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ABSTRACT
The aim of this study was to assess the ability of the Demand-Control-Support (DCS) model as well as the psychological contract model (PCM) to predict the wellbeing experienced by 2,566 Australian police officers. While the level of explained variance attributed to the PCM was substantially less than the DCS, measures of contract breach and organisational fairness still captured significant portions of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. Overall, the results of this study suggest that both the DCS and the PCM should figure prominently in strategies aimed at reducing or preventing police stress.
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INTRODUCTION
Occupational stress is quickly becoming the single greatest cause of occupational disease and can have far-reaching consequences for both the worker and the workplace (Leigh & Schnall 2000). Although job stress is a concern for many industries and occupational groups, some professions appear to be more vulnerable to experiencing high levels of stress at work than others (Kop, Euwema & Schaufeli 1999). Policing has been identified as one of these particularly stressful occupations with law enforcement work being ranked among the top-fve most stressful occupations world-wide (Dantzer 1987; Liberman, Best, Metzler, Fagan, Weiss & Marmar 2002). Organisational stressors such as heavy workloads, inadequate support, staff shortages and poor communication are considerably more prevalent and problematic than acute (e.g., attending accident scenes) operational stressors (e.g., Biggam, Power & MacDonald 1997; Brough 2004). Widely-used job stress models such as the demand-control-support (DCS) model generally examine these stressors from a person-environment fit perspective (e.g., Collins & Gibbs 2003), whereby the level of fit between the demands of the environment and the capacities of the individual influences the attitudinal and behavioural outcomes (Lazarus & Folkham 1984). There is evidence that other theoretical frameworks, such as the psychological contract model (PCM) (Rousseau 1995), may also offer useful insights into the work-
stress relationship. The remainder of this introduction will outline the rationale for using the DCS and the PCM to investigate the organisational stressors experienced by police officers and will discuss possible interactions between these two models.

The Demand-Control-Support (DCS) Model

The DCS model is one of the most widely used models underpinning occupational research on employee stress and wellbeing (Fox, Dwyer & Ganster 1993). The DCS started with an emphasis on the demand of the job and the degree of control or discretion that the employee has over their work. The initial demand-control model proposed that the risk of psychological and physical illness due to strain increases with increasing demands and is ameliorated to some extent by the level of job control exercised by the employee (Karasek, Baker, Marxer, Ahlbom & Theorell 1981). The demand-control model was later expanded to include the social support available to the individual (Karasek & Theorell 1990). High strain jobs therefore represent those situations where the demands are not matched by adequate levels of decision-making authority and/or support from supervisors and colleagues. The direct and interactive relationships between demand, control, support and wellbeing have been extensively tested (see van der Doef & Maes 1999 for a review). Research has consistently demonstrated that the component variables are predictive of health-related outcomes, although there has been mixed support for the demand x control x support variable (e.g., Stansfeld, Head & Marmot 2000; Bond & Bunce 2003; De Lange, Taris, Kompier, Houtman & Bongers 2004). Further, the DCS has been found to have strong cross-occupational versatility and is relevant to a range of professional groups, including law enforcement and other emergency service personnel (Karasek & Theorell 1990).

The Psychological Contract Model (PCM)

The PCM is grounded in the early work of social exchange theorists such as Blau (1964) and Adams (1965) and refers to employees’ beliefs about the mutual obligations between the employee and their organisation (Rousseau 1989; Rousseau 1998). These beliefs are based on the perception that employer promises have been made (e.g. competitive wages, promotional opportunities, training) in exchange for certain employee obligations such as the giving of their time, energy, and technical skills.
The psychological contract is based on reciprocity - as an employee contributes more to an organisation, their expectations about what is owed tend to increase. Then, as the organisation meets various expectations of the employee, that side of this, often implicit, contract becomes increasingly fulfilled. However, when the employee perceives that the organisation has failed to fulfil one or more elements of the psychological contract, there is a breach of contract (Morrison & Robinson 1997). Breaches in psychological contract can involve “feelings of betrayal and deeper psychological distress” (Rousseau 1989, p.122) and, as they are commonly experienced by employees from a range of industries (e.g., Robinson & Rousseau 1994), the psychological contract model may explain significant proportions of the stress experienced by police officers. However, this model has been primarily used to examine extra-role behaviour such as organisational citizenship behaviours (Coyle-Shapiro 2002) and, in the case of stress among law enforcement personnel, the authors have been able to locate few studies of police stress that have been guided by the psychological contract model. The aim of this study is therefore to add to the job stress literature by testing the capacity of the PCM to predict the stress experienced by police officers. Comparing the PCM with a well-established model of occupational stress like the DCS will provide a useful insight into the relative benefits of combining psychological contract theory with a generic job stress model.

**Organisational fairness – a contextual moderator of the work-stress relationship**

An important moderator to consider when investigating the impact of psychological contract breaches is organisational fairness. Perceptions of fairness are central to the assessment of contract breaches and will heavily influence the severity of the outcomes (Rousseau 1995; Morrison & Robinson 1997). In situations where an individual can distinguish unfair procedures and treatment that occurred along with the breach of the psychological contract, more intense feelings of anger and distress may result (Morrison & Robinson 1997).

There are strong indications that perceptions of fairness will influence how employees respond to other potentially stressful conditions, not just breaches in psychological contract. For example, recent research has found that perceptions of fairness moderate the relationship between job demands and job satisfaction (Janssen 2001). More specifically, this study found that employees who perceive that there
is a fair balance between job effort and job rewards perform better and are more satisfied in response to heightened job demands than those who perceive they are under-rewarded for their efforts. The Janssen study also raises doubts over the role of job control in moderating the relationship between job demands and affective responses with the findings showing that the job demands-fairness interaction was predictive of job satisfaction and job performance, while the demands x control variable failed to account for a significant portion of variance in these two variables. However this study was based on a relatively small sample of employees (N=170) and, as acknowledged by the author, further research is required to clarify the role of potential moderators such as organisational fairness and job control (Janssen 2001). Another aim of the present study is therefore to clarify the influence that fairness and control have on the relationship between job demands and job strain. The outcomes of these analyses will then provide a firmer indication of the variables that need to be addressed in order to combat the negative effects of demanding and potentially stressful working environments.

Two outcome measures will be used to assess job stress in the present study; psychological health and job satisfaction. Both variables are frequently used to measure job stress and are considered key dimensions of individual wellbeing (Warr 1990). Psychological health is a context-free measure of wellbeing and refers to the feelings people have irrespective of any particular setting. In contrast, job satisfaction captures the feelings people have about themselves in relation to their job and is used to measure job-specific wellbeing. Incorporating both these measures provides a more detailed assessment of the relationship between the working conditions and situations covered in this study and an individual’s overall level of wellbeing.

 METHOD

 Participants
 The study sample consisted of police officers employed in an Australian, state-based police force. The officers were asked to complete a self-report survey and, of the approximately 8,000 police officers employed in the organisation, 2,505 completed and returned their surveys (i.e., 31% response rate). To summarise the demographic characteristics of the sample, 80% (2,010) of respondents were male and 72% (1,805) were aged between 30 and 49 years. There was a relatively even spread of employees
across tenure groups (classified by 10 year intervals: 9 and less years, 10-19 years, and 20 or more years), and the highest level of education attained by the majority of officers was secondary school (49%: 1,218).

Measures

Psychological Health. The GHQ-12 (Goldberg & Williams 1988) consists of 12 items measuring self-perceived psychological health. Each item is scored on a four-point Likert scale ranging from ‘not at all’ (0) to ‘much more than usual’ (3). Higher scores on the measure are indicative of higher levels of self-rated psychological health. The scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.91.

Job Satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured using 15 items developed by Warr and colleagues (Warr, Cook & Wall 1979). The measure consisted of two subscales that measure the intrinsic and extrinsic factors of the job that contribute to an employee’s satisfaction. Items were measured on a seven-point likert scale with a range of ‘Extremely Satisfied’ (1) to ‘Extremely Dissatisfied’ (7). The Cronbach’s alpha was 0.83 for intrinsic and 0.73 for extrinsic job satisfaction.

Job Demands. This variable was measured using a quantitative workload scale developed by Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison, and Pinneau (Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison & Pinneau 1980). The scale assesses both physical and psychological demands and consists of 11 items measuring the amount of work performed by the employee and the pace that it is performed at. Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from ‘rarely’ (5) to ‘very often’ (1). The scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.89.

Job Discretion. Job discretion was measured using a nine item scale developed by Karasek (1985). The scale measured the degree to which individuals were able to make work related decisions and acquire new skills. Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from ‘Strongly Disagree’ (1) to ‘Strongly Agree’ (5), whereby higher scores indicated higher levels of discretion. A Cronbach’s alpha of 0.72 was recorded.

Support. Social Support from within the organisation and from non-work sources was measured using a scale developed by Etzion (1984). The scale contains nine items, seven of which require two answers, one relating to the employees work environment and the second to their life outside of work.
These two responses form the two subscales: support at work and support outside work. The two remaining items relate to three specific roles people have in the employees’ life (i.e., partner, family, and friends/supervisor, co-workers and subordinates). Responses are recorded on a seven-point likert scale ranging from ‘very little’ (1) to ‘very much’ (7). A Cronbach’s alpha of 0.86 for support at work, and 0.87 for support outside work.

Psychological Contract Breach. This variable was measured using the five items from Robinson and Morrison’s (2000) ‘Perceived contract breach’ measure. The scale assesses the extent to which employee’s expectations were breached by their employer. These items were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from ‘Disagree Strongly’ (1) to ‘Agree Strongly’ (5), with a low score indicating a greater breach of the respondents’ expectations. The scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.90.

Organisational Fairness. Colquitt’s (2001) justice scales were used to measure the four forms of fairness: procedural (the justice of processes that lead to an outcome), distributive (extent to which outcomes are consistent with implicit allocation norms), interpersonal (extent to which decision makers treat people with respect and dignity) and informational fairness (extent to which decisions makers explain the rationale). Items were recoded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from ‘Very Often’ (1) to ‘Rarely’ (5), hence lower scores were indicative of a higher level of perceived fairness within the organisation. The Cronbach’s alphas were: 0.84 for procedural fairness, 0.85 for distributive fairness, 0.91 for interpersonal fairness and 0.91 for informational fairness.

RESULTS

Prior to undertaking the data analyses, both the independent and dependent variable measures were screened for the accuracy of scores, missing data, outliers and for violations of the assumptions of the regressions. The evaluation of these assumptions indicated that the data met the requirements for normality, linearity and homoscedasticity, particularly when investigating collinearity and multicollinearity (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). Missing data was treated using listwise deletion (Roth 1994) and all statistical analyses were undertaken using SPSS 12.0.1 for Windows (SPSS Inc., 2004).
Table 1 lists the descriptive statistics and correlations for each of the study variables. The correlations were conducted to highlight the pattern of relationships between the independent and dependent variables that would be used in the regression analyses. Table 1 indicates that there were a large number of significant correlations between the target measures and predictor variables.

**Hierarchical Regression Analyses**

Hierarchical regression analyses were performed for each of the outcome measures (intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction and well-being). Blocks of independent variables were entered in the order of: (1) demographical variables, (2) the DCS variables, (3) breach and the four fairness subscales, (4) squared job demands, breach and fairness subscales, and (5) the interaction terms. Demographic variables were also entered into the regression analyses to control for any confounding effect that tenure, gender and age may have on the relationship between the other independent variables and the outcome measures. The order of entry was based on the need to examine the extent to which the DCS variables, breach and the four fairness subscales accounted for additional variance in the outcome measures. The squared variables and the main effect interaction terms were entered into the proceeding blocks with the aim of providing further information regarding the nature of the relationship between the independent variables. Note that the ‘centred’ variable was utilised within these analyses for job demands, job control, breach and the four fairness subscales.

The overall equation displayed in Table 2 significantly explained the variance in intrinsic job satisfaction, $R^2_{adj} = 0.632$, $F(33, 1907) = 100.05, p < .001$. The overall equation was also significant for the outcome measures for extrinsic job satisfaction, $R^2_{adj} = 0.560$, $F(33, 1897) = 71.82, p < .001$, and well-being, $R^2_{adj} = 0.229$, $F(33, 1918) = 18.23, p < .001$.

The results of the multiple regression analyses in Table 2 indicated the first block of the demographic variables accounted for significant, but relatively small amounts of variance in all three outcome variables, with 4% for extrinsic job satisfaction and 3% for both intrinsic job satisfaction and well-being. The DCS variables in the second step accounted for much larger amounts of variance, ranging from 20% for well-being, to 44% for extrinsic job satisfaction and 53% for intrinsic job satisfaction. The third step, including breach and each of the four fairness subscales, accounted for
significant amounts of variance in the three outcome measures, but was only 1% for well-being and 6% and 8% for intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction, respectively. Although the next step, with job demands, breach and the four fairness subscales squared, also made a significant contribution to the model for intrinsic job satisfaction and well-being, the amount of variance accounted for was negligible, with approximately 1% for wellbeing and a negligible amount for intrinsic job satisfaction. The fifth block, which included the interaction terms, was significant for intrinsic job satisfaction, but accounted for a negligible proportion of the variance.

In relation to the contribution made by specific predictor variables, gender, job demands, job control, support at work and breach were the only independent variables that significantly predicted all three outcome measures. The tenure dummy variables of 4 years or less, 5-9 years and 20-24 years were significant predictors of well-being, whilst the 5-9 years tenure group was a significant predictor of intrinsic job satisfaction. None of the age dummy variables were significant predictors for any of the outcome measures. Support outside work was a significant predictor of well-being, whilst for the fairness subscales, procedural fairness was a significant predictor of intrinsic job satisfaction, distributive fairness significantly predicted both intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction, and interpersonal fairness was a significant predictor of extrinsic job satisfaction. Job demands squared significantly predicted well-being, and the interaction between job demands and procedural fairness was significant for intrinsic job satisfaction, which was the only significant interaction term across the three outcome measures.

Given that the beta weight for both job demands and job demands squared was negative for well-being, it can be inferred that there is a negative relationship between job demands and well-being, in that as job demands increase, well-being is reduced. In relation to the significant interaction between job demands and procedural fairness for intrinsic job satisfaction, it can be observed in Table 2 that the beta weight for this interaction, in addition to those for job demands and procedural fairness, are negative in orientation (although please note that the fairness subscales were coded so that higher scores equalled lower levels of fairness). This suggests that as job demands increase and there is a reduction in the level of procedural fairness, intrinsic job satisfaction is also reduced.
DISCUSSION

The primary aim of this study was to assess the ability of the DCS and the PCM to predict the strain experienced by a sample of Australian police officers. This study also sought to clarify the role of organisational fairness and job control in modifying the relationship between job demands and job stress. The results of the regression analyses provided strong support for the additive effects of the DCS and suggest that the component variables should play a prominent role in strategies designed to prevent or reduce the impact of police stress. While the level of explained variance attributed to the psychological contract and organisational justice variables was substantially less than the JSM, these variables still captured significant portions of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. The analyses involving the interactive variables (job demands x fairness and job demands x control) yielded inconsistent results although, as outlined below, there was some support for a demand-fairness interaction. Higher-order analyses also revealed a curvilinear relationship between job demands and wellbeing.

The relative influence of the DCS and PCM

The individual components of the JSM were the only independent variables that were predictive of all three outcome measures. The predictive capacity of social support at work was particularly strong and adds weight to a growing number of studies that have shown close associations between the advice, assistance and feedback received from colleagues and supervisors and employee wellbeing (e.g., Leong, Furnham & Cooper 1996; Swanson & Power 2001; De Lange, Taris et al. 2004). Likewise, the prominence of job control in the regression results is consistent with previous studies indicating that this work characteristic is an important causal determinant of a number of important outcomes including mental health and job satisfaction (Bosma, Marmot, Hemingway, Nicholson, Brunner & Stansfeld 1997; Smulders & Nijhuis 1999; Terry & Jimmieson 1999; Bond & Bunce 2003).

Although the regression analyses describing the main effects (Step 1-3, Table 2) suggest that the relationship between job demands and the outcome variables is linear (i.e., as demands increase, job satisfaction and wellbeing decreases), the higher order analyses indicate that this relationship is more complex and includes curvilinear effects. When demand squared is regressed against wellbeing, the
beta is negative and significant (see Step 4, Table 2). This result suggests that the relationship between demand and wellbeing is an inverse-U shape and that both low and high demand are associated with low wellbeing. However, given that the main effect for demand on wellbeing is negative and significant, the overall combined effect between demand (both in Step 2 and 4) and wellbeing is a lopsided inverted U. That is, wellbeing drops relatively slowly when demands increase from low to moderate, however they fall away dramatically in the face of high demands. These results indicate that high demands are much more likely to contribute to high job strain when compared to low or moderate levels of demand.

In terms of the influence of the psychological contract and organisational fairness models, the results generally indicate that both models provide a useful framework for examining employee strain. While the level of variance attributed to the breaches and fairness variables was considerably smaller than the JSM (see Step 3, Table 2), the breaches variable was predictive of all outcome variables (i.e., as fulfilled expectations increased, job satisfaction and wellbeing also increased). In addition, distributive fairness was predictive of both forms of job satisfaction. When coupled with other studies linking psychological contract violations with key employee attitudes (e.g., Robinson 1996; Kickul, Lester & Belgio 2004), there is strong evidence to suggest that strategies aimed at minimising contract breaches will enhance employee satisfaction and wellbeing. Organizations therefore need to ensure that they do not make or convey unrealistic promises and that both employer and employee have a clear and consistent understanding of what each party will give and receive in the employment relationship. Nevertheless, contract violations are often unavoidable and the influence of fairness in the present study suggests that where breaches are necessary, organizations need to ensure that the procedures leading to the breach are fair and transparent, and that employees are treated in an equitable and respectful way (e.g., Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter & Ng 2001; Elovainio, Kivimaki & Vahtera 2002; Kickul, Lester & Finkl 2002).

**Interactions between job demands and contextual variables**

Virtually all of the interactions analysed in Step 5 of the regression analyses (Table 2) failed to reach significance. The only exception was the relationship between the demands-procedural fairness
interactive variable and intrinsic satisfaction. However, rather than moderate the demand-strain relationship, as would be expected based on the Janssen (2000; 2001) papers, the output from the regressions (Table 2) suggests that demand and procedural fairness had a (negative) synergistic effect on intrinsic job satisfaction. The main effect of procedural fairness has a negative beta, while the main effect for job demands is also negative. Furthermore, the beta for the interaction variable (demand by procedural fairness) is negative and hence, the presence of three negative beta’s indicates that when demand increases and procedural fairness increases, the (negative) impact on intrinsic job satisfaction is greater than the negative impact that would have occurred if the effects of demand and procedural fairness had simply been added together. This synergistic effect indicates that efforts to reduce job strain need to consider both measures to prevent the problem in the first place, but if this situation does occur, then organisations need to have mechanisms in place to ensure that the processes associated with high-demand jobs (in particular) are seen to be fair.

The present study has some limitations that need to be considered. First, the study employed a cross-sectional design and therefore the results are limited to the situation when the participants were surveyed. The ability to develop firm conclusions regarding the role of internal and external coping resources, for example, would be strengthened by a longitudinal study. The second limitation relates to the reliance on the subjective views of the participants and the subsequent concern this raises about common method variance. This concern applies more to the dependent, rather than the independent variables, wherein additional objective measures of the outcome variables would have enhanced the validity of the findings. However, some reassurance is gained from research that has shown a high correlation between expert ratings of job conditions and subjective assessments (Karasek, Baker et al. 1981; Spector 1992).

Conclusion

Overall the DCS model demonstrated good utility in predicting wellbeing. The addition to the core DCS model of fairness and breach improved upon the predictive ability of the DCS model alone. The findings of this study imply that incorporating more of the social elements of the workplace into analyses of stress, strain and wellbeing would be a productive avenue of exploration for future
research. In particular, within the relatively well-defined sphere of police work organisations may wish to pay more attention to their officers perceptions of the fairness of the procedures in the workplace (e.g. for promotion and transfer procedures).
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Table 1
**Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among Study Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td>29.46</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic job satisfaction</td>
<td>35.16</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>0.77***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>0.43***</td>
<td>0.43***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job demands</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>-0.23***</td>
<td>-0.33***</td>
<td>-0.22***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job control</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.51***</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.20***</td>
<td>0.06***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support at work</td>
<td>39.19</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>0.66***</td>
<td>0.64***</td>
<td>0.40***</td>
<td>-0.20***</td>
<td>0.35***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support outside work</td>
<td>51.43</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
<td>0.10***</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.05***</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.52***</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
<td>-0.20***</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.42***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural fairness</td>
<td>25.85</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>-0.43***</td>
<td>-0.42***</td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
<td>0.16***</td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
<td>-0.38***</td>
<td>-0.07**</td>
<td>-0.43***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive fairness</td>
<td>14.34</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>-0.41***</td>
<td>-0.47***</td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>-0.10***</td>
<td>-0.31***</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.43***</td>
<td>0.49***</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal fairness</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>-0.38***</td>
<td>-0.40***</td>
<td>-0.18***</td>
<td>0.07***</td>
<td>-0.21***</td>
<td>-0.37***</td>
<td>-0.06**</td>
<td>-0.35***</td>
<td>0.44***</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational fairness</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>-0.45***</td>
<td>-0.44***</td>
<td>-0.22***</td>
<td>0.15***</td>
<td>-0.20***</td>
<td>-0.41***</td>
<td>-0.05*</td>
<td>-0.46***</td>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>0.41***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Table 2
**Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Intrinsic Job Satisfaction, Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Well-being**

| Independent Variable | B     | SE B | β    | ΔR²  | B     | SE B | β    | ΔR²  | B     | SE B | β    | ΔR²  |
|----------------------|-------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|
| **Step 1**           |       |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |      |
| Tenure - 4yrs or less| -0.84 | 0.49 | -0.04| -0.96| 0.54  | -0.05| 1.29 | 0.63 | 0.07* |       |      |      |      |
| Tenure - 5-9yrs      | -1.32 | 0.45 | -0.07**| -0.78| 0.49  | -0.04| 1.39 | 0.57 | 0.09* |       |      |      |      |
| Tenure - 10-14yrs    | -0.77 | 0.43 | -0.04| 0.33 | 0.48  | 0.02 | 0.69 | 0.55 | 0.04  |       |      |      |      |
| Tenure - 15-19yrs    | -0.45 | 0.38 | -0.03| 0.50 | 0.42  | 0.03 | 0.89 | 0.49 | 0.06  |       |      |      |      |
| Tenure - 20-24yrs    | -0.36 | 0.38 | -0.02| 0.08 | 0.41  | 0.00 | 1.14 | 0.48 | 0.06* |       |      |      |      |
| Gender - Male        | -1.29 | 0.27 | -0.07***| -1.39| 0.30  | -0.08***| 1.09 | 0.34 | 0.07**|       |      |      |      |
| Age - 29yrs or less  | 0.11  | 0.54 | 0.01 | 0.60 | 0.60  | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.69 | 0.01  |       |      |      |      |
| Age - 30-39yrs       | 0.15  | 0.43 | 0.01 | 0.31 | 0.48  | 0.02 | 0.50 | 0.56 | 0.04  |       |      |      |      |
| Age - 40-49yrs       | 0.08  | 0.34 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.37  | 0.01 | 0.04***| 0.19 | 0.43  | -0.01|       | 0.03***|      |
| **Step 2**           |       |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |      |
| Job demands centred  | -0.09 | 0.02 | -0.09***| -0.18| 0.02  | -0.17***| -0.16| 0.02 | -0.17***|       |      |      |      |
| Job control centred  | 0.49  | 0.02 | 0.31***| 0.22 | 0.03  | 0.14***| 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.09***|       |      |      |      |
| Support at work      | 0.27  | 0.01 | 0.39***| 0.27 | 0.01  | 0.38***| 0.16 | 0.02 | 0.26***|       |      |      |      |
| Support outside work | -0.02 | 0.01 | -0.02 | 0.53***| -0.02| 0.01 | -0.02 | 0.44***| 0.08  | 0.01  | 0.14***| 0.20***|      |
| **Step 3**           |       |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |       |      |      |      |      |
Breach centred & 0.30 & 0.03 & 0.17*** & 0.27 & 0.04 & 0.16*** & 0.14 & 0.04 & 0.09** \\
Procedural fairness centred & -0.08 & 0.02 & -0.06** & -0.04 & 0.03 & -0.03 & 0.05 & 0.03 & 0.05 \\
Distributive fairness centred & -0.17 & 0.03 & -0.10*** & -0.27 & 0.03 & -0.16*** & -0.01 & 0.04 & -0.00 \\
Interpersonal fairness centred & -0.05 & 0.04 & -0.03 & -0.16 & 0.04 & -0.09*** & -0.04 & 0.05 & -0.02 \\
Informational fairness centred & -0.06 & 0.03 & -0.04 & 0.06*** & -0.03 & 0.03 & -0.02 & 0.08*** & 0.00 & 0.04 & 0.00 & 0.01** \\

**Step 4**

Job demands centred² & -0.00 & 0.00 & -0.03 & -0.00 & 0.00 & -0.02 & -0.01 & 0.00 & -0.07** \\
Breach centred² & -0.00 & 0.01 & -0.01 & 0.00 & 0.01 & 0.01 & -0.01 & 0.01 & -0.02 \\
Procedural fairness centred² & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & -0.00 & 0.00 & -0.01 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.02 \\
Distributive fairness centred² & 0.01 & 0.01 & 0.01 & -0.00 & 0.01 & -0.01 & 0.01 & 0.01 & 0.01 \\
Interpersonal fairness centred² & 0.01 & 0.01 & 0.02 & 0.01 & 0.01 & 0.02 & -0.00 & 0.01 & -0.01 \\
Informational fairness centred² & -0.01 & 0.01 & -0.03 & 0.00* & 0.00 & 0.01 & 0.02 & 0.00 & -0.00 & 0.01 & -0.02 & 0.01** \\

**Step 5**

Job demands centred × Job control centred & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.01 & -0.00 & 0.00 & -0.02 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 0.03 \\
Job demands centred × Procedural fairness centred & -0.01 & 0.00 & -0.04* & -0.00 & 0.00 & -0.02 & 0.01 & 0.01 & 0.03 \\
Job demands centred × Distributive fairness centred & -0.01 & 0.01 & -0.03 & -0.01 & 0.01 & -0.03 & -0.01 & 0.01 & -0.03 \\
Job demands centred × Interpersonal fairness centred & -0.01 & 0.01 & -0.03 & -0.01 & 0.01 & -0.03 & 0.00 & 0.01 & -0.00 \\
Job demands centred × Informational fairness centred & 0.01 & 0.01 & 0.04 & 0.00 & 0.01 & 0.01 & -0.01 & 0.01 & -0.03 \\
Breach centred × Procedural fairness centred & 0.00 & 0.01 & 0.01 & -0.01 & 0.01 & -0.04 & 0.01 & 0.01 & 0.04 \\
Breach centred × Distributive fairness centred & -0.00 & 0.01 & -0.01 & -0.00 & 0.01 & -0.01 & -0.01 & 0.01 & -0.01 \\
Breach centred × Interpersonal fairness centred & 0.01 & 0.01 & 0.02 & 0.02 & 0.01 & 0.02 & -0.02 & 0.01 & -0.04 \\
Breach centred × Informational fairness centred & -0.01 & 0.01 & -0.02 & 0.00* & -0.00 & 0.01 & -0.09 & 0.00 & 0.02 & 0.01 & 0.05 & 0.01 \\

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001