

Correlates of Personal and Entrepreneurial Traits and Stress among Executive Management Students in Delhi NCR

M. Venkatesan*, Shabnam Parveen**, Anubha Rohatgi***

Abstract

Stress is an integral part of professional life. In professional life, one encounters innumerable amount of stressors, which induces stress. However, an optimum level of stress can be said necessary for a healthy professional life. The literature sources found that the locus of control, personality, and entrepreneurial style have played an influential role in overcoming stress among working executive. With this assumption, present research is designed to examine the impact of personality, interpersonal relationship, personal traits, and entrepreneurial motivation with stress of executive management students. With incidental sampling method 64 executives turned management student were chosen for the study. The tools used in this study were standardised stress such as professional stress, MBTI, FIRO-B, general enterprising tendency test, self-efficacy, locus of control, and self-esteem scales. The statistical tools such as mean, standard deviation, correlation, T-test, regression analysis, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used in this study. Finding indicated that stress of executive management students were influenced by extroversion, introversion, sensing, intuitive, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving personality dimensions, and entrepreneurial motivation factors such as need for achievement, need for autonomy, creative tendency, moderate, and drive & determination had significantly predicted stress of executive management students. This research also established relationship between stress and personal traits such as self-efficacy, general self-efficacy, social self-efficacy, self-esteem. Locus of control had significantly in-

fluenced or predicted stress. Further results indicated that locus of control, personality type and entrepreneurial traits have positive impact on stress among executive management students; concurrently the personal variables such as self-efficacy and self-esteem have negative impact on stress. From the study, we conclude that improvisation in personality traits and the entrepreneurial motivation would make positive impact on stress among executive management students.

Keyword: Personality Dimensions, Personal Variables, Self Efficacy, Self-Esteem, Interpersonal Relationship, Entrepreneurial Motivation

Introduction

Today's world is a competitive world and every business organisation is competing with each other as well as against time to prove their own stability and sustainability. As a result professional work life has become increasingly demanding and challenging. The health psychologists had suggested five major categories of work stressors responsible for mounting pressure on an employee. They are such as intrinsic to the job, role in the organisation, video display terminal stress, relationship at work, and career development (Cooper, Cooper, & Eaken, 1988; Hedge, Erikson, & Rubin, 1992). The socio-economic and family background do play vital role in influencing stress in work situation (Swanson, Power, & Simpson, 1998). Even though the tolerance level of professional life

* Associate Professor, IIFT, New Delhi, India. Email: venkatesan@iift.edu

** Programme Associate at Assessment and Development center, IIFT, New Delhi, India.

*** Programme Associate at Assessment and Development Center IIFT, New Delhi, India.

also has increased, the globalisation process had brought technological advancement such as global communication networks through satellite, wireless technology, social networking sites, etc., which added more pressure among organisations especially on the people who work in the organisation.

Selye was one of the pioneers in the field of stress and defined stress “as a way of physical adaptation to new circumstances, a reply to irritations that disturb the individual balance” (Selye, 1949). Another definition was given by Greenberg and Baron (2000), who defined stress as “a complex pattern of emotional states, physiological reactions and related thoughts in response to external demands” (Greenberg & Baron, 2000). In other words stress arises when individuals perceive that they cannot adequately cope with the demands being made on them or with threats to their well-being (Lazarus, 2006). It is believed that an optimum level of stress is required to perform any task at work setting. The organisational and work related stressors are responsible for inducing stress among working professionals. Especially the job related stress is lying in a psychological continuum from positive to negative. Either situation/stressors could be viewed as challenging or threatening or else accommodative. Indeed, the increase in the level stress may lead to organisation’s related problems such as absenteeism, turnover, poor job performance, accidents and errors, and alcohol and drug abuse (Williams *et al.*, 2001).

The scenario of executive stress in multinational companies is beyond comparison because their workers collaborate with colleagues from other countries, where there is a chance of cross cultural conflicts and other work related problems creep in, which may lead to job related stress among its professionals (Haratani & Kawakami, 1999). Grant Thornton International Business Report revealed that in South Asian region on-the-job-stress has increasingly becoming hindrance for the organisations and gradually becoming an international phenomenon, and indeed, it is particularly affecting the business leaders. The report shows that in 2006, Chinese businessmen experienced increase in stress levels by 84%, followed by Taiwanese who exhibited 82% increase, Indians 79% and Russian 76%. The leading IT magazine in India had made a survey on call centre industry and revealed that the high attrition rates, employee demotivation, increase in recruitment cost were associated with higher degree of stress level prevailing among the call centre employees

(DQ-IDC, 2003). In fact, Hart and Cooper (2001) had explained this phenomenon as stress-strain approach which is based on four basic premises such as unpleasant emotional states, positive and negative reactions, adverse work experience, any single variable which causes stress. A survey conducted by Assocham on Corporate India executives who manages a turnover of more than 100 million US \$, revealed that 68% of the executives were inept at handling stress. (PTI, ET, 2007). The latest study conducted by Nielson revealed that the Indian working woman are the most stressed in the world. Indeed, 87% of Indian woman felt stressed most of the time, and 82% of them had no time to relax (Goyal, 2011).

The major causes for executive stress could be organisational related factors such as management, department, team, groups, organisational climate and culture etc. Indeed, most of the organisations do diligent work in the area of employee morale and employee engagement. The increasing demand of working organisations such as meaningful employee engagement beyond their job, expecting value addition in terms of overall business, business associateship, high performing teams, six sigma at all functional areas, etc., put undue pressure on employees. At times, the employee is expected to stretch himself or herself beyond their potential, reminds us the reminiscence of “Peter Principle” Peter & Hull, 1969). Indeed, every managerial level employee is playing the entrepreneurial role (Mintzberg, 1975) both in letter and spirit in every possible way, which adds more work pressure amongst employees. In most of the cases, if the stress level of the employee crosses certain limit, communication channel between all verticals and the team-based assignments will have its setback. The impact of executive stress leads to absenteeism, alcoholism, departmental conflict, misunderstanding between managers, subordinates etc.

The contemporary organisations demand dynamic, versatile and multi faceted personality with highest level of creativity and innovation and determination in an individual. Indeed, competition among business houses are increasing with rapid phase, the need of an hour is to find out what sort of permutation and combination of personality and determination would handle the stress level of an employee optimally. As far as working executives are concerned, not much of empirical work is shown in the light of personality attributes, entrepreneurial tendency, and executive stress related dimensions. Predicting

the level of stress among working executives and the psychological variables besides entrepreneurial tendency that is a motivational variable, which are influencing the stress, is the priority of this study. Thus, the present study would certainly add on value addition in terms of action research in the area of working executives and their stress especially in Delhi NCR.

Review of Literature

The personality attributes with stress variables among working executives are well research area in India. Khoury and Analoui's (2010) study on how Palestinian manager cope with stress reveals that employees who worked in private sector had experienced more stress than those who were working either public sector or NGO sector. Further, the study also revealed that the employees' personality type and their stress coping style were identified as primary stressors responsible for employee stress.

Idris, Dollard, and Winefield's (2010) study on lay theory explanations of occupational stress showed that individual factors played an important role in work stress and also individual traits as key to stress reduction rather than management interventions. This study identified new concept from external factors such as globalisation which impinges on work.

Nikolaou, Tomprou, and Vaicola's (2007) study on individual inducement and the role of personality implication for psychological contract found that extraversion and conscientiousness are associated with intrinsic psychological contract. On the other hand, neuroticism is associated with extrinsic psychological contract. The result also established relationship between personal variables such as extraversion, conscientiousness, and neuroticism with intrinsic psychological contract which may lead to create differences in stress level of an individual.

Suliman's (2007) study on emotional intelligence at work and its links with conflict and innovation revealed significant differences between employee's perception of emotional intelligence, conflict and readiness to create and innovate. This study is based on managers and researchers from Arab world.

Towell's (2001) study on personality differences and computer related stress among business students found that students specialised in MIS experienced a

significantly higher number of stressor than the juniors and MBA student in general and they also experienced greater average severity of stress than the pre-majors.

Chen and Silverthorne's (2008) study on the impact of locus of control on job stress, job performance and job satisfaction in Taiwan revealed that individuals with a higher internal locus of control experience lower level of job stress, higher level of job performance, and satisfaction. This study also examined the effectiveness of accountant's personality with locus of control in predicting level of job satisfaction, stress and performance in Taiwan.

Das and Singhal's (2003) study had explored the effect of job autonomy upon occupational stress among managers; 300 male managers were selected for the study. The findings of the study revealed that the managers with high job autonomy show less stress as compared to managers with low job autonomy.

Ho's (1995) study on Singapore executives in service sector-insurance, financial and banking: stress, personality and well-being shows that Type-A individuals had perceived and experienced more stress than their Type-B counterparts.

The Entrepreneurial Traits and Stress

Vakola and Nikolaou (2005) study on Attitudes towards organisational change: what is the role of employees' stress and commitment shows that highly stressed individuals demonstrate decreased commitment and increased reluctance to accept organisational interventions. This study had found negative correlation between occupational stressors and attitudes to change. It is also shown that the study results were not in the favour of the role of organisational commitment as a moderator in the relationship between occupational stress and attitude to change.

The Interpersonal Relation and Stress

McCormick and Barnett's (2011) study on teacher's attributions on stress and their relationships with burnout found that occupational stress attributed to personal failings negatively predicted personal accomplishment. This study defines centrality of stress attributed to student misbehaviour in predicting each of the three dimensions of burnout: depersonalisation, emotional exhaustion,

and personal accomplishment. Similarly, Aziz and Cunningham's (2008) study found that work stress and work-life imbalance are correlated with work holism, regardless of gender. This study shows that gender does not moderate the relations between work holism with work stress and work-life imbalance.

Bhattacharya and Guha (2006) conducted a study on stress and coping: A study on lady criminal lawyers of Kolkata city. A group of 34 lady criminal lawyers were selected for the study. The significant factors, which are generating stress, are busy schedule of work, odd duty hours, poor interaction, leading tendency of superiors, and poor interpersonal relationship among the colleagues in the work environment.

Potter, Smith, Strobel, and Zutra (2002) found that the interpersonal stressors at work place have influence on the employees. Interpersonal conflicts experienced in the work place also predict diseases and decline in well-being. Results proved that psychosocial environment of work place have unique effects on employee.

Personal Information and Stress

Chand and Monga (2007) examined the correlates of job stress and burnout among hundred faculty members from two universities. Respondents with internal locus of control, high social support, and high job involvement had experienced less stress. Results also revealed that, the maximum stress was reported by professors and minimum by assistant professors. Higher education can combat stress and burn out related problems among the faculty members.

Anitha Devi (2007) study aimed at identifying the degree of life stress and role stress experienced by professional women. A total sample of 180 women professionals belonging to six occupations were chosen for the study. The result showed science and technology professionals and doctors experienced significantly greater life and role stress followed by administrators and self-employed. Teachers and bankers experienced comparatively lesser stress in both role as well as life. It also showed that older person experience lower life stress and role stress. Younger people experience more stress as compared to older people. The greater the numbers of years of service, greater life and role stress. The lower the income, greater stress experienced *i.e.* stress decreases with increase in income.

Aminabhavi and Triveni (2000) revealed that managers experience significantly higher occupational stress than clerks. The fact is that managers have greater responsibility of his position than the clerks. Age, sex, coping strategies of bank employees do not influence their occupational stress.

Bhatia and Kumar (2005) studied occupational stress and burnout in industrial employees. A sample consisted of 100 employees belonging to supervisor and below supervisor level. Their experience/length of service varied from 2-6 and 7-12 years. Industrial employees at supervisor rank and below supervisor rank with more experience of service had more occupational stress due to more feeling of depersonalisation and more emotional exhaustion.

Virk, Chhabra, Kumar (2001) conducted a study on occupational stress and work motivation in relation to age, job level, and Type-A behaviour. They reported that age and job level can have strong influence on job stress.

From the review of literature, it has been observed that reasonable number of researchers have established a relationship between personal traits and stress among working professionals. The personality traits such as personality type (Khoury and Analoui, 2010), consciousness and neuroticism (Nikolaou *et al.*, 2007), emotional intelligence (Suliman, 2007), internal locus of control (Chen & Silverthorne, 2008), individual factor (Idris *et al.*, 2010), copying style and personality Type-A/Type-B (Ho, 1995; Virk *et al.*, 2001), conflict, (Suliman, 2007) had shown positive relationship with level of stress.

The motivational factors such as job involvement (Chand & Monga, 2007), job autonomy (Das & Singhal, 2003), readiness to create and innovate (Suliman, 2007) had a positive relationship with the level of stress and job performance and satisfaction. In the era of globalisation, educational qualification plays a vital role in career development and also plays a positive role in leveling stress. The educational qualification of business students with MIS majors (Towell, 2001; Chand & Monga, 2007), managers, clerks (Aminabhavi & Triveni, 2000), Science & Technology professionals, doctors, administrators, self-employed, teachers, and bankers (Anita Devi, 2007) had shown positive influence on stress.

On the other hand the interpersonal relationship (Bhattacharya & Guha, 2006) and interpersonal conflict

(Potter *et al.*, 2002) and variables among working professionals had negative impact on the depersonalisation, emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment. Similarly the occupational positions such as supervisor rank and below supervisor rank (Bhatia & Kumar, 2005) have strongly influenced with occupational stress. Surprisingly the organisational commitment, intervention and attitude to change (Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005) variables found to have no connection with occupational stress. Succinctly, the age, gender and coping strategies of bank employees (Aminabhavi & Triveni, 2000) have not influenced their occupational stress in relation between age and stress.

To sum up, the aforesaid researchers had done extensive research on stress using the samples consisted of employees, professionals belonging to supervisor, below supervisor, managers, faculties, science & technology professional, doctors, administrators, self-employed, teachers, bankers, professors, assistant professors, criminal lawyers, clerk, and students etc. As far as working executives who are into management education are concerned, not many studies have been done so far. The personal attributes personality variables such as thinking, feeling, intuition, judging, sensing, perceiving, introversion and extraversion (MBTI), interpersonal relationship variables, and entrepreneurial tendency are some of the essential components in managerial life in order to control the executive stress. But so far there is comprehensive study made in this regard. Thus, the present study is made to explore the relationship between personality variable, interpersonal relationship and entrepreneurial tendency and executive stress.

Research Methodology

Problem

A study of stress and its correlation with personal variables and entrepreneurial traits of executive management students in Delhi NCR Region.

Rationale

The literature review of the current study revealed that personality traits, personal attributes, and interpersonal relationship among working professionals have been playing a vital role in predicting stress level of the working professionals. Although the stress level of working

professionals across spectrum was predicted by personal, social, and organisational variables by numerous studies across the globe, the present study would be helpful in finding out the mediation variables causing stress among working professionals who were also doing a part time programme on management. The proposed study would enable to explore the relationship between subordinates, superiors, and their related stress. The intellectual capital of the working professional might be causing less sense of interaction and motivation with their respective colleagues. This research would be helpful to increase judgement, perceiving, and control over others.

Objectives

- To identify relationship between personality dimensions, personal traits, entrepreneurial components and interpersonal relationship and stress among executive students in management.
- To identify the difference between personality dimensions, personal traits, entrepreneurial components and interpersonal relationship and stress among executive students in management.
- To identify the variables such as personality dimensions, personal traits, entrepreneurial components and interpersonal relationship prediction on stress among executive students in management.

Hypotheses

- There will be a plausible relationship between personality dimensions, personal traits, entrepreneurial components and interpersonal relationship and stress among executive students in management.
- There will be a significant difference between personality dimensions, personal traits, entrepreneurial components and interpersonal relationship with stress among executive students in management.
- Personality dimensions, personal traits, entrepreneurial components, interpersonal relationships would be able to predict executive students' stress significantly and positively.

Sampling

The executives who joined the Masters in Business Administration programme and were working in and around Delhi-NCR with an experience ranging from three

years to fifteen years were chosen for the study. Incidental sampling techniques were used for the study. Out of 100 executives 64 executives had filled up the questionnaire with utmost care.

Instrument Used

The following instruments were administered on the selected sample and their responses were compiled and analysed with the help of statistical tools. Almost all the instruments used in this study were well established with different population. As a customary practice enough care had been taken to find out the suitability and reliability of all the instruments were meticulously tested with the selected sample. The various types of instruments or scales used in the study were mentioned as below.

MBTI Scale: Myers-Brigs type indicator instrument is a self-report questionnaire designed to make Jung's theory of psychological types which is useful in everyday life and it included 93 items to test participant's behaviour. MBTI is developed by Swiss Psychiatrist Carl G. Jung. Jung's psychological type theory defines eight different pattern of normal behaviour such as extraversion, introversion, perceiving, judging, sensing, intuition, thinking, and feeling.

FIRO-B Scale: Fundamental interpersonal relations orientation-behaviour (FIRO-B) is a theory of interpersonal relations, introduced by William Schultz in 1958. This theory mainly explains the interpersonal underworld of a small group. The theory is based on the belief that when people get together in a group, there are three main interpersonal needs they are looking to obtain – affection/openness, control, and inclusion. This scale has 54 items in order to help in assessing interpersonal relation.

The General Enterprising Tendency Scale (GET): The General measure of Enterprising Tendency (GET) test was developed in 1987-1988 by Dr Sally Caird and Mr Cliff Johnson at Durham University Business School, UK. This scale has 54 items which are designed to measure five dimensions of personality such as need for achievement, autonomy, drive and determination, risk taking, and creativity. These dimensions have been thought to be predictive of an entrepreneurial personality.

Stress Scale: Professional stress scale was developed by David Fontana and adapted from Managing Stress, The

British Psychological Society and Rutledge Ltd., 1989. This scale has 24 items.

Self-efficacy Scale: The General self-efficacy scale was developed in German by *Matthias Jerusalem* and *Ralf Schwarzer* in 1981. This scale has 10 items that are designed to assess optimistic self-beliefs to cope with a variety of difficult demands in life. The uniqueness of the scale is to assess optimism, which refers to personal agency, i.e., the belief that one's actions are responsible for successful outcomes.

“Self-efficacy is the belief in one's effectiveness in performing specific tasks” (Wikipedia), on the other hand Bandura (1977) had explained self-efficacy as efficacious and inefficacious activity, thought process and the feeling aspect of two individuals. As a result, both the individuals predict the future differently. Staples *et al.* (1998) suggested few sources of information based on which individuals form his or her judgements. The sources of information are performance accomplishments, vicarious experience, social persuasion, and physiological and emotional states.

As far as the social efficacy is concerned, it is one of the sub dimensions of self-efficacy. It is considered as how far an individual is confident enough in his or her ability to persuade and engaged in “social interaction tasks” in order to initiate and maintain interpersonal relationships” (Smith & Betz, 2000). Sherer, Maddux, Mercadante, Prentice-Dunn, Jacobs, and Rogers (1982) define social self-efficacy as personal efficacy expectancies in social situations.

Self-esteem Scale: The self-esteem scale was developed by Rosenberg. This scale has 10 items on a five-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Self-esteem is defined as individual's holistic emotional evaluation as well as his or her own worthiness (Hewitt, 2008). Indeed, it is being judgmental about one's own attitude towards oneself (Smith & Mackie, 2007).

Locus of Control Scale: According to Julian Rotter's (1960) investigation into how people's behaviours and attitudes affected the outcomes of their lives. This orientation is known as your “locus of control.” This scale has 29 items and each item has two options. There were few dummy items and the remaining items represents locus of control of an individual.

Reliability for each scales administered are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Reliability for Scales

No. of Scales	Scale	Mean	Cronbach Alpha	No of Items/Dimensions
1	MBTI	4.54	.69	93
2	FIRO-B	3.80	.68	6
3	GET	6.92	.54	5
4	Stress	.613	.66	24
5	Locus of Control	.316	.79	23
5A	Self Efficacy	3.97	.74	23
5B	General Self-Efficacy	4.22	.72	17
5C	Social Self-Efficacy	3.602	.50	6

Statistical Design

Structure design for this research has been designed as per the requirements of the objective to be fulfilled. In this research, analysis of variance, t-test, regression analysis

and correlation are used. Correlation or perspective research design is used to identify relationship among student, manager and executive.

Result and Analysis

Table 2: Correlation and Personal Variable and Stress

	Personal variable				
	Global Self-Efficacy GSE	Social Self-Efficacy	Self-efficacy	Self-esteem	Locus of Control
Stress	-.37**	-.18	-.36**	-.27**	.30*

Table 2 shows the Pearson’s correlation between personal traits variable and stress of working executive. It can be noted that general social efficacy, self-efficacy, and self-esteem were negatively correlated with stress while locus of control is positively correlated with stress (-.37, -.36, -.27 and .30 respectively). Ironically, the social self-efficacy was not correlated significantly with the stress.

Table 3: Correlation and Personality Dimension

	Personality traits							
	Extraversion	Introversion	sensing	Intuitive	thinking	feeling	judging	perceiving
Stress	-.21	.23	-.12	.16	-.33**	.34**	-.23	.18

Table 3 shows the Pearson’s correlation between personality dimension and stress of working executive. It can be noted that thinking personality type is negatively correlated with stress while feeling personality type is

positively correlated with stress, whereas extraversion, introversion, sensing, intuitive, judging, and perceiving personality type are not significantly correlated with the stress (-.33 and .34) respectively.

Table 4: T-Test between Stress and Introversion

	Introversion	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	F	Sig.
stress	>= 8.00	15.4857	7.45722	62	.401	4.201	.045
	< 8.00	14.8276	5.19663	60.357	.415		

Table 4 shows that the stress is significantly differing in high and low introversion-personality type among working executive (t=.401; P<0.45). This result depicts that working executive whoever is having high level of introversion-personality type prompt to have more stress than their counter part. High Introversion-M= 15.48, High Introversion-SD=7.45, Low Introversion-M=14.82, Low Introversion-SD=5.19.

Table 5: T-Test between Stress and Expressed Affection

	Expressed Affection	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	F	Sig.
stress	>= 3.00	13.4211	4.55377	62	-2.768	8.523	.005
	< 3.00	17.7692	7.98653	36.150	-2.511		

Table 5 shows that the stress is significantly differing in high and low expressed affection-interpersonal relation among working executive ($t = -2.77$; $P < 0.005$). This result depicts that working executive whoever is having lesser level of expressed affection prompt to have more stress.

High Expressed Inclusion-M= 13.42, High Expressed Inclusion-SD=4.55, Low Expressed Inclusion-M=17.76, Low Expressed Inclusion-SD=7.98.

Table 6: Predictors of Stress with Personality Variables

	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>Multiple R</i>	<i>R Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Regression	33.933	20	1.697	.765	.585	2.608	.006
Residual	24.067	37	.650				

Dependent Variable: stress
Predictors: Extroversion Introversion Sensing Intuitive Thinking Feeling Judging Perceiving

Table 7: Predictors of Stress with Personality Variables

<i>Independent variables</i>	<i>Standardised Coefficients</i>				
	<i>Beta</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Extroversion	-.019	.209	1	.008	.929
Introversion	.438	.214	2	4.192	.023
Sensing	1.043	.345	4	9.120	.000
Intuitive	1.140	.341	3	11.202	.000
Thinking	-.895	.243	3	13.544	.000
Feeling	-.523	.236	2	4.900	.013
Judging	-1.019	.341	3	8.926	.000
Perceiving	-.820	.331	2	6.127	.005

Dependent Variable: stress

Tables 6 and 7 show multiple regression analysis between personality dimensions with the stress. Overall variance is explained by the personality dimension on stress was 58% ($F = 2.61$, $P < .01$). It can be noted that introversion, sensing, and intuitive personality dimension ($B = .44$, $P < .023$; $B = 1.04$, $P < .00$; $B = 1.14$, $P < .00$ respectively) are

positively influencing stress. On the other hand, it can also be noted that thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving –personality type ($B = -.89$, $P < .00$; $B = -.52$, $P < .01$; $B = -1.02$, $P < .00$; $B = -.82$, $P < .00$ respectively) are negatively contributing to the stress.

Table 8: Predictors of Stress with Entrepreneurial Motivational Variables

	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>Multiple R</i>	<i>R Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Regression	18.397	7	2.628	.540	.292	3.241	.006
Residual	44.603	55	.811				

Dependent Variable: stress
Predictors: Need for Achievement need for autonomy Creative tendency moderate Drive and Determination

Table 9: Predictors of Stress with Entrepreneurial Motivational Variables

Independent variables	Standardised Coefficients				
	Beta	Std. Error	df	F	Sig.
Need for Achievement	-.104	.120	1	.753	.389
Need for autonomy	-.310	.119	1	6.837	.011
Creative tendency	.308	.124	2	6.206	.004
moderate	-.178	.128	2	1.929	.155
Drive and Determination	-.280	.116	1	5.761	.020

Dependent Variable: stress

Tables 8 and 9 show multiple regression analysis between entrepreneurial motivations with the stress. Overall variance is explained by the entrepreneurial motivation on stress was 29% ($F=3.24$, $P<.01$). Creative tendency ($B=$

.308, $p<.004$) is positively influencing stress. On the other hand, drive and determination and need for autonomy ($B= -.280$, $p<.020$; $B= -.310$, $p<.011$ respectively) are negatively contributing to stress.

Table 10: Predictors of Stress with Self Related Traits

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	Multiple R	R Square	F	Sig.
Regression	31.128	13	2.394	.697	.486	3.642	.000
Residual	32.872	50	.657				

Dependent Variable: stress
Predictors: Global Self Efficacy, Social Self Efficacy, Self Efficacy, Self Esteem and Locus of Control

Table 11: Predictors of Stress with Self Related Traits

Independent variables	Standardised Coefficients				
	Beta	Std. Error	df	F	Sig.
Global Self Efficacy	1.315	.429	3	9.390	.000
Social Self Efficacy	.846	.230	3	13.460	.000
Self Efficacy	-1.914	.529	4	13.088	.000
Self Esteem	-.229	.110	1	4.328	.043
Locus of Control	.380	.113	2	11.352	.000

Dependent Variable: stress

Tables 10 and 11 show multiple regression analysis between personal variable with the stress. Overall variance is explained by the personal variable on stress was 48% ($F=3.64$, $P<.00$). It can be noted that general self-efficacy, social self-efficacy and locus of control ($B= 1.315$, $p<.00$; $B=.846$; $P<.00$; $B=.380$; $P<.00$) are positively influencing stress. On the other hand, self-efficacy and self-esteem ($B= -1.914$, $p<.00$; $B= -.229$, $p<.043$ respectively) are negatively contributing to stress.

Discussion

Stress is an integral part of professional life. In professional life, one encounters innumerable amount of stressors,

which induces stress. However, an optimum level of stress is a necessary condition of a healthy professional life where the negative continuum of stress causes hypotension, heart disease etc concurrently positive continuum of stress helps in improving professional performance. Managerial life is a roller coaster where every manager has to maintain the equilibrium in a professional environment. Managing stress is an art where one supposes to maintain a balance between pleasure and pain. In order to manage the stressors and decrease the degree of stress, professionals need to utilize his or her personal resources also such as personality traits and motivational competencies. The present research is designed to examine the impact of

personality, interpersonal relationship, personal traits, and entrepreneurial motivation with stress of working executive.

The first hypothesis i.e. “There will be a plausible relationship between personality dimensions, personal traits, entrepreneurial components and interpersonal relationship and stress among executive students in management” is partially proven, as indicated by the result of Table 2 and 3. The findings suggest that general social efficacy, self-efficacy, and self-esteem were negatively correlated with stress while locus of control is positively correlated with stress (-.37, -.36, -.27 and .30 respectively), which means that the higher level of general self-efficacy, self-efficacy, and self-esteem are correlated with lower level of stress among working executive. On the other hand higher level of locus of control is correlated with the higher level of stress. As a whole, working executive who are having ability to achieve goal and to overcome obstacle and having self-regard, self-integrity experience lower level of stress and those who are dominated by the external locus of control experience higher level of stress. Our findings is in contrasts to the result of study done by Chen and Silverthorne’s in 2008, on the impact of locus of control on job stress, job performance and job satisfaction in Taiwan; it revealed that individuals with a higher internal locus of control experience lower level of job stress, higher level of job performance and satisfaction. This study also examined the effectiveness of accountant’s personality with locus of control in predicting level of job satisfaction, stress and performance in Taiwan.

Results also show that thinking personality type is negatively correlated with stress while feeling personality type is positively correlated with stress, which means that the high level of thinking personality is correlated with lower level of stress among working executive. On the other hand, high level of feeling personality is correlated with higher level of stress among working executive. As a whole, the working executive who are dominated by their thought process experience lower level of stress and those who are dominated by feeling experience higher level of stress. It was observed from the analysis that there was no relationship between entrepreneurial factors and stress.

The second hypothesis stating that “There will be a significant difference between personality dimensions, personal traits, entrepreneurial components and interpersonal relationship with stress among executive

students in management” is partially proven, as indicated by the result from Table 4 and 5. The findings reveal that stress is significantly differing in high and low introversion personality type among working executive ($t=.401$; $P<0.45$), which means that working executive whoever is having high level of introversion personality type prompt to have more stress than their counter part. The findings also show that there is significant difference in the level of stress experienced by working executive who are high and low on expressed affection ($t=-2.77$; $P<0.005$), which means that working executive whoever is having lesser level of expressed affection prompt to have more stress. Results also showed that there is no significant difference between entrepreneurial components and stress among executive students in management.

The third and the last hypothesis stating that “Personality dimensions, personal traits, entrepreneurial components, interpersonal relationships would be able to predict executive students’ stress significantly and positively” is proven, as indicated by the results of Tables 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11. The findings of Tables 6 and 7 reveal that, personality dimension explains 58% of variance in stress. It can be noted that introversion, sensing, and intuitive personality dimension ($B=.44$, $P<.023$; $B=.1.04$, $P<.00$; $B=1.14$, $P<.00$ respectively) are positively influencing stress, which means that working executive who had introvert nature, sensing ability and intuitions influence the level of stress. On the other hand, it can also be noted that thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving personality type ($B=-.89$, $P<.00$; $B=-.52$, $P<.01$; $B=-1.02$, $P<.00$; $B=-.82$, $P<.00$ respectively) are negatively contributing to the stress, which means that higher level of thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving negatively influences the level of stress among working executive whereas extroversion personality dimension have not significantly contributes to stress among working executive.

It can be observed from Tables 8 and 9 that overall variance explained by the entrepreneurial motivation on stress was 29% ($F=3.24$, $P<.01$). Further it is noted that creative tendency ($B=.308$, $p<.004$) is positively influencing stress, which means that higher level of creative tendency influences the level of stress among the working executive. On the other hand, drive and determination and need for autonomy ($B=-.280$, $p<.020$; $B=-.310$, $p<.011$ respectively) are negatively contributing to stress, which means that higher level of need for autonomy and drive and determination negatively influences the level

of stress among working executive whereas need for achievement and moderate (risk taking)-entrepreneurship variable have not significantly contributes to stress among working executives.

The findings from Table 10 and 11 shows that overall variance explained by the personal variable on stress was 48% ($F=3.64$, $P<.00$). It can be noted that general self-efficacy, social self-efficacy, and locus of control ($B= 1.315$, $p<.00$; $B=.846$; $P<.00$; $B= .380$; $P<.00$) are positively influence stress, which means that higher level of general self-efficacy, social self-efficacy, and locus of control contributes to the level of stress among the working executive. On the other hand, self-efficacy and self-esteem ($B= -1.914$, $p<.00$; $B= -.229$, $p<.043$ respectively) are negatively contributes to stress, which means that higher level of self efficacy and self esteem negatively influences the level of stress among working executive.

Conclusion

The findings reveal that working professionals with clear conviction with his or her work, individual with high self image, individual with thinking dominated personality type, and individual who have low expressed affection experience less stress as compared to working professional who have no control over his or her activities, professionals who were dominated by their feeling, and professional who are high on introversion-personality type bound to have more stress. It can be concluded from the result that personality dimensions such as extraversion, introversion, sensing, intuitive, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving had significantly predicted stress in which introversion, sensing, and intuitive personality dimension with (43%, 10.43%, 11.43% respectively) had emerge predominate factor with prediction stress. To some extent thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving-personality type (89%, 52%, 10% and 82%, respectively) also had predicted on stress among working professionals. It was also explored that entrepreneurial motivation factors such as need for achievement, need for autonomy, creative tendency, moderate, and drive & determination had significantly predicted stress in which creative tendency with 30% had emerge predominate factor with prediction stress. To some extent need for achievement, need for autonomy, moderate, and drive & determination (10%, 31%, 17% and 28%, respectively) also had predicted on stress among working professionals. It shows personal

variable such as self- efficacy, general self-efficacy, social self-efficacy, self-esteem, and locus of control had significantly predicted stress in which general self-efficacy, social self-efficacy, and locus of control (13%, 84% and 38% respectively) had emerge predominate factor with prediction stress. To some extent self-efficacy and self-esteem (19% and 22% respectively) also had predicted on stress among working professionals.

References

- Aminabhavi, V. A., & Triveni, S. (2000). Variables causing occupational stress on the Nationalized and non- nationalized bank employees. *Journal of Communication Guidance and Research*, 17(1), 20-29.
- Anitha Devi, S. (2007). Occupational stress: A comparative study of women in different occupations. *Prajnan*, 35(1), 61-74.
- Aziz, C., & Cunningham, J. (2008). Work holism, work stress, work-life imbalance: Exploring gender's role. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 23(8), 553-566.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bhatia, P., & Kumar, A. (2005). Occupational stress and burn out in industrial employees. *Indian Psychological Review*, 64(4), 191-198.
- Bhattacharya, S., & Guha, N. (2006). Stress and coping: A study on lady criminal lawyers of Kolkata city. *Intellectual Property Rights, Special Issue*, 67, 227-234.
- Chand, P., & Monga, O. P. (2007). Correlates of job stress and burnout. *Journal of Communication Guidance and Research*, 24(3), 243-252.
- Chen, J. C., & Silverthorne, C. (2008). The impact of locus of control on job stress, job performance and job satisfaction in Taiwan. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(7), 572-582.
- Cooper, C. L., Cooper, R.D., & Eaken, L. H. (1988), *Living with Stress*, Penguin Books, London
- Das, I., & Singhal, R. (2003). Effect of job autonomy upon occupational stress among managers. *Indian Psychology Review*, 60(1), 47-51.
- Goyal, M. (2011). *Indian women most stressed in the world: Nielsen survey*. Economic Times Bureau Jun 29.

- Greenberg, J., & Baron, R. A. (2000). *Behavior in organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hart, P. M., & Cooper, C. L. (2001). Occupational stress: Toward a more integrated framework. In N. Anderson, D.S. Ones, H.K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds), *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology* (vol 2: Personnel Psychology). London: Sage.
- Haratani, T., & Kawakami, N. (1999). Work, stress, and health '99: organization of work in a global economy. Retrieved from www.cdc.gov/niosh/stress99.html,
- Hedge, A., Erikson, W. A., & Rubin, G. (1992). Effects of personnel and organizational factors and sick building syndrome in air-conditioned offices, in Quick, J.C., Murphy, L.R., Hurrell, J.J. (Eds), *Stress and Well Being at Work*, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, pp.286-98.
- Hewitt, J. P. (2009). *Oxford handbook of positive psychology*. Oxford University Press. pp. 217-224
- Ho, J. T. S. (1995). The Singapore executive: Stress, personality and wellbeing. *Journal of Management Development*, 14(4), 47-55
- Idris, M., Dollard, M. F., & Winefield, A. H. (2010). Lay theory explanation of occupational stress: The Malaysian context. *Cross Cultural Management an International Journal*, 17, 135-153.
- Khoury, G., & Analoui, F. (2010). How Palestinian managers cope with stress. *Journal of Management Development*, 29(3), 282-291.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1966). *Psychological stress and the coping process*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McCormick, J., & Barnett, K. (2011). Teachers' attributions for stress and their relationships with burnout. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 25(3), 278-293.
- Mintzberg, H. (1975). The Manager's Job: Folklore and Fact. *Harvard Business Review*, 53(4), 49-61.
- Nikolaou, I., Tomprou, M., & Vakola, M. (2007). Individuals' inducements and the role of personality: Implications for psychological contracts. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(7), 649-663.
- Parker, H., & Williams, L. (2001). Alcohol, cannabis, ecstasy and cocaine: Drugs of reasoned choice amongst young adult recreational drug users in England. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 12, 397-413.
- Peter, L. J., & Hull, R. (1969). *The peter principle: Why things always go wrong*. New York: William Morrow and Company.
- Potter, P. T., Smith, B. W., Strobel, K. R., & Zutra, A. J. (2002). Interpersonal workplace stressors and well-being: A multiwave study of employees with and without Arthritis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 789-796.
- PTI. (2007). Majority of Indian CEOs fail to counter stress: Assocham. *The Economic Times*.
- Rani, S., & Mahalingam, V. T. (2003). A DQ-IDC INDIA SURVEY: BPO Employee Satisfaction Survey.
- Selye, H. (1949). Effect of ACTH and cortisone upon an anaphylactoid reaction. *Canada Medical Association Journal*, 61, 553.
- Smith, H. M., & Betz, N. E. (2002). An examination of efficacy and esteem pathways to depression in young adulthood. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49, 438-448.
- Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercadante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports*, 51, 663-671.
- Smith, E. R., & Mackie, D. M. (2007). *Social Psychology*, pp. 107.
- Suliman, A. (2007). Emotional intelligence at work: Links to conflict and innovation. *Employee Relations*, 29(2), 208-220
- Swanson, V., Power, K., & Simpson, R. (1998). A comparison of stress and job satisfaction in female and male GPs and consultants. *Stress Medicine*, 12(1), 17-26.
- Towell, L. (2000). Personality differences and computer related stress in business students. *American Journal of Business*, 16(1), 69-76.
- Vakola, M., & Nikolaou, I. (2005). Attitudes towards organizational change: What is the role of employees' stress and commitment? *Employee Relations*, 27, 160-174.
- Virk, J., Chhabra, J., & Kumar, R. (2001). Occupational stress and work motivation in relation to age, job level and type-A behaviour. *Journal of Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 27(1&2), 51-55.