reduction. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree).

Block 6.2 Social support

Ssc, Sss, Ssf, Social support

Based on Caplan et al. (1975) and other social support literature, 10 items representing three factors were developed for the purposes of this study. The three factors were based on the source of support – co-worker support, supervisor support, and family support. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score on either scale reflects a sense that support is available.

Block 7 Core self-evaluations

The scales capturing the higher-order construct Core self-evaluations was presented by Judge, Bono, Erez, Locke, & Thoresen (2002), and is comprised of four scales each measuring self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control and neuroticism. Two of these scales were included in the questionnaire:

Lo Locus of control

This eight-item scale was based on Levenson (1981) and consist of eight items, where a high score reflects internal locus of control, i.e. the sense that the individual herself believes she has control rather than believing in luck. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree).

Ne Neuroticism

This scale consists of 12 items developed by Eysenck & Eysenck (1968), reflecting the tendency to interpret situations negatively and to be pessimistic. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (disagree) to 5 (agree), and a high score reflects a higher degree of neuroticism.

Block 8 Mental health complaints

Gh General health questionnaire

This 12-item version by Goldberg (1979) describes the general mental health of the individual. The response alternatives ranged from 1 (never) to 4 (always) (but is usually recoded to a 0-3 scale), and a high score reflects a greater degree of mental health complaints.

Block 9 Somatic health complaints

Hb Health complaints

This scale is based on Andersson (1986), and was modified by Isaksson & Johansson (1997), and by the authors for the purpose of this study. The scale consists of ten items reflecting various physical health complaints. The responses were given on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always), and a high score reflects more frequent physical health complaints.

Extra Open-ended question

Ex 01

The questionnaire was concluded with an open-ended question, asking the respondents to comment or give additional information.

Results

Block 2 Work climate

Tables A.2.1 through A.2.15 describe measurement properties for the scales in Block 2. Overall, they exhibited good factor structures and Cronbach's alpha values, explained a satisfactory amount of variance and had stable internal consistency. In the few scales where problems were revealed, this is noted.

As can be seen in Table A.2.1, the items measuring *Competency demands (Lkr)* had stable, moderate to high factor loadings. However, the internal consistency was rather low, showing Cronbach's alpha values from .70 to .72 for Time 2 through 4, and even lower for Time 1 ($\alpha = .64$). There were some changes in explained variance, with ranges between 40 % and 51 %. Both mean value levels and standard deviation levels were comparable, with ranges between 3.56 and 3.62 and 0.80 and 0.87 respectively.

The scale measuring *Goal clarity (Mk)* exhibited overall good measurement properties (see Table A.2.2). Cronbach's alpha was very similar at all times and limited to a range between .82 and .85. Also explained variance was stable (54-56 %), which goes for mean value levels between 3.77 and 3.91 and standard deviation levels between 0.76 and 0.83.

Over time, items measuring *Role conflict (Rf)* had a stable Cronbach's alpha at acceptable .78 and .79. Table A.2.3 shows that the scale accounted for a very similar amount of variance over 42 % at all times. Mean levels varied between 1.88 and 2.07, while all standard deviation values could be found in the interval between 0.73 and 0.78.

Table A.2.4 shows measurement properties for the scale *Quantitative role overload (Be)*, revealing somewhat low but still satisfactory Cronbach's alpha values between .74 and .79. The variance explained ranged between 50 and 56 %, mean values between 3.30 and 3.48 and standard deviations were found around 0.87.

With a Cronbach's alpha ranging between .71 and .80, satisfactory measurement properties are presented for *Qualitative role overload (Kb)* in Table A.2.5. Items account for 39 to 44 % of variance at Time 1 through 3 and 50 % at Time 4. Mean values ranged between 2.11 and 2.21 and standard deviations were stable around 0.80.

Interpersonal conflicts (Pk) shown in Table A.2.6 exhibited a stable Cronbach's alpha of .85 at all times, except for .81 at Time 1. The lowest explained variance by the three items is 60 % at Time 1 and the highest is 67 % at Time 3. Only a small variation in means could be identified between 1.95 and 2.22 and standard deviation levels ranged between 0.94 and 1.10.

The *Autonomy (Au)* scale in Table A.2.7 was psychometrically sound, with a stable Cronbach's alpha above .80 and 51 to 54 % of variance explained. Means varied between 3.78 and 3.90, while standard deviations were found in a range between 0.69 and 0.75.

Task completion ambiguity (Pf) in Table A.2.8 was measured using four items with a high Cronbach's alpha between .82 and .85. Explained variance ranged between 54 %

and 59 %. Means ranged between 1.85 and 1.92 and standard deviations were found at around 0.74.

Task quality ambiguity (Qk) exhibited good measurement properties, as shown in Table A.2.9, but item Qk03 had somewhat lower factor loadings than the other items. Cronbach's alpha was high, between .86 and .89, while the factor solution accounted for at least 62 % of the variance. Means were stable between 1.81 and 1.94, and standard deviations were 0.68 or 0.69.

As presented in Table A.2.10 items measuring *Job challenge (Lk)* loaded onto one factor, and the internal consistency was acceptable in a range between .72 and .78. A 74 % explained variance at Time 1 is a clear exception, as it varied between 42 % and 49 % at the other times. Mean values had only a small variation between 3.79 and 3.88, while 0.69 and 0.77 represents the lowest and highest standard deviations.

In Table A.2.11 three of four items measuring *Feedback (Kr)* exhibited high factor loadings in the range between .85 and .96. The whole scale's Cronbach's alpha varied between .83 and .87. However, there seems to be a problem with item Kr03 as its factor loadings did not reach higher than .50. At Time 2 it actually dropped under .40 (.38). The factor solution accounted for at least 62 % of the variance, means were stable between 3.08 and 3.16, while the standard deviation was 0.99 with the exception of 0.94 at Time 2.

The *Communication (Lri)* scale in Table A.2.12 exhibited good measurement properties, with a Cronbach's alpha between .89 and .91. The factor solution accounted for 61 to 67 % of the variance. There was only a very small variation in mean levels between 3.18 and 3.25, while 0.91 and 0.99 were the lowest and highest standard deviations.

A high Cronbach's alpha between .84 and .87 represents the picture in Table A.2.13. These are measurement properties for items measuring *Feedback from project manager (Kru)*. It should be noted that item Kr03u was an exception from this overall good result, with factor loadings ranging from .41 to .52. 63 to 67 % of variance was explained, mean values varied between 3.16 and 3.34, while the standard deviation was 0.83 at three times and 0.87 at Time 1.

Table A.2.14 holds measurement properties for the scale *Communication with project manager (Lriu)*. Cronbach's alpha was stable just under .90, and the factor solution accounted for 61 to 64 % of variance. Means were stable between 3.38 and 3.51, which go for standard deviations between 0.76 and 0.81.

Block 3 Organizational characteristics

Tables A.3.1 through A.3.8 show the measurement properties for Block 3 of the questionnaire. The block contains measurements of organizational characteristics.

As shown in Table A.3.1, the scale measuring *Quantitative job insecurity (Ko)* exhibited good measurement properties at all four times. Cronbach's alpha ranged from .90 to .95. The scale also had relatively high explanatory value, accounting for between 75 to 87% of the variance. Standard deviations were ranging from 0.77 to 1.05.

Regarding *Qualitative job insecurity (Ka)* in Table A.3.2, this scale showed adequate measurement properties, with Cronbach's alpha ranging from .74 to .79. Approximately 45 % of the variance was explained by the factor solution. The standard deviations could be found in the interval of 0.89 and 0.95.

The questions concerning *Gender equality (Jm)* exhibited satisfactory measurement properties (see Table A.3.3), with Cronbach's alphas ranging between .87 and .88, and between 65 and 66% of the variance explained at all four times. Standard deviations are fairly equal across times, and vary in the interval of .94 and .99.

Centralization (Ce), shown in table A.3.4, was measured with a 3-item scale that was included in the questionnaire at time 2, 3 and 4. The scale's reliability measured .81 at all times, and it explained approximately 59% of the variance. The standard deviations are .58 at Times 2 and 3, and 1.03 at Time 4.

Work-related health-attributions (Ha), as shown in table A.3.5, was included in the questionnaire at Times 3 and 4. The scale exhibited satisfactory measurement properties at both times, with a Cronbach's alpha at .83 and .84, respectively, and it explained 63% of the variance at Time 3, and 65% at Time 4. Standard deviations were approximately 1.

The *Trust (Tr)* scale (see table A.3.6) exhibited good measurement properties at all four times, with the lowest Cronbach's alpha at .92, and the highest at .94. The variance explained was also fairly high, ranging from 71 to 76%. The standard deviations could be found in the interval of 0.78 and 0.92.

In table A.3.7 the results for the scale measuring *Organizational justice (Oj)* are presented. The scale consists of three items that show high factor loadings. The scale also showed good reliability with Cronbach's alpha levels at .85, and variance explained between 67 and 74%. Mean values varied from 3.51 to 3.81, and the standard deviations ranged between .82 and .91.

Subjective job dependency (Sjd), as shown in table A.3.8, was measured with four items, exhibiting moderate to high factor loadings. The scale was psychometrically sound with Cronbach's alpha ranging from .77 to .83. Mean values were fairly equally distributed, between 3.50 and 3.57. Standard deviations varied from .94 to .99.

Block 4 Absenteeism/Presenteeism

In tables A.4.1 through A.4.4, distribution frequencies and descriptive statistics for scales included in Block 4 of the questionnaire are presented.

Number of times on sick-leave (Fr01a), Table A.4.1) was added to the questionnaire at Time 4. The scale is subject to some internal missing, with 66 respondents not answering. Thus, conclusions made on the basis of these results should be done with caution. The mean value on this scale were 5 times on sick-leave (SD=1.99), but it should be noted that 74 % of respondents never had been on sick-leave and that 21 % had been on sick-leave only once.

Number of days on sick-leave (Fr01b), shown in Table A.4.2, was also added to the questionnaire at Time 4. This scale was also subject to internal attrition with 159 respondents missing, and precaution should be made drawing conclusions from these

results as well. The mean number of days on sick-leave was 1.5 (SD=6). However, the number ranged between 0 and 90. 67 % of the respondents had never been on sick-leave, and about one fourth of respondents had been on sick-leave for three days or less.

Table A.4.3 shows descriptive statistics for *Presenteeism* or *Number of times working while ill* (Fr03a). This question was asked at all four times. Number of missing increased from 27 at Time 1 to 67 at Time 4. Mean times working while ill had only small changes through times. However, it seems like the amount of respondents who never had worked while ill dropped from Time 1 to Time 2 and 3, before increasing again at Time 4. Numbers also reveal that the amount of respondents working 1, 2 and 3 times while ill had a peak at Time 2 and 3. Without over exaggerating the meaning of these figures, it also can be noted that no one worked while ill more than 6 times at Time 1. At remaining times this number was 6 and 7.

The reported *Presenteeism* or *Number of days working while ill* (Fr03b), shown in Table A.4.4, is affected by high internal attrition (130-421). However, when the number of missing is highest (Time 1 and 2) the number of respondents reporting 0 days working while ill is lowest, and vice versa. A possible explanation for this is that non-responses can have been plotted differently from one time to another. Mean values are 3.3 and 3.6 at Time 1 and 2, and 1.7 and 1.2 at Time 3 and 4. However, if our assumption about non-responses is right, these differences probably do not tell much. As for Times working while ill, there are more employees at Time 2 and 3 reporting days working while ill in the lower range between 1 and 4, than at Time 1 and 4.

Block 5 Work-related attitudes and behaviors

Tables A.5.1 through A.5.11 summarize measurement properties for scales in Block 5. Some scales revealed rather problematic issues, while other items exhibited good measurement properties.

Items measuring *Job satisfaction (Js)* is presented in Table A.5.1 and show that the scale exhibits good measurement properties. Factor loadings are high, which also goes for the Cronbach's alpha values found at .87 or higher. Means vary in the range between 3.80 and 4.00. The standard deviations varied between 0.80 and 0.90.

Table A.5.2 reveals that there was a problem with the scale measuring *Affective organizational commitment (Oc)*. A two-factor structure was extracted, and a one-factor solution had to be specified at Time 2, 3 and 4. The cause of this is largely found in item Oc06 with factor loading as low as between .13, resulting in Cronbach's alpha values of .68 at the highest. Items accounted for 42 to 47 % of variance, mean values varied between 3.10 and 3.27, while standard deviations were stable just above 0.70. However, when item Oc06 was removed at Time 2, 3 and 4, the three remaining items loaded onto one factor. This adjustment also resulted in a considerable improvement of Cronbach's alpha values, now in a range between .76 and .80. The proportion of explained variance was also increased, with 54 and 58 at the lowest and highest percentages.

A one-factor solution had to be specified at all times for the item measuring *Perceived performance (Pp)*. Shown in Table A.5.3, the scale had acceptable measurement properties with moderate factor loadings and a stable Cronbach's alpha above .70. The factor solution accounted for about one third of the variance. Means were stable and centred around 4.30, as goes for standard deviations from 0.43 to 0.47.

Turnover intention (It), found in Table A.5.4, exhibited good measurement properties. Cronbach's alpha ranged between .83 and .88, while 62 to 71 % of variance was accounted for. Means varied between 1.68 and 1.86, and standard deviations could be found in the range between 0.88 and 1.03.

In Table A.5.5 it can be read that the scale measuring *Work involvement/work centrality (Wi)*, exhibited rather poor measurement properties. A one-factor solution had to be specified at Time 1, 2 and 3. Factor loadings as low as .39 and no higher than .64, in addition to Cronbach's alpha values between .59 and .63, adds to this picture. 27 to 31 % of variance was accounted for by this factor solution, means ranged between 2.69 and 2.82, while standard deviations were rather stable in a range between 0.62 and 0.67.

External employability (Ae) exhibited good measurement properties. Cronbach's alpha was both stable and high at .87 and .88, while 60 to 63 % of variance was explained. The lowest and highest mean levels were 3.92 and 4.03, and the standard deviations ranged between 0.81 and 0.85.

Table A.5.7 presents good measurement properties for the scale measuring *Work-life imbalance (Wli)* Cronbach's alpha ranged between .85 and .89, and between 58 and 67 % of variance was explained. Means could be found in an interval between 2.45 and 2.81 and standard deviations between 0.93 and 1.00.

As presented in Table A.5.8, the *scale Life-work imbalance (Lwi)* exhibited overall good measurement properties. Cronbach's alpha varied in between .76 and .80, and 46 to 51 % of variance was accounted for by the factor solution. Mean values were comparable between 1.49 and 1.56, as goes for standard deviations between 0.57 and 0.61.

Table A.5.9, *Over-commitment (Ovc)*, shows that the scale had very good measurement properties. With exception for one item all factor loadings were high, and Cronbach's alpha was high and very stable at .90 or higher. The factor solution accounted for at least 61 % of variance. Means ranged between 2.89 and 3.15, while 0.98 and 1.05 was the lowest and highest standard deviations.

The scale measuring *Work engagement (En)* was included in the questionnaire at Time 4, and a detailed description is found in Table A.5.10. All items but En09, had high factor loadings and the Cronbach's alpha was .93. The factor solution accounted for about 60 % of variance, the mean score was 3.83 and the standard deviation was 0.83.

Items measuring *Demands for billable hours (Db)* revealed high factor loadings, with an exception for item Db04. This item probably serves as an explanation for the fact that a one-factor solution had to be specified at Time 1. Despite this, Cronbach's alpha was still acceptable between .74 and .79. 53 to 56 % of variance was explained, mean values ranged between 3.63 and 3.82 and the standard deviation was stable between 0.91 and 0.94. Removing item Db04 resulted in a one-factor solution, a Cronbach's alpha well over .80 and explained variance approaching 70 %.

Block 6.1 Coping strategies

Measurement properties for the four scales measuring Coping strategies are presented in Tables A.6.1.1 through A.6.1.4. The scale that is used here is a short version of a 40-item scale, where items have been subdivided into three-item scales relating to four

different aspects of the coping process; Change the situation, Accommodation, Devaluation and Avoidance.

The questions measuring *Coping – Change the situation (Ccs 01-03)* made a psychometrically sound scale with Cronbach's alpha levels at .82. Between 61 and 67% of the variance was explained, and means fluctuated around 3.8. Standard deviations were around 0.70.

The scale *Coping – Accommodation (Ccs 04-06)* exhibited low Cronbach's alpha levels between .64 and .70. The variance explained was about 40 % at Times 1, 2 and 3, whereas for Time 4, the explained variance went up to 44 %. Mean values rested at about 3, and the scale's standard deviation was approximately 0.71.

Coping – Devaluation (Ccs 07-09) showed better Cronbach's alpha values at .79 at Times 1 and 2, going up to .83 and .82 at Times 3 and 4, respectively. Explained variance was around 60 % for this scale, and mean values ranged from .87 to .92. Standard deviations were fairly stable, varying from .87 to .92.

The scale *Coping-Aavoidance (Ccs 10-12)* was psychometrically sound, with alpha levels between .83 and .86. The proportion of variance explained rested between 62 % at Time 1 and 68 % at Time 2, while means varied from 2.38 to 2.53. The standard deviation was 0.89 at Time 1 and 0.95 for the last three measurement times.

Block 6.2 Social support

The scales measuring social support in Block 6.2 of the questionnaire are presented in Tables A.6.2.1 through A.6.2.3. As can be seen, all three scales showed good measurement properties.

The scale *Social support – Co-workers (Ssc)* was measured by three items loading onto one factor. With alpha levels at .80, the scale showed good reliability. Approximately 59 % of the variance was explained, and means ranged between 3.85 and 3.94. The standard deviation varied from 0.81 to 0.87.

Social support – Supervisor (Sss) was measured by three items which all loaded onto one factor, and showed high factor loadings (.85). The scale exhibited good measurement properties at all four times, with Cronbach's alpha levels between .92 and .94. The scale also showed relatively high explanatory value, accounting for between 78 % of the variance at Time 1 to 83 % of the variance at Time 4. Means were fairly similar across all four times at about 3.4 and standard deviations were ranging from 1.08 to 1.14.

Regarding *Social support – Family (Ssf)*, this scale exhibited adequate measurement properties, with Cronbach's alpha values around .84. The scale consisted of four items, and between 55 and 58 % of the variance was explained. Means varied from the lowest value of 3.65 at Time 1 to the highest level at Time 4 with 3.82. The standard deviation was around 1.

Block 7 Core self-evaluations

Measurement properties for the scales in Block 7 of the questionnaire, the two dimensions from Core self-evaluations, are shown in Tables A.7.1 and A.7.2.

Locus of control (Lo) in Table A.7.1 was measured with a scale consisting of eight items. As the items loaded onto different factors, a one-factor solution had to be specified at all four times. With the one-factor solution, moderate factor loadings were obtained. The scale was psychometrically sound, with Cronbach's alpha at .74 at Time 1, and .75 at Times 2, 3 and 4. The variance explained by this scale was around 28 %. Means fluctuated around 3.80, and standard deviations ranged from 0.50 at Time 1 and 0.54 at Time 2.

The scale measuring *Neuroticism* (Table A.7.1.2., *Ne*) consisted of 12 items. Because the items loaded onto more than one factor, a one-factor solution had to be specified at all four times. After this specification was made, most items showed moderate factor loadings. However, three items had higher factor loadings (.70) at all four times, namely Ne03, Ne04 and Ne10. Item Ne07 also had higher factor loadings (.70) at Times two three and four. Otherwise, the scale exhibited good measurement with Cronbach's alpha levels at .90 at Times 1, 2 and 3, and .91 at Time 4. The variance explained ranged from 42 % at Time 2 to 46 % at Time 3. Means were fairly equal around 2.10, and standard deviations were all just above 0.70.

Block 8 Mental health complaints

Table A.8.1 shows the measurement properties of Block 8.1, the scale measuring Mental health complains (Gh). The 12 items used is the short version of the General Health Questionnaire, GHQ. A one-factor solution had to be specified at all four times. Given that specification, most of the items showed moderate factor loadings. However, item Gh03 showed factor loadings below .40. Otherwise, the scale exhibited good measurement properties, with Cronbach's alpha at approximately .84. The variance explained was about 31 % across times. Means varied between 0.68 and 0.76, and the standard deviation was approximately 0.40.

Block 9 Somatic health complains

In table A.9.1, measurement properties for the scale measuring *Somatic health complains (Hb)* are presented. The scale consist of ten items, and as the items loaded onto multiple factors, a one-factor solution had to be specified at all four times of measurement. The factor loadings obtained given this specification were ranging from low to moderate. Items Hb02, Hb08, Hb09 and Hb10 had especially low factor loadings at all four times, whereas items Hb04 and Hb05 had stronger factor loadings, just below .70 at time one, and .70 or slightly higher at the last three times of measurement. The scale was otherwise psychometrically sound with a Cronbach's alpha between .72 and .75, but merely 23-25% of the variance was explained. Means were fairly equal across time at around 1.70, and the standard deviation was .55 at all times.

Concluding remarks

The scales used in this questionnaire exhibited overall good measurement properties, and in terms of internal consistency and factor structure they are for the most part adequate or better. However, minor problems were identified with some scales, and it is recommended that these problems are taken into account when using data collected

with them. Three scales had a Cronbach's alpha not reaching .70 at any time point, namely Organizational commitment, Work involvement/work centrality and the Coping dimension Accommodation. Concerning the latter, problems may be explained by the fact that the coping scales have been translated but not yet completely validated in the Swedish context.

No significance testing was done concerning the scales' stability over time, but as presented in tables and text the analyses revealed overall small changes in mean levels, factor loadings and Cronbach's alpha. The samples reported good health, moderate stress levels, and a reasonable working climate through all waves. This is somewhat surprising knowing that the business world has experienced an economical recession during these data collections.

References

- Allen, N.J., & Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Andersson, K. (1986). *Utveckling och prövning av ett frågeformulärsystem rörande arbetsmiljö och hälsotillstånd [Development and test of a questionnaire concerning work environment and health]* (Rapport 2). Örebro: Yrkesmedicinska kliniken.
- Beehr, T.A., Walsh, J.T., & Taber, T.D. (1976). Relationship of stress to individually and organizationally valued states: Higher order needs as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61, 41-47.
- Boyar, S. L., Carson, C. M., Mosley, D. C., Maertz, C. P., & Pearson; A. W. (2006). Assessment of the validity of Netemeyer et al.'s WFC and FWC scales. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 17(1), 34-44.
- Brayfield, A.H., & Rothe, H.F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35, 307-311.
- Caplan, R.D. (1971). *Organizational stress and individual strain: A social-psychological study of risk factors in coronary heart diseases among administrators, engineers, and scientists*. Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, University Microfilms No. 72/14822, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Caplan, R.D., Cobb, S., French, J.R.P. Jr, Harrison, R.V., & Pinneau, S.R. (1975). *Job demands and worker health: Main effects and occupational differences*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cheng, G. H.-L. & Chan, D. K.-S. (2008). Who suffers more from job insecurity? A meta-analytic review. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 57, 272-303.
- Clark, L.J. (2005). *Moderators of the effects of perceived job insecurity: A comparison of temporary and permanent employees*. Doctoral thesis, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia.
- Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386-400.
- Eysenck, H.J. & Eysenck, S.B.G. (1968). *Manual for the Eysenck Personality Inventory*. San Diego, CA: Educational and Industrial Testing Service.
- Fryer, D., & Payne, R. (1986). Being unemployed: A review of the literature on the psychological experience of unemployment. In C. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, (pp. 235-278). New York: Wiley.
- Goldberg, D. (1979). *Manual of the general health questionnaire*. London: NFER Nelson.
- Greenhalgh, L. & Rosenblatt, Z. (1984). Job insecurity: toward conceptual clarity. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(3), 438-448.
- Guppy, A., Edwards, J.A., Brough, P., Peters-Bean, K.M., Sale, C., & Short, E. (2004). The psychometric properties of the short version of the Cybernetic Coping Scale: A multigroup confirmatory factor analysis across four samples. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 39-62.

- Göransson, S., Näswall, K., & Sverke, M. (2009). Work-related health attributions: their impact on work attitudes. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 2, 6-21.
- Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 159-170.
- Hall, D.T., & Hall, F.S. (1976). The relationship between goals, performance, self-image, and involvement under different organizational climates. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 9, 267-278.
- Hellgren, J., Sjöberg, A., & Sverke, M. (1997). Intention to quit: Effects of job satisfaction and job perceptions, in F. Avallone, J. Arnold, & K. de Witte (Eds.), *Feelings work in Europe* (pp. 415-423). Milano: Guerini.
- Hellgren, J., Sverke, M., & Isaksson, K. (1999). A two-dimensional approach to job insecurity: Consequences for employee attitudes and well-being. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 179-195.
- Hellgren, J., Sverke, M., & Näswall, K. (2008). Changing Work Roles: New Demands and Challenges. In K. Näswall, J. Hellgren, & M. Sverke (Eds.) *The individual in the changing working life* (pp. 46-66). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hovmark, S., & Thomsson, H. (1995). *ASK - ett frågeformulär för att mäta arbetsbelastning, socialt stöd, kontroll och kompetens i arbetslivet* (Reports from the Department of Psychology 86). Stockholm: Stockholms universitet, Psykologiska institutionen.
- Isaksson, Hellgren, & Pettersson (1998). *Strukturomvandling inom svensk detaljhandel: Uppföljning av omorganisation och personalminskning i KF/KDAB* [Structural transformation in Swedish retail trade: Follow-up of a reorganization and layoff in KF/KDAB]. Reports from the Department of Psychology, Stockholm University, 97:1998.
- Isaksson, K., & Johansson, G. (1997). Avtalspension med vinst och förlust: Konsekvenser för företag och medarbetare [Early retirement agreement for better or worse: Consequences for companies and workers]. Stockholm: Folksam.
- Jahoda, M. (1981). Work, employment, and unemployment: Values, theories, and approaches in social research. *American Psychologist*, 36 (2), 184-191.
- Jahoda, M. (1982). Employment and unemployment: A social-psychological analysis. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Erez, A. Locke, E.A., & Thoresen, C.J. (2002). The scientific merit of valid measures of general concepts: Personality research and core self-evaluations. In J.M. Brett, & F. Drasgow (Eds.), *The psychology of work: Theoretically based empirical research*, (pp. 55-77). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kanungo, R.N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 341-349.
- Kinnunen, U., Mauno, S., Nätti, J., & Happonen, M. (2000). Organizational antecedents and outcomes of job insecurity: a longitudinal study in three organizations in Finland. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 443-459.
- Levenson, H. (1981). Differentiating among internality, powerful others, and chance. In H.M. Lefourt (Ed.), *Research with the locus of control construct* (pp. 15-63). New York: Academic Press

- Mellor, S., Mahieu, J.E., & Swim, J.K.(1994). Cross-level analysis of the influence of local union structure on women's and men's union commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 203-210.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 400-410.
- Näswall, K., Baraldi, S., Richter, A., Hellgren, J., & Sverke, M. (2006). *The salaried employee in the modern working life: Threats and challenges. Technical report on the sample, data collection, and measurement properties of the instruments.* SALTSA Report No 2006:3. Stockholm: National Institute for Working Life & SALTSA.
- Näswall, K., & De Witte, H. (2003). Who feels insecure in Europe? Predicting job insecurity from background variables. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 24 189-215.
- Probst, T. M. (2005). Countering the negative effects of job insecurity through participative decision making: Lessons from the demand-control model. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(4), 320-329.
- Rizzo, J.R., House, R.J., & Lirtzman, S.I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 150-163.
- Robinson, S.L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 574-599.
- Schaufeli, W.B. & Bakker, A. (2003). Downloaded from www.schaufeli.com, 2009-09-01.
- Sjöberg, A. & Sverke, M. (2000). The interactive effect of job involvement and organizational commitment on job turnover revisited: A note on the mediating role of turnover intention. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 3, 247-252.
- Sverke, M. & Sjöberg, A. (1994). Dual commitment to company and union in Sweden: An examination of predictors and taxonomic split methods. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 15, 531-564.
- Sverke, M., Hellgren, J. & Näswall, K. (2002). No security: a meta-analysis and review of job insecurity and its consequences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7(3), 242-264.
- Sverke, M., Hellgren, J., & Öhrming, J. (1997). Hospital corporatization: How are nurses' job perceptions and work-related attitudes affected?. *Reports from the Department of Psychology*, Stockholm University, 1997, No. 839.
- Tamres, L. K., Janicki, D., & Helgeson, V. S. (2002). Sex differences in coping behaviour:A meta-analytic review and an examination of relative coping. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6(1), 2-30.
- van der Vliet, C. & Hellgren, J. (2002). *The modern working life: Its impact on employee attitudes, performance and health.* (SALTSA report 4, 2002). Sweden, National Institute for Working Life & SALTSA.
- Walsh, J.T., Taber, T.D., & Beehr, T.A. (1980). An integreted model of perceived job characteristics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 25, 252-267.

Appendix

Block 1 Demographics

Table A.1.1. Distribution over the different offices

Lgt01	Distribution of persons over offices N (%)	Time 1		Time 2		Time 3		Time 4	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Stockholm Plan 2		23	4.0	22	3.8	19	3.4	-	-
Stockholm Plan 3		21	3.7	23	4.0	23	4.1	-	-
Stockholm Plan 5		23	4.0	19	3.3	21	3.7	-	-
Stockholm Plan 6		22	3.9	18	3.1	17	3.0	-	-
Stockholm Grupp 2		-	-	-	-	-	-	26	4.6
Stockholm Grupp 3		-	-	-	-	-	-	29	5.1
Stockholm Grupp 6		-	-	-	-	-	-	25	4.4
Stockholm Redovisning		8	1.4	25	4.4	21	3.7	27	4.7
Business consulting		-	-	-	-	6	1.1	-	-
Stockholm övriga		-	-	4	0.7	-	-	-	-
Stab		14	2.5	21	3.7	27	4.8	25	4.4
Corporate Finance		10	1.8	8	1.4	7	1.2	8	1.4
Skatt		26	4.6	23	4.0	31	5.5	28	4.9
Göteborg		36	6.3	39	6.8	32	5.7	41	7.2
Malmö		16	2.8	14	2.4	12	2.1	20	3.5
Helsingborg		14	2.5	9	1.6	11	1.9	14	2.5
Kristianstad		13	2.3	18	3.1	18	3.2	15	2.6
Västerås		17	3.0	17	3.0	18	3.2	20	3.5
Eskilstuna		18	3.2	18	3.1	16	2.8	15	2.6
Nyköping		16	2.8	15	2.6	16	2.8	12	2.1
Lindesberg		-	-	-	-	2	0.4	-	-
Örebro		28	4.9	30	5.2	27	4.8	25	4.4
Karlstad		31	5.5	25	4.4	16	2.8	17	3.0
Borlänge		2	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uppsala		25	4.4	27	4.7	29	5.1	25	4.4
Norrköping		17	3.0	18	3.1	21	3.7	24	4.2
Linköping		25	4.4	24	4.2	23	4.1	26	4.6
Jönköping		18	3.2	17	3.0	15	2.7	21	3.7
Visby		9	1.6	11	1.9	12	2.1	10	1.8
Östersund		24	4.2	28	4.9	25	4.4	15	2.6
Sundsvall		22	3.9	14	2.4	16	2.8	18	3.2
Luleå		10	1.8	11	1.9	13	2.3	11	1.9
Umeå		14	2.5	19	3.3	20	3.5	15	2.6
Gävle		16	2.8	16	2.8	14	2.5	18	3.2
Sandviken		3	0.5	4	0.7	4	0.7	-	-
Falun		17	3.0	18	3.1	16	2.8	18	3.2
Övriga		30	5.3	19	3.3	17	3.0	23	4.0

Table A.1.2. *Closest manager*

Lgt02	Which manager do you report to?	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
	Office manager	94.5	95.5	94.9	94.9
	Sector manager north of Sweden	2.1	1.4	1.1	1.6
	Sector manager south of Sweden	1.6	1.2	1.8	1.8
	CEO	1.8	1.9	2.3	1.8

Block 2 Work-climate

Table A.2.1. *Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Competency demands*

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Lkr01	I am expected to develop my competence	.77	.80	.75	.76
Lkr02	The nature of my works means I continually have to develop myself and learn to think in new ways	.60	.69	.83	.72
Lkr03	I feel pressure to continually learn in order to manage my work task	.48	.50	.52	.53
Eigenvalue		1.19	1.37	1.52	1.41
Variance explained		39.50	45.66	50.63	46.90
α		.64	.70	.73	.70
N		562	566	557	568
M		3.61	3.56	3.62	3.62
SD		.80	.84	.87	.85

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.2.2. *Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Goal Clarity*

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Mk01	I know exactly what is expected of me	.71	.75	.73	.76
Mk02	Explanation is clear of what has to be done	.81	.83	.82	.79
Mk03	I know what my responsibilities are	.74	.76	.78	.73
Mk04	There exist no clear, planned goals and objectives for my job (R)	.70	.64	.71	.65
Eigenvalue		2.21	2.23	2.33	2.16
Variance explained		55.13	55.81	58.28	54.11
α		.83	.83	.85	.82
N		563	564	553	557
M		3.91	3.91	3.77	3.80
SD		.80	.76	.83	.80

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale

Table A.2.3. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Role Conflict

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Rf01	I receive incompatible requests from two or more people	.70	.68	.72	.69
Rf02	I have to do things that should be done differently	.60	.67	.65	.64
Rf03	I have to buck a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment	.56	.49	.50	.62
Rf04	I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others	.56	.62	.57	.54
Rf05	I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it	.82	.78	.76	.78
Eigenvalue		2.16	2.13	2.11	2.16
Variance explained		43.19	42.69	42.17	43.11
α		.78	.78	.78	.79
N		555	556	556	568
M		1.88	2.05	2.07	2.03
SD		.73	.78	.77	.76

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.2.4. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Quantitative Role overload

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Be01	I am given enough time to do what is expected of me in my job (R)	.72	.65	.66	.66
Be02	It fairly often happens that I have to work under a heavy time pressure	.79	.75	.73	.84
Be03	I often have too much to do in my job	.74	.79	.75	.62
Eigenvalue		1.68	1.62	1.52	1.51
Variance explained		56.13	53.84	50.81	50.45
α		.79	.77	.75	.74
N		561	564	556	566
M		3.51	3.57	3.48	3.30
SD		.87	.88	.86	.87

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.2.5. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Qualitative Role overload

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Kb01 I feel unreasonable demands in my work	.60	.56	.61	.70
Kb02 I consider my responsibilities as unreasonable	.65	.52	.62	.71
Kb03 I have work demands that are difficult to accomplish	.74	.73	.75	.75
Kb04 My work contains elements that are too demanding	.68	.68	.68	.67
Eigenvalue	1.77	1.58	1.77	2.01
Variance explained	44.34	39.41	44.33	50.20
α	.76	.71	.76	.80
N	560	565	555	566
M	2.11	2.21	2.19	2.13
SD	.78	.78	.79	.83

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.2.6. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Interpersonal conflicts

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Pk01 My work is hampered by the existence of power struggles and territorial thinking at my workplace	.69	.74	.70	.75
Pk02 Intrigues in my working place impair the work climate	.68	.77	.82	.78
Pk03 There are a great deal of tension on the work place due to prestige and conflicts	.93	.92	.92	.89
Eigenvalue	1.80	1.99	2.01	1.96
Variance explained	60.01	66.46	67.07	65.37
α	.81	.85	.85	.85
N	560	564	558	568
M	1.95	2.22	2.16	2.20
SD	.94	1.10	1.06	1.07

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.2.7. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Autonomy

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	
Au01	I have satisfactory influence over decisions concerning my job	.70	.73	.77	.72
Au02	I can make my own decisions on how to organize my work	.69	.69	.66	.68
Au03	There is scope for me to take own initiatives in my work	.70	.72	.73	.68
Au04	I have a job where I can really prove my ability	.79	.80	.78	.77
Eigenvalue	2.07	2.18	2.17	2.05	
Variance explained	51.76	54.39	54.32	51.12	
α	.81	.83	.82	.81	
N	565	570	563	568	
M	3.90	3.79	3.81	3.78	
SD	.69	.75	.71	.73	

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.2.8. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Task completion ambiguity

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	
Pf01	I determine when my work assignments are completed (R)	.61	.68	.71	.65
Pf02	I know when a task is completed (R)	.72	.71	.78	.69
Pf03	I can decide if my work assignment is finished or not (R)	.83	.81	.79	.86
Pf04	It is up to me to assess when my work assignment is completed (R)	.77	.75	.80	.82
Eigenvalue	2.18	2.17	2.37	2.30	
Variance explained	54.50	54.23	59.20	57.56	
α	.82	.82	.85	.84	
N	560	566	557	557	
M	1.85	1.91	1.92	1.90	
SD	.73	.75	.75	.73	

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.2.9. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Task quality ambiguity

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Qk01 I know when I have done good work (R)	.87	.87	.92	.92
Qk02 I can sense when I have carried out a job well (R)	.84	.82	.85	.79
Qk03 I can judge the quality of my work (R)	.65	.63	.62	.64
Qk04 When my work is carried out well, I can feel it (R)	.89	.80	.84	.86
Eigenvalue	2.68	2.49	2.65	2.62
Variance explained	67.05	62.13	66.16	65.39
α	.89	.86	.88	.87
N	563	566	554	557
M	1.81	1.94	1.90	1.91
SD	.68	.69	.69	.68

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.2.10. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Job Challenge

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Lk01 I'm learning new things all the time in my job	.82	.74	.85	.84
Lk02 My work is characterized by change and variation	.60	.61	.64	.62
Lk03 My work requires continual involvement	.44	.59	.58	.59
Lk04 I have opportunities for personal development	.65	.65	.69	.66
Eigenvalue	1.65	1.68	1.94	1.67
Variance explained	74.36	41.92	48.54	46.74
α	.72	.74	.78	.78
N	564	569	556	566
M	3.88	3.83	3.84	3.79
SD	.69	.73	.77	.77

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.2.11. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Feedback

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Kr01	I usually know whether or not my work is satisfactory on this job	.92	.91	.96	.94
Kr02	I have a pretty good idea of whether or not I am performing my job sufficiently well	.89	.88	.88	.89
Kr03	I often have trouble figuring out whether I'm doing well or poorly on this job (R)	.50	.38	.50	.42
Kr04	My boss gives me a pretty good idea of how well I'm performing my job	.88	.85	.88	.88
Eigenvalue		2.67	2.47	2.72	2.62
Variance explained		66.63	61.70	67.96	65.39
α		.87	.83	.87	.86
N		346	342	340	556
M		3.16	3.11	3.13	3.08
SD		.99	.94	.99	.99

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.2.12. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Communication

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Lri01	My manager has an open communication with me.	.74	.75	.79	.82
Lri02	My manager explains clearly and comprehensively when I need it	.77	.78	.80	.80
Lri03	My managers explanations are good and satisfying	.86	.89	.91	.89
Lri04	My manager provides necessary information in due time.	.78	.78	.79	.76
Lri05	The manager caters to my needs in terms of information	.76	.77	.78	.81
Eigenvalue		3.07	3.17	3.32	3.34
Variance explained		61.46	63.39	66.37	66.87
α		.89	.90	.91	.91
N		559	558	551	557
M		3.24	3.18	3.19	3.21
SD		.91	.96	.97	.99

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.2.13. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Feedback from project manager

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Kr01u I usually get to know from my project manager whether or not my work is satisfactory on this job	.87	.95	.91	.92
Kr02u I have a pretty good idea of whether or not I am performing my job sufficiently well	.88	.86	.90	.89
Kr03u I often have trouble figuring out whether I'm doing well or poorly on this job (R)	.52	.41	.46	.46
Kr04u My project manager gives me a pretty good idea of how well I'm performing my job	.91	.85	.91	.89
Eigenvalue	2.64	2.53	2.68	2.62
Variance explained	65.96	63.22	67.11	65.53
α	.87	.84	.87	.86
N	193	195	192	327
M	3.34	3.25	3.25	3.16
SD	.87	.83	.83	.83

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.2.14. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Communication with Project manager

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Lri01u My project manager has an open communication with me.	.82	.77	.84	.77
Lri02u My project manager explains clearly and comprehensively when I need it	.79	.83	.78	.79
Lri03u My project managers explanations are good and satisfying	.83	.86	.84	.84
Lri04u My project manager provides necessary information in due time.	.74	.71	.74	.74
Lri05u The project manager caters to my needs in terms of information	.81	.76	.78	.73
Eigenvalue	3.19	3.11	3.16	3.03
Variance explained	63.79	62.14	63.20	60.53
α	.90	.89	.89	.88
N	193	195	192	327
M	3.51	3.46	3.41	3.38
SD	.81	.77	.76	.78

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Block 3 Organizational characteristics

Table A.3.1. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Job insecurity (Quantitative)

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Ko01	I am worried that I will have to leave my job before I would like to	.89	.90	.91	.94
Ko02	There is a risk that I will have to leave my present job in the year to come	.90	.89	.84	.93
Ko03	I feel uneasy about losing my job in the near future	.89	.87	.86	.92
Eigenvalue		2.39	2.37	2.27	2.60
Variance explained		79.56	79.01	75.62	86.61
α		.92	.92	.90	.95
N		568	573	564	568
M		1.45	1.59	1.62	1.92
SD		.77	.81	.82	1.05

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.3.2. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Job insecurity (Qualitative)

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Ka01	My future career opportunities in the organization are favorable (R)	.54	.53	.54	.61
Ka02	I feel worried about my career development within the organization	.84	.84	.75	.81
Ka03	I worry about my future wage development	.64	.55	.67	.68
Ka04	I worry about getting less stimulating work tasks in the future	.64	.68	.65	.68
Eigenvalue		1.83	1.76	1.73	1.95
Variance explained		45.66	43.91	43.24	48.68
α		.76	.74	.75	.79
N		565	570	563	568
M		2.28	2.40	2.39	2.52
SD		.90	.89	.90	.95

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.3.3. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Gender Equity

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	
Jm01	Equal opportunities between men and women exist at my work place	.85	.86	.83	.85
Jm02	When positions are being appointed it doesn't matter if the applicant is a man or a woman	.59	.59	.59	.58
Jm03	I believe men and women are treated equally at my work place.	.95	.94	.95	.95
Jm04	Men and women are treated equally when the wages are set	.79	.83	.82	.83
Eigenvalue	2.59	2.66	2.62	2.65	
Variance explained	64.87	66.42	65.55	66.13	
α	.87	.88	.87	.88	
N	551	551	545	564	
M	3.58	3.47	3.52	3.52	
SD	.96	.98	.94	.99	

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.3.4. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Centralization

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	
Ce01	Employees are encouraged to participate when important decisions are made in this organization (R)	-	.91	.89	.88
Ce02	Employees are encouraged to speak up when they disagree with a decision concerning the organization (R)	-	.71	.72	.70
Ce03	Only people in managerial positions are involved when it comes to organizational decisions	-	.67	.68	.72
Eigenvalue	-	1.79	1.78	1.78	
Variance explained	-	59.51	59.18	59.34	
α	-	.81	.81	.81	
N	-	569	560	567	
M	-	3.01	3.00	3.12	
SD	-	.58	.58	1.03	

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.3.5. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Work-related health attributions

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	
Ha01	I think I can continue to work as I do now and remain healthy in the long run (R)	-	-	.68	.70
Ha02	I believe that my work affects my health in a negative way	-	-	.88	.90
Ha03	If I had another job my health would probably be better	-	-	.80	.80
Eigenvalue	-	-	1.88	1.94	
Variance explained	-	-	62.63	64.78	
α	-	-	.83	.84	
N	-	-	564	568	
M	-	-	2.30	2.28	
SD	-	-	1.00	1.01	

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.3.6. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Trust

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	
Tr01	I can expect my employer to treat me in a consistent and predictable fashion	.76	.76	.80	.80
Tr02	My employer is always reliable	.76	.80	.80	.86
Tr03	My employer is open and honest with me	.90	.85	.88	.88
Tr04	I am sure that I can trust my employer	.95	.88	.92	.88
Tr05	I have complete confidence in my employer	.90	.90	.89	.93
Eigenvalue	3.69	3.53	3.69	3.79	
Variance explained	73.72	70.50	73.75	75.72	
α	.93	.92	.93	.94	
N	389	350	347	567	
M	3.94	3.74	3.75	3.57	
SD	.78	.81	.84	.92	

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.3.7. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Organizational justice

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	
Oj01	I feel that my employer treats me fairly	.94	.92	.87	.90
Oj02	My employers judgments are usually fair	.78	.80	.83	.79
Oj03	I find that my employer behaves fairly towards me	.72	.79	.88	.85
Eigenvalue	2.02	2.11	2.22	2.14	
Variance explained	67.26	70.34	73.94	71.47	
α	.85	.87	.89	.88	
N	349	349	349	567	
M	3.81	3.63	3.66	3.51	
SD	.82	.85	.84	.91	

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.3.8. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Subjective job dependency

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	
Sjd01	My income from my job in this organisation is important to me (and my dependents)	.50	.52	.54	.57
Sjd02	I could easily adjust my financial commitments (by reducing expenditure or increasing other sources of income) should I lose my job in this organisation (R)	.62	.70	.70	.72
Sjd03	I consider that if I lost my job in this organisation my standard of living would change to the worst	.78	.83	.76	.88
Sjd04	To maintain the standard of living I desire for myself (and my dependents), I must keep my current job	.79	.74	.77	.83
Eigenvalue	1.87	1.99	1.95	2.28	
Variance explained	46.80	49.63	48.73	57.11	
α	.77	.79	.78	.83	
N	567	574	563	568	
M	3.54	3.50	3.55	3.57	
SD	.94	.98	.94	.99	

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Block 4 Absenteeism/Presenteeism

Table A.4.1. Descriptive statistics for number of times on sick-leave

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Fr01a	How many times have you been absent from work because of illness during the past three months?	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
	0	-	-	-	375 (73.1)
	1	-	-	-	109 (21.2)
	2	-	-	-	22 (4.3)
	3	-	-	-	2 (0.4)
	5	-	-	-	2 (0.4)
	6	-	-	-	1 (0.2)
	15	-	-	-	1 (0.2)
	40	-	-	-	1 (0.2)
	Mean (SD)	-	-	-	5 (1.99)
	Missing	-	-	-	66

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.4.2. Descriptive statistics for number of days on sick-leave

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Fr01b				
How many days have you been absent from work because of illness during <i>the past three months?</i>	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
0	-	-	-	283 (67.4)
1	-	-	-	38 (9.0)
2	-	-	-	33 (7.9)
3	-	-	-	25 (6)
4	-	-	-	9 (2.1)
5	-	-	-	17 (4)
6	-	-	-	3 (.7)
7	-	-	-	2 (.5)
8	-	-	-	1 (.2)
9	-	-	-	1 (.2)
15	-	-	-	2 (.5)
17	-	-	-	1 (.2)
18	-	-	-	1 (.2)
28	-	-	-	1 (.2)
30	-	-	-	1 (.2)
60	-	-	-	1 (.2)
90	-	-	-	1 (.2)
Mean (SD)	-	-	-	1.5 (6)
Missing	-	-	-	159

Table A.4.3. Descriptive statistics for number of times of working while ill

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Fr03a				
How many times have you been at work, when you should been home, because of illness during the <i>past three months?</i>	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
0	396 (72.8)	301 (55.3)	325 (62.5)	372 (72.7)
1	81 (14.9)	105 (19.3)	101 (19.4)	79 (15.4)
2	41 (7.5)	77 (14.2)	57 (11)	40 (7.8)
3	17 (3.1)	38 (7)	21 (4)	9 (1.8)
4	4 (.7)	5 (.9)	5 (1)	5 (1.)
5	4 (.7)	9 (1.7)	5 (1)	1 (.2)
6	1 (.2)	2 (.4)	-	-
7	-	1 (.2)	1 (.2)	1 (.2)
8	-	1 (.2)	-	-
10	-	3 (.6)	3 (.6)	2 (.4)
14	-	-	-	1 (.2)
15	-	-	1 (.2)	1 (.2)
16	-	1 (.2)	-	-
18	-	1 (.2)	-	-
20	-	-	-	1 (.2)
25	-	-	1 (.2)	-
Mean (SD)	.5 (.9)	.9 (1.7)	.7 (1.8)	.6 (1.6)
Missing	27	35	47	67

Table A.4.4. Descriptive statistics for number of days of working while ill

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Fr03b				
How many days have you been at work, when you should been home, because of illness during the past three months?	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
0	6 (4)	2 (.8)	241 (55.1)	276 (67.5)
1	27 (18)	36 (15.2)	35 (8)	28 (6.8)
2	41 (27.3)	74 (31.2)	62 (14.2)	43 (10.5)
3	26 (17.3)	36 (15.2)	27 (6.2)	19 (4.6)
4	13 (8.7)	28 (11.8)	22 (5)	16 (3.9)
5	14 (9.3)	23 (9.7)	14 (3.2)	12 (2.9)
6	9 (6)	12 (5.1)	7 (1.6)	3 (0.7)
7	4 (2.7)	7 (3)	5 (1.1)	2 (0.5)
8	4 (2.7)	4 (1.7)	3 (.7)	2 (0.5)
9	-	1 (.4)	1 (.2)	2 (0.5)
10	4 (2.7)	9 (3.8)	14 (3.2)	1 (0.2)
12	1 (.7)	1 (.4)	-	-
14	-	1 (.4)	3 (.7)	2 (0.5)
15	-	1 (.4)	1 (.2)	1 (0.2)
16	-	1 (.4)	-	-
18	-	1 (.4)	-	-
20	1 (.7)	-	-	1 (0.2)
25	-	-	1 (.2)	-
40	-	-	-	1 (0.2)
60	-	-	1 (.2)	-
Mean (SD)	3.3 (2.7)	3.6 (2.9)	1.7 (4.3)	1.2 (3.0)
Missing	421	342	130	170

Block 5 Work-related attitudes and behaviors

Table A.5.1. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Job satisfaction

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Js01 I enjoy being at my job	.88	.89	.88	.90
Js02 I am contented with the job I have	.82	.86	.89	.89
Js03 I am satisfied with my job	.80	.76	.80	.78
Eigenvalue	2.08	2.11	2.20	2.22
Variance explained	69.35	70.17	73.21	73.88
α	.87	.87	.89	.89
N	565	572	563	568
M	4	3.83	3.88	3.80
SD	.80	.86	.85	.90

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.5.2. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Organizational commitment

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Oc02 I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it	.67	.65	.67	.70
Oc05 I have a strong sense of affinity to the organization I work for	.87	.88	.90	.91
Oc06 It often feels as the organizations problems are the same as my own problems	.16	.20	.13	.13
Oc07 The organization has a big personal importance to me	.74	.66	.59	.66
Eigenvalue	1.79	1.67	1.63	1.77
Variance explained	44.81	41.87	46.76	44.13
α	.68	.67	.64	.68
N	563	570	560	568
M	3.27	3.12	3.13	3.10
SD	.71	.73	.70	.74

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale. A one-factor solution had to be specified at Time 2, 3 and 4.

Table A.5.3. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Perceived performance

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	
Pp01	I manage most of the situations that arise in my work	.55	.59	.64	.64
Pp02	I feel secure and competent in my occupational role	.66	.62	.66	.65
Pp03	I take own initiative to solve problems in my job	.64	.64	.60	.64
Pp04	I always try to be professional in my work	.53	.54	.50	.68
Pp05	I always do my best at work	.52	.60	.53	.50
Eigenvalue	1.69	1.79	1.73	1.83	
Variance explained	33.89	35.82	34.69	36.54	
α	.72	.73	.72	.73	
N	565	572	560	563	
M	4.32	4.30	4.29	4.31	
SD	.45	.47	.46	.46	

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale. A one factor solution had to be specified at Time 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Table A.5.4. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Turnover intention

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	
It01	I feel that I could leave this job	.84	.87	.85	.84
It02	I am actively looking for other jobs	.66	.76	.77	.67
It03	If I was completely free to choose I would leave this job	.85	.91	.89	.86
Eigenvalue	1.85	2.12	2.12	1.9	
Variance explained	61.79	70.55	70.76	63.19	
α	.82	.87	.88	.83	
N	567	570	560	572	
M	1.68	1.86	1.80	1.81	
SD	.88	1.03	.99	.96	

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.5.5. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Work involvement/work centrality

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Wi01	Work should be only a small part of one's life (R)	.41	.48	.39	.49
Wi02	In my view, an individual's personal life goals should be work-oriented	.51	.47	.64	.56
Wi03	The most important things that happens in life involve work	.61	.58	.61	.52
Wi04	Work should be considered central to life	.54	.61	.51	.64
Eigenvalue		1.08	1.16	1.19	1.23
Variance explained		27.06	28.95	29.86	30.73
α		.59	.61	.62	.63
N		561	571	559	563
M		2.82	2.75	2.74	2.69
SD		.62	.67	.63	.64

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale. A one factor solution had to be specified at Time 1, 2 and 3.

Table A.5.6. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Employability (External)

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Ae01	I am aware of other employments where I could make use of what I have learnt in my current job	.64	.65	.64	.59
Ae02	I could get a similar (or better) job without having to relocate	.65	.61	.72	.68
Ae03	The work qualifications I bestow are in demand by employers	.59	.64	.65	.64
Ae04	With my work qualifications I can find new work relatively quickly	.95	.94	.94	.94
Ae05	With my experience I can find new work relatively quickly	.95	.95	.95	.93
Eigenvalue		2.99	2.99	3.13	2.98
Variance explained		59.75	59.82	62.51	59.53
α		.87	.87	.88	.87
N		563	570	561	570
M		3.92	4.03	4.01	3.94
SD		.85	.81	.82	.82

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.5.7. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Work-life interference

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Wli01	The demands in my work interfere with my home and family life	.77	.75	.79	.78
Wli02	The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities	.77	.80	.83	.81
Wli03	Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me	.80	.82	.86	.84
Wli04	Due to work-related duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities	.71	.79	.78	.82
Eigenvalue		2.34	2.51	2.68	2.63
Variance explained		58.44	62.87	66.92	65.67
α		.85	.87	.89	.88
N		565	572	560	563
M		2.62	2.81	2.59	2.45
SD		.93	1.00	1.00	.96

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.5.8. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Life-work interference

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Lwi01	Demands of my spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities	.67	.69	.73	.68
Lwi02	I have to put off doing things at work because of demands on my time at home	.50	.57	.60	.55
Lwi03	Things I want to do at work don't get done because of the demands of my family or spouse/partner	.79	.76	.80	.84
Lwi04	Family-related strain interferes with my ability to perform job-related duties	.73	.73	.70	.76
Eigenvalue		1.85	1.93	2.01	2.04
Variance explained		46.34	48.13	50.32	51.05
α		.76	.78	.80	.79
N		566	572	562	572
M		1.53	1.56	1.53	1.49
SD		.57	.61	.59	.58

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.5.9. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Over-commitment

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	
Ovc01	It often occurs that I wake up in the morning and think about work related problems	.74	.78	.75	.78
Ovc02	When I come home, it is easy for me to switch off from work (R)	.75	.73	.72	.78
Ovc03	Those who are close to me say I give too much of myself to my work	.52	.52	.56	.53
Ovc04	I can rarely let go of thoughts concerning my work	.84	.85	.84	.86
Ovc05	Even in the evenings when I am free I think about work	.91	.95	.91	.93
Ovc06	My work is on my mind even on the week-ends	.87	.89	.88	.85
Eigenvalue	3.66	3.83	3.70	3.83	
Variance explained	61.06	63.82	61.66	63.83	
α	.90	.91	.90	.91	
N	565	571	562	563	
M	3.00	3.15	3.01	2.89	
SD	.98	1.05	1.01	1.03	

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.5.10. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Work Engagement

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	
En01	At my work, I feel bursting with energy	-	-	-	.80
En02	At my job, I feel strong and vigorous	-	-	-	.85
En03	I am enthusiastic about my job	-	-	-	.91
En04	My job inspires me	-	-	-	.85
En05	When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work	-	-	-	.73
En06	I feel happy when I am working intensely	-	-	-	.76
En07	I am proud of the work that I do	-	-	-	.70
En08	I am immersed in my job	-	-	-	.79
En09	I get carried away when I'm working	-	-	-	.59
Eigenvalue	-	-	-	-	5.44
Variance explained	-	-	-	-	60.48
α	-	-	-	-	.93
N	-	-	-	-	572
M	-	-	-	-	3.83
SD	-	-	-	-	.83

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.5.11. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Demands for billable hours

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Db01 I find the demands for billable hours unreasonably high	.80	.80	.83	.82
Db02 I find the demands for billable hours stressful	.96	.93	.94	.94
Db03 I feel pressured to maintain a high ratio between time and billable hours	.71	.75	.74	.71
Db04 My the demands for billable hours motivates me in my work (R)	.22	.25	.32	.29
Eigenvalue	2.10	2.13	2.22	2.16
Variance explained	52.54	53.35	55.61	54.04
α	.74	.76	.79	.78
N	521	521	503	514
M	3.63	3.78	3.82	3.79
SD	.91	.91	.94	.92

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale. A one factor solution had to be specified in Time 1

Block 6.1 Coping strategies

Table A.6.1.1. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Coping – Change the situation

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Ccs01 I try to change the situation to get what I want	.85	.83	.87	.88
Ccs02 I focus my efforts on changing the situation	.64	.72	.73	.77
Ccs03 I work on changing the situation to get what I want	.83	.81	.81	.80
Eigenvalue	1.83	1.87	1.94	2.01
Variance explained	61.00	62.23	64.73	67.10
α	.82	.83	.84	.86
N	558	572	561	561
M	3.79	3.77	3.82	3.77
SD	.70	.72	.73	.71

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.6.1.2. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Coping – Accommodation

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Ccs04 I make an effort to change my expectations	.81	.74	.81	.78
Ccs05 I try to adjust my expectations to meet the situation	.56	.70	.57	.64
Ccs06 I try to adjust my own standards	.49	.41	.49	.56
Eigenvalue	1.21	1.20	1.22	1.33
Variance explained	40.18	40.10	40.60	44.32
α	.64	.64	.65	.70
N	555	565	551	561
M	3.00	2.94	2.96	3.00
SD	.71	.70	.71	0.71

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.6.1.3. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Coping - Devaluation

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Ccs07 I tell myself the problem is unimportant	.55	.51	.60	.56
Ccs08 I tell myself the problem wasn't so serious after all	.86	.85	.85	.88
Ccs09 I tell myself the problem isn't such a big deal after all	.85	.93	.92	.91
Eigenvalue	1.77	1.83	1.93	1.91
Variance explained	58.83	61.15	64.19	63.59
α	.79	.79	.83	.82
N	563	570	560	561
M	2.63	2.62	2.62	2.75
SD	.87	.87	.92	.89

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.6.1.4. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Coping – Avoidance

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Ccs10 I try to turn my attention away from the problem	.71	.72	.70	.74
Ccs11 I try to keep my mind off the problem	.85	.88	.89	.90
Ccs12 I try to avoid thinking about the problem	.79	.86	.85	.77
Eigenvalue	1.86	2.03	2.02	1.94
Variance explained	61.93	67.72	67.34	64.65
α	.83	.86	.86	.84
N	563	570	557	561
M	2.38	2.40	2.39	2.53
SD	.89	.95	.95	.95

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Block 6.2 Social support

Table A.6.2.1. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Social support – Co-workers

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Ssc01	I usually receive help from my co-worker when something needs to be done quickly	.73	.69	.70	.70
Ssc02	I always receive the help I need from my co-worker when difficulties in my work arise	.89	.91	.92	.92
Ssc03	When I encounter problems at work, there is always a co-worker to turn to	.74	.78	.67	.73
Eigenvalue		1.85	1.90	1.78	1.87
Variance explained		61.81	63.44	59.41	62.30
α		.82	.83	.80	.82
N		566	576	563	568
M		3.89	3.85	3.87	3.94
SD		.82	.87	.83	.81

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.6.2.2. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Social support - Supervisor

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Sss01	When I encounter problems at work, I can always ask my manager for advice	.86	.87	.85	.90
Sss02	I always receive help from my manager when difficulties in my work arise	.86	.88	.89	.90
Sss03	My manager helps me when I encounter problems in my work that I can not solve by myself	.93	.96	.94	.93
Eigenvalue		2.35	2.45	2.41	2.49
Variance explained		78.44	81.74	80.42	82.99
α		.92	.93	.92	.94
N		563	570	559	566
M		3.46	3.40	3.42	3.43
SD		1.08	1.12	1.11	1.14

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Table A.6.2.3. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Social support - Family

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Ssf01	I have someone outside of work to whom I can talk about difficulties and problems in my work	.91	.89	.87	.87
Ssf02	When things are difficult and confusing at work I have someone outside of work who supports me	.72	.66	.77	.72
Ssf03	I have a network of people outside of work in which I can discuss work related problems	.67	.72	.59	.63
Ssf04	I can receive support from those who are close to me when it comes to problems at work	.71	.68	.78	.76
Eigenvalue		2.30	2.21	2.32	2.25
Variance explained		57.47	55.28	57.94	56.34
α		.84	.83	.84	.83
N		566	574	560	568
M		3.65	3.72	3.74	3.82
SD		1.04	1.01	1.00	.99

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale.

Block 7 Core self-evaluations

Table A.7.1. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Locus of control

		Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Lo01	Whether or not I get to be a leader depends mostly on my ability	.48	.41	.39	.49
Lo02	When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work	.41	.50	.50	.42
Lo03	When I get what I want, it's usually because I'm lucky (R)	.54	.46	.59	.53
Lo04	I have often found that what is going to happen will happen (R)	.49	.46	.59	.54
Lo05	I can pretty much determine what will happen in my life	.67	.60	.64	.66
Lo06	I am usually able to protect my personal interests	.46	.58	.56	.50
Lo07	When I get what I want, it's usually because I worked hard for it	.42	.50	.42	.45
Lo08	My life is determined by my own actions	.61	.67	.55	.65
Eigenvalue		2.13	2.24	2.28	2.29
Variance explained		26.59	27.99	28.51	28.64
α		.74	.75	.75	.75
N		561	568	558	568
M		3.85	3.80	3.82	3.80
SD		.50	.54	.53	.53

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale. A one-factor solution had to be specified at Time 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Table A.7.2. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Neuroticism

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Ne01 My feelings are easily hurt	.63	.64	.68	.64
Ne02 I'm a nervous person	.67	.59	.62	.61
Ne03 I'm a worrier	.75	.74	.80	.80
Ne04 I am often tense or "high strung"	.76	.72	.78	.74
Ne05 I often suffer from "nerves"	.66	.59	.62	.62
Ne06 I am often troubled by feelings of guilt	.72	.64	.67	.68
Ne07 My mood often goes up and down	.66	.74	.72	.70
Ne08 Sometimes I feel miserable for no reason	.64	.67	.66	.65
Ne09 I am an irritable person	.59	.62	.62	.64
Ne10 I often feel fed up	.72	.70	.71	.70
Ne11 I often worry too long after an embarrassing experience	.60	.61	.65	.60
Ne12 I often feel lonely	.54	.56	.54	.53
Eigenvalue	5.30	5.14	5.49	5.27
Variance explained	44.12	42.83	45.73	43.89
α	.90	.90	.91	.90
N	564	570	560	568
M	2.05	2.10	2.10	2.09
SD	.71	.72	.73	.72

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale. A one-factor solution had to be specified at Time 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Block 8 Mental health complaints

Table A.8.1. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring General health questionnaire

	Have you over the past two weeks.	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Gh01	Been able to concentrate (R)	.48	.40	.52	.49
Gh02	Lost sleep over worry	.54	.57	.51	.50
Gh03	Felt that you are playing a useful part in things (R)	.35	.36	.38	.39
Gh04	Felt capable of making decisions (R)	.47	.51	.52	.50
Gh05	Felt constantly under strain	.50	.47	.54	.53
Gh06	Felt you could face up to problems (R)	.52	.58	.65	.51
Gh07	Been able to enjoy day-to-day activities (R)	.60	.65	.64	.61
Gh08	Felt that you could not overcome difficulties?	.57	.59	.56	.56
Gh09	Felt unhappy and depressed	.71	.71	.73	.69
Gh10	Lost confidence in yourself	.63	.63	.69	.70
Gh11	Been thinking of yourself as a worthless person	.64	.57	.61	.56
Gh12	Been feeling reasonably happy (R)	.58	.59	.62	.58
Eigenvalue		3.70	3.75	4.03	3.73
Variance explained		30.86	31.24	33.57	31.1
α		.84	.84	.85	.84
N		559	570	561	576
M		.68	.76	.70	.70
SD		.37	.39	.40	.40

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale. A one factor solution had to be specified at Time 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Block 9 Somatic health complaints

Table A.9.1. Factor analysis results, reliability, and descriptive statistics for the scale measuring Somatic health complaints

	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4
Hb01 Stomach problems?	.49	.41	.46	.46
Hb02 Heart or chest problems?	.32	.31	.28	.31
Hb03 Joint problems	.44	.54	.50	.57
Hb04 Muscular problems?	.68	.70	.71	.74
Hb05 Neck/Shoulder pains?	.69	.71	.71	.72
Hb06 Back pain?	.62	.59	.58	.61
Hb07 Headaches?	.49	.46	.52	.45
Hb08 Skin irritations or itching?	.31	.31	.26	.23
Hb09 Breathing problems?	.28	.22	.28	.31
Hb10 Longterm colds?	.28	.24	.26	.30
Eigenvalue	2.35	2.31	2.36	2.52
Variance explained	22.54	23.13	23.63	25.19
α	.73	.72	.75	.75
N	561	566	461	576
M	1.69	1.76	1.73	1.72
SD	.55	.55	.55	.55

Note: Measured on a 1-5 scale. A one-factor solution had to be specified at Time 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Department of Psychology
Stockholm University
106 91 Stockholm
Sweden
www.psychology.su.se

