

Association between Job Stressors and Heavy Drinking: Age Differences in Male Japanese Workers

Hisanori HIRO^{1*}, Norito KAWAKAMI², Katsutoshi TANAKA¹, Ken NAKAMURA¹
and the Japan Work Stress and Health Cohort Study Group

¹Kitasato University Graduate School of Medical Sciences, 15–1 Kitasato 1, Sagami-hara, Kanagawa 228-8555, Japan

²Department of Mental Health, University of Tokyo Graduate School of Medicine, 7–3–1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

Received May 31, 2006 and accepted January 10, 2007

Abstract: The objective of the present study is to investigate the association between various occupational stressors and heavy drinking among male Japanese workers in different age groups. Using the Generic Job Stress Questionnaire, 13 occupational stressors and 2 workplace support indicators were assessed. The questionnaire survey was conducted of 25,104 workers, and the present study analyzed the data from 17,501 male workers. Heavy drinking was defined as weekly alcohol consumption of >275 g, and a total of 1,131 men (6.5%) were classified as heavy drinkers. After adjusting for shift work, occupational class, marital status and smoking, heavy drinking was related to “support from supervisor” for the 18–29 and 50–72 yr-old groups. For the 30–39 yr-old group, heavy drinking was related to “intragroup conflict”, “job control” and “cognitive demands.” For the 40–49 yr-old group, heavy drinking was related to “physical environment”, “quantitative workload” and “underutilization of abilities.” The present study clarified that certain occupational stressors relate to heavy drinking, and that this association varies among different age groups.

Key words: Alcohol, Stress, Workplace, Job stressor, Social support

Introduction

Numerous cross-sectional and longitudinal studies have been conducted to assess the association of occupational environment and stress with alcohol consumption, harmful drinking, and alcohol dependence^{1–29}. However findings are still conflicting and inconclusive¹.

Most studies in this field have shown some association between drinking and job stress. For example, as far as cross-sectional studies are concerned, Hingson *et al.* conducted a household survey and reported that job stress was associated with mean alcohol consumption, heavy drinking, and drunkenness². House *et al.* found that job tension was associated with average weekly alcohol consumption³. In addition, Ragland *et al.* studied urban

transit operators and documented that those who often experienced job stress were likely to drink heavily⁴. As far as longitudinal studies are concerned, Crum *et al.* reported that, among men, even after adjusting for job insecurity and workplace support, alcohol dependence and abuse were associated with high-strain jobs⁵.

However, Mensch *et al.* show low correlation between alcohol consumption and job stress among young men⁶, and Cooper *et al.* documented no significant relationship between job pressure and alcohol consumption or problem drinking⁷. Head *et al.* also reported no significant association between objectively assessed stress and alcohol dependence among male workers by cohort study⁸.

Many types of job stressors exist. Some of them have been suggested to correlate to drinking⁹. San José *et al.* reported that males and females in the range of 45–74 yr old reporting high hazardous physical working conditions

*To whom correspondence should be addressed.

and high demands were more likely to be heavy drinkers than to be light drinkers¹⁰. Hemmingsson *et al.* found that low work control was related to later alcohol abuse among young men by longitudinal study¹¹. Greenberg *et al.* reported that low job autonomy, low use of capacities and lack of participation in decision making in the workplace were associated with heavy drinking and negative consequences from drinking¹². Clarke *et al.* investigated the relationship of drinking frequency, alcohol consumption, duration of heavy drinking, and severity of alcohol dependence to six of the eight factors common to jobs with high incidence of alcohol dependence as reported by Plant (availability of alcohol, social pressure to drink, separation from family due to work commitments, lack of supervision, collusion in heavy drinking by colleagues, and strains and stresses; they excluded high or low income and recruitment of individuals predisposed to drink heavily)¹³. They found no significant correlation. Moreover, when they examined nine occupational stress factors and stressors (feeling strained, working alone, working irregular shifts, dangerous work, work overload, responsibility for others, job security, complicated work, and assessment by quantity of output), they found that, among men, none correlated to alcohol consumption and frequency, and among women, a significant correlation existed only with “responsibility for others”.

There are few studies for Japanese workers. Kawakami *et al.* studied male workers in a Japanese computer factory and found lack of intrinsic rewards was correlated to heavy and problem drinking. Job overload, lack of control over pace and job future ambiguity was not significantly correlated to them¹⁴. Hagihara *et al.* reported that “work requiring advanced knowledge and skill”, “time pressure”, “clear job purpose or goal” was related with heavy drinking among male white-collar workers¹⁵. They conducted another study for 30–50 yr-old male white-collar workers and documented that job demands and skill discretion (such as a variety of skills and creativity at work) defined in the job demands-control model³⁰ were associated with alcohol consumption¹⁶.

Some studies have used the demand/control model³⁰ to assess psychosocial work environments. Using such a model, highly stressful work environments are those with high job demand and low job control. However, different studies have arrived at different conclusions^{1, 5, 17, 18}. In addition, several studies have used the effort-reward imbalance model. Using this model, work is considered stressful if despite high effort, rewards, such as wages, social approval, job security, and career advancement opportunities, are low³¹. Some studies have found that this imbalance increases the risk for alcohol dependence among men⁸, but others have

found no significant correlation with heavy drinking¹.

Drinking is also reported to be influenced by social support¹⁹. Workplace support can be divided into general support and support that directly relates to drinking, and both types of support may play a role in drinking among workers³². Hemmingsson *et al.* found evidence that low level of workplace support was related to later alcohol abuse among young men¹¹. But in the Japanese study by Kawakami *et al.*, lack of workplace support was not correlated to heavy and problem drinking¹⁴. Hagihara *et al.* reported that social support has both positive and negative influences on the relationship between job stress and alcohol consumption²⁰.

As far as the interaction between stress and drinking is concerned, various models, including the tension reduction hypothesis³³, have been proposed, but it is generally accepted that no single model could explain all cases³⁴. Cooper *et al.* stated that this association was complicated by individual differences in types of stress, coping mechanisms, responses to stress, and expectancies for effects of drinking³⁵. Furthermore, national and racial differences exist in the use of alcohol to relieve stress and tension³⁶, and clear gender differences have been reported^{37, 38}. In terms of age, studies have shown that young people are more likely to use alcohol to relieve and deal with stress^{11, 39}. In contrast, some studies have not shown a clear correlation between stress factors and alcohol consumption among the elderly⁴⁰.

Therefore, the discrepancies in the results of previous studies on the association between job stress and heavy drinking are due to not only study design and measurement methods, but also race, gender, age, stress vulnerability, motivation to drink, and geographical factors.

It is supposed that certain job stressors are associated with heavy drinking among male Japanese workers. Based on the results of the above-mentioned studies, we hypothesized that the association between occupational stress and heavy drinking varies among different age groups in male Japanese workers. In order to prove this hypothesis, the association between various job stressors and heavy drinking was investigated by different age groups using the scale that could assess lots of job stressors.

Methods

Subjects

The present study was conducted using the data obtained as a baseline survey of the Japan Work Stress and Health Cohort Study (JSTRESS Study) (reported in detail elsewhere^{41, 42}). A questionnaire was distributed to 29,471 workers at nine companies and factories from April 1996 to

May 1998; 25,104 workers replied (average response rate, 85.2%). Of the total respondents, 19,681 men answered questions about age, recent drinking history, and average alcohol consumption. After excluding 2,180 nondrinkers, a total of 17,501 men remained as subjects. Nondrinkers were eliminated in order to further clarify the association between job stressors and heavy drinking, because many have specific reasons for abstaining from drinking or cannot drink due to constitutional factors. Women were also excluded, because habitual drinkers are few among them.

Job stressors and heavy drinking assessment

Job stressors and workplace social support indicators were measured using the Generic Job Stress Questionnaire (GJSQ)⁴³. The GJSQ was developed by researchers at the U.S. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) and assesses the components of the job-stress model. In addition to 13 stressors (physical environment, role conflict, role ambiguity, intragroup conflict, intergroup conflict, job control, quantitative work load, variance in work load, underutilization of abilities, responsibility for people, cognitive demands, job future ambiguity, and employment opportunities), it can assess buffers of stress-stress reactions (social support and self-esteem). It is designed in a modular style, and researchers can adjust forms and scales to suit each investigation. The degree of reliability for the internal consistency of each stressor ranged from 0.75 to 0.89. The validity and reliability of the Japanese version of the GJSQ have been confirmed^{44,45}. Thirteen job stressor scales and two workplace support indicator scales (supervisor support and coworker support) were used in the present study. The questionnaire contained the following: a ten-item physical environment scale, eight-item role conflict scale, six-item role ambiguity scale, eight-item intragroup conflict scale, eight-item intergroup conflict scale, sixteen-item job control scale, eleven-item quantitative workload scale, three-item variance in workload scale, three-item underutilization of abilities scale, four-item responsibility for people scale, five-item cognitive demands scale, four-item job future ambiguity scale, three-item employment opportunities scale, four-item social support from supervisors scale, and four-item social support from coworkers scale.

Heavy drinking was defined as weekly alcohol consumption of >275 g. This is based on alcohol consumption with increased risk for sickness absence as reported by a previous study⁴⁶. This definition is also based on the estimates of increased health risk related to hazardous alcohol consumption, commonly used several countries¹. For each subject, based on answers provided on the questionnaire form (average

alcohol consumption per drinking day, average number of drinking days per month and types of alcohol beverages), weekly alcohol consumption (in grams) were calculated.

Statistical analysis

Subjects were divided into the following four age groups: 18–29, 30–39, 40–49 and 50–72 yr.

First of all, the average score for the above-mentioned 13 job stressors and workplace support indicators was calculated for each age group, and average scores were subjected to a variance analysis. The Scheffe method was used for multiple comparison. The scores of the job stressors and workplace supports were divided into tertiles labeled “low”, “intermediate” or “high”, so that, for example, those subjects within the top third of all scores on the physical environment scale were labeled as having “high physical environment score”.

Next, the association between job stressors and heavy drinking was analyzed in three stages. First of all, logistic regression analysis was conducted by handling heavy drinking as a dependent variable and the 13 job stressor scores and 2 workplace support indicators as independent variables. For each job stressor, adjusted odds ratio and 95% confidence interval for heavy drinking were calculated. Second, the same analysis was conducted adjusting for shift work and occupational class. Third, the same analysis was conducted additionally adjusting for marital status and smoking. These analyses were carried out using SPSS 10.0J.

Ethical considerations

Because the present study analyzed the data obtained by the JSTRESS study, it was not reviewed by the Kitasato Ethical Review Board. Prior to implementation, the Human Subject Committee at Gifu University approved the investigation methods, contents and procedures of the JSTRESS study.

Results

Descriptive statistics

The rate of daily drinking (≥ 28 d/month) was 11.1% among the 18–29 yr old group, 26.8% among the 30–39 yr old group, 36.1% among the 40–49 yr old group and 37.9% among 50–72 yr old group.

Of the total subject population, 1,131 men (6.5%) were identified as heavy drinkers. The mean and standard deviation of weekly alcohol consumption were 351.0 mg and 168.6 mg in heavy drinkers, 81.3 mg and 65.5 mg in non-heavy drinkers.

Table 1. Demographic variables, occupational class and shift work by age group among male respondents of the baseline survey of the Japan Work Stress and Health Cohort Study

	Age group (yr)			
	18–29	30–39	40–49	50–72
	(n=2,256) n (%)	(n=5,328) n (%)	(n=6,832) n (%)	(n=3,085) n (%)
Heavy drinkers*	45 (2.0)	259 (4.9)	549 (8.0)	278 (9.0)
Basic education				
Less than high school	10 (0.4)	112 (2.1)	845 (12.7)	973 (32.4)
High school or some college	1,546 (69.5)	2,819 (53.8)	3,978 (59.6)	1,592 (53.0)
College or higher	667 (30.0)	2,309 (44.1)	1,850 (27.7)	440 (14.6)
Unknown	33 (–)	88 (–)	159 (–)	80 (–)
Marital status				
Married	612 (27.6)	4,059 (77.3)	5,972 (89.3)	2,861 (95.2)
Never married	1,596 (71.9)	1,100 (20.9)	569 (8.5)	63 (2.1)
Previously married	11 (0.5)	92 (1.8)	145 (2.2)	81 (2.7)
Unknown	37 (–)	77 (–)	146 (–)	80 (–)
Occupational class				
Manager	0	301 (5.7)	1,741 (25.9)	812 (27.0)
Professionals	232 (10.5)	1,290 (24.5)	796 (11.8)	198 (6.6)
Technicians	485 (22.0)	1,195 (22.7)	747 (11.1)	182 (6.1)
Clerks	149 (6.7)	400 (7.6)	422 (6.3)	185 (6.2)
Service & sales workers	13 (0.6)	44 (0.8)	69 (1.0)	80 (2.7)
Craft and related trade workers	314 (14.2)	561 (10.7)	960 (14.3)	427 (14.2)
Machine operators and assemblers	804 (36.4)	999 (19.0)	1,216 (18.1)	602 (20.0)
Laborers	163 (7.4)	297 (5.6)	404 (6.0)	283 (9.4)
Other	49 (2.2)	177 (3.4)	372 (5.5)	239 (7.9)
Unknown	47 (–)	64 (–)	105 (–)	77 (–)
Shift work				
Yes	810 (36.2)	1,376 (25.9)	1,065 (15.7)	440 (14.4)
No	1,430 (63.8)	3,931 (74.1)	5,702 (84.3)	2,620 (85.6)
Unknown	16 (–)	21 (–)	65 (–)	25 (–)
Smoking				
Smoker	1,230 (54.9)	2,951 (55.8)	3,833 (56.8)	1,504 (49.9)
Non-smoker	1,009 (45.1)	2,336 (44.2)	2,921 (43.2)	1,513 (50.1)
Unknown	17 (–)	41 (–)	78 (–)	68 (–)

*Average weekly consumption >275 g of absolute alcohol.

Table 1 shows the subject profiles in each age group. A χ^2 test showed a significant difference in the proportion of heavy drinkers among the age groups ($p < 0.01$); the tendency was toward a higher proportion of heavy drinkers with increasing age. Moreover, χ^2 test showed a significant difference in the proportion of rotating-shift workers ($p < 0.01$); the tendency was toward a lower proportion of rotating-shift workers with increasing age.

Job stressor and workplace support scores

Table 2 shows the average scores for the job stressors and workplace support indicators for each age group. The average scores of Physical environment, role conflict, role ambiguity, intragroup conflict, intergroup conflict, quantitative work load,

underutilization of abilities, job future ambiguity, social support from supervisor and social support from coworkers were higher in younger age groups. The average scores of job control, responsibility for people, cognitive demands and employment opportunities were higher in elder age groups. Analysis of variance (multiple comparison by Scheffe method) showed a significant intergroup difference for role conflict, role ambiguity, intragroup conflict, intergroup conflict, quantitative work load, variance in work load, job future ambiguity, and employment opportunities among all age groups ($p < 0.01$, $p < 0.05$). As to the other job stressors, a significant difference was seen for some two-group combinations. Similarly, for the social support indicators, a significant difference was seen for some two-group combinations.

Table 2. Job stressor and workplace support scale scores by age groups

	Score range	18–29		30–39		40–49		50–72	
		N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)
Job stressor									
Physical environment	10–20	2,216	14.6 (2.9)	5,242	14.1 (3.0)	6,641	13.9 (3.1)	2,913	13.8 (3.0)
Role conflict	8–56	2,200	24.5 (7.2)	5,223	25.7 (7.4)	6,613	23.9 (7.5)	2,955	22.2 (7.8)
Role ambiguity	6–42	2,208	20.1 (5.6)	5,258	19.0 (5.7)	6,669	17.2 (5.6)	2,982	16.2 (5.7)
Intragroup conflict	8–40	2,196	20.0 (5.1)	5,203	20.4 (5.1)	6,534	19.6 (4.9)	2,874	18.9 (5.1)
Intergroup conflict	8–40	2,196	20.0 (5.2)	5,203	20.4 (5.1)	6,534	19.5 (5.1)	2,874	19.0 (5.2)
Job control	16–90	2,194	39.8 (9.9)	5,186	46.2 (11.4)	6,582	50.6 (12.6)	2,927	50.7 (13.4)
Quantitative work load	11–55	2,195	36.6 (6.2)	5,187	38.3 (6.5)	6,550	37.7 (6.5)	2,916	35.7 (6.6)
Variance in work load	3–15	2,228	8.9 (3.0)	5,273	9.5 (3.0)	6,707	9.2 (3.0)	2,994	8.5 (3.1)
Underutilization of abilities	3–15	2,231	11.0 (2.8)	5,274	10.3 (2.7)	6,717	10.1 (2.8)	2,995	10.2 (2.8)
Responsibility for people	4–20	2,225	8.0 (3.3)	5,253	10.1 (3.9)	6,683	11.9 (4.2)	2,979	11.9 (4.3)
Cognitive demands	4–20	2,228	14.2 (2.3)	5,258	15.0 (2.4)	6,725	15.2 (2.4)	3,015	15.2 (2.5)
Job future ambiguity	4–20	2,224	15.2 (3.1)	5,251	14.7 (3.4)	6,684	14.3 (3.7)	2,972	13.8 (4.3)
Employment opportunities	3–15	2,224	11.3 (1.8)	5,250	11.5 (1.7)	6,683	12.0 (1.8)	3,004	12.3 (1.8)
Workplace support									
Social support from supervisor	4–20	2,219	15.1 (3.0)	5,240	14.8 (3.1)	6,660	14.8 (3.1)	2,973	14.9 (3.2)
Social support from coworkers	4–20	2,219	15.7 (2.8)	5,240	15.2 (2.8)	6,660	15.1 (2.8)	2,973	15.1 (2.9)

One-way ANOVA (multiple comparison: Scheffe):

Not significant:

Physical environment 40–49:50–72, Job control 40–49:50–72,

Underutilization of abilities 30–39:40–49, 40–49:50–72, 30–39:50–72, Responsibility for people 40–49:50–72,

Cognitive demands 30–39:50–72, 40–49:50–72, Social support from supervisor 18–29:50–72, 30–39:40–49, 30–39:50–72, 40–49:50–72,

Social support from coworkers 30–39:40–49, 30–39:50–72, 40–49:50–72

p<0.05: Role conflict 18–29:40–49, Intergroup conflict 18–29:30–39

p<0.01: Others

Logistic regression analysis

When the scores for the thirteen job stressors and the two workplace supports were entered as explanatory variables, “physical environment” and “social support from supervisor” were significantly and positively associated with heavy drinking for the 18–29 yr-old group. For the 30–39 yr-old group, “physical environment”, “role conflict” and “intragroup conflict” were significantly and positively associated with heavy drinking, and “cognitive demands” was negatively associated with heavy drinking. For the 40–49 yr-old group, in addition to “physical environment”, significant associations existed with “quantitative work load” and with “underutilization of abilities”. “Physical environment” and “underutilization of abilities” were positively associated with heavy drinking, and “quantitative workload” was negatively associated with heavy drinking. For the 50–72 yr-old group, “responsibility for people” and “social support from supervisor” were significantly associated with heavy drinking. In the “responsibility for people” scale, the proportion of heavy drinkers was lowest in intermediate score group. In the “social support from supervisor” scale, it was highest in the intermediate score group.

When rotating shift and occupational class were added as explanatory variables, only one factor, “social support from supervisor” was significantly and positively associated with heavy drinking for the 18–29 yr-old group and 50–72 yr-old group. For the 50–72 yr-old group, the proportion of heavy drinkers was highest in intermediate score group. For the 30–39 yr-old group, “role conflict”, “intragroup conflict” and “job control” were significantly and positively associated with heavy drinking, and “cognitive demands” was negatively associated with heavy drinking. For the 40–49 yr-old group, the association of job stressors and workplace supports with heavy drinking remained unchanged.

Table 3 shows the results of the analysis including marital status and smoking as explanatory variables. Even when adjusted for marital status and smoking, there was no change in the association of heavy drinking with the job stressors and workplace support indicators for three groups. For the 30–39 yr-old group, “intragroup conflict”, “job control” and “cognitive demands” were significantly associated with heavy drinkers. But “role conflict” was not significantly associated with heavy drinkers. No significant correlation existed between shift rotation and heavy drinking for any age group.

Table 3. Association of job stressors and workplace supports with heavy drinking by age groups: odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs)

	Age group (years)							
	18–29		30–39		40–49		50–72	
	n	OR (95% CI)	n	OR (95% CI)	n	OR (95% CI)	n	OR (95% CI)
Job stressors								
Physical environment								
Low score (<14, n=6,524)	569	1.00	1,660	1.00	2,293	1.00	899	1.00
Intermediate score (n=4,718)	564	1.24 (0.46–3.35)	1,272	0.97 (0.66–1.42)	1,415	1.07 (0.83–1.40)	572	1.12 (0.75–1.67)
High score (>15, n=5,770)	767	1.57 (0.60–4.07)	1,566	1.27 (0.87–1.85)	1,568	1.34* (1.02–1.77)	650	1.17 (0.75–1.80)
Role conflict								
Low score (<22, n=5,998)	643	1.00	1,299	1.00	1,886	1.00	964	1.00
Intermediate score (n=5,117)	578	1.01 (0.43–2.38)	1,337	1.44 (0.98–2.12)	1,635	0.87 (0.67–1.13)	610	0.76 (0.51–1.15)
High score (>27, n=5,876)	679	1.41 (0.56–3.55)	1,862	0.98 (0.64–1.50)	1,755	0.92 (0.69–1.23)	547	1.03 (0.67–1.58)
Role ambiguity								
Low score (<16, n=6,281)	391	1.00	1,307	1.00	2,263	1.00	1,066	1.00
Intermediate score (n=4,529)	550	0.42 (0.15–1.16)	1,232	0.72 (0.49–1.07)	1,406	1.05 (0.81–1.36)	502	0.79 (0.51–1.21)
High score (>19, n=6,307)	959	0.89 (0.38–2.08)	1,959	0.80 (0.54–1.18)	1,607	0.76 (0.56–1.02)	553	1.22 (0.78–1.91)
Intragroup conflict								
Low score (<18, n=5,686)	613	1.00	1,317	1.00	1,910	1.00	855	1.00
Intermediate score (n=5,996)	689	1.57 (0.69–3.58)	1,644	1.15 (0.77–1.71)	1,903	0.91 (0.70–1.19)	726	0.76 (0.51–1.12)
High score (>22, n=5,125)	598	0.92 (0.31–2.69)	1,537	1.63* (1.05–2.54)	1,463	1.27 (0.93–1.75)	540	0.68 (0.41–1.12)
Intergroup conflict								
Low score (<18, n=5,636)	628	1.00	1,300	1.00	1,918	1.00	815	1.00
Intermediate score (n=5,545)	609	0.86 (0.37–2.01)	1,510	1.19 (0.80–1.78)	1,733	1.16 (0.88–1.52)	705	1.34 (0.90–2.00)
High score (>22, n=5,626)	663	0.84 (0.32–2.23)	1,688	1.11 (0.70–1.75)	1,625	1.07 (0.77–1.49)	601	1.32 (0.80–2.18)
Job control								
Low score (<44, n=5,690)	1,165	1.00	1,681	1.00	1,239	1.00	508	1.00
Intermediate score (n=5,451)	590	1.60 (0.78–3.28)	1,573	1.23 (0.86–1.76)	1,618	1.16 (0.87–1.54)	643	0.83 (0.53–1.31)
High score (>52, n=5,748)	145	0.30 (0.36–2.40)	1,244	1.54* (1.00–2.37)	2,419	1.06 (0.77–1.47)	970	0.84 (0.51–1.39)
Quantitative work load								
Low score (<35, n=6,101)	787	1.00	1,406	1.00	1,700	1.00	942	1.00
Intermediate score (n=5,458)	612	0.79 (0.34–1.83)	1,405	0.81 (0.55–1.20)	1,801	0.72* (0.55–0.94)	671	1.01 (0.67–1.53)
High score (>40, n=5,289)	501	0.74 (0.25–2.19)	1,687	0.92 (0.57–1.47)	1,775	0.72 (0.51–1.01)	508	1.09 (0.63–1.90)
Variance in work load								
Low score (<8, n=5,568)	669	1.00	1,254	1.00	1,559	1.00	831	1.00
Intermediate score (n=5,915)	677	1.55 (0.65–3.69)	1,541	1.01 (0.68–1.50)	1,827	0.98 (0.74–1.29)	705	0.95 (0.63–1.45)
High score (>10, n=5,719)	554	1.64 (0.51–5.31)	1,703	1.20 (0.73–1.96)	1,890	0.99 (0.70–1.41)	585	0.93 (0.53–1.65)
Underutilization of abilities								
Low score (<10, n=6,786)	564	1.00	1,796	1.00	2,221	1.00	932	1.00
Intermediate score (n=4,179)	430	0.63 (0.25–1.55)	1,169	0.99 (0.69–1.40)	1,322	1.04 (0.80–1.37)	484	0.88 (0.58–1.34)
High score (>11, n=6,252)	906	0.56 (0.25–1.25)	1,533	0.92 (0.64–1.33)	1,733	1.42** (1.10–1.84)	705	1.09 (0.73–1.61)

(Continued)

Discussion

Recently Osaki *et al.* conducted a nationwide survey on alcohol drinking behavior and alcohol dependence among Japanese adults using a representative sampling method, and reported that daily drinking rate was 18.6% for 20–29 yr-old men, 25.4% for 30–39 yr-old men, 36.1% for 40–49 yr-old men and 44.7% for 50–59 yr-old men⁴⁷⁾. The rate of daily drinking in this sample was slightly lower but almost comparable.

There were fair differences of the average scores for the job stressors among age groups. They are certainly reflected with some characteristic aspects of the working situation in each age group, which can indirectly affect the relationship between job stressors and heavy drinking.

In the present study, we were able to confirm that a significant correlation exists between heavy drinking and several job stressors and that this relationship varies among the different age groups.

While the causes for age difference could not be clarified

Table 3. (Continued) Association of job stressors and workplace supports with heavy drinking by age groups: odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs)

	Age group (years)							
	18–29		30–39		40–49		50–72	
	n	OR (95% CI)	n	OR (95% CI)	n	OR (95% CI)	n	OR (95% CI)
Responsibility for people								
Low score (<9, n=5,661)	1,167	1.00	1,734	1.00	1,182	1.00	496	1.00
Intermediate score (n=5,404)	585	0.63 (0.29–1.34)	1,611	0.98 (0.70–1.38)	1,518	1.00 (0.75–1.34)	641	0.67 (0.42–1.05)
High score (>12, n=6,075)	148	0.52 (0.11–2.39)	1,153	0.98 (0.65–1.48)	2,576	1.14 (0.84–1.55)	984	0.96 (0.60–1.52)
Cognitive demands								
Low score (<14, n=4,528)	691	1.00	1,166	1.00	1,191	1.00	517	1.00
Intermediate score (n=5,817)	687	0.97 (0.47–2.04)	1,505	0.72 (0.51–1.02)	1,793	0.96 (0.73–1.26)	667	1.38 (0.90–2.10)
High score (>15, n=6,881)	522	0.72 (0.28–1.88)	1,827	0.67* (0.47–0.97)	2,292	1.15 (0.87–1.52)	937	1.09 (0.70–1.69)
Job future ambiguity								
Low score (<13, n=5,530)	416	1.00	1,363	1.00	1,881	1.00	846	1.00
Intermediate score (n=6,317)	839	1.04 (0.43–2.56)	1,773	0.90 (0.64–1.27)	1,883	0.83 (0.65–1.07)	640	1.12 (0.77–1.63)
High score (>16, n=5,284)	645	1.25 (0.48–3.26)	1,362	0.84 (0.57–1.24)	1,512	0.94 (0.71–1.23)	635	0.79 (0.52–1.22)
Employment opportunities								
Low score (<12, n=6,909)	988	1.00	2,189	1.00	1,976	1.00	603	1.00
Intermediate score (n=5,138)	573	0.68 (0.31–1.48)	1,329	0.83 (0.59–1.15)	1,602	0.89 (0.69–1.15)	631	0.78 (0.51–1.19)
High score (>12, n=5,114)	339	0.86 (0.35–2.10)	980	1.09 (0.77–1.55)	1,698	1.10 (0.87–1.40)	887	1.03 (0.71–1.50)
Workplace supports								
Social support from supervisor								
Low score (<14, n=5,342)	533	1.00	1,408	1.00	1,628	1.00	681	1.00
Intermediate score (n=6,432)	681	3.69* (1.16–11.68)	1,725	0.86 (0.61–1.22)	2,040	1.03 (0.79–1.34)	777	1.66* (1.10–2.50)
High score (>16, n=5,418)	686	5.44** (1.60–18.42)	1,365	0.70 (0.45–1.07)	1,608	1.05 (0.76–1.45)	663	1.33 (0.80–2.22)
Social support from coworkers								
Low score (<15, n=6,062)	525	1.00	1,610	1.00	1,934	1.00	848	1.00
Intermediate score (n=5,510)	556	1.16 (0.47–2.86)	1,491	1.04 (0.73–1.49)	1,809	0.86 (0.67–1.11)	629	0.84 (0.56–1.25)
High score (>16, n=5,520)	819	0.63 (0.24–1.61)	1,397	1.12 (0.75–1.68)	1,533	0.83 (0.61–1.13)	644	0.80 (0.50–1.28)
Shift work								
No (n=13,683)	1,215	1.00	3,330	1.00	4,472	1.00	1,819	1.00
Yes (n=3,691)	685	1.34 (0.65–2.78)	1,168	1.05 (0.76–1.44)	804	0.77 (0.57–1.04)	302	1.16 (0.74–1.82)
Occupational class								
A group (n=9,135)	780	1.00	2,873	1.00	3,203	1.00	1,131	1.00
B group (n=7,236)	1,120	1.34 (0.60–3.01)	1,625	1.56* (1.11–2.19)	2,073	1.13 (0.88–1.45)	990	0.88 (0.60–1.29)
Marital status								
Married (n=13,504)	528	1.00	3,489	1.00	4,755	1.00	2,029	1.00
Never/previously married (n=3,657)	1,372	1.86 (0.79–4.34)	1,009	1.17 (0.85–1.62)	521	1.30 (0.96–1.75)	92	1.38 (0.71–2.69)
Smoking								
Non-smoker	854	1.00	2,014	1.00	2,365	1.00	1,099	1.00
Smoker	1,046	5.58** (2.13–14.57)	2,484	1.91** (1.40–2.60)	2,911	1.63** (1.32–2.01)	1,022	1.97** (1.44–2.71)

A group: managers/professionals/technicians/clerks, B group: service&sales workers/craft and related trade workers/machine operators and assemblers/laborers.

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.

in the present study, several hypotheses could be formed.

First of all, as suggested by Kasl *et al.*⁴⁰⁾, when compared to young people, older people have set drinking habits which are not affected by environmental factors. This could explain the finding that no significant correlation existed between heavy drinking and all job stressors for the 50–72 yr-old group. But then the same results were found among 18–29

yr-old groups. Japanese young workers may tend to cope their stress with other means but drinking.

Secondly, certain stressors may affect drinking behavior in different age groups¹⁹⁾. For the 30–39 yr old group, heavy drinking correlated to intragroup conflict, job control and cognitive demands. Intragroup conflict may induce high strain that relate to heavy drinking because of work ethics

and workplace responsibilities among the group. The higher job control, the higher the incidence of heavy drinking. The direction of this relationship was opposite to what was expected. But findings about this relationship are somewhat inconclusive in previous studies^{10, 21, 22}). It may be also affected with national and rational differences about the use of alcohol to relieve stress and tension. The higher cognitive demands were, the lower the prevalence of heavy drinking was. The direction of this relationship was also opposite to what was initially expected. For the 30–39 yr-old group, lower class occupations (B group), which are supposed to have lower cognitive demands compared to higher class occupations (managers, etc.), were more likely to be heavy drinker. Occupational difference in norms and behaviors for drinking, not just cognitive demands itself, may be a primary factor for the negative association between cognitive demands and heavy drinking. For the 40–49 yr-old group, heavy drinking was correlated to physical environment, quantitative workload and underutilization of abilities. Japanese male workers between the ages of 40–49 tend to be busy with things besides work, such as family obligations, and if quantitative workload is high, the amount of time for drinking may be reduced, thus lowering the likelihood of heavy drinking. Underutilization of abilities may play a role because of prides for abilities among the group. In the report by San José *et al.*, physical working conditions and job demands were significantly associated with heavy drinking among middle and old aged citizens¹⁰. Greenberg *et al.* reported that low use of capacities and lack of participation in decision making in the workplace were associated with heavy drinking and negative consequences from drinking¹²). The results of the present study are similar to those of the reports.

Moreover, social support from supervisor was related with heavy drinking among two age groups. In 18–29 yr-old group, the higher the social support from supervisor, the higher the incidence of heavy drinking. In 50–72 yr-old group, the risk for heavy drinking was highest in intermediate group. In general, social support is thought to alleviate stress, and the greater the social support, the lower the stress^{11, 19}). Support from supervisor and coworkers is an important form of social support. Lack of supervision can delay the recognition of problem drinking, thereby promoting heavy drinking⁴⁸). However, supervisors and coworkers can play different roles in heavy drinking as Hagihara *et al.* pointed out²⁰). Some of the high scores for support from supervisor might have resulted from men being encouraged to drink during social gatherings and meetings. Furthermore, if supervisors are tolerant of heavy drinking and problems

stemming from it, heavy drinking can be exacerbated. In other words, supervisors can enable heavy drinking⁴⁹). This could have played a role for the 18–29 yr-old and 50–72 yr-old groups.

As to shift rotation, the present study did not show a significant correlation to heavy drinking. Regland *et al.* reported that shift work was associated with alcohol consumption¹⁸). There are several forms of rotating shifts, such as 2-shift and 3-shift schedules. In order to more closely investigate the association between heavy drinking and rotating shift, it will be necessary to include shift pattern and duration of employment as variables.

Some of the advantages of the present study are that numerous questions and items related to job stress were analyzed in a large number of male workers. It was possible to investigate various stressors and confounding factors.

However, when interpreting the results of the present study, it is necessary to consider its limitations.

First of all, it is well known that people underestimate alcohol consumption. This can undervalue the true association between heavy drinking and stressors. In addition to the items that exhibited a significantly correlation to heavy drinking, other important job stressors might exist. We did not also take drinking pattern into consideration. Drinking the weekly total in fewer settings can be more harmful than drinking the same total amount spread throughout the week. The relation of job stressors with drinking may be different by drinking pattern.

Secondly, although we used a questionnaire that evaluates many facets of job stressors, there may be other job stressors that closely correlate to heavy drinking. For example, differences are apparent in the volume of drinking and the severity of problem drinking among the different occupations. In the past, some studies have been conducted on the association between occupation and drinking^{50–52}). Even when adjusting for demographic variations, there appear to be significant differences in the incidence of alcohol dependence and the volume of alcohol consumption among various occupations. Hypotheses that explain such occupational differences can be roughly divided into four groups⁵²): 1) the structural model states that alienation and stress caused by the structural characteristics of work influence drinking; 2) the social control model states that workplaces with loose regulations about drinking promote heavy drinking in people with a tendency for alcohol dependence; 3) the social availability model states that problem drinking is facilitated if drinking is a norm for a group. In Japan, studies have suggested that attitudes toward drinking at the workplace (tolerance toward problem drinking, and acceptance of the

benefits of drinking for work) correlate to problem drinking⁵³; and 4) the motivational model states that motivation to drink is accelerated by physically poor working environments or break-ups of trust, social and sexual relationships. Job stressors are most closely related to the first and fourth models. It is possible that the components for these models influence the association between heavy drinking and job stressors. For example, if a workplace with poor physical environments tends to be more lenient about problem drinking, then only the association between heavy drinking and physical environment may be apparent. Besides, some combinations of job stressors may be strongly related to heavy drinking. As the aim of the present study was investigating the association of each stressor with heavy drinking, we did not examine the possibilities. It should be studied in the future.

Thirdly, we did not consider stressors that are not directly related to workplace as explanatory variables. It is possible that such stressors could explain the age differences. Moreover, we did not add individual factors such as coping styles and expectancies for effects of drinking to explanatory variables. They can modify the relation between job stress and heavy drinking. But it is difficult to intervene for them in the workplace.

Lastly, the present study was cross sectional, and only the association between heavy drinking and job stress was investigated. Therefore, some findings could be interpreted ambiguously. Several job stressors may actually encourage heavy drinking, but on the other hand, problem drinking may affect job stress. For example, workers who have occupational problems caused by heavy drinking may experience strong intragroup conflicts. In order to more closely assess the effects of occupational stress on heavy drinking, longitudinal studies will be needed in the future.

Despite these limitations, the present study yielded important findings regarding the relationship between job stressors and heavy drinking. At present, measures to improve mental health are being promoted in many workplaces in Japan. Assessment and improvement of job stress are also important in improving mental health. Investigating stress-reducing measures from the viewpoint of preventing problem drinking can contribute to maintenance and promotion of worker health. The results of this study suggests that the scheme of the stress management for preventing heavy and problem drinking should be formed individually for each age group. The measure which is effective among some age groups may be invalid among other age groups. Further studies should be conducted on this point.

Acknowledgement

The authors express special thanks to other members of the Japan Work Stress and Health Cohort Study Group: Takashi Haratani (Japan National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health), Yoshiharu Aizawa (Kitasato University), Fumio Kobayashi (Aichi Medical University), Masao Ishizaki (Kanazawa Medical University), Takeshi Hayashi (Hitachi Information and Telecommunication Systems, Ltd.), Osamu Fujita (Aichi Education University), Takeshi Masumoto (Mitsubishi Chemistry Co.), Shogo Miyazaki (Meiji University Law School), Shuji Hashimoto (Fujita Health University School of Medicine) and Shunichi Araki (Japan National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health).

References

- 1) Kouvonen A, Kivimaki M, Cox SJ, Poikolainen K, Cox T, Vahtera J (2005) Job strain, effort-reward imbalance, and heavy drinking: a study in 40,851 employees. *J Occup Environ Med* **47**, 503–13.
- 2) Hingson R, Mangione T, Barrett J (1981) Job characteristics and drinking practices in the Boston metropolitan area. *J Stud Alcohol* **42**, 725–38.
- 3) House JS, Strecher V, Metzner HL, Robbins CA (1986) Occupational stress and health among men and women in the Tecumseh Community Health Study. *J Health Soc Behav* **27**, 62–77.
- 4) Ragland DR, Greiner BA, Yen IH, Fisher JM (2000) Occupational stress factors and alcohol-related behavior in urban transit operators. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* **24**, 1011–9.
- 5) Crum RM, Muntaner C, Eaton WW, Anthony JC (1995) Occupational stress and the risk of alcohol abuse and dependence. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* **19**, 647–55.
- 6) Mensch BS, Kandel DB (1988) Do job conditions influence the use of drug? *J Health Soc Behav* **29**, 169–84.
- 7) Cooper ML, Russel M, Frone MR (1990) Work stress and alcohol effects: a test of stress-induced drinking. *J Health Soc Behav* **31**, 260–76.
- 8) Head J, Stansfeld SA, Siegrist J (2004) The psychosocial work environment and alcohol dependence: a prospective study. *Occup Environ Med* **61**, 219–44.
- 9) Janes CR, Ames GM (1993) The workplace. In: *Recent developments in alcoholism*, Vol 11, Galanter M (Ed.), 123–41, Plenum Press, New York.
- 10) San José B, van de Mheen H, van Oers JAM, Mackenbach JP, Garretsen HFL (2000) Adverse working conditions and alcohol use in men and women. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* **24**, 1207–13.
- 11) Hemmingsson T, Lundberg I (1998) Work control, work demands, and work social support in relation to alcoholism among young men. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* **22**, 921–7.
- 12) Greenberg ES, Grunberg L (1995) Work alienation and

- problem alcohol behavior. *J Health Soc Behav* **36**, 83–102.
- 13) Clarke M, Farid B, Romaniuk H (1990) Occupational risk factors in alcoholism. *Br J Addict* **85**, 1611–4.
 - 14) Kawakami N, Araki S, Haratani T, Hemmi T (1993) Relations of work stress to alcohol use and drinking problems in male and female employees of a computer factory in Japan. *Environ Res* **62**, 314–24.
 - 15) Hagihara A, Tarumi K, Miller AS, Nebeshima F, Nobutomo K (2000) Work stressors and alcohol consumption among white-collar workers: a signal detection approach. *J Stud Alcohol* **61**, 462–5.
 - 16) Hagihara A, Tarumi K, Nobutomo K (2001) A signal detection approach to the combined effects of work stressors on alcohol consumption. *J Stud Alcohol* **62**, 798–805.
 - 17) Kuper H, Marmot M (2003) Job strain, job demands, decision latitude, and risk of coronary heart disease within the Whitehall II study. *J Epidemiol Community Health* **57**, 147–53.
 - 18) Ragland DR, Greiner BA, Psych D, Krause N, Holman BL, Fisher JM (1995) Occupational and nonoccupational correlates of alcohol consumption in urban transit operators. *Prev Med* **24**, 634–45.
 - 19) Vasse PM, Nijhuis FJN, Kok G (1998) Associations between work stress, alcohol consumption and sickness absence. *Addiction* **93**, 231–41.
 - 20) Hagihara A, Tarumi K, Nobutomo K (2003) Positive and negative effects of social support on the relationship between work stress and alcohol consumption. *J Stud Alcohol* **64**, 874–83.
 - 21) Romelsjö A, Hasin D, Hilton M, Bostrom G, Diderichsen F, Haglund B, Hallqvist J, Karlsson G, Svanstrom L (1992) The relationship between stressful working conditions and high alcohol consumption and severe alcohol problems in an urban general population. *Br J Addict* **87**, 1173–83.
 - 22) Kuper H, Marmot M (2003) Job strain, job demands, decision latitude, and risk of coronary heart disease within the Whitehall II study. *J Epidemiol Community Health* **57**, 147–53.
 - 23) Niedhammer I, Goldberg M, Leclerc A, David S, Bugel I, Landre MF (1998) Psychosocial work environment and cardiovascular risk factors in an occupational cohort in France. *J Epidemiol Community Health* **52**, 93–100.
 - 24) Gorman DM (1988) Employment, stressful life events and the development of alcohol dependence. *Drug Alcohol Depend* **22**, 151–9.
 - 25) Allamani A, Cipriani F, Innocenti S, Lumuto C, Marchi M, Morretini A (1988) Alcohol drinking patterns and work areas: epidemiological study of factory and rural workers in Florence, Italy. *Br J Addict* **83**, 1169–78.
 - 26) Seeman M, Seeman AZ, Budros A (1988) Powerlessness, work, and community: a longitudinal study of alienation and alcohol use. *J Health Soc Behav* **29**, 185–98.
 - 27) Parker DA, Harford TC (1992) Gender-role attitudes, job competition and alcohol consumption among women and men. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* **16**, 159–65.
 - 28) Fagin L, Carson J, Leary J, De Villiers N, Bartlett H, O'Malley P, West M, McElPatrick S, Brown D (1996) Stress, coping and burnout in mental health nurses: finding from three research studies. *Int J Soc Psychiatry* **42**, 102–11.
 - 29) Richman JA, Flaherty JA, Rospenda KM (1996) Perceived workplace harassment experiences and problem drinking among physicians: broadening the stress/alienation paradigm. *Addiction* **91**, 391–403.
 - 30) Karasek R, Theorell T (1990) *Healthy work, stress, productivity, and the reproduction of working life*. Basic Books, New York.
 - 31) Siegrist J (1996) Adverse health effects of high effort/low reward conditions. *J Occup Health Psychol* **1**, 27–41.
 - 32) Rice C, Longabaugh R, Stout RL (1997) A comparison sample validation of “Your Workplace”: an instrument to measure perceived alcohol support and consequences from the work environment. *Addict Behav* **22**, 711–22.
 - 33) Conger JJ (1956) Alcoholism: theory, problem and challenge. II. reinforcement theory and the dynamics of alcoholism. *Q J Stud Alcohol* **17**, 296–305.
 - 34) Pohorecky LA (1991) Stress and alcohol interaction: an update of human research. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* **15**, 438–59.
 - 35) Cooper ML, Russel M, Skinner JB, Frone MR, Mudar P (1992) Stress and alcohol use: moderating effects of gender, coping, and alcohol expectancies. *J Abnorm Psychol* **101**, 139–52.
 - 36) Neff JA (1986) Alcohol consumption and psychological distress among U.S. anglos, hispanics and blacks. *Alcohol Alcohol* **21**, 111–9.
 - 37) Ames GM, Rebhun LA (1996) Women, alcohol and work: Interactions of gender, ethnicity and occupational culture. *Soc Sci Med* **43**, 1649–63.
 - 38) Dawson DA, Grant BF, June Ruan W (2005) The association between stress and drinking: modifying effects of gender and vulnerability. *Alcohol Alcohol* **40**, 453–60.
 - 39) Bonaguro JA, McLaughlin M, Sussman K (1987) Adolescent stress and alcohol usage. In: *Chemical Dependencies*, Chambers CA, Jorciardi JA, Petersen DM, Siegal HA and White OZ (Eds.), 300–6, Ohio University Press, Ohio.
 - 40) Kasl SV, Ostfeld AM, Berkman LF, Jacobs SC (1996) Stress and alcohol consumption: the role of selected social and environmental factors. In: *Stress and addiction*, Gottheil E, Druley KA, Pashko S and Weinstein SP (Eds.), 40–59, Plenum Press, New York.
 - 41) Kawakami N, Haratani T, Kobayashi F, Ishizaki M, Hayashi T, Fujita O, Aizawa Y, Miyazaki S, Hiro H, Masumoto T, Hashimoto S, Araki S (2004) Occupational class and exposure to job stressors among employed men and women in Japan. *J Epidemiol* **14**, 204–11.
 - 42) Kawakami N, Tsutsumi A, Haratani T, Kobayashi F, Ishizaki M, Hayashi T, Fujita O, Aizawa Y, Miyazaki S, Hiro H, Masumoto T, Hashimoto S, Araki S (2006) Job strain, worksite support, and nutrient intake among employed Japanese men and women. *J Epidemiol* **16**, 79–89.
 - 43) Hurrell Jr JJ, Nelson DL, Simmons BL (1998) Measuring job stressors and strains: where we have been, where we are, where we need to go. *J Occup Health Psychol* **3**, 368–89.

- 44) Haratani T, Kawakami N, Araki S (1993) Reliability and validity of the NIOSH Generic Job Stress Questionnaire. *Sangyo Igaku* **35** (Suppl), S214.
- 45) Haratani T (2004) Practical application of the NIOSH Generic Job Stress Questionnaire. *Occupational Mental Health* **12**, 12–9.
- 46) Vahtera J, Poikolainen K, Kivimäki M, Ala-Mursula L, Pentti J (2002) Alcohol intake and sickness absence: a curvilinear relation. *Am J Epidemiol* **156**, 969–76.
- 47) Osaki Y, Matsushita S, Shirakawa T, Hiro H, Higuchi S (2005) Nationwide survey alcohol drinking and alcoholism among Japanese adults. *Jpn J Alcohol & Drug Dependence* **40**, 455–70.
- 48) Whitehead PC, Simpkins J (1983) Occupational factors in alcoholism. In: *The pathogenesis of alcoholism*, Kiss B and Begleiter H (Eds.), 405–553, Plenum Press, New York.
- 49) Roman PA, Blum TC, Martin JK (1992) 'Enabling' of male problem drinkers in work groups. *Br J Addict* **87**, 275–89.
- 50) Plant MA (1977) Alcoholism and occupation: a review. *Br J Addict* **72**, 309–16.
- 51) Harford TC, Parker DA, Grant BF, Dawson DA (1992) Alcohol use and dependence among employed men and women in the United States in 1988. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* **16**, 146–8.
- 52) Mandel W, Eaton WW, Anthony JC, Garrison R (1992) Alcoholism and occupations: a review and analysis of 104 occupations. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* **16**, 734–46.
- 53) Hiro H (1997) Occupational stress and problem drinking. *Jpn J Alcohol & Drug Dependence* **32**, 450–1.