2019

The Role of Gender in Workplace Exhaustion: Female Perceptions of Stress in the Technology Workplace

Madison C. Wills
Georgia Southern University

The Role of Gender in Workplace Exhaustion: Female Perceptions of Stress in the Technology Workplace

An Honors Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Honors in *Information Technology.*

By
Madison Wills

Under the mentorship of Dr. Cheryl Aasheim

ABSTRACT

As the role of the information technology professional expands, an increasing amount of technology employees are experiencing workplace exhaustion. Adding to that stress, women face other obstacles as minorities in the field. This project identifies characteristics of how gender influences perceived stress and exhaustion in the technology workplace. Through the use of statistics and spreadsheets, this study analyzes survey data regarding information technology professional job perceptions. Expanding upon previous research on this data set, this study adds the element of gender. It was discovered that men were more likely to experience stressors such as role conflict, role ambiguity, and a greater perceived workload. Women were more likely to experience emotional dissonance stressors such as positive display rules, apparent sincerity, social astuteness, and avoidance of conflict.

Thesis Mentor: _____

Dr. Cheryl Aasheim

Honors Director: _____

Dr. Steven Engel

April 2019
Department of Information Technology
University Honors Program
Georgia Southern University

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements 2

Introduction 3

Literature Review 4

Information Technology Workplace Exhaustion and Turnover 4

Heavy Workload 5

Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity 6

Emotional Dissonance 6

Female Stress in the Information Technology Workplace 7

Opportunities for Advancement 8

Social, Psychological, and Cultural Concerns 9

Gender Pay Gap Concerns 10

Hypothesis Development 10

Methodology 13

Results 16

Discussion 18

Conclusion 26

Works Cited 27

Appendix 1 – Complete Statistics 29

Appendix 2 – Survey Questions 33

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank my thesis mentor, Dr. Cheryl Aasheim, for agreeing to guide me through the process of completing this project. Her advice has been invaluable over the entirety of this project. I really appreciate her taking time out of her busy schedule to help me.

Second, I would like to thank Dr. Paige Rutner for allowing me to branch off of her work and use the survey data she collected in her study. This opportunity has allowed me to look into research that is fascinating, and I am grateful to have had a chance to look into it more.

Additionally, I would like to thank Georgia Southern and the University Honors Program for the education and opportunities I've been given over my time here. Choosing to pursue my education with Georgia Southern is one of the best decisions I have ever made. It has always felt like a home away from home, and it is bittersweet moving on.

Finally, I would like to thank Ben Siclare and my parents for motivating me and pushing me to keep going with this project. With the stressors of being a senior (graduating, finding a job, capstone projects, etc.) and other extenuating circumstances, there were many moments that I felt overwhelmed and that I couldn't do this. They helped me realize that I could do it, and I am forever grateful for their love and support.

Introduction

Across all career fields, stress in the workplace is an unavoidable part of being a professional. For those employees in the field of information technology, this stress load has become increasingly overbearing as the role of technology in business has expanded, morphed, and evolved in recent years. Careers that once mainly involved working with the technology now demand greater interpersonal skills and knowledge of business processes in order to aid in decision making. Under the pressure of great expectations, many technology professionals are now experiencing workplace exhaustion in their careers. Employees are increasingly becoming more likely to leave jobs as they become frustrated and unsatisfied with workplace demands.

In a similar fashion, females across all career fields have experienced gender specific stressors in the workplace. Even in the present where there is a push for greater workplace equality, women experience obstacles such as the gender pay gap, gender bias for promotions and management positions, and stereotyping. In the technology field, women are greatly in the minority as the field has traditionally been dominated by males. With less equality and diversity in the workplace, women in technology are more susceptible to gender related workplace obstacles. Combining gender related stressors with previously referenced technology stressors can make an impact on whether female technology employees experience workplace exhaustion.

The following sections provide information to help better understand technology and gender related workplace stressors. After reviewing the literature, this paper will perform an analysis on an IT employee questionnaire dataset in an effort to identify characteristics of how gender influences perceived stress and exhaustion in the

technology workplace. This work expands upon research performed by Dr. Paige Rutner in "Emotional Dissonance and the Information Technology Professional."

Literature Review

As technology professionals take on more responsibilities in their careers, workplace exhaustion is becoming more apparent. Stressors in the workplace such as workload, role conflict and ambiguity, and emotional dissonance are leading to higher turnover intention rates and lower employee satisfaction rates. In addition to this stress, minorities in the workplace, such as female technology employees, face many other obstacles that contribute to exhaustion and burnout. The following sections provide a review of literature regarding both technology workplace exhaustion and female stressors in the technology workplace in the context of this project.

Information Technology Workplace Exhaustion and Turnover

As the role of technology in business has changed over time, the information technology professional has progressively taken on more responsibilities. This expanding role is speculated to be a crucial factor in the high turnover rates present in the IT field as professionals experience work exhaustion, which is "the depletion of one's emotional, mental, and physical resources" in the job setting (Rutner et al., "Emotional Dissonance" 636). This exhaustion or burnout in the IT workplace has been reviewed in numerous studies, with many citing heavy workload, role conflict and role ambiguity, and emotional dissonance as potential causation (Rutner et al., "Work Exhaustion" 103). As employees feel more overwhelmed in the IT workplace, they may experience reduced job satisfaction and emotional distress that can lead to higher turnover rates as employees search for other job positions (Rutner et al., "Emotional Dissonance" 636). Work

exhaustion has become a very important topic to employers and recruiters as more people leave companies. It can be difficult to replace the technical talent lost and increases costs associated with training. In fact, in the years between 1970 and 2000, United States technology employee turnover rates ranged anywhere from 15 to 33 percent, and present turnover rates have not improved (Joseph 547*)*.

Heavy Workload

Increasingly heavy workload is a crucial factor to consider in workplace exhaustion. Technology workers are discovering that they not only require technical capabilities to perform their jobs, but also need customer service, problem solving, and interpersonal skills due to the creative and ever-changing nature of technology in business (Rutner et al., "Emotional Dissonance" 636). Instead of working strictly with technology, professionals are now often given tasks that require communicating with clients, customers, and peers in the non-IT segments of the business. With such varying types of work expectations placed on the IT professional, employees are finding themselves working in unsatisfactory conditions and at not ideal times. In 1998, a survey uncovered that of 1,180 networking professionals, 94% felt that they worked in a deadline or crisis mode at least some of the time, and 84% admitted to bringing work home or working week nights and weekends at least some of the time (Moore 144). Some IT employees are expected to be on call to fix technology, 24 hours a day and seven days a week. This leads to a feeling of never being able to escape the workplace as vacations and weekends are not truly separated from work time (Moore 144). When these workload demands begin to impact the work-life balance and the work-family balance, IT

employees are more likely to experience the workplace burnout as they take on more responsibilities without getting a break (Armstrong, “Exhaustion” 717).

Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity

Role conflict and ambiguity are byproducts of heavy workload that impact workplace exhaustion. Individuals often experience role conflict when they are faced with simultaneous occurrences of multiple role requirements that depend on one another (Li and Shani 109). The boundary spanning role of a technology professional feeds into role conflict, as professionals deal with aspects of companies such as technology, business, customer relations, etc. (Moore 144).

With role ambiguity, IT employees lack a clearly defined idea of expectations associated with the role, how the role expectations will be fulfilled, and the consequences of role performance (Li and Shani 108). In these instances, users, peers, and management can offer unclear, conflicting, and volatile expectations on a technology professional that is unsure of their role and authority (Li and Shani 109). Ambiguity also comes from the ever changing and expansive nature of technology in business. Both role conflict and role ambiguity relate to job expectations, and those that experience high levels of these are much less likely to evaluate a job positively (Rutner et al., “Emotional Dissonance” 639).

Emotional Dissonance

Emotional dissonance is the conflict between the way a person feels in an interaction and the emotion a person feels compelled to display in an interaction (Rutner et al., “Emotional Dissonance” 636). This has become a factor in IT workplace exhaustion because technology professionals are expected to take on many technical roles and perspectives while still showing empathy and concern. For example, computer help

desk employees might feel angry or annoyed with clients that have naive questions, but they are expected to be polite and mild mannered with the clients (Rutner et al., "Emotional Dissonance" 636). Some employees find the expectation to act a certain way intrusive and a loss of control in terms of their emotional identity (Rutner et al., "Work Exhaustion" 104). Dissonance causes stress on technology employees because displaying additional emotion requires more effort by the employee on top of what the job already entails (Rutner et al., "Work Exhaustion" 104). Whether positive or negative, emotional dissonance has been found to greatly impact workplace exhaustion by adding the stress of having to act differently than what is felt. As employees have greater workloads and interact with more technology stakeholders, emotional dissonance has been shown to ultimately reduce job satisfaction and increase turnover intention (Rutner et al., "Emotional Dissonance" 647).

Female Stress in the Information Technology Workplace

While great efforts have been made to encourage diversity and equality in the workplace, female technology workers are still a minority. A study in 2000 found that only 28.9 percent of the nearly 3.41 million employed IT workers were female (Ghazzawi 11). In the time that information technology has been around, the field has been highly male centric, in turn offering psychological, structural, and organizational stressors specifically to females in the technology workplace. Women have been faced with lower salaries, less opportunities for promotions and management positions, stereotypes, and negative social interactions (Armstrong, "Advancement" 143). Studies have shown that these stressors tie into workplace exhaustion as female technology

workers are much more likely to report turnover intention than their male counterparts (Thatcher 247).

Opportunities for Advancement

One of the main stressors that female technology workers have been exposed to is lack of opportunity to climb up the ladder and work in higher-level jobs. Research has indicated that women are overrepresented in lower-level jobs, and it has been argued that those women that do make it to management aspire to positions lower than their male counterparts (Baroudi and Igbaria 185). Reports have shown that while the technology field is about 20 percent women, only seven percent of top technology executives are female (Baroudi and Igbaria 185). A "glass ceiling" exists that prevents women from reaching upper management in a variety of speculated ways. Due to stereotypes experienced with the male dominated field, some professionals perceive less ease of movement in an organization because they possess fewer resources and opportunities to develop career skills (Joseph 553**)**. Other studies have suggested gender bias in job performance evaluations can prevent advancement to top management due to inappropriate sex-role stereotypes, social isolation, and work-family conflict being incorporated into a manager's evaluation (Igbaria and Baroudi 109). These factors have led researchers to believe that female technology professionals experience higher levels of stress, have less job satisfaction and loyalty to a company, and possess a greater desire to leave the company due to restricted promotion opportunities and unfair treatment (Joseph 553).

Social, Psychological, and Cultural Concerns

Social, psychological, and cultural factors also play into the stress that women experience in the technology workplace, manifesting in both a woman's internal self-expectations and the external views from society (Ahuja 22). In terms of external stereotypes, women have traditionally taken on a variety of roles such as mother, wife, or caretaker during the peak of their careers. When faced with trying to manage a career, child care, and a home, some women have been viewed by employers as lacking commitment and not taking their careers as seriously as male colleagues (Ahuja 25). As technology has become more globalized, professionals are expected to work longer hours and travel more often. When women are perceived as more family oriented and not willing to travel or work late, their chances of being hired or advancing in their career are lessened (Ahuja 22**)**. For those women that have advanced in their career to top executive level, some have experienced being perceived as a "token" female executive, leading to feelings of isolation, less access to mentors, exclusion from informal networks, and difficulty gaining trust of their male counterparts (Igbaria and Baroudi 111).

From an internal perspective, women put strict expectations on themselves to act a certain way in the workplace due to societal norms. Studies have shown that women are more likely than men to hide feelings of emotion (Erickson and Ritter 157). Many women internalize negative evaluations and stereotypes and participate in "self-limiting" behaviors due to lack of social contacts, knowledge and skill development, and visibility. In these instances, they might decline a difficult assignment or refuse to participate in an opportunity for additional training and development (Baroudi and Igbaria 187). Women experience social and psychological stressors on both an internal and external level that make an impact on the amount of stress they experience in the workplace.

Gender Pay Gap Concerns

Relating to the lack of advancement in a company and the social concerns females experience in the technology workplace, a gender pay gap exists. Even with education, age, work experience, and job level controlled, studies have uncovered that women receive lower salaries than their male counterparts (Ahuja 21). Some researchers have speculated that this stems from the "traditional" household stereotype in which women are the secondary earners of the family and only work during times of economic need, leaving once the need no longer exists (Baroudi and Igbaria 188). In these scenarios it is assumed the male "breadwinner" of the family should be paid more to provide for his family (Baroudi and Igbaria 188). Researchers have also speculated some employers assume women accumulate less human capital (skills and knowledge learned through work experience and training), thus they do not need to be compensated equally with male counterparts (Baroudi and Igbaria 184). With the assumption that women require more flexible schedules and are more likely to interrupt their career to take care of family or relocate for a spouse's career, some businesses anticipate a lack of loyalty and a low return on investment from the employee (Igbaria and Baroudi 111). All of these factors have been shown to influence women to report lower career success and greater stress in the workplace (Baroudi and Igbaria 188).

Hypothesis Development

This study expands upon previous research performed by Dr. Paige Rutner in "Emotional Dissonance and the Information Technology Professional." This paper adds to the previous research by taking the established research model and analyzing data in terms of gender and how females perceive stress and exhaustion in the technology

workplace. The following hypotheses build upon Dr. Rutner's research and have been modified to view the impacts of gender.

A variety of constructs exist within the emotional labor theory that help describe stressors technology professionals experience in the workplace. Emotional dissonance theory is one such construct. Negative emotional dissonance involves suppressing displays of emotion, and some technology employees feel they have lost emotional expression when this occurs. The employee might be upset with both the customer and the fact they must suppress feelings when speaking with the customer (Rutner et al., "Emotional Dissonance" 637). It is hypothesized that this will lead to greater feelings of work exhaustion and decrease satisfaction due to the conflict. With the added stereotypes women face in the workplace, often seen as being more emotional than men, it is also hypothesized that women will feel the effects of emotional dissonance more than men.

Hypothesis 1: *Negative emotional dissonance is experienced in greater levels for women than men.*

Job satisfaction is another construct used in the study. This construct is important because workplace exhaustion is expected to produce lower job satisfaction levels. When overworked and overwhelmed, technology employees are not expected to be satisfied with their careers (Rutner et al., "Emotional Dissonance" 638). With the additional stressor that women experience that ultimately impact their workload, it is hypothesized that women more than men will experience greater amounts of workplace exhaustion.

Hypothesis 2: *Work exhaustion is experienced in greater levels for women than men.*

Role conflict and role ambiguity are other constructs that impact work exhaustion and job satisfaction in this study. Role conflict has been known to reduce job satisfaction as there is an incompatibility between job expectations. High levels of ambiguity or conflict have led to employees being less likely to evaluate a job positively (Rutner et al., "Emotional Dissonance" 639). It is hypothesized that women will experience stress and exhaustion from role ambiguity and role conflict more than men.

Hypothesis 3: *Role ambiguity is experienced in greater levels for women than men.*

Hypothesis 4: *Role conflict is experienced in greater levels for women than men.*

Autonomy is another construct within this study. Employees that have been given higher degrees of autonomy and discretion on how to perform work responsibilities have shown increased job satisfaction levels (Rutner et al., "Emotional Dissonance" 639). It is hypothesized that women will experience autonomy stressors more than men.

Hypothesis 5: *Autonomy stressors are experienced in levels greater for women than men.*

Turnover intention is the final construct. Employees that experience dissatisfaction with jobs have been shown to be more likely to leave those jobs. Job satisfaction is key in turnover intention (Rutner et al., "Emotional Dissonance" 639). It is hypothesized that women will experience greater levels of turnover intention related to job satisfaction than men.

Hypothesis 6: *Turnover intention appears in levels greater for women than men.*

Table 1: Construct details

Construct	Abbreviation	Number of Survey Questions
Boundary Spanning Groups	BS_who	9
Stress Groups	Stress_who	9
Representation	BSA_Rep	5
Negotiation	BSA_Neg	6
Information Processing	BSA_InfPro	6
Training	BSA_Tr	5
Positive Display Rules	EL_PDR	4
Negative Display Rules	EL_NDR	3
Perceived Workload	PW	4
Work Exhaustion	WE	5
Turnover Intention	TO	4
Role Ambiguity	RA	6
Role Conflict	RC	8
Respond to Other's Emotions	ROE	5
Surface Acting	SA	3
Deep Acting	DA	3
Networking Ability	NetAb	6
Apparent Sincerity	ApSin	3
Social Astuteness	SocAst	5
Interpersonal Influence	IntInf	4
Yielding/Accepting	Acc	4
Compromising	Comp	4
Forcing/Asserting	Assert	4
Problem Solving	ProbSol	4
Avoiding	Avoid	4

Table 1 above lists the constructs, construct abbreviations, and number of survey questions dedicated to each construct.

Methodology

The data for this study was collected in Dr. Rutner's "Emotional Dissonance and the Information Technology Professional" research in 2007 through a questionnaire of technology employees at Fortune 100 companies. The questionnaire consisted of 133 questions that addressed the constructs mentioned in the hypothesis development above as well as demographic information regarding job title, age, gender, education, salary, IT tenure, organization tenure, current job tenure, and organization name. While 294

technology employee responses were recorded, 274 responses were deemed usable (93.2 percent). Responses that were submitted in the incorrect format, did not identify a gender, or were missing five or more non-optional answers were eliminated. The respondents held a variety of positions including managers, programmers, and customer support specialists. Of the 274 usable responses, 98 are female employees (35.8 percent).

In investigating the effects of gender on workplace exhaustion and turnover, two tables were created for analysis. One table displayed the statistics t-stat, p-value, mean, standard deviation, and sample size for individual survey questions in terms of males versus females. The second table displayed the statistics t-stat, p-value, mean, standard deviation, and sample size for constructs in terms of males versus females. In order to determine significant differences between the responses of males and females, a t-test was performed for each survey question in the first pivot table and for each construct grouping in the second pivot table. Survey questions and constructs with p-values less than 0.05 were considered significant. Survey questions and constructs with p-values below 0.10 were also flagged for potential significance.

Survey question data is reported in a variety of Likert scales and in some instances the questions have been reverse coded. Thus, the same value across multiple questions does not mean the same thing. The following assertions are in regard to the full survey listed in Appendix 2. Answering in a positive manner does not raise concerns while answering in a negative manner does raise concerns.

Table 2: Scale details

Question Range	Scale	Scale Description	Positive Answer	Negative Answer	Constructs Referenced
1 – 9	7 Point Likert	1 = Strongly Disagree 7 = Strongly Agree	1	7	PW, WE
10 – 15	7 Point Likert	1 = Strongly Disagree 7 = Strongly Agree	7	1	RA
16 - 23	7 Point Likert	1 = Strongly Disagree 7 = Strongly Agree	1	7	RC
24 - 41	7 Point Likert	1 = Strongly Disagree 7 = Strongly Agree	1	7	NetAb, ApSin, SocAst, IntInf
42	7 Point Likert	1 = Strongly Disagree 7 = Strongly Agree	7	1	TO
43	7 Point Likert	1 = Strongly Disagree 7 = Strongly Agree	1	7	TO
44	7 Point Likert	1 = Very Unlikely 7 = Very Likely	7	1	TO
45	7 Point Likert	1 = Very Unlikely 7 = Very Likely	1	7	TO
46, 48- 52	7 Point Likert	1 = Strongly Disagree 7 = Strongly Agree	1	7	EL_PDR, EL_NDR
47	7 Point Likert	1 = Strongly Disagree 7 = Strongly Agree	7	1	EL_PDR
53 - 63	5 Point Likert	1 = Never 5 - Always	1	5	ROE, SA, DA
65 - 86	5 Point Likert	1 = Very Little 5 = Very Much	1	5	BSA_Rep, BSA_Neg, BSA_InfPro, BSA_Tr
87 - 95	7 Point Likert	1 = Not at All or Infrequently 7 = Very Often	1	7	BS_who
96 - 104	7 Point Likert	1 = Very Low Stress 7 = Very High Stress	1	7	BS_stress
105 - 124	5 Point Likert	1 = Not at All 5 = Very Much	1	5	Acc, Comp, Assert, ProbSol, Avoid

Table 2 above gives information regarding the scaling of the survey questions. The table provides the questions being discussed, scale, scale description, indications of positive and negative answering, and the constructs addressed by the question groupings.

Results

The below tables refer to the questions in the survey given to technology professionals. To view all questions in the given survey, please refer to the complete survey in Appendix 2.

Table 3: Statistics for partial list of survey questions

	Survey Number	t-stat	p-value	Male			Female		
				$\overline{x_1}$	n_1	s_1	$\overline{x_2}$	n_2	s_2
Stress_who_2	97	1.6788	0.0472	3.0857	175	1.5226	3.4184	98	1.5967
Stress_who_9	104	2.1572	0.0167	1.8730	63	1.5170	1.3659	41	0.8767
BSA_Neg6	75	1.8019	0.0363	2.9375	176	1.9948	3.4167	96	2.1490
BSA_InfPro5	80	2.4027	0.0085	4.3029	175	1.9697	3.7245	98	1.8724
BSA_Tr1	82	2.7115	0.0036	4.2343	175	1.8006	3.5714	98	2.0102
BSA_Tr2	83	2.5685	0.0054	4.3125	176	1.7675	3.7041	98	1.9389
BSA_Tr3	84	2.2463	0.0127	4.2312	173	1.8666	3.6837	98	1.9619
BSA_Tr4	85	1.6590	0.0491	4.0457	175	1.9118	3.6327	98	2.0071
EL_PDR2	47	4.1870	0.00002	2.8182	176	1.8125	2.0104	96	1.3346
EL_PDR4	49	2.9566	0.0017	4.3771	175	1.7090	5.0104	96	1.6739
_PW1	1	1.9563	0.0257	3.5284	176	1.7416	3.1237	97	1.5747
_WE1	5	2.0583	0.0203	3.7443	176	1.9649	3.2755	98	1.7130
_WE2	6	2.0366	0.0213	3.8920	176	1.9320	3.4184	98	1.7953
_WE4	8	1.9841	0.0241	3.3352	176	2.0102	2.8776	98	1.7218
_WE5	9	2.5952	0.0050	2.8920	176	1.8137	2.3469	98	1.5786
_RA1	10	1.7626	0.0395	4.4091	176	1.8162	4.7755	98	1.5487
_RA3	12	2.5551	0.0056	4.3466	176	1.5664	4.8163	98	1.3949
_RA4	13	3.7781	0.0001	5.0966	176	1.5546	5.7041	98	1.0899
_RA5	14	3.1651	0.0009	4.6857	175	1.6694	5.2653	98	1.3136
_RA6	15	2.0707	0.0197	4.2557	176	1.7014	4.6804	97	1.5765
_RC1	16	2.5807	0.0052	4.3029	175	1.7647	3.7320	97	1.7381
_RC3	18	2.3641	0.0094	3.0114	176	1.7188	2.5464	97	1.4574
_RC7	22	1.7557	0.0401	3.4659	176	1.8736	3.0510	98	1.8756
_RC8	23	2.4076	0.0084	3.4489	176	1.9329	2.8980	98	1.7467
_ROE1	53	1.7427	0.0413	2.7955	176	1.1043	3.0408	98	1.1241
_ApSin1	30	2.1256	0.0172	6.0000	176	1.1629	6.2755	98	0.9452
_ApSin3	32	3.1701	0.0008	5.6149	174	1.1477	6.0612	98	1.0956
_SocAst1	33	2.0830	0.0191	3.9143	175	1.3474	4.2653	98	1.3290
_SocAst2	34	1.8970	0.0294	4.3977	176	1.4065	4.7347	98	1.4110
_SocAst3	35	2.0550	0.0204	4.2045	176	1.5642	4.5816	98	1.3918
_SocAst4	36	2.1119	0.0178	4.7670	176	1.4837	5.1429	98	1.3702
_SocAst5	37	3.0632	0.0012	4.2557	176	1.4212	4.7653	98	1.2601

_IntInf1	38	1.8170	0.0352	5.0170	176	1.3630	5.3163	98	1.2745
_IntInf2	39	2.2179	0.0137	5.0114	176	1.3055	5.3750	96	1.2849
_IntInf3	40	1.9210	0.0279	4.9489	176	1.4032	5.2551	98	1.1807
_IntInf4	41	1.7332	0.0421	4.6307	176	1.3755	4.9184	98	1.2831
_Comp4	112	2.3596	0.0095	3.0455	176	0.9221	3.3061	98	0.8501
_Assert2	114	2.8976	0.0020	2.6534	176	1.0053	2.3061	98	0.9193
_Assert1	113	2.1909	0.0147	2.9486	175	0.9637	2.6939	98	0.8968
_Assert3	115	3.0042	0.0015	2.7955	176	1.0242	2.4388	98	0.8929
_Assert4	116	2.1090	0.0179	2.1207	174	1.0071	1.8571	98	0.9794
_Avoid1	121	1.7067	0.0445	3.1193	176	1.0127	3.3367	98	1.0096
_Avoid2	122	2.2455	0.0128	2.7841	176	0.9937	3.0825	97	1.0810
_Avoid4	124	1.7798	0.0381	3.2045	176	1.0888	3.4433	97	1.0451
Salary	129	3.3499	0.0005	2.3452	168	1.0059	1.9688	96	0.7965
IT_tenure	130	2.2564	0.0124	13.4614	175	9.9296	10.9021	97	8.3751
Stress_who_1	96	1.4731	0.0709	2.5805	174	1.4629	2.8776	98	1.6676
Stress_who_7	102	1.3971	0.0818	2.7600	175	1.6800	2.4688	96	1.6199
BSA_Tr5	86	1.5648	0.0594	3.2286	175	1.8560	3.5816	98	1.7492
EL_PDR1	46	1.5679	0.0590	4.7216	176	1.8515	5.0816	98	1.8052
EL_PDR3	48	1.5849	0.0571	4.9886	176	1.7516	5.3367	98	1.7376
_PW2	2	1.4867	0.0691	3.5795	176	1.8782	3.2449	98	1.7324
_TO2	43	1.3704	0.0858	2.4253	174	1.7980	2.1224	98	1.7218
_RC6	21	1.5487	0.0613	3.9773	176	1.9539	3.6020	98	1.9046
_DA2	62	1.3741	0.0853	2.2743	175	1.0713	2.4490	98	0.9702
_DA3	63	1.5488	0.0613	2.2659	173	1.0853	2.4694	98	1.0122
_NetAb1	24	1.4619	0.0725	4.1364	176	1.5644	4.4184	98	1.5113

Table 3 above gives statistics for survey questions with p-values less than 0.10.

Table 3 provides insight into the statistics for survey questions in the data set. Rows shown above are for survey questions with p-values less than 0.10. The first column provides the question code and the second column provides the corresponding survey question number. The third column presents the calculated t-stat, and the fourth column presents the calculated p-value. Columns five through seven respectively present the average response, sample size, and standard deviation for males answering that particular question. Columns eight through ten respectively present the average response, sample size, and standard deviation for females answering that particular question. For the full statistics table including every survey question, please refer to Appendix 1.

Table 4: Statistics for partial list of constructs

	t-stat	p-value	Male			Female		
			$\overline{x_1}$	n_1	s_1	$\overline{x_2}$	n_2	s_2
Work Exhaustion	1.8877	0.0301	3.4773	175.40	1.9378	3.0490	97.40	1.7114
Role Ambiguity	2.3615	0.0095	4.4921	175.20	1.6855	4.9467	97.20	1.4234
Apparent Sincerity	2.2126	0.0139	5.9645	175.00	1.0604	6.2415	98.00	0.9523
Social Astuteness	2.2305	0.0133	4.3079	175.00	1.4446	4.6980	98.00	1.3524
Interpersonal Influence	1.9229	0.0278	4.9020	174.80	1.3618	5.2162	98.00	1.2558
Forcing	2.5456	0.0057	2.6295	175.60	1.0001	2.3240	97.60	0.9221
Training	1.5660	0.0593	4.0105	175.00	1.8405	3.6347	97.80	1.9334
Perceived Workload	1.4464	0.0746	3.7401	175.40	1.8241	3.4228	97.40	1.6848
Role Conflict	1.4346	0.0763	3.6425	174.80	1.8578	3.3119	97.20	1.8008
Avoiding	1.4569	0.0732	3.1463	175.60	0.9801	3.3304	97.20	1.0103
Deep Acting	1.3298	0.0923	2.3183	174.80	1.1005	2.4917	97.80	0.9923

Table 4 contains statistics for constructs with a p-value less than 0.10

Table 4 provides insight into the statistics for constructs within the data set. Each construct is made up of several survey questions. Rows shown above are for constructs with p-values less than 0.10. The first column provides the construct type/subtype. The second column presents the calculated t-stat for the construct, and the third column presents the calculated p-value for the construct. Columns four through six respectively present the average response, sample size, and standard deviation for males answering in that particular construct. Columns seven through nine respectively present the average response, sample size, and standard deviation for females answering in that particular construct. For the full table including every construct, please refer to Appendix 1.

Discussion

In analyzing the statistics for the survey questions, it can be seen that men and women experience stress in the workplace differently. The following sections will address the hypotheses and how the data indicates gender impacts workplace stressors.

In terms of emotions, it was hypothesized that negative emotional dissonance is experienced in greater levels for women than men. Several construct types and subtypes addressed this topic including social apparent sincerity, social astuteness, interpersonal influence, avoidance, and positive display rules. Two of the three survey questions regarding apparent sincerity (ApSin1 and ApSin3) were identified as potentially significant. Both questions indicated that the females in the study experienced a greater need to be seen as sincere and show genuine interest in people. ApSin1 had a t-stat of 2.13 and a p-value of 0.0172, and ApSin3 had a t-stat of 3.17 and a p-value of 0.0008, indicating that this finding is most likely not due to chance. This supports hypothesis one. In applying this result, women may be more likely to expend extra energy to make sure coworkers and clients like them.

All five of the survey questions regarding social astuteness (SocAst1, SocAst2, SocAst3, SocAst4, and SocAst5) were identified as being potentially significant. Each of the five questions indicated that the females in the survey more so than men felt they had strong social astuteness. They shared that they understood people well, paid close attention to facial expressions, were good at sensing motivations and hidden agendas of others, knew the right thing to say or do to influence others, and had good intuition on how to present themselves to others. Each of the survey questions had high t-stats and low p-values, with SocAst5 having the highest t-stat of 3.0632 and the lowest p-value of 0.0012. This shows that females feeling more socially astute in this study is most likely not due to chance. This finding could support hypothesis one in that understanding and feeling more of a social situation could lead to greater extra energy expended on the

female's behalf throughout her work day due to heightened awareness. In order to determine this, further psychological research will need to be completed.

All four of the survey questions regarding interpersonal influence (IntInf1, IntInf2, IntInf3, and IntInf4) were identified as being potentially significant. Each of the four questions indicated that females in the survey more so than men felt they had strong interpersonal influence. They shared it was easy to develop good rapport with people, they could make people comfortable and at ease, were good at getting people to like them, and could communicate effectively with others. Each of the survey questions had a t-stat greater than 1.7 and a p-value less than 0.05, indicating that these findings are most likely not due to chance. With further psychology research, this finding could support hypothesis one if women expend more energy by being more aware in their heightened interpersonal skills.

Three of the four survey questions regarding avoidance (Avoid1, Avoid2, and Avoid4) were identified as being potentially significant. Each of the three questions indicated that females in the survey more so than men avoided interpersonal conflict. They shared that they often avoid confrontation about differences, avoid differences of opinion as much as possible, and try to avoid confrontation with others. Each question had a t-stat greater than 1.7 and a p-value less than 0.05, indicating that these results are most likely not due to chance. This finding supports hypothesis one. If females are more often avoiding conflict at work, they could be experiencing emotions such as fear that could be taking more energy from day to day functioning.

All four questions regarding positive display rules (EL_PDR1, EL_PDR2, EL_PDR3, and EL_PDR4) have significant numbers with EL_PDR2 having a t-stat of

4.187 and a p-value of 0.00002 and EL_PDR4 having a t-stat of 2.9566 and a p-value of 0.0017. These questions identified that females more so than males felt their workplace put expectations on them to express positive emotions to customers, act excited and enthusiastic around customers, and make the customer feel good. These findings are most likely not due to chance, and tie in well with hypothesis one. Female employees more than males in this study find that they must spend more energy being positive and excited with customers.

Other survey question findings regarding emotion could support hypothesis one. The question Comp4 regarding compromise has a t-stat of 2.3596 and a p-value of 0.0095 and shares that females more so than males in this study strive whenever possible for a 50-50 compromise. The question ROE1 regarding responding to other's emotions has a p-value of 1.7427 and a p-value of 0.0413 and shares that females more so than males in this study felt they had to help customers, clients, or coworkers feel better about themselves. Both of these give strong support for hypothesis one. The questions DA2 and DA3 discuss deep acting with DA2 having a t-stat of 1.3741 and a p-value of 0.0853 and DA3 having a t-stat of 1.5488 and a p-value of 0.0613. They share that females more so than males in this study feel they try to experience the emotions they must show and often really try to feel the emotions they must show as part of their job.

In terms of workplace exhaustion, it was hypothesized that work exhaustion is experienced in greater levels for women than men. Four of the five questions regarding workplace exhaustion (WE1, WE2, WE4, and WE5) were identified as being potentially significant. Each of the four questions indicated that the males in this survey experienced more feelings of workplace exhaustion. They shared that they felt emotionally drained

from their work, felt used up by the end of the work day, felt burned out from work, and that working all day is a strain sometimes. Each question had a t-stat above 1.9 and a p-value less than 0.025, indicating that these findings are most likely not due to chance. Also, one question regarding perceived workload (PW1) had a t-stat of 1.9563 and a p-value of 0.0257, sharing that males in this study felt the number of requests, problems, and complaints they deal with is more than expected. All of these questions do not support hypothesis two. The results of this study indicate that these males experience more workplace exhaustion than the females.

In terms of role ambiguity, it was hypothesized that role ambiguity is experienced in greater levels for women than men. Five of the six survey questions regarding role ambiguity (RA1, RA3, RA4, RA5, and RA6) were identified as being potentially significant. Each of the five questions indicated that the males in this survey experienced more role ambiguity on the job. They shared that they were uncertain about their authority, felt they didn't divide time properly, were unsure of their responsibilities, and did not know exactly what was expected of them. Of these questions, RA3, RA4, and RA5 all had p-values less than 0.01 and t-stats above 2.5. With low p-values and high t-stats this shows that the males feeling role ambiguity more than females in this study is most likely not due to chance. This finding does not support hypothesis three.

In terms of role conflict, it was hypothesized that role conflict appears in greater levels for women than men. Five of the eight survey questions regarding role conflict (RC1, RC3, RC6, RC7, and RC8) were identified as being potentially significant. Each of the five questions indicated that the males in this survey experienced more role conflict on the job. They shared that they believed their current job should be performed

differently, had to work on unnecessary things, had to buck rules or policies to perform jobs, and often received assignments without adequate resources to execute it. Of these questions, RC1, RC3, and RC8 all had p-values less than 0.01 and t-stats above 2.3. With low p-values and high t-stats, this shows that the males feeling role conflict more than females in this study is most likely not due to chance. This finding does not support hypothesis four.

In terms of autonomy, it was hypothesized that autonomy stressors are experienced in levels greater for women than men. While few questions addressed this outright, some could play a role in these feelings. Four of the five questions regarding training (BSA_Tr1, BSA_Tr2, BSA_Tr3, and BSA_Tr4) were identified as being significant. These shared that males felt they had more instances in helping with training, sharing that they often offered technical assistance outside their unit, provided information and advice to others outside the unit, and assisted others with troubleshooting problems. Each had a t-stat greater than 1.65 and a p-value less than 0.05. Feeling the expectation or pressure to often train or help others could prevent these male employees from feeling they have autonomy over their own responsibilities. This could potentially not support hypothesis five.

On another note, all four questions regarding force and assertion (Assert1, Assert2, Assert3, and Assert4) were identified as being significant. These shared that males showcased more assertive or forceful behaviors in the workplace than the women in this study. They felt they searched for their own gains, pushed their own point of view, do everything to win, and fight for a good outcome for themselves. Each had a t-stat greater than 2.1 and a p-value less than 0.018, showing these results are not likely due to

chance. With more psychology research, this might indicate in the work environment that men exhibit behavior that allows them to gain their own autonomy and fight for their working conditions. This neither supports or disproves hypothesis five.

In terms of turnover intention, it was hypothesized that turnover intention levels were experiences in levels greater for women than men. Only one survey question (TO2) showed significance with a t-stat of 1.3704 and a p-value of 0.0858. This question shared that males more so than females in this study felt they would most likely be looking for a job with a different company in the next year. With a p-value not less than 0.05, this finding is more likely due to chance than other findings in this study. Being only one piece of evidence that isn't highly credible, this finding neither supports nor disproves hypothesis six.

A handful of other findings stand out as important in this study. Two questions regarding stress when working with others (Stress_who_1 and Stress_who_2) indicated that females more so than males experienced greater stress when working with other IT personnel, whether they had the same or a different job as they did. One question regarding networking ability (NetAb1) indicated that females more so than males felt they put a lot of effort and time into networking with others at work. One question regarding IT tenure (IT_tenure) was indicated as significant showing that females had less experience than males. Finally, the question regarding salary (Salary) indicated that females were being paid much less than males in this study. This question had a t-stat of 3.3499 and a p-value of 0.0005, showing this most likely was not attributed to chance.

Looking back at the results, females tend to be influenced more by emotions and social interactions. In experiencing greater social astuteness, apparent sincerity,

interpersonal influence, avoidance of conflict, positive display rules, and stress from other IT personnel, females more than males in this study are more stressed from emotions and emotional dissonance. Many of these traits indicated in the study as being emotional stressors for females are not negative traits to have, but positive emotional dissonance can still take a toll on work exhaustion.

The men in this study were found to be more likely to experience role ambiguity, role conflict, work exhaustion, and turnover intention. Many of these traits circle around the idea of work not meeting a worker's expectations, whether the role, the conflicting interests, or workload are not as described.

Table 5: Hypothesis results

Hypothesis	Supported	Evidence
H1: Negative emotional dissonance is experienced in greater levels for women than men.	Yes	ApSin1, ApSin3, SocAst1, SocAst2, SocAst3, SocAst4, SocAst5, IntInf1, IntInf2, IntInf3, IntInf4, Avoid1, Avoid2, Avoid4, Comp4, ROE1, DA2, DA3
H2: Work exhaustion is experienced in greater levels for women than men.	No	WE1, WE2, WE4, WE5, PW1
H3: Role ambiguity is experienced in greater levels for women than men.	No	RA1, RA3, RA4, RA5, RA6
H4: Role conflict is experienced in greater levels for women than men	No	RC1, RC3, RC6, RC7, RC8
H5: Autonomy stressors are experienced in levels greater for women than men.	Unsure	BSA_Tr1, BSA_Tr2, BSA_Tr3, BSA_Tr4, Assert1, Assert2, Assert3, Assert4
H6: Turnover intention appears in levels greater for women than men	Unsure	TO2

Table 5 above summarizes the discussion in terms of the hypothesis support and evidence to support or not support the hypothesis.

Conclusion

This study expands upon the work of Dr. Paige Rutner on workplace exhaustion and emotional dissonance by adding the element of gender. Through statistic and spreadsheet analysis, workplace exhaustion stressors were identified for both female and male workers. Female stressors in the study revolved around emotions and male stressors in the study revolved around work not meeting expectations. Knowing more about workplace exhaustion can aid management and businesses in attaining better turnover retention, preventing employees from becoming overworked, stressed, and ready to leave the company. Further research should seek how to address these stressors in the workplace, leading to improved employee satisfaction and efficiency. As the information technology workplace becomes more diverse and females become less of a minority, it is important that management takes on more diverse perspectives on how to keep employees from getting workplace exhaustion.

Works Cited

Ahuja, M K. “Women in the Information Technology Profession: a Literature Review, Synthesis and Research Agenda.” *European Journal of Information Systems*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2002, pp. 20–34., doi:10.1057/palgrave.ejis.3000417.

Armstrong, Deborah J., et al. “Advancement, Voluntary Turnover and Women in IT: A Cognitive Study of Work–Family Conflict.” *Information & Management*, vol. 44, no. 2, 2007, pp. 142–153., doi:10.1016/j.im.2006.11.005.

Armstrong, Deborah J., et al. “Exhaustion from Information System Career Experience: Implications for Turn-Away Intention.” *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 3, 3 Sept. 2015, pp. 713–727., doi:10.25300/misq/2015/39.3.10.

Baroudi, Jack J., and Magid Igbaria. “An Examination of Gender Effects on Career Success of Information Systems Employees.” *Journal of Management Information Systems*, vol. 11, no. 3, 1994, pp. 181–201., doi:10.1080/07421222.1994.11518055.

Erickson, Rebecca J., and Christian Ritter. “Emotional Labor, Burnout, and Inauthenticity: Does Gender Matter?” *Social Psychology Quarterly*, vol. 64, no. 2, 2001, p. 146., doi:10.2307/3090130.

Ghazzawi, Issam. "Gender Role in Job Satisfaction: The Case of the U.S. Information Technology Professional.” *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2010, pp. 1-26.

Igbaria, Magid, and Jack J. Baroudi. “The Impact of Job Performance Evaluations on Career Advancement Prospects: An Examination of Gender Differences in the IS Workplace.” *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 19, no. 1, Mar. 1995, pp. 107–123., doi:10.2307/249713.

Joseph, Damien, et al. “Turnover of Information Technology Professionals: A Narrative Review, Meta-Analytic Structural Equation Modeling, and Model Development.” *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 31, no. 3, Sept. 2007, pp. 547–577., doi:10.2307/25148807.

Li, Eldon Y., and Abraham B. Shani. “Stress Dynamics of Information Systems Managers: A Contingency Model.” *Journal of Management Information Systems*, vol. 7, no. 4, 1991, pp. 107–130., doi:10.1080/07421222.1991.11517906.

Moore, Jo Ellen. “One Road to Turnover: An Examination of Work Exhaustion in Technology Professionals.” *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 24, no. 1, Mar. 2000, pp. 141–168., doi:10.2307/3250982.

Rutner, Paige S., et al. “Emotional Dissonance and the Information Technology Professional.” *MIS Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 3, Sept. 2008, pp. 635–652., doi:10.2307/25148859.

Rutner, Paige S., et al. “Work Exhaustion in Information Technology Professionals.” *ACM SIGMIS Database*, vol. 42, no. 1, 18 Feb. 2010, pp. 102–120., doi:10.1145/1952712.1952718.

Thatcher, Jason B., et al. “Turnover of Information Technology Workers: Examining Empirically the Influence of Attitudes, Job Characteristics, and External Markets.” *Journal of Management Information Systems*, vol. 19, no. 3, 2002, pp. 231–261., doi:10.1080/07421222.2002.11045736.

Appendix 1 – Complete Statistics

Table A1: Statistics for full list of survey questions

	t-stat	p Value	Male			Female		
			$\overline{x_1}$	n_1	s_1	$\overline{x_2}$	n_2	s_2
BS_who_1	0.4384	0.3307	6.0800	175	1.5717	5.9898	98	1.6629
BS_who_2	0.7096	0.2393	5.5511	176	1.5067	5.6837	98	1.4680
BS_who_3	0.2074	0.4179	4.3793	174	1.8830	4.4286	98	1.8790
BS_who_4	0.5203	0.3016	4.4540	174	1.7700	4.5714	98	1.7957
BS_who_5	0.9866	0.1624	4.1705	176	1.8042	3.9381	97	1.8931
BS_who_6	1.1531	0.1249	3.3125	176	1.8645	3.6122	98	2.1648
BS_who_7	0.5915	0.2774	2.8920	176	1.7467	2.7526	97	1.9266
BS_who_8	0.4322	0.3330	2.3736	174	1.7432	2.4742	97	1.8892
BS_who_9	0.0306	0.4878	1.7586	58	1.6537	1.7692	39	1.6865
Stress_who_1	1.4731	0.0709	2.5805	174	1.4629	2.8776	98	1.6676
Stress_who_2	1.6788	0.0472	3.0857	175	1.5226	3.4184	98	1.5967
Stress_who_3	1.2805	0.1007	3.0057	174	1.4719	3.2551	98	1.5799
Stress_who_4	0.1819	0.4279	3.5852	176	1.7135	3.5464	97	1.6747
Stress_who_5	0.3910	0.3481	3.0057	176	1.6114	2.9271	96	1.5695
Stress_who_6	0.4530	0.3255	2.8750	176	1.6118	2.9691	97	1.6588
Stress_who_7	1.3971	0.0818	2.7600	175	1.6800	2.4688	96	1.6199
Stress_who_8	0.3898	0.3485	2.3829	175	1.4567	2.4632	95	1.6971
Stress_who_9	2.1572	0.0167	1.8730	63	1.5170	1.3659	41	0.8767
BSA_Rep1	0.5277	0.2991	2.8057	175	1.9025	2.6771	96	1.9284
BSA_Rep2	0.9999	0.1591	3.7898	176	1.8818	4.0412	97	2.0455
BSA_Rep3	0.4248	0.3357	3.6343	175	1.8371	3.7423	97	2.0970
BSA_Rep4	0.0048	0.4981	3.9886	175	1.8731	3.9898	98	2.1309
BSA_Rep5	0.8595	0.1954	4.0000	175	2.0142	3.7732	97	2.1226
BSA_Neg1	0.5414	0.2944	3.2686	175	2.0062	3.4082	98	2.0645
BSA_Neg2	0.1710	0.4322	2.9253	174	1.9769	2.9694	98	2.0774
BSA_Neg3	1.1666	0.1222	2.3580	176	1.8223	2.1020	98	1.6933
BSA_Neg4	1.0181	0.1548	3.0571	175	1.8538	2.8163	98	1.8863
BSA_Neg5	0.0862	0.4657	2.8864	176	1.8274	2.9072	97	1.9588
BSA_Neg6	1.8019	0.0363	2.9375	176	1.9948	3.4167	96	2.1490
BSA_InfPro1	0.1273	0.4494	3.2241	174	1.8356	3.2551	98	1.9759
BSA_InfPro2	0.9617	0.1685	3.4886	176	1.8247	3.2680	97	1.8079
BSA_InfPro3	0.4815	0.3153	2.5460	174	1.8054	2.4388	98	1.7383
BSA_InfPro4	0.6130	0.2702	3.6322	174	1.9542	3.4742	97	2.0763
BSA_InfPro5	2.4027	0.0085	4.3029	175	1.9697	3.7245	98	1.8724
BSA_InfPro6	0.6105	0.2710	3.3523	176	1.8062	3.2041	98	1.9896
BSA_Tr1	2.7115	0.0036	4.2343	175	1.8006	3.5714	98	2.0102
BSA_Tr2	2.5685	0.0054	4.3125	176	1.7675	3.7041	98	1.9389
BSA_Tr3	2.2463	0.0127	4.2312	173	1.8666	3.6837	98	1.9619
BSA_Tr4	1.6590	0.0491	4.0457	175	1.9118	3.6327	98	2.0071
BSA_Tr5	1.5648	0.0594	3.2286	175	1.8560	3.5816	98	1.7492
EL_PDR1	1.5679	0.0590	4.7216	176	1.8515	5.0816	98	1.8052
EL_PDR2	4.1870	0.00002	2.8182	176	1.8125	2.0104	96	1.3346

EL_PDR3	1.5849	0.0571	4.9886	176	1.7516	5.3367	98	1.7376
EL_PDR4	2.9566	0.0017	4.3771	175	1.7090	5.0104	96	1.6739
EL_NDR1	1.2205	0.1117	4.4229	175	1.9460	4.7347	98	2.0680
EL_NDR2	1.0092	0.1569	3.8023	172	1.7805	4.0412	97	1.9099
EL_NDR3	0.6014	0.2740	4.0514	175	1.7961	4.1959	97	1.9512
_PW1	1.9563	0.0257	3.5284	176	1.7416	3.1237	97	1.5747
_PW2	1.4867	0.0691	3.5795	176	1.8782	3.2449	98	1.7324
_PW3	1.1414	0.1274	3.9602	176	1.8258	3.7143	98	1.6413
_PW4	1.2382	0.1084	3.8920	176	1.8509	3.6082	97	1.7909
_WE1	2.0583	0.0203	3.7443	176	1.9649	3.2755	98	1.7130
_WE2	2.0366	0.0213	3.8920	176	1.9320	3.4184	98	1.7953
_WE3	0.8506	0.1979	3.5227	176	1.9684	3.3265	98	1.7483
_WE4	1.9841	0.0241	3.3352	176	2.0102	2.8776	98	1.7218
_WE5	2.5952	0.0050	2.8920	176	1.8137	2.3469	98	1.5786
_TO1	1.0108	0.1565	5.1486	175	1.8794	5.3776	98	1.7468
_TO2	1.3704	0.0858	2.4253	174	1.7980	2.1224	98	1.7218
_RA1	1.7626	0.0395	4.4091	176	1.8162	4.7755	98	1.5487
_RA2	1.3157	0.0947	4.1591	176	1.8052	4.4388	98	1.6167
_RA3	2.5551	0.0056	4.3466	176	1.5664	4.8163	98	1.3949
_RA4	3.7781	0.0001	5.0966	176	1.5546	5.7041	98	1.0899
_RA5	3.1651	0.0009	4.6857	175	1.6694	5.2653	98	1.3136
_RA6	2.0707	0.0197	4.2557	176	1.7014	4.6804	97	1.5765
_RC1	2.5807	0.0052	4.3029	175	1.7647	3.7320	97	1.7381
_RC2	0.8937	0.1861	3.3429	175	1.8508	3.1327	98	1.8716
_RC3	2.3641	0.0094	3.0114	176	1.7188	2.5464	97	1.4574
_RC4	0.0508	0.4798	4.2727	176	1.9582	4.2857	98	2.0653
_RC5	0.3162	0.3760	3.3182	176	1.8094	3.2474	97	1.7471
_RC6	1.5487	0.0613	3.9773	176	1.9539	3.6020	98	1.9046
_RC7	1.7557	0.0401	3.4659	176	1.8736	3.0510	98	1.8756
_RC8	2.4076	0.0084	3.4489	176	1.9329	2.8980	98	1.7467
_ROE1	1.7427	0.0413	2.7955	176	1.1043	3.0408	98	1.1241
_ROE2	1.1156	0.1328	2.9148	176	1.1071	3.0714	98	1.1180
_ROE3	0.9914	0.1612	2.5341	176	1.1913	2.6837	98	1.2003
_ROE4	0.0247	0.4901	2.6875	176	1.1526	2.6837	98	1.2665
_ROE5	0.1060	0.4578	3.0857	175	1.2135	3.1020	98	1.2247
_SA1	0.5608	0.2877	2.9886	176	1.2247	2.9072	97	1.1037
_SA2	1.2187	0.1120	2.2557	176	1.1269	2.4184	98	1.0194
_SA3	0.0596	0.4763	2.8182	176	1.2159	2.8265	98	1.0500
_DA1	1.0685	0.1431	2.4148	176	1.1450	2.5567	97	0.9945
_DA2	1.3741	0.0853	2.2743	175	1.0713	2.4490	98	0.9702
_DA3	1.5488	0.0613	2.2659	173	1.0853	2.4694	98	1.0122
_NetAb1	1.4619	0.0725	4.1364	176	1.5644	4.4184	98	1.5113
_NetAb2	0.3575	0.3605	4.0398	176	1.6319	3.9694	98	1.5216
_NetAb3	0.4967	0.3099	3.9543	175	1.6277	3.8571	98	1.5051
_NetAb4	1.1595	0.1236	4.4091	176	1.6524	4.6531	98	1.6788
_NetAb5	0.3200	0.3746	3.5625	176	1.4949	3.6224	98	1.4813
_NetAb6	0.4144	0.3395	3.7670	176	1.6332	3.6837	98	1.5753

_ApSin1	2.1256	0.0172	6.0000	176	1.1629	6.2755	98	0.9452
_ApSin2	1.0378	0.1501	6.2784	176	0.8705	6.3878	98	0.8161
_ApSin3	3.1701	0.0008	5.6149	174	1.1477	6.0612	98	1.0956
_SocAst1	2.0830	0.0191	3.9143	175	1.3474	4.2653	98	1.3290
_SocAst2	1.8970	0.0294	4.3977	176	1.4065	4.7347	98	1.4110
_SocAst3	2.0550	0.0204	4.2045	176	1.5642	4.5816	98	1.3918
_SocAst4	2.1119	0.0178	4.7670	176	1.4837	5.1429	98	1.3702
_SocAst5	3.0632	0.0012	4.2557	176	1.4212	4.7653	98	1.2601
_IntInf1	1.8170	0.0352	5.0170	176	1.3630	5.3163	98	1.2745
_IntInf2	2.2179	0.0137	5.0114	176	1.3055	5.3750	96	1.2849
_IntInf3	1.9210	0.0279	4.9489	176	1.4032	5.2551	98	1.1807
_IntInf4	1.7332	0.0421	4.6307	176	1.3755	4.9184	98	1.2831
_Acc4	0.3386	0.3676	3.0852	176	0.8038	3.0510	98	0.8002
_Acc3	0.7515	0.2265	3.4943	176	0.7687	3.4184	98	0.8197
_Acc2	0.6657	0.2531	2.8902	173	0.7561	2.8265	98	0.7563
_Acc1	0.5324	0.2975	2.7356	174	0.7945	2.6804	97	0.8317
_Comp1	0.6384	0.2619	3.7029	175	0.8091	3.7732	97	0.9025
_Comp2	0.5220	0.3010	3.6875	176	0.8720	3.7449	98	0.8726
_Comp3	1.2201	0.1117	3.1771	175	0.9900	3.3163	98	0.8523
_Comp4	2.3596	0.0095	3.0455	176	0.9221	3.3061	98	0.8501
_Assert2	2.8976	0.0020	2.6534	176	1.0053	2.3061	98	0.9193
_Assert1	2.1909	0.0147	2.9486	175	0.9637	2.6939	98	0.8968
_Assert3	3.0042	0.0015	2.7955	176	1.0242	2.4388	98	0.8929
_Assert4	2.1090	0.0179	2.1207	174	1.0071	1.8571	98	0.9794
_ProbSol1	0.5512	0.2910	3.7841	176	0.8848	3.7245	98	0.8425
_ProbSol2	0.0240	0.4904	3.6914	175	0.8258	3.6939	98	0.8006
_ProbSol3	0.1406	0.4442	3.9318	176	0.7731	3.9184	98	0.7515
_ProbSol4	0.3625	0.3586	3.7886	175	0.8458	3.8265	98	0.8210
_Avoid1	1.7067	0.0445	3.1193	176	1.0127	3.3367	98	1.0096
_Avoid2	2.2455	0.0128	2.7841	176	0.9937	3.0825	97	1.0810
_Avoid3	0.1635	0.4351	3.4773	176	0.8254	3.4592	98	0.9054
_Avoid4	1.7798	0.0381	3.2045	176	1.0888	3.4433	97	1.0451
_TO3	0.1233	0.4510	5.9657	175	1.4497	5.9898	98	1.6004
_TO4	0.0529	0.4789	2.2841	176	1.6407	2.2959	98	1.8417
Age	0.5552	0.2896	37.8786	173	10.1510	37.1563	96	10.2625
School	0.2257	0.4108	2.9886	176	0.7976	3.0102	98	0.7353
Salary	3.3499	0.0005	2.3452	168	1.0059	1.9688	96	0.7965
IT_tenure	2.2564	0.0124	13.4614	175	9.9296	10.9021	97	8.3751
OrgTen	0.2091	0.4173	8.2571	175	7.9522	8.0561	98	7.4282
JobTen	0.0204	0.4919	6.6583	174	6.3447	6.6429	98	5.7866

Table A1 above gives statistics for all survey questions.

Table A2: Statistics for full list of constructs

	t-stat	p Value	Male			Female		
			$\overline{x_1}$	n_1	s_1	$\overline{x_2}$	n_2	s_2
BS_who	0.1179	0.4531	3.8857	162.11	1.7271	3.9133	91.11	1.8184
Stress_who	0.0751	0.4701	2.7949	162.67	1.5609	2.8101	90.67	1.5490
BSA_Rep	0.0041	0.4984	3.6437	175.20	1.9017	3.6447	97.00	2.0649
BSA_Neg	0.1264	0.4498	2.9055	175.20	1.9136	2.9366	97.40	1.9715
BSA_InfPro	0.8225	0.2057	3.4243	174.80	1.8659	3.2275	97.60	1.9101
BSA_Tr	1.5660	0.0593	4.0105	175.00	1.8405	3.6347	97.80	1.9334
EL_PDR	0.6251	0.2662	4.2264	175.00	1.7811	4.3598	97.80	1.6378
EL_NDR	0.9518	0.1710	4.0922	175.20	1.8409	4.3239	97.80	1.9764
PW	1.4464	0.0746	3.7401	175.40	1.8241	3.4228	97.40	1.6848
WE	1.8877	0.0301	3.4773	175.40	1.9378	3.0490	97.40	1.7114
TO	0.1648	0.4346	3.7869	175.40	1.8387	3.7500	97.20	1.7343
RA	2.3615	0.0095	4.4921	175.20	1.6855	4.9467	97.20	1.4234
RC	1.4346	0.0763	3.6425	174.80	1.8578	3.3119	97.20	1.8008
ROE	0.7597	0.2240	2.8035	174.60	1.1538	2.9163	97.60	1.1867
SA	0.2137	0.4155	2.6875	175.00	1.1891	2.7174	97.60	1.0577
DA	1.3298	0.0923	2.3183	174.80	1.1005	2.4917	97.80	0.9923
NetAb	0.2826	0.3889	3.9782	175.20	1.6007	4.0340	97.80	1.5456
ApSin	2.2126	0.0139	5.9645	175.00	1.0604	6.2415	98.00	0.9523
SocAst	2.2305	0.0133	4.3079	175.00	1.4446	4.6980	98.00	1.3524
IntInf	1.9229	0.0278	4.9020	174.80	1.3618	5.2162	98.00	1.2558
Acc	0.5712	0.2842	3.0513	175.00	0.7808	2.9941	98.00	0.8020
Comp	1.1866	0.1182	3.4032	175.00	0.8983	3.5351	97.60	0.8694
Assert	2.5456	0.0057	2.6295	175.60	1.0001	2.3240	97.60	0.9221
ProbSol	0.0793	0.4684	3.7990	175.60	0.8324	3.7908	97.20	0.8039
Avoid	1.4569	0.0732	3.1463	175.60	0.9801	3.3304	97.20	1.0103
TO	0.0854	0.4660	4.1249	174.80	1.5452	4.1429	97.00	1.7210

Table A2 above gives statistics for all constructs.

Appendix 2 – Survey Questions

Regarding how you feel about your job: (scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree)

1. I feel that the number of requests, problems, or complaints I deal with is more than expected.
2. I feel that the amount of work I do interferes with how well it is done.
3. I feel busy or rushed.
4. I feel pressured.
5. I feel emotionally drained from my work.
6. I feel used up at the end of the work day.
7. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.
8. I feel burned out from my work.
9. Working all day is really a strain for me.

These questions ask about your job assignments and responsibilities: (scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree)

10. I feel certain about how much authority I have.
11. Clear, planned goals and objectives exist for my job.
12. I know that I have divided my time properly.
13. I know what my responsibilities are.
14. I know exactly what is expected of me.
15. Explanation is clear of what has to be done.
16. I have to do things that should be done differently.
17. I receive an assignment without the manpower to complete it.
18. I have to "buck" a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment.
19. I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently.
20. I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.
21. I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.
22. I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it.
23. I work on unnecessary things.

These questions ask about how you work with others on the job: (scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree)

24. I spend a lot of time and effort at work networking with others.
25. At work, I know a lot of important people and am well connected.
26. I am good at using my connections and networks to make things happen at work.
27. I have developed a large network of colleagues and associates at work who I can call on for support when I really need to get things done.
28. I spend a lot of time at work developing connections with others.

29. I am good at building relationships with influential people at work.
30. It is important that people believe I am sincere in what I say and do.
31. When communicating with others, I try to be genuine in what I say and do.
32. I try to show a genuine interest in other people.
33. I always seem to instinctively know the right thing to say or do to influence others.
34. I have good intuition or savvy about how to present myself to others.
35. I am particularly good at sensing the motivations and hidden agendas of others.
36. I pay close attention to people's facial expressions.
37. I understand people very well.
38. It is easy for me to develop good rapport with most people.
39. I am able to make most people feel comfortable and at ease around me.
40. I am able to communicate easily and effectively with others.
41. I am good at getting people to like me.

Looking at the future: (scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)

42. I will be with this company five years from now.
43. I will probably look for a job at a different company in the next year.

Looking at the future: (scale: 1 = very unlikely to 7 = very likely)

44. How likely is it that you will be working at the same company this time next year?
45. How likely is it that you will take steps during the next year to secure a job at a different company?

What is expected of you when you work with other people? In these questions, the terms "customer" and "client" refers to anyone inside or outside the organization that you provide service to. (scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)

46. Part of my job is to make the customer feel good.
47. My workplace does not expect me to express positive emotions to customers as part of my job.
48. This organization would say that part of the product to customers is friendly, cheerful service.
49. My organization expects me to try to act excited and enthusiastic in my interactions with customers.
50. I am expected to suppress my bad moods or negative reactions to customers.
51. This organization expects me to try to pretend that I am not upset or distressed.
52. I am expected to try to pretend I am not angry or feeling contempt while on the job.

On an average day at work, how frequently do you: (scale: 1 = never to 5 = always)

53. Help customers, clients, or coworkers feel better about themselves
54. Help customers, clients, or coworkers deal with stresses and difficulties at work

55. Attempt to “keep the peace” by calming clashes between customers, clients, or coworkers.
56. Attempt to calm customers, clients, or coworkers in order to deal with technical problems.
57. Have to be sensitive to other’s emotional states in order to accomplish your work.
58. Resist expressing your true feelings.
59. Pretend to have emotions that you don’t really have.
60. Hide your true feelings about a situation.
61. Make an effort to actually feel the emotions that you need to display to others.
62. Try to actually experience the emotions that you must show.
63. Really try to feel the emotions that you have to show as part of my job.

The following questions are about your typical work situation and responsibilities.

64. Which of the following best describes your normal work unit?
    a. I normally work independently of any groups or departments.
    b. I normally work as a member of a department in my organization.
    c. I normally work as part of a permanent team or group.
    d. I normally work in groups that are formed for a particular project.
    e. Other: Please describe

To what extent do you feel this activity is a part of your work responsibility when dealing with people outside your work unit? (scale: 1 = very little to 5 = very much)

65. “Talk up” the work unit to outsiders.
66. Report the progress of the work unit to a higher organizational level.
67. Keep others in the company informed of your work unit’s activities.
68. Respond to questions about the work unit’s progress, goals, or activities.
69. Take responsibility for the work unit’s performance when dealing with others outside the work unit.
70. Persuade other individuals that the work unit’s activities are important.
71. Prevent outsiders from “overloading” the work unit with too much information or too many requests.
72. Acquire resources (e.g., money, new members, equipment) for the work unit.
73. Persuade others to support the work unit’s decisions.
74. Procure things which the work unit needs from other groups or individuals within the company.
75. Negotiate with others for delivery deadlines.
76. Scan the environment inside or outside the organization for technical ideas/expertise.
77. Collect technical information/ideas from individuals outside the work unit.
78. Find out whether others in the company support or oppose your work unit’s activities.

79. Gather system requirements from technology users.
80. Research possible technical solutions to technology issues.
81. Investigate business processes of others outside your work unit.
82. Offer technical assistance to others outside your work unit.
83. Provide information or advice to individuals outside your work unit.
84. Assist others outside your work unit with troubleshooting technical problems.
85. Respond to requests for technical help to others outside your work unit.
86. Train users of technology in new or existing systems.

IT professionals must often work with other groups of employees. On average, how often do you work with the following groups? (scale: 1 = not at all or infrequently to 7 = very often)

87. Other IT personnel doing the same job that I do.
88. Other IT personnel doing a different job than I do
89. IT Users – staff personnel
90. IT Users – managerial personnel
91. Other IT personnel outside my department
92. Non-IT personnel outside my department
93. Other IT personnel outside my organization
94. Non-IT personnel outside my organization
95. Other – please specify:

What degree of stress do you generally experience when you work with the following groups of employees? (scale: 1 = very low stress to 7 = very high stress)

96. Other IT personnel doing the same job that I do.
97. Other IT personnel doing a different job than I do
98. IT Users – staff personnel
99. IT Users – managerial personnel
100. Other IT personnel outside my department
101. Non-IT personnel outside my department
102. Other IT personnel outside my organization
103. Non-IT personnel outside my organization
104. Other – specified above:

Disagreements sometimes occur in the workplace. Consider a disagreement you may have had with customers or clients when answering the following questions. How often was the conflict resolved in the manner specified? When I have a conflict at work, I do the following: (scale: 1 = not at all to 5 = very much)

105. I give in to the wishes of the other party.
106. I concur with the other party.

107. I try to accommodate the other party.
108. I adapt to the other parties' goals and interests.
109. I try to realize a middle-of-the-road solution.
110. I emphasize that we have to find a compromise solution.
111. I insist we both give in a little.
112. I strive whenever possible towards a fifty-fifty compromise.
113. I push my own point of view.
114. I search for gains.
115. I fight for a good outcome for myself.
116. I do everything to win.
117. I examine issues until I find a solution that really satisfies me and the other party.
118. I stand for my own and other's goals and interests.
119. I examine ideas from both sides to find a mutually optimal solution.
120. I work out a solution that serves my own as well as other's interests as good as possible.
121. I avoid a confrontation about our differences.
122. I avoid differences of opinion as much as possible.
123. I try to make differences loom less severe.
124. I try to avoid a confrontation with the other.

These questions are about you:

125. Which of the following best describes your job title and responsibilities?

a. Computer Programmer – Convert project specifications and statements of problems and procedures to detailed logical flow charts for coding into computer language. Develop and write computer programs to store, locate, and retrieve specific documents, data, and information. May program web sites.

b. Computer Security Specialist - Plan, coordinate, and implement security measures for information systems to regulate access to computer data files and prevent unauthorized modification, destruction, or disclosure of information

c. Computer Software Engineer, Applications - Develop, create, and modify general computer applications software or specialized utility programs. Analyze user needs and develop software solutions. Design software or customize software for client use with the aim of optimizing operational efficiency. May analyze and design databases within an application area, working individually or coordinating database development as part of a team

d. Computer Software Engineer, Systems Software - Research, design, develop, and test operating systems-level software, compilers, and network distribution software for medical, industrial, military, communications, aerospace, business, scientific, and general computing applications. Set operational specifications and formulate and

analyze software requirements. Apply principles and techniques of computer science, engineering, and mathematical analysis

e. Computer Support Specialist - Provide technical assistance to computer system users. Answer questions or resolve computer problems for clients in person, via telephone or from remote location. May provide assistance concerning the use of computer hardware and software, including printing, installation, word processing, electronic mail, and operating systems

f. Computer Systems Analyst - Analyze science, engineering, business, and all other data processing problems for application to electronic data processing systems. Analyze user requirements, procedures, and problems to automate or improve existing systems and review computer system capabilities, workflow, and scheduling limitations. May analyze or recommend commercially available software. May supervise computer programmers

g. Database Administrator - Coordinate changes to computer databases, test and implement the database applying knowledge of database management systems. May plan, coordinate, and implement security measures to safeguard computer databases

h. Network and Computer Systems Administrators - Install, configure, and support an organization's local area network (LAN), wide area network (WAN), and Internet system or a segment of a network system. Maintain network hardware and software. Monitor network to ensure network availability to all system users and perform necessary maintenance to support network availability. May supervise other network support and client server specialists and plan, coordinate, and implement network security measures

i. Network Systems and Data Communications Analysts - Analyze, design, test, and evaluate network systems, such as local area networks (LAN), wide area networks (WAN), Internet, intranet, and other data communications systems. Perform network modeling, analysis, and planning. Research and recommend network and data communications hardware and software. Includes telecommunications specialists who deal with the interfacing of computer and communications equipment

j. Computer and Information Systems Managers - Plan, direct, or coordinate activities in such fields as electronic data processing, information systems, systems analysis, and computer programming

k. Other – please specify

126. How old are you? _____

127. Are you:

a. Male

b. Female

128. What is the highest level of education you have attained?

a. high school diploma

b. associate degree

c. bachelor degree
d. graduate degree

129. What is your annual salary?
a. under $50,000
b. $50,000-$74,999
c. $75,000-$99,999
d. $100,000-$149,999
e. $150,000-$199,999
f. over $200,000

130. How many years of IT experience do you have? _____

131. How many years have you been at your current organization? _____

132. How many years of experience do you have in your current job? _____

133. What is the name of your organization? _____