

International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health

Re: Siegrist J, Dragano N, Nyberg ST et al. Validation abbreviated measures of effort-reward imbalance at work in European cohort studies: the IPD-Work consortium
--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	IAOEH1334
Full Title:	Re: Siegrist J, Dragano N, Nyberg ST et al. Validation abbreviated measures of effort-reward imbalance at work in European cohort studies: the IPD-Work consortium
Article Type:	Letter to the Editor
Corresponding Author:	BongKyoo Choi, ScD, MPH Center for Occupational and Environmental Health, University of California Irvine Irvine, CA UNITED STATES
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Center for Occupational and Environmental Health, University of California Irvine
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	BongKyoo Choi, ScD, MPH
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	BongKyoo Choi, ScD, MPH SangBaek Ko, MD PhD Paul Landsbergis, PhD MPH Marnie Dobson, PhD Arturo Juárez Garcia, PhD Peter Schnall, MD MPH Dean Baker, MD MPH
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	

Re: Siegrist J, Dragano N, Nyberg ST et al. Validation abbreviated measures of effort-reward imbalance at work in European cohort studies: the IPD-Work consortium

BongKyoo Choi^{1*}, ScD MPH; Sangbaek Ko^{1,2}, MD PhD; Paul Landsbergis³, PhD MPH; Marnie Dobson¹, PhD; Arturo Juárez Garcia, PhD^{1,4}; Peter Schnall¹, MD MPH; Dean Baker¹, MD MPH.

¹ Center for Occupational and Environmental Health, University of California, Irvine, USA.

² Yonsei University, Wonju College of Medicine, Wonju, South Korea.

³ State University of New York Downstate School of Public Health, New York, USA.

⁴ School of Psychology, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, Mexico.

*Corresponding author: BongKyoo Choi, ScD MPH.

Center for Occupational and Environmental Health,

University of California, Irvine

100 Theory, Irvine, CA, 92617

E-mail: b.choi@uci.edu.

Phone: 949-824-5130

Fax: 949-824-2345

Dear Editor,

Re: Siegrist J, Dragano N, Nyberg ST et al. Validation abbreviated measures of effort-reward imbalance at work in European cohort studies: the IPD-Work consortium

We read with interest the paper by Siegrist et al. (2013) about the validation of short partial or proxy versions of the effort-reward imbalance (ERI) scales in 10 cohorts of the IPD-Work consortium. The validation was conducted using 5 IPD-Work consortium cohorts with original ERI scales. Due to serious methodological problems in the validation procedures, we disagree with the conclusion of the authors that the short partial or proxy versions of ERI scales in the 10 cohorts were validated, or can be used to assess ERI.

First of all, the authors reported that there was “a relatively high degree of heterogeneity of the partial versions of the ERI scales in terms of wording of items and their response format” in the IPD-Work cohorts. They did not explicitly report to what extent the wording of items were different in the 10 cohorts with incomplete ERI scales (BELSTRESS, COPSOQ-2, DWECS, IPAQ, PUMA, FPS, NWCS, POLS, Whitehall II, and WOLF-S) from those in the 5 cohorts with original ERI scales (HNR, SOEP, SLOSH, GAZEL, and WOLF-F). Furthermore, it was implied in Siegrist et al. (2013) that the wordings of 2 items for extrinsic effort and 3 items for reward used in the Whitehall II Study (Kuper et al., 2002), were the same as those in the 5 cohorts with original ERI scales. However, Table 1 below shows that the wordings of the ERI items used in the Whitehall II Study are substantially different from the original ERI items. If significantly different wordings of ERI items were used for partial ERI scales in the 10 cohorts, the validity of the partial versions cannot be assessed appropriately by statistical analyses with the 5 cohort data in which original ERI items (not the partial versions) were used.

Likewise, if a different response format (e.g., four-point Likert style, strongly disagree to strongly agree) was used for partial or proxy ERI scales, the validity of the partial versions cannot be tested with the 5 cohort data in which original ERI scales with the five-point two-step response format were available [i.e., (1) does not apply; (2) does apply, but subject does not consider herself or himself distressed; (3) does apply and subject considers herself or himself somewhat distressed; (4) does apply and subject considers her or himself distressed; and (5) does apply and subject considers herself and himself very distressed] (Siegrist et al. 2004). One cannot assume that the responses of survey participants to ERI items on a different response format (e.g., four-point Likert scale) will be the same as the responses on the original five-point response scale. More importantly, response item format is theoretically related to what the ERI

scales are intended to measure. ERI scales based on the original item response set are intended to assess a combination of the existence of a work stressor and the degree of perceived stress by the work stressor, while ERI scales based on a different response set (e.g., four-point Likert style) are intended to assess only the existence of a work stressor without including the extent of perceived stress. It is illogical to assume that partial versions of ERI scales based on a different item response format and original versions of ERI scales based on the original response format are measuring the same construct.

In addition, the content validity of the partial or proxy versions of ERI scales (particularly, the “reward” scale) in the 10 cohorts is generally weak. This cannot be overcome or improved through statistical analyses. We found that only 2 (reward A and reward E) out of the 7 partial ERI reward scales in the 10 cohorts were built on at least one item for each of the three theoretical dimensions of reward (promotion/financial reward, esteem reward, and job security reward) (Siegrist 1996; Siegrist et al. 2004). The partial version of the reward scale (reward G) was built on ERI items for only one theoretical dimension of reward (promotion). Furthermore, the sensitivities for the ERI ratios based on partial scales (Effort A/Reward E; and Effort B/Reward C) against complete scales were low, i.e. less than on average, 0.70 (in other words, false negatives greater than 30%). It seems inappropriate to call these low sensitivities “acceptable agreements” in the paper by Siegrist et al. (2013). We think that if all partial versions of ERI scales from the 10 cohorts are included in future individual meta-analyses of the IPD-Work consortium, the true associations between effort, reward and ERI and health outcomes (including “hard” outcomes such as cardiovascular disease) would likely be significantly underestimated in the analyses.

References

1. Siegrist J, Dragano N, Nyberg ST et al. Validating abbreviated measures of effort-reward imbalance at work in European cohort studies: the IPD-Work consortium. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. 2013 Mar 2. [Epub ahead of print]
2. Kuper H, Singh-Manoux A, Siegrist J, Marmot M. When reciprocity fails: effort-reward imbalance in relation to coronary heart disease and health functioning within the Whitehall II study. *Occup Environ Med*. 2002;59(11):777-84.
3. Siegrist J. Adverse health effects of high-effort/low-reward conditions. *J Occup Health Psychol*. 1996;1(1):27-41.

4. Siegrist J, Starke D, Chandola T, Godin I, Marmot M, Niedhammer I, Peter R. The measurement of effort-reward imbalance at work: European comparisons. *Soc Sci Med*. 2004 Apr;58(8):1483-99.

Table 1. The ERI items for extrinsic effort and reward used in the Whitehall II study according to the two sources: the original paper from the Whitehall II study (Kuper et al. 2002) and the IPD-Work paper (Siegrist et al. 2013).

Scales	Items	
	According to the paper by Kuper et al (2002)	According to the IPD-Work paper by Siegrist et al (2013)
<i>Extrinsic effort</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have to work very fast? • Do you have to work very intensively? • Do you have enough time to do everything? • Does your work demand a high level of skill and expertise? • Does your job require you to take the initiative? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have constant time pressure due to a heavy work load (ERI 1) • Over the past few years, my job has become more and more Demanding (ERI 6)
<i>Reward</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you ever get praised for your work? • Does your job provide you with a variety of interesting things? • Do you consider your job very important? • Do your colleagues consider your job very important? • How often do you get help and support from your colleagues? • How often do you get help and support from your immediate superior? • How satisfied are you with your usual take home pay? • How satisfied are you with your work prospects? • How satisfied are you with the way your abilities are used? • How satisfied are you with the interest and skill involved in your job? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I receive the respect I deserve from my superiors (ERI 7) • My job promotion prospects are poor (ERI 11) • Considering all my efforts and achievements, my salary/income is adequate (ERI 17)