

## **To Study the Level of Stress among Management Trainees**

**Dr. Shine David\*; Pooja Agrawal\*\*; Surabhi Jain\*\***

\*Assistant Professor, Institute of Management Studies,  
Devi Ahilya University, Indore, India.

\*\*Student (MBA) Institute of Management Studies,  
Devi Ahilya University, Indore, India.

For correspondence: agrawalpooja261@gmail.com, jainsur93@gmail.com

---

### **Abstract**

*Stress is experienced in organizational roles as problems are encountered in performance of the role. The Nature of Stress can be investigated by number of Attributes. There is always a difference in a way of living, of man and woman. Naturally, this also concludes the level of stress they encounter must be different. There Sample was taken from lower and middle age group belonging to various industries having differentiated work experience of zero to One year. Study focused only the management trainees. This study focuses to ensure if stress is actually affected on the basis of Gender. It also helps better appreciation of differences in problems faced by Man and Woman differently. The results of the study can help in formulating a contingency model to enhance organizational performance and effectiveness.*

**KEYWORDS-** Role Stress, Management Trainee, Stressors.

### **Introduction**

Stress is an inevitable part of human nature. Origin can be sighted from the late 17th Century when it was recognized with behavior, attitudes, and personal traits, as meant by the Latin word: Stringer. Further, in the 18th and 19th Centuries, the meaning of stress was understood as synonymous to internal conflict and strain with reference to an object or person (Hinkle 1973). As such people don't reply directly to a stimulus, they respond to the observed meaning of it, in collaboration of their perception which is affected by Environment. Stress is not independent on

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)**  
**Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015**

the individual appraisal of what resources are available for meeting the required demands. The modern view of stress is that it arises from a lack of linkages between an individual and its environment when there is a lack of ability to cope with the demands made (Harrison 1978).

Role stress results when there is a problem in performance of the individual. When such problems are solved, the results come out as the reduction of role stress, since it can't be eliminated. This finally results in the increased wellbeing of the role performer and enhanced performance organizational levels. This paper is focused on the study of organisational role stress as a dependent variable and personal variables such as gender as independent variables. Its target is to find the nature of role stress and to conduct an empirical analysis to determine whether role stress is differently affected on the basis of Gender or not. It also includes age (middle age groups), management levels (junior, middle), and qualification levels (middle, high qualification levels) as well as varied industry.

## **Review of Literature**

Stress can be understood by both wanted and unwanted events of life. Stress resulting from favorable events is called Eustress (means vital stress). On the other hand, stress as a outcome from unfavorable events is called Distress (means stress that causes harm). Distress has bad effects on the individuals' physical and mental growth.

The concept of role stress was introduced by **Kahn, et al. (1964)** he hypothesized majorly three role stressors (i.e., role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload). In this framework, role conflict included intra sender, inter role conflict, and person role conflict.

Earlier, there were two role stressors were measured, gradually **Beehr, Walsh and Taber (1976)** evolved a role overload scale comprising three items. However, this situation changed after the contribution made by **Pareek (1982)**, as before this research on role stress was restricted to role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload, which represented the complexities of work performance. Eventually in 1982 Pareek identifying eight role stressors which closely addressed the issues being faced in organizations by its employees. He hypothesized the "Your Feelings About Your Role" (**YFAYR**) Scale, which consist 40 items to measure inter role distance, role stagnation, role ambiguity, role erosion, role overload, role isolation, role inadequacy and self-role distance. Later, the scale was improved, by him only, through factor analysis, which led to division of role ambiguity into the new aspect of role ambiguity and role expectation conflict;

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)**  
**Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015**

and role inadequacy into resource inadequacy and personal inadequacy. Afterwards, a detailed role stress measurement scale comprising 50 items for the measurement of ten role stressors was realized. This instrument was called the Organizational Role Stress **(ORS) Scale (Pareek 1983)**. The Organization Role **(Pareek 1993)** is defined by the expectations of its role senders, which includes all the stakeholders for that particular role.

The ORS got this significance because in 2004 had made it mandatory for the measurement of role stress in organizations. The scale has been widely recognized for research on role stress **(Pestonjee 1999)**, and because the stressors mentioned in ORS were very much relevant for the company under study as reflected by studies on role stress **(Bhattacharya & Basu 2007, Dasgupta & Kumar 2009)**.

## **Methodology**

### **Objective of Study**

- To measure level of role stress among Male and Female Management trainees in selected organizations.
- To explore the factors affecting the role stress level of management trainees.

## **Hypothesis**

H01: There is no significant difference in the work life balance of male and female management trainees.

H02: There is no significant difference in the level of need of training program among male and female management trainees

H03: There is no significant difference in the importance given to the work role of male and female management trainees.

H04: There is no significant difference in the work pressure experience by male and female management trainees.

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)**  
**Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015**

H05: There is no significant difference in the inadequacy faced by male and female management trainees.

H06: There is no significant difference in the dissonance experienced by male and female management trainees between their personal values and work role.

H07: There is no significant difference in the level of ambiguity encountered by male and female management trainees regarding the importance of their work role.

H08: There is no significant difference between imbalance between organizational and personal roles of male and female management trainees.

H09: There is no significant difference in the barriers perceived by male and female management trainees in their development at their workplace.

H10: There is no significant difference in the level of organizational demand conflict experienced by male and female management trainees.

H11: There is no significant difference in the willingness of male and female management trainees to perform other role tasks.

H12: There is no significant difference in the work overload of male and female management trainees.

H13: There is no significant difference in the level of role isolation felt by male and female management trainees from other roles.

H14: There is no significant difference in the inability of male and female management trainees to perform work role.

H15: There is no significant difference in the male and female management trainees' ability and role demand.

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)**  
**Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015**

*H16:* There is no significant difference in the vagueness felt by male and female management trainees regarding their role's contribution in the organization.

## **Questionnaire**

Personal variable, i.e. Gender, was recorded for each respondent. The ORS scale (Pareek 1983), was referred and judgmental sampling was used for measuring the following role stressors by observing the frequency of behaviors associated with each role stressor.

- 1) Role overload (RO) arises when there are too many or very high expectations from one's work role.
- 2) Self-role distance (SRD) results when the role occupant experiences a conflict between the self and his/her work role; the role demands what the role avoids to do.
- 3) Role isolation (RI) results when the role occupant experiences lack of interaction and communication with the connected roles to his main role.
- 4) Role stagnation (RS) results from inability to take over a new role due to lack of competence for it.
- 5) Role erosion (RE) results when some of the important functions belonging to one's own role are performed by other roles.

For each role stressor, there were statements which define various attributes of role stress. Respondents are required to rate each item/statement from one to five (One denotes the most likely situation "Always" and five signifies the least likely situation "Never").

## **RELIABILITY**

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.885	.886	20

The Standard range of reliability is 0.5-1. Reliability testing of this questionnaire comes out to be 0.88 which signifies that reliability lies in standard scale.

## **Sample Size**

For this judgmental questionnaire was used by taking reference of Udai Pareek's role stress questionnaire. A total of 102 responses, from different industries were taken from Management trainees belonging to various streams viz. Marketing, Finance and HR.

## **Statistical Test**

For testing, initially reliability test of the questionnaire was done. Testing of Data was done by two methods- Factor Analysis and ANOVA through SPSS Software.

## **Limitations of the Study**

- The study does not include any bar for Industries, which availed a wide range of collection of Respondents.
- Due to limited time some factors were not covered, which could have contributed significantly in the study.
- The study is not confined to particular region, which have availed the sample from different regions.

## Findings and Analysis

The KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-olkin) measures the sampling adequacy, which should be greater than 0.5 for a satisfactory factor analysis to proceed. Large value for the KMO measure indicates that a factor analysis of the variables is a good idea. Another indicator of the relationship among variable is Bartlett's test of sphericity. Bartlett's test of sphericity is used to test the null hypothesis that the variable in the population correlation matrix are uncorrelated. The observed significance level is 0.000(table1). It is concluded that the strength of the relationship among variables is strong. It is a good idea to proceed with factor analysis for the data.

### KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.834
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	726.400
	df	190
	Sig.	.000

Further, a factor analysis was conducted, whose findings are tabulated as:

### Summary of factors extracted

S.No.	Factors and their loadings	Variables	variable loading
F1.	Role Overloading (3.054)	a)Work life balance b)Role burden c)Organizational and personal role imbalance	.800 .727 .680

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)**  
**Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015**

		d)Work pressure	.607
F2.	Self-role distance (2.675)	a)Conflict between abilities and role demand	.779
		b)Ambiguity regarding importance of work-role	.633
		c)Training and Development	.559
		d)Dissonance between personal values and work role	.520
F3.	Role isolation (2.392)	a)Separation of the work role from other 's work roles	.772
		b)Vagueness regarding work role's contribution in the organisation	.575
		c)Conflict among different expectations	.516
F4.	Role Stagnation (2.238)	a)Work role importance	.750
		b)Development Barriers	.621
		c)Personal inadequacy	.522
F5.	Role Erosion (1.567)	a)Inability to perform the work role	.766
		b)Willingness to perform other task	.678

The total Cumulated rotated loading is 59.496.

Also,

A one way **ANOVA** was conducted to identify the level of role stress among male and female Management trainees. The result can be described as:

For H01,  $F(1,100) = 3.003$ ,  $p = 0.86$ . Since the value of  $p$  is greater than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H01 is accepted. It concludes that there is no significant difference in the work life balance of male and female management trainees. The reason for the same can be



**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)**  
**Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015**

recognized as the males are busy in their social engagements and females in managing their household responsibilities.

For H02,  $F(1,100) = .904$ ,  $p = .344$ . Since the value of  $p$  is greater than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H02 is accepted. It concludes that there is no significant difference in the level of need of training among male and female management trainees because of the same qualification pursued by male and female management trainees.

For H03,  $F(1,100) = .745$ ,  $p = .390$ . Since the value of  $p$  is greater than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H03 is accepted. It concludes that there is no significant difference in the importance given to the work role of male and female management trainees because both the male and female are at the same level of designation in the organization that is Management trainee.

For H04,  $F(1,100) = 1.587$ ,  $p = .211$ . Since the value of  $p$  is greater than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H04 is accepted. It concludes that there is no significant difference in the work pressure of male and female management trainees which suggests a reason that organization do not discriminates between male and female employees.

For H05,  $F(1,100) = 1.042$ ,  $p = .310$ . Since the value of  $p$  is greater than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H05 is accepted. It concludes that there is no significant difference in the inadequacy faced by male and female management trainees because both male and female employees are working on same profile.

For H06,  $F(1,100) = 8.233$ ,  $p = .005$ . Since the value of  $p$  is less than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H06 is rejected. It concludes that there is a significant difference in the dissonance faced by male and female management trainees between their personal values and work role. This difference arose because of the different perception of males and females.

For H07,  $F(1,100) = 1.107$ ,  $p = .0295$ . Since the value of  $p$  is greater than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H07 is accepted. It concludes that there is no significant difference in the level of ambiguity experience by male and female management trainees regarding the importance of their work role. Because both of them are accountable to more than one superior which leads to different expectations of different superiors.

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)**  
**Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015**

For H08,  $F(1,100) = .018$ ,  $p = .893$ . Since the value of  $p$  is greater than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H08 is accepted. It concludes that there is no significant difference in the imbalance of organizational and personal roles of management trainees. The reason can be noted as being a trainee, its their very first experience in a professional environment.

For H09,  $F(1,100) = .084$ ,  $p = .773$ . Since the value of  $p$  is greater than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H09 is accepted. It concludes that there is no significant difference in the barriers experience by males and females management trainees in their development at work place. The reason for the same can be recognized that the organization's delegation of responsibilities is restricted to the practicing role.

For H10,  $F(1,100) = 2.090$ ,  $p = .151$ . Since the value of  $p$  is greater than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H10 is accepted. It concludes that there is no significant difference in the level of organisational demand conflict experienced by male and female management trainees because of the imbalance of personal and organizational life, demands are not fulfilled with the deadlines which leads to conflict.

For H11,  $F(1,100) = 5.366$ ,  $p = .023$ . Since the value of  $p$  is less than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H11 is rejected. It concludes that there is a significant difference in the willingness of male and female management trainees to perform other role's tasks. The reason for the same can be denoted that the females are too much occupied with their extra organisational responsibilities which restrict them to assume more responsibilities.

For H12,  $F(1,100) = 2.960$ ,  $p = .88$ . Since the value of  $p$  is greater than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H12 is accepted. It concludes that there is no significant difference in the work overload of male and female management trainees because both of them are assigned with the same level of authorities and responsibilities.

For H13,  $F(1,100) = .000$ ,  $p = .993$ . Since the value of  $p$  is greater than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H13 is accepted. It concludes that there is no significant difference in the level of role isolation felt by male and female management trainees' from other work roles. The reason can be noted that there is lack of motivation from the organization's part.

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)**  
**Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015**

For H14,  $F(1,100) = 1.060$ ,  $p = .306$ . Since the value of  $p$  is greater than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H14 is accepted. It concludes that there is no significant difference in the inability of male and female management trainees because they are not trained as per the job requirements.

For H15,  $F(1,100) = .000$ ,  $p = .988$ . Since the value of  $p$  is greater than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H15 is accepted. It concludes that there is no significant difference in the male and female management trainees' ability and role demand because the trainees prefer employability irrespective of their specific domain.

For H16,  $F(1,100) = 2.697$ ,  $p = .104$ . Since the value of  $p$  is greater than 0.05 (tabulated value), hence the null hypothesis H16 is accepted. It concludes that there is no significant difference in the vagueness felt by male and female management trainees regarding their role's contribution in the organization. The reason for this is the lack of understanding of contribution of their role in the company's overall objective.

## **Conclusion**

The level of role stress has been investigated in this study that- is there any difference between the level of role stress of male and female management trainees. By observing the data of the study, it is revealed that role stress experienced in the company under study is not based on gender i.e. **there is no significant difference in the level of role stress among male and female management trainees.**

Some stressors are being identified, on the basis of factor analysis, which comprises the organisational role stress. Since each role stressor results from a particular kind of problem experienced by the management trainees during the course of their role performance. Hence these role stressors are not uniform among the management trainees. A better understanding of different problems prevailing across the company would facilitate the organisations to easily identify the opportunities for improving individual and organisational performance and achieve effectiveness in different parts of the company.

As the role stressors are not uniform for all the management trainees, so there cannot be one uniform solution which holds good for the organisation as a whole. More likely what would be profitable is not to use a readymade solution instead specific and different solutions for different parts of the organisation. The findings of this study are of strategic importance as they can lead

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)**  
**Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015**

to the enhancement of organisational performance and effectiveness. It should also be noted that this study was conducted in different industries in India, and consequently, replication in other countries is warranted. Further, the research has potential to provide guidance to human resource managers in the generation of a framework that integrate the consequences and implications of the findings of this study.

## References

- Hinkle, L. E. (1973). The concept of stress in the biological and social sciences. *Science, Medicine and Man*, 1(1), 31-48.
- Harrison, R. V. (1978). Person-environment fit and job stress. In C. L. Cooper & R. Pyne (Eds.). *Stress at work* (175-205). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Selye, H. (1975). Confusion and controversy in the stress field. *Journal of Human Stress*, 1(2), 37-44
- Kahn, R. L, Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: John Wiley.
- Beehr, T. A., Walsh, J. T., & Taber, T. D. (1976), Relationship of stress to individually and organizationally valued states: Higher order needs as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61(1), 41-47.
- Pareek, U. (1982). *Organizational role stress scales (manual, scale, answer sheet)*. Ahmedabad: Navin Publications.
- Pareek, U. (1983). Organizational roles stress. In L. D. Goodstein & J. W. Pfeiffer (Eds.). *The 1983 annual* (115-123). San Diego, CA: University Associates.
- Gordon, J. (2004). *Pfeiffer classic inventories, questionnaires, and surveys for training and development*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Pestonjee, D. M. (1999). *Stress and coping - The Indian experience* (2nd ed.). New Delhi: Sage Publications.

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)**  
**Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015**

- Bhattacharya, S., & Basu, J. (2007). Distress, wellness and organizational role stress among IT professionals: Role of life events and coping resources. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 33(2), 169-178.
- Dasgupta, H., & Kumar, S. (2009). Role stress among doctors working in a government hospital in Shimla. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(3), 356-370.
- Pareek, U. (1993). *Making organizational roles effective*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishin

**APPENDIX**

**Total Variance Explained**

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	6.650	33.251	33.251	6.650	33.251	33.251	3.054	15.272	15.272
2	1.635	8.174	41.426	1.635	8.174	41.426	2.647	13.236	28.508
3	1.376	6.881	48.307	1.376	6.881	48.307	2.392	11.961	40.469
4	1.209	6.046	54.352	1.209	6.046	54.352	2.238	11.192	51.661
5	1.029	5.144	59.496	1.029	5.144	59.496	1.567	7.835	59.496
6	.972	4.860	64.356						
7	.907	4.535	68.892						
8	.781	3.904	72.796						
9	.769	3.845	76.640						
10	.640	3.202	79.842						
11	.607	3.036	82.878						
12	.558	2.789	85.667						
13	.490	2.448	88.115						
14	.423	2.116	90.231						
15	.418	2.089	92.320						
16	.408	2.042	94.363						
17	.381	1.907	96.270						
18	.303	1.515	97.786						
19	.247	1.237	99.022						
20	.196	.978	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotated Component Matrix <sup>a</sup>					
	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
VAR00001	.800				
VAR00005	.727				
VAR00011	.680				
VAR00015	.607				
VAR00018		.779			
VAR00009		.633			
VAR00002		.559			
VAR00008		.520			
VAR00010					
VAR00016			.772		
VAR00019			.575		
VAR00013			.516		
VAR00020					
VAR00004				.750	
VAR00012				.621	
VAR00007				.522	
VAR00006					
VAR00003					
VAR00017					.766

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)**  
**Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015**

VAR00014					.678	
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.						

**Descriptives**

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
VAR00001	Male	53	3.5472	1.08426	.14893	3.2483	3.8460	1.00	5.00
	Female	49	3.9184	1.07697	.15385	3.6090	4.2277	1.00	5.00
	Total	102	3.7255	1.09143	.10807	3.5111	3.9399	1.00	5.00
VAR00002	Male	53	3.6792	1.10547	.15185	3.3745	3.9840	1.00	5.00
	Female	49	3.8776	.99232	.14176	3.5925	4.1626	2.00	5.00
	Total	102	3.7745	1.05217	.10418	3.5678	3.9812	1.00	5.00
VAR00004	Male	53	4.2264	.89101	.12239	3.9808	4.4720	2.00	5.00
	Female	49	4.3878	.99617	.14231	4.1016	4.6739	1.00	5.00
	Total	102	4.3039	.94176	.09325	4.1189	4.4889	1.00	5.00
VAR00005	Male	53	3.1132	1.15460	.15860	2.7950	3.4315	1.00	5.00
	Female	49	3.3878	1.03715	.14816	3.0899	3.6857	1.00	5.00
	Total	102	3.2451	1.10298	.10921	3.0285	3.4617	1.00	5.00
VAR00007	Male	53	3.0566	1.11657	.15337	2.7488	3.3644	1.00	5.00
	Female	49	3.2653	.93040	.13291	2.9981	3.5325	1.00	5.00
	Total	102	3.1569	1.03163	.10215	2.9542	3.3595	1.00	5.00
VAR00008	Male	53	3.5094	1.29530	.17792	3.1524	3.8665	1.00	5.00
	Female	49	4.1837	1.05423	.15060	3.8809	4.4865	1.00	5.00
	Total	102	3.8333	1.22744	.12153	3.5922	4.0744	1.00	5.00
VAR00009	Male	53	4.2075	1.06263	.14596	3.9147	4.5004	2.00	5.00
	Female	49	4.4082	.83960	.11994	4.1670	4.6493	2.00	5.00
	Total	102	4.3039	.96256	.09531	4.1149	4.4930	2.00	5.00
VAR00011	Male	53	3.1321	1.20954	.16614	2.7987	3.4655	1.00	5.00
	Female	49	3.1633	1.12448	.16064	2.8403	3.4863	1.00	5.00
	Total	102	3.1471	1.16379	.11523	2.9185	3.3756	1.00	5.00
VAR00012	Male	53	3.8113	1.14450	.15721	3.4959	4.1268	1.00	5.00
	Female	49	3.8776	1.16606	.16658	3.5426	4.2125	1.00	5.00
	Total	102	3.8431	1.14965	.11383	3.6173	4.0689	1.00	5.00

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)**  
**Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015**

VAR00013	Male	53	3.9434	.88611	.12172	3.6992	4.1876	2.00	5.00
	Female	49	4.2041	.93496	.13357	3.9355	4.4726	1.00	5.00
	Total	102	4.0686	.91478	.09058	3.8889	4.2483	1.00	5.00
VAR00014	Male	53	2.2264	.97352	.13372	1.9581	2.4948	1.00	4.00
	Female	49	2.6939	1.06466	.15209	2.3881	2.9997	1.00	5.00
	Total	102	2.4510	1.04006	.10298	2.2467	2.6553	1.00	5.00
VAR00015	Male	53	3.0943	1.14798	.15769	2.7779	3.4108	1.00	5.00
	Female	49	3.5102	1.29297	.18471	3.1388	3.8816	1.00	5.00
	Total	102	3.2941	1.23150	.12194	3.0522	3.5360	1.00	5.00
VAR00016	Male	53	3.7736	1.08560	.14912	3.4744	4.0728	1.00	5.00
	Female	49	3.7755	1.02602	.14657	3.4808	4.0702	2.00	5.00
	Total	102	3.7745	1.05217	.10418	3.5678	3.9812	1.00	5.00
VAR00017	Male	53	3.0189	1.42087	.19517	2.6272	3.4105	1.00	5.00
	Female	49	3.2857	1.17260	.16751	2.9489	3.6225	1.00	5.00
	Total	102	3.1471	1.30799	.12951	2.8901	3.4040	1.00	5.00
VAR00018	Male	53	3.9623	.99927	.13726	3.6868	4.2377	2.00	5.00
	Female	49	3.9592	1.07934	.15419	3.6492	4.2692	2.00	5.00
	Total	102	3.9608	1.03332	.10231	3.7578	4.1637	2.00	5.00
VAR00019	Male	53	3.8113	1.02012	.14012	3.5301	4.0925	2.00	5.00
	Female	49	4.1224	.88111	.12587	3.8694	4.3755	2.00	5.00
	Total	102	3.9608	.96392	.09544	3.7715	4.1501	2.00	5.00



**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)**  
**Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015**

**ANOVA**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
VAR00001	Between Groups	3.508	1	3.508	3.003	.086
	Within Groups	116.806	100	1.168		
	Total	120.314	101			
VAR00002	Between Groups	1.001	1	1.001	.904	.344
	Within Groups	110.812	100	1.108		
	Total	111.814	101			
VAR00004	Between Groups	.663	1	.663	.745	.390
	Within Groups	88.916	100	.889		
	Total	89.578	101			
VAR00005	Between Groups	1.919	1	1.919	1.587	.211
	Within Groups	120.953	100	1.210		
	Total	122.873	101			
VAR00007	Between Groups	1.109	1	1.109	1.042	.310
	Within Groups	106.381	100	1.064		
	Total	107.490	101			
VAR00008	Between Groups	11.574	1	11.574	8.233	.005
	Within Groups	140.592	100	1.406		
	Total	152.167	101			
VAR00009	Between Groups	1.025	1	1.025	1.107	.295
	Within Groups	92.554	100	.926		
	Total	93.578	101			
VAR00011	Between Groups	.025	1	.025	.018	.893
	Within Groups	136.769	100	1.368		
	Total	136.794	101			

**International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)**  
**Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015**

VAR00012	Between Groups	.112	1	.112	.084	.773
	Within Groups	133.379	100	1.334		
	Total	133.490	101			
VAR00013	Between Groups	1.730	1	1.730	2.090	.151
	Within Groups	82.789	100	.828		
	Total	84.520	101			
VAR00014	Between Groups	5.564	1	5.564	5.366	.023
	Within Groups	103.691	100	1.037		
	Total	109.255	101			
VAR00015	Between Groups	4.403	1	4.403	2.960	.088
	Within Groups	148.773	100	1.488		
	Total	153.176	101			
VAR00016	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.993
	Within Groups	111.814	100	1.118		
	Total	111.814	101			
VAR00017	Between Groups	1.813	1	1.813	1.060	.306
	Within Groups	170.981	100	1.710		
	Total	172.794	101			
VAR00018	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.988
	Within Groups	107.843	100	1.078		
	Total	107.843	101			
VAR00019	Between Groups	2.465	1	2.465	2.697	.104
	Within Groups	91.379	100	.914		
	Total	93.843	101			