

Supplemental Material - for online publishing only
Supplemental Material 1: Psychometric Properties of the Scales Used to Measure the
Variables of Demand, Control, Peer Social Support and Supervisor Social Support

To document construct validity, this supplement provides the results of the factorial structure of the measures of workload, control and support. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to test the fit of the data with the latent factors representing the constructs of workload and control. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used to test the adequacy of using two measures to represent peer and supervisor social support because each of which had less than two items per factor.

The CFA provided strong support for the measurement model of control because it had very good fit with the data in that $\chi^2 = 6.48$ ($df = 4$), $p = .04$, all fit indexes were above .99 (i.e., NFI, TLI, and CFI) and the misfit indexes also indicated very good fit with the data with RMSEA = .049 and SRMR = .01. The CFA conducted on the items included in the measure of workload also supported their measurement model in that $\chi^2 = 23.2$ ($df = 7$), $p < .01$. Because the sample size is quite large, non-significant χ^2 could be due to small discrepancies. Indeed, all the approximate fit indexes indicated satisfactory fit of the measure with the data: NFI, TLI, and CFI were all above .98, RMSEA = .06 (90% CI = .04 - .09) and SRMR = .02.

The EFA used to test the four social support items and showed that they can indeed be represented by two factors; using principal component analysis (similar results were obtained using maximum likelihood method of extraction) with Oblimin rotation showed that the matrix could be represented by two factors accounting for .57% and 24% of the variance, respectively. The first factor loaded high (above .90 in the pattern matrix) on peer social support whereas the second factor loaded high (above .80 in the pattern

matrix) on supervisor social support. The correlation between the two types of social support (see Table 1) was .39, supporting the above results of the EFA.