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Abstract
Support from school leadership and from peers has been recognised as beneficial to the morale of teachers. It can enhance job satisfaction and can have a moderating influence on felt occupational stress. This paper reports on a study that conceptualised support as three distinct dimensions of organisational communication. The three dimensions are described in terms of their manifestation as communication practices in schools. Relationships between these dimensions and job satisfaction and occupational stress of school staff members were also investigated. The participants were three hundred and fifty six staff members from primary schools of Catholic diocesan systems across New South Wales, Australia. Quantitative and qualitative data were obtained using a questionnaire survey. The findings suggest that supportive communication can indeed be beneficial to school staff. Implications for school leadership teams and staff members are discussed.

Introduction
It cannot be denied that communication performs a number of vital functions in organisations. A number of theorists have, in the past, attempted to categorise organisational communication according to its functions. Communication can be used to share information or for the purpose of regulating behaviour of staff members (Samson & Daft, 2005). People in organisations communicate to innovate and change in response to changing environments (Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Rafferty & Parker, 2006). They also interact as they participate in decision making and teamwork (Seibold & Shea, 2001). Another function of communication is the provision of support between superiors and subordinates and among peers (Macgeorge, Samter & Gillihan, 2005). This may be termed supportive communication.

Supportive communication, as it is conceptualised here, is consistent with Etzioni’s (1961) expressive and Scott and Mitchell’s (1976) emotive functions of communication as it is concerned with expressions of feelings and deals with attitudes. The concept of supportive communication is also similar to Scott and Mitchell’s (1976) motivation function in terms of the sharing of praise and encouragement. Like Goldhaber’s (1993) human function, the supportive function serves the emotional, interpersonal and morale needs of individuals.

The concept of supportive communication
Supportive communication is defined, for this study, as that by which people in organisations fulfil and cater for needs for affirmation, encouragement, social interaction and assistance. The term has been used in relation to social and task support in organisations (Albrecht, Burleson & Goldsmith, 1994; Rosenfeld & Richman, 1999).
There are several ways in which supportive communication may occur. Generally, any show of concern or interest in others may be perceived as supportive communication (Albrecht et al, 1994; Hoy & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2009; Hoy, Tarter & Witkoske, 1992). Examples of this might include praise, appreciation and other forms of recognition, encouragement, constructive criticism as well as demonstrating trust (Buunk & Verhoeven, 1991; Chapman, 1983; Hoy et al, 1992; Keyes, Maxwell & Capper, 1999; Ramus, 2001). Active listening and other signs of empathetic engagement with others may also be perceived as supportive communication (Hoy et al, 1992; Rosenfeld & Richman, 1999), provided the listening is associated with empathy and understanding. Research conducted in the area of communication motives revealed behaviours consistent with supportive communication to be associated with the fulfilment of needs for pleasure (communicating for fun and emotional lift), affection (communicating to help or thank) and inclusion (Anderson & Martin, 1995; Rubin, Perse & Barbato, 1988).

Supportive communication can occur in the downward, horizontal and upward channels, and can provide a number of positive outcomes for organisations. In a study of schools, downward supportive communication from principals was found to be positively associated with teachers’ perceptions of school effectiveness (Hoy et al, 1992). Another study conducted in schools suggested that downward supportive communication was associated with greater school effectiveness (in terms of instruction) overall (Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Reitzug, 1989).

Downward support from school administration, particularly principals, can have a significant impact on the core business of schools, teaching and learning. From a study that included Catholic schools, Logerfo (2006) reported that teachers who received support and encouragement from their principals tended to perceive themselves as more responsible for student achievement and, in turn, their students achieved better results on standardised tests compared to teachers who experienced less downward support. On the other hand, in a study conducted over the same period, support from school leadership was found to have little or no relationship with student achievement (Miller & Rowan, 2006).

Innovation and change, a core factor in pedagogical improvement, may also be influenced by downward supportive communication. McIntyre and Kyle (2006) found that teachers who had made improvements to their pedagogy for teaching reading, and maintained these changes over the long term had principals who encouraged the changes and bolstered this with professional development and other administrative support. This was in contrast to teachers whose principals demonstrated limited, short term, support.

Research in many settings, including schools, strongly suggests that supportive communication from superiors to subordinates (downward supportive communication) will result in more positive feelings about work (Buunk & Verhoeven, 1991; Chapman, 1983; De Nobile & McCormick, 2008; Whaley, 1994). Downward support has been linked to morale, employee commitment and intention to leave (Allen, 1992; Butcher & Kritsonis, 2007; Ray, 1990). A study of schools in Western Australia found that downward support was associated with staff turnover (Bruce & Cacciope, 1989). Other studies conducted in schools and other organisations revealed downward support to be associated with support from peers (horizontal
supportive communication), also known as collegiality (Buunk & Verhoeven, 1991; Hoy et al, 1992).

Evidence of upward supportive communication is limited in the communication literature. Reitzug (1989) recorded incidents of teachers giving support to principals as part of a vertical reciprocation. A more recent study identified upward supportive communication as a salient variable among school staff (De Nobile & McCormick, 2008). Lee and Jablin’s (1995) communication category of “supportiveness” did not imply any direction, but suggested that upward as well as downward supportive interactions could take place in various situations.

There is ample evidence for the idea of horizontal supportive communication (Anderson & Martin, 1995; Buunk & Verhoeven, 1991; Ray, 1990; Rich, 1995). Rich (1995) described horizontal support in terms of teacher support groups and their dependence on collegiality, horizontal communication and social interaction among staff. This, in turn, meets the professional development and social interaction needs of staff. Buunk and Verhoeven (1991) found that horizontal support helped staff to deal with problems they encountered with superiors. Other studies have described how horizontal supportive communication allows an avenue for staff to share concerns and leads to more positive attitudes to work (Anderson & Martin, 1995; De Nobile, 2003; Ray, 1990).

Given these findings it is reasonable to hypothesise that supportive communication will be positively related to job satisfaction (H1). Occupational stress is often interpreted as negative experience about work. It is therefore hypothesised that, all things being considered, supportive communication will be negatively associated with occupational stress (H2).

Supportive communication has been linked to trust (Rich, 1995). The study of schools by Hoy et al (1992) identified a positive correlation between trust and support from both leadership and colleagues. These results were echoed in a later study of Australian schools (Wallace, 1999). From his extensive review of superior-subordinate communication literature, Jablin (1979) proposed that downward supportive communication (in the form of a “consideration” leadership style) may reduce subordinate propensity to distort their upward communication. Distortion, the altering or omission of information, occurs when there is low trust between superiors and subordinates.

Supportive communication is consistent with the ethos of Catholic schools which encourages the nurturing of individuals to achieve their full potential intellectually, physically, spiritually, emotionally and morally (Flynn, 1993; Flynn & Mok, 2002). This may be achieved by imitating the attitudes and actions Jesus Christ in establishing positive and giving relationships with others (Flynn, 1993; Johnson, McCreery & Castelli, 2000; Starratt, 1990). Supportive communication is also implied in the notions of community and belonging often associated with Catholic schools in Australia (Bell, 1996; Flynn, 1993; Flynn & Mok, 2002; Mok & Flynn, 1998).

Despite the body of literature describing supportive communication and congruent concepts and their effects on organisations, the concept of supportive communication
requires further study as a phenomenon in Catholic primary schools as there is a lack of systematic study in this context. The research reported here seeks to shed some light on supportive communication as an organisational phenomenon, and how it may impact the work of teachers and other school staff members.

**Method**

Supportive communication was investigated as part of a larger study of organisational communication in schools. This study was exploratory. The aim was to identify supportive communication as a salient communication variable and describe some of the ways in which school staff members experience it. This would result in a description of Supportive communication as it applies to the Catholic primary schools involved in the study. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected.

**Participants**

The participants were staff members from Catholic primary schools in New South Wales, Australia (n = 356). They were representative of the general population of the Catholic diocesan systems from which they were drawn (14% male, 86% female). The participants were drawn from all geographical regions of the state (metropolitan and rural). Participants were invited to complete a questionnaire survey. Anonymity and confidentiality were assured and maintained.

**Instrument**

The Organisational Communication in Primary Schools Questionnaire (OCPSQ) was designed to identify a number of communication variables, including supportive communication. Items were generated to account for a number of types of communication in the upward, downward and horizontal directions of flow. Aspects of supportive communication were constructed as questionnaire items. These were statements concerning downward, upward and horizontal supportive communication.

Upward supportive communication items referred to instances when staff members communicate emotional or professional support to the principal. Downward supportive communication referred to instances when the principal communicates support to staff members. Horizontal supportive communication items concerned instances when staff members communicate support and encouragement to one another. All items were mixed with those representing other communication variables to minimise response set bias (Babbie, 1995).

Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which each item was indicative of communication at their school on a Lickert-type scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) for later scoring. Additionally, the OCPSQ concluded with an open-ended question inviting participants to make any further comments they wished about communication at their schools.

In light of the literature linking supportive communication to feelings about work and morale, measures of job satisfaction and occupational stress were included in the larger questionnaire. A modified version of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ) developed by Lester (1987) was used to measure job satisfaction. Additionally, a revised version of the Teacher Attribution of Responsibility for Stress Questionnaire (TARSQ) developed by McCormick (1997)
was used to measure occupational stress. Details of these instruments are described elsewhere (De Nobile & McCormick, 2007).

**Analyses**

Data from questionnaire items were entered on to an SPSS database. Factor analysis, using principal axis factoring and an oblimin rotation was employed to identify underlying data structures (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998). Multiple regression analyses were conducted to investigate relationships between organisational communication and job satisfaction and stress. Statements from the open ended question were coded according to their content and separated into theme categories (Krathwohl, 1998). These were then cross-checked to ensure categories were conceptually logical and distinct (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper & Allen, 1993).

**Results and Discussion**

**Towards a description of supportive communication**

**Factor analyses**

Factor analysis of the OCSPQ items revealed a ten-factor solution that accounted for 59% of the variance. The solution was checked using the criteria of eigenvalues greater than unity and examination of a scree plot. The total factor solution is described in greater detail elsewhere (De Nobile, 2003). However, the factor solution is summarised in Table 1, followed by brief descriptions of the factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor name</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Reliability (alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vertical openness of communication</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.99</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal supportive communication</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to communication channels</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical load of communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward supportive communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward supportive communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of information</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic communication</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vertical openness of communication** concerned openness between the principal and staff members. **Horizontal supportive communication** concerned support shared among peers. **Directive communication** was concerned with instruction giving and compliance gaining by the principal. **Access to communication channels** concerned opportunities to communicate with the principal through official channels. **Cultural communication** concerned the transmission of cultural information among staff members. **Vertical load of communication** related to the amount of information flowing between staff members and the principal. This factor was retained despite its relatively low alpha reliability because of its interpretability. The low Cronbach $\alpha$ was no doubt the result of there being only two items. **Upward supportive communication** concerned staff members giving support to the principal. **Downward supportive communication** was related to how principals communicate support to staff members. **Adequacy of information** was concerned with the perception of sufficiency and accuracy of information.
Most dimensions of communication were originally conceptualised in terms of possible direction of flow, and, hence were anticipated as three factors each (upward, downward and horizontal). However, only supportive communication emerged as three distinct factors. What follows is a description of each factor, representing supportive communication as it was experienced in the participating schools.

**Horizontal supportive communication** emerged as a ten item factor \((a = .89)\). This factor concerned support giving between peers at the same hierarchical level, such as that between teachers or among executive members. It was typified by items such as “Staff members at this school support one another”, “Staff members give supportive comments and feedback to other staff members”, “Staff at this school can talk to one another when they have a problem”, “Staff members express feelings about work to one another” and “As a staff, we help each other get through the day”. The items suggest that peers act as a support mechanism to offset concerns and frustrations regarding work and to provide mutual encouragement. **Horizontal supportive communication** is also about professional sharing and skill-building as suggested by the items concerning feedback and help.

**Upward supportive communication** emerged as a factor with three items. Despite the comparatively low number of items loading on the factor, the alpha reliability was quite strong \((a = .85)\). This factor concerns a dimension of communication where staff members are giving support to the principal. The items included, "Staff members give emotional support to the principal" and "Staff give moral support to the principal". These items suggest that, contrary to the impression one might receive from the scant literature on the topic, upward support is indeed a salient feature of organisational communication in schools. This dimension of communication not only concerns the provision of support to the principal, but indicates a certain level of openness between staff and principal. This provides some support for the proposition from the literature discussed earlier that supportiveness is linked to trust.

**Downward supportive communication** emerged as a six item factor \((a = .94)\). This factor concerned supportive behaviour of the principal towards staff members. Items that typified this factor included, “The principal is encouraging”, “The principal provides staff with positive feedback” and “The principal gets behind staff when they are doing things about which they are not confident”. Other items within this factor concerned principal valuing staff input into decision-making. Hence, it can be stated that **Downward supportive communication** describes a dimension of communication encompassing a variety of forms of support from the principal. Key aspects of this are encouragement and positive feedback.

The emergence of three factors suggests that supportive communication may be a strong feature of organisational communication in the participating schools. The coherency among the items within the three factors suggests that they are conceptually sound communication variables that may be measured in organisations, particularly Catholic primary schools.
Qualitative analysis

The last item of the OCPSQ invited participants to make whatever comments they wished about communication at their school. Two hundred and sixty statements were given by the 103 participants who responded to this item. These were recorded, sorted and analysed according to the qualitative data methodology described previously. An iterative process of content analysis was used to categorise statements under distinct headings. Once categories were organised, they were evaluated and re-evaluated for consistency several times. Thirty-two initial categories were ultimately refined to 26. Of these categories, one of the largest concerned supportive communication. Fourteen statements concerned supportive communication in general. A closer examination of these revealed predominance towards horizontal types of supportive communication (13 statements) over what might be described a vertical supportive communication (1 statement).

The following statement concerning vertical support, made by a female classroom teacher, indicates that support giving can be bi-directional (simultaneously upward and downward):

“Great supportive atmosphere between staff and principal at this school makes communication easy and effective”

This statement also suggests that such supportive dyadic interactions facilitate clear and successful communication within the school. Certainly, the free flowing support giving may be indicative of some degree of openness of communication. Openness relates to honest and undistorted messages. Hence, the reference to efficiency is understandable. Indeed, the link between supportive communication and honest, open communication is alluded to by another female classroom teacher from another school:

“Staff relationships at this school are exceptionally friendly and supportive and the feeling of community is a really strong one. Therefore honest communication is not difficult.”

Another statement referred to the principal as a model of supportive communication whose example other staff members tended to follow in terms of professional support:

“I have found the other teachers willing to help one another with any educational or school related problems. I believe this follows on from the principal’s lead.”

Clearly, this statement refers to the benefits of Downward supportive communication in fostering the developing and maintenance of Horizontal supportive communication. Given that principals are often described as cultural leaders (Youngs, 2007), this link is not surprising and it highlights a further, flow-on, benefit of Downward supportive communication. The role of the principal in establishing a supportive school climate cannot be overemphasised here.

Besides that quoted above, four other statements referred to a link between supportive communication and the provision of professional assistance. It is apparent that professional development and acculturation (even possibly mentoring) may be facilitated by supportive communication. Two quotes, the first by an experienced female teacher’s aide, and the second by a male executive teacher new to a rural school, typify how this may work:

“I am at present doing a school support course by correspondence and I have received great support and assistance from the principal
and staff answering any question I may have and clarifying points I am unsure of.”

“Being so isolated, there are a lot of “mother figures” which is great (and very much needed)!”

Two items dealt with the way Horizontal supportive communication is related to the generation of positive feelings about the school and to a sense of affiliation. The first statement, by an experienced male classroom teacher referred to a high level professionalism:

“The communication is very good, as the staff take the time to treat each other with courtesy and respect.”

The second statement alluded to a link between Horizontal supportive communication and a sense of affiliation or belonging:

“Each member of staff is valued and feels very comfortable in the workplace.”

One statement by an experienced female executive member linked Horizontal supportive communication with staff enthusiasm and openness. Most interestingly, supportive communication was referred to as a key to the school’s success.

“Our staff is a very supportive, enthusiastic and open school where communication is a key to our success.”

Other statements referred to Horizontal supportive communication in terms of warmth and inclusiveness, staff members who ‘get along’ with one another and staff who care for one another. Still other statements linked supportive communication to approachability of staff members and the free giving of help. These may certainly be described as benefits to staff members in that they would help to develop or maintain a positive experience of the workplace.

**Relationships of supportive communication with feelings about work**

**Correlation and Multiple regression analyses**

Pearson correlations were conducted to ascertain the strength and direction of the relationships between supportive communication and job satisfaction and stress. Multiple regression analyses were conducted with organisational communication variables as the independent variables and job satisfaction, then occupational stress factors as dependent variables. What follows is a summary of the results, focussed exclusively on the relationships with supportive communication. For the purposes of this paper, only results where supportive communication factors were the best predictors of job satisfaction and occupational stress are shown.

Table 2 shows the results of correlations and multiple regression of supportive communication on job satisfaction factors. The correlations give support to the first hypothesis (H1). The relationships were all in the positive direction, indicating that increased levels of supportive communication are associated with increased job satisfaction.
Table 2. Summary of correlation and multiple regression analyses for job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent: Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward supportive communication</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>982.26 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent: Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal supportive communication</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>259.14 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent: Work itself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward supportive communication</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>61.56 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent: Relationships with the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal supportive communication</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>20.93 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlations were significant at p < .001. All regression statistics were significant at p < .001.

Downward supportive communication was the best predictor of satisfaction with supervision and satisfaction with the work itself. The variable, Supervision concerns satisfaction with the way principals support, affirm and otherwise supervise staff members. The relationship is logical. The relationship of Downward supportive communication with Work itself (concerning intrinsic satisfaction gained from working with students in schools) requires some explanation. This indicates that if the principal is an encourager and someone who affirms staff often, staff are more likely to be satisfied with the work itself, and vice versa. If a principal is providing positive feedback about a job, complimenting staff on a job well done or getting behind those who are unsure of what to do, it is likely to assist them to do a good job and enjoy their work experience. On the other hand, if a staff member intrinsically enjoys his or her work, he or she is likely to receive supportive communication from the principal.

Horizontal supportive communication was the best predictor of satisfaction with colleagues and the relationships with students. Colleagues concerns satisfaction that comes from interaction with co-workers on both personal and professional levels. Given this, it is easy to see why the two will be so associated. The relationship with Relationships with the students may be explained in terms of collegial support for classroom management. It might be that staff members support each other with advice on difficult pupils or share information about the children. Positive relationships with the students may also result and be a reflection of positive relations among staff. Therefore, in a school where horizontal supportive communication is frequent, staff members are likely to report satisfaction with relationships with the students, and vice versa.

Table 3 shows the results of correlations and multiple regression of supportive communication on occupational stress factors. The correlation coefficient provides support for the second hypothesis (H2) as the relationships is in the negative direction, indicating that increased levels of supportive communication are associated with decreased occupational stress.
Supportive communication was a best predictor for only one occupational stress factor. School domain concerned stress attributed to support (or, rather, lack of such) from school administration in particular, and the school generally. Such a relationship is understandable because they concern similar aspects of school life.

It was anticipated that supportive communication variables would have relationships with most or all of the stress factors, and it must be noted that Upward supportive communication and Horizontal supportive communication were second predictors of other stress factors (these relationships will be explored further, in the context of a larger study, in a subsequent paper). Nevertheless, the result reported here provides further substantiation for the proposition that supportive communication may benefit staff members.

The findings reported here would appear to support previous literature indicating that supportive communication practices may be beneficial to schools (Buunk & Verhoeven, 1991; Butcher & Kritsonis, 2007). For example, positive associations have been found between supportive communication and job satisfaction and (to a more limited extent) occupational stress. As these two variables have been linked to turnover intention and other forms of organisational withdrawal (Allen, 1992; Butcher & Kritsonis, 2007; Luthans, 2002), awareness of supportive communication practices by school systems and leadership teams is essential.

Implications for school leadership
Given the potential benefits of supportive communication reported here, it is timely to point out some implications for school principals and leadership teams. There are several reasons why principals need to be aware of supportive communication and to be effective at downward support.

Firstly, the associations reported here linking downward supportive communication practices to increased job satisfaction and decreased occupational stress suggest that greater use of this kind of communication may be beneficial to staff members, but, more importantly still, can potentially reduce staff turnover. Turnover is costly to schools in terms of disruption to teaching and learning, as well as potentially disruptive to staff members who remain. Secondly, principals who lead by example in offering downward support may help to produce a supportive and trusting school climate that is characterised by high levels of Horizontal supportive communication. Horizontal support has been related in this study to job satisfaction, as well as (as suggested by the qualitative data) feelings of affiliation and the provision of professional support with school or class related problems.
Leading on from this, a third implication is directed at school systems. This study suggests that the selection criteria for principals, as developed by school systems or independent school boards, needs to include evidence of the ability to engage effectively in Downward supportive communication and to foster higher levels of Horizontal supportive communication. Principals have been widely acknowledged as cultural leaders of school communities (Youngs, 2007). Therefore, their impact on improved communication practices and the potential benefits cannot be underestimated.

### Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the concept of supportive communication through quantitative and qualitative means and how it may impact on the working lives of staff members in Catholic primary schools. Three communication factors, Horizontal supportive communication, Upward supportive communication and Downward supportive communication were identified from empirical data analysis. Examination of qualitative data explained how supportive communication might be experienced in these Catholic primary schools in more detail.

Statistical analyses revealed that significant relationships may exist between supportive communication and job satisfaction and stress. Qualitative data suggested a number of positive outcomes of supportive communication, including: honesty and openness, professional development and support, a sense of affiliation and belonging, high levels of professionalism and the perception of school success. Implications for school leaders and school systems were drawn from these findings and briefly discussed.

This study has revealed some aspects of a concept of organisational communication that is not new, but little studied in the context of Catholic primary schools. However, due to the limited amount of qualitative data, the scope of the study is rather small and the implication is that supportive communication should be investigated in greater depth. Inclusion of interview data would accommodate a deeper description of the phenomenon and how it influences schools and school staff members. Nevertheless, Supportive communication is a concept that school leaders and educational systems should be aware of in light of the potential for associations with job satisfaction, occupational stress and other factors.
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