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ABSTRACT
The present study investigate that the Stress Management by Development of Emotional Intelligence with reference to CMTS, BSNL, Tamil Nadu Telecom Circle. Stress is a process in which environmental demands tax or exceeds the adaptive capacity of an organism resulting in psychological and biological changes that may place persons at risk for disease. The responses to stress management items indicate an individual’s tolerance to stress and impulse control. Emotional Intelligence is the ability to monitor one’s own and other’s emotions, to discriminate among them and to use the information to guide one’s thinking and actions. The study comprises the managing Stress by using behaviour interventions. To examine the level of EQ using by Baron’s Emotional Quotient Inventory Scale among BSNL executives. This has 15 subscales. The sample size was restricted to 93 executives in a respective group are included male and female and their age group is 25 to 56 years. The 15 subscales included self-regard, emotional self awareness, assertiveness, independence, self-actualization, empathy, social-responsibility, inter-personal relationship, stress-tolerance, impulse-control, reality-testing, flexibility, problem-solving, optimism and happiness. The respective group was administered the behavioural interventions for post test. The interventions included anger relaxation technique, genital muscle relaxation technique, slow-deep breathing exercise, Benson’s relaxation response, simplified kundalini yoga, laughter technique and reduction of breathing rate. The respective group in the after intervention was found to be higher in stress management skills, emotional intelligence and reduced stress level than respective group before intervention the reason being that respective group post test got the benefit from behavioural intervention.
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INTRODUCTION
Stress arises when individuals perceive that they cannot adequately cope with the demands being made on them or with threats to their well being, Lazarus (1966). Stress is many-faceted process that occurs in reaction to events or situations in our environment termed stressors. Stress is the process of appraising events as threatening, challenging or harmful and responding to such events on a physiological, emotional, cognitive or behavioural level.

Emotional Intelligence is the ability to monitor one’s own and other’s emotions, to discriminate among them and to use the information to guide one’s thinking and actions (Salovey and Mayer, 1990). The concept of emotional intelligence is an umbrella term that captures a broad collection
of individual skills and dispositions, usually referred to as soft skills or inter and intra-personal skills, that are outside the traditional areas of specific knowledge, general intelligence and technical or professional skills. Most of the authors on the topic note that in order to be a well adjusted, fully functioning member of society (or family member, spouse, employee, etc.), one must possess both traditional intelligence and emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence involves being aware of emotions and how they can affect and interact with traditional intelligence (e.g., impair or enhance judgement, etc.). This view fits well with the commonly held notion that it takes more than just brains to succeed in life—one must also be able to develop and maintain healthy interpersonal relationships. Viewed from this perspective, emotional intelligence is nothing new. According to Mayer and Salovey (1993) emotional intelligence allows up to think more creatively and to use our emotions to solve problems. Emotional intelligence probably overlaps to some extent with general intelligence. The emotionally intelligent person is skilled in four areas, namely identifying emotions, using emotions, understanding emotions and regulating emotions.

This body of research has examined how organizations, as powerful culture eating institutions, have applied normative expectations and established boundaries for the acceptable expression of emotion among employees through tactics such as applicant screening and selection measures, employee training, off-the-job socialization opportunities, organisational rewards and the creation of rituals, ideologies and other symbols for indoctrinating the newly hired into the culture of the organization (Gopinath, 2011c). A study concerned with workplace emotion dimensions of employees in BSNL, trichy secondary switching area, Tamil Nadu Circle was undertaken (Gopinath, 2011a). The study was empirically conducted using a structured questionnaire dealing with various aspects of emotional patterns. After thoroughly analyzing the primary data, the researcher concludes that employees at BSNL, by nature as well as by work culture, have developed a high degree of equanimity, balanced altitude and are characterized by high level of self accountability as well as avoidance of personal hatred. Finally, it is concluded that workplace emotions are multi dimensional in the organization and hence, being a service enterprise, the corporate has the onus of harvesting the flux of emotions to build a professional work attitude in employees. A study was carried out on Employee’s work place emotions in BSNL organization (Gopinath, 2011b). It was found out that workplace emotions were multi dimensional in the BSNL organization. Being a service enterprise, the corporate has the onus of harvesting the flux of emotions to build a professional work attitude in employees. Based on the research findings and personal observations, the following suggestions are brought forth for the improvement of the workplace system, Special orientation programmes may be arranged for giving new exposure to higher bench mark standards.

The concept of EI has been extensively popularized in the lay press and corporate world as individual purport the potential ability of EI to predict various markers of success was examined by Romanelli et al. (2006). EI most commonly incorporates concepts of emotional expression and regulation, self-awareness and empathy. Emotional intelligence in promoting self-efficacy of the visually impaired fresh students of Federal College of Education (special) was carried out by Eniola and Busari (2007). Besides this, EI training program in promoting self-efficacy of the visually impaired student showed no improvement in the self-efficacy. Emotional intelligence training and its implications for stress, health and performance was carried out by Slaski and Cartwright (2003). Differences were found in scores before the program and after the program. The training improved mental health and decreased the feelings of occupational stress.

- The objectives of the study
- To assess the emotional intelligence of executives
METHODOLOGY

Sample frame: The sample size was restricted to 93 executives in a respective group are included male and female and their age group is 25-56 years. The study the sample unit is chosen on stratified proportionate sampling method.

Data collection method: The standardized questionnaire was given to respective groups. The socio-demographics dimensions and Baron’s emotional quotient inventory scales of the respective group pre-test before intervention is denoted by “A”. “B” pertains to the socio-demographics dimensions and Baron’s emotional quotient inventory scales are the post-test after intervention respective group after eight weeks. The Baron’s emotional quotient inventory scales with 5 likert scale format.

Statistical tools: Primary data were collected, tabulated. A pilot study was carried out to revise the questionnaires and for item analysis. The validity and reliability of the questionnaires were measured. The internal consistencies of scale were assessed through computing Cronbach’s Alpha. The questionnaire shows the reliability value ranging from 0.6-0.9. Implication from these values indicates that all of the items used for each component in the questionnaire have a high and consistent reliability values.

MATERIALS

- Socio-Demographics Dimensions and Emotional Intelligence Scale (Bar-On, 1997).

Behavioural interventions:

- Anger Relaxation Technique (Ganesan, 1980a, unpublished paper)
- Genital Muscle Relaxation Technique (Ganesan, 1980b, 1984 unpublished papers)
- Slow-Deep Breathing Exercise (White, 1975)
- Benson’s Relaxation Response (Benson, 1998)
- Simplified Kundalini Yoga (Maharishi, 1972)
- Laughter Technique (Ganesan, 1990a, unpublished paper)
- Reduction of Breathing Rate (Ganesan, 1990b, unpublished paper)

All the above behavioural interventions are known as training methods or techniques. Each of them involves simple practices. A minimum of 10 and a maximum of 20 min can be allotted for each technique.

Statement of problem

- To evaluate the effectiveness of behavioural intervention in the management of stress among executives to enhance emotional intelligence
- The current study is devoted to analyze the emotional intelligence based on Bar-On emotional quotient inventory scale and reduction of executives stress based on behavioural intervention
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the mean, standard deviation and mean difference of the respective group before and after interventions for the 15 sub-scales of EQ.

Hypothesis 1: There exists a significant difference among the emotional self-awareness subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

The Emotional Self-Awareness subscale of the Mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 27.68 and 1.11 respectively; the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 33.13 and 1.52 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the Emotional Self-Awareness subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be 5.45 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 46.22; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the Emotional Self-Awareness subscale before and after interventions on respective group.

Hypothesis 2: There exists a significant difference among the Assertiveness subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

The Assertiveness subscale of the Mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 25.32 and 0.47 respectively; the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 30.77 and 1.20 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the Assertiveness subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be 5.45 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 46.22; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the Assertiveness subscale before and after interventions on respective group.

Hypothesis 3: There exists a significant difference among the Self-Regard subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-scales</th>
<th>Before (A)</th>
<th>After (B)</th>
<th>Modulus of mean difference</th>
<th>Critical ratio (t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional self-awareness (ES)</td>
<td>27.68±1.11</td>
<td>33.13±1.52</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>46.22**2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness (AS)</td>
<td>25.32±0.47</td>
<td>30.77±1.20</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>46.22**3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self regard (SR)</td>
<td>28.70±1.11</td>
<td>34.42±1.65</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>70.48**4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self actualization (SA)</td>
<td>29.68±1.11</td>
<td>39.40±1.65</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>70.48**5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence (IN)</td>
<td>21.56±1.19</td>
<td>27.81±1.61</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>50.04**6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy (EM)</td>
<td>23.65±0.87</td>
<td>32.65±1.35</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>74.76**7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter personal relationship (IR)</td>
<td>33.80±1.32</td>
<td>48.33±1.76</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>104.65**8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility (SRES)</td>
<td>29.89±1.25</td>
<td>39.61±1.74</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>77.97**9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving (PS)</td>
<td>24.54±1.03</td>
<td>36.16±1.36</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>97.38**10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality Testing (RT)</td>
<td>32.17±1.17</td>
<td>42.80±1.58</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>97.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility (FL)</td>
<td>25.38±1.33</td>
<td>33.92±1.63</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>82.87**12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Tolerance (ST)</td>
<td>31.06±1.08</td>
<td>40.26±1.27</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>99.86**13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulses Control (IC)</td>
<td>31.34±0.85</td>
<td>40.57±1.31</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>99.86**14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness (HA)</td>
<td>31.87±0.98</td>
<td>40.16±1.49</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>81.92**15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism (OP)</td>
<td>25.80±0.76</td>
<td>34.02±1.27</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>81.93**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 93, **p<0.01
The self-regard subscale of the Mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 28.70 and 1.11 respectively, the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 38.42 and 1.65 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the self-regard subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be 9.72 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 70.48; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the Self-Regard subscale before and after interventions on respective group.

**Hypothesis 4:** There exists a significant difference among the self-actualization subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

The self-actualization subscale of the mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 29.68 and 1.11 respectively, the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 39.40 and 1.66 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the self-actualization subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be 9.72 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 70.48; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the self-actualization subscale before and after interventions on respective group.

**Hypothesis 5:** There exists a significant difference among the Independence subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

The Independence subscale of the mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 21.53 and 1.19 respectively, the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 27.81 and 1.61 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the independence subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be 6.28 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 50.04; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the independence subscale before and after interventions on respective group.

**Hypothesis 6:** There exists a significant difference among the empathy subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

The empathy subscale of the mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 23.65 and 0.87 respectively, the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 32.65 and 1.35 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the empathy subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be 9.00 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 74.76; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the empathy subscale before and after interventions on respective group.

**Hypothesis 7:** There exists a significant difference among the inter-personal relationship subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

The inter-personal relationship subscale of the mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 33.80 and 1.32 respectively, the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 48.33 and 1.76 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the inter-personal relationship subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be
14.54 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 104.65; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the inter-personal relationship subscale before and after interventions on respective group.

**Hypothesis 8:** There exists a significant difference among the social responsibility subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

The social responsibility subscale of the mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 29.89 and 1.25 respectively, the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 39.51 and 1.74 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the social responsibility subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be 9.61 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 77.97; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the social responsibility subscale before and after interventions on respective group.

**Hypothesis 9:** There exists a significant difference among the Problem Solving subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

The problem solving subscale of the mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 24.54 and 1.03 respectively, the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 35.16 and 1.36 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the problem solving subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be 10.62 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 97.38; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the problem solving subscale before and after interventions on respective group.

**Hypothesis 10:** There exists a significant difference among the reality testing subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

The reality testing subscale of the mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 32.17 and 1.17 respectively, the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 42.80 and 1.58 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the reality testing subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be 10.62 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 97.38; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the reality testing subscale before and after interventions on respective group.

**Hypothesis 11:** There exists a significant difference among the flexibility subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

The flexibility subscale of the mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 25.38 and 1.33 respectively, the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 33.92 and 1.63 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the flexibility subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be 8.55 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 82.87; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the flexibility subscale before and after interventions on respective group.
Hypothesis 12: There exists a significant difference among the stress tolerance subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

The stress tolerance subscale of the mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 31.06 and 1.08 respectively, the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 40.26 and 1.27 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the stress tolerance subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be 9.19 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 99.86; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the stress tolerance subscale before and after interventions on respective group.

Hypothesis 13: There exists a significant difference among the impulses control subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

The impulses control subscale of the mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 31.38 and 0.85 respectively, the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 40.57 and 1.31 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the impulses control subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be 9.19 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 99.86; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the impulses control subscale before and after interventions on respective group.

Hypothesis 14: There exists a significant difference among the happiness subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

The happiness subscale of the mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 31.87 and 0.98 respectively, the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 40.10 and 1.49 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the happiness subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be 8.23 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 81.92; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the happiness subscale before and after interventions on respective group.

Hypothesis 15: There exists a significant difference among the optimism subscale before and after intervention on respective group.

The optimism subscale of the mean and S.D scores of the respective group before intervention/pre test (A) are 25.80 and 0.75 respectively, the same scores after intervention/post test (B) are 34.02 and 1.27 respectively. This confirms an improvement of the optimism subscale scores of the respondents after eight weeks of the application of intervention. The mean difference scores between before and after intervention was found to be 8.23 and it is significant (Critical ratio = 81.92; p<0.01). Therefore there is a significant difference among the optimism subscale before and after interventions on respective group.

DISCUSSION

- There was an improvement in the total EQ score, improvement in stress management skills which was contributed from development of EI
- Significant changes were observed in the Pre test and post test after eight weeks of behavioural intervention
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Among executives significant changes were observed in the areas of 15 sub-scales were well improved, due to eight weeks of behavioural intervention.

Hence it may be concluded that behavioural intervention is very effective in managing stress and reduction of executives stress.

CONCLUSION

Findings from the present study reveal that the behavioral intervention improved the stress management score with 15 subscales and reduced the executive stress herein studied. The sample population namely, respective group pre test (A) and, behavioural intervention for eight weeks was given to respective group pre test (A) which has now been termed as respective group post test (B). The behavioural interventions included Anger relaxation technique, genital muscle relaxation technique, slow-deep breathing exercise, Benson’s relaxation response, simplified kundalini yoga, laughter technique and reduction of breathing rate.

Groups A and B: The respective group in the after intervention was found to be higher in stress management skills, emotional intelligence and reduced stress level than respective group before intervention the reason being that respective group post test got the benefit from behavioural intervention.
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