|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix Table A: Measurement Invariance Over Time for Job Demands/Resources Indicators** | | | | | |
| **Measurement Models** | **Δ CFI** | **Δ Chi-square** | **Δ *df*** | ***p*** | **SRMR** |
| Psychological job demands |  |  |  |  |  |
| Configural vs. Metric invariance | 0.004 | 14.10 | 6 | 0.03 | 0.011 |
| Decision authority |  |  |  |  |  |
| Configural vs. Metric invariance | 0.001 | 3.88 | 6 | 0.69 | 0.018 |
| Schedule control |  |  |  |  |  |
| Configural vs. Metric invariance | 0.001 | 36.04 | 21 | 0.02 | 0.087 |
| FSSB |  |  |  |  |  |
| Configural vs. Metric invariance | 0.000 | 7.20 | 9 | 0.62 | 0.021 |
| *Note*: CFI = comparative fit index, SRMR = standardized root mean squared residual (refers to the metric invariance model). | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix Table B: Goodness-of-fit Statistics for the Confirmatory Factor Analysis Models, by Wave** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Panel A: Wave 1** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Models** | **Chi-square** | ***df*** | **N** | **RMSEA lower** | **RMSEA upper** | **CFI** | **SRMR** | **Δ Chi-square** | **Δ *df*** | ***p*** |
| A | 4714.77 | 135 | 1467 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.47 | 0.14 |  |  |  |
| B | 4359.62 | 134 | 1467 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.51 | 0.12 |  |  |  |
| C | 1601.02 | 132 | 1467 | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.83 | 0.07 |  |  |  |
| D | 1178.53 | 129 | 1467 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.88 | 0.06 |  |  |  |
| B vs. A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 355.15 | 1 | 0.000 |
| C vs. B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2758.61 | 2 | 0.000 |
| D vs. C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 422.48 | 3 | 0.000 |
| **Panel B: Wave 2** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Models** | **Chi-square** | ***df*** | **N** | **RMSEA lower** | **RMSEA upper** | **CFI** | **SRMR** | **Δ Chi-square** | **Δ *df*** | ***p*** |
| A | 5196.04 | 135 | 1518 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.52 | 0.13 |  |  |  |
| B | 5010.26 | 134 | 1518 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.54 | 0.13 |  |  |  |
| C | 1754.94 | 132 | 1518 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.85 | 0.08 |  |  |  |
| D | 1349.85 | 129 | 1518 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.89 | 0.06 |  |  |  |
| B vs. A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 185.78 | 1 | 0.000 |
| C vs. B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3255.33 | 2 | 0.000 |
| D vs. C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 405.09 | 3 | 0.000 |
| **Panel C: Wave 3** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Models** | **Chi-square** | ***df*** | **N** | **RMSEA lower** | **RMSEA upper** | **CFI** | **SRMR** | **Δ Chi-square** | **Δ *df*** | ***p*** |
| A | 5634.59 | 135 | 1514 | 0.16 | 0.17 | 0.50 | 0.13 |  |  |  |
| B | 5330.73 | 134 | 1514 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.52 | 0.13 |  |  |  |
| C | 1888.66 | 132 | 1514 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.84 | 0.08 |  |  |  |
| D | 1317.95 | 129 | 1514 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.89 | 0.06 |  |  |  |
| B vs. A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 303.85 | 1 | 0.000 |
| C vs. B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3442.07 | 2 | 0.000 |
| D vs. C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 570.71 | 3 | 0.000 |
| **Panel D: Wave 4** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Models** | **Chi-square** | ***df*** | **N** | **RMSEA lower** | **RMSEA upper** | **CFI** | **SRMR** | **Δ Chi-square** | **Δ *df*** | ***p*** |
| A | 5827.98 | 135 | 1539 | 0.16 | 0.17 | 0.50 | 0.13 |  |  |  |
| B | 5553.8 | 134 | 1539 | 0.16 | 0.17 | 0.53 | 0.12 |  |  |  |
| C | 1829.24 | 132 | 1539 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.85 | 0.08 |  |  |  |
| D | 1318.69 | 129 | 1539 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.90 | 0.06 |  |  |  |
| B vs. A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 274.18 | 1 | 0.000 |
| C vs. B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3724.57 | 2 | 0.000 |
| D vs. C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 510.55 | 3 | 0.000 |
| *Note*: Model A = 1 factor (psychological job demands, decision authority, schedule control, and FSSB as a single dimension), Model B = 2 factors (psychological job demands and decision authority as one dimension; schedule control and FSSB as another dimension), Model C = 3 factors (psychological job demands as one dimension; decision authority and schedule control as one dimension; FSSB as another dimension), Model D = 4 factors. RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, CFI = comparative fit index, SRMR = standardized root mean squared residual. | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix Table C: Descriptive Statistics, by Job Constellations and Industry (IT/LTC)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **IT** | | | |  | **LTC (Long-Term Care)** | | | | |  | |  | |
|  | High strain/low hours (9%) | High strain/long hours (2%) | Active (42%) | Lower strain (48%) |  | High strain/low hours (34%) | High strain/low hours/shift work (31%) | High strain/long hours (8%) | Active (13%) | Lower strain (14%) | |  | |
| Female | 39% | 9% | 38% | 38% |  | 98% | 89% | 84% | 91% | 95% | | \*\*\* | |
| Age | 44.56 | 43.55 | 45.74 | 46.62 |  | 38.34 | 38.34 | 38.54 | 42.08 | 44.32 | | \*\*\* | |
| Race |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |
| Non-Hispanic White | 53% | 55% | 73% | 70% | \* | 70% | 63% | 45% | 78% | 79% | | \*\*\* | |
| Non-Hispanic Black | 3% | 9% | 4% | 4% |  | 8% | 21% | 39% | 11% | 13% | | \*\*\* | |
| Hispanic | 2% | 9% | 4% | 9% |  | 19% | 11% | 11% | 6% | 5% | | \*\*\* | |
| Asian | 42% | 27% | 18% | 17% | \*\*\* | 3% | 6% | 5% | 5% | 4% | |  | |
| Native-born | 58% | 64% | 75% | 77% | \* | 78% | 68% | 55% | 82% | 85% | | \*\*\* | |
| Educational Attainment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |
| High School or Lower | 3% | 0% | 2% | 2% |  | 44% | 35% | 36% | 19% | 26% | | \*\*\* | |
| Some College | 20% | 0% | 17% | 18% |  | 50% | 51% | 50% | 50% | 50% | |  | |
| College or Higher | 76% | 100% | 81% | 80% |  | 6% | 14% | 14% | 31% | 24% | | \*\*\* | |
| Tenure (in years) | 10.74 | 11.36 | 12.88 | 13.58 |  | 7.75 | 5.91 | 5.58 | 7.89 | 9.33 | | \*\*\* | |
| Personal Income | 85526 | 100555 | 100314 | 95196 | \*\*\* | 31123 | 32874 | 42147 | 51290 | 50202 | | \*\*\* | |
| Manager | 2% | 9% | 35% | 19% | \*\*\* | 3% | 3% | 9% | 42% | 32% | | \*\*\* | |
| Changes in Marital Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |
| Continuously married | 73% | 91% | 83% | 83% |  | 54% | 58% | 46% | 64% | 78% | | \*\*\* | |
| Continuously single | 20% | 0% | 15% | 14% |  | 32% | 29% | 46% | 25% | 13% | | \*\*\* | |
| Got married | 5% | 9% | 1% | 2% |  | 6% | 6% | 5% | 5% | 6% | |  | |
| Divorced | 2% | 0% | 1% | 1% |  | 8% | 7% | 3% | 5% | 4% | |  | |
| Changes in Parental Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |
| No child living at home both waves | 41% | 27% | 35% | 37% |  | 35% | 42% | 36% | 45% | 40% | |  | |
| No (W1) --> Yes (W4) | 3% | 0% | 4% | 4% |  | 4% | 5% | 8% | 3% | 7% | |  | |
| Yes (W1) --> No (W4) | 0% | 0% | 3% | 4% |  | 2% | 2% | 3% | 6% | 2% | |  | |
| Child living at home both waves | 56% | 73% | 59% | 56% |  | 59% | 52% | 53% | 46% | 50% | |  | |
| Changes in Adult Care |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  | |
| No both waves | 66% | 73% | 65% | 67% |  | 60% | 62% | 57% | 58% | 63% | |  | |
| No (W1) --> Yes (W4) | 7% | 9% | 10% | 8% |  | 10% | 10% | 12% | 8% | 10% | |  | |
| Yes (W1) --> No (W4) | 17% | 0% | 12% | 14% |  | 15% | 16% | 11% | 14% | 13% | |  | |
| Yes both waves | 10% | 18% | 12% | 11% |  | 14% | 12% | 20% | 19% | 13% | |  | |
| Randomized to STAR | 51% | 36% | 52% | 51% |  | 49% | 43% | 45% | 43% | 49% | |  | |
| *Notes*: 1. Stars represent ANOVA results testing whether workers in different clusters differ in those variables. Tests are conducted for IT and LTC workers separately. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. The "high strain/low hours" cluster is not shown for IT, as there is only one IT employee in that category. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. \*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appendix Table D: Comparisons between Person-Centered and Variables-Centered Approaches** | | | |
| **Outcome: Job Satisfaction** |  | *df* | BIC |
| Person-Centered Approach |  | 27 | 3001 |
| Variable-Centered Approach 1 | | 68 | 3077 |
| Variable-Centered Approach 2 | | 212 | 3908 |
| **Outcome: Emotional Exhaustion** | | *df* | BIC |
| Person-Centered Approach |  | 27 | 5509 |
| Variable-Centered Approach 1 | | 68 | 5604 |
| Variable-Centered Approach 2 | | 212 | 6491 |
| **Outcome: Work-to-Family Conflict** | | *df* | BIC |
| Person-Centered Approach |  | 27 | 3612 |
| Variable-Centered Approach 1 | | 68 | 3726 |
| Variable-Centered Approach 2 | | 212 | 4606 |
| **Outcome: Family-to-Work Conflict** | | *df* | BIC |
| Person-Centered Approach |  | 27 | 2525 |
| Variable-Centered Approach 1 | | 68 | 2736 |
| Variable-Centered Approach 2 | | 212 | 3630 |
| **Outcome: Psychological Distress** | | *df* | BIC |
| Person-Centered Approach |  | 27 | 8316 |
| Variable-Centered Approach 1 | | 68 | 8391 |
| Variable-Centered Approach 2 | | 212 | 9285 |
| *Note*: "Person-Centered Approach" refers to models presented in Table 3 where well-being outcomes are regressed on job constellations and covariates. "Variable-Centered Approach 1" refers to the models where each of the three job demands (psychological job demands, work hours, and shift work) is interacted with each of the three job resources (decision authority, schedule control, and FSSB) at each of the first three waves to predict well-being (also controlling for covariates). "Variable-Centered Approach 2" refers to the models where each of the six job characteristics (psychological job demands, work hours, shift work, decision authority, schedule control, and FSSB) is interacted with one another at each of the first three waves to predict well-being (also controlling for covariates). | | | |