

PERSONALITY AT WORK: A STUDY OF TYPE A-B

AMBER RAZA

College of Management Sciences
PAF-Karachi Institute of Economics and Technology
amber@pafkiet.edu.pk

Abstract

The objective of this study was to measure the impact of stressors on personality types in Call Centers. Based on literature survey five potential workplace stressors were identified, namely (1) Task Demands, (2) Role Demands, (3) Interpersonal Demands, (4) Organizational Structure and (5) Organizational Leadership. Based on the literature survey, a relationship model was developed that was inclusive of the above stressors, and three personality types, which were Type A, Type AB and Type B.

The sample size for the study was 100. The subjects were supervisors and agents drawn non-randomly from various Call Centers of Karachi. All the subjects completed a questionnaire comprised of 27 questions based on occupational stress index (Srivasta and Singh 1981) and AB Personality Continuum (National Institute of Safety and Health 1975).

The three personality types A, B & AB all go through stress, however it is the Type A, which thrives on stress.

The sources of stress measured in the study were Task Demand, Role Demand, Interpersonal Demands, Organizational Structure and Organizational Leadership.

The stressor that most contributed to the Personality type A's stress in the study was Interpersonal Demand (0.38), which is justified by the literature review as Personality type A are not team players and prefer to work alone.

Whereas Personality type B was stressed because of Role Demand (0.38) which is also proved by the literature review as personality type B are laid back and do not take their roles seriously. Hence it can be concluded that type A tends to cope well with stress as compared to type AB and type B. The performance of the respondents can be made better if the supervisors are aware of the personality types and thereby motivate them accordingly.

I. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The objective of this study was to measure the impact of stressors on personality types in Call Centers.

II Literature Review

II.I Stress

a) Conceptualizations and Definitions of Stress

The concept of stress has incurred several different meanings in the psychological literature due to the various stress perspectives that have been adopted. Thus, stress may be used to define an external event (or stimulus), a response, or appraisal of a situation (Cohen, Kessler, & Gordon, 1997). However, disparate uses of the one term can lead to confusion about its meaning and measurement, and may hinder comparisons of empirical research employing the concept. The definitions of stress commonly put forth in the literature will be briefly described below in order to demonstrate the different uses of the term, and to clarify the specific definitions that will be used in the current paper. The various theories and models of job stress all propose that the stress process originates with exposure to *stressors* (Mino et al. 1999). *Stressors* arising in the work environments are classified as *psychosocial* (e.g., time pressure) and/or *physical* (e.g., noise) (Israel et al. 1996). In the discussion that follows we describe the job stress process according to the widely used and accepted University of Michigan job stress model (Israel et al. 1996). In brief, exposure to *stressors* (either psychosocial or physical) can lead to *perceived stress*. *Perceived stress* can, in turn, lead to *short-term responses* to stress. These *short term responses* can be physiological (e.g., elevated blood pressure), psychological (e.g., tenseness), or behavioural (e.g., smoking as a form of coping). *Short-term responses* can then lead to *enduring health outcomes* of a physiological (e.g., coronary heart disease), psychological (e.g., anxiety disorder), or behavioural (e.g., nicotine addiction, alcoholism) nature.

Each of these steps in the stress process can be affected by a wide range of modifying variables (social, psychological, biophysical, behavioural and genetic factors). In addition, the process is not simply linear, as feedback loops may occur between different steps (e.g., enduring health outcomes may lead to increased vulnerability to continuing job stressors). In addition, physical and psychosocial stressors can interact to increase vulnerability to enduring health effects of job stress (Lindstrom 1987). Notable examples in this regard are noise (Blomkvist et al. 2005) and ergonomic exposures (Huang et al. 2002). Finally, recent evidence suggests that the effects of job stress on enduring health outcomes may be greater among lower socio-economic or occupational status groups. (Landsbergis 1999, 2003).

b) Stimulus or Environmental Stress Perspectives

Stimulus definitions of stress focus on external stimuli or events. An external stimulus is defined as stress when it is thought to cause some kind of effect or reaction on the organism. In the psychological literature, such stimuli have come to be referred to as stressors, although some researchers still adopt the term stress to define the same concept.

II.II Stressors

a) Working conditions and physical environment

Working conditions of jobs have been linked to physical and mental health. It was found that poor mental health related directly to unpleasant work conditions, physical effort and speed in job performance and excessive, inconvenient hours (e.g. shifts). In addition, researchers have found increasing evidence that repetitive and dehumanizing environments adversely affect physical health (Cooper & Marshall 1978; Kornhauser, 1965; Osipow, 1998; Osipow & Davis, 1988; Sharit & Salvendy, 1982).

b) Work and / or role overload

Work overload also known as role overload is considered to be a more important stressor for managers and “white-collar workers” than working conditions. It can be seen in terms of quantitative and qualitative overload. Quantitative overload refers to having too much to do, whereas qualitative overload refers to work that is too difficult for the incumbent to perform (French & Caplan, 1973). It has been theorized that “overload” in any system will result in a breakdown of some kind within the system. In one study conducted by French and Caplan (1973), it was found that quantitative overload was linked to cigarette smoking (a risk factor for coronary heart disease). They found that people with more telephone calls, office visits and meetings per given unit of work time were found to smoke significantly more cigarettes than people with fewer stressors of this nature. In a study by Margolis, Kroess and Quinn (1974) (as cited in Cooper & Marshall, 1978), quantitative work overload was significantly related to indicators of stress such as escapist drinking, absenteeism from work.

c) Task Demands

Task demands constitute the structure of the person’s job (degree of freedom or independence, interest and involvement in job, use of technology, working conditions and physical layout). Autonomy and leverage to do the work the way the employee feels comfortable tends to reduce job stress considerably. The physical environment of the workplace matters a lot, jobs with too much noise, overcrowded rooms, and premises; with interruptions, phone bells ringing, unsafe machinery putting employees lives at risk cause an increase in anxiety and stress level. Working in a place where the boss is constantly monitoring the employee can make the employee feel self conscious, on guard and nervous [Decenzo and Robbins-2002].

d) Role Demands

They include those pressures that the employee faces with defined role that he or she plays in the organization. Role Conflicts create expectations that may be difficult to fulfill or meet. Role overloaded is when an individual is given too much work to do in a short span of time. Role ambiguity is generated when the individual is not clear about what he is expected to do his reporting relationships and responsibilities. [Decenzo and Robbins-2002].

e) Interpersonal Demands

These pressures are created due to peers, other colleagues and coworkers. Sometimes the individual is involved in an unfriendly and hostile working environment. His colleagues become uncooperative and non supportive when he is new into the organization or needs help in some regard and the boss is too unfeeling and inhuman. With no support from his boss and peers work pressures bog down the individual and stress escalates further. [Decenzo and Robbins-2002].

f) Organizational Structure

Sometimes the design of the job and policies of the organization can become the source of stress. Intensive rules and regulations to follow, centralized decision making whereby decision making rests with top management only and the employee is not given the opportunity to interfere or make decisions or to have his say in matters that affect him or are important to him are the examples of structured variables that create stress. [Decenzo and Robbins-2002].

Sometimes organizational life cycle creates different sorts of problems and pressures for employees. The establishment and the decline stage are quite stressful. Establishment stage includes excitement and instability, as the organization is to capture market share whereas, in decline stage organization sustain losses, employees are fired, there are layoffs. Fear of losing jobs and job insecurity inclines generate stress among employees. Stress is the least in the maturity and the growth stages where the organization is at its peak and the employees are satisfied. [Decenzo and Robbins-2002].

II.III PERSONALITY

Personality, defined as .the relatively stable behavioural patterns and attitudes of a given individual. (Costa & McCrae, 1985) is likely to play an important role. While personality was briefly alluded to in Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) transactional stress model as a determinant of primary appraisal, more attention needs to be given to the types of personality dispositions that make some people more vulnerable to certain stressors and others less so. Personality is a wide-reaching concept and it is possible that only some dimensions are likely to be relevant.

a) Personality and stress

Personality researchers, point to stable and enduring dispositions, which in their view explain why some persons are more vulnerable to stressful situations than others. Neuroticism, for example, is suggested to be linked to individual differences in emotional reactivity to stress (Costa & McCrae, 1985, 1987). Moreover, there is a growing body of evidence from very different populations, linking broad personality dispositions, such as, Neuroticism or Extraversion, but also lower-level or more specific traits, such as, Optimism to specific ways of coping and change thereof in a variety of potentially taxing situations.

Looking at findings brought forth by both lines of research, there is thus evidence for both diversity and flexibility, but also predictable order to the way individuals deal with stress.

b) Type A and Type B

Type A behaviour. “Type A” behaviour is characterized by a chronic sense of time urgency and an excessive competitive drive (Friedman & Rosenman, 1974). There is an established link between the “Type A” behaviour pattern and both perceptions of stress and stress-related outcomes. Froggatt and Cotton (1987) found that “Type As” created significantly more stress than “Type Bs” by increasing the volume of workload imposed on themselves when completing a fairly simple task. Zylanski and Jenkins (1970) showed that “Type As” placed themselves in more stressful work environments. “Type A” employees also work longer hours, take on more overtime, report higher levels of workload, greater supervisory responsibilities, and more role conflict than “Type B” individuals (Ganster, Sime & Mayes, 1989). Cumulatively, the research on “Type A” behaviour suggests that “Type A” individuals experience time pressures because they underestimate the time that is required to accomplish tasks; tend to work quickly and to show impatience and decreased work performance if forced to work slowly; ignore, suppress or deny physical or psychological symptoms while working under pressure, and report such symptoms only when the work is finished; work harder and experience physiological arousal when a task is perceived as challenging; express hostility and irritation in response to a challenge or threat; and need to be in control of the immediate environment to such an extent that a lack of control may elicit a hostile competitive response (Chesney & Rosenman, 1980) (Table 1). Furthermore, “Type A” behaviour, and specifically the hostility and anger that is associated with “Type A” behaviour, has been found to be related to heart disease (Friedman & Rosenman, 1974; Williams, 1989).

Table 1: Type A & B Personality

Type A	Type B
Competitive	Team player
Impatient & Perfectionist	Relaxed & forgiving
Workaholic	Enjoy vacations & leisure

Source: Friedman & Rosenman, 1974

The manner in which occupational stress affects the individual has been related to the personality type of the individual. An example is given in Robbins (1993), which describes the research done by Friedman and Rosen pertaining to the “Type A” personality who is three times more likely to suffer from coronary heart disease than the “Type B” personality. The “Type A” person tends to be impatient and is constantly striving to do as much as possible in the shortest period of time.

Atkinson (1994) refers to a ‘Type A working environment’, which encourages “Type A” behaviour whereby the employee is ‘expected’ to be hard-driven, ambitious and competitive. Atkinson (1994) indicates that the “Type A” working environment exposes the employee continuously to stress placing pressure on the individual to ‘become’ a “Type A” personality in order to keep his or her job.

Contrary to previously held beliefs that the impatient, hard-driving individual is more susceptible to heart disease, Robbins (1993) states that new evidence has linked mainly hostility and anger to heart disease, resulting in chronically angry and suspicious individuals being most at risk.

c) Coping and personality

Callan (1993) distinguishes between external and internal coping resources that assist the individual to overcome adverse or stressful events. Internal coping resources consist of the personality and cognitive factors that provide the psychological context for coping. Ashford (1988) refers to internal coping resources as consisting of self-efficacy, self-esteem, locus of control, freedom of self-denigration and the tolerance of ambiguity.

Self-efficacy concerns the control or mastery that the individual perceives that he or she has in order to deal with a given situation. Self-esteem is the positive regard that the individual has for himself or herself. The differences in locus of control have been shown to mediate the relationship of stressful life events and changes to depression and anxiety. Freedom of self-denigration entails the level of negative attitudes that the individual has for himself or herself. Tolerance of ambiguity is viewed as an important internal coping resource implying that individuals showing positive indications in these patterns and personality characteristics in individuals, Fleishman (1984) advocates that a strong self-esteem appears to have a positive effect in coping with stress. Self-efficacy is also considered to be a positive factor in coping with stress.

However, the underlying factor in coping appears to be ‘control’ or mastery, the belief that the individual can control aspects that affect himself or herself (Fleishman, 1984). Callan (1993) includes socio-emotional support and tangible support as external coping resources. Socio-emotional support assists in buffering the psychological distress that the individual experiences in times of crises. The types of social support may be divided into emotional assistance, for example caring and empathy and tangible support. Tangible support includes physical aid and could be in the form of financial support or offering information to assist the individual in order to cope with the stressful event.

Social support is usually provided by family, colleagues or friends. Ben-Sira (1985) indicates that where individuals have the self-confidence to overcome adverse life situations, one of the sources lies in the positive interaction between the individual and society. Individuals with supportive families tend to rely on active coping methods whilst individuals without supportive family systems reveal a tendency to use avoidance in order to cope with adverse life events (Callan, 1993).

III. Stress Moderators Model: The Role of Personality & Coping Styles

The stress moderators approach (Krantz & Hedges, 1987) suggests that individuals with certain personality dispositions may have tendencies towards using particular coping strategies when stressed, and maladaptive coping styles are thought to lead to adverse physiological and behavioural consequences. Some of the health behaviours discussed in the above dangerous behaviours model (e.g., smoking, alcohol consumption) may be used as a form of coping. However, such health behaviours are not considered as a coping style in the stress-moderators model until stress is perceived.

The “Type A” behaviour pattern is positively associated with emotion-focused coping (Endler & Parker, 1990; Greenglass, 1988; Pittner et al., 1983; Weidner & Matthews, 1978), which is consistent with the aggressive and hostile characteristics of this behaviour pattern. Other studies have identified that “Type As” are also more likely to use avoidance-focused coping (Endler & Parker, 1990), such as the suppression of aversive physical and emotional states (Pittner & Houston, 1980; Pittner et al., 1983). Some suggest that the suppressive coping strategies are used to allow the “Type A” individual to remain in proximity to the stressor in order for them to achieve their competitive (or otherwise ambitious) goals; however, with the negative consequences for health due to prolonged contact with the stressor (Houston, 1981; Matthews & Brunson, 1979; Smith & Anderson, 1986).

Watson and Hubbard (1996) also found that individuals with certain personality traits are more likely to adopt certain coping strategies to manage stressful or demanding situations; specifically associations were found between neuroticism and avoidant forms of coping; between conscientiousness and active, problem-focused coping; between extraversion and social support seeking and problem-focused coping; between openness and painful problem-solving that involved learning about the problem; and between agreeableness and positive appraisal problem-solving. Further, other studies have found introversion to be associated with less seeking of social support (Amir Khan, Risinger, & Swickert, 1995).

IV Methodology

The present study examines five potential workplace stressors namely Task Demands, Role Demands, Interpersonal Demands, Organizational Structure and Organizational Leadership. Three personality types are considered in the present paper, Type A, Type AB and Type B. A framework illustrating the stress-personality relationship is presented (see Figure 1).

Figure 1 Moderator in Stressor-stress relationship

As can be seen in the figure, personality is a moderator, which is a variable that intervenes in the causal relationship between two other variables, usually reducing the causal effect. In the stressor-stress relationship, moderators can either reduce the physiological response to the stressor or reduce the effect of stress on performance.

a) The Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 100 supervisors and agents at Call Centers, drawn on the basis of random sampling from different Call Centers based in Karachi. The respondents' function within the company included supervising and telemarketing. All the subjects completed a questionnaire comprised 27 questions based on occupational stress index (Srivasta and Singh 1981) and AB Personality Continuum (National Institute of Safety and Health 1975).

b) Instrument Employed in the Study

The questionnaire is a mix of Organizational Stress Index (OSI) developed by Srivasta and Singh 1981 and a Type A-B Continuum developed by National Institute of Safety and Health (NIOSH) printed in the Job Demands and Worker Health.

c) Occupational Stress Index

The Occupational Stress Index is questionnaire-based, and does not require on-the-job analysis. The Occupational Stress Index (OSI) is an additive burden model, which focuses on work stressors relevant to the cardiovascular system (Belkic et al 1995). The OSI incorporates elements of the Job Strain Model (Karasek 1979), as well as other formulations of how stress leads to cardiovascular disease, such as features of work in high-risk occupations. The underlying motivation for developing such an approach is to help pinpoint areas for intervention, by striving to reflect actual work experiences.

The Occupational Stress Index (OSI) can be tailored to specific occupations, thus allowing comparison among occupations of the stress burden faced by workers.

d) Type A-B Continuum

The questionnaire uses the Likert Scale; which is the most commonly used rating scale. The questionnaire consists of a set of declarative statements with which respondents are asked to indicate the degree of their agreement or disagreement.

V. RESULTS

V.I. MEASURE OF CENTRAL TENDENCIES

Measures of central tendency and dispersion classified by Stressors- Task Demand, Role Demand, Interpersonal Demand, Organizational Structure and Organizational Leadership and all personality types are presented in table 1 a. Highest level of stress is recorded by “Organizational Structure” (3.52) (Policies of the company and the design of the job). The lowest level of stress is generated by factors grouped under “Task Demand” (2.96) (i.e. the level of autonomy given to a person, working conditions etc). The following data (table 1a) is for all personality types i.e. Type A, Type B and Type AB, therefore the standard deviation is high, which indicates that the stress level felt by the respondents is dissimilar and there is extensive variation. Table 1b shows the data of type A and the overall stress felt by this personality type. The overall stress is relatively higher with 3.38 whereas the overall stress felt by personality type AB (table 1c) is 3.47 and overall stress felt by personality type B (table 1 d) is 3.11. The data supports the literature that the stress is felt most by personality type A and Type AB.

Table 1a: Central Tendencies of stressors and all personality types

	<i>Task Demands</i>	<i>Role Demand</i>	<i>Interpersonal Demands</i>	<i>Organizational Structure</i>	<i>Organizational Leadership</i>	<i>Overall Stress</i>	<i>Personality</i>
Mean	2.96	3.25	3.48	3.52	3.49	3.34	2.88
Standard Error	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.06
Median	3.00	3.40	3.50	3.33	3.38	3.31	2.83

According to the literature it is identified that type A personalities are not team players and this is further proven by the data given in table 1b where among stressors Interpersonal demands (3.50) is high. It is interesting to note that the Task Demand average is 3.00 which is considerably low but then Type A are workaholics therefore this is a proof that Tasks are not the major cause of stress among type A personalities.

The overall stress level (table 1 c) experienced by type AB is 3.47 which is high but that is because type AB personality has both the characteristics of type A and Type B identified in the literature survey. Similarly the highest level of stress is recorded by Organizational Structure 3.67. The respondents' opinions varied normally with standard deviation of 0.37 to 0.73.

Skewness for all determinants of stress were negative except Organizational Leadership with a value of 0.05. The negative skewness indicates that the majority of the respondents' opinions on the respective determinants were below the average level.

Table 1c: Central Tendencies of stressors and personality type AB

	<i>Task Demands</i>	<i>Role Demand</i>	<i>Interpersonal Demands</i>	<i>Organizational Structure</i>	<i>Organizational Leadership</i>	<i>Overall Stress</i>	<i>Personality AB</i>
Mean	3.06	3.44	3.59	3.67	3.58	3.47	3
Standard Error	0.11	0.07	0.08	0.11	0.11	0.07	0.06
Median	3.00	3.60	3.75	3.50	3.75	3.43	3.22
Mode	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.35	3.00
Standard Deviation	0.68	0.48	0.54	0.73	0.73	0.43	0.37
Sample Variance	0.47	0.23	0.29	0.53	0.54	0.19	0.14
Kurtosis	2.04	1.85	-0.45	-0.54	0.02	1.07	-1.09
Skewness	-0.29	-0.82	0.00	0.23	0.03	-0.47	-0.17
Range	4.00	2.60	2.25	3.00	3.00	2.11	1.11
Minimum	1.00	1.80	2.50	2.00	2.00	2.11	2.56
Maximum	5.00	4.40	4.75	5.00	5.00	4.22	3.67
Sum	128.50	144.40	150.75	154.33	150.50	145.70	131.56
Count	42.00	42.00	42.00	42.00	42.00	42.00	42.00

Table 1 d measures the central tendencies of the personality type B and the stressors- Task Demand, Role Demands, Interpersonal Demands, Organizational Structure and Organizational Leadership. The overall stress measured is 3.11, whereas Organizational Leadership and Interpersonal demands measured 3.33 and 3.27 respectively. The standard deviation is high which means the respondent's views vary significantly.

Table 1d: Central Tendencies of stressors and personality type B

	<i>Task Demands</i>	<i>Role Demand</i>	<i>Interpersonal Demands</i>	<i>Organizational Structure</i>	<i>Organizational Leadership</i>	<i>Overall Stress</i>	<i>Personality B</i>
Mean	2.78	2.91	3.27	3.25	3.33	3.11	2.26
Standard Error	0.15	0.11	0.16	0.13	0.09	0.09	0.03
Median	3.00	2.90	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.99	2.28
Mode	2.00	2.80	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.12	2.44
Standard Deviation	0.86	0.60	0.89	0.76	0.48	0.50	0.19
Sample Variance	0.74	0.36	0.79	0.58	0.23	0.25	0.04
Kurtosis	-0.83	-1.10	-0.22	0.13	-1.59	0.38	-1.53
Skewness	-0.32	-0.26	0.70	0.67	0.45	0.97	-0.13
Range	3.00	1.80	3.00	3.00	1.25	1.83	0.56
Minimum	1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.75	2.45	2.00
Maximum	4.00	3.80	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.28	2.56
Sum	89.00	93.20	104.50	104.00	106.50	99.44	72.22
Count	32.00	32.00	32.00	32.00	32.00	32.00	32.00

V.II PEARSON CORRELATION

To identify the moderating effect of personality types on each stressor a correlation matrix is developed. Each personality type is compared with the stressors studied in this paper.

a) Personality Type A

Correlation between Task Demand and Personality type A is (-0.16) which indicates that the stressor and the personality type A have a very weak relationship table 2 a. This stands true by Endler & Parker, 1990, who have identified that Type A use “avoidance method” which is the reason that Task demand has the weakest relationship with the personality type.

Table 2a- Correlation Matrix Stressor and Personality type A

	<i>Task Demands</i>	<i>Role Demand</i>	<i>Interpersonal Demands</i>	<i>Organizational Structure</i>	<i>Organizational Leadership</i>	<i>Overall Stress</i>	<i>Personality A</i>
Task Demands	1.00						
Role Demand	0.81	1.00					

Interpersonal Demands	0.33	0.58	1.00				
Organizational Structure	0.15	0.39	0.64	1.00			
Organizational Leadership	0.33	0.15	0.49	0.26	1.00		
Overall Stress	0.79	0.85	0.78	0.63	0.55	1.00	
Personality A	-0.16	0.07	0.38	0.29	0.29	0.18	1.00

However a relatively stronger relationship is found between Interpersonal demands (0.38) and type A which may be due to the hostility and anger that are associated with “Type A” behaviour which were identified by Friedman & Rosenman 1974 and Williams, 1989. Both Organizational Structure and Organizational Leadership have 0.29 each with the personality type A which is indicative of the fact that these stressors contribute to some extent to the overall stress level among this particular stress type.

b) Personality Type AB

Personality Type AB is a mix of the characteristics of both Type A and Type B personality. This is the reason that each stressor has a relatively weak relationship with each stressor. The weakest relationship is with Task demands with 0.09 & Role Demand has the strongest relationship with Role demand 0.26.

Table 2b- Correlation Matrix Stressor and Personality type AB

	<i>Task Demands</i>	<i>Role Demand</i>	<i>Interpersonal Demands</i>	<i>Organizational Structure</i>	<i>Organizational Leadership</i>	<i>Overall Stress</i>	<i>Personality AB</i>
Task Demands	1.00						
Role Demand	0.70	1.00					
Interpersonal Demands	0.20	0.52	1.00				
Organizational Structure	0.16	0.27	0.60	1.00			
Organizational Leadership	0.09	-0.09	0.25	0.63	1.00		
Overall Stress	0.61	0.64	0.72	0.81	0.62	1.00	
Personality AB	0.09	0.26	0.22	0.17	0.09	0.23	1.00

These figures are further justified by the literature survey that the personality Type AB has a mix of the characteristics of both personality Type A and Type B which help in moderating the impact of stressors on the respondents overall stress.

c) Personality Type B

Personality Type B experiences stress and is not able to cope with stress as well as personality Type A. This is the reason that the all stressors contribute to the overall stress level. Personality type B is relatively considered to be easygoing and lazy therefore they find the stressor Role Demand (0.38) to be the highest contributor to overall stress. Similarly Organizational Structure (0.31) has a stronger relationship in contributing to stress in Type B personality.

Table 2c- Correlation Matrix Stressor and Personality type B

	<i>Task Demands</i>	<i>Role Demand</i>	<i>Interpersonal Demands</i>	<i>Organizational Structure</i>	<i>Organizational Leadership</i>	<i>Overall Stress</i>	<i>Personality B</i>
Task Demands	1.00						
Role Demand	0.54	1.00					
Interpersonal Demands	0.09	0.53	1.00				
Organizational Structure	0.15	0.30	0.80	1.00			
Organizational Leadership	0.13	0.16	0.53	0.50	1.00		
Overall Stress	0.56	0.72	0.84	0.80	0.60	1.00	
Personality B	-0.02	0.38	0.28	0.31	0.16	0.31	1.00

Interestingly the stressor Task Demand has the weakest relationship with the personality Type B. This is again indicative of the fact that personality Type B does not take his / her Task seriously.

VI. HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Three different hypotheses were developed. An analysis was carried out to measure the relationships of the stressor's and the personality types. The results and the interpretation of the hypotheses are presented below:

VI.I Hypothesis one

H_{1₀} : There is no relationship between stressors and the personality type A

H_{1_A} : There is at least one stressors relationship with the personality type A

Multiple regression (table 3) was used to test the hypothesis and the summarized result is presented below.

Table 3 Multiple regression Stressors & Type A

Regression Statistics

Multiple R	0.58
R Square	0.34
Adjusted R Square	0.17
Standard Error	0.58
Observations	26.00

	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	5.00	3.41	0.68	2.02	0.12
Residual	20.00	6.76	0.34		
Total	25.00	10.17			

	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
Intercept	-0.06	1.31	-0.04	0.97	-2.78	2.67
Task Demands	-0.63	0.30	-2.10	0.05	-1.25	0.00
Role Demand	0.78	0.55	1.43	0.17	-0.36	1.92
Interpersonal Demands	0.04	0.45	0.09	0.93	-0.90	0.98
Organizational Structure	0.01	0.25	0.04	0.97	-0.52	0.54
Organizational Leadership	0.68	0.40	1.70	0.10	-0.15	1.51

A relationship does exist between the stressors and the personality type, however the p-value for Task Demands and Organizational Leadership is 0.05 and 0.10 respectively which indicates a stronger relationship with the “personality type A” therefore the alternate hypothesis of at least one stressor having a relationship with the personality type is accepted.

R^2 is 0.34 this indicates that the five stressors would cause a change of 34% in the personality type A. The regression coefficient for Task demand is -0.63 that indicates a reverse relationship between the stressor and the personality type A.

The F value is high and falls in the critical region, which means that there is variation in the means of the stressors.

VI.II Hypothesis two

H_{2_0} : There is no relationship between stressors and the personality type B

H_{2_A} : There is at least one stressor’s relationship with the personality type B

Multiple regression (table 4) was used to test the hypothesis and the summarized result is presented below.

Table 4 Multiple regression Stressors & Type B

Regression Statistics

Multiple R	0.79
R Square	0.63
Adjusted R Square	0.56
Standard Error	0.26
Observations	32.00

	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	5.00	2.91	0.58	8.76	0.00
Residual	26.00	1.73	0.07		
Total	31.00	4.64			

	Coefficients	Standard	t Stat	P-value	Lower	Upper
Intercept	0.69	0.24	2.84	0.01	0.19	1.19
Task Demands	-0.16	0.08	-2.03	0.05	-0.32	0.00
Role Demand	0.43	0.13	3.37	0.00	0.17	0.69
Interpersonal Demands	-0.25	0.12	-2.07	0.05	-0.49	0.00
Organizational Structure	0.21	0.11	1.84	0.08	-0.02	0.43
Organizational Leadership	0.27		0.09	2.86	0.01	0.07
				0.46		

A very strong relationship exists between all the stressors and the personality type B, as all the p-values for stressors between 0 to 0.08 which indicate stronger relationship with the “personality type B”. Therefore the alternate hypothesis of at least one stressor having a relationship with the personality type is accepted.

R^2 is 0.63, which indicates that the five stressors would cause a change of 63% in the personality type B. The regression coefficient for Task demand is -0.16 that indicates a reverse relationship between the stressor and the personality type B.

The F value is high and falls in the critical region which means that there is variation in the means of the stressors

VI.III Hypothesis Three

H_{3_0} : There is no relationship between stressors and the personality type AB

H_{3_A} : There is at least one stressor’s relationship with the personality type AB

Multiple regression (table 5) was used to test the hypothesis and the summarized result is presented below.

Table 5 Multiple regression Stressors & Type AB

Regression Statistics

Multiple R	0.48
R Square	0.23
Adjusted R Square	0.12
Standard Error	0.38
Observations	42.00

	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	5.00	1.59	0.32	2.15	0.08
Residual	36.00	5.32	0.15		
Total	41.00	6.91			

	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
Intercept	1.82	0.54	3.36	0.00	0.72	2.91
Task Demands	-0.21	0.12	-1.85	0.07	-0.45	0.02
Role Demand	0.50	0.18	2.74	0.01	0.13	0.87
Interpersonal Demands	-0.02	0.17	-0.12	0.91	-0.35	0.32
Organizational Structure	-0.06	0.13	-0.43	0.67	-0.33	0.21
Organizational Leadership	0.14	0.12	1.17	0.25	-0.10	0.38

A strong relationship exists between the stressors and the personality type AB, except for Interpersonal Demand, Organizational Structure and Organizational Leadership, which have a p-value of 0.91, 0.67 and 0.25 respectively. Therefore the alternate hypothesis of at least one stressor having a relationship with the personality type AB is accepted.

R^2 is 0.23 this indicates that the five stressors would cause a change of 23% in the personality type AB. The regression coefficient for Task demand is -0.21 that indicates a reverse relationship between the stressor and the personality type AB.

The F value is high and falls in the critical region which means that there is variation in the means of the stressors

The multiple regression to measure the relationship of stressors and personality types identifies that the personality type B has the strongest relationship with all the stressors used to measure the stress level among respondents in this paper. Whereas personality type A had a strong relationship with Organizational Leadership, Task Demands and Role Demands. Personality type AB were effected by stressors Task demands and Role Demands. This indicates that type A is able to cope and thrive under stress as compared to type B and type AB.

VI. IV. Interpretations of the Hypotheses

The three hypotheses ascertained that at least one stressor has an impact on the three personality types testing in the study. Personality Type B faced the most stress, which is also proven by the literature survey carried out in the study, therefore the data is validated. Similarly Personality Type A felt less stress due to the coping mechanism of this particular personality type. Since Personality Type AB has the characteristics of both Personality types A & B therefore this particular personality type also felt less stress as compared to Personality type B.

Overall it can be said that the current study proves that each and every kind of personality type helps in coping with stress.

VII. Conclusion

The three personality types A, B & AB all go through stress. However it is the Type A, which thrives on stress.

The sources of stress measured in the study were Task Demand, Role Demand, Interpersonal Demands, Organizational Structure and Organizational Leadership.

The stressor that most contributed to the Personality type A's stress in the study was Interpersonal Demand (0.38), which is justified by the literature review as Personality type A are not team players and prefer to work alone. Whereas Personality type B was stressed because of Role Demand (0.38) which is also proved by the literature review as personality type B are laid back and do not take their roles seriously. Hence it can be concluded that it type A tends to cope well with stress as compared to type AB and type B. The performance of the respondents can be made better if the supervisors are aware of the personality types and thereby motivate them accordingly.

REFERENCES

Amirkhan, J. H., Risinger, R. T., & Swickert, R. J. (1995). Extraversion: A "hidden" personality factor in coping? *Journal of Personality*, 63, 189 – 212.

Ashford, C.R., Managerial response to environmental induced stress, *Academy of Management Journal*, 6, pp. 260—272 1988

Atkinson, R. C. Introduction. *Proceedings of the Ciba Foundation Symposium on the origins and development of high ability: Vol. 178 (pp. 1-4).* Chichester: John Wiley & Sons (1994).

Ben-Sira, P.M., Comparative fit indices in structural models, *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, pp. 238—246. 1985

Blomkvist V, Eriksen W, Theorell T, Ulrich R, Rasmanis G. Acoustics and psychosocial environment in intensive coronary care. *Occup Environ Med* 2005;62:e1.

Callan, R.D., Job Demands and Worker Health, HEW Publication No. (NIOSH), pp. 75—160, Washington D.C (1993),

Chesney, M.A. and Rosenman, R.H., .Type A behavior in the work setting, in C.L. Cooper & R. Payne (Eds.) Current Concerns in Occupational Stress, John Wiley, London. 1980

Cohen, S., Kessler, R. C., & Gordon, L. U. (1997). Measuring Stress: A Guide for Health and Social Scientists. NY: Oxford University Press
Lovallo, W. (2004).

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. Personality disorders and the five factor model of personality. Journal of Personality Disorders, 4, 362-371, 1985

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. Four ways five factors are basic. Personality and Individual Differences, 13, 653-665. ,1987

Cooper, C.L. & Marshall, J. : Sources of managerial and white collar stress. In C.L. Cooper & R. Payne (Eds), Stress at work (pp.81-106) 1978

Decenzo D. A., Robbins S P : Human Resource Management: Concepts and Practices 2002

Endler, N S & Parker J D A Coping inventory for stressful situations Toronto Multi Health Systems 1990.

French, J.R.P. Jr. and Caplan, R.D Organizational stress and individual strain. In A.J.J Marrow (Ed.), The failure of success. New York NY: AMACOM 1973.

Friedman, M. and Rosenman, R.H., Type A Behavior and Your Heart, Times Books, New York. 1974

Froggatt, K.L. and Cotton, J.L., The impact of Type A behavior pattern on role overload-induced stress and performance attributions, Journal of Management, 13, pp. 87—90. 1987

Fleishman, J.A., (1984), Personality characteristics and coping patterns, Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 25, pp. 229—244

Folkman, S. and Lazarus, R.S., (1980), An analysis of coping in a middle- aged community sample, Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 21, pp. 219—239.

Fleishman, J.A. Personality characteristics and coping patterns. Journal of Health and Social behavior 25(1) 229-234 1984

Ganster, D.C. and Schraubroeck, J., (1991), Work stress and employee health, *Journal of Management*, 17, 2, pp. 235—271.

Ganster, D.C., Sime, WE. and Mayes, B.T., (1989), Type A behavior in the work setting: a review and some new data, in A.W. Siegman and T.M. Dembroski (Eds.) *In Search of Coronary-Prone Behavior: Beyond Type A*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey.

Greenglas E R A gender role perspective of coping and burnout *Applied Psychology An International Review* 39 (1) 5-27 1988

Houston, B. K. (1983). Psychophysiological responsivity and the Type A behavior pattern. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 17, 22 – 39.

Huang GD, Feuerstein M, Sauter SL. Occupational stress and work-related upper extremity disorders: concepts and models. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* 2002;41:298-314.

Israel BA, Baker EA, Goldenhar LM, Heaney CA, Schurman SJ. Occupational stress, safety, and health: conceptual framework and principles for effective prevention interventions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 1996;1(3):261-286.

Karasek R.A. Job demands, Job Decision Latitude and Mental Strain: Implications for Job Redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly* (24) 285-307
Belkic K, Savic C, Theorell T, Cizinsky S. Work Stressors and Cardiovascular Risk: Assessment for Clinical Practice. Part I. Stockholm (Sweden): Stress Research Reports. National Institute for Psychosocial Factors and Health. Section for Stress Research, Karolinska Institute, WHO Psychosocial Center; 1995. Report No.: 256.

Krantz & Hedges Individual differences and subjective stress and dissatisfaction at work, *Studia Psychologica*, 1, pp. 27—40. 1987

Kornhauser, A.. Mental health of the industrial worker. New York, NY: Wiley 1965

Landsbergis PA, Schnall PL, Warren K, Pickering TG, Schwartz JE. The effect of job strain on ambulatory blood pressure in men: does it vary by socioeconomic status? *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1999;896:414-6.

Landsbergis PA, Schnall PL, Pickering TG, Warren K, Schwartz JE. Lower socioeconomic status among men in relation to the association between job strain and blood pressure. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health* 2003;29(3):206-215.

Lindstrom K, Mantysalo S. Physical and chemical factors that increase vulnerability to stress or act as stressors at work. In: Kalimo R, El-Batawi M, Cooper C, editors. *Psychosocial factors at work*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1987:112-123.

Matthews, K. A., & Brunson, B. I. (1979). Allocation of attention and the Type A coronary-prone behavior pattern. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 2081 – 2090.

Margolis, B.L.; Kores, W.M. and Quinn, R.P. : Job stress A unlisted Occupational hazard, *Journal of Occupational Medicine*, 16, 1974.

Mino Y, Shigemi J, Tsuda T, Yasuda N, Bebbington P. Perceived job stress and mental health in precision machine workers of Japan: a 2 year cohort study. 1999;56(1):41- 45.

Osipow, S.H. Occupational Stress Inventory-Revised Edition(OSI-R). Professional Manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources. 1998

Osipow, S.H. & Davis A The relationship of coping resources to occupational stress and strain. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 32 1-15. 1988

Pittner, M. S., Houston, B. K., & Spiridigliozzi, G. (1983). Control over stress, Type A behaviour pattern, and response to stress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 627 – 637.

Pittner, M. S., & Houston, B. K. (1980). Response to stress, cognitive coping strategies, and the Type A behavior pattern. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 147 – 157.

Robbins, S.P., , Organizational Behavior: Concepts, Controversies and Applications, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs. (1993)

Sharit. J. & Salvendy, G Occupational stress: Review and reappraisal . *Human Factors* 24(2), 129-162 1982.

Smith, T. W., & Anderson, N. B. (1986). Models of personality and disease: An interactional approach to Type A behaviour and cardiovascular risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 1166 – 1173.

Srivastava, A.K. & Singh, A.P. : Manual of the Occupational stress Index, Department of Psychology, Banaras University, Varanasi, 1981.

Watson, D., & Hubbard, B. (1996). Adaptational style and dispositional structure: Coping in the context of the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality*, 64, 737 – 774.

Weidner, G., & Matthews, K. A. (1978). Reported physical symptoms elicited by unpredictable events and the Type A coronary-prone behavior pattern. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 1213 – 1220.

Williams, R., , The Trusting Heart: Great News About Type A Behavior, Times Books, New York. (1989)

Zylanski, S.J. and Jenkins, C.D., Basic dimensions within the coronary-prone behavior pattern, Journal of Chronic Diseases, 22, pp. 781—795. 1970

WEBSITES

www.psychweb.pdx.edu/.../stress_webnotes.htm

<http://www.workhealth.org/OSI%20Index/OSI%20Introduction.html>

<http://www.niosh.com>

Questionnaire

Appendix 1

Circle the number on the scale that represents the amount of the characteristics being rated. That is low numbers represent minimum amounts and high numbers represent maximum amounts. Thus, if you think there is very little of the characteristic associated with your job, circle 1. If you think there is a little, circle 2. If you think there is a lot of the characteristics, circle 4 and so on. For each scale circle only one number.

1. a. Do you lack power or influence in your job? 1 2 3 4 5

2. a. Are you certain about the exact requirements utilized? 1 2 3 4 5

d. Does your concept of expected behavior contradict the organizations concept of expected behavior? 1 2 3 4 5

e. Do you face a situation in your job in which contradictory expectations create inconsistency? 1 2 3 4 5

3 a Are you dissatisfied with your personal relationships at work? 1 2 3 4 5

b. Are you embarrassed to ask for help at work? 1 2 3 4 5

reciprocated by colleagues who make things difficult

4 a Do you have your say in decision making or in matters that affect you or are important to you? 1 2 3 4 5 b.

Do you have too many rules to follow, stringent policies to abide by and centralized decision making at your work place? 1 2 3 4 5

c. Are you under pressure to keep up with technological break throughs all the time? 1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

1 2 3 4 5

8. I thrive on challenging situations. The more challenges I have, the better 1 2 3 4
5 9. In comparison to most people I know I'm very involved in my work 1 2
3 4 5

10. It seems as if I need 30 hours a day to finish all the things I'm faced with. 1 2 3 4
5

11. In general I approach my work more seriously than most people I know 1 2 3 4 5

12. I guess some people can be casual about their work but I am not one of them

13. My achievements are considered to be significantly higher than those of most people

Personal Information

Company: _____

Gender:

1) Male

2) Female

Age:

1) 15 - 25

2) 26 - 35

3) 36 - 45

4) 46 - 55

5) 56 +

I know
Name:
Jo