

The Relationship between Psychological Hardiness and Demographic Variables of Employees at Automobile Industry

R. Jayashree^{1,2}, Dr. R. Rajendran³

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, Easwari Engineering College.

²Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Annamalai University.

³Associate professor, Research Supervisor, Department of Business Administration, Annamalai University.

Psychological hardiness is a personality characteristic that is accompanying with a person's ability to manage and respond to stressful life events with coping strategies that turn potentially unfortunate situations into a learning opportunity. This study is to analyse the level of psychological hardiness and its association with some demographic variables among employees working in the automobile industry. The sample of this study, which was chosen randomly based on the simple random sampling which consists of 156 employees. In order to achieve the aims of the research, a descriptive analysis approach was used, the psychological hardiness scale was adopted by the researchers and administered to the study sample after assessing its psychometric properties. The results of this research showed that there is no significant difference at the level of psychological hardiness among employees with regard to demographic variable such as age, gender, workplace, years of experience.

Keywords: Psychological hardiness, Demographic factors, employees.

1. Introduction

The concept of hardiness was introduced by Kobasa (1979), who defined it “as a resistance resource in the encounter with stressful situations”. Due to the psychological and personality traits of the employees in the work environment, some of the employees are less affected to their occupational and environmental pressure at their workplace in day-to-day activities. In contrast some of the employees are not able to tolerate the existing pressure. The researcher believes that the personality trait which exists among these individuals called the psychological hardiness. This hardiness makes them tolerate the stressful situations without experiencing any disorder. Having such an effectual personality trait the individuals at their job with high environmental and professional stress and pressure the productivity of the

employees will be high than those who don't have such trait.

Owning high levels of psychological hardiness is important for dealing with the demands of the job. Employees in the automobile industry are often exposed to high levels of stress due to long working hours, target, Competition and emotionally charged situations, which can lead to exhaustion and decreased job satisfaction. By having high levels of psychological hardiness, employees in automobile industry are better able to cope with the demands of the job and avoid burnout. This can lead to better job satisfaction, improved productivity, and a healthier work environment.

Hardiness (psychological), on the other hand referred to as psychological hardiness, personality hardiness, cognitive hardiness in the literature, it is a personality style first introduced by Suzanne C. Kobasa (1979). Further the concept of hardiness enlarged in their book (Maddi, S. R., & Kobasa, S. C. 1984) and a series of investigation by Salvatore Maddi, Kobasa and their graduate students of Chicago university (Kobasa, S. C. 1982; Kobasa, S. C., Maddi, S. R., & Courington, S. 1981; Kobasa, S. C., Maddi, S. R., & Kahn, S. 1982; Kobasa, S. C., Maddi, S. R., Puccetti, M. C., & Zola, M. A. 1985; Kobasa, S. C., Maddi, S. R., & Zola, M. A. 1983; & Kobasa, S. C., & Puccetti, M. C. 1983).

From the viewpoint of Kobasa, an individual with psychological hardiness has the three following personality traits:

- a. He trusts that he is able to control and affect the actions and considers the pressures as changeable.
- b. He is able to intensely feel commitment towards the actions he does.
- c. He expects that changing a high adversity increases growth and considers it as an part of life.

Hardiness has been proposed to safeguard the mental and physical effects of stress on the individual. According to research, hardiness improves mental health by facilitating coping and assessment strategies (Florian, Mikulincer & Taubman, 1995). The question of whether hardiness may be used to identify students who struggle with academic, social, emotional, and attachment adjustment was investigated by Mathis, Michele, Lecci, and Len (1999). The findings indicated that overall hardiness was a more accurate indicator of mental health than of physical health. It is frequently regarded as a crucial component of psychological resilience or as a route that leads to resilient results at the individual level (Bartone, P. T., & Hystad, S. W. 2010, Bonanno, G. A. 2004). There are also clear parallels between other psychological personality traits and hardiness. Main ones are dispositional optimism (Scheier, , M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985), sense of coherence (Antonovsky, 1987), locus of control (Rotter, J. B. 1966), and (SOC) self-efficacy (Bandura, A. 1997).

Researcher has exposed that psychological hardiness is positively correlated with the job satisfaction, well-being, mental and physical health of the employees. By considerate how psychological hardiness can support employee's well-being, that can help to them to develop the skills they need to flourish in their roles.

The psychological hardiness might be affected by factors such as age, gender, education level, marital status, type of employment, place of work, and work experience. Few studies

have yet been conducted on the subject, but their outcomes have been very inconsistent. By knowing how the socio-demographic variables that are connected with psychological hardiness, automobile industry can develop targeted interferences and support programs to help employees to cope up with stress and improve their mental and physical health. This study can help to recognize the potential differences in psychological hardiness among employees based on their socio-demographic characteristics, such as age, gender, and education level. This could be used to develop policies and programs that promote equity and fairness in the workplace, and ensure that all of them have access to the resources and support they need in their jobs.

2. Objective of the Study:

To study the relationship between demographic variables and psychological hardiness.

3. Methodology:

A descriptive study was conducted to carried out with the aim to determine the role of socio-demographic variable in predicting psychological hardiness of the employees. Permission was got from the concerned organization to collect the data from their employees. A sample of (156) employees was randomly selected through the simple random technique, from the automobile sectors. By using self-administered questionnaire data was collected from the participants. The research instrument consists of the tool include the socio-demographic data of the employees participating in the study (age, gender, marital status, qualification, monthly income, workplace, and years of experience) and the psychological hardiness.

The score estimate for the research scale has been assessed based on the responses derived from the percentage of the items. The items which is always answered was assigned a score of (3), the items which is sometimes answered were assigned a score of (2), and the rarely answered items were assigned a score of (1). Total scores were added and ranged in percentages. Score was assessed in percentages of the mean depending on the Likert scale. Depending on the Likert scale the percentage of the mean were assessed.

4. Statistical analysis

Table 1: Psychological hardiness with regard to age.

Age PsychologicalHardiness	Source ofvariance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Commitment	Between Groups	14.471	3	4.823	.286	.834
	Within Groups	2531.760	152	16.656		
	Total	2546.231	155			
Challenge	Between Groups	12.816	3	4.272	.193	.912
	Within Groups	3439.978	152	22.631		
	Total	3452.794	155			
Control	Between Groups	33.654	3	11.218	.649	.553
	Within Groups	2618.570	152	17.227		
	Total	2652.224	155			
Overall	Between Groups	97.694	3	32.564	.300	.835
	Within Groups	16501.903	152	108.565		

	Total	16599.599	155			
--	-------	-----------	-----	--	--	--

Df= Degree of freedom, F= F-statistic, Sig= Significance

From the above table 1 it is found that there is no significant difference among the psychological hardiness with regard to employee age.

Table 2: Psychological hardiness with regard to gender.

GenderPsychological hardiness		M	SD	t	df	p≤ 0.05	Sig
Commitment	Male	35.83	4.286	1.123	154	.258	N.S
	Female	36.69	3.595				
Challenge	Male	35.39	4.445	1.684	154	.074	N.S
	Female	36.85	5.070				
Control	Male	30.15	3.996	.578	154	.547	N.S
	Female	30.72	4.409				
Overall	Male	105.41	10.241	1.471	154	.127	N.S
	Female	107.98	10.431				

M=Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, t= t-test, df= Degrees of freedom, Sig= Significance.

From the above table 2 it shows that there is no significant difference among the psychological hardiness with to regard to employee gender.

Table 3: Psychological hardiness with regard to years of experience.

yearsPsychological hardiness		M	SD	t	df	p≤ 0.05	Sig
Commitment	> 10 years	37.68	3.944	.866	154	.345	N.S
	10 ≤ years	35.88	4.129				
Challenge	> 10 years	35.75	4.664	.214	154	.729	N.S
	10 ≤ years	35.92	4.752				
Control	> 10 years	30.33	4.548	1.711	154	.114	N.S
	10 ≤ years	30.66	3.854				
Overall	> 10 years	103.99	10.550	.386	154	.539	N.S
	10 ≤ years	104.45	10.279				

M=Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, t= t-test, df= Degrees of freedom, Sig= Significance.

From the above table 3 it shows that there is no significant difference among the psychological hardiness with to regard to employee years of experience.

Table 4: Psychological hardiness with regard to workplace.

Workplace PsychologicalHardiness	Source ofvariance	Sum ofSquares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Commitment	Between Groups	6.791	2	3.395	.204	.816
	Within Groups	2549.426	153	16.662		
	Total	2556.217	155			
Challenge	Between Groups	28.432	2	14.216	.641	.528
	Within Groups	3404.256	153	22.250		
	Total	3432.688	155			
Control	Between Groups	31.100	2	15.55	.937	.394
	Within Groups	2630.124	153	17.190		
	Total	2652.224	155			
Overall	Between Groups	69.761	2	34.880	.323	.725
	Within Groups	16533.838	153	108.064		
	Total	16599.609	155			

Df= Degree of freedom, F= F-statistic, Sig= Significance.

From the above table 4 it is found that there is no significant difference among the psychological hardiness with regard to employee workplace.

5. Discussion:

This research analysed the psychological hardiness of 156 employees using three c's: Commitment, control and challenge. The result shows that the employees had a psychological hardiness overall with fair level identified in each domain. The findings may have suggestions for the employee ability to cope with stress and become accustomed to changes in their work environment. The study suggests that several factors may contribute to the employee degree of psychological hardiness consists of the nature of work, lack of work-life balance and the individual differences. The results proved in the above tables showed that there is no significant difference between the age, gender, years of experience and workplace and the overall psychological hardiness score. It showed that these factors don't have impact on the level of psychological hardiness.

6. Conclusion:

The motive of this study is to identify the impact of demographic variables on psychological hardiness. From the study it reveals that demographic variable doesn't influence the psychological hardiness. The psychological hardiness is the traits which the individual possesses exclusive of his/her demographic factors but along with other situational factors this demographic factor would change the velocity of the individual hardiness towards their actions. It is assumed that further research could be conducted with different sample groups by using different research methodologies and techniques may provide another dimensions in regard to the psychological hardiness and demographic factors.

References

1. Kobasa SC. Stressful life events, personality, and health: an inquiry into hardiness. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 1979 Jan; 37 (1): 1
2. Leak, G. K., & Williams, D. E. (1989). Relationship between social interest, alienation, and psychological hardiness. *Individual Psychology*, 45(3), 369-375.
3. Engel jH, Siewerdt, Jackson, Wait, Sahyoun. (2011). Hardiness, depression, and emotional well-being and their association with appetite in older adults. *University of Maryland, the American Geriatrics society*, 482-487
4. Maki, L. G., & Hassan, B. M. Personality hardiness and its relationship to self-esteem among university instructors. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Researches*. 2011;8(31).
5. Abdul-Salam, T., & Safrat, S. A. Emotional intelligence and its relationship to shyness among students at the University of Baghdad. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Researches*, 2012;9(34).
6. Maddi, S. R., & Khoshaba, D. M. (2001). *Personal views survey* (3rd ed. revised). Newport Beach, CA: The Hardiness Institute.
7. Qaddumi, H. (2011). The influence of selected demographic variables on hardiness of EFL teachers in Palestine. *Journal of Al-Quds Open University for Research and Studies*, 25(1), 9-42.
8. McCalister, K., Dolbier, C., Webster J., Mallon M., & Steinhardt, M. (2006). Hardiness and support at work as predictors of work stress and job satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Promotion*. 20(3), 183-191.
9. Maddi, S. (2013). Personal hardiness as the basis for resilience in hardiness. *Turning stressful circumstances into resilient growth*, Chapter 2m <http://www.springer.com>. 20/07/2013 a 6h30.

10. Reinhoudt, C. (2004). Factors related to aging well: the influence of optimism, hardiness and spiritual well being on the physical health functioning of older adults. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Ohio State University. U.S.A.
11. Sezgin, F. (2009). Relationships between teacher organizational commitment, psychological hardiness and some demographic variables in Turkish primary schools, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(5), 630- 651.
12. Thakur, S., Chawla, J. (2016). Comparative study of psychological hardiness among teacher trainees in relation to gender. *International Education and Research Journal*, (1)2, 109-111.
- Wiebe, D. (1991). Hardiness and Stress Moderation: A Test Proposed Mechanisms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(1), 89-99.
13. Maddi, S., Kahn, S., & Maddi, K. (1998). The effectiveness of hardiness training. *Consulting psychology, Journal Practice and Research*, 50, 78-86.
14. McCalister, K., Dolbier, C., Webster J., Mallon M., & Steinhardt, M. (2006). Hardiness and support at work as predictors of work stress and job satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Promotion*. 20(3), 183-191.