



DOES ALTRUISTIC CALLING REDUCE PERCEIVED STRESS: EVIDENCE FROM CHINA

Xuanwei Cui¹

Zhejiang University of Finance and Economics

KEYWORDS

Altruistic Calling, Perceived Stress, Social support theory

ABSTRACT

Even though there has been much discussion about the relationship between altruistic calling and perceived stress, empirical research studies on the subject are scarce. By drawing on Social Support Theory, the current study aims to examine the impact of altruistic calling on perceived stress. The research design was a non-experimental quantitative design using a survey methodology. Data were collected from 94 students in three universities in the eastern region of China. The findings indicated that altruistic calling did not predict perceived stress, $\beta = .08$, $t(92) = 1.26$, $p = .21$. To conclude, the current study might play a key role in providing the groundwork for future research on the effects of altruistic calling on stress perception.

2181-2675/© 2023 in XALQARO TADQIQOT LLC.

DOI: **10.5281/zenodo.10204962**

This is an open access article under the Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.ru>)

¹ Economic School, Zhejiang University of Finance and Economics, Hangzhou, Zhejiang Province, China

ALTRUISTIK CHAQIRIQ QABUL QILINGAN STRESSNI KAMAYTIRADIMI: XITOYDAN DALILLAR

KALIT SO'ZLAR/ КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА:

altruistik chaqiruv, sezilgan stress, ijtimoiy qo'llab-quvvatlash nazariyasi

ANNOTATSIYA/ АННОТАЦИЯ

Garchi altruistik chaqiruv va idrok etilgan stress o'rtasidagi bog'liqlik haqida ko'p bahs-munozaralar bo'lgan bo'lsa ham, bu mavzu bo'yicha empirik tadqiqotlar kam. Ijtimoiy qo'llab-quvvatlash nazariyasiga asoslanib, ushbu tadqiqot altruistik chaqiruvning idrok etilgan stressga ta'sirini o'rganishga qaratilgan. Tadqiqot loyihasi tadqiqot metodologiyasidan foydalangan holda eksperimental bo'lmagan miqdoriy dizayn edi. Ma'lumotlar Xitoyning sharqiy mintaqasidagi uchta universitetning 94 talabasidan to'plangan. Topilmalar shuni ko'rsatdiki, altruistik chaqiruv sezilgan stressni bashorat qilmagan, $b = .08$, $t(92) = 1.26$, $p = .21$. Xulosa qilish uchun, hozirgi tadqiqot altruistik chaqiruvning stressni idrok etishga ta'siri bo'yicha kelajakdagi tadqiqotlar uchun asos yaratishda muhim rol o'ynashi mumkin.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there has been a dramatic proliferation of research concerned with the reliability of altruism (Cucciniello et al., 2022; Xi et al., 2022; Zare et al., 2023). One of the most fruitful areas of altruism research has focused on Altruistic Calling. Altruistic Calling refers to the exhibited purposeful behaviors of a leader to influence and improve the lives of others by means of service (Barbuto Jr. & Gottfredson, 2016; Peterson et al., 2017). Prior literature has examined the antecedent factors of Altruistic Calling from the angle of organizational behavior, such as emotional intelligence and trust (Barbuto Jr. et al., 2014; Du Plessis & Nel., 2015). Nevertheless, a substantial body of research has invariably focused on the consequences of Altruistic Calling (Petersen et al., 2017; Prakasch & Ghayas, 2019; Sahawneh & Benuto, 2018). For instance, the study conducted by Krog and Govender (2015) suggested that Altruistic Calling would be positively related to perceived empowerment among 257 employees in a fleet management organization. Likewise, employees' engagement in firms would increase under the leadership of executives who showed them altruism (Khan et al., 2020). Further, according to Rashid et al. (2019) and Rashid et al. (2019), Altruistic Calling was strongly related to organizational citizenship behaviors among employees in the workplace. However, few studies have reported the effects of Altruistic Calling on Perceived Stress.

Perceived Stress, a psychological term, has recently come into research focus and is being investigated in social studies (Huh et al., 2021; Teles et al., 2020). Perceived Stress refers to the subjective perception and evaluation of stress that is evoked by internal or external stimuli for an individual (Cohen et al., 1983). The extant research on perceived stress has shown that several psychologically related variables serve as antecedent factors

affecting Perceived Stress, such as ethnic identity (Espinosa et al., 2018), decision-making competence (Geisler & Allwood, 2018), burnout (Janko & Smeds, 2019; Makara-Studzinska et al., 2021), and cultural intelligence (Tabuse & Otsuka, 2023). Notwithstanding, most of the extant research on perceived stress has been conducted to empirically and theoretically examine the impact of Perceived Stress on its outcome variables (Gong et al., 2021; Peng et al., 2022). For instance, researchers have noted the role of perceived stress can result in depressive symptoms and psychological distress in educational settings in China and Portugal (Teles et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2021; Zhang Dong, et al., 2022; Zhang, Zou, et al., 2021). According to Liu et al. (2022), Chinese college students have been noticed to have a short-form video application addiction because they tend to be more prone to experience self-attrition and seek self-compensation under stress. Given that a growing number of professors in Portuguese universities have been required to perform more teaching and administrative duties, they would experience a stress response, such as emotional distress and burnout syndrome (Teles et al., 2020). Likewise, because the COVID-19 pandemic posed a threat to the physical and mental health of general populations, the study conducted by Yan et al. (2021) revealed that perceived stress was associated with emotional distress among participants in China.

Even though there is much discussion on altruistic calling and perceived stress in the literature, there is a paucity of data-based published research studies on the relationship between altruistic calling and perceived stress. To address this gap in the literature, the current study aims to examine the influence of altruism calling on perceived stress. The research question that guides the current study is: Does altruistic calling predict perceived stress among university students in the eastern part of China?

The researcher postulates that university students in China are likely to experience perceived stress when their professors exhibit purposeful behaviors to influence and improve their lives through service. The researcher provides the following rationale or theoretical reasoning for this proposition. According to Social Support Theory, “the importance of the role of perceived support suggests the need to consider both the interpersonal and the intrapersonal contexts in which supportive provisions become available”(Sarason et al., 1990). As far as the interpersonal context is concerned, students are likely to feel psychologically empowered to respond to issues in their lives when they observe their professors’ supporting and caring responses in the interpersonal environment. Regarding the intrapersonal setting, individuals might develop coping and resilience mechanisms that may help them deal more effectively with challenging and stressful circumstances when they perceive and engage with the supportive and care-giving relationships they are having with their professors. For instance, the study conducted by Szkody et al. (2020) found that the social support given to students would negatively moderated the relationship between students’ worry about COVID-19 and their psychological health. Likewise, the study conducted by McLean et al.(2022)suggested that first-year students with higher levels of social support reported lower levels of stress. The

researcher thus proposes the following hypothesis:

H1: Altruistic calling positively predicts perceived stress.

METHOD

Population and Sample

The research design was a non-experimental quantitative design using survey methodology. A convenient sampling sample method was utilized. The population for the current study was university students in the eastern part of China. Data were collected from 94 students in three universities in the eastern part of China. Based on the expected medium effect size of .15, power of .80, and a significance level of $\alpha = .05$ (Cohen, 1992), a sample size of 94 is sufficient to conduct a simple regression analysis for the current study.

Measure

The researcher created Chinese versions of measures for Altruistic Calling and Perceived Stress by following Brislin’s (1980) translation-back-translation procedure. To measure altruistic calling, one sub-scale of the Chinese version of the Servant Leadership Scale developed by Barbuto and Wheeler (2006), the Altruistic Calling Scale, was employed. The Altruistic Calling scale has three items. The Altruistic Calling Scale utilizes a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The score of the Altruistic Calling Scale is computed by summing responses across items and ranges from 3 to 15. The mean or average score of the Altruistic Calling Scale is calculated by dividing the score of the Altruistic Calling Scale by three, which is the number of items of the Altruistic Calling Scale. Previous research showed that the Altruistic Calling Scale had acceptable validity and reliability. For the current study, the Cronbach’s alpha for the Altruistic Calling Scale was .89, indicating a high degree of internal consistency among the items on the scale (Yockey, 2018, p. 106). The means of the individual items ranged from 2.96 to 3.11, with a mean on the total scale of 8.82 ($SD = 2.03$). The mean and standard deviation of the items of the Altruistic Calling Scale are provided in Table 1.

Table 1

Reliability Statistics for the Altruistic Calling Scale

Variable	Dimensio n	Ite m	Mea n	Std.Deviatio n	N	Cronbach’s Alpha
Altruistic Calling	-	AL1	3.11	1.01	9 4	.64
		AL2	2.76	0.77	9 4	
		AL3	2.96	0.87	9 4	
Scale Statistics: Mean = 8.82 Variance = 4.13, Std. Deviation = 2.03, N of items = 3						

To measure perceived stress, the Perceived Stress Scale developed by Cohen et al. (1983), was employed. The Perceived Stress Scale has 14 items. The Perceived Stress Scale utilizes a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The score of the Perceived Stress Scale is computed by summing responses across items and ranges from 14 to 70. The mean or average score of the Perceived Stress Scale is calculated by dividing the score of the Perceived Stress Scale by 14, which is the number of items of the Perceived Stress Scale. Previous research showed that the Perceived Stress Scale had acceptable validity and reliability. For the current study, the Cronbach’s alpha for the Perceived Stress scale was .89, indicating a good degree of internal consistency among the items on the scale (Yockey, 2018, p. 106). The means of the individual items ranged from 3.71 to 4.07, with a mean on the total scale of 54.19 (*SD* = 5.84). Overall, the participants’ responses on the scale indicated that they possessed a high degree of Perceived Stress. The mean and standard deviation of the items of the Perceived Stress Scale are provided in Table 2.

Table 2

Reliability Statistics for the Perceived Stress Scale

Variable	Dimension	Item	Mean	Std.Deviation	N	Cronbach’s Alpha
Perceived Stress	-	PS1	3.47	1.02	94	.69
		PS2	3.71	0.96	94	
		PS3	3.85	0.96	94	
		PS4	4.02	0.90	94	
		PS5	3.80	0.97	94	
		PS6	4.07	0.93	94	
		PS7	4.07	0.86	94	
		PS8	3.93	0.92	94	
		PS9	3.89	0.96	94	
		PS10	4.06	0.88	94	
		PS11	3.80	0.96	94	
		PS12	3.96	0.97	94	
		PS13	3.83	0.93	94	
		PS14	3.72	0.93	94	

Scale Statistics:

Mean = 54.19, Variance = 34.07, Std. Deviation = 5.84, N of items = 14

RESULTS

Table 3 displays the valid observations for the demographic variables: Gender, Age, Level of Education, and Field of Study. In regard to the frequency for each category of age, students who took part in the current study were 49(52.1%) males and 45(47.9%). With regard to the frequency for each category of age, 53(56.4%) students were between 18-20

years old, 24(25.5%) students were between 21-23 years old, and 17(18.1%) students who were between 24-26 years in the current study.

With regard to the frequency for each category of level of education, 69(69.1%) students from undergraduate schools and 29(30.9%) students from graduate schools participated in the current study.

In regard to the frequency for each category of Field of study, 23(24.5%) students studied in the field of Economics and Management, 33 students studied in the field of Culture, Art, and Humanity, and 38(40.4%) students studied in the field of Science and Technology.

Table 3

Frequencies for Demographic Variable: Gender, Age Group, Level of Education, and Field of Study

		Frequen cy	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulativ e Percent
Gender	Male	49	52.1	52.1	52.1
	Female	45	47.9	47.9	100
	Total	94	100	100	
Age Group	18-20 years old	53	56.4	56.4	56.4
	21-23 years old	24	25.5	25.5	81.9
	24-26 years old	17	18.1	18.1	100
	Total	94	100	100	
Level of Educati on	Undergraduate School	65	69.1	69.1	69.1
	Graduate School	29	30.9	30.9	100
	Total	94	100	100	
Field of Study	EM	31	33.0	33.0	33.0
	CAH	12	12.8	12.8	45.7
	ST	51	54.3	54.3	100
	Total	94	100	100	

Note. EM = Economics and Management; CAH = Culture, Art, and Humanity, ST = Science and Technology.

Table 4 presents the sample size (N), minimum and maximum, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis for the three items of the Altruistic Calling Scale. The means for each of the items on the scale ranged from 2.96 to 3.11. Because the skewness statistics of items of the Altruistic Calling Scale were between 0.87 and 1.01, which is less than two (West et al., 1995); and the kurtosis statistic of each item is between -0.44 and 0.57, which is less than seven (West et al., 1995), the data in the sample can be considered to have a normal distribution in the current study.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for the Items of the Altruistic Calling Scale

N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis			
							Statistic	Statistic	
AC1	94	1	5	3.11	1.01	0.10	0.25	-0.44	0.49
AC2	94	1	5	2.76	0.77	0.31	0.25	0.57	0.49
AC3	94	1	5	2.96	0.87	0.18	0.25	-0.43	0.49
Valid N (listwise)	94								

Note. AC = Altruism Calling.

Table 5 presents the sample size (N), minimum and maximum, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis for the three items of the Perceived Stress Scale. The means for each of the items on the scale ranged from 3.71 to 4.07. Because the skewness statistics of items of the Perceived Stress Scale were between -0.81 and -0.18, which is less than two (West et al., 1995); and the kurtosis statistic of each item is between -0.76 and 0.21, which is less than seven (West et al., 1995), the data in the sample can be considered to have a normal distribution in the current study.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for the Items of the Perceived Stress Scale

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Std. Error	Kurtosis	Std. Error
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
PS1	94	1	5	3.47	1.02	-0.56	0.25	0.07	0.49
PS2	94	1	5	3.71	0.96	-0.52	0.25	0.05	0.49
PS3	94	1	5	3.85	0.96	-0.59	0.25	-0.19	0.49
PS4	94	2	5	4.02	0.90	-0.58	0.25	-0.50	0.49
PS5	94	2	5	3.80	0.97	-0.45	0.25	-0.71	0.49
PS6	94	1	5	4.07	0.93	-0.81	0.25	0.21	0.49
PS7	94	2	5	4.07	0.86	-0.46	0.25	-0.76	0.49
PS8	94	2	5	3.93	0.92	-0.45	0.25	-0.67	0.49
PS9	94	1	5	3.89	0.96	-0.77	0.25	0.45	0.49
PS10	94	1	5	4.06	0.88	-0.81	0.25	0.59	0.49
PS11	94	2	5	3.80	0.96	-0.18	0.25	-1.02	0.49
PS12	94	1	5	3.96	0.97	-0.78	0.25	0.04	0.49
PS13	94	1	5	3.83	0.93	-0.38	0.25	-0.36	0.49
PS14	94	1	5	3.72	0.93	-0.23	0.25	-0.43	0.49
Valid	94								
N									

Note. PS = Perceived Stress.

Table 6 displays the results of two independent samples t-tests. The results showed that there was not a statistically significant difference in Altruistic Calling scores between male students and female students. Male students ($M = 2.90, SD = 0.65$) had the same score of Altruistic Calling as female students ($M = 2.98, SD = 0.71$), $t(92) = 0.52, p = .06, d = .04$. The results also showed that there was not a statistically significant difference in Perceived Stress scores between male students and female students. Male students ($M = 3.81, SD = 0.45$) had the same score of Perceived Stress as female students ($M = 3.94, SD = 0.37$), $t(93) = 1.47, p = .14, d = .30$.

Table 6

Results of the Independent-Samples t Tests with Altruistic Calling and Perceived Stress as the Dependent Variables

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	p	d
AC	Male	49	2.90	.65	92	.52	.06	.04
	Female	45	2.98	.71				
PS	Male	49	3.81	.45	92	1.47	.14	.30
	Female	45	3.94	.37				

Note. AC = Altruistic Calling; PS = Perceived Stress.

Table 7 displays the results of two independent samples t-tests. The results showed that there was not a statistically significant difference in Altruistic Calling scores between students from undergraduate schools and those from from graduate schools. Students from undergraduate schools ($M = 2.97, SD = .71$) had the same scores of Altruistic Calling as those from graduate schools ($M = 2.87, SD = .61$), $t(92) = 0.63, p = .53, d = .03$.

As shown in Table 8, there was not a statistically significant difference in Perceived Stress scores between students from undergraduate schools and those from graduate schools. Students from undergraduate schools ($M = 3.84, SD = .44$) had the same score of Perceived Stress as those from graduate schools ($M = 3.93, SD = .35$), $t(92) = 1.05, p = .30, d = .05$.

Table 7

Results of the Independent-Samples t Tests with Altruistic Calling and Perceived Stress as the Dependent Variables

	Level of Education	N	Me an	Std. Deviation	t	df	p	d
A C	Undergraduate School	65	2.9 7	.71	0.6 3	92	.53	.03
	Graduate School	29	2.8 7	.61				
PS	Undergraduate School	65	3.8 4	.44	1.0 5	92	.30	.05
	Graduate School	29	3.9 3	.35				

Note. AC = Altruistic Calling; PS = Perceived Stress.

Table 8 and Table 9 display the results of the one-way between-subjects ANOVA. The results showed that the Altruistic Calling scores did not vary based on the age groups, $F(2, 91) = 0.71, p = .50, \eta^2 = .02$. The results also showed that the Perceived Stress scores did not

vary based on the age groups, $F(2, 91) = 0.81, p = .45, \eta^2 = .02$.

Table 8

Descriptives for Altruistic Calling and Perceived Stress

	Age Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
AC	18-20 years old	53	3.01	0.70
	21-23 years old	24	2.83	0.51
	24-26 years old	17	2.86	0.80
	Total	94	2.94	0.68
PS	18-20 years old	53	3.84	0.43
	21-23 years old	24	3.96	0.48
	24-26 years old	17	3.85	0.24
	Total	94	3.87	0.42

Note. AC = Altruistic Calling; PS = Perceived Stress.

Table 9

Results of the One-Way between Subjects ANOVA with Altruistic Calling and Perceived Stress as the Dependent Variables

		Sum Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2
AC	Between Groups	0.65	2	0.33	0.71	0.50	.02
	Within Groups	42.01	91	0.46			
	Total	42.66	93				
PS	Between Groups	0.28	2	0.14	0.81	0.45	.02
	Within Groups	15.88	91	0.18			
	Total	16.17	93				

Note. AC = Altruistic Calling; PS = Perceived Stress.

Table 10 and Table 11 display the results of one-way between-subjects ANOVA. The results showed that the Altruistic Calling scores from students did not vary based on the field of study, $F(2, 91) = 2.31, p = .11, \eta^2 = .05$. Students who studied in the field of Culture, Art, and Humanity ($M = 4.08, SD = .30$) had same Altruistic Calling scores as those who those who studied in the field of both Economics and Management ($M = 3.64, SD = .53$) and Science and Technology ($M = 3.83, SD = .34$).

The Perceived Stress scores from students did not vary based on the field of study, $F(2, 91) = 2.64, p = .08, \eta^2 = .06$. Students who studied in the field of Culture, Art, and

Humanity ($M = 4.10, SD = .23$) had same Perceived Stress scores as those who studied in the field of both Economics and Management ($M = 3.78, SD = .44$) and Science and Technology ($M = 3.87, SD = .42$).

Table 10
Descriptives for Altruistic Calling and Perceived Stress

	Field of Study	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
AC	1. EM	31	2.99	0.63
	2. CAH	12	3.28	0.74
	3. ST	51	2.83	0.67
	Total	94	2.94	0.68
PS	1. EM	31	3.78	0.44
	2. CAH	12	4.10	0.23
	3. ST	51	3.87	0.42
	Total	94	3.87	0.42

Note. AC = Altruistic Calling; PS = Perceived Stress; EM = Economics and Management; CAH = Culture, Art, and Humanity; ST = Science and Technology.

Table 11
Results of the One-Way between Subjects ANOVA with Altruistic Calling and Perceived Stress as the Dependent Variables

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2
AC	Between Groups	2.06	2	1.03	2.31	.11	0.05
	Within Groups	40.60	91	0.45			
	Total	42.66	93				
PS	Between Groups	0.89	2	0.44	2.64	.08	0.06
	Within Groups	15.28	91	0.17			
	Total	16.17	93				

Note. AC = Altruistic Calling; PS = Perceived Stress.

Table 12 displays the results of the Pearson correlation analysis. The results showed that there was no relationship between Altruistic Calling and Perceived Stress, $r(92) = -.12, p = .21$.

Table 12

Results of the Pearson Correlations between Altruistic Calling and Perceived Stress

		AC	PS
AC	Pearson Correlation	1	.13
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.21
	N	94	94
PS	Pearson Correlation	.13	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.21	
	N	94	94

Note. AC = Altruistic Calling; PS = Perceived Stress.

H1 was tested using simple linear regression analysis at a significance level of .05 in SPSS. Preliminary analyses were also performed to ensure no violation of the assumption of normality (Yockey, 2018, p. 357). As shown in Appendix G, because the absolute value of the skewness statistic was less than two and the absolute value of the kurtosis statistic was less than 7 for both Altruistic Calling and Perceived Stress, the scores for both Altruistic Calling and Perceived Stress were treated as being normally distributed (West et al.,1995, p. 74). As shown in Table 13, a regression analysis was conducted with Altruistic Calling as the independent variable and Perceived Stress as the dependent variable. The researcher rejected the *H1* that Altruistic Calling predicted Perceived Stress. Altruistic Calling was not a significant predictor of Perceived Stress, $\beta = .08$, $t(92) = 1.26$, $p = .21$.

Table 13

Results of the Simple Regression Analysis with Perceived Stress as the Dependent Variable

	PS				
	B	Std. Error	β	t	p
(Contant)	3.63	.19		18.94	.000
AC	.08	.06	.13	1.26	.21
R ²	.02				
Adjusted R ²	.01				
F	1.58				
df	(1, 92)				

Note. AC = Altruistic Calling; PS = Perceived Stress.

DISCUSSION

The results of the statistical analyses for the demographic variable Gender demonstrated that there was no significant difference in altruistic calling and perceived stress between male and female students. These findings suggest that both male and female students perceive that their professors exhibit intentional actions to impact and enhance their lives via acts of service. These findings also suggest that both male and female university students have the same subjective impression and assessment of stress they

experience, whether it was elicited by stimuli that were internal or external in nature.

Moreover, the results of the statistical analyses for the demographic variable Level of Education demonstrated that there were no significant differences in altruistic calling and perceived stress between students from graduate schools and those from undergraduate schools. The results of the statistical analyses for the demographic variable Age Group indicated that there were no significant differences in altruistic calling and perceived stress among students who were 18-20 years old, 21-23 years old, and 24-26 years old. These findings could be explained by the fact that there isn't a big age gap between graduate and undergraduate students. In particular, because both graduate students and undergraduate students can be regarded as youngsters, they are likely to achieve equal altruistic calling and perceived scores.

Furthermore, the results of the statistical analyses for the demographic variable Field of Study showed that there was no significant difference in altruistic calling among students from the fields of Science & Technology, Economics & Management, and Culture, Art, and Humanity. These results showed that all students believed their professors acted with a purpose to impact and better their lives through service, regardless of the fields in which they were studying. Likewise, the results also showed that there was no significant difference in perceived stress among students from the fields of Science & Technology, Economics & Management, and Culture, Art, and Humanity. This result indicates that regardless of the student's academic backgrounds, they all have a similar degree of subjective awareness of the stress that was elicited by internal or external stimuli.

Finally, the results revealed that there was no relationship between altruistic calling and perceived stress. The research question examined whether altruistic calling can predict perceived stress among university students in the eastern part of China. Based on the simple linear regression analysis results, the researcher rejects *H1*, suggesting that altruistic calling does not predict perceived stress. This finding implies that students' subjective perception and evaluation of individual pressure are not considerably lessened, even in the case where professors exhibit intentional behaviors to impact and enhance the lives of university students through service. This finding is incongruous with the empirical study conducted by Szkody et al. (2020), which contended that social assistance provided to college students would adversely reduce the association between students' worry over COVID-19 and their psychological health. The study conducted by McLean et al. (2021), suggesting that first-year students with higher levels of social support reported lower levels of stress, is also contrary to this finding. The cause of this is unclear, although it could be related to the convenient sampling technique, which could skew the results (McMillan, 2016, p. 123). Therefore, it is advised that researchers use a random sampling technique in their upcoming investigations to "maximize the sample's representatives by eliminating bias" (Vogt, 2007).

CONCLUSION

The current study examined how altruistic calling affected perceived stress by drawing on Social Support Theory. The simple regression analysis showed that altruistic

calling did not predict perceived stress using a .05 level of significance. This finding can be explained by taking into account the bias introduced by the convenient sampling approach. As a result, this unexpected finding should be viewed with caution. In this regard, it is nevertheless recommended that professors demonstrate intentional actions to affect and enhance the lives of students through service in order to minimize the subjective sense of students' stresses. In this sense, the current study might play a key role in providing the groundwork for future research on the effects of altruistic calling on stress perception. Accordingly, the current study is an important first step in determining how university students in the eastern region of China perceive stress in relation to altruistic calling.

REFERENCES

- Barbuto Jr, J. E., Gottfredson, R. K., & Searle, T. P. (2014). An examination of emotional intelligence as an antecedent of servant leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 21(3), 315-323.
- Barbuto Jr. (Jay), J. E., & Gottfredson, R. K. (2016). Human capital, the millennial's reign, and the need for servant leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 10(2), 59-63.
- Brislin, R. W. (1980). Translation and content analysis of oral and written materials. *Methodology*, 389-444.
- Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 24(4), 385.
- Cucciniello, M., Pin, P., Imre, B., Porumbescu, G. A., & Melegaro, A. (2022). Altruism and vaccination intentions: Evidence from behavioral experiments. *Social Science & Medicine*, 292, 114195.
- Du Plessis, M., & Nel, P. (2015). The influence of emotional intelligence and trust on servant leadership. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 41(1), 1-9.
- Espinosa, A., Tikhonov, A., Ellman, L. M., Kern, D. M., Lui, F., & Anglin, D. (2018). Ethnic identity and Perceived Stress among ethnically diverse immigrants. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 20, 155-163.
- Geisler, M., & Allwood, C. M. (2018). Decision-making competence, social orientation, time style, and perceived stress. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9,440.
- Gong, Z., Wang, L., & Wang, H. (2021). Perceived Stress and internet addiction among Chinese college students: mediating effect of procrastination and moderating effect of flow. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 632461.
- Huh, H. J., Kim, K. H., Lee, H. K., Jeong, B. R., Hwang, J. H., & Chae, J. H. (2021). Perceived stress, positive resources and their interactions as possible related factors for depressive symptoms. *Psychiatry Investigation*, 18(1), 59-68.
- Janko, M. R., & Smeds, M. R. (2019). Burnout, depression, perceived stress, and self-efficacy in vascular surgery trainees. *Journal of Vascular Surgery*, 67(6), 1-11.
- Khan, M. M. S., Ghayas, M. M., & Kashif, S. (2020). Servant Leadership and organizational commitment. *New Horizons*, 14(2), 223-240.

Krog, C. L., & Govender, K. (2015). The relationship between servant leadership and employee empowerment, commitment, trust and innovative behaviour: A project management perspective. *Journal of Human Resource Management, 13*(1), 1-12.

Liu, H., Novotný, J. S., & Váchová, L. (2022). The effect of mobile phone addiction on PSand mediating role of ruminations: Evidence from Chinese and Czech university students. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 1057544.

Makara-Studzińska, M., Załuski, M., Biegańska-Banaś, J., Tyburski, E., Jagielski, P., & Adamczyk, K. (2021). Perceived Stress and burnout syndrome: A moderated mediation model of self-efficacy and psychological comfort among polish air traffic controllers. *Journal of Air Transport Management, 96*, 102105.

McLean, L., Gaul, D., & Penco, R. (2022). Perceived social support and stress: a study of 1st year students in Ireland. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 1-21*.

Peng, Y., Zhou, H., Zhang, B., Mao, H., Hu, R., & Jiang, H. (2022). Perceived Stress and mobile phone addiction among college students during the 2019 coronavirus disease: The mediating roles of rumination and the moderating role of self-control. *Personality and Individual Differences, 185*, 111222.

Peterson, C., DeSimone Jr, P. J., Desmond, T. J., Zahn, B., & Morote, E. S. (2017). Elementary principal wisdom: Teacher perceptions of leadership. *Journal for Leadership and Instruction, 16*(1), 44-48.

Prakasch, J. N., & Ghayas, M. M. (2019). Impact of servant leadership on turnover intentions in banking sector of Karachi. *RADS Journal of Business Management, 1*(1), 22-30.

Rashid, M., Tasmin, R., Qureshi, M. I., & Shafiq, M. (2019). A PLS analysis on the relationship between servant leadership and academicians OCB in MTUN universities. *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology, 8*(5), 1360-1368.

Sahawneh, F. G., & Benuto, L. T. (2018). The relationship between instructor servant leadership behaviors and satisfaction with instructors in an online setting. *Online Learning, 22*(1), 107-129.

Sarason, I. G., Sarason, B. R., & Pierce, G. R. (1990). Social support: The search for theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 9*(1), 133-147.

Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of health and social behavior, 385-396*.

Szkody, E., Stearns, M., Stanhope, L., & McKinney, C. (2021). Stress-buffering role of social support during COVID-19. *Family Process, 60*(3), 1002-1015.

Tabuse, M., & Otsuka, Y. (2023). Effects of cultural intelligence on perceived stress among the Japanese overseas workers. *Japanese Psychological Research, 1-17*.

Teles, R., Valle, A., Rodríguez, S., Piñeiro, I., & Regueiro, B. (2020). Perceived stress and indicators of burnout in teachers at Portuguese higher education institutions (HEI). *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(9), 3248.

Vogt, W. P. (2007). *Quantitative research methods for professionals*. Allyn & Bacon.

Wang, X., Lu, L., Wang, X., Qu, M., Yuan, L., Gao, Y., & Pan, B. (2021). Relationships between cross-cultural adaptation, perceived stress and psychological health among international undergraduate students from a medical university during the COVID-19 pandemic: A moderated mediation model. *Frontiers in Psychiatry, 12*, 783210.

West, S. G., Finch, J. F., & Curran, P. J. (1995). Structural equation models with nonnormal variables: Problems and remedies. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications* (pp. 56–75). Sage Publications, Inc.

Xi, J., Lee, M. T., Carter, J. R., & Delgado, D. (2022). Gender differences in purpose in life: The mediation effect of altruism. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 62*(3), 352-376.

Yan, L., Gan, Y., Ding, X., Wu, J., & Duan, H. (2021). The relationship between Perceived stress and emotional distress during the COVID-19 outbreak: Effects of boredom proneness and coping style. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 77*, 102328.

Yockey, R. D. (2018). *SPSS demystified: A simple guide and reference*. (3rd ed.). Taylor & Francis.

Zare, J., Aqajani Delavar, K., & Derakhshan, A. (2023). The impact of altruism on the emotions and English summary writing skills of L2 learners: An intervention study in light of positive psychology. *Language Teaching Research, 13621688231151632*.

Zhang, Q., Dong, G., Meng, W., Chen, Z., Cao, Y., & Zhang, M. (2022). Perceived Stress and psychological impact among healthcare workers at a Tertiary Hospital in China during the COVID-19 outbreak: The moderating role of resilience and social support. *Frontiers in Psychiatry, 12*, 570971.

Zhang, X., Zou, R., Liao, X., Bernardo, A. B., Du, H., Wang, Z., ... & He, Y. (2021). Perceived stress, hope, and health outcomes among medical staff in China during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychiatry, 11*, 588008.