REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of related literature is crucial in order to get an understanding of the variables included in the study. An insight into related review of literature also aids in hypotheses formulation and making predictions.

Today the pursuit of higher education and its accompanied stress is the most deliberated topic due to its impact on students and requires a lot of attention and research (Agolla, 2009; Ellison, 2004; Ongori and Agolla, 2008; Rees and Redfern, 2000). Academic stress is visible when demands exceed the aiding resources of an individual. When the student moves to an unfamiliar environment, he/she faces the challenge of confronting it and the transition of being separated from his/her previous familiar environment. Francis et al., 1987, Dyck, 2001, Grawitch et al., 2007 and Ongori, 2008 emphasise that, “most students are deficiently prepared for the psychological, emotional, and academic actualities of advanced education and this poses a great threat to the students’ lives and negates the positive gains that they would expect after completion of education”. Erkululu and Chafra (2006) opine that, when stress exerts too much pressure, an individual becomes disorganised, disoriented and cannot cope up adequately, resulting in stress related problems, psychological and physical unhealthiness (Fisher and Hood, 1987). Mac George et al., 2005 and Tennant, 2002 found that “if a student is not able to cope adequately with academic stress, severe psycho-social-emotional repurcussions may result”.

Agolla (2009); Maslach et al.(2007); Ongori and Agolla (2008) “identified stress symptoms as paucity of energy, satiating with counter medication, high blood pressure, despiritedness, increase or decrease in craving for food, lack of absorption, agitation, and tension among others. An individual experiencing one of these factors is likely to be a victim of stress. While the negative effects of stress on an individual may
vary considerably from one student to another, it is generally based on their previous encounter with situations and the resilience capacity of the student”.

Various authors namely Ongori and Agolla (2009), Ornelas and Kleiner (2003), Vermunt and Steenman 92005) and Topper(2007) identified causes of stress in educational environments as long sedentary durations, less than expected performance, imbalanced interpersonal relationships, shortfall of resources, lesser time to perform academic assignments, poor work conditions, oversstaffed work stations and lecture halls. Ongori, (2007), Awino and Agolla, (2008) and Fairbrother and Warn, 2003stressed that “excessive paperwork, too many assignments, competition with other students, failures, financial constraints, poor relationships with other students or lecturers, family or problems at home are also contributing factors”. It is a pertinent fact that in order to minimise the stress among students, the educational authorities must develop strategies that help identifying and assessing stress at the onset.

In the light of Yerkes Dodson’s law of arousal required level of stress can enhance learning and academic performance (Kaplan and Sadock, 2000), high stress levels in students may affect memory (Vondras et al.,2005). Choi et al.,2007; Elliot et al., 2005; Hofer, 2007; Robbins et al., 2006 found that “concentration, and problem-solving ability, leading to decreased learning, ineffective coping and diminished academic performance”. Dixon et al.,2008; Higginson,2006; Laio et al., 2007 and Wells, 2007 discovered that “lack of retention, increased physical and mental health problems affected stress resistance”. Bressler and Bressler (2007) found “that reduced self-esteem caused issues”, “Inappropriate self management choices” were quoted by Thud et al.,(2000) impaired information processing (Lok and Bishop 1999; Lopez and Gormity,2002; Silver and Glicken,1990) and disturbed social relations (Fairbrother and Warn,2004) accentuated stress”.

Thus, a conducive environment is better for learning, with the focal point being the students’ needs. Students’ notions vary with respect to their psyche and upbringing
which influences their approach towards the environment around them. Students at the college and university level have different prospects and values that they want to fulfil, which is only possible if the students’ expectations, goals, and values are congruent with that of the educational institution (Goodman, 1993).

### III.1 ACADEMIC STRESS AND PERFORMANCE

From a life-event stress perspective, embarking on a career presents a unique and significant challenge that lead to stress and adjustment difficulties (Sarason et al., 1978). Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005; Robotham and Julian, 2006; Tinto, 1993, and Hammer et al., 1998; Wan, 1992 acknowledge that “Stress is the most extensive part of the college students’ experiential training and they find it quiet demanding”.

Campbell and Svenson, (1992) and Misra and McKean, (2000) say that “Students picture experiencing emotional and cognitive reactions to this stress, especially due to external pressures and self-imposed assumptions”. The domains of a student’s life i.e. interpersonal, intrapersonal, academic or environmental are affected by severe stress (Jaramillo et al., 2004; Ongori and Agolla, 2008; Topper, 2007; Verment and Steenman, 2005) and the amalgamation of all affects reaction to stress and performance.

Macan et al., 1990 and Truman and Hartley, 1996 report that “Academic stress can be seen in coming to terms with course requirements, grade competition, controversies relating to time and task management”. There is a need to harmonise with advanced learning domains (Van-Rooijens, 1986) in terms of the mounting intricacies of the material to be lettered and the greater superlative of time required and endeavour to master it, the need to continually regulate self and to foster improvements in thinking skills and learning craft (Fram and Bonvillian, 2001). Examinations, writing term papers, boring instructors and consequently the decision of traditional, full time enrolment versus part time enrolment, are also suggested as a source of stress among the general college student population (Ting et al., 2006). Schafer (1996) considered these as daily hassles which were usually institution related.
Test or exam anxiety made students emotionally vulnerable (Fisher, 1994). Receiving a lower grade than expected also impinged upon the student’s health and cause a decline in scores (Evans and Fitzgibbon, 1992; Ratana, 2003). Greenberg, 1981, stressed that “Coupled stress in academic activities to negative outcomes such as deviating health”. Aldwin and Greenberger, 1987, “Projected despondency to be conclusively related to poorer academic performance”. Clark and Rieker, 1986 and Linn and Zeppa, 1984 corroborate similarly.

**Interpersonal interactions** with faculty, roommates, friends, peers, adjustment to the campus environment and lack of traditional support networks like family affected reactions to academic stress (Kariv and Heiman, 2005; Misra, 2000; Von Ah et al., 2004). Personal goals, social activities, financial burdens, managing multiple roles, including interpersonal relationships in the home and at work, dictate time management skills (Misra et al., 2000) and lead to changes in academic performance.

**Intrapersonal** stressors like emotional stress, apprehension, valuation of the gravity of the role demands and the students’ competence to endure the demands are bracketed with Stress (wan, 1992) and so are the associated stipulations of that are felt as immensely pressurising by the students (Murphy and Archer, 1996). Lesco and Summerfield, 1989 and Misra and McKeans 2003 feel that, “intrapersonal stress bestows in abundance to deteriorations in both physical and psychological health”. To plunge in one’s and others’ expectations puts the students’ prospects into peril be it academic or sports, subjecting him to a downward spiral putting his self-esteem at stake. This might cause humiliation and guilt to develop leading to rejection (Schafer, 1996).

**Environmental** stress could be viewed in problems like incompatibility with roommates. Blai, (1972) stress that “the impetus in form of motivation given by a roommate has a concrete impact that would aid academic achievement”. Ryan, (2004) explained emphatically that “It is a well propounded fact that students who themselves
are academically stronger create less hassles, thereby allowing the roommates to perform well”. Dusselier et al., (2005) found that number of hours in crowded lecture halls increased stress, those students who could not study in their residence halls and had roommate conflicts also had higher stress. Zaleski et al., (1998) found that as the number of stressful life events experienced increased for college students, physical symptoms for stress appeared. Students who experienced either kind of stressors displayed disharmony in mental and physical health and were at a grave risk for poor academic performance, thereby heightening the academic stress and bolstering a cycle of stress, inefficient and inadequate coping, and deteriorated health (Haines et al.,1996; Ward Struthers et al., 2000).


Aldwin and Greenberger (1987) and (Pfeiffer, 2001) in their respective studies anticipated that, “academic stress was related to anxiety and depression in college students. Nonetheless, plentious stress can interfere with a student’s groundwork, attention, and subsequently pursuance of goals, but optimum level of stress can be advantageous to the students by motivating them to peak performance”.

Siegrist (1998) registered and interpreted an Association relating to academic Stress and degradation of health pitches expected to impact the performance level. Smith et al.,(2000) specifically mentioned that “where timeframe is like a deadline and shining performance is an issue all the students are likely to be pressurised by stress”. Haines et al. (1996) also found that stress and its symptoms caused a major impact on the performance of the students.
Pentagon and Creedon (1978) found that “performance in academic arena and persistence in college were correlated to the amount of stress experienced”. Akgun and Ciarrochi (2003) construed that the affinity between academic stress, performance and the resultant consequence marked that skills to manage abated the negative impact of academic stress while performing. A major concern for today is the flux of the college environment which is pushing the students to the brink of stress and making performance difficult and retaining their relative ranks in positions (HornNeville, 2006). A symbolic, compelling negative relationship was discovered, and stress in life and general academic performance

De Meuse, 1985, Garrity and Ries, 1985 and Isakson & Jarvis, 1999 in their specific studies found “A significant negative relationship was discovered between life stress and general academic performance”. De Meuse (1985) adduced that academic accomplishment was negatively correlated to life stress and students who underwent stress performed poorly across the six indexes of classroom performance. Garrity and Ries (1985) validated that college grades would be inversely correlated with life events which were negative in nature. Felstein and Wilcox (1992) also found similar correlations as Garrity and Ries. However, Womble (2003) could not forge a significant relationship between the two variables.

Hence, the strains of academia are the most powerful aggravates in a student’s life (Felsten and Wilcox, 1992; Struthers et al., 2000). Bankston and Zhou (2002) banked upon a compelling and symbolic positive relationship between stress and academic performance of college students. Pancer et al. (2000) has very aptly reported that “the students experiencing low levels of stress were relatively well-adjusted to the university activities and environment”.

Agarwal and Chahar (2007); Leisa et al. (2008); Pau et al. (2007); Radcliffe and Lester (2003) support the assertion that professional students experience more stress
than general college population. Although Bunevicius, et al. (2008) did not agree with the assertion and said the two groups did not differ in the experience of stress.

**Gender specifics** also influence approach, acknowledgement, and reactivity to stressors (Misra et al., 2000). Feminine gender are more expressive about what they feel, whereas masculine gender try and control their emotions, accept the problem and engage in problem-solving efforts (Hyde and Plant, 1995; Milkie and Thoits, 1993). Dorff, 1997; Hudson and O'Reagan, 1994; Sori et al., 1996) found that girls are more affected by negative events or stress than boys especially on scored self-imposed stress (Misra et al., 2000). Hyde and Plant, (1995) Tubman and Windle, 1995 and Windle and windle (1996) respectively concluded that “When compared at similar levels of stress, women generally exhibit stress more overtly than males and report significantly more negative life events than boys across all stages of adolescence as well as higher levels of stress (Plunkett et al., 2000)”. However Eweniyi (2009); Mostafa (2011); Shah et al., (2009) differed and did not report gender differences in experience of stress.

### III.2 PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND ACADEMIC STRESS

Lazarus (1999) stated that personality is “the main source of variation in the arousal of stress and how it affects human functioning is the way an individual evaluates subjectively the personal significance of what is happening”.

According to Bolger and Zuckerman (1995) “Personality is the decisive element in health and cognitive well being outcomes”. Certain personality attributes lower the behavioural threshold, making some actions more feasible in appearance. Personality mitigates, alleviates the stress process, from appraisal, to finding the apt coping strategy to the emotional conclusion (Vollrath, 2001).

The importance of subjectivity and distinctiveness that the students bring into the academic setting is important (Tinto, 1993), it is this variation that allows for considerable difference in performance responses. Carver and Scheier, (2000)
commented that “Personality traits are distinguishing qualities of a person, that prompt them to think or act in a similar fashion in response to a variety of different stimuli”.

Studies have shown that personality variables explain the variance in performance better than demographic, environmental, or organizational factors (Huebner and Mills, 1994; Piedmont, 1993; Byrne, 1993). Personality variables moderate the effect of stress and burnout in students too, accounting for the fact that different people may react differently to the same situation (Sarason and Sarason, 2005). There is a proliferation of empirical evidence to support the contention that personality affects the reaction to stress (McEwen and Stellar, 1993; Pike et al., 1997).

Busato et al. (1999); Eysenck (1981); Furnham (1992) found that personality was an important predictor of academic performance and is analogous to learning. Vroom (1960) believed generic achievement to be a conglomerate amalgamation of intelligence and motivation, where motivation can be understood in light of personality characteristics. Cattell and Butcher (1968); Eysenck (1967); Kline and Gale (1977) delved into the relationship between personality and academic performance to infer conclusively. Yet, Academic achievement was typically associated with intelligence rather than with by personality Neisser et al., (1966) and Sternberg and Kaufman, (1998). De Raad and Schouwenburg (1996); Rindermann and Neubauer (2001); Wolfe and Johnson, (1995) conclusively found that personality is linked notably to academic performance. However Allik and Realo, (1997); Rothstein et al. (1994) differed from the conducted studies and found no significant correlation of personality and academic achievement.

Studies on burnout and personality have referred to a wide scope of personality traits captured in a five-factor structure known as the “Big Five” (Barrick and Mount, 1991; John, 1990; Goldberg, 1992). The big five were formally conceptualised by Costa and McCrae after various improvements.
NEUROTICISM

Zobel et al. (2004) defined neuroticism as “a temperamental sensitivity to negative stimuli.” Penley and Tomaka, (2002) explained Neuroticism “As a proclivity heading towards the experience of apprehension, strain, pity for self, animosity, incoherent thinking, abruptness, self-consciousness, desolation, despondency and low self esteem.” Ormel and Wohlfarth (1991) affirm that neuroticism escorts sensitivity for to psychological affliction and indicates a propensity to grip improbable ideas, inefficient coping, and an ineptitude to control urges. Neuroticism being a single dimension can be expressed by two terminals of: emotional stability and negative emotionality. McCrae, 1990; Schwebel and Suls, 1999 “Use the term “neuroticism” interchangeably with the term “negative-affectivity” . Individuals’ displaying higher negative affectivity have more receptivity for failures and frustrations of daily life (Zobel et al., 2004) and exhibit emotional problems related to aggression, anxiety and they tend to be impulsive and awkward (Lee et al., 2005; McCrae, 1992). David and Suls, (1999) said “Individuals high on neuroticism exhibit ‘hostile reactions, cathartic (venting of negative emotions), confrontative coping’ or ‘interpersonal withdrawal” O’Brien and DeLongis, (1996) agreed with what David and Suls expounded. Neurotic individuals exhibit zero tolerance to problems encountered (Lee et al., 2005; David and Suls, 1999). Lahe, (2009) found that neuroticism is connected to weaker psychological and physiological health. According to Watson and Pennebaker (1989) stress is highly correlated with negative affectivity, indicating that individuals who are high in neuroticism experience report higher burnout. Deary et al. (2003); Goddard et al. (2004) also found a significant association between neuroticism and emotional fatigue among students and modulated daily hassles too.

Bolger (1990); McCrae & Costa (1986) have associated neuroticism with ineffective coping strategies such as denial, wishful thinking, and self-criticism—rather than more effective strategies—like problem solving and proactive behaviour.
Eysenck (1947) was of the view that “Individuals who display high neuroticism tend to set extremities in goals and tend to underestimate their own performance and react with strong emotions and self-criticism in stressful situations”. Bolger, 1990; Heppner et al., 1995; McCrae and Costa, 1986; Van Heck, 1997. It eventually leads to physical illness (Van Heck, 1997) and development of psychopathology (Widiger and Trull, 1992). As Johnson, 2006; Srivastava, (2006) found that, “Individuals tallying high on neuroticism are more inclined to experiences of anxiety, anger, depression, and inhibits the faculties of the individual to make decisions, think clearly, and effectively cope with stress”. Vulnerability to stress decreases the ability and effectiveness of individuals on task performance (Sarason and Sarason, 2005).

LePine et al., 2004; Lingard, 2003; Zellars et al., 2000 found that affiliations among neuroticism and burnout and categorically show that the individuals high on neuroticism higher emotional exhaustion and lower personal achievement. Buhler and Land (2003) found that higher the neuroticism more is the experience of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and diminished resistance to stress and persistently low goal achievement. Neurotic individuals are way more stressed than others due to inadequate coping mechanisms (Carver et al., 2010).

Neuroticism’s significant negative and relation to academic performance, supports the opinion that emotionally stable individuals perform better in university classes (Lathey, 1991; Sanchez-Marin et al.,2001) and is thus a predictor of academic achievement (Zeidner and Matthews ,2000). Ebstrup et al.(2011) found a contrary significant positive correlation between neuroticism and stress but a moderately significant negative relationship among extraversion and stress.

EXTRAVERSION

The tendency to employ optimism and self-confidence in interactions characterizes extraverts (Costa and McCrae, 1992) is expressly associated with an increased feeling of personal accomplishment. Extraversion tends to be associated with
the use of rational problem-solving coping strategies and with seeking support socially and positively reappraising (Dorn and Matthews, 1992; Watson and Hubbard, 1996). Extraverts have a bent for experiencing positive emotions and gravitate towards sociability, warmth, cheerfulness, and energy (Lee et al., 2005, McCrae, 1992). Researchers have shown that “individuals high on extraversion tend to use more adaptive forms of emotion-focused coping” (Hooker et al., 1994; McCrae and Costa, 1986), “seek support” (David and Suls, 1999; Watson and Hubbard, 1996), “positive thinking or reinterpretation” (McCrae and Costa, 1986; Watson and Hubbard, 1996), and “substitution and restraint” (McCrae & Costa, 1986). Barrick et al. (2001) along with Hurtz and Donovan (2000) in their respective studies suggest that “extraversion is correlated to performance in general”. Gellately and Irving (2001) revealed that “individuals with extrovert behaviour perform better on an average in high occupational autonomy tasks”.

Francis et al., (2004); Michielsen et al., (2004), and Piedmont (1993 found extraversion to be negatively associated with emotional depletion of resources. Buhler and Land (2003) observed, “Contrary to most of the literature which has presented extraversion as a “psycho-protective” factor, a positive relationship exists between extraversion and two burnout variables (emotional exhaustion and depersonalization).

Deary et al. (1996) and Zellars et al. (2000) found a positive associations among personal achievements and extraversion. Furnham and Chamorro-Premuzic (2004); Garon and Moore (2006); Hooper et al. (2008) found that extraverts are highly gregarious and highly responsive to immediate rewards, and can be conveniently distracted to socially active prospects in comparison to introverts, with a consequential effect on the grades. This revealed that high self-confidence reimburses for the negating influence of extraversion on performance.
Rolfhus and Ackerman (1999) found negative relationships between Extraversion and performance on knowledge tests, attributing differences in knowledge acquisition to time spent by introverts and extraverts on studying.

On the other hand Furnham and his colleagues (1998) reported that extraverts positively performed better than introverts on the dimension of reasoning. Eysenck (1967); Furnham et al. (1998), suggested better relationship of Extraversion and intelligence which influences speed tests that tilt to favour extraverts, than power tests.

Child (1964); Entwistle and Entwistle (1970); Savage (1962) reported that “introverts are better than extroverts as they have a greater ability to learn and have better study habits. Kline and Gale (1971) disagreed. Cowell and Entwistle (1971) concluded that, introverts have a very positive approach toward studying and they have a similar performance similar to those of neurotic extraverts. Sanchez-Marin and colleagues (2001) because of their sociability, distractibility index and impulsive nature, extraverts fail to perform better than introverts.

**Openness to experiences** mainly indicates divergent thinking, analysis of situations, and enhancing creativity (Goldberg, 1992). Openness **refers to the tendency to learn new or productive experiences in terms of individuals personal development and other positive spheres** (Costa and McCrae, 1992; Goldberg, 1993; John, 1990).

Openness to experience echoes flexibility, imaginativeness, and intellectual curiosity which helps to deal with stressful situations (Watson and Hubbard, 1996). According to Eysenck individual high in the component of openness fantasizes and daydreams more than the others about life and greater interest in art. They are emotional, perform newer things and acknowledge ideas and adapt themselves comfortably to the stressful situations than people low in openness. On the other hand, people who are low in openness are more conventional, traditional inclination, they are
comfortable in familiar environments rather than performing in newer environs. So they have limited interests, conservative in approach (O’Brien and DeLongis, 1996).

Open individuals also exhibited clarity of self and related concepts along with an internal locus of control and emotional stability. Self-confidence represents efficaciousness, confidence, and emotional stability (Levitt et al., 1994; Tavani and Losh, 2003). Further Openness to Experience has a positive relationship with academic performance (Ashton et al., 2000; Barchard, 2003).

Griffin and Hesketh (2004); Conard, 2006; Duff et al., 2004; Furnham et al., 2004; Oswald et al., (2004) reported that, “openness to experience had a prognostic validity that was contingent on what aspect of performance was being measured and argued that openness of external experience was identifiable with performance. Openness might have an association with awareness of negative emotions and feelings but could not predict academic performance”.

Smith and Williams (1992) argued that individuals accenting on openness to experience have stress reducing tactic because they appraised situations as less threatening. Deary et al. (1996) calculated a minor, yet significant positive relationship between personal accomplishment and openness. Zellars et al. (2000) reportedly discovered relationships a positive one between openness and personal accomplishment and a negative one between openness and depersonalization. Deary et al. (2003) discovered individuals with openness tend to be emotionally exhausted soon as they use up the resources. Piedmont (1993) expressed negative relationship between openness and the three components of burnout.

AGREEABLENESS

Agreeableness is characterised by trustworthiness, helpfulness, sociability and caring nature as opposed to animosity, apathy to others, selfishness, and nonconformity which identifies the other continuum. There is a positive relationship
of agreeableness with social support (Hooker et al., 1994; Vickers et al., 1996). Piedmont (1993) found a negative correlation of agreeableness with the first two components of burnout namely emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and positively with personal accomplishment.

Agreeable people are good at maintain interpersonal relationships and place greater value on them (Graziano and Tobin, 2002), (Digman, 1997), are more pro-social (Graziano et al., 2007; Penner et al., 2005), cooperative and helpful (Graziano and Eisenberg, 1997; LePine and Van Dyne, 2001), and thus liked by peers (Jensen et al., 2002) and hence get more support to fight and resist stress. Agreeable individuals thus are liked due to their behaviour and easy accessibility but sometimes may land themselves in a sea of stress.

O’Brien and DeLongis, 1996 said “Individuals high on agreeableness are more likely to cope in ways that engage or protect social relationships such as seeking support and avoiding confrontation” (Individual with acute tendency of agreeableness appear “less likely to employ emotion focused coping strategies such as self-blame, avoidance, wishful thinking” (Lee, 2005 and Hooker, 1994), or “disengagement (Watson and Hubbard, 1996) as compared to those lower on the aspect”. Barrick et al. (2001); Hurtz and Donovan (2000); and Salgado (1997) reported a negative relationship of success and agreeableness.

Piedmont (1993) and Deary and his colleagues (1996) consistently, concluded that agreeableness is negatively related to cynicism. Zellars et al. (2000) reportedly found a low relationship of agreeableness with cynicism and a negative relationship with stress.

CONSCIENTIOUSNESS

This notion refers to the individuals intent to accomplish new things including higher level of cognitive ability, positive impulse management and goal focussed
behaviour (DeRaad, 2000). Pawlik-Kienlen (2007) revealed that “conscientious individuals are organised, disciplined, dedicated and loyal, especially at work”. Edwards, (1998) recommended that “Being aimless, negligent, careless and unreliable are not the characteristics of a conscientious individual”. Conscientiousness individuals tend to be systematic, dedicated, dependable, controlled, hardworking, strongwilled, and self-disciplined (Lee et al., 2005). Conscientious students tend to be more flexible, confident, trustful and cooperative (McCrae and John, 1992). These kinds of behaviour are required for an individual to be able to cope proactively, by planning and setting goals (Aspinwall and Taylor, 1997). Perhaps this personality factor is more consistently related with academic performance (Busato et al., 2000; De Raad, 1996; Kling, 2001).

Smith, (1969) conceptualised this relationship in terms of the so-called ‘strength of character’ factor. Conscientiousness is closely related to motivation, a variable of considerable importance with regard to all types of performance (Anderson and Keith, 1997; Boekaerts, 1996; Furnham, 1995). Conscientiousness makes a unique contribution to the prediction of university performance academically and otherwise too in areas of life where effort is required (Conard, 2006; Noftle and Robins, 2007; Wagerman and Funder, 2007).

The significant relationship between performance and conscientiousness is because of the significant traits affecting like working hard, being systematically organised and career oriented in thought and planning (Busato et al., 2000; Kling, 2001; Mount and Barrick, 1995; Salgado, 1997). Conard (2006); Noftle and Robins (2007); Wagerman and Funder (2007); Wolfe and Johnson (1995), found that conscientiousness positively predicted college Grade Point Average. Oswald and colleagues (2004) explained that conscientiousness is significantly predictive of better performance whereas extraversion insignificantly negatively performance.

Costa et al. (1991) proposed that conscientiousness has two aspects: proactive which is concerned with development and inhibitive component which emphasises self-
control and caution. Noftle and Robins (2007) found that achievement-striving, perseverance, and self-control were the essential predictors of academic performance, and Caprara et al., (1998) reported that the social learning variables of academic self-efficacy and self-regulatory efficacy predicted academic performance over and above the Big Five variables; it is important to determine if the broader construct of conscientiousness remains a significant predictor after controlling for the effects of these more specific and “essential” predictors.

Watson and Hubbard, (1996) have always classified conscientiousness with problem-solving ability and affective coping. The conscientious individual’s persistency and self-discipline will probably also cause him or her to finish tasks and to accomplish things. Piedmont (1993) and Deary et al. (2003) have found a significant relationship between conscientiousness and personal-accomplishment. LePine et al. (2004) revealed insignificant relationship between conscientiousness and burnout. Conscientiousness is always labelled as an important component of academic performance. Ebstrup et al. (2011) discovered a moderate negative relationship between conscientiousness and organizational stress.

Type A behaviour pattern

Characteristics such as competitiveness, a strong sense of time urgency (Strickland, 2001), impatience, ambitiousness, restlessness and aggressiveness are observed in Type-A behavior pattern (Friedman and Rosenman, 1974). Type-A people have higher level of competitiveness than Type-B individuals, they race against time and react when faced with obstacles (Burger, 1993). Some researchers have found individuals exhibiting Type A behaviours to be more productive at tasks (Jamal, 1985; Matthews et al., 1980; Taylor et al., 1984) and some found them to be less productive than their Type B counterparts (Strube et al., 1983). Type A individuals always display stress in one of the four behaviours: Hostility/ impatience, Compulsiveness/ perfectionism, Competitiveness and Chronic tension. They are multi taskers,
hyperactive exhibit time urgency and ambition. The influential attribute of Type A behavior contributes to success, and the negative aspects affect the person’s health and social relationships. Due to haste and urgency in time management and work completion Type A’s may commit certain errors which make them vulnerable to stress as they neither think calmly, retrospectively or presently, they just want to get over with the work which makes them prone to more mistakes leading them to depression and feeling of inadequacy which they cannot handle.

III.3 SELF EFFICACY AND ACADEMIC STRESS

The concept of Self efficacy is associated with personal evaluation of individual’s capability to successfully finish a course of action which an individual desires to accomplish (Bandura, 1986,97). It is a formulate with its expansive applicability varying in accordance with the domain which requires it (Zimmerman, 2000), and so it assessed in view of outcome required for the domain (Bandura, 1986; Pajares, 1996). This affects a student’s view about his motivation to succeed and attain goals. These variables are also related to dropping out rates (Higgins, 2005). As Audia et al., (2000); Hansford & Ballie 1982; and Milton et al., (1991) put it “higher self-efficacy beliefs can lead to better academic performance (Academic self concept/efficacy is one academic factor that is predictive of academic success & persistence”.

According to Bandura (1982), “self-efficacy expectations are the beliefs a person has about his or her ability to successfully perform a given task or behaviour”.

Wood & Locke, (1987) include concentration in lectures and corresponding exams, grasping, explaining concepts, discriminating and differentiating them, memorizing and taking notes as an activity in furtherance of success in academic settings. Bong, 2001; Lindley and Borgen, 2002; Zhang and RiCharde, 1998, found that students who are persistently making efforts with the belief and related activities perform better each time.
Bandura (1993) postulated that “belief in self-efficacy could affect outcomes by increasing motivation and aid, support the efforts needed to master challenging academic related tasks and tutoring for the efficient use of acquired knowledge and skills”. Students with higher self efficacy who are emotionally intelligent attain develop attitude with positives which prompts for success in college. Berrollo, 2003; Field, 2001; Isen, 2003; Khramtsova et al. 2007 associated well-being and life satisfaction to be a derivative of student efficacy predictive of motivation, self-discipline and respect for systems and increased desire for learning. The ace indicator of performance which can be rated for assessment of the student is motivation or self efficacy (Devadoss and Foltz, 1996; Jones, 1984; Zajacova et al., 2005). Facets associated with learning like semester load, time expanse utilized while working, and even relationships at home have been found to make an impact on the student’s performance (Cutrona et al., 1994; Devadoss and Foltz, 1996; Szafran, 2001). Chemers et al., 2001; Zajacova et al., 2005 address self-efficacy in academics as a more potent and dependable predictor of performance than stress, adjustment, and endurance in college students. Self-efficacy is also fundamental element of learned resourcefulness (Rosenbaum, 1990). Self-efficacy is associated with and corresponds positively to achievement outcomes (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 1996; Schunk, 1995) and indexes of self-regulation, and achievement (Pintrich & De Groot, 1990 and Bouffard et al., 1991). Hence the conclusion by Zimmerman and Bandura, (1992,1994) that self-efficacy influences achievement of goals holds true. Chemers, Hu, and Garcia (2001) found that self-efficacy yielded direct relationship with Justin and corresponding performance of 1st years.

Yukselturk & Bulut (2007) found that lower self-efficacy and nervousness in students affected a student. Efficacy moderates and mediate anxiety arousal and the attainment of objectives (Bandura & Adams, 2005).
Lent et al. (1986), Gerardi (1990) examined three indexes: self efficacy, achievement and ability and found that they were adequate predictors of academic success and had predictive validity and associated consequences and deciphered them as factors that genuinely affected self efficacy and that too significantly. Bandura (1986) stated that motion adaptive ability is the end product of stronger self-efficacy.

Maddur & Meir (1995) were of the view stated self-efficacy is contingent, solid base which helps individuals to approach new revelations without incapacitating them. These beliefs about their self affects their judgement and emotional adaptability, setting of goals and persisting in the world. students almost always keep grades as a predictor of self-worth (Crocker et al., 2002).

The impact of low self efficacy could cause a causality and could disgruntle a student and may fail him and his endeavours (Bandura and Locke, 2003), thus, students may be vulnerable to stress and depression which may negatively impact academic achievement. There is no question that research does not support the notion that academic self-efficacy cannot influence performance (Vrugt, Langereis, & Hoogstraten, 1997). Tuckman & Sexton, (1992), “Individuals with academic self-efficacy tend pursue challenging goals, seek out of the box-innovative solutions, persevere in difficult tasks, and perform to the best of their capabilities. Such efforts a lead to goal achievement”.

Rosenberg et al., 1995; Wiggins and Schatz,1994 examined the relationship between self efficacy, self esteem and earned grades, achievement test scores and found that the most significant positive correlation was between self efficacy score and grade point average. Liu et al., (1992) concluded that bi-directional continuum between self-esteem, and academic achievement displaying reciprocal relationship of the factors. Alves-Martins et al.(2002) found a relationship between efficacy and achievement beliefs of successful and unsuccessful students.
Academic locus of control interests itself with the idea whether the academic Commons of an individual is viewed him as a result of his behaviour or the reaction of others. This construct concisely represents strive for achievement and effects of conscientious involving self-control on academic achievement. Rotter (1966) proposed that “individuals’ perceptions of the degree to which they control their own lives vary along a continuum of internal versus external control. Individuals who feel that they have ability to substantially control their life have an internal locus, in comparison whenever someone posits that situations and significant others control them they are exhibiting external locus of control.

As Abouserie, 1994; Gadzella, 1994; Shelley and Pakenham, 2004, portray that stress as an outcome is determined by the individuals beliefs about whether he controls himself or others do. It was found by Findley and Cooper(1983) that students who feel that they can control themselves and their actions that is have internal locus of control, can mitigate their own stress levels. The internals expended greater effort in achievement, felt better while achieving and had sense of pride in success and guilt of failure if at all the fail. An absolute comparison comes out in the individuals having external locus of control. They always attribute outcomes to others and circumstance. While performing they have less energy, experience low pride and higher guilt and shame(Findley and Cooper, 1983; Phares and Lamiell, 1975).

Hattrup et al. (2005); Reininger (2005); Shepherd et al. (2006) discovered that higher than internal control better the performance of the students that is on the higher end of continuum. Trice (1987) and Levy(2007) reported that those who have internal academic locus of control participate more in classes, are diligent to devote time and setting and do not miss classes and almost always attend them. Persistence is also higher in individuals who are internals.

Bandura (1999) cited a study by Caprara et al. (1998) that provided empirical precedent that made learning variables locus of control, and expectancy better
variables to predict variance in performance than the traditional assessors like motivation and conscientiousness. The better performance of internals prove that these have better predictive validity of such measures (Levy, 2007; Reininger, 2005; Shepherd et al., 2006)

Howard and Midway, 2004; Martin and Dixon, 1989 investigated and found that students with internal locus of control are better adjusted in their college and performed better in comparison to their external locus of control counterparts. Mooney et al. (1991) conducted a survey and found that distance from home affected students adjustments. They found that an internal locus of control, helped the student to perceive and interpret the distance as distance “just right” for them to perform.

According to Martin and Dixon, (1989); Mooney et al., (1991), locus of control accounted for most of the variance in academic adjustment with the internals being better than externals. Parkes,( 1986) and (Amirkhan, 1990) in their research indicates that internal locus of control was associated with adaptive coping and external world were to lesser extent using problem focused.

Locus of control has been studied in stress research and is termed as a strong predictor of coping behaviours (Fleming et al., 1984). Folkman (1984) proposed that event controllability may shape or determine the role of coping and internality-externality. Individuals who perceive events as changeable are more likely to use problem-focused coping approach whereas emotion-focused coping be used only if there were no options perceived. If an event is perceived as unchangeable, individuals a use distancing and escape-avoidance(Folkman et al.,1986). Compass and his colleagues’in 1991 explained “Beliefs about the controllability of stressful events could influence the degree to which an individual attempts to master or change the stressful circumstances, as opposed to trying to tolerate or adjust to adverse circumstances”. Thus, an internal control is associated with more adaptive direct coping strategies than
an external locus of control (Parkes, 1984) and persistence (Bandura, 1982). Overall, individuals with an internal control, were more inclined to use direct coping strategies and perceived the situation as more controllable (Petrosky and Birkimer, 1991).

In a study Brosschot et al., (1994), asserted that people with an internal locus c used active coping strategies namely problem solving and expression of anger etc. Of those individuals with an external locus, the belief in powerful others was associated with preference for of passive coping strategies like avoidance, depression, and palliative responses, while belief in chance was associated with pathological problems and increased social anxiety. (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). Adolescents who perceived control over situations majorly use problem-focused coping (Compas et al., 1988; Schonpflug and Jansen, 1995).

**HARDINESS**

It is a psychological phenomenon as it is a perception of one’s inner strength that allows for the physical manifestation of that strength, i.e., the quick recovery from disruptions in functioning and return to previous level of functioning (Carver, 1998; Steinhardt and Dolbier, 2008). Resilience or hardiness is a outcome of healthy adaptations (Rutter, 1990) and is often viewed in the psychological context insomuch as it refers to cognitive capacity to avoid psychopathology despite difficulties (Tugade et al., 2004). Individuals who are resilient display adaptive coping skills and impinge upon stressors as opportunities for learning and development. This protective factor is often viewed as the opposite pole of the risk factor (Ortega and collegues., 2008). Kamya (2000) showed that greater levels of hardiness were associated with greater self-esteem among social work students. In turn, individuals with greater self-esteem are better able to cope with stress and achieve higher grades (Clifton et al., 2004). The interrelatedness of these concepts further suggests the existence of an overarching internal strength such as resilience.
Hardiness was also examined in context of adjustments of students in the higher education places like universities and specifically in areas which are important for a healthy outcome namely, academic front, social adjustment, personal/emotional balance along with commitment to goal and attachment with Institute where the individual is studying (Mathis & Lecci, 1999) and it was found that higher hardiness was predictive of adjustment. Hardiness has also been studied in light of coping incantations and Florian et al., (1995) found that the concept was amalgamated with use of problem focused strategies and its usage in solving issues.

Campbell-Sills et al., (2006) found that resilience was significantly co-related to task-oriented coping, which can address stressors. (Kariv and Heiman, 2005). Clifton and colleagues (2004) found that, of several demographic and environmental variables, hardiness, problem-focused coping strategies as well as perceived control had the largest effects on academic achievement. Therefore, a student’s level of resilience and the manifestations of that resilience are related to effective adaptive resources to academic stress.

3.4 COPING BEHAVIOUR AND ACADEMIC STRESS

Lazarus and Folkman (1984) conceptualized and said it is a "constantly changing behavioural and cognitive efforts to manage specific external and/or internal demands that are appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of the person". Coping means the process of executing the chosen response, to protect themselves from a negative physical and psychological consequences resulting from a pile of demands.

Moos and Holahan, (2003) define coping as “a response to specific stressful situations. Coping is a dynamic process and a stabilising factor that helps in maintaining psychological balance over time and prepares with resistance to respond to fluctuating demands and stresses”.
Heppner and Baker (1997), “individuals’ coping styles are reflected in how they habitually construe and manage complex situations. In general, when personality characteristics, personal relationships and situational parameters come together to produce a robust coping style, individuals tend to exhibit the following characteristics. They tend to display more self-confidence and control over situations and to be more persistent and assertive; and they tend to be more likely to expect success. These individuals will also tend to be less anxious, less depressed and have fewer health problems”.

Lazarus and Folkman, (1984); and Kim and Duda, (2003) explained that “how an individual copes is influenced by his or her resources, which include health and energy (azarus and Folkman, 1984), social support, material resources and existential beliefs (Individuals with these resources have been found to sustain stress better”.

According to Folkman and Lazarus, 1986 Coping strategies are stated to have fundamental functions – management of the problem causing stress and administrating emotions relating to those strains. Lazarus (1966) described three types of coping: active-cognitive coping, which involves a person’s cardinal attempts to manage assessment of the strength of the stressor; active-behavioural coping, which refers to overt behavioural attempts to deal face on with the problem and its effects; avoidance coping, which involves attempts to consciously avoid confronting the stressor. Most research involving coping strategies include a similar distinction between those oriented toward approaching and confronting the stressor and those oriented towards avoiding the stressor (Roth and Cohen, 1986). Holohan and Moos, 1991; Vitaliano et al., (1987) found that individuals who utilize approach coping strategies are better adjusted psychologically than those who employ more avoidant coping strategies.

Brown & Cross, 1997 and Tao et al and collegues, (2000) found a positive correlation of college achievement and coping and established that ideally adjusted
adolescents used more wholesome and complete coping efforts, such as, strategising an action plan, employ the resources available socially for supporting themselves emotionally, adequately and therapeutically discuss problems to find solutions and also engage in fruitful cognitive and other healthy activities.

Leong et al. (1997) found that effective, action oriented coping was a predictor of all round adjustment of university students. Jorgenson & Dusek (1990) examined that adequately adjusted freshmen exhibited problem focused coping and used social support for handling issues. Struther’s et al (2000) found that stress was reduced by problem focused coping and not by emotional focused or avoidance coping. Andrews & Wilding (2004); Shields (2000) and Struthers (2001) found that problem focused coping relieved stress and increased the Grade point average and persistence towards successful completion of degrees. Task oriented coping was better in relieving stress. D’Zurilla & Sheedy (1991) prove that problem focused coping is an important strategy that reduces and moderates stress by directly dealing with the situation and its emotional effects and lead to adjustment and reduction of stress (Causey and Dubow, 1993; Reid et al., 1994; Structon and Lumpin, 1993). Billing & Moss (1981) portrayed results that avoidance oriented strategy associated was linked to maladjustment and more stress. Parker (1999) suggested that in longer usage task oriented strategy should be the most efficacious.

On the other Kohn et al.(1994) found that both the coping strategies were positively related to adaptation towards stress. Although avoidance based coping hand positive as well as negative adaptation to stress. Oakland and Ostell (1996) reported that though there was no evidence to corroborate that stress did not correlate negatively with either of the coping strategies backed a positive relationship among avoidance focused strategies and coping was found dead stress (Bowman and Stern, 1995; Dunkley et al., 2000; Oakland and Ostell, 1996).

**Gender differences**
As a consistent pattern of gender differences has emerged in the coping literature it is visible specifically, that female college students appear to use emotion-focused coping strategies (Endler and Parker, 1990; Harju and Bolen, 1998; Leong & Bonz, 1997; Ptacek et al., 1994). Endler and Parker (1994) found that female college students scored significantly higher on emotional aspects, evasion, aberration and social deviation than their male counterparts (Carver et al., 1989; Schill & Beyler, 1992). Researchers found that female college students used scales which were less adaptive than their male counterparts (Grant, 2004; VanBoven & Espelage, 2006).

Haarr and Movash (1999) found that females use more of it or avoidance based strategies, and more emotional and social support strategies as well (Rawson et al., 1999) than men who used more task oriented and physical methods and problem oriented approach and experienced less distress (Higgins and Endler, 1995). However emotional coping was a positive assessor of stress in the two genders (Cooper and Bright, 2001). Dusselier (2005) gathered the information that the female gender had more pressure on of performance than males. The females experience emotions with more intensity and frequency and reacted with hostility and wishful thinking.

However, Eschenbeck et al., (2007) found that males utilized avoidance-oriented coping strategies more often than females and females utilized approach-oriented methods like seeking support from the social group and finding solutions to problems more often than males. According to Carlson and Grant (2008), males utilized avoidant strategies such as distraction and physical release of emotion more often than females and females utilized the approach strategy of seeking social support more often than males.

Coping behaviour and social support structures therefore moderated the effect of stress and anxiety on an individual whether male or female (Allen and Herbert, 1994; Rawson et al., 1994).
SOCIAL SUPPORT refers to the contribution of support from one’s own clan, associates, and advisers and can make an impression on a student’s success. Support that is available socially can be examined as the perceived availability of resources provided by family and friends that assist the person in everyday activities (Dolbier and Steinhardt, 2000; Procidano and Heller, 1983; Rayle, 2006). Support be it any arena of life, i.e., emotion related, study affected, and money related monitor the success of the student. The benefits of support have been associated read with physical and mental healthiness. Greater levels of social support are associated with lower levels of depression, fewer episodes of negative life events, more positive mood, and greater life satisfaction (Aldwin, 1994; Balk, 1995; Demakis and McAdams, 1994).

Within higher education settings, a palpable social support for students is faculty. Support from professors and student friends have been positively associated with self-esteem (Clifton, et al., 2004). The lack of social support from professors has a derogatory, demeaning effect on the academics (Clifton, 1997). Student perceptions of social support have also been positively associated with health-promoting behaviours such as exercise, good nutrition, and avoidance of substance abuse (Hubbard et al., 1984; Martinelli, 1999). Conversely, research among college students suggests that withdrawing from social support relates to negative life satisfaction (Mori, 2000).

According to Fass and Tubman, 2002; Larose, 2005 “Benefits of Social support are increased confidence, optimistic attitude and rising academic understanding” and having no support leads to increased anxiety and lowered academic success (Aspelmeier and Kerns, 2003). It has been reported that more the perception of family support and social acceptance along with conducive academic environment (if the incidence of depression in students. (Hall et al., 2004; Rayle and Chung, 2007; Saltzman and Holahan, 2002; Way and Robinson, 2003).

Having social support musters a buffer for stressful times if need be, for the students (Hazan and Zeifman, 1999). This helps to facilitate growth of confidence,
worthiness and efficacy belief in students (Cutrona et al., 1994) and leads to multi
levelled processing of information and retentive memory packed with skills to solve
problems with problem solving skills, subjective well being, self esteem (Mikulineer et
al., 2001) and increased academic success (Bernier et al., 2004).

Social support is thus categorically connected psychological well-being
(Procidano & Heller, 1983) and adaption in college (Brooks & DuBois, 1995; Isakson
psychological symptomatology could be the end product of lack of social support of
family and friends and were better predictors of stress than other life events.

Brooks and DuBois (1995) contended that the ones who receive more support
socially are anticipated to get higher grades and ratings. This significant relationship of
college adjustment with the support available socially can also be held to be true for
students of diverse ethnicities and races (Kenny and Stryker, 1996; Zea et al., 1995).

MacGeorge et al., (2005) highlighted the beneficial impact of supportive
behaviours from family and friends on the student’s psychological health. Zaleski et al.
(1998) noted that social support provided by friends was positively associated with
adjustment to college life. Lafreniere, Ledgerwood, and Docherty (1997) found that
greater the support of the family better the adjustment of the student at the University

Rice and Whaley, (1994), Soucy and Larose, (2000) found a significant
relationship which impacts adjustment to college was parental attachment of the
student. This attachment was frequently displayed by researchers to bring out the
relationship of perceived support and achievement (Domagala-Zysk, 2006; Rosenfeld et
al., 2000; Bahar, 2010; and Rueger et al., 2010).

Lapsley et al., 1990, Rice and Whaley 1994; Soucey and Larose (2000) found that
parental influence attachment as positively related to stress resistance and adjustment to
college life and thereby accomplished academically.
Protinsky and Gilkey, 1996; Strage and Brandt, 1999; Wintre and Sugar, 2000 found that parental style of upbringing and psychological control (Soucy & Larose, 2000), have been shown to have a collaborative effort on the results of the students. Strage and Brandt (1999) reported that if the student gets active encouragement from the parents it has a significant impact on his or her performance. In contrast Wintre and Sugar (2000) found that and heartache of parent demeans the self-concept of the child/student which negatively affects the performance scores.

Cutrona et al. (1994) reported that only the support of the parents and not of the peer group could predict academic achievement in future. If studied longitudinally studied by DeBerad et al. (2004) emphasised the importance of both beer and parental support in positive accomplishments and consequently achievement.

The above discussion on the related review of literature shows that academic stress is an important issue and of high concern in education institutions. Academic stress negatively affects the overall performance of the students. This important factor cannot be overlooked in the present day educational institutions if they want the students to compete at the global level. In this context, the present investigation is an important study to assess the impact of personality variables in the experience of stress.