Online Supplement (Tables)

**Table 1.**

*Measurement Tools*

| Construct | Scale | Scoring | Description | Reliability |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mental health-related constructs | | | | |
| Depressive symptoms | The Patient Health Questionnaire-2 (PHQ-2; Kroenke et al., 2003) | 0-3 (0 = "not at all", 1 = "several days", 2 = "more than half the days", 3 = "nearly every day") | The PHQ-2 was developed based on the long form as a tool for preliminary screening of depression. The respondents were asked to rate the frequency of occurrence of two depressive symptoms (anhedonia and depressed mood) over the past two weeks by choosing one of the following four response options: "0-Not at all", "1-Several days", "2-More than half the days", or "3-Nearly every day". The total scores range from 0 to 6 and higher scores indicate more severe depressive symptomatology. Using a cut-off of 3, the PHQ-2 has a sensitivity of 82.9% and specificity of 90% for diagnosis major depressive disorder. | 0.60 |
| Anxiety symptoms | The Generalized Anxiety Disorder 2-item (GAD-2; Kroenke et al., 2007) | 0-3 (0 = "not at all", 1 = "several days", 2 = "more than half the days", 3 = "nearly every day") | The GAD-2 is a simple initial screening tool for generalized anxiety disorder developed based on the long from. It reflects how often the subjects have suffered from first two core symptoms of generalized anxiety disorder (felling nervous, anxious or on the edge & not able to stop or control worrying) over the past two weeks. GAD-7 scores range from 0 to 6 with higher scores representing more severe anxiety symptoms. Using a cut-off of 3, the GAD-2 has a sensitivity of 86% and specificity of 83% for diagnosis generalized anxiety disorder. | 0.72 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Flourishing | The Flourishing Scale (FS; Diener et al., 2010) | 1-7<br>(1 = “strongly disagree”, 7 = “strongly agree”) | The FS consisted of 8 items measuring the respondent's self-perceived success in important areas such as relationships, self-esteem, purpose, and optimism. The scale provides a single psychological well-being score. respondents rated the extent in which they agreed or disagreed the 8 statements relating to their wellbeing, for instance, ‘I lead a purposeful and meaningful life’, ‘My social relationships are supportive and rewarding’ and ‘I am optimistic about my future’. The higher scores represents a person with many psychological resources and strengths and thus more flourished. | 0.82 |
| Help-seeking | Self-constructed | Intention:<br>0-10<br>(0 = ‘‘no at all willing’’, 10 = ‘‘most willing’’);<br>Behaviour:<br>0-10<br>(0 = ‘‘did not attend at all’’, 10 = ‘‘most often’’) | Respondents’ intention towards help-seeking was assessed using 3 self-constructed questions asking whether they were willing to 1: seek professional help when facing psychological distress, 2: encourage acquaintances to seek psychological services when needed, 3: discuss mental health issues with others. They would rate their level of willingness. There was an additional question assessing their actual help-seeking behaviours by asking how often do they attend mental health-related activities. | 0.73 |
| Workplace mental health resources | Self-constructed | Availability:<br>1-5, (1 = ‘none’ to 5 = ‘adequate’);<br>Usage:<br>Yes/No;<br>Preference:<br>Open-ended | Four items were constructed by the authors to gauge the availability, utilization and preference of workplace mental health resources. Participants were asked to 1) indicate the availability of resources; 2) whether they would use the resources available for them; 3) for those who answer ‘no’ in (2), to provide reasons in an open-ended format; and 4) indicate the preferred type of workplace mental health resource in an open-ended format. | N/A |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Work-related constructs | | | | |
| Relational justice | Adapted from items used in Kivimäki et al. (2003). | 1-5 (1 = ‘‘very little’’ to 5 = ‘‘very much’’) | The RJ assesses whether an individual 1) considers the respondent’s viewpoint, 2) is able to suppress personal biases, 3) treats the respondent with kindness and consideration and 4) takes steps to deal with you in a truthful manner. Higher scores indicate higher relational justice at workplace. | 0.84 |
| Effort-reward imbalance | Adapted from the items used in Kivimäki et al. (2007). | 1-5 (1 = ‘‘very little’’ to 5 = ‘‘very much’’) | ‘Effort’ was asked with a single question: “How much do you feel you invest in your job in terms of skill and energy?’. ‘Reward’ was assessed with a scale containing 3 questions about feelings of getting a return from work in terms of (1) income and job benefits, (2) recognition and prestige, and (3) personal satisfaction. Scoring method followed Siegrist et al. (2004) in which a ratio between effort and reward was calculated by averaging the scores of the three ‘reward’ items and divided by the ‘effort’ score. Higher values indicate imbalance between high costs and low rewards. | 0.74 |
| Job-demand-control | The Swedish Demand–Control–Support Questionnaire (DCSQ; (Sanne, Torp, Mykletun, & Dahl, 2005) | 1-5 (1 = ‘‘very little’’ to 5 = ‘‘very much’’) | there were two questions assessing psychological demands asking about whether the worker has sufficient time for the assigned task and if there were conflicting demands. Another two questions asked about decision latitude, i.e. control, in which the worker can decide on how to carry out the work and what should be done. Finally, a question assessing social support asked whether there is good collegiality at work. To make sense of these components, an ‘Iso-strain’ index was formulated by taking job strain (demand divided by control) divided by support. A higher index score indicates higher job demands in a context of low control and low social support. | 0.71 |

**Table 2.**

*Comparisons of LCA Models with Different Number of Latent Classes*

| Model | Log-Likelihood | AIC | BIC | SSABIC | Entropy | Class count of the smallest class | LMR LR p-value | ALMR LR p-value | BLR T p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1-Class | -7111.81 | 14263.62 | 14361.91 | 14298.39 | - | 1007 | - | - | - |
| 2-Class | -6811.29 | 13704.57 | 13906.08 | 13775.86 | 0.675 | 488 | 0.0019 | 0.002 | <0.0001 |
| **3-Class** | **-6645.91** | **13415.81** | **13720.53** | **13523.61** | **0.801** | **283** | **0.0206** | **0.0211** | **<0.0001** |
| 4-Class | -6539.02 | 13244.04 | 13651.96 | 13388.35 | 0.816 | 140 | 0.839 | 0.8401 | <0.0001 |

*Note.* AIC: Akaike information criterion; BIC: Bayesian information criterion; SSABIC: Sample-size adjusted Bayesian information criterion; LMR LR: Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test. ALMR LR: Adjusted Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test; BLRT: Bootstrap likelihood ratio test.

**Table 3.**

*Item-response Probability for a 3-class Model*

| Variable | Scale/Category | Frontline workers (n=392) | Established leaders (n=332) | Emerging executives (n=283) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Latent class prevalence | - | .38 | .34 | .28 |
| Gender | Male | **.54** | **.58** | .42 |
| | Female | .47 | .42 | **.58** |
| Income (HKD) | $14,999 or below | .30 | <.01 | .12 |
| | $15,000-$39,999 | **.66** | .25 | **.83** |
| | $40,000-$69,999 | .03 | .46 | .05 |
| | $70,000 or above | .01 | .28 | <.01 |
| Highest education attainment | Below primary | .06 | <.001 | <.001 |
| | Secondary | **.90** | .11 | <.01 |
| | Tertiary | .03 | **.89** | **.99** |
| Age | 18-29 | .10 | .02 | **.59** |
| | 30-39 | .19 | .25 | .30 |
| | 40-49 | .25 | .38 | .10 |
| | 50-59 | .32 | .29 | .02 |
| | >60 | .14 | .06 | <.01 |
| Position | Professional, Managers, Executive | .18 | **.82** | .43 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Self-employed / Entrepreneurs | .05 | .08 | .01 |
| | Office / non-office skilled | .36 | .07 | .30 |
| | Office / non-office non-skilled | .41 | .03 | .25 |
| Industry | Commercial Sector | .14 | .31 | .21 |
| | Semi-professional / Professional | .12 | .38 | .32 |
| | Hospitality | .15 | .03 | .04 |
| | Retail & Sales | .17 | .07 | .09 |
| | Construction / Manufacturing | .20 | .14 | .11 |
| | Public Services | .05 | .06 | .09 |
| | Media | .02 | <.001 | .08 |
| | Logistics / Transport | .14 | .02 | .06 |

*Note.* Item-response probability >.50

**Table 4.**

*General Demographics of Respondents*

| Variable | Scale/Category | Entire sample (n=1007) | Frontline workers (n=392) | Established leaders (n=332) | Emerging executives (n=283) | Between class differences | Post-hoc tests / pairwise comparisons[1] | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | n(%) / M(SD) | n(%) / M(SD) | n(%) / M(SD) | n(%) / M(SD) | $\chi^2$ | FW vs EL Mean Diff/ $\chi^2$ | FW vs EE Mean Diff/ $\chi^2$ | EL vs EE Mean Diff/ $\chi^2$ |
| SES | | | | | | | | | |
| Gender | Male | 524 (52%) | 210 (53.6%) | 200 (60.2%) | 114 (40.3%) | 24.99*** | 3.26 | 11.63** | 24.35*** |
| | Female | 483 (48%) | 182 (46.4%) | 132 (39.8%) | 169 (59.7%) | | | | |
| Income (HKD) | $14,999 or below | 140 (13.9%) | 107 (29.7%) | 0 (0%) | 33 (12.2%) | 616.00*** | 412.31*** | 29.92*** | 324.15*** |
| | $15,000-$39,999 | 532 (52.8%) | 242 (67.2%) | 65 (21.6%) | 225 (83.3%) | | | | |
| | $40,000-$69,999 | 169 (16.8%) | 9 (2.5%) | 148 (49.2%) | 12 (4.4%) | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $70,000 or above | 90 (8.9%) | 2 (0.6%) | 88 (29.2%) | 0 (0%) | | | | |
| Highest education attainment | Below primary | 24 (2.4%) | 24 (6.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 873.71*** | 594.18*** | 645.88*** | 24.05*** |
| | Secondary | 386 (38.3%) | 359 (92.3%) | 27 (8.2%) | 0 (0%) | | | | |
| | Tertiary | 590 (58.6%) | 6 (1.5%) | 303 (91.8%) | 281 (100%) | | | | |
| Age | 18-29 | 206 (20.5%) | 36 (9.3%) | 3 (0.9%) | 167 (59.4%) | 485.40*** | 47.83*** | 291.41*** | 341.50*** |
| | 30-39 | 236 (23.4%) | 73 (18.9%) | 76 (23%) | 87 (31%) | | | | |
| | 40-49 | 250 (24.8%) | 96 (24.8%) | 131 (39.7%) | 23 (8.2%) | | | | |
| | 50-59 | 229 (22.7%) | 127 (32.8%) | 99 (30%) | 3 (1.1%) | | | | |
| | >60 | 77 (7.6%) | 55 (14.2%) | 21 (6.4%) | 1 (0.4%) | | | | |
| Position | Professional, Managers, Executive | 465 (46.2%) | 77 (19.9%) | 273 (82.7%) | 115 (41.1%) | 357.61*** | 338.58*** | 40.34*** | 184.58*** |
| | Self-employed / Entrepreneurs | 50 (5%) | 16 (4.1%) | 31 (9.4%) | 3 (1.1%) | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Office / non-office skilled | 244 (24.2%) | 138 (35.7%) | 19 (5.8%) | 87 (31.1%) | | | | |
| | Office / non-office non-skilled | 234 (23.2%) | 153 (39.5%) | 7 (2.1%) | 74 (26.4%) | | | | |
| Industry | Commercial Sector | 210 (20.9%) | 55 (14.4%) | 103 (31.7%) | 52 (18.9%) | 202.93*** | 142.45*** | 93.66*** | 48.07*** |
| | Semi-professional / Professional | 258 (25.6%) | 49 (12.8%) | 116 (35.7%) | 93 (33.8%) | | | | |
| | Hospitality | 77 (7.6%) | 56 (14.6%) | 10 (3.1%) | 11 (4%) | | | | |
| | Retail & Sales | 113 (11.2%) | 64 (16.7%) | 24 (7.4%) | 25 (9.1%) | | | | |
| | Construction / Manufacturing | 151 (15%) | 77 (20.1%) | 46 (14.2%) | 28 (10.2%) | | | | |
| | Public Services | 61 (6.1%) | 18 (4.7%) | 18 (5.5%) | 25 (9.1%) | | | | |
| | Media | 29 (2.9%) | 8 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 21 (7.6%) | | | | |
| | Logistics / Transport | 78 (7.7%) | 54 (14.1%) | 6 (1.8%) | 18 (6.5%) | | | | |
| | Others | 6 (0.6%) | 2 (0.5%) | 2 (0.6%) | 2 (0.7%) | | | | |

*Note.* *<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001; [1]FW: Frontline workers, EL: Established leaders, EE: Emerging Executive

**Table 5.**

*Appraisal of Mental Health Resources at Work*

| | | Entire sample (n=1007) | Frontline workers (n=392) | Established leaders (n=332) | Emerging executives (n=283) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Domain | Category | n(%) / M(SD) | n(%) / M(SD) | n(%) / M(SD) | n(%) / M(SD) |
| Evaluation of resources at work | | | | | |
| Sufficiency of mental health resources provided at workplace | Mean scores | 1.32 (1.25) | 1.26 (1.27) | 1.46 (1.28) | 1.24 (1.19) |
| | No service at all | 366 (36.3%) | 155 (41.6%) | 110 (34.4%) | 101 (36.2%) |
| | Insufficient | 218 (21.6%) | 72 (19.3%) | 64 (20.0%) | 82 (29.4%) |
| | Neither sufficient nor insufficient | 97 (9.6%) | 39 (10.5%) | 34 (10.6%) | 24 (8.6%) |
| | Sufficient | 291 (28.9%) | 107 (28.7%) | 112 (35%) | 72 (25.8%) |
| Usage mental health resources provided at workplace | Will use and is currently using | 127 (12.6%) | 55 (14.3%) | 38 (11.7%) | 34 (12.1%) |
| | Will use in the future if needed | 728 (72.3%) | 274 (71.4%) | 238 (73.5%) | 216 (77.1%) |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Will not use | 133 (13.2%) | 55 (14.3%) | 48 (14.8%) | 30 (10.7%) |
| Reasons of not using[1] | | | | | |
| | No demand for extra support | 81 (60.9%) | 42 (76.4%) | 31 (64.6%) | 8 (26.7%) |
| | Lack of trust in mental health services | 33 (24.8%) | 7 (12.7%) | 14 (29.2%) | 12 (40%) |
| | Accessibility issue | 14 (10.5%) | 7 (12.7%) | 1 (2.1%) | 6 (20%) |
| | Fear of disclosure | 16 (12.0%) | 1 (1.8%) | 6 (12.5%) | 6 (20%) |
| | Work-related concerns | 3 (2.3%) | 1 (1.8%) | 1 (2.1%) | 2 (6.7%) |
| | Lacking mental health literacy | 2 (1.5%) | 1 (1.8%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (3.3%) |
| | Other | 4 (3.01%) | 1 (1.8%) | 2 (4.2%) | 1 (3.3%) |
| Needs[2] | | | | | |
| No such need | N/A | 52 (5%) | 34 (8.7%) | 13 (3.9%) | 5 (1.8%) |
| Learning resources | Seminars or workshops | 413 (41%) | 147 (37.5%) | 148 (44.6%) | 118 (41.7%) |
| | Online courses | 281 (28%) | 104 (26.5%) | 93 (28.0%) | 84 (29.7%) |
| | Continuing education programme | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| Allowance/financial resources | Medical insurance coverage on mental health conditions | 651 (65%) | 226 (57.7%) | 214 (64.5%) | 211 (74.6%) |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Fringe benefits | 3 (0.3%) | 1 (0%) | 1 (0.3%) | 1 (0.4%) |
| | Salary adjustment | 2 (0.2%) | 1 (0.3%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) |
| Mental-health friendly policies | Policy catering mental ill-health conditions | 635 (63%) | 241 (61.5%) | 208 (62.7%) | 186 (65.7%) |
| | On-site coach/psychologist | 386 (38%) | 120 (30.6%) | 132 (39.8%) | 134 (47.3%) |
| | Work-life balance policy | 2 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.3%) | 1 (0.4%) |

*Note.* 1: n divided by the number of people who answered ‘Will not use’; 2: n divided by the total number of respondents