<u>Stressor scales Translation to Hebrew Reliability/Validity</u>
Shani Pindek, University of Haifa

Conducted on January 7th, 2018. Participants were recruited from university classes, mostly from programs that are designed for working adults.

N= 110 employees, 21 males and 80 females (the rest declined to answer), Mean age of 33 (SD = 9.8). Of the 110 participants, 55 are employed full time, 44 are employed part time, and the rest declined to answer.

Reliabilities for the factors were .68, .85, and .90 for interpersonal conflict, workload and organizational constraints respectively.
Removing item number 1 in the interpersonal conflict scale (IC1) increased the alpha from .68 to .77

Here are the results of a CFA (run with Mplus, allowing the factors to covary)

Item	Mean	SD	Model 1: All items				Model 2: Excluding IC1		
			Factor1	Factor2	Factor3		Factor1	Factor2	Factor3
IC1	2.55	0.82	.21				----		
IC2	1.61	0.71	.55				.54		
IC3	1.79	0.85	.94				.96		
IC4	1.62	0.81	.73				.72		
Wrkld1	3.65	1.39		.75				.75	
Wrkld2	3.59	1.21		.89				.89	
Wrkld3	3.18	1.31		.67				.67	
Wrkld4	4.21	0.95		.59				.59	
Wrkld5	3.18	1.40		.82				.82	
OCS1	2.00	1.12			.67				.67
OCS2	2.59	1.11			.56				.56
OCS3	2.36	1.19			.65				.65
OCS4	2.06	1.17			.64				.64
OCS5	1.86	1.05			.56				.56
OCS6	1.93	1.03			.51				.51
OCS7	2.46	1.16			.74				.74
OCS8	2.22	1.08			.65				.65
OCS9	2.28	1.08			.72				.73
OCS10	2.20	1.14			.77				.77
OCS11	2.02	1.06			.74				.74

All items loaded significantly at $p < .001$ on their factors with the exception of IC1, which loaded significantly at $p < .05$.

Fit statistics for Model 1 (including all items) were: $\chi^2_{(167)} = 333.45$, $p < .001$, RMSEA = .095, CFI = .835, TLI = .813, SRMR = .094

Fit statistics for Model 2 (excluding IC1) were: $\chi^2_{(149)} = 297.39$, $p < .001$, RMSEA = .095, CFI = .85, TLI = .828, SRMR = .083

Factor correlations (latent):

	Model 1: All items				Model 2: Excluding IC1		
	conflict	workload	constraints		conflict	workload	constraints
Conflict							
Workload	.39				.37		

Constraints	.58	.47			.56	.47	

The results of an EFA (Maximum likelihood extraction, extracting 3 factors, and Promax rotation) after removing the first conflict item are good:

Pattern Matrix[a]

	Factor		
	1	2	3
IC2	.156	.167	.401
IC3	-.036	.024	1.011
IC4	.040	-.120	.719
Wrkld1	-.042	.706	.104
Wrkld2	-.038	.890	.060
Wrkld3	.029	.549	.190
Wrkld4	-.146	.793	-.249
Wrkld5	.189	.747	-.078
OCS1	.624	.029	.058
OCS2	.521	.037	.094
OCS3	.597	-.042	.097
OCS4	.666	-.052	-.021
OCS5	.521	-.005	.045
OCS6	.547	-.118	.021
OCS7	.732	.038	.026
OCS8	.673	.030	-.010
OCS9	.685	-.001	.031
OCS10	.796	.065	-.076
OCS11	.869	-.035	-.122

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.

Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.