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ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 pandemic has had an evident impact on the workforce. Pandemic-related job demands have been linked with an increase of emotional exhaustion (Barello et al., 2020) and burnout in healthcare workers (Cotel et al., 2021). Research suggests emotional demands and social comparison are associated with emotional exhaustion (Geisler et al., 2019; Tuxford & Bradley, 2015; Fischer, 2009; Buunk, et al., 2001). Furthermore, emotional exhaustion may be facilitated by not saying no to extra work demands. The relationship between social comparison behaviors, emotional demands, and not saying no may be different for male and female employees. Integrating the job demands-resources model with role theory, I examined gender differences in the relationship between social comparison behaviors, emotional demands, and not saying no in tenure-track and tenured faculty. A sample of 460 participants recruited via snowball sampling between April and June 2020 was used for analyses. Using a moderated mediation model and ordinary least squares regression analyses, results suggest that the relationship between social comparison behaviors and not saying “no” is fully mediated by emotional demands, and that gender moderates this relationship such that women who engage in more social comparison behaviors experience a greater degree of perceived emotional demands compared with their male counterparts. Implications for research and practice are discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

Workers are expected to handle a variety of responsibilities without growing tired or becoming burnt out. The Job Demand-Resource (JD-R) theory suggests that workers can only meet this expectation if they have ample resources to mitigate the demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). However, as both demands and resources can wax and wane, further investigations are crucial for workers’ health. Perhaps now more than ever, considering the COVID-19 global pandemic has simultaneously raised job demands and lowered employee resources.

Since 2020, employees worldwide are experiencing new job demands such as adjusting to an influx of online responsibilities and implementing and adhering to COVID-19 safety protocols. Additionally, increased telecommuting during the pandemic is associated with an increase of social isolation and family-work conflicts (Galanti et al., 2021), effectively decreasing resources that could otherwise help employees maintain a healthy relationship with work. Unsurprisingly, these perceived job demands during the COVID-19 pandemic have been linked with an increase of emotional exhaustion (Barello et al., 2020) as well as burnout in healthcare workers (Cotel et al., 2021).

Furthermore, research suggests that these changes to the workplace have intensified gender discrepancies in demands and associated outcomes. Recent research suggests that 44% of women report being the only guardian at home to care for a school-aged child/child compared to 14% of men, with both genders being married or living with a partner (Zamarro, 2020). Additionally, in March of 2020, college-educated women
reduced their working hours at significantly higher rates than their male counterparts: 64% of college-educated mothers, 52% of college-educated women without young children, and 36% of college-educated fathers reported working less in March (Zamarro, 2020). Role theory would suggest that due to traditional roles held by men and women, women’s work would be disproportionately impacted due to care responsibilities during the pandemic (Aziz et al., 2020).

Integrating JD-R with role theory, I will examine gender discrepancies in workload for academics during the pandemic. Specifically, I will examine the indirect effect of social comparison behaviors on not saying no via emotional demands as a mediating mechanism. In addition, I will examine gender as a moderator, or boundary condition, on the association between social comparison behaviors and emotional demands. It is expected that social comparison behaviors will positively predict not saying “no”. Additionally, I anticipate that emotional demands will be positively associated with both social comparison behaviors and not saying “no”, and that these relationships will be stronger for women than for men. The conceptual model guiding this research is presented as Figure 1 (see p. 25).

Not Saying “No”

Not saying “no” to extra work, roles, and projects, for example, is an understudied phenomenon in the industrial/organizational psychology literature and is mostly observed through anecdotal evidence, blogs, and self-help books (O’Brien, 2014). Although there is little to no published academic work on this topic, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), a well-studied phenomenon, may bring theoretical background to the concept of not saying no.
Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) are behaviors employees engage in which are extra, non-mandatory work that benefits the organization and its members (Podsakoff, 2009). OCB contains two dimensions which distinguish between the motivations of engaging in the behavior. Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Individual indicates an altruistic desire to help others in a way that benefits an individual and Organizational Citizenship Behavior-Organizational indicates behaviors that would benefit the organization (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Not saying “no” to extra work may be a specific observable behavior of OCB, which may be a gendered phenomenon. I suggest the behavior of chronically not saying “no” to additional work is not motivated by positive intentions but by socially related phenomena that pressure female employees to accept additional responsibilities regardless of potential negative outcomes.

**Gender Discrepancies in Not Saying “No”**

Not saying “no” is a phenomenon anecdotally targeted as an issue for professional women. Research suggests that gender moderates the relationship between perceived organizational support and OCB; men, more so than women, need to feel organizational support to reciprocate with OCB (Thompson et al., 2020). This would indicate that men are less likely to engage in OCBs when their efforts would be assumed to go unrecognized. In contrast, women were found to need less perceived organizational support to feel obligated to perform non-mandatory tasks. Thompson et al. (2020) also found that gender was the most relevant factor when assessing work behaviors that are not required. Gender roles may have played a part in this phenomenon, since it is expected that men are more agentic, and women are more nurturing (Beauregard, 2012). Therefore, women may be expected to perform OCBs more so than men, as OCBs may
be seen as a way to nurture others and/or the organization. Additionally, it would also be logical to presume that women may perform OCBs out of habit, if OCBs are in line with their gender role.

Furthermore, there is evidence that these gender roles spill-over into the workplace in regard to OCB. Research supports the proposition that those who adhere to masculine gender beliefs do not relate to OCB-courtesy (engaging in OCBs to reduce possible issues with others) (Aziz et al., 2020). Aziz et al (2020) suggests this is because masculine role beliefs align with agentic tendencies instead of communal ones. It is also suggested by Allen (2006) that “feminine OCBs” (engaging in OCBs out of altruism and/or courtesy) are more likely to be seen as in-role for women and therefore would not be credited to women in the same way as to men. This is exemplified by Allen (2006) finding that women who engage in OCBs are less likely than men to receive promotional rewards.

Taken together, the aforementioned research suggests that women will engage in OCBs because it is expected of them due to their role in society, and not because it would benefit them through personal or monetary recognition.

Social Comparison Behaviors

Social comparison refers to the "process of thinking about information about one or more other people in relation to the self" (Wood, 1996). Pioneered by Leon Festinger in 1954, social comparison theory started as a base idea that humans have a drive for self-evaluation. Today, this phenomenon has been contextualized within the workplace and is often studied through the orientation of the comparison. In other words, if the individual engaging in comparison is doing so in a downward direction (viewing themselves as
superior in some way) or in an upward direction (viewing themselves as inferior in some way; Buunk et al., 2001).

Regardless of the orientation, individuals may engage in social comparison behaviors to fulfill competitive desires. Garcia et al. (2013) defines this as “comparison concerns”, or the desire to have or earn a superior position to that of others. When a competitive mindset is involved, engaging in social comparison behaviors can cause more harm than good. Colpaert et al. (2015) found that, when engaging in upward comparisons with a competitive mindset, individuals evaluated themselves less positively at significantly higher rates. Additionally, research suggests when individuals engage in social comparisons with others who have already attained goals, motivation will decrease (Chan & Briers, 2019). Furthermore, social comparison behaviors are shown to have negative influences on worker affect even without the context of competition. Engaging in upward social comparisons is associated with being envious of coworkers, negative emotional affect, and increased levels of burnout (Fischer, 2009; Buunk et al., 2001; Halbesleben & Buckley, 2006).

Social comparison also influences employee’s engagements in OCBs. Specifically, those who engaged in upward social comparisons perform OCBs at significantly lower rates, with the reverse also being supported (Spence et al., 2011), suggesting that engaging in specific orientations influences individuals to view themselves either more positively or negatively depending on the direction of the comparison. Additional results suggest that engaging in an upwards comparison is likely to invoke more negative self-reflections, and a reduction in OCBs (Spence et al., 2011).
While OCBs are defined and measured by the employee’s positive motivations to engage in such behaviors, I argue that not saying no is influenced by the negative pressure to engage in similar behaviors. In other words, I posit that engaging in social comparison behaviors places significant pressure on the individual to perform extraneous duties at work. As such, I hypothesize the following:

**Hypothesis 1:** Social comparison behaviors will be positively associated with not saying “no.”

**Emotional Demands**

Emotional demands in the workplace can be defined as the event of having to regulate emotions when interacting with individuals and when in certain circumstances while in a place at work (Heuven et al., 2006; Taris & Schreurs, 2009). Additionally, emotional demands are non-exclusive to employee interactions (Duarte et al., 2020); emotionally taxing interactions can come from individuals who are not fellow employees of the individual’s workplace.

In the context of work, emotional demands can be conceptualized as a job demand. JD-R posits that job demands (e.g., work intensity, emotional labor) and job resources (e.g., social support, job control) influence employee outcomes. Bakker & Demerouti (2007) elaborate that job demands will become job stressors when employees exert high levels of effort to meet demands, and when there are not enough job resources available to mitigate the negative impact of the stressors. When job demands become job stressors, Bakker and Demerouti (2007) explain that employee well-being is impacted because employees will overextend their resources in attempting to address the stressors. Specifically, emotional demands as a job demand are associated with emotional
exhaustion (Geisler et al., 2019; Duarte et al. 2020; Tuxford & Bradley, 2015) and negative employee well-being (Taris & Schreurs, 2009; Duarte, et al. 2020).

It is the case that engaging in comparison behaviors may be associated with more emotional investment in employees’ work, which can increase the perception of emotional demands. Social comparison behaviors are associated with self-reflections, which influence employees’ workplace behaviors (Spence et al., 2011). Furthermore, social comparisons influence employees’ perceived status amongst their peers, and the perceived need to “prove themselves” (Brockman, 2021). Given that engaging in social comparison behaviors is associated with negative affect for employees (Buunk, 2001) among other negative outcomes, it is logical to suggest, then, that engaging in social comparison behaviors would be associated with more emotional demands. Therefore, I hypothesize that:

**Hypothesis 2:** Social comparison behaviors will be positively associated with employees’ emotional demands.

Furthermore, JD-R would suggest that increased demands at work are associated with more negative outcomes (Demerouti et al., 2001). It could be that those who engage in more social comparison behaviors and subsequently have more emotional demands associated with engaging in such behaviors, may feel additional pressure to not say no when asked to take on additional work. Therefore, I hypothesis that:

**Hypothesis 3:** Emotional demands will be significantly associated with not saying “no.”

**Hypothesis 4:** Emotional demands will partially mediate the relationship between social comparison behaviors and not saying “no.”
The Moderating Role of Gender

Importantly, the relationship between social comparison behaviors, emotional demands, and not saying no may be more significant for women as compared to men. Research supports that when students engage in upward social comparisons, they are less confident in their academic abilities, with women reporting more frequently engaging in upward social comparison (Pulford et al., 2018). Research further suggests that women and Black students report feeling like they have to prove themselves to a higher degree than non-marginalized groups (Brockman, 2021).

What’s more, research suggests that there are gender differences in emotional demands (Wieclaw et al., 2008; Younès et al., 2018). Emotional demands associated with work are associated with women’s rates of clinically diagnosed depression (Wieclaw et al., 2008) and suicidality in primary care workers (Younès et al., 2018). Role Theory would suggest that women are expected to be more nurturing in society (Beauregard, 2012), which influences their performance and roles in the workplace (Allen, 2006). Role expectations may influence instances of taking on additional work for women. When individuals are expected to hold a more nurturing demeanor and overall position in working environments, the demands for the individual to get emotionally involved may be more prevalent. Therefore, I hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 5: Gender will moderate the relationship between social comparison behaviors and emotional demands such that the relationship between social comparison behaviors and emotional demands will be stronger for women than for men.
Present Study

Integrating JD-R theory, role theory, and extrapolating from prior research, I will examine the relationships between social comparison behaviors, emotional demands, and not saying “no” to extra work responsibilities. Furthermore, I will examine gender as a moderator on the relationship between social comparison behaviors and emotional demands. Specifically, using a moderated mediation model and a sample of tenure-track and tenured academics from institutions in the U.S., I will examine these relationships in the context of the early COVID-19 pandemic.

METHODS

Participants

Participants included tenure-track and tenured academics working at U.S. institutions of higher learning recruited via snowball sampling. A Qualtrics link was sent to the social networks of Dr. Ho Kwan Cheung and Dr. Katrina Burch, who conceptualized and collaborated on this research project and data collection examining workload differences in academics during the pandemic. In addition, a Qualtrics link was sent to heads of multiple departments across multiple universities within the United States. Participants were required to be either tenure-track or tenured faculty, instructors and contingent faculty were ineligible to participate given the differences in performance appraisal and promotion for rank. The research project consisted of three time waves, but data for my thesis consists of wave 1 data collection only, with data collected between April and June 2020.
The average age of participants was 43.91 years \((SD = 10.45)\). Additionally, participants reported an average working tenure of 9.68 years \((SD = 8.65)\) and mentoring an average of 3.6 students. Participants also served on an average of 3.14 committee memberships \((SD = 1.81)\). In addition, participants reported having an average of 1.3 children, with children’s’ average age being 17.5 \((SD = 11.57)\). Most participants were married (75%), white (83%), and tenure track assistant professors (40%). Additionally, the disciplines of the participants included: social sciences (44.3%), business (22.6%), natural sciences (11.3%), physical sciences (7.1%), humanities (6%), engineering (1.2%), information technology (0.9%) and others (6.5%). A little over half of the participants reported their gender as “female” (54.1%), with 45.3% reporting their gender as “male.” Two participants reported their gender as “non-binary” or “other;” these two participants were not included in analyses. Finally, participants served in higher education institutions in 40 different states, with 22% of participants working in institutions in New York.

**Measures**

**Social Comparison Behaviors.** Social comparison behaviors were assessed with 10-items specifically formulated for this study by H. K. Cheung. Questions included the stems, “How often have you compared yourself with your academic peers on...”. An example items is “teaching quality.” Responses were assessed using a 5-point frequency scale, with 1 being *not at all* and 5 being *all the time*. Responses were coded so that higher values indicated more frequently engaging in social comparison behaviors (Cronbach’s \( \alpha = .88 \)).
**Emotional Demands.** Emotional demands were assessed with the 4-item scale adapted from Pejtersen et al. (2010). An example item is, “Is your work emotionally demanding?” Responses were assessed using a 5-point frequency scale ranging from 0 to 4, with 0 being 0% of the time and 4 being 100% of the time. Responses were coded such that higher values indicated more perceived emotional demands (Cronbach’s α = .80).

**Chronically Not Saying “No”**. Chronically not saying “no” was assessed using 13-items developed by O’Brien (2014). An example item is, “It is very difficult for me to say no to others,” and “When I am behind on my own projects, I still have problems saying “no” to others’ requests.” Responses were rated on a 5-point frequency scale, ranging from never to usually, and were coded such that higher scores indicated more instances of not saying “no” (Cronbach’s α = .93).

**Demographics.** Participants work and personal demographics were assessed including age, gender, type of institution (e.g., research-focused), number of children, and number of committees, to name a few.

**Procedure**

After clicking on the Qualtrics survey link, participants were provided with an informed consent document to ensure their willing participation. The Qualtrics link they used consisted of a survey of 18 total constructs in addition to personal and work demographic information. For the sake of my research, I only included social comparison behaviors, emotional demands, and saying “no” in my statistical analyses, along with work and personal demographic information which was controlled for (see below).

Data were collected at three different time points between April and December 2020. For my research, I am using the first data point which was collected between April
2020 to June 2020. For this time period, there were 167 total participants. Participants were not compensated. Instead, they were informed that for every participant recorded, a one-dollar donation to Feed America would be made.

RESULTS

Statistical analyses were performed in SPSS using macro model 7 from Preacher et al. (2007). Using the macro model from Preacher et al. (2007), I was able to conduct ordinary least squares regressions (OLS) in SPSS to examine the conditional indirect effect of social comparison behaviors, the predictor variable, on saying “no”, the outcome variable through emotional demands as the mediator, where gender served as a moderating variable for the predictor and the mediator. Zero-order bivariate correlations were conducted in order to determine variables that should be controlled. Participant’s type of institution (research-focused, balanced, or teaching-focused), age of children, and number of committees they are involved in were found to influence the relationships of interest and were hence controlled. Additionally, variables were centered to reduce non-essential multicollinearity, and bootstrapped estimates were used to resample for the conditional indirect effects based on 5,000 samples. Please see Table 1 (p. 28) for means, standard deviations, and correlations among study variables of interest.

Please see Table 2 (p. 29) and Figure 2 (p. 26) for results of study hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 stated that social comparison behaviors would be significantly associated with not saying no. Hypothesis 1 was partially supported ($r = .31, p < .001$); when participants engaged in more social comparison behaviors, this was associated with a
greater degree of not saying “no.” However, regression analyses indicated that the
association between social comparison behaviors and not saying “no” was no longer
significant with emotional demands included in the model ($\beta = .08, p = .36$).

Hypothesis 2 stated that social comparison behaviors would be significantly
associated with emotional demands. Hypothesis 2 was supported ($\beta = .40, p < .001$), as
engaging in social comparison behaviors significantly predicted more emotional
demands. Hypothesis 3 stated that emotional demands would be positively associated
with not saying “no.” Hypothesis 3 was also supported ($\beta = .28, p < .001$), as greater
emotional demands significantly predicted the tendency to not say “no.”

Hypothesis 4 stated that emotional demands would partially mediate the
relationship between social comparison behaviors and not saying “no.” Hypothesis 4 was
partially supported, with results indicating that emotional demands fully mediated the
relationship between social comparison behaviors and not saying “no,” (indirect effect =
$.15, CI (90) = .06, .29$).

Finally, hypothesis 5 stated that gender would moderate the relationship between
social comparison behaviors and emotional demands. Hypothesis 5 was supported, as
gender significantly moderated the relationship between social comparison behaviors and
emotional demands, such that this relationship was stronger for women than men ($\beta =
.30, p = .06$), as indicated by the simple slope test for women ($t = 4.6; p < .001; CI
(.31,.77$). Overall, the interaction is marginally significant, and the effects for women are
more significant than the effects for men. Please see Figure 3 (p. 27) for the graphed
moderation results.
DISCUSSION

I sought to examine the factors that influence employees’ inability to refuse additional work. In academia, the pressure to take on additional, unpaid work through service such as reviewing manuscripts and serving on thesis committees can be extreme. I posited that social comparison behaviors would disproportionately influence perceived emotional demands, and that higher rates of emotional demands will lessen employee capacity to say “no” when requests are made. Additionally, I posited that gender discrepancies exist in the aforementioned relationships such that the association between social comparison behaviors and emotional demands is greater for women compared to their male counterparts. Results of hypotheses were largely supported. Specifically, academics who engaged in more social comparison behaviors were more likely to not say no to additional work requests, and this relationship was fully mediated by emotional demands. Furthermore, women were more likely to experience greater emotional demands when they engaged in more social comparison behaviors compared to men.

Theoretical Implications

Integrating JD-R with role theory, my results support the literature suggesting that engaging in social comparison is associated with detrimental workplace outcomes (Pulford et al., 2018), and that gender discrepancies exist in the aforementioned relationships. Furthermore, my results add to the minimal literature on the construct of chronically not saying “no” by suggesting women have more difficulty with denying professional requests more-so than men (O’Brien, 2014).
Strengths and Limitations

The early pandemic was difficult on many people, struggling to adjust to a new way of working while simultaneously having full-time care responsibilities. For academics, this adjustment included a large-scale shift to remote teaching and learning. Dr. Cheung and Dr. Burch sought to give voice to academics struggling to meet the rapid shift and increase in demands and did so through the collection of this data.

However, like all research, my study is not without its limitations. First, the data associated with my research is self-report and cross-sectional in nature (only wave 1 was analyzed). Therefore, results must be interpreted with caution and causal inferences cannot be made. Data were collected at the highest impact of COVID-19, April 2020-June 2020. The conditions within the pandemic have gone through multiple changes throughout the past two years. For instance, virtually all non-essential businesses were closed during 2020, then were re-opened in 2021 with a mask mandate in place, then finally lifting the mask mandate in 2022. However, this data is taken from a highly influential event, an event that is likely to have long-standing impacts on the working population for the foreseeable future. Lastly, this data only consisted of professors at universities across the United States and therefore cannot speak to those in other professions.

Practical Implications and Future Research

COVID-19 has shifted the workplace to longstanding degrees, such that employees may be negatively impacted for years to come. Female employees have been negatively affected by the pandemic to higher degrees than their male counterparts. However, it should be the organization’s responsibility to provide resources to help
employees manage their workloads and home responsibilities. One way to mitigate negative organizational outcomes is by providing women resources informing about mindful work and project engagement. Mindfulness can give employees the tools necessary to assess their current mental and physical strains and resources, which could result in lightened mental loads and stress. Additionally, training employees how to recognize biased gendered roles and the influence workplace roles and behavior may relieve some of the gender discrepancies found in this study. Anecdotal evidence suggests that women are often asked to perform additional duties due to the expectation that they will say yes. Gender bias training may bring to light for some individuals their implicit biases for making women their main source for help. During the pandemic, women have reported being the main contributors to household and childcare duties, and for many, meant they reduced their working hours to fulfill these duties (Zamarro 2020). This is likely to influence the perceived emotional demands of their work as well as their abilities to say “no” to requests. Further research would be needed to identify the relationships between familial and household duties, perceived job demands/resources, and gender.

Telecommuting may also show a high association with not saying “no” with further research. As workers perform their duties at home, the demand to take on additional responsibilities may rise due to the misinformed notion that telecommuters have more time and/or resources that would allow them to perform these tasks. For academics specifically, many, if not all, of their responsibilities were required to be fulfilled online via Zoom and other team-communication platforms. Due to this, many of their job demands increased significantly. Academics learned how to navigate new online
spaces, restructured their courses, and many experienced pay-cuts along with much more in only a short notice. This study adds to the literature of not saying “no” as a construct, but future research should consider studying it further under the contexts of telecommuting specifically.

It would also be in the interest of organizations to try and control social comparison behaviors such that workers do not lose motivation. Chan and Briers (2019) found that priming participants with a cooperative goal alleviated the negative effect of losing motivation when comparing oneself with an accomplished peer. Therefore, organizations should incorporate a cooperative framework to their workplace environment in order to influence social comparisons in a more positive way.

CONCLUSION

Understanding the influential factors in chronically not saying “no” to requests and extraneous responsibilities is an important course of action to improve female employees’ work and personal outcomes. This study shows the disproportionate effects of social comparison on women, as they were found to engage more in this behavior. It was also found that engaging in social comparison behaviors influenced both perceived emotional demands and chronically not saying “no.” Furthermore, women have reported much higher rates of home and childcare than men (Zamarro, 2020) and the pandemic added to job demands, which has negatively impacted levels of exhaustion, burnout, and their overall wellbeing (Barello et al., 2020; Cotel et al., 2021). These results are a warning sign to organizations, depicting a story of working women who face increasing
societal, job, and emotional demands becoming more exhausted and burned out the
ger longer these conditions go unchecked.
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Figure 1. Conceptual Model
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Figure 2. Model Depicting Results of Hypothesis Testing

Note. $p < .10^*$, $p < .001^{***}$
Figure 3. Moderating Effect of Gender
Table 1. Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>43.91</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Type of Institution</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Committees</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Age of Children</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>11.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SCB</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Emotional Demands</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Saying No</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( p < .05 \); reliabilities of study measures are displayed along the diagonal.
**Table 2. Results of Hypothesis Testing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emotional Demands</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Not Saying “No”</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>Est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Children</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors Indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCB – ED – Not Saying “No”</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ED = emotional demands; SCB = social comparison behaviors
## Social Comparison Behaviors

**REFERENCE:** Written specifically for this study by H.K. Cheung

**STEM:** In the last month of the spring, how often have you compared yourself with your peers on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#</th>
<th>Var. Name</th>
<th>Response Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCB1.1 Research productivity</td>
<td>1 = Not at All&lt;br&gt;2 = Rarely&lt;br&gt;3 = Some of the Time&lt;br&gt;4 = Most of the Time&lt;br&gt;5 = All the Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SCB1.2 Teaching quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SCB1.3 Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SCB1.4 Fulfilling family responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SCB1.5 Completing household responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SCB1.6 Maintaining romantic relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SCB1.7 Maintaining friendships and other social relationships outside of family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SCB1.8 Having hobbies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SCB1.9 Self-Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SCB1.10 Achieving work-life balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Emotional Demands**


**STEM:** Please indicate the frequency of each of the following statements as they related to you and your work. In the last month of the spring semester…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#</th>
<th>Var. Name</th>
<th>Response Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ED1</td>
<td>Does your work put you in emotionally disturbing situations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ED2</td>
<td>Do you have to relate to other people’s personal problems as part of your work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ED3</td>
<td>Is your work emotionally demanding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ED4</td>
<td>Do you get emotionally involved in your work?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not Saying “No”**


**STEM:** Please consider the extent to which you engaged in the following behaviors while at work in the last month of the spring semester…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q#</th>
<th>Var. Name</th>
<th>Response Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No 1.1</td>
<td>I have trouble saying “no” when people ask me to engage in extra work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No 1.2</td>
<td>I have a hard time saying “no” when my male co/workers/colleagues ask for my help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No 1.3</td>
<td>I often agree to serve on committees and help with things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I have a hard time saying “no” when my subordinates/junior colleagues ask for my help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I usually agree readily to help my coworkers when they ask me, despite how much work it is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>After I say “no” to a few requests for help, I start to feel guilty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Even though I know I don’t have time, I often agree to do things that are time-consuming.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It is very difficult for me to say no to others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I have a hard time saying “no” when my supervisors/senior colleagues ask for my help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I often agree to do things immediately and then regret not having said “no” later.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>When I am behind on my own projects, I still have problems saying “no” to others’ requests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I agree to help people I work with at the detriment of achieving my own goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I have a hard time saying “no” when my female coworkers/colleagues ask for my help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>