On the Reaffirmation of the Relationship Between the ODI and the DASS

My research was a Quantitative study that sought to reaffirm the previously explored relationship between the Occupational Depression Inventory (ODI) and Depression Anxiety Stress Scale’s (DASS) depression subscale. This was a topic that appealed to me due to my own struggles with mental health issues, and a want to further understand how it impacts work life. The ODI itself was recently developed by Schonfeld and Bianchi (2020), as a tool that would allow people to get a measure of work-ascribed depression. It had found significant relationships with a number of depression scales, and displayed convergent validity with the DASS for detecting cause-neutral depressive symptoms.

Being acutely aware of my position as a student, and limited ability to access participants, I toiled over how I would get a research question out of this. My “eureka” moment came when I realized that as a new scale, it really hasn’t been tested in all too many contexts. Specifically, students. So this was my starting point, ODI + DASS + Students = dissertation. Exactly what the hell I was thinking I will never know! Thanks to my supervisor, I was able to narrow down just exactly what I was going to do. I would run a linear regression analysis comparing the two scales, and to take it a step further, use factor analysis to see how the other predictor variables in my demographics affected this relationship. One tedious ethics application process later, it was ready to go to the masses! Midway through distributing my survey, on a whim, I emailed one of the authors Irvin Schonfeld about my interest in doing work on the ODI. He was very enthused that someone was working on his scale, though he did basically say that the idea for my dissertation was bad and that the ODI is not designed for being used on non-employed individuals. I walked away from that email a little discouraged, but I reasoned, well someone’s got to test this thing in a different context, as up until that point every study had only employed participants.

I accrued around 100 participants via my survey, though after deleting incomplete, and repeated measures I had a meagre N = 55. I ended up running around 4 different linear regressions each with different combinations of variables. I won’t bother you with that here. My simple linear regression containing the two variables had an R-squared = 0.27, P < 0.001. Though it was small, this meant the relationship between the two measures was significant and accounted for 27% of the variance in the model. I couldn’t technically accept the null hypothesis despite not getting the exact results I expected, that being that they would have a strong relationship, because it was significant, just small. I think there’s a metaphor in there. Though it might not have been the most ground-breaking or sexy study out there, it was small, and significant to me and I suppose that’s all that matters. Would I do it all again?

No probably not.