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Abstract

The structure of the workplace around the world has changed. Multinational workforces need to be taken into consideration by organisations, including those in Ireland. The aim of this research is to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and stress, job demands, coping strategies, team work and quality of life, taking into consideration the diversity of the workplace. The quantitative design was applied, with a survey sent out to two multinational companies, with 114 participants (N=114) completing the survey. The results confirmed that there is a significant relationship between diversity and job satisfaction and that diversity moderates relationship between stress and job satisfaction. The findings are discussed in the context of emerging literature on diversity within the organisational psychology.
1. Introduction

Job satisfaction is one of the most researched topics in organisational psychology. It has been studied considering its relationship with a wide number of variables, such as job stress, job demands, coping styles, turnover intentions, job demands and control, and various demographics.

Until recently, the research has focused on a one dimensional approach to the workplace or employees, not considering the multicultural context and workplace diversity. It is important to acknowledge the change to the structure of the workplace, of the cultural context in multinational organisations, and overall the change in a society that is becoming more diverse.

In Ireland the multicultural context is relevant to the workplace, with many companies being multinational and employing people from different cultural backgrounds. The aim of this research was to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and stress in multicultural organisations based in Ireland. It attempts to explore the diversity of the company in relation to other variables, such as stress, coping strategies, team work and turnover intentions, and their relationship with people’s cultural background, their length of stay in Ireland and their overall quality of life.

This research and its results should contribute to emerging literature within the organisational psychology, with emphasis placed on diverse work environments. It may yield useful information, especially in relation to Irish workplaces and the increasing number of multinational companies employing various nationalities in one office.
1.1 Understanding Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has significant implications for work and employees. It is defined by Locke (1976) as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or experience.” (p. 1300) Spector considers job satisfaction being simply “the degree to which people like their jobs” (Spector, 1997, p.vii). However, there’s more to it: job satisfaction can be an emotional indicator of the well-being or mental health, it can show whether people are treated well at the workplace, and it can indicate the level of employee engagement (Spector, 1997). Therefore, both emotional and cognitive factors are included in the attitudinal approach towards the definition of the job satisfaction.

It is a common practice among many companies to measure the level of job satisfaction of their employees every year. Organisational performance may depend on the satisfaction and the companies create elaborate plans based on the surveys’ results to ensure their workers’ job satisfaction. Harter, Schmidt and Hayes (2002), in their meta-analysis of 36 companies, found that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and productivity, profit and customer satisfaction. They stated that changes in management practices that change job satisfaction, also lead to increasing company profits. Another research found a positive relationship between job satisfaction and job performance (Judge, Thoreson, Bono and Patton, 2002).

As a widely researched topic, job satisfaction is considered to have effects on employee behaviour (Alizadeh, Darvishi, Nazari and Emami, 2012; Tang and Ibrahim, 1998), commitment towards the workplace (Yücel, 2012, who also linked job satisfaction with the turnover intentions), burnout (Nagar, 2012; van der Doef, Mbazzi and Verhoeven, 2012) and mental health (Mark and Smith, 2012, Pasca and Wagner, 2012). Nowadays the workplace is constantly changing, expanding into new ethnic and cultural areas, where globalisation, new
technology and diversity are prevalent. Some research attempts to establish connections between the “new workplace” and job satisfaction. Al Jenaibi (2011) studied diverse workplaces in the United Arab Emirates and found that job satisfaction is related to effective management, communication, facilities, and benefits, including salaries, technologies, and future job directions. Sora, Caballer and Peiró (2010) examined the Spanish workforce and proposed that in the changing work environment job satisfaction is negatively related to job insecurity.

Pasca & Wagner consider studying different cultural groups in an organisation and important undertaking, where a multicultural work environment may relate to job satisfaction (2012). Their paper emphasises the necessity of comparing perceptions of workplace for immigrants and Canadian employees, as it is fundamental to creating a healthy work environment for all employees. Their findings showed no significant difference in satisfaction between Canadians and immigrants, and this could be related to the quality of life in the country or positive attitude towards immigration.

In relation to collectivistic dimensions in different cultures and job satisfaction, Klassen, Usher and Bong (2010) found that there is a significant difference between these two variables in a Korean sample, but not in a North American sample of teachers. This study also shows that cultural context influences experiences in relation to work motivation and satisfaction.

In an earlier study O’Reilly and Roberts found that there is a significant difference in job satisfaction between white and non-white females in the US (1973). They proposed that more exploration is needed regarding the cultural difference in the approach towards work, as they have found that their findings are only speculative. Gold, Webb and Smith (1982) also found differences in job satisfaction between black and white mental health employees,
suggesting that different values and beliefs lie underneath one’s perception of satisfaction. Therefore, different factors should be taken into consideration also when measuring job satisfaction.

Throughout the years many researchers found a relationship between job stress, job demands, coping styles and other variables, and job satisfaction. Collins (2008) in his paper that shows the number of different studies relating to stress, satisfaction, coping, social support and individual workers in statutory social workers, points out the relationship between all these variables, which has to be considered in the workplace. Amongst teachers, research has found a relationship between job satisfaction, stress, job involvement and efficacy (Klassen, Usher & Bong, 2010; Muthuvelayutham & Mohanasundaram, 2012). Support and job control is also considered to be related to job satisfaction (Paoline & Lambert, 2012).

This research will use the multicultural approach in studying job satisfaction, attempting to see if there is any difference between Irish and non-Irish workers. As per Pasca and Wagner’s study (2012) this difference may depend on many factors, such as quality of life, which this research is also going to investigate. It will be also examined whether there is a relationship between job demand and control, turnover intentions and job satisfaction, also looking into the security of the job, as per the changing structure of the workplace in the 21st century.
1.2 Job Stress

1.2.1 Stress and coping

Stress is a broad concept that may convey a variety of meanings. Taylor defines it as a “negative emotional experience” (p. 147) which is accompanied by various changes, such as physiological, behavioural and cognitive. According to Lazarus stress levels rely on the person-environment fit, where the stress is defined as a transaction between the person and the environment (Sonnentag & Frese, 2003). Lazarus points out those coping strategies are essential in dealing with stress; he states that in a secondary appraisal a person assesses their coping abilities and resources in order to adequately respond to stressors. Coping is the process of executing a person’s response to a stressor. There is a wide number of research regarding stress and coping strategies, which is now considered to be well designed and conducted (Lazarus, 2000).

1.2.2 Occupational stress

A large number of research in relation to occupational stress confirms that stress is a major factor in the work environment with wide spread consequences for the individuals and organisations (Sonnentag & Frese, 2003). These consequences extend to a person’s relationship with other aspects of their lives, such as family, friends and health. For organisations the consequences may lead to a less engaged workforce, extended sick leave, or increased turnover.

Work stressors have been categorised into physical or task stressors, such as light, heat, noise; and psychological stressors (Landy and Comte, 2010). There can be many stressors affecting a worker’s life, and the effects of the multiple levels of stressors can be cumulative, and affect a person’s physical and psychological well-being.
Furnham (2005) lists twelve stressors, such as occupational demands intrinsic to the job, role conflict, role ambiguity, over- and underload, responsibility of others, lack of social support, lack of participation in decisions, working conditions, organisational change etc., however this list is not exhaustive. Many of the stressors are related, or factors that are unique to someone’s job could cumulate with other more common stressors in the workplace.

Work stressors have been defined in many studies, such as workload and organisational constraints (Spector & Jex, 1998) and scales have been designed to measures these variables. These scales usually group stressors, for example into task-related, social stressors, or others referring to job security, work-life imbalance, communication, pay and benefits and the aspects of the job itself (Barkhuizen & Rothmann, 2008). These various types of stressors are found to have a relationship with the levels of stress and ill-health. Barkhuizen and Rothman (2008) report that overload and work-life balance have a significant relationship with ill health of the examined group of academics.

Considering the vast amount of research regarding occupational stress, there is a gap still existing with respect of the applicability of this research to different cultural groups (Pasca & Shannon, 2011). An emphasis must be put on the family relationships, social connections, and cultural background of the workers, including specific variability of the immigrant workers. This research will attempt to investigate the gap mentioned above, with regards to the work stress and coping strategies amongst Irish and non-Irish employees. In particular, two aspects of work stress, occupational constraints (OCS), which measures the difficulty of the work and quantitative workload (QWI), which assesses the amount of work in a job (Spector & Jex, 1998), will be measured, with their relation to different coping styles, including individualistic and collectivistic styles.
1.3 Turnover Intentions

Turnover is viewed in general as the movement of the employees out of an organisation, however this definition may be inconsistent and needs to be further clarified. Coomber & Barriball (2007) propose, after Fishbein & Ajzen (1975), that behavioural intention precedes the actual behaviour. The intention to leave would be the predictor of the actual leave (McFarlane Shore & Martin, 1989). The cognitive process of turnover intention is considered as an outcome of variables such as job satisfaction. Coomber & Barribell (2007) found in their study that stress and leadership issues influence turnover in a sample of nurses.

Kemmery, Mossholder & Bedeian (1987) also studied the behavioural turnover intentions, as related to role stress and physical symptomatology. The results of their study show that job satisfaction and physical health influence turnover intentions.

Fang (2001) points out that turnover “results from a combination of organizational events, working conditions and psychological factors interacting with each other to affect employee attitude – cognition, affect and intended behaviour – in and towards an organization.” (p. 860). Turnover is also not a sudden decision, but it is constantly influenced by different levels of other variables, such as stress, leading eventually to the behaviour intention to leave. They used the measure for turnover intention as one question, where they asked the participants how likely it is that they will look for another job within a year. Their study showed that stress and organisational commitment have implications for turnover intentions.

Stewart, Volpone, Avery & McKay (2011) researched whether the diversity in the workplace has any interaction with the turnover intentions, considering also ethical context. The results showed that workplace ethics climate moderated the diversity climate–turnover
intentions relationship. In line with previous research (Fang, 2001), the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions will be examined in this study.

1.4 Job Demand and Control

Pasca & Wagner (2011) point out that the demand-control model proposed by Karasek is important in the field of work stress, as it puts emphasis on the combination of low control and high demands leading to negative health outcomes. In an organisational setting, if the employees experience high demands and have little control over the work, they are exposed to stressors influencing their health.

Karasek (1979) used data from two national surveys in the US and Sweden to test the job strain model. His findings show that “it is the combination of low decision latitude and heavy job demands which is associated with mental strain” (p. 285). The variables are also negatively connected with job satisfaction. Karasek proposed redesigning of the workplace to allow for a more decision based structure allowing all employees to participate in the decision making scheme.

Certain job characteristics were incorporated to form the measurement scale of the demand – control model (Karasek et al., 2008). These are: decision latitude, skill discretion, decision authority, psychological job demands, job insecurity and physical exertion. Additionally, social support was added to the model, stating that risk of illness is related to high demand, low control and low social support in the workplace. Addition of social support to Karasek’s model shows that some workplace pressures may develop from social interactions among the employees (Karasek, 2008). Low social control can contribute to the
development of chronic disease, deregulating, with other variables, the homeostasis of the organism. This, in turn, can result in chronic stress and disease.

Karasek’s model can be measured using his Job Content Questionnaire (Karasek, Brisson, Kwakami, Houtman, Bongers, Amick, 1998). The model has been replicated and shows validity in different populations, for example, Japanese working sample (Kawakami, Kobayashi, Araki, Haratani & Furui, 1995).

The redesigned model of demand-control-support may be found useful when testing immigrant population, taking into consideration possible social isolation of the immigrants (Pasca & Wagner, 2011). The criticism points out that it does not take into consideration other aspects, such as demographics, ethnicity, immigration status, or social support outside the workplace and the collectivist approach to the workplace (especially group work).

The stressors of low control and high demand will be examined in this research, which will focus on the aspects that are not included in the initial model: immigration status and different coping styles. The relationship with job satisfaction and factors of job demands, such as psychological strain, decision authority, decision latitude, job insecurity and skill discretion will also be examined.

1.5 Coping Strategies in a Workplace: Individualistic and Collectivistic Styles

As stated previously in this paper, coping is the process of executing the response to a stressor. Stress can be understood in comparison to coping and vice versa. Usually the coping strategies are divided into problem solving and emotion focused coping (Collins, 2008). Positive coping strategies involve planning, restraint and social support (Carver, Scheier and
Weintraub, 1989; Brown, Westbrook and Challagalla, 2005). Negative strategies involve denial and disengagement (Hassan et al., 2006).

Heppner et al. (2006) point out that most of the research on coping styles involves only white college students from the US, and not enough studies involve a cross-cultural approach. Different coping styles may apply to different cultures, especially where more emphasis is placed on interdependence and collectivism as opposed to independence and individualism.

Moore and Constantine (2005) also studied coping styles in relation to collectivistic approach. They found that sample of African, Asian and Latin American students used social support seeking and forbearance to cope with their problems. The researchers state that peer and family relationships are important and may form a mutual reliance between recipients and providers in collectivistic cultures. The forbearance is defined as “the tendency to minimise or conceal problems or concerns so as not to trouble or burden others” (Moore & Constantine, 2005). The findings of this study confirm validity and reliability, and internal consistency of the measure used. It shows that in terms of measuring diverse environments different scales should be used in order to capture all possible coping strategies in a given sample.

Coping strategies have been found to moderate the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction (Healy, McKay & Healy, 2000) and that wide range of coping strategies is used amongst the workforce (Abouerise, 1996). Also, certain coping strategies may only be used by some people and not others. Therefore, it is important to account for various coping styles amongst the population (Koeske, Kirk & Koeske, 1993).
This research will attempt to measure whether the coping strategies moderate the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction, taking into account both collectivistic and different individualistic styles.

1.6 Inclination to Teamwork

There has been a huge change in organisational structure in the last two decades in relation to teams. Teamwork is now considered to contain the expertise and ability to combine different skillsets in order for the company to be successful (Furnham, 2005). Moreover, the teams are sometimes spread out across different countries and continents, which brought in the concept of virtual teams (Kirkman and Mathieu, 2005). Teams can also combine people from different cultural backgrounds in one place. This team diversity may be difficult to manage, but some research suggests that diverse groups are more effective at identifying problems and generating solutions (Watson, Kumar and Michaelsen, 1993; Magjuka and Baldwin, 1991).

Kozlowski and Bell (2003) define teams in terms of groups composed of two or more individuals who share the same goals, perform tasks organisationally relevant, interact socially and are embedded in organisational boundaries. There are many types of teams on different organisational levels.

Kalisch, Hyunhwa & Rochman (2010) in their paper stated that teamwork and job satisfaction have a strong relationship. They studied a group of nurses, where teamwork would be considered a highly important component of the organisational structure. They found that “Participants levels of job satisfaction with current position and satisfaction with
occupation were both higher when they rated their teamwork higher (P < 0.001) and perceived their staffing as adequate more often (P < 0.001).” (p. 938)

Team work and its effectiveness are found to have a relationship with stress levels and team commitment (Drach-Zahavy & Freund, 2007). The autonomy of the team is also found to be correlated with job strains and performance (Leach, Wall, Rogelberg & Jackson, 2005). In terms of performance, the distinction into collectivistic and individualistic approach to teamwork shows that there is a significant difference into how people from these two groups perform in or outside of a group (Earley, 1993).

Jackson et al. (2006) proposed that preference for in-groups work, a psychological collectivism, can have a value as a predictor for a group member performance. This could possibly imply that group work for individualists may be an additional source of stress, where the collectivist would not experience the same level of stress in group work. The current research will examine the inclination to teamwork and job satisfaction. It will also look at the difference between Irish and non – Irish employees in relation to job satisfaction and teamwork.

1.7 Diversity in a Multicultural Workplace

Societies become more diverse and workplaces also become more diverse, with employees from different cultural backgrounds. This can be due to one organisation having offices in different countries, but also, due to diverse communities in one place, one office in one country can employ people with different backgrounds. Especially multinational companies face both types of workplace diversity, with offices around the world and seeking to employ different nationalities in one country.
The theories regarding occupational diversity are yet to be well defined (Alderfer & Sims, 2003). Diversity dynamics operate at personal and group level, with some theories referring to the dynamics, such as collectivistic versus individual coping strategies or social identity theory.

Volpone, Avery & McKay (2012) conducted research with a large sample size (N=5,537), attempting to find a relationship between appraisal reaction, racial ethnicity and employee engagement in a diverse workplace. They found that diversity as a mediating variable has a relationship with appraisal reactions and employee engagement. This suggests that employers should focus on providing a more transparent workplace in order to ensure their employees’ engagement levels.

According to Findler, Wind & Mor Barak, (2007) “diversity characteristics are related to the way employees are treated within the organization, thereby influencing their perception of fairness, inclusion, and social support received” (p. 70). They conducted research using a sample size of 114 participants, and used measures for diversity characteristics (race and ethnicity, immigrant status, gender, age and education), inclusion – exclusion, social support, stress, general well-being, job satisfaction and organisational commitment. Their findings show a significant relationship between diversity and organisational-culture variables. Further investigation is needed to generalise the concepts used in the research, with inclusion and diversity being included in the complexity of the workplace.

This research will measure the diversity in the multicultural workplace, and assess whether there is a relationship between diversity and job satisfaction. Also, diversity may be a moderating factor between job stress and job satisfaction.
1.8 Job satisfaction, job stress and quality of life.

Satisfaction from work, levels of stress at work, and good peer and management relationships don’t just stay at work. All these emotional and cognitive attitudes relate to external life, social relationships, levels of life satisfaction and overall quality of life. Vice versa, problems at “home” may negatively reflect the performance and interactions at work, leaving to lower job satisfaction. Work as a social phenomenon needs to be placed in wider contexts of all life interactions (Rice, 1980).

Horowitz, Blackburn, Edington & Kloss (1988) stated that there is an awareness that job stress relates to the quality of life. In their study they found that there is a relationship between job stress, job satisfaction and the quality of life. Job strains were studied by Lerner, Levine, Malspeis & D'Agostino (1994), who also found the relationship between job stress and quality of life.

London, Crandall and Seals (1977) examined a large sample of American national probability data and found that job satisfaction contributes to the quality of life. Drobnic, Beham and Prag (2010) conducted a wider study among different EU countries in terms of relationships between job satisfaction and quality of life. They found that job security is a key element in people’s quality of life. Good working conditions, career prospects, translate into job satisfaction, which turns into life satisfaction and better quality of life. They also stated that the life satisfaction varies across countries, being higher in more affluent countries.

Akranavičiūtė and Ruževičius (2007) examined the concept of quality of life, in relation to quality of work and other job factors. They found that improving working conditions may influence the employees’ quality of life overall, not only the quality of work life. Beham, Drobnic and Verwiebe (2006) state that “more research is needed on the
detrimental impact of new technologies, flexible work arrangements and new working techniques and arrangements on work intensification, and consequently on employees’ well-being/health, work-life balance, and life satisfaction.” (p.37)

Current research will seek to establish the relationship between job satisfaction and the quality of life. The relation between diversity of the workplace and job satisfaction could possibly relate also to the employees’ quality of life.

1.9 Rationale of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between variables such as job stress, job demands, coping strategies and job satisfaction, taking into consideration the diversity of the workplace and cultural differences between the employees in coping strategies and group work. The study questions whether the multicultural workplace mediates the relationship between the variables such as job stress and job satisfaction and the quality of life. Also, whether there is a relationship between demographic variables, such as the nationality of the employees and different coping strategies, attitudes towards group work, and the stress and satisfaction at work.

Overall the results of this study should contribute to the literature from the field of organisational psychology, focusing on job satisfaction in newer research on diversity and cultural differences in the work place.

Therefore, the main hypothesis states:

H1: It is hypothesised that there will be a significant relationship between diversity of the workplace and employees’ job satisfaction.
H2: It is hypothesised that there will be a significant relationship between job stress and job satisfaction with the diversity of the workplace as a moderating factor.

H3: It is hypothesised that coping styles moderate the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction.

H4: It is hypothesised that there will be a significant relationship between nationality, length of stay in Ireland and job satisfaction.

H5: It is hypothesised that there will be a significant relationship between turnover intentions and job satisfaction.

H6: It is hypothesised that there will be a significant relationship between job demand factors: psychological job demands, skill discretion, decision authority, decision latitude, and job satisfaction.

H7: It is hypothesised that there will be a significant relationship between job stress and quality of life.

H8: It is hypothesised that there is a significant relationship between inclination to team work and job satisfaction.

H9: It is hypothesised that there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and quality of life.
2. Method

2.1 Participants

A quota, convenience and snowball sample was used, which consisted of the employees of predominantly two multinational organisations (“Company A” and “Company B”) based in Ireland. This was also the inclusion criterion, and the invitation to participate in the research was sent electronically via email to the prospective participants. The exclusion criterion was based on the voluntary nature of the survey, where the participants could refuse to give the informed consent and withdraw from participating in the survey.

The survey was sent out to the selected convenience sample of employees of Company A via email, asking also to forward the survey to anyone who might be interested in participating in the research. Prior to sending out the survey, the permission was obtained from the Vice President of the company to allow conducting of the research. The duration of collecting the responses was two weeks, with a reminder email sent out at the end of week one of the collection.

Company B was approached by sending out the email to one supervisor known to the researcher asking to forward the invitation to the greatest number of employees possible. The reminder was also sent out in the middle of collecting of the responses, and the duration of this collection lasted two and a half weeks.

The total number of participants who completed the survey was 114 (N=114). Apart from Company A and Company B, via the snowball method, employees from a further 2 companies took part in the survey.

From the total number of participants, the breakdown of sex shows that the number of participating males was 60 and females was 54. The age of participants was also collected in
a demographic question grouping the responses in 4 categories with the following results: 18 – 27 years (15.8%), 28 – 35 years (56.1%), 36 – 45 years (25.4%), 55 – 64 years (2.6%) and more than 65 years (0.00%). The participants were also asked to provide their nationality and length of stay in Ireland. The participants were also asked to state whether their position in the company is a managerial position or not.

2.2 Design

This study employed non experimental quantitative design survey, correlational and cross-sectional.

In the study the following are the predictor variables: job stress, diversity, coping strategies: active coping, venting, planning, acceptance, seeking social support, forbearance; group work, job demands: skill discretion, decision authority, psychological job demands, job insecurity; nationality and type of role in the organisation. The following are the criterion variables: job satisfaction, turnover intentions and the quality of life.

2.3 Materials

The email sent out to participants, with the invitation to participate in the study, contained the link to a “SurveyMonkey” questionnaire, which was created by the researcher for the purpose of the study. The first page of the survey consisted of the brief explanation of the research and the informed consent with the information about the anonymous and voluntary nature of the study (see Appendix 2).
The questionnaire consisted of 99 questions and ended with the thank you page and contacts to support agencies, such as Aware and Samaritans (see Appendix B).

2.3.1 Demographic questions

The demographic questions were designed by the researcher. They were used at the beginning of the questionnaire, and consisted in total of eight questions. The first question asked for the age of the participant with the answers grouped into six categories (see: Appendix B). The second questions asked for the gender. The third question was descriptive and asked to write down the “Nationality” of the participant. The fourth question was also descriptive and asked for the “Country of residence”. The fifth question also asked to write down a response to the “Name of the company that you work for”.

The sixth question asked about the duration of stay in the country of residence, with eight possible categories of answer (see: Appendix B). The seventh question asked for the position in the company with two possible answers: manager or non-manager. This question aimed to get information about the type of the role of the participant in the organisation, which can be correlated with the level of stress.

The last demographic question asked about the immediate family size, with the answers being grouped into four possible options (see: Appendix B). The answer to this question could give an insight into further analysis of the collectivistic coping styles of the participants.
2.3.2 Job Satisfaction Scale

The Job Satisfaction Scale (Paoline & Lambert, 2012) is a global measure rather than facet, focusing on the broader domains of the employees’ job satisfaction. It consists of five questions, which were adopted by Paoline & Lambert from Brayfield and Rothe’s research (1951). The answers to the questions are reported on a 5-point Likert scale (1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – neither agree nor disagree, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree). The questions were summed to form an index for statistical measure purposes, with a minimum possible score of 5 and maximum score of 25 (range=20). The research has found that the scale had a Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of .82 (Paoline & Lambert, 2012). Brayfield and Rothe (1951) found that their scale had good validity, and Yücel (2012) conducted exploratory factor analyses in relation to this scale, which showed validity of the scale above the acceptable lower limits for each question.

2.3.3 Job Stress Scales: QWI and OCS

Job stress was measured using two scales: Quantitative Workload Inventory (QWI) and Organisational Constraints Scale (OCS). QWI is designed to assess the amount of workload in a job and it is a 5-items scale (Spector & Jex, 1998). There are five response choices, where the participants state how often each statement occurs, from less than once per month (1) to several times per day (5). If the level of workload is high, the level of scores would represent this by high scores, with a possible range from 5 to 25. Average internal coefficient alpha was reported to be .82 across 15 studies (Spector & Jex, 1998), also moderate convergent validity was found for this scale.
OCS refers to organisational constraints which are things that interfere with task performance at work. Spector and Jex (1998) based the scale on the work of Peters and O’Connor (1980), where there are 11 areas of constraints. Each item on the scale assesses different areas of constraints and all items are summed to form the total score, ranging from 11 to 55. Participants answering questions indicate how often it is difficult to do their job because of the specified item. The answers range from 1 = less than once per month or never, to 5 = several times per day. OCS is viewed as a casual indicator scale (Spector & Jex, 1998), which means that the scale consists of items which combined constitute the construct, but are not representations of the same construct. For example the “your supervisor” item is not equivalent to “poor equipment or supplies”. For this reason the coefficient alpha is not calculated as an index of reliability for this scale.

2.3.4 Psychological Diversity Climate Perceptions

The Diversity Climate Perceptions scale was developed by McKay, Avery, Tonidandel, Morris, Hernandez and Hebl (2007). The scale consists of nine items, which address the extent to which the employees perceive the diversity as valued in the organisation. The responses were scored on a 5-point Likert scale: 1 = well below expectations, 2 = below expectations, 3 = neither below or above expectations, 4 = above expectations, 5 = well above expectations. The range of the scores is 25 with the minimum 20 and maximum 45. McKay et al. (2007) found that Cronbach’s alpha confirmed the reliability of the scale (.82). This scale was also used by Volpone, Avery and McKay (2012) who confirmed internal consistency of Cronbach’s alpha as .91.
2.3.5 Inclination to Teamwork

The Inclination to Teamwork scale includes four items, with responses scored on a 5-point Likert scale (from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The first two items on the scale were recoded, as they referred to the participant’s preference to work alone rather than in groups (Taras, 2013). This scale was used by Earley (1994), who reported Cronbach’s alpha as .73. The validity factor analysis showed eigenvalue of 4.89, accounting for 49 per cent of the total variance, and factor loadings ranged from .51 to .82 (Earley, 1994).

2.3.6 Turnover Intention

Turnover intention was measured using one question (Fang, 2001): “How likely is it that you will actively look for another job somewhere else in the next year?”. The responses have four possible answers: 1 = not likely at all, 2 = slightly possible, 3 = quite possible and 4 = almost certain. This measure was constructed to assess person’s frequency of thinking of quitting the job, which can be used to analyse the multidimensional approach to relationship between other variables, such as job satisfaction and stress and turnover intention.

2.3.7 Brief COPE subscales

The Brief COPE scales were developed in a patient setting in order to minimise the time in which it takes the participants to respond to the questionnaire (Carver, 1997). There are two items on each scale in Brief COPE, which in total consists of fourteen scales. The possible answers range from 1=”strongly disagree” to 4=”strongly agree”. For the purpose of this research four scales were used: Active Coping, Venting, Planning and Acceptance. The
range of scores is 6, with a minimum 2 and a maximum 8. These scales cannot be summed into one index, as they refer to different constructs. This research uses the aforementioned scales as a part of coping styles with collectivistic measure as one of the factors. Carver (1997) found the following reliability of the scales: Active coping alpha = .68, Venting = .50, Planning = .73 and Acceptance = .57. Youssof (2010) examined the scales regarding the reliability and validity and found acceptable internal consistency after applying factor analysis. Cooper, Katona and Livingstone (2008) conducted regression analyses that the indicated convergent and concurrent validity of the scales.

2.3.8 Collectivistic Coping Styles Measure

Moore and Constantine (2005) developed the Collectivistic Coping Styles Measure (CCSM) in order to assess the degree to which students from different cultural backgrounds used social support seeking and forbearance as methods to cope with their problems. This scale consists of nine items, five of them measuring Seeking Social Support subscale and four measuring Forbearance. The responses are collected on a 5-item Likert scale (1 = not used, 2 = used a little, 3 = unsure, 4 = used moderately, 5 = used often). Range of scores in Seeking Social Support is 20 (minimum is 5 and maximum is 25), and in Forbearance is 16 (minimum is 4 and maximum is 20). The subscales were found to have good construct, concurrent validity and test – retest reliability (More and Constantine, 2005). These two subscales will be used separately in the research, as the covariance is found to be negative (-.320). This can also mean that for Seeking Social Support subscale, high number responses correlate with low level of responses for Forbearance subscale.
2.3.9 *Job Content Questionnaire* scales

The Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) is an instrument designed to measure the “content” of the participant’s work tasks. It focuses on psychological structure of the work situation, such as issues relevant to work demands and decision-making opportunities. This questionnaire also includes other aspects of work, such as job insecurity and psychosocial strain outcome scales (Karasek et al., 1998).

This research used the recommended format with thirty-eight questions. These questions are then used to compute the following subscales: Skill Discretion (six questions, range=26), Created Skill (three questions, range=8), Decision Authority (three questions, range=36), Decision Latitude (comprised of Skill Discretion and Decision Authority, range=62), Psychological Job Demands (five questions, range=25) and Job Insecurity (three questions, range=5). In relation to Job Insecurity subscale, it must be noted here that the researcher chose to use two questions to combine the score (“Sometimes people permanently lose jobs they want to keep. How likely is it that during the next couple of years you will lose your present job with your employer?” and “My job security is good”), as the third question “How steady is your work?” was found to include 95.6 per cent of participants responding “Regular and steady” (N=109).

Karasek et al. (1998) found good reliability for each of the subscales in JCQ amongst the USA population. Their findings were also replicated in Japan (Kawakami, Kobayashi, Araki, Haratani and Furui, 1995). Doef and Maes (1999) state that from 1979 to 1997 they were able to gather 63 samples that used the JCQ, which shows the popularity of the measure. Györkös, Becker, Massoudi, de Bruin and Rossier (2012) confirm in their recent study that JCQ is still being used, however the results of this questionnaire in different cultures requires further exploration.
2.3.10 Quality of Life

The Quality of Life was measured using one question, used by the researcher from The World Health Organisation Quality of Life – BREF (The WHOQOL Group, 1998). This question assesses the general quality of life, and participants are asked to consider their life in the last four weeks. The responses are received on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = very poor, 2 = poor, 3 = neither poor nor good, 4 = good, 5 = very good).

There are a number of global measures that use one question to measure the quality of life, such as Campbell (1976) or Andrews and Withey (1976). Kerce (1992) reports that these global measures have good validity, for example Andrews and Withey (1976) measure ranged from .70 to .82 depending on the data set.

2.4 Procedure

The participants received an email with the invitation to respond to the survey, with the URL link directing them to the survey website. The questionnaire was designed so that the answering of each question was mandatory and it was impossible to skip the question. It took approximately 15 minutes to complete the survey.

The participants received brief information about the nature of the study. They were advised that the research is conducted in relation to work satisfaction, stress and diversity in a multicultural organisation in Ireland. They were also informed that the aim of the study was to understand more about such workplaces and how an organisation’s environment is related to employees’ satisfaction (see details in Appendix 2). The participants were given the college’s contact details if they wished to obtain more information about this research.
The participants were given the information at the beginning of the survey about the voluntary and anonymous nature of the study, and the right to withdraw at any point without penalty (see: Appendix B).
3. Results

The data in this research was recorded and computed using SPSS version 18. A series of descriptive and inferential statistics were performed on the data through this program.

3.1 Descriptive statistics

The frequencies were obtained for the following demographic data: nationality, company name, position in the company (see Table 1), length of stay in Ireland and immediate family size (see Table 2). The overall sample consisted of 114 respondents (N=114), of which 52.6% of them were males (N=60) and 47.4% were females (N=54). In terms of nationality (for detailed nationality breakdown see Figure 1 in Appendix A), 48.2% of participants were Irish (N=55) and 51.3% were non-Irish (N=58).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Irish</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company A</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company B</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position in the company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manager</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The duration of stay answers showed that almost 50% of participants lived more than 20 years in Ireland, followed by 5 – 10 years (27.2%) and 2 – 5 years (14.9%). Immediate
family size was grouped into 4 possible categories and showed that most of participants answered: 3 – 5 people (N=52), which accounted for 45.6% of all participants, followed by 1 – 2 people (N=30) with 26.3%.

Table 2. Frequencies of duration of stay in Ireland and immediate family size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of stay in Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 6 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12 month</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 20 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate family size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 people</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 people</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 people</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range of scores, mean and standard deviation were calculated for variables, such as job satisfaction, where the possible range of scores was from 5 to 25, and mean result high in relation to the range (19.55), with SD=4.10 showing the dispersion of the scores also considerably high. Diversity’s mean results (33.69) were considerably high when compared to the range (25), SD=5.52. Job stress scales, OCS and QWI, differed in their range of scores, 11 – 37 and 5 - 25 respectively, and their mean scores also showed different results, but the OCS mean result (19.35) scored quite low considering the range, with a high dispersion in the distribution of scores (SD=6.00). Four coping styles (Brief COPE: active coping, venting, planning, acceptance) variables had a possible range of scores from 2 to 8, and their mean
results showed higher than the average of the range. The variance of scores for coping styles were from SD=1.61 to SD=2.01. In relation to collectivistic coping styles the range of scores differed, and so did mean and standard deviation results, however both means were low when compared to the range. In job demands variables, the mean results were high considering the range of scores.

### Table 3. Descriptive statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Constraints (OCS)</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Workload (QWI)</td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>33.69</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclination to teamwork</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active coping</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venting</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking social support</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbearance</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill discretion</td>
<td>35.46</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created skill</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision authority</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological job demands</td>
<td>35.75</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job insecurity</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, the frequencies were obtained for turnover intentions and quality of life variables (see Figure 2 and 3 in Appendix A). Almost 50% of participants responded “Not likely at all” when asked about looking for another job elsewhere within the next year. 58% of participants responded that their quality of life is good.
Table 4. Frequencies of turnover intentions and quality of life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not likely at all</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly possible</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite possible</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither poor nor good</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*How likely is that you will actively look for another job somewhere else in the next year?

**How would you rate your quality of life?

3.2 Inferential statistics

Firstly, the Kolmogorov - Smirnoff normality check of the variables was conducted, showing that the main criterion variable of job satisfaction (M=19.55, SD=4.10) was not normally distributed (for full list of results please see Table 1 in Appendix A).

In relation to first hypothesis, Spearman’s Rho correlation coefficient was conducted and results of this test showed that there was a significant positive moderately strong relationship between diversity (M=33.69, SD=5.52) and job satisfaction ($rho(114) = .477, p < .001$, 2 – tailed).

In relation to second hypothesis, the scatterplot was obtained to examine the trend in the relationship between diversity and job satisfaction. The results showed that there was a monotonic relationship between these two variables (see Figure 4 in Appendix A). Next, Spearman’s Rho correlation coefficient was conducted in order to establish the relationship
between two job stress scales and job satisfaction. The result of this test showed that there was no significant relationship between quantitative workload inventory (QWI: M=16.91, SD=5.23)) and job satisfaction \((\rho(113) = -.015, p = .877, 2 – tailed)\), and that there was a significant moderately strong negative relationship between occupational constraints scale (OCS: M=19.35, SD=6.00) and job satisfaction \((\rho(113) = -.478, p < .001, 2 – tailed)\).

Secondly, a regression test was conducted in order to test whether diversity moderates the relationship between job stress (OCS) and job satisfaction. Diversity was entered first, followed by OCS as predictors of job satisfaction. The adjusted R square value obtained for diversity was .207 with significance at \(p < .001\) level, which means that diversity explains 20% of a variance of the job satisfaction. Next, the adjusted R square value for diversity and job stress was .271 with significance at \(p = .001\) level, which means that these variables explain 27% of the variance of the job satisfaction. The final model of the regression showed that diversity (Beta = .367) weakened the relationship between job stress (Beta = -.290) and job satisfaction, acting as a moderating factor (see Table 5 for results).

### Table 5. Regression summary table for second hypothesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Diversity</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>5.403</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Diversity</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>4.329</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job stress (OCS)</td>
<td>-.290</td>
<td>-3.420</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to third hypothesis, firstly the Spearman’s Rho correlation coefficient test was conducted in order to obtain the information about the relationship between hypothesised moderating factors, different coping styles and job satisfaction. The results showed that there was a significant moderately strong difference between venting (M=4.36, SD=1.61) and job satisfaction \((\rho(114) = -.309, p = .001, 2 – tailed)\), and a significant weak difference between
acceptance (M=5.38, SD=1.78) and job satisfaction (\(\text{rho}(114) = -.202, p = .031, 2 \text{ - tailed}\)). Other coping styles did not have a significant relationship with job satisfaction. Secondly, a regression test was conducted to examine the moderating relationship that the coping styles would have with job stress (OCS) and job satisfaction. Acceptance and venting were entered in the first model, followed by OCS as a predictor. The examination of adjusted R square value for acceptance and venting was .111 at significance p = .001, which showed that coping styles explained 11% of variance of job satisfaction. Additionally, the adjusted R square value for coping styles and stress was .209 with significance level at p < .001, meaning that it explained 21% of variance in job satisfaction. The results of the regression test showed that acceptance (Beta = -.087) and venting (Beta = -.235) acted as moderating factors, weakening the relationship between job stress (OCS) (Beta = -.335) and job satisfaction (see Table 6 for results).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Venting</td>
<td>-.294</td>
<td>-3.198</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-1.527</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Venting</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>-2.668</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.991</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job stress (OCS)</td>
<td>-.335</td>
<td>-3.840</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to fourth hypothesis, firstly a Mann – Whitney U test was conducted in order to examine the difference in job satisfaction regarding the nationality. The results showed that there was no significant difference in job satisfaction according to the nationality of the employees (\(z = -.659, p = .510, 2 \text{ - tailed}\)). Also, a Kruskall – Wallis one – way ANOVA test showed that there was no significant difference in job satisfaction (M=19.55, SD=4.10) according to the duration of stay in Ireland (\(\chi^2(7) = 4.91, p = .671\)).
In relation to fifth and sixth hypothesis, Spearman’s Rho correlation coefficient was conducted. The results showed, firstly, that there was a significant moderately strong negative relationship between turnover intentions and job satisfaction \((rho(114) = -.536, p = .000, 2 – \text{tailed})\). Secondly, between certain job demand subscales and job satisfaction, there was no significant relationship between psychological job demands \((M=35.75, SD=5.80)\) and job satisfaction \((rho(114) = .011, p = .905, 2 – \text{tailed})\), and there was a significant moderately strong positive relationship between skill discretion \((M=35.46, SD=5.66)\) and job satisfaction \((rho(114) = .609, p = .000, 2 – \text{tailed})\), created skill \((M=9.45, SD=1.69)\) and job satisfaction \((rho(114) = .690, p = .000, 2 – \text{tailed})\), decision authority \((M=34.25, SD=7.32)\) and job satisfaction \((rho(114) = .574, p = .000, 2 – \text{tailed})\), decision latitude \((M=69.70, SD=11.74)\) and job satisfaction \((rho(114) = .673, p = .000, 2 – \text{tailed})\), and a significant weak relationship between job insecurity \((M=3.47, SD=1.15)\) and job satisfaction \((rho(114) = .218, p = .020, 2 – \text{tailed})\). Table 7 shows correlation coefficient results for the variables measured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.536**</td>
<td>-.609**</td>
<td>.690*</td>
<td>.574**</td>
<td>.673**</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.218*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.356**</td>
<td>.861**</td>
<td>.611**</td>
<td>.853**</td>
<td>.221*</td>
<td>.235*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.463**</td>
<td>.611**</td>
<td>.577**</td>
<td>.775**</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \(p\) significant at .05 level.
** \(p\) significant at .01 level.

In relation to seventh hypothesis, Spearman’s Rho correlation coefficient was conducted to examine the relationship between job stress and quality of life. Two scales of job stress, OCS and QWI, were used in this measurement. The results showed that there was
a significant weak negative relationship between occupational constraints (M=19.35, SD=6.00) and quality of life (rho(113) = -.348, p = .000, 2 – tailed), and there was no significant relationship between quantitative workload and quality of life (rho(113) = -.071, p = .454, 2 – tailed).

In relation to eight hypothesis, Spearman’s Rho correlation coefficient was conducted, and the results showed that there was a significant weak positive relationship between inclination to teamwork (M=14.78, SD=2.16) and job satisfaction (rho(114) = .226, p = .015, 2 – tailed). Furthermore, to test whether nationality of the employees has a relationship with the inclination to teamwork, a Mann – Whitney U test was conducted, which revealed that there was no significant difference between Irish and non-Irish nationals and the inclination to teamwork (z = -.976, p = .329, 2 - tailed).

In relation to ninth hypothesis, Spearman’s Rho correlation coefficient was conducted, which showed that there was a significant weak positive relationship between job satisfaction (M=19.55, SD=4.10) and quality of life (rho(114) = .275, p = .003, 2 – tailed).
4. Discussion

The aim of this research was to investigate the relationship between job stress, job satisfaction, quality of life and diversity in a multicultural organisation in Ireland. It also looked at other variables that potentially would also have a relationship with job satisfaction: turnover intentions, inclination to group work, coping styles and job demands. Nine hypotheses were set up at the beginning of the project, and overall the significant relationship was found in eight of them. The results show that there is a significant relationship between diversity and job satisfaction and that diversity acts as a moderating factor between job stress and job satisfaction. Also, the coping styles moderate the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction, but the results were found only for two coping styles. The significant relationship was also found between turnover intentions and job satisfaction, job demands and job satisfaction, job stress and quality of life, inclination to team work and job satisfaction; and job satisfaction and quality of life. The significant difference was not found in job satisfaction when looking at nationality or length of stay in Ireland.

4.1 Job satisfaction, stress, job demands and diversity.

This study found that there is a significant relationship between diversity and job satisfaction. Furthermore, diversity was found to be a moderating factor between job stress and job satisfaction. These findings are supported by previous research, in which Findler, Wind and Mor Barak (2007) conducted a study in a high tech company in Israel (N=114) and found that diversity and it’s characteristics related to employees’ job satisfaction and well – being. They also put a hypothesis that work stress results from lack of fit with the environment. This environment needs to be provided by the employer and the organisation, providing opportunities and inclusion practices for all employees.
According to Volpone, Avery and McKay (2012), diversity mediates relationship between appraisal reaction and employee engagement. This research attempted to extend this relationship to examine whether diversity mediated stress and job satisfaction. Pasca and Wagner (2011) stressed the importance of examining the workplace stress in emerging diverse and multicultural organisations. In line with this statement, diversity was found to be a moderating factor between job stress and satisfaction, and furthermore the job demand model was used to see whether it has a relationship with job satisfaction in a diverse workplace. Karasek’s model of high demands and low control (Karasek et al., 2008) was found to have a relationship with job satisfaction. Therefore, as Pasca and Wagner (2011) suggested, the existing workplace stress model was examined in terms of a working population sample.

4.2 Demographic variables, job satisfaction and inclination to team work.

It was also suggested by Pasca and Wagner (2011) that the nationality of the employees and their duration of stay in a country is taken into consideration when researching diversity, stress and satisfaction in a workplace.

This research examined the difference in job satisfaction regarding the nationality and the length of stay in Ireland. No difference has been found in the results. This, however, has also been a result of a previous research by Pasca and Wagner (2012), who studied diverse workforces in Canada. They suggested that the perceptions of the immigrants and their quality of life may have a positive effect on the results that did not show any difference in work satisfaction between their samples. It may be also suggested that the companies treating all employees equally and attempting to fit their policies into different nationalities may have a certain effect on the satisfaction of the diverse workforce.
Teamwork and job satisfaction was found to have a strong relationship in a previous research (Kalisch, Hyunhwa and Rochman, 2010; Drach-Zahavy and Freund, 2007). This research confirms these findings, and it also found that there is no difference in inclination to teamwork and nationality of the participants. Earley (1993) and Jackson (2006) suggest that there would be a difference between individualistic and collectivistic personality and the inclination to teamwork. This research, however, did not differentiate between these two. This may be due to the fact that the participants were mostly from different European countries. Also this specific differentiation may not be possible, since the collectivistic styles are found in Asian populations (Earley, 1993). Also, it needs to be considered that teamwork is now considered to be an essential part of a workplace in 21-st century (Furnham, 2005), and employees from all different backgrounds would have a greater experience in teamwork.

4.3 Coping styles, job stress and job satisfaction.

The importance of researching the variety of coping styles was confirmed in this research, as Heppner et al. (2006) pointed out that it is important to account for various cultural groups using different coping styles. It was found that venting and acceptance had moderated the significant relationship with job satisfaction and that they also acted as moderating factors between job stress and job satisfaction. Koeske, Kirk and Koeske (1993) found that two coping strategies had an impact on stress as buffers – control base coping and avoidance (which had long term negative consequences). Abouserie (1996) found that the participants used a wide variety of coping strategies, which was not confirmed in this research.
4.4 Turnover intentions and job satisfaction.

This research found that there is a significant negative relationship between turnover intentions and job satisfaction. This finding is in line with previous research, where Kemmery, Mossholder and Bedeian (1987) found that job satisfaction and health have a relationship with turnover intentions. Fang (2001) used one question in order to measure the turnover intentions and also found the relationship between turnover intentions, organisational commitment and supervisory satisfaction.

4.5 Job stress, job satisfaction and quality of life.

Two hypotheses were tested in order to find the relationship between job stress and quality of life, and job satisfaction and quality of life. The results showed that there was a significant relationship between job stress and quality of life, which confirms the previous research in this area (Horowitz, Blackburn, Edington and Kloss, 1988; by Lerner, Levine, Malspeis and D'Agostino, 1994). It was also found that job satisfaction had a significant relationship with quality of life. This is also in line with previous research, showing these result in American (London, Crandall and Seals, 1997) and EU samples (Beham and Prag, 2010).

4.6 Strengths, drawbacks and further study opportunities.

This research was able to examine the diversity in a multicultural workplace in relation to job stress and satisfaction. This is considered to be a topic that is new, requires more attention from the researchers, and is close to the lives of many people around the
world. It was possible to obtain the sample from two different multinational companies, which showed the variety of possible responses, and yet it yielded the same results. The emerging topic of job satisfaction and stress in a “new” workplace is considered to have a gap in the literature (Pasca and Shannon, 2011), and this study attempted to add its findings to this topic regarding the workforce in Ireland.

Due to the limitations of the research, it was not possible to obtain a larger sample from non – Irish nationalities, and it was not possible to study them separately. It was only possible to differentiate between Irish and non – Irish samples, however more participants that are not Irish could give more insight into how the workforce from various cultural backgrounds feel about the workplace in Ireland.

As the method of the study was via online questionnaire, it was not possible to control the environment or the time when the study was taken. However, stronger control was not the aim of the study, but the allowance to take the questionnaire in a person’s free time, when they would feel comfortable answering all the questions.

Further research could attempt to include more companies and give a bigger sample to study the work behaviours and attitudes and the diverse environment. It is important that the research moves towards the 21st century workplace and examine whether the diversity of different groups in the workplace relates to the satisfaction of the non – national population. The recent studies show that in certain countries there is no difference in job satisfaction or quality of life between national and non – national samples (Pasca and Shannon, 2012). This, however, would be a much more contextual result of certain groups of the workforce, and more research is needed to study various cultural groups in different work organisations.

Also, as there are wider studies on health and quality of life in EU countries (Beham and Prag, 2010; Beham, Drobnic and Verwiebe, 2006), they could possibly be extended to
examine the mobility of the workforce, and related stress, coping strategies and job satisfaction. The research could include more private sector companies, where new technologies are implemented and where more flexible working arrangements (for example: working schedule, working from home, virtual and global teams) have been implemented.

4.7 Possible applications.

The research related to the diversity in a workplace could be used in the performance measurements used by organisations. Some companies measure the satisfaction of their employees, for example once a year, and in order to gain more insight into the application of inclusion and equality, they could include questions relating to the cultural background and diversity.

Applying diversity in a workplace should steam from the research that confirms the relationship between job stress, job satisfaction and diversity in an organisation. It would be hard to find a company that does not employ people from different cultural backgrounds, and this does not apply only to large multinational organisations. More research in this area in Ireland could help the smaller workplaces to apply the diversity measures to make sure that the employees from different cultural backgrounds feel less stressed and more satisfied with their work.

There are models created for including diversity in a workplace (Sue, 1991; Jayne and Dipboye, 2004) that allow the companies to integrate the applications of the research into their policies and behaviours. They need to consider the complexity of the subject, where there are many aspects of job satisfaction and stress amongst the employees. Different techniques would apply to large multinational organisations and small local firms, therefore
more research is needed to include these types of workplace in order to create intervention models.

4.8 Conclusions.

The results of this research point out to the importance of diversity in the workplace and also the importance of the future research in this area. The research focused on multinational companies which had a considerably large sample of non-Irish participants. Taking into account the limitations of the study, it was possible to present the relationship between job satisfaction, job stress and diversity as a moderating factor reducing this relationship. It was also possible to examine the relationship between stress coping strategies and job satisfaction; turnover intentions and job satisfaction; job demands and job satisfaction; job stress and quality of life; and inclination to teamwork and job satisfaction. The results showed that there is a relationship between various factors and job satisfaction. The results also showed that there was no difference in job satisfaction regarding the participant’s nationality and duration of stay in Ireland.

This leads to future research opportunities, especially in a larger sample of Irish companies. The possibility of application of this research extend to various diversity models, and based on the research results the models should be diversified in order to cater for various cultural groups, also taking into account the length of stay amongst the immigrant population. The workplace in the 21st century has changed and the emerging research in this area focuses on the cultural differences of employees. This study attempted to add more findings to this topic of diversity in a multicultural workplace.


Appendix A

Figure 1. *Nationality breakdown*

[Bar chart showing the nationality breakdown of participants.]

Figure 2. *Turnover intentions*

[Bar chart showing turnover intentions among participants.]
Figure 3. *Quality of life*

![Bar Chart: Quality of life](chart1.png)

Figure 4. *Diversity and job satisfaction scatterplot*

![Scatterplot: Diversity vs. Job Satisfaction](chart2.png)
Table 1. *Results of Kolmogorov - Smirnov (a) test of normality.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Constraints</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Workload</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclination to teamwork</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active coping</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venting</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking social support</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbearance</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill discretion</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created skill</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision authority</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision latitude</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological job demands</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job insecurity</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Study information

My name is Aleksandra Kreft and I'm a Final Year Psychology student in Dublin Business School. I'm conducting a research in relation to work satisfaction, stress and diversity in multicultural organisation. I’d appreciate your participation in my research.

The aim of this study is to understand more about such workplaces and how organisation’s environment is related to employees’ satisfaction.

Your participation in this study is completely anonymous and voluntary. You may leave the questionnaire at any time without penalty.

If you have any questions about your rights as participant, about this research, or if you have any suggestions or concerns, please contact Dr Garry Prentice at Dublin Business School.
Your age is:

- 18 – 27 years
- 28 – 35 years
- 36 – 45 years
- 46 – 54 years
- 55 – 64 years
- More than 65 years

Gender:

- Male
- Female

Nationality:

Country of residence:

Name of the company that you work for:

How long have you lived in your country of residence:

- Less than 3 months
- 3 – 6 months
- 7 – 12 months
- 1 – 2 years
- 2 – 5 years
- 5 – 10 years
- 10 – 20 years
- More than 20 years
Your position in company:

- Non-manager employee
- Manager

Your immediate family size is:

- None
- 1 – 2 people
- 3 – 5 people
- More than 5 people

How often do you find it difficult or impossible to do your job because of…?

Poor equipment or supplies.

- Less than once per month or never
- Once or twice per month
- Once or twice per week
- Once or twice per day
- Several times per day

Organisational rules and procedures.

- Less than once per month or never
- Once or twice per month
- Once or twice per week
- Once or twice per day
- Several times per day
Other employees.

- Less than once per month or never
- Once or twice per month
- Once or twice per week
- Once or twice per day
- Several times per day

Your supervisor.

- Less than once per month or never
- Once or twice per month
- Once or twice per week
- Once or twice per day
- Several times per day

Lack of equipment or supplies.

- Less than once per month or never
- Once or twice per month
- Once or twice per week
- Once or twice per day
- Several times per day

Inadequate training.

- Less than once per month or never
- Once or twice per month
- Once or twice per week
Once or twice per day
Several times per day

Interruptions by other people.

Less than once per month or never
Once or twice per month
Once or twice per week
Once or twice per day
Several times per day

Lack of necessary information about what to do or how to do it.

Less than once per month or never
Once or twice per month
Once or twice per week
Once or twice per day
Several times per day

Conflicting job demands.

Less than once per month or never
Once or twice per month
Once or twice per week
Once or twice per day
Several times per day

Inadequate help from others.

Less than once per month or never
Once or twice per month

Once or twice per week

Once or twice per day

Several times per day

Incorrect instructions.

Less than once per month or never

Once or twice per month

Once or twice per week

Once or twice per day

Several times per day

How often does your job require you to work very fast?

Less than once per month or never

Once or twice per month

Once or twice per week

Once or twice per day

Several times per day

How often does your job require you to work very hard?

Less than once per month or never

Once or twice per month

Once or twice per week

Once or twice per day

Several times per day
How often does your job leave you with little time to get things done?

- Less than once per month or never
- Once or twice per month
- Once or twice per week
- Once or twice per day
- Several times per day

How often is there a great deal to be done?

- Less than once per month or never
- Once or twice per month
- Once or twice per week
- Once or twice per day
- Several times per day

How often do you have to do more work than you can do well?

- Less than once per month or never
- Once or twice per month
- Once or twice per week
- Once or twice per day
- Several times per day

I like my job better than the average worker does.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
Most days I am enthusiastic about my job.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I definitely dislike my job.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I find real enjoyment in my job.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I am fairly well satisfied with my job.

- Strongly disagree
To what extent does the company engage in each of the following?

**Recruiting from diverse sources.**

- Well below expectations
- Below expectations
- Neither below or above expectations
- Above expectations
- Well above expectations

**Offer equal access to training.**

- Well below expectations
- Below expectations
- Neither below or above expectations
- Above expectations
- Well above expectations

**Open communication on diversity.**

- Well below expectations
- Below expectations
- Neither below or above expectations
- Above expectations
o Well above expectations

Publicise diversity principles.

o Well below expectations
o Below expectations
o Neither below or above expectations
o Above expectations
o Well above expectations

Offer training to manage diverse population.

o Well below expectations
o Below expectations
o Neither below or above expectations
o Above expectations
o Well above expectations

Respect perspectives of people like me.

o Well below expectations
o Below expectations
o Neither below or above expectations
o Above expectations
o Well above expectations

Maintains diversity-friendly work environment.

o Well below expectations
o Below expectations
o Neither below or above expectations
o Above expectations
o Well above expectations

Workgroup has climate that values diverse perspectives.

o Well below expectations
o Below expectations
o Neither below or above expectations
o Above expectations
o Well above expectations

Top leaders visibly committed to diversity.

o Well below expectations
o Below expectations
o Neither below or above expectations
o Above expectations
o Well above expectations

If the group is slowing me down, it is better to leave it and work alone.

o Strongly disagree
o Disagree
o Neither agree nor disagree
o Agree
o Strongly agree
A person does better work working alone than in a group.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Problem solving by groups gives better results than does problem solving by individuals.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Co-operation among team members usually helps to solve problems.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

How likely is that you will actively look for another job somewhere else in the next year?

- Not likely at all
- Slightly possible
- Quite possible
Almost certain

These items deal with ways you've been coping with the stress in your life. There are many ways to try to deal with problems. These items ask what you've been doing in general to cope with stressful events. Obviously, different people deal with things in different ways, but think about what you usually do when you are under a lot of stress. Each item says something about a particular way of coping. I want to know to what extent you've been doing what the item says, how much or how frequently. Don't answer on the basis of whether it seems to be working or not—just whether or not you're doing it. Use these response choices. Try to rate each item separately in your mind from the others. Make your answers as true FOR YOU as you can.

I've been concentrating my efforts on doing something about the situation I'm in.

- I haven't been doing this at all
- I've been doing this a little bit.
- I've been doing this a medium amount.
- I've been doing this a lot.

I've been taking action to try to make the situation better.

- I haven't been doing this at all
- I've been doing this a little bit.
- I've been doing this a medium amount.
- I've been doing this a lot.

I've been saying things to let my unpleasant feelings escape.

- I haven't been doing this at all
- I’ve been doing this a little bit.
- I’ve been doing this a medium amount.
- I’ve been doing this a lot.

I’ve been expressing my negative feelings.

- I haven’t been doing this at all
- I’ve been doing this a little bit.
- I’ve been doing this a medium amount.
- I’ve been doing this a lot.

I’ve been trying to come up with a strategy about what to do.

- I haven’t been doing this at all
- I’ve been doing this a little bit.
- I’ve been doing this a medium amount.
- I’ve been doing this a lot.

I’ve been thinking hard about what steps to take.

- I haven’t been doing this at all
- I’ve been doing this a little bit.
- I’ve been doing this a medium amount.
- I’ve been doing this a lot.

I’ve been accepting the reality of the fact that it has happened.

- I haven’t been doing this at all
- I’ve been doing this a little bit.
- I’ve been doing this a medium amount.
I’ve been learning to live with it.

I haven’t been doing this at all

I’ve been doing this a little bit.

I’ve been doing this a medium amount.

I’ve been doing this a lot.

The statements below are intended to represent some of the behaviours you might use to cope with stressful situations in your life. In responding to the statements below, please think of a specific stressful situation that you have encountered within the past 2 – 3 months. A stressful situation is any situation that you found troubling or otherwise caused you to worry. Such a situation might have been related to your friends, family, school, job, romantic relationship, or other people or things you consider to be important in your life. While keeping this problem in mind, please use the following 5 – point scale to indicate the extent to which you used the following strategies to help you cope with the stress you experienced.

I spoke with a friend to seek support about the problem

Not used

Used a little

Unsure

Used moderately

Used often
I received advice or support from someone who had experienced a similar problem or concern.

- Not used
- Used a little
- Unsure
- Used moderately
- Used often

I told myself that I could overcome the problem or concern.

- Not used
- Used a little
- Unsure
- Used moderately
- Used often

I didn’t express my feelings about the problem to others because I didn’t want to burden them.

- Not used
- Used a little
- Unsure
- Used moderately
- Used often
I minimised the problem or concern so others wouldn’t worry about me.

- Not used
- Used a little
- Unsure
- Used moderately
- Used often

I spent time with my family member(s) or friend(s).

- Not used
- Used a little
- Unsure
- Used moderately
- Used often

I kept the problem or concern to myself in order not to worry others.

- Not used
- Used a little
- Unsure
- Used moderately
- Used often

I shared the problem or concern with someone from my own cultural background.

- Not used
- Used a little
- Unsure
I spoke with a family member to seek guidance or support about the problem.

For the questions below, please check the box with the answer that comes closest.

My job requires that I learn new things.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

My job involves a lot of repetitive work.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

My job requires me to be creative.

- Strongly disagree
My job allows me to make a lot of decisions on my own.

My job requires a high level of skill.

On my job, I have very little freedom to decide how I do my work.

I get to do a variety of different things on my job.
I have a lot of say about what happens on my job.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

My job requires working very fast.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

My job requires working very hard.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
My job requires lots of physical effort.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I am not asked to do an excessive amount of work.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I have enough time to get the job done.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I am often required to move or lift very heavy loads on my job.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
My work requires rapid and continuous physical activity.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I am free from conflicting demands that others make.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

My job requires long periods of intense concentration on the task.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

My tasks are often interrupted before they can be completed, requiring attention at a later time.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
My job is very hectic.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I am often required to work for long periods with my body in physically awkward positions.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Waiting on work from other people or departments often slows me down on my job.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

My job security is good.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree
How steady is your work?

- Regular and steady
- Seasonal
- Frequent layoffs
- Both seasonal and frequent layoffs
- Other

During the past year, how often were you in a situation where you faced job loss or layoff?

- Never
- Faced the possibility once
- Faced the possibility more than once
- Constantly
- Actually laid off

Sometimes people permanently lose jobs they want to keep. How likely is it that during the next couple of years you will lose your present job with your employer?

- Not at all likely
- Not too likely
- Somewhat likely
- Very likely

How many people are in your work group or unit?

- I work alone
- 2 – 5 people
- 6 – 10 people
- 11 – 20 people
- 20 or more people

I have significant influence over decisions in my work group or unit.

- I work alone
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree

My work group or unit makes decisions democratically.

- I work alone
  - Strongly disagree
  - Disagree
  - Agree
  - Strongly agree

I have at least some chance that my ideas will be considered about company policy (e.g., hiring, firing, wage levels, plant closing, new machinery purchases, etc.).

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly agree

I supervise other people as part of my job.

- No
Yes 1 – 4 people
Yes 5 – 10 people
Yes 11 – 20 people
Yes more than 20 people

I am a member of a union or employee association.

Yes
No

My union or employee association is influential in affecting company policy.

I am not a member
Strongly disagree
Disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

I have influence over the policies of the union or employee association.

I am not a member
Strongly disagree
Disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

My prospects for career development and promotions are good.

Strongly disagree
Disagree
In five years, my skills will be still valuable.

What level of skill is required on your job in terms of years of formal training? (Not necessarily the same as your education.)

The following question asks how you feel about your quality of life. Please choose the answer that appears most appropriate. If you are unsure about which response to give to a question, the first response you think of is often the best one.

Please keep in mind your standards, hopes, pleasures and concerns. I ask that you think about your life in the last four weeks.

How would you rate your quality of life?

- Very poor
If you have been affected by the issues covered in this research, please contact one of the agencies for support:

Samaritans: email: jo@samaritans.org or call 1850 60 90 90

Aware helpline: 1890 303302

Mental Health Ireland: info@mentalhealthireland.ie