Using Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches to Study Job Stress in Different Cultural, Gender, and Occupational Groups

Cong Liu, Paul Spector, and Lin Shi

## Background

- Job stress research
  - Job stressors
  - Job strains
  - The relations between job stressors and job strains
- Job stress in special populations
  - Cultural groups
  - Gender groups
  - Occupational groups

## Quantitative Vs. Qualitative Method

- Quantitative approach: Rating scales
  - Mean comparisons
  - Relation comparisons
- Qualitative approach: Stressful Incident Record
  - Replicate the quantitative results
  - Group-specific job stressors and strains



## Job Stress for Men and Women

- The Institute for Social Research Model (Katz & Kahn, 1978)
- Different gender roles expected for men and women (Iwasaki, Yoshi, MacKay, & Ristock, 2004)
  - Men: Finances; women: social life (McDonough & Walters, 2001)
  - Hypothesis 2a. Women would experience more interpersonal conflict at work than men.
- The differential vulnerability hypothesis (McDonough & Walters, 2001; Roxburgh, 1996)
  - Hypothesis 2b. Women would experience more job strains than men
  - Hypothesis 2c. Gender would moderate the relation between interpersonal conflict and job satisfaction. Specifically, the relation would be stronger for women than for men.



Method						
Participants		US	China			
Measurement	Male	134	129			
<ul> <li>Quantitative scales</li> <li>Job autonomy</li> <li>Interpersonal conflict</li> <li>Frustration</li> <li>Depression</li> <li>Job satisfaction</li> <li>Qualitative scales</li> <li>Stressful Incidents Record (Keenan &amp; Newton, 1984)</li> </ul>	Female	198	173			
	Faculty	173	166			
	Staff	159	136			
	Quantitative	300	286			
	Qualitative	179	187			
	Total	336	312			
Procedure						

Culture-Specific Job Stressors and Strains					
Job stressors	US	China	Job strains	US	China
1. Constraints	42	47	1. Anger	41	18
2. Workload	42	33	2. Anxiety	19	65
<ol> <li>Conflict</li> <li>Lack of control</li> </ol>	38 <mark>38</mark>	38 <mark>6</mark>	3. Frustration 4. Overwhelm	22 13	0 2
<ol> <li>Job evaluations</li> <li>Work mistakes</li> </ol>	3 6	21 22	5. Helplessness 6. Sadness	<mark>2</mark> 13	11 8
7. W-F conflict	3	7	7. Withdraw	4	2
Other	7	13	8. Energy	6	9
Overall	179	187	Other	22	26
			Overall	142	141
$(\chi^2 = 52.53, df = 7, p = .001)$			$(\chi^2 = 72.84, df = 7, p = .001)$		



Job stressors

- Quantitative job autonomy: US > CN (t = 7.58, df = 578, p = .001)
- Qualitative job control: US > CN ( $\chi^2$  = 28.08, df = 1, p = .001)
- Job strains
  - Quantitative results:
    - Frustration: No difference
      - Depression: CN > US (*t* = -1.74, *df* = 568, *p* = .08)
  - Qualitative results:
    - Anger/frustration: US > CN ( $\chi^2$  = 11.93, df = 1, p = .001;  $\chi^2$  = 24.45, df = 1, p = .001)
    - Anxiety/helplessness: CN > US ( $\chi^2$  = 30.15, df = 1, p = .001;  $\chi^2$  = 6.06, df = 1, p = .001)



Gender-Specific Job Stressors and						
Strains						

Job stressors	Male	Female	Job strains	Male	Female
1. Constraints	15	27	1. Anger	11	30
2. Workload	21	20	2. Frustration	6	15
3. Conflict	10	28	3. Anxiety	10	9
4. Lack of control	10	28	4. Overwhelm	4	9
5. Work mistakes	6	0	5. Sadness	4	9
Other (e.g., W-F conflicts)	8	5	Other (e.g., helplessness)	11	22
Overall	70	108	Overall	46	94
$(\chi^2 = 22.21, df = 5, p = .001)$					





Occupation-Specific Job Stressors and Strains					
Job stressors	Faculty	Staff	Job strains	Faculty	Staff
1. Constraints	25	17	1. Anger	28	13
2. Workload	26	16	2. Frustration	6	16
3. Conflict	17	21	3. Anxiety	12	7
4. Lack of control	20	18	4. Overwhelm	8	5
5. Work mistakes	6	0	5. Sadness	9	4
Other (e.g., W-F conflicts)	9	4	Other (e.g., helplessness)	17	16
Overall	103	76	Overall	80	61
			$(\chi^2 = 11.87, df = 5, p = .04)$		



- Job stressors
  - Quantitative job autonomy: No significant difference
  - Qualitative job autonomy: No significant difference
- Job strains
  - Quantitative results:
    - Turnover intentions: Support > Faculty (F = 5.92, df = 1, p = .02)
  - Qualitative results:
    - Anger: Faculty > Support ( $\chi^2 = 3.35$ , df = 1, p = .046)
    - Frustration: Support > Faculty ( $\chi^2 = 8.94$ , df = 1, p = .001)



## Conclusions, Limitations and Future Research

- Conclusions
- Limitations and future study