Durgadevi Saraf Institute of Management Studies (DSIMS) *The Management Quest*
Vol.2, Issue 2, October 2019 -March 2020
Online ISSN:2581- 6632

A Study of Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) of Gen Y Management Students

* **Ravindra Dey** ** **Fleur Fernandes**

ABSTRACT

Gen Y workforce' global growth has increased the need to effectively address their work-requirements. In this study, 2 factors: Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) are selected to understand the basis of these requirements because they are highly prevalent in organizations.

The aim of this study was to understand the influences on leadership behavior and stress, and the inter-relationship effects. In this research, the 118 Gen Y management students' Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) were studied.

Many of these business students will be future leaders in organizations, and knowledge of these variables and their interplay will help to guide company effectively in leading their workforce. Since the analysis was on the leader himself, it provides better understanding of the antecedents and consequences of the leadership behavior and work stress (Burnout) on individuals. Organizations must ensure that leadership behavior must not promote stress and that even though burnout may be endemic, its levels must be kept to the minimum so that leadership behavior does not get adversely affected.

Key words: Leadership Behavior, Work Stress, Burnout, Gen Y, Management Students.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the recent decades, all sectors of employment i.e. Government and Private have experienced stress at work that has led to undesirable consequences for the health and safety of individuals and for the health of their organizations. Because of this output, the trades unions and scientific

** Head of OB, Xavier Institute of Management& Research, Mumbai*
*** Human Resource Management Student, Xavier Institute of Management & Research, Mumbai*

bodies have voiced increasing concerns about the contributing factors to this stress.

A Centre for Creative Leadership Report has said that eighty-eight percent of leaders reported that work is a primary source of their stress and that having a leadership role increases the level of stress. They also feel their Work Stress has definitely increased in the past five years. According to them, stress has been caused mainly by job demands: job responsibilities and decision-making that has been got through leadership behaviors engaged by them to help them gain focus and perspective on various work challenges. Previous reports show that Leaders experience stress equally from their bosses, peers, and customers (The Stress of Leadership, 2007). The impact of this Work Stress has created Work Stress Burnout or simply Burnout. But most individuals joining industry today already have pre-formed Leadership Behaviors and Work Stress Burnout. Unfortunately, over 60% of leaders say their organizations do not help them in managing this stress (The Stress of Leadership, 2007).

Hence, Work Stress Burnout is a major challenge in Occupational Health. Some of these challenges have costed 500 Million Euros/ year within different European countries to address work stress and its accompanying symptoms- cardiovascular, metabolic, immune, psychological etc. (Psychosocial risks and workers health—OSHWiki, n.d.). Accordingly, stress ascribed to work leads to severe negative consequences for their organizations particularly with lost working days, absenteeism, and diminished firm performance. Hence, in the long-run, with multiple organizations facing the same problems, the economy will definitely get affected.

Work stress is a serious problem for all different age groups of people on all hierarchical levels from the top of an organization to the bottom of it. Therefore, it is crucial to deepen our knowledge on the present incoming Gen Y's levels of work stress. To handle Work Stress effectively, one of the major factors influencing it is Leadership Behavior. Every individual has their own Leadership Behavior but, there are certain characteristic Leadership Behaviors for each generation. By knowing the innate Leadership Behavior of Gen Y Management students and their incoming pre-conditioned Burnout levels will be useful because they play a crucial role in shaping the working conditions, attitudes and behaviors of their

employees (Bass et al., 2008; G. Yukl, 1989; G. A. Yukl & Gardner, 2020). Hence this research, will help in Stress Management in organizations.

To manage any Organizational Stress level, the leader's stress level needs to be considered. An indicator of this is through the expression of their Leadership Behavior. Moreover, these full-range leadership behaviors represent the core of many leadership theories. Most previous studies have classified Leadership Behavior into Transformational, Transactional and Laissez-Faire Behaviors/ styles and have studied their implications on Work Stress. Previous research has indicated transformational leadership style is negatively linked to symptoms and feelings of stress and also to burnout among subordinates. The situation is similar, although not so consistent, in the case of transactional leadership. In in case of the laissez-faire style of leadership, people show more symptoms of stress and burnout (Lyons & Schneider, 2009). But most of previous research have not focused on any specific generation.

A research on Gen Y management students who are the future leaders in companies would provide a better insight in terms of their Leadership Behaviors and Burnout. Leadership Behavior factors have been considered instead of any specific leadership style as this is an evolving generation that utilizes factors from both styles depending on the need for them, but certain factors prevail more dominantly than the others. Hence, this requires investigation.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

"Leadership is defined as the process of influencing others to understand, and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives" (G. A. Yukl & Gardner, 2020). To be an effective leader, certain leadership competencies are required. Bartram (2002) defines these competencies as "the set of behaviors that are instrumental in the delivery of desired results" (White Paper—The SHL Universal Competency Framework, 2011). Firms are now focusing on their leadership abilities because their aim is to get maximum employee productivity and performance (Kickul & Neuman, 2000).

Classically, leadership styles are transformational and transactional. These styles have been developed through many Leadership Theories and Models that have been classified into various categories-

1. Trait theories: This was one of the earliest viable approaches to systematically study leadership on the basis of personality, social background and physical characteristics. With this background Stogdill (1948) classified leader traits into Capacity, Achievement, Responsibility, Participation and Status (Stogdill, 1948).

2. Behavior theories: This came about because of the shift in thought process from thinking about leadership in terms of 'traits', to leadership as a form of activity, 'behavior'. Hence many theories are in this category-

a. Leadership Style Theory: Identified the Autocratic and Democratic leadership styles (Carr, 1969; Lewin, 1947).

a. The Ohio State Studies/ Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ): The main aim was to identify only the effective leadership styles which were 2 categories: Consideration (A leader that is sensitive to subordinates, respects their ideas and feelings, establishes mutual trust, shows appreciation, listens carefully to problems and seeks input from subordinates about important decisions) and Initiating (A leader who is task-oriented and directs subordinates' work activities toward goal-achievement.). Thus, the behavioral factors in focus were Reconciliation, Tolerance to Uncertainty, Persuasion, Structure, Tolerance to Freedom, Role Assumption, Consideration, Production Emphasis, Predictive Accuracy and Integration (Bass et al., 2008; DuBrin, 2016; Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) | Fisher College of Business, n.d.; Northouse, 2001; Nystrom, 1978; Robbins, 2001).

b. The University of Michigan Studies: This was done simultaneously as Ohio State Studies. They identified categories as Job Centered and Employee Centered (DuBrin, 2016).

c. Blake and Mouton's Leadership Grid: This was an extension of the Ohio State Studies. This grid provides a framework for understanding leadership behavior by dividing it into two attitudinal dimensions: concern for production (similar to initiating structure & job centered) and concern for people (Similar to consideration and employee centered) ("Managerial grid model," 2019; Molloy, n.d.). Styles identified were Authority, Country Club, Impoverished, Middle-of-the-road and Team Management.

3. Contingency theories: Contingency leadership theory recommends using the leadership style that best suits the situation (Jung & Avolio, 1999).

a. Fiedler's Contingency Theory uses situational variables and matched leadership according to task structure, leader-member relationships and position power on the basis of Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) scale (Fiedler et al., 1969; Northouse, 2001; Smith & Hughey, 2006; G. Yukl, 1989).

b. House's Path-Goal Theory uses situational variables - nature of the task, the work environment and subordinate characteristics. Classified leadership behavior as supportive, directive, participative and achievement oriented (Evans, 1970; Hejres et al., 2017; House, 1971).

c. Vroom & Yetton Normative Decision Theory uses various aspects related to situational related decision making and according adopts different decision making procedures: autocratic, consultation and joint decision making (Vroom & Yetton, 1981).

d. Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory to determine effective leadership uses subordinate readiness as the situational variable. This theory determines which leadership styles (telling, selling, participating, and delegating) matches the situation (followers' maturity level to complete a specific task) so that the organization can maximize its performance (Hersey-blanchard-1988.pdf, n.d.)

e. Leadership Continuum Theory and Model focuses on who makes the decisions, hence boss- to subordinated- centered (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1973).

4. Integrative leadership theories: Weber and House's theories focus on leadership charisma that influences the followers commitment (House, 1971; Weber et al., 2012), whereas Conger and Kanungo's theory focuses on the characteristic qualities of a charismatic leader's behavior- Extremity of vision, high personal risk, use of unconventional strategies, accurate assessment of the situation, communication of self-confidence and use of personal power (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). Transactional (contingent reward, management-by-exception) and transformational (charisma, inspirational, intellectual stimulation and consideration) leadership theory is also included under these theories along with the laissez-faire leadership factor (Bass et al., 2008; Northouse, 2001; G. A. Yukl & Gardner, 2020).

"Positive leadership behavior is a set of actions, taken by individuals in a position of power and influence, to motivate and cultivate others through mechanisms of empowerment, engagement, and collaborative assignment to meaningful work" (Jordan, 2016). Effective leadership behavior will contribute to employee happiness, well-being, and mindfulness that will benefit organizations indicated through profit, company achievement, and winning competitive situations in the markets. Hence, this research has adopted the Leadership Behavior Development Questionnaire (LBDQ) which has had many positive impacts in terms of leader's knowledge acquisition, self-awareness, perspective and behavior changes (Van Velsor et al., 1997).

"Stress is defined as the psychological response of an individual to a situation that exceeds the individuals' resources" (Folkman et al., 1986). Stressors are usually classified as physical or psychological that lead to many severe health- and performance-impairing consequences. Corporate employees normally face impaired attention capacity, memory capacity, decision making, judgement and performance (Beilock & Carr, 2005; Buchanan, 2006; Chajut & Algom, 2003; Ganster & Rosen, 2013; LeBlanc, 2009; Shaham et al., 1992). According to Conservation of Resources Theory (COR theory) (Hobfoll, 1989) and the Job Demands-Resources Model (Demerouti & Rispens, 2014), stress will originate through a 2 stage process: firstly, an individual evaluates whether a situation poses a threat (challenging/harmless) to self and secondly, if the individual has enough resources to overcome this situation, If not enough resources are available to cope, stress is experienced. Initially, it will lead to burnout- a mental state of exhaustion (Job Burnout | Annual Review of Psychology, n.d.). Thus, Burnout is also called Work Stress (Lastovkova et al., 2018).

Though the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1981b) was developed to measure Burnout and was considered as the gold standard, there were several issues that made not viable for this research (Bakker et al., 2005; Schaufeli et al., 2001). Hence, the BAT has been used and its assessment involved - combination of a deductive and an inductive approach, up-to-date content, diagnostic use and has a general easy-to-use self-administered version. It assesses individual's burnout levels in terms of 6 factors: exhaustion, mental distance, cognitive impairment, emotional impairment, psychological complaints and psychosomatic complaints.

Relationship between Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout)

In the present research, the focus is on leadership behavior i.e. to understand that of Gen Y's and possible outcomes of these theoretically connected types to work stress. The research is widely distributed over multiple perspectives- the relationship between leadership behavior and stress-related impact, the impact of demographics on these variables and the variable influences. This research can be described as follows:

(1) **Stress-related antecedents of leadership behaviors.**

Previous research has shown that in situations with high work stress, transformational leadership behavior is preferable because it assumes that the leader does not panic and instead acts as a role model. In due course, he is able to channel the followers into efforts to achieve group goals (Bass et al., 2008) . A transformational leader would be able to do this because the situation would promote this leader's use of charisma as indicated in previous research (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Halverson et al., 2004). But even in times of high stress and crisis, leaders by themselves get affected with stress that limits their ability to perform effective leadership behaviors. To make matters more difficult, recent studies have implied that psychological resources of leaders have diminished and led to a reduction of effort in leader behaviors (Byrne et al., 2014; Courtright et al., 2016). This has been indicated through core leadership tasks involving decision-making, empathy or goal-setting, are incompatible with high burnout experienced by the leader (Arnold et al., 2015). Hence, if a leader is too burnout, it could prevent him from administering through effective leadership behaviors and thus eventually culminate in poor leadership.

(2) **Stress-related consequences of leadership behaviors.**

Though leaders may help their followers to cope with stress, they themselves may be the source of stress for their followers (Bass et al., 2008). This has been observed in the laissez-faire leader behavior, which fosters more occurrences of stressful and challenging situations (Skogstad et al., 2007). This research on stress-related focus on leadership behavior is important because important research questions still remain unanswered (Skogstad et al., 2014). This includes that some studies could not replicate stable effects of leadership behaviors on correlates of followers' work stress (Malloy & Penprase, 2010; Stordeur et al., 2001). Also, background

information of employees is an important information source for research that influences leader's behavior in the presence of work stress. Because based on these variable levels, they will serve as key indices of organizational performance.

(3) **Differentiated measurement of Leadership Behavior and Work Stress.**

Background information of employees is an important information source for research that influences leader's behavior in the presence of work stress. Because based on these variable levels, they will serve as key indices of organizational performance (Rizzo et al., 1970).

(4) **Theoretically connected mediating mechanisms**.

In general, the relation between leadership behavior and work stress may be linked through the presence/absence of potentially harmful/innocuous working conditions (Leonard, 2013). Leaders also influence the occurrence, perception, and interpretation of working conditions. All this may culminate into negative or boost positive aspects of work (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). Therefore, this research would help to test theoretically aspects that can influence leadership behavior and work stress. As a result, presenting a coherent set of mediating variables that are grounded within a framework to explain the role of full-range leadership behaviors and the mediation process by which stress-related outcomes are affected (van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013).

3. HYPOTHESIS OF THIS STUDY

$H0_1$: Leadership Behavior in general has no significant relationship with Work Stress in general of Gen Y students.

$H0_2$: Leadership Behavior factors has no significant relationship with Work Stress factors of Gen Y students.

$H0_3$: Leadership Behavior factors has no significant relationship with Work Stress in general of Gen Y students.

$H0_4$: Leadership Behavior in general has no significant relationship with Work Stress factors of Gen Y students.

$H0_5$: There is no significant difference between male and female Gen Y students with respect to Leadership

Behavior.

$H0_6$: There is no significant difference with respect to Leadership Behavior between the Gen Y students on the basis of education.

$H0_7$: There is no significant difference with respect to Leadership Behavior across different work-experience groups of Gen Y students.

$H0_8$: There is no significant difference between male and female Gen Y students with respect to Work Stress.

$H0_9$: There is no significant difference with respect to Work Stress between the Gen Y students on the basis of education.

$H0_{10}$: There is no significant difference with respect to Work Stress across different work-experience groups of Gen Y students.

$H0_{11}$: Prediction of Work Stress (Burnout) level with Leadership Behavior cannot be done

$H0_{12}$: Prediction of Leadership Behavior level with Work Stress (Burnout) cannot be done

$H0_{13}$: Prediction of Leadership Behavior level with Work Stress (Burnout) factors cannot be done

$H0_{14}$: Prediction of Work Stress (Burnout) level with Leadership Behavior factor cannot be done

4. METHOD

4.1 Sample and Setting

In this study, the population composed of students from different Business Management Schools in and around Mumbai. The major mode of sampling was convenience sampling where students undertook the tests for Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout). The data was collected by administering the questionnaire to the respondents individually through Google forms and hard copies. Respondents who were contacted through emails were asked to fill out the survey online. Hence, the final sample for the study was 118 students out of which 52 respondents were males and 66 were females. Majority of the respondents were Non-Engineering, i.e. 88 respondents and 30 respondents were Engineering. Presences of Work Experience was also documented, 51

respondents were freshers, 25 respondents had less than 1year work experience and 42 respondents had 1-5years work experience.

4.2 Measures

Based on literature and discussions, two research instruments were used to carry out the survey. After access was obtained from the Ohio State University, the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ – XII) was used for measuring Leadership Behavior and the Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT) was used to measure Work Stress Burnout. The reliability for the sample was found to have an acceptable level of consistency for all variables as 0.749 **(Table 1)**. The reliability for the sample was found to have a high level of consistency for both the instrument i.e. Cronbach alpha score of 0.902 for Leadership Behavior and 0.803 for Burnout. **(Tables 2 and 3).**

The data was collected through questionnaires and it consisted of two sections. Section 1 i.e. Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire consisted of a total of 20 statements and the respondents rated the questions on a 5-point scale. The respondents were asked to read each statement and rate each statement on how closely that statement seemed to be like him/her (1: Never 5: Always). In section 2, the Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT) was used, which consisted of 24 questions. All questions were true keyed. The respondents have to read each statement and mention whether they agree or disagree on a scale of 1 to 5 (1: Never 5: Always).

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis was developed to answer the flowing research questions: What is the relationship between Leadership Behavior of Gen Y students and Work Stress (Burnout)? How do the demographic variables of gender, education and work experience moderate the relationship between Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) of Gen Y students? What different measures can influence leadership behavior and burnout among Gen Y students?

Table 4 suggests there is a strong negative association between Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout), hence $H0_1$ is rejected.

Table 5 provides an overview of the relationship between Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout). There is a strong Association between factors of Leadership Behavior and factors of Work Stress (Burnout). Hence $H0_2$ is rejected. **Table 6** looks at the relationship between the different factors of Leadership Behavior and Burnout. The result shows there is a strong association between all 10 factors except Tolerance Uncertainty of Leadership Behavior and Burnout. Therefore, we reject null hypothesis $H0_3$ that Leadership Behavior has no significant relationship with the Burnout for Gen Y students. **Table 7** looks at the relationship between the different factors of Burnout and Leadership Behavior. The result shows there is a strong association between all 6 factors except Psychosomatic Complaints of Burnout and Leadership Behavior. Therefore, we reject null hypothesis H04 that Burnout has no significant relationship with the Leadership Behavior for Gen Y students.

Through correlation, it was determined that, there is a significant strong negative correlation between Leadership Behavior and Work Stress Burnout. This comes as no surprise because it is linked through workplace presence of stressful working conditions as indicated by Leonard (Leonard, 2013). The reasons for these conditions are influenced by the leadership as derived through the leader's behavior. Since todays' generation does not adopt a fixed method of leading their followers, the inability to predict, interpret and perceive the implications of the adopted leadership causes this generation to get stressed that ultimately leads to burnout as described in the Conservation of Resources Theory (COR theory) (Hobfoll, 1989) and the Job Demands-Resources Model (Demerouti & Rispens, 2014). This correlation confirms that the leadership experienced through this generation's leadership behavior culminates into negative aspects in work in other words burnout that was proposed by Piccolo and Colquitt (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006).

Within the Leadership Behavior, strong correlations are seen between Persuasion and Reconciliation, Structure and Reconciliation, Structure and Tolerance Uncertainty, Structure and Persuasion, Tolerance Freedom and Reconciliation, Tolerance Freedom and Tolerance Uncertainty, Tolerance Freedom and Persuasion, Tolerance Freedom and Structure, Role Assumption and Reconciliation, Role Assumption and Persuasion, Role Assumption and Structure, Role Assumption and Tolerance Freedom, Consideration and Reconciliation, Consideration and Tolerance

Uncertainty, Consideration and Persuasion, Consideration and Structure, Consideration and Tolerance Freedom, Consideration and Role Assumption, Production-Emphasis and Reconciliation, Production-Emphasis and Tolerance Uncertainty, Production-Emphasis and Persuasion, Production- Emphasis and Structure, Production-Emphasis and Tolerance Freedom, Production-Emphasis and Role Assumption, Production-Emphasis and Consideration, Predictive-Accuracy and Reconciliation, Predictive-Accuracy and Tolerance Uncertainty, Predictive-Accuracy and Persuasion, Predictive-Accuracy and Structure, Predictive-Accuracy and Tolerance Freedom, Predictive-Accuracy and Role Assumption, Predictive-Accuracy and Consideration, Predictive-Accuracy and Product-Emphasis, Integration and Reconciliation, Integration and Tolerance Uncertainty, Integration and Persuasion, Integration and Structure, Integration and tolerance Freedom, Integration and Role Assumption, Integration and Consideration, Integration and Product-Emphasis and finally Integration and Predictive Accuracy. A weaker correlation was seen between Persuasion and Tolerance Uncertainty.

Within the Work Stress (Burnout), strong correlations are seen between Mental Distance and Exhaustion, Cognitive Impairment and Exhaustion, Cognitive Impairment and Mental Distance, Emotional Impairment and Exhaustion, Emotional Impairment and Mental Distance, Emotional Impairment and Cognitive Impairment, Psychological Complaints and Exhaustion, Psychological Complaints and Cognitive Impairment, Psychological Complaints and Emotional Impairment, Psychosomatic Complaints and Exhaustion, Psychosomatic Complaints and Emotional Impairment, Psychosomatic Complaints and Psychological Complaints. A weaker correlation was seen between Psychosomatic Complaints and Cognitive Impairment.

Between the Leadership Behavior factors and the Burnout Average a strong adverse correlation was observed between Burnout and Reconciliation, Burnout and Persuasion, Burnout and Structure, Burnout and Tolerance Freedom, Burnout and Role Assumption, Burnout and Production-Emphasis, Burnout and Predictive-Accuracy, and Burnout and Integration.

Between the Leadership Behavior Average and the Burnout factors a strong adverse correlation was observed between Leadership Behavior and Exhaustion, Leadership Behavior and Mental Distance, Leadership Behavior and Cognitive Impairment, Leadership Behavior and Emotional Impairment, Leadership Behavior and Psychological Complaints.

Therefore, this research helps proving the theoretically aspects that influence leadership behavior and work stress. As a result, this research is able to present a coherent set of mediating variables that are grounded within a valid and reliable frameworks to explain the role of full-range leadership behaviors and the indicators which demonstrates stress-related outcomes (Malloy & Penprase, 2010; Stordeur et al., 2001; van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013). This research also proves that for Gen Y, irrespective of whether transactional, transformational or laissez-faire leadership styles, this generation does have significant burnout levels already present within them which will continue change depending on the leadership behaviors exerted irrespective of the leadership styles used. Thus, this research deviates previous research which indicated that depending on the type of leadership style used, the levels of burnout will change whereas in this research it proves that leadership behavior is the one that requires more focus as it is the basis for any leadership styles (Lyons & Schneider, 2009; Skogstad et al., 2007, 2014; van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013). Hence, companies need to apply appropriate leadership behaviors to address these burnout symptoms to avoid having a negative impact on their employees and their organizations.

In order to be an effective GenY leader, they will have to deal with their generation having antecedent burnout levels and accordingly create a supportive atmosphere for the Gen Y workforce to thrive. A key method of handling this is through their leadership behavior via effective communication directly and indirectly in which previous research on prior Generations have shown that it can be done through the appropriate use of different leadership styles, but this research establishes that leadership behavior plays the more important role (de Vries et al., 2010).

Previous research has shown, depending on the type of communication, effects from leadership behavior on reducing stress are stronger when only direct communication is used for transformational leadership, and when only indirect communication is applied in transactional leadership (de

Vries et al., 2010). Since, transactional behaviors do depend on the precision of communication, which can be achieved optimally via indirect communication like email. Technical information requiring specific details on working tasks and feedback should be in writing form and hence no personal conversation is required. Empirical results have also revealed that contingent reward is effective when leader follower distance is high (Howell et al., 2005). This happens because communication via email offers a feeling of autonomy to the employee who then can decide when to read and when to respond to the message of the supervisor, which leads to less perceived stress.

On the other hand, transformational leadership is characterized by assured, supportive and expressive communication behaviors, which are best achieved via direct communication (de Vries et al., 2010). Directly talking to followers is important to create a group identity, and to consider the individual background of each person. With regards to followers' performance, transformational leadership is, in particular, linked to high performance when distance is low, and does not show this link when distance is high. This indicates that a close interaction between leader and follower is beneficial (Howell et al., 2005). Lastly, if moderated mediational effects are shown through workplace peers, then the relationship between leadership and stress via social support will be positive.

Table 8 looks at the mean and standard deviation for each of the Leadership Behavior factors across all respondents. The top three Leadership Behaviors are Tolerance Freedom, Consideration and Production Emphasis whereas the bottom three Leadership Behaviors are Predictive Accuracy, Tolerance Uncertainty and Role Assumption.

Table 9 gives the ranking of the mean and standard deviation for each of the **leadership behavior** factors across **male and female respondents**.

Table 10 looks at the t-test among gender for leadership behavior. Given, that there were large number of male (52) and female (66) respondents, it was felt useful to check significance of difference of mean scores of male and female participants with respect to the Leadership Behavior. A very interesting finding of the study was that Structure, Persuasion and Reconciliation were ranked the exact same position for both genders.

Tolerance Freedom is the highest among the females and not males. When looking at the overall Leadership Behavior scores across male and female participants, the t-test did not show up any significant difference. Therefore, we accept the Null Hypothesis $H0_5$ that there is no significant difference between male and female Gen Y students with respect to Leadership Behavior.

From the results, there is no difference in the overall leadership behavior between male and female. However, there is a difference in the way leadership behavior is brought about. Both genders rely strongly on tolerance to freedom as a way to bring about effective leadership in long term scenarios. This makes this generation very different from the previous generations, most characteristically distinct from the analysis done in the Trait Theories as given by Stogdill (Heilman, 2001; Stogdill, 1948). In the 1940's, leadership was focused only on Capacity, Achievement, Responsibility, Participation and Status, whereas this generation uses leadership behavior through emphasis on tolerance to freedom, production-emphasis, consideration and integration. The current generation does not rely heavily on predictive-accuracy, are less likely to actively exercise leadership roles rather they could surrender it to others and are less likely to be tolerant toward uncertainty. The results obtained in this study proves that Gen Y's male and female leadership behaviors are still very much alike w.r.t each other's as in previous generations, as indicated in prior research. But the way Gen Y conducts its leadership behavior is different from previous generations as its behavior tends to lead with a transformational leadership style (Eagly et al., 1995; Eklund et al., 2017).

Table 11 gives the ranking of the mean and standard deviation for each of the **Leadership Behavior** factors across **Engineers and Non-Engineers groups** among Gen Y students.

Table 12 looks at the t-test among Engineers and Non-Engineers for Leadership Behavior. There were a large number of Engineer (30) and Non-Engineer (88) respondents, so it was felt useful to check the significance of difference of mean scores of Engineers and Non-Engineers participants with respect to the leadership behavior. When looking at the overall Leadership behavior scores across Engineers and Non-Engineers participants the t-test does not show significant difference between the two

groups at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis H06 that there is no significant difference between Engineers and non-Engineers when it comes to overall Leadership Behavior.

Reasons for adopting this type of classification is that engineers bring diverse innovations, useful strengths and useful perspectives. This has been clearly indicated in their preferences as indicated in the results. Engineering graduates have the tendency to exhibit a leadership behavior through clear definitions of roles and their expectations at the beginning itself. Hence, they focus more on their leadership behavior being more structural. To achieve their targets, engineers lead their followers through persuasion; hence adopting a more transformational form of leadership style for this as seen in previous generations in prior literature (Erkutlu, 2008; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006). Non-engineering graduates on the other hand have a more 'soft skill' approach and leads through behavior of tolerance to freedom and consideration. Both Graduates consider leadership behavior with emphasis on production- emphasis as important. Hence, engineers tend to adopt a leadership behavior which tends towards transactional leadership style and non-engineers tend to adopt a leadership behavior which is more a transformational leadership style. Hence, both groups have very different ideas of importance of different ways of leadership behavior. However, there is no significant difference between the overall Leadership Behavior of different group of Gen Y students categorized on the basis of education. The leadership behavior of this generation is however different from previous generations (Salahuddin, 2010).

Table 13 gives the ranking of the mean and standard deviation for each of the **Leadership Behavior** factors across **Work Experience groups among Gen Y students**. **Table 14** looks at the ANOVA among Work Experience groups for Leadership Behavior. Given that there were substantial numbers among various work experience groups, it was felt useful to check the significance of difference of mean scores among these various work-experience groups with respect to Leadership Behavior. The various work experience groups were: Nil Experience (51), < 1-year experience (25), and 1 – 5 years' experience (42).

To look at Leadership Behavior across different work experience groups we analyzed the data using ANOVA. As the table shows the F-value 5.241

obtained is significant at .007 level. This suggests that there is a significant relationship between Leadership Behavior and work experience. Therefore, we reject the Null Hypothesis $H0_7$ that there is no significant difference among various Work experience groups for Leadership Behavior among Gen Y students. The scores suggest that work experience is positively related with Leadership Behavior. An examination of the mean scores of the Leadership Behavior factors the work experience categories, suggests that there is a significant difference between Freshers and less than 1year work experience as indicated by Tukey HSD and LSD.

Since, there is a significant difference between the Leadership Behavior across different work-experience groups of Gen Y students. Freshers and less than 1year work experience are found higher overall Leadership Behavior scores with Gen Y students. This is because that this generation wants to lead as they think it empowers them though they lack the industry experience and expertise (Fries, n.d.). Freshers and less than 1year work experience value tolerance to freedom, production-emphasis, consideration and integration. They do this through showing a willingness to leave when leadership doesn't meet standards, express different needs regarding leadership training, embrace a flat management structure, value leaders who seek feedback from all employees, push back against policy for policy's sake, as leaders they seek to empower and transform, and seek and support flexibility and work-life balance (Fries, n.d.). Gen Y with work experience of 1-5 years also gives importance to the same factors but with nearly the same magnitude for all 3 top factors. From the point of view of work experience, leadership behaviors not valued are mainly tolerance uncertainty and role assumption. Freshers and 1-5years work experience do not value predictive-accuracy as much. Less than 1year work experience values reconciliation considerably less than other groups. This indicates that Gen Y's leadership behavior gives them a more transformational leadership styles than transactional. As for this generation, laissez-faire leadership style is definitely not preferable. If one had to consider the leadership methods adopted by this generation, it would be that they focus on having positive leadership behavior outcome, hence they focus on using a combination of behavioral, contingency and integrative leadership theories unlike previous research (Erkutlu, 2008; Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006; G. A. Yukl & Gardner, 2020).

Table 15 looks at the mean and standard deviation for each of the **Burnout** factors across all respondents. The top three Burnout factors are Exhaustion, Mental Distance and Cognitive Impairment, whereas the bottom three Burnout factors are Emotional Impairment, Psychological Complaints and Psychosomatic Complaints.

Table 16 looks at the mean and standard deviation for each of the **Burnout** factors across **male and female** respondents.

Table 17 looks at the t-test among gender for Burnout. It was felt useful to check significance of difference of mean scores of male and female participants with respect to Burnout. When looking at the overall Burnout scores across male and female participants the t-test did not show up any significant difference, therefore, we accept the Null Hypothesis $H0_8$ that there is no significant difference between male and female Gen Y students with respect to Burnout.

From the results, there is no significant difference between male and female Gen Y students with respect to Work Stress (Burnout). However, the types of Burnouts in this Generation are different. Both genders suffer from exhaustion. In addition to this, males suffer burnout more in the form of mental distance and emotional impairment, hence this is indicated through their reluctance to work and inability to control their frustrated emotions. Thus, males' burnout exhibit core systems than secondary burnout symptoms (Burnout Assessment Tool, n.d.). On the other hand, females not only do they suffer from emotional impairment but also from cognitive impairment. Thus, they will experience frustrations at work as well as memory problems, attention and concentration deficits and poor cognitive performance. Hence, their burnout will also be indicated by core symptoms. Both genders have low chances of psychological and psychosomatic complaints being manifested from burnout and hence, these complaints are likely to originate from other sources besides work. Of the two genders however, females are more likely to suffer from these complaints than males. Both genders have similar responses to stress as in accordance with previous research, however this research shows different levels of different types of burnout between the two genders. Further research (Eklund et al., 2017) can involve measuring the types of response to stress in terms of response to Fight-or-Flight response (Rodolfo, n.d.),

the Polyvagal Theory (Porges, 2001), and the Tend-and-Befriend response (Taylor et al., 2000).

Table 18 gives the ranking of the mean and standard deviation for each of the **Burnout** factors across **Engineers and Non-Engineers groups** among Gen Y students.

Table 19 looks at the t-test among Engineers and Non-Engineers for personal values. It was felt useful to check significance of difference of mean scores of Engineers (30) and Non-Engineers (88) participants with respect to the Burnout. When looking at the overall Burnout factors across Engineers and Non-Engineers participants the t-test shows significant difference at .05 level. This suggest that there is a significant relationship at 0.05 level between Burnout across Education groups. Therefore, we reject the Null Hypothesis $H0_9$ that there is significant difference among Engineering and Non-Engineering group for Burnout among Gen Y students.

Since, the results indicate that there is significant difference between the overall Work Stress (Burnout) scores of Engineers when compared with the scores of Non-Engineers. Like in the gender-wise analysis, both type of graduates suffer exhaustion, with engineering graduates experiencing more exhaustion burnout than non-engineering. The burnout symptoms of both are the same- emotional impairment and mental distance, only in interchangeable ranks. Hence, engineer's response to burnout will be more in the form of feeling frustrated and angry at work, irritability, overreacting, feeling upset or sad without knowing why which are indicative symptoms of emotional impairment. Non- engineering initial response will be indicated by a strong reluctance or aversion to work (Mental Distance).

The ranks of Burnout factors among Engineers and Non-Engineers were the same for both in terms of Cognitive Impairment, Psychological Complaints and Psychosomatic Complaints. Hence, the work related stress is not likely to cause secondary related burnout symptoms (Burnout Assessment Tool, n.d.). Hence, depending on the type of work force, companies will have to lead with different kinds of leadership behaviors depending on the situation and the educational background of the affected employees. Use of guidelines provided in the Situation theories will be

beneficial for the company in the long-run as indicated in previous research (Lerman, 2010; Norris & Vecchio, 1992). Furthermore, Gen Y leaders, depending on their education background will experience the same symptoms discussed above. The leadership behavioral response to the affected burnt-out leaders would require a combination of transactional and transformational leadership styles in different proportions depending on the educational background of these leaders as well (Stordeur et al., 2001).

Table 20 gives the ranking of the mean and standard deviation for each of the **Burnout** factors across **Work Experience groups** among Gen Y students. **Table 21** looks at the ANOVA among Work Experience groups for Burnout. It was felt useful to check the significance of difference of mean scores among these various work-experience groups with respect to Burnout. The various work experience groups were: Nil Experience (51), < 1-year experience (25), and 1 – 5 years' experience (42). To look at Burnout across different work experience groups we analyzed the data using ANOVA.

As the **table 21** shows the F-value 2.309 obtained is significant at .104. This suggest that there is a no significant relationship between Burnout and work experience. Therefore, we accept the Null Hypothesis $H0_{10}$ that there is no significant difference among various Work experience groups for Burnout among Gen Y students.

The results indicate that freshers and less than one-year work experience management students have burnout in the form of exhaustion, mental distance and cognitive impairment. Though the magnitude of this burnout is considerably less for freshers than for those with less than one-year experience. One would have hypothesized that as one gets more work experience, the more burnout occurs. But in the group with 1-5years work experience, exhaustion is the only common burnout symptom that all other work experience groups experience as well. In this group, unusual burnout symptoms are experience, namely emotional impairment and psychological complaints. This is the first situation wherein a work-related stress has caused a secondary burnout symptom. This could indicate that as one gets more experience, there are chances of secondary burnout symptoms as well as more diverse symptoms being experienced with this Generation.

This is in accordance with published reports of Millennial Burnout wherein Depression and "deaths of despair" are on the rise among millennials as they suffer through financial stress, loneliness and work place burnout (Lonely, burned out, and depressed, n.d.). Reports argue that previous generations have also experienced burnout but the causes, nature and symptoms of this work stress burnout for Gen Y is different and has been poorly researched upon (Bean, 2016). Another distinct feature of this research is that psychosomatic complaints has not been experienced much in this generation. A reason for this is that this generation truly does not experience it or would have wanted to withhold this sensitive information in this study. Thus, a conclusive research on this aspect cannot be expressed. All this indicates, that companies cannot adopt a one-remedy-fix-all policy to address the issue of work stress in this generation as consideration needs to be given in terms of gender, education background and work experience. Leadership Behaviors will also vary according to these demographics in terms of importance to this generation and their requirements need to be addressed suitably.

Regression results for Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) is shown in **Table 22.** We see that the correlation Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) is .476 exactly what we see in **Table 4**. This indicates a strong association between the two variables. We carried out further regression analysis that will allow us to predict values of Work Stress Burnout (variable y) values from Leadership Behavior practices (variable x). The prediction equation is $Y = a + bx$. Thus, our prediction equation would be

$$Y' = 4.174 + (-.496)X$$

where Y is the dependent variable and x is the independent variable. So, if Leadership Behavior practices score is 4 then the prediction for Work Stress Burnout would be 2.191.

Regression results for Work Stress (Burnout) and Leadership Behavior is shown in **Table 23.** We see that the correlation Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) is .476 exactly what we see in **Table 4**. This indicates a strong association between the two variables. We carried out further regression analysis that will allow us to predict values of Leadership Behavior Practices (variable y) values from Work Stress

Burnout (variable x). The prediction equation is Y = a + bx. Thus our prediction equation would be

$$Y' = 4.375 + (-.457)X$$

where Y is the dependent variable and x is the independent variable. So, if Work Stress Burnout score is 4 then the prediction for Leadership Behavior practices would be 2.547.

Regression results for Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) factors is shown in **Table 24.** We see that the correlation Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) factors is .520. This indicates a strong association between the variables. We carried out further regression analysis that will allow us to predict values of Leadership Behavior practices (variable y) values from Work Stress Burnout factors (variables x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5 and x_6). The prediction equation is $Y = a + bx_1+cx_2+dx_3+ex_4+fx_5+gx_6$ Thus our prediction equation would be

$$Y' = 4.456 + (-.046)X_1+(-.203)X_2+(-.102)X_3+(-.073)X_4+(-.033)X_5+(-.011)X_6$$

where y is the dependent variable and x is the independent variable. So, if all Work Stress Burnout variable scores are 4 then the prediction for Leadership Behavior practices would be 2.584.

Regression results for Work Stress (Burnout) and Leadership Behavior factors is shown in **Table 25.** We see that the correlation Leadership Behavior and Workstress (Burnout) factors is .662. This indicates a strong association between the variables. We carried out further regression analysis that will allow us to predict values of Work Stress Burnout (variable y) values from Leadership Behavior factors (variables x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8, x_9 and x_{10}).
The prediction equation is

$$Y = a + bx_1+cx_2+dx_3+ex_4+fx_5+gx_6+ix_7+jx_8+kx_9-lx_{10}.$$

Thus, our prediction equation would be

$$Y' = 4.637 + (-.322)X_1+(-.001)X_2+(-.066)X_3+(-.155)X_4+(-.038)X_5+(-.142)X_6+(.321)X_7+(-.035)X_8+(-.017)X_9+(-.158)X_{10}$$

where y is the dependent variable and x is the independent variable. So, if all Leadership Behavior scores are 4 then the prediction for Burnout would be 2.185.

As indicated with the first equation generated, that as the influence Leadership Behavior becomes less, it has adverse consequences to the Gen

Y individual, the Burnout level will increase. Through the second regression equation, the results also indicate that for the Gen Y leader himself who is experiencing burnout that as his stress level increase, the ability for him to carry out the appropriate leadership style through his leadership behavior will diminish.

The first equation indicates that supportive leadership behavior is required as guidance for this generation. If guidance decreases, then Gen Y has the tendency to get stressed-out that ultimately results in burnout. In terms of dealing with the consequences of a burnt out work force, adopting a leadership style that is either transformational, transactional and/or laissez-faire is more suitable in this scenario because this generation is not a one-method-fix-all problems as done for previous generation as indicated in previous research (Bass et al., 2008; Gregersen et al., 2014; Skogstad et al., 2007). Meaningful relationships between the burnout employees and appropriate leadership behaviors conducts fostering the acceptance of group goals and identifying and articulating a vision.

The second equation indicates that as stress increases, leadership behavior of the same Gen Y individual will decrease. This is in accordance with previous research wherein the leader's stress was linked to the staff stress level and showed that as staff stress levels increased so did the supervisor's (Giorgi et al., 2015). So has it also be linked other stress related researches (Gregersen et al., 2014).

Regression analysis was also done to determine the levels in different burnout factors contributing to the diminishing effect of leadership behavior. It predicted that Mental Distance and Cognitive Impairment and Emotional Impairment were the factors that produced the most diminishing leadership behavior effect whereas Psychosomatic Complaints for this generation produced the least. Finally, Regression analysis was also done to determine the levels in different leadership behavior factors contributing to burnout. It predicted that were the factors that Reconciliation, Structure, Role Assumption and Integration produced the most burnout effect whereas Consideration for this generation produced the least in fact it may have a positive impact.

Thus, in this research using valid and reliable instruments, one as able to predict the burnout effect form the leadership behavior factors, and the leadership behavior effect form the burnout factors.

6. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

Though the research did give an insight into the Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) levels of Gen Y management students using the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ – XII) and the Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT), certain areas could not be investigated due to various limitations. Much work needs to be done to resolve these areas in order to have a balanced leadership and stress management approach for dealing with this generation. Hence, future studies should revolve around the following areas-

1. A limitation of this research is that it was conducted with a homogenous population of management students. Future research could have a variety of different disciplines to determine if there is any uniqueness with different combinations of Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout). A larger sample would be preferable.
2. Since this research is based only from a single person's perspective, future research should involve gaining a leader's and follower's perspective from themselves as well as of each other.
3. Another limitation is that the current research is based on the current Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) of the participants and the results could be subject to change in the future.
4. The effect of organization's strategies on leadership behavior and burnout levels could be investigated in future.
5. How effective would technology be in influencing different Leadership Behaviors and Work Stress (Burnout)?
6. Future research could further our comprehension of the complex nature of Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) by examining other individual factors (intelligence levels, self-efficacy, etc.) and environmental factors (socio-economic background, educational institutions attended) as predictors of Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) and link them as contributors in decision making.
7. How should the combinations of Leadership Behaviors and Work Stress (Burnout)preferences be incorporated in advising? How effective are interventions that take these combinations into account?

8. Does mixing appropriate individuals with certain levels of leadership behavior and burnout, when forming project teams lead to better team products? Does it lead to increased inter-personal conflict? If the answer to each question is "yes," do the improved products compensate for the greater burnout risk? Does making team members aware of their differences lower the potential for conflict?

7. CONCLUSION

The results of this study are important both theoretically and practically because this generation is presently positioned to give critical contributions to decision-making in today's world.

In this research, the Gen Y management students' Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) were investigated using valid and reliable instruments i.e. the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ – XII) and the Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT) to meet the objectives of this research.

Gen Y ranks Tolerance Freedom, Consideration and Production-Emphasis highly in terms of leadership behavior whereas Exhaustion, Mental-Distance and Cognitive Impairment are the burnout symptoms most felt by this generation. Through Pearson's Correlation, a strong relationship was determined between Leadership Behavior and Work Stress (Burnout) and even between their factors. Demographic studies were conducted for Leadership Behaviors and Work Stress (Burnout) on the basis of gender, graduation background and work experience. Significant differences were seen with the group with Freshers and less than 1year work experience of having a higher overall Leadership Behavior scores with Gen Y students, and significant difference between the overall Work Stress (Burnout) scores of Engineers when compared with the scores of Non-Engineers. Through regression analysis, equations for estimations of leadership behavior and work stress levels were also generated.

It is important to know the Leadership Behaviors and Work Stress (Burnout) levels of this Gen Y population because they are distinctly different from previous generations. Many of these business students will be future leaders and knowledge of these variables and their interplay will

help guide the company in effectively leading their workforce. Since the analysis was on the leader himself, it provides better understanding of the antecedents and consequences of the leadership behavior and work stress (Burnout) on individuals and the organizations. Organizations must ensure that leadership behavior must not promote stress and that even though burnout may be endemic its levels must be kept to the minimum so that leadership behavior does not get adversely affected.

REFERENCES

- Arnold, K. A., Connelly, C. E., Walsh, M. M., & Martin Ginis, K. A. (2015). Leadership styles, emotion regulation, and burnout. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 20(4), 481–490. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039045
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Euwema, M. C. (2005). Job Resources Buffer the Impact of Job Demands on Burnout. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10(2), 170–180. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.2.170
- Bass, B. M., Bass, R., & Bass, B. M. (2008). The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications (4th ed., Free Press hardcover ed). Free Press.
- Bean, S. (2016, September 12). Overwork and burnout affects all the generations in the workplace. Workplace Insight. https://workplaceinsight.net/overwork-and-burn-out-affects-all-the-generations-in-the-workplace/
- Beilock, S. L., & Carr, T. H. (2005). When High-Powered People Fail: Working Memory and "Choking Under Pressure" in Math. Psychological Science, 16(2), 101–105. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.00789.x
- Buchanan, T. W. (2006). Impaired memory retrieval correlates with individual differences in cortisol response but not autonomic response. Learning & Memory, 13(3), 382–387. https://doi.org/10.1101/lm.206306
- Burnout Assessment Tool. (n.d.). Retrieved March 3, 2020, from https://burnoutassessmenttool.be/startpagina_eng/
- Byrne, A., Dionisi, A. M., Barling, J., Akers, A., Robertson, J., Lys, R., Wylie, J., & Dupré, K. (2014). The depleted leader: The influence of leaders' diminished psychological resources on leadership behaviors. The Leadership Quarterly, 25(2), 344–357. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.09.003
- Carr, C. (1969). Book Reviews: The Human Organization: By R. Likert (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967), pp. 258. Price $8.55 (Aust.). Journal of

Industrial Relations, 11(1), 77–78. https://doi.org/10.1177/002218566901100112

- Chajut, E., & Algom, D. (2003). Selective attention improves under stress: Implications for theories of social cognition. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85(2), 231–248. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.231
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings. The Academy of Management Review, 12(4), 637. https://doi.org/10.2307/258069
- Courtright, S. H., Gardner, R. G., Smith, T. A., McCormick, B. W., & Colbert, A. E. (2016). My Family Made Me Do It: A Cross-Domain, Self-Regulatory Perspective on Antecedents to Abusive Supervision. Academy of Management Journal, 59(5), 1630–1652. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.1009
- de Vries, R. E., Bakker-Pieper, A., & Oostenveld, W. (2010). Leadership = Communication? The Relations of Leaders' Communication Styles with Leadership Styles, Knowledge Sharing and Leadership Outcomes. Journal of Business and Psychology, 25(3), 367–380. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-009-9140-2
- Demerouti, E., & Rispens, S. (2014). Improving the image of student-recruited samples: A commentary. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 87(1), 34–41. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12048
- DuBrin, A. J. (2016). Leadership: Research findings, practice, and skills (Eighth Edition). Cengage Learning.
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 117(1), 125–145. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.1.125
- Eklund, K. E., Barry, E. S., & Grunberg, N. E. (2017). Gender and Leadership. In A. Alvinius (Ed.), Gender Differences in Different Contexts. InTech. https://doi.org/10.5772/65457
- Erkutlu, H. (2008). The impact of transformational leadership on organizational and leadership effectiveness: The Turkish case. Journal of Management Development, 27(7), 708–726. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710810883616
- Evans, M. G. (1970). The effects of supervisory behavior on the path-goal relationship. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 5(3), 277–298. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(70)90021-8
- Fiedler, F. E., O'Brien, G. E., & Ilgen, D. R. (1969). The Effect of Leadership Style Upon the Performance and Adjustment of Volunteer Teams Operating in Stressful Foreign Environment. Human Relations, 22(6), 503–514. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872676902200602

- Folkman, S., Lazarus, R. S., Gruen, R. J., & DeLongis, A. (1986). Appraisal, coping, health status, and psychological symptoms. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50(3), 571–579. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.50.3.571
- Fries, K. (n.d.). 7 Ways Millennials Are Changing Traditional Leadership. Forbes. Retrieved March 3, 2020, from https://www.forbes.com/sites/kimberlyfries/2018/01/18/7-ways-millennials-are-changing-traditional-leadership/
- Ganster, D. C., & Rosen, C. C. (2013). Work Stress and Employee Health: A Multidisciplinary Review. Journal of Management, 39(5), 1085–1122. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313475815
- Giorgi, G., Mancuso, S., Fiz Perez, F. J., Montani, F., Courcy, F., & Arcangeli, G. (2015). Does Leaders' Health (and Work-Related Experiences) Affect their Evaluation of Followers' Stress? Safety and Health at Work, 6(3), 249–255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shaw.2015.07.005
- Gregersen, S., Vincent-Ho per, S., & Nienhaus, A. (2014). Health-Relevant Leadership Behaviour: A Comparison of Leadership Constructs. German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung, 28(1–2), 117–138. https://doi.org/10.1177/239700221402800107
- Halverson, S. K., Murphy, S. E., & Riggio, R. E. (2004). Charismatic Leadership in Crisis Situations: A Laboratory Investigation of Stress and Crisis. Small Group Research, 35(5), 495–514. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496404264178
- Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and Prescription: How Gender Stereotypes Prevent Women's Ascent Up the Organizational Ladder. Journal of Social Issues, 57(4), 657–674. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00234
- Hejres, S., Braganza, A., & Aldabi, T. (2017). Investigating the Effectiveness of Leadership Styles on Instructional Leadership and Teachers Job Expectancy in Kingdom of Bahrain. American Journal of Educational Research, 5(7), 694–709. https://doi.org/10.12691/education-5-7-2
- Hersey-blanchard-1988.pdf. (n.d.). Retrieved February 19, 2020, from https://ess220.files.wordpress.com/2008/02/hersey-blanchard-1988.pdf
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. American Psychologist, 44(3), 513–524. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513
- House, R. J. (1971). A Path Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16(3), 321. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391905

- Howell, J. M., Neufeld, D. J., & Avolio, B. J. (2005). Examining the relationship of leadership and physical distance with business unit performance. The Leadership Quarterly, 16(2), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.01.004
- Job Burnout | Annual Review of Psychology. (n.d.). Retrieved March 2, 2020, from https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397
- Jordan, S. R. (2016). Positive Leadership Behavior. In A. Farazmand (Ed.), Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance (pp. 1–6). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_1341-1
- Jung, D. I., & Avolio, B. J. (1999). Effects of Leadership Style and Followers' Cultural Orientation on Performance in Group and Individual Task Conditions. Academy of Management Journal, 42(2), 208–218. https://doi.org/10.5465/257093
- Kickul, J., & Neuman, G. (2000). Emergent Leadership Behaviors: The Function of Personality and Cognitive Ability in Determining Teamwork Performance and KSAs. Journal of Business and Psychology, 15(1), 27–51. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007714801558
- Lastovkova, A., Carder, M., Rasmussen, H. M., Sjoberg, L., Groene, G. J. de, Sauni, R., Vevoda, J., Vevodova, S., Lasfargues, G., Svartengren, M., Varga, M., Colosio, C., & Pelclova, D. (2018). Burnout syndrome as an occupational disease in the European Union: An exploratory study. Industrial Health, 56(2), 160–165. https://doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.2017-0132
- Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) | Fisher College of Business. (n.d.). Leadership Initiative | Fisher College of Business. Retrieved February 19, 2020, from https://fisher.osu.edu/centers-partnerships/leadership/leader-behavior-description-questionnaire-lbdq
- LeBlanc, V. R. (2009). The Effects of Acute Stress on Performance: Implications for Health Professions Education: Academic Medicine, 84(Supplement), S25–S33. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0b013e3181b37b8f
- Leonard, H. S. (Ed.). (2013). The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of the psychology of leadership, change and organizational development. John Wiley & Sons.
- Lerman, A. (2010). Situational Leadership Theory. 12.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in Group Dynamics: Concept, Method and Reality in Social Science; Social Equilibria and Social Change. Human Relations, 1(1), 5–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872674700100103
- Lonely, burned out, and depressed: The state of millennials' mental health in 2019. (n.d.). Business Insider. Retrieved March 3, 2020, from

https://www.businessinsider.in/strategy/news/lonely-burned-out-and-depressed-the-state-of-millennials-mental-health-in-2019/articleshow/71521984.cms

- Lyons, J. B., & Schneider, T. R. (2009). The effects of leadership style on stress outcomes. The Leadership Quarterly, 20(5), 737–748. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.06.010
- Malloy, T., & Penprase, B. (2010). Nursing leadership style and psychosocial work environment: Leadership style and work environment. Journal of Nursing Management, 18(6), 715–725. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2010.01094.x
- Managerial grid model. (2019). In Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Managerial_grid_model&oldid=905944974
- Molloy, P. L. (n.d.). A Review of the Managerial Grid Model of Leadership and its Role as a Model of Leadership Culture. 31.
- Norris, W. R., & Vecchio, R. P. (1992). Situational Leadership Theory: A Replication. Group & Organization Management, 17(3), 331–342. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601192173010
- Northouse, P. G. (2001). Leadership: Theory and practice (2nd ed). Sage Publications.
- Nystrom, P. C. (1978). MANAGERS AND THE HI-HI LEADER MYTH. Academy of Management Journal, 21(2), 325–331. https://doi.org/10.2307/255767
- Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational Leadership and Job Behaviors: The Mediating Role of Core Job Characteristics. Academy of Management Journal, 49(2), 327–340. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2006.20786079
- Porges, S. W. (2001). The polyvagal theory: Phylogenetic substrates of a social nervous system. International Journal of Psychophysiology, 42(2), 123–146. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8760(01)00162-3
- Psychosocial risks and workers health—OSHWiki. (n.d.). Retrieved March 1, 2020, from https://oshwiki.eu/wiki/Psychosocial_risks_and_workers_health
- Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Complex Organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 15(2), 150. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391486
- Robbins, S. P. (2001). Organizational behavior (9th ed). Prentice Hall.
- Rodolfo, K. (n.d.). What is homeostasis? : Scie... 3.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., Hoogduin, K., Schaap, C., & Kladler, A. (2001). On the clinical validity of the maslach burnout inventory and the burnout measure. Psychology & Health, 16(5), 565–582. https://doi.org/10.1080/08870440108405527

- Shaham, Y., Singer, J. E., & Schaeffer, M. H. (1992). Stability/Instability of Cognitive Strategies Across Tasks Determine Whether Stress Will Affect Judgmental Processes'. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22(9), 691–713. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1992.tb00998.x
- Skogstad, A., Aasland, M. S., Nielsen, M. B., Hetland, J., Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2014). The Relative Effects of Constructive, Laissez-Faire, and Tyrannical Leadership on Subordinate Job Satisfaction: Results From Two Prospective and Representative Studies. Zeitschrift Für Psychologie, 222(4), 221–232. https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000189
- Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12(1), 80–92. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.80
- Smith, B. L., & Hughey, A. W. (2006). Leadership in Higher Education — Its Evolution and Potential: A Unique Role Facing Critical Challenges. Industry and Higher Education, 20(3), 157–163. https://doi.org/10.5367/000000006777690972
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. The Journal of Psychology, 25(1), 35–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1948.9917362
- Stordeur, S., D'Hoore, W., & Vandenberghe, C. (2001). Leadership, organizational stress, and emotional exhaustion among hospital nursing staff. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 35(4), 533–542. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2001.01885.x
- Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. H. (1973, May 1). How to Choose a Leadership Pattern. Harvard Business Review, May 1973. https://hbr.org/1973/05/how-to-choose-a-leadership-pattern
- Taylor, S. E., Klein, L. C., Lewis, B. P., Gruenewald, T. L., Gurung, R. A. R., & Updegraff, J. A. (2000). Biobehavioral responses to stress in females: Tend-and-befriend, not fight-or-flight. Psychological Review, 107(3), 411–429. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.107.3.411
- The Stress of Leadership. (2007). 16.
- van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S. B. (2013). A Critical Assessment of Charismatic—Transformational Leadership Research: Back to the Drawing Board? The Academy of Management Annals, 7(1), 1–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2013.759433
- Van Velsor, E., Leslie, J. B., Fleenor, J. W., & Morrison, A. M. (1997). Choosing 360: A guide to evaluating multi-rater feedback instruments for management development. Center for Creative Leadership.
- Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1981). Leadership and decision-making (2. paperback pr). Univ. of Pittsburgh Pr.

- Weber, M., Henderson, A. M., & Parsons, T. (2012). Max Weber: The theory of social and economic organization. Martino Publishing.
- White Paper—The SHL Universal Competency Framework. (2011). 11.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial Leadership: A Review of Theory and Research. Journal of Management, 15(2), 251–289. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638901500207
- Yukl, G. A., & Gardner, W. L. (2020). Leadership in organizations (Ninth edition). Pearson Education, Inc.