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ABSTRACT

The current study investigated the relationship between the psychological capital and work tension of entrepreneurs on their level of job satisfaction using a national (United States) random sample of 144 founders who were the top management team leaders of their new ventures. As expected, the findings demonstrate a positive relationship between psychological capital and job satisfaction and a negative relationship between work tension and job satisfaction. Also in alignment with our predictions, psychological capital was found to reduce the negative effects of work tension on job satisfaction. As such, it appears that the development of psychological capital within entrepreneurs may help them to build resistance against the wide range of psychological stressors that they inherently face while leading their new ventures.

INTRODUCTION

The act of creating a new venture is an intentional choice made by an entrepreneur (Bird, 1988). Typically this decision is driven, in part, by non-financial factors such as the desire to have greater independence (Cooper & Artz, 1995) or to follow one’s passion (Cardon, Zietsma, Saporito, Matherne, & Davis, 2005). Given this fact, we know remarkably little about what drives satisfaction and psychological well-being for entrepreneurs. This is an important issue for two main reasons. First, new business founders act as models signaling the desirability of entrepreneurship as a vocation to other individuals. To this end, psychologically distressed entrepreneurs are likely to convey to others that new venture creation is not a worthwhile undertaking. Secondly, dissatisfied entrepreneurs are more likely to reduce their efforts and give up in the face of adversity, thus experiencing a greater rate of venture failure.

Considering that the context of new venture creation and development is fraught with environmental stressors that can cause work tension (Baron, 1998), it would seem that entrepreneurs must possess a degree of mental hardiness in order to persist and maintain high levels of psychological well-being. We conceptualize this mental hardiness in terms of psychological capital—defined as psychic resources that can be drawn from in order to meet the emotional challenges of the moment (Csikszentmihalyi, 2004). While human capital defines “what you know” and social capital defines “who you know,” psychological capital is said to define “who you are” (Jensen & Luthans, 2006). Luthans and Youssef (2004) suggest that individuals possessing the combination of self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resiliency tend to be endowed with high levels of psychological capital.

The current study considers the relationship of psychological capital and work tension with the job satisfaction of lead entrepreneurs, who are defined for the purposes of the current study as individuals who are both founders and the top management team leaders of their firms. We focus on the lead entrepreneur due to evidence suggesting that—although new ventures are often formed by founding teams—one individual typically emerges as the leader (Ensley, Carland, & Carland, 2000) and has an inordinate impact on the vision and strategic direction of the firm (Baum, Locke, & Kirkpatrick, 1998). This responsibility typically involves leading the firm through dynamic conditions, and making strategic decisions under great time pressure and with limited resources (Baron, 1998; Ensley, Pearce, & Hmieleski, 2006). This set of circumstances would appear to make lead entrepreneurs particularly susceptible to experiencing work-related tension from their jobs, since they shoulder the bulk of the responsibility for the eventual success or failure of their businesses. Further, the high level of dependence
that nascent firms place on their lead entrepreneurs requires that they are able to deal effectively with high levels of psychological strain and flourish under adverse conditions.

Through the current study we hope to make two primary contributions. The first is to demonstrate the value of psychological capital within the domain of entrepreneurship, where physical, human, and social forms of capital have historically received much greater attention. Secondly, we seek to add to a growing literature on the well-being of entrepreneurs (e.g., Brigham, De Castro, & Shepherd, 2007; Hmieleski & Corbett, 2006), by examining one pathway (i.e., psychological capital) through which the negative effects of work tension experienced by entrepreneurs might be reduced.

With these goals in mind, the paper proceeds as follows. First, we briefly review the literature on psychological capital and work tension, and develop hypotheses for their relationships with the well-being of entrepreneurs. Afterward, we outline the methodology of the study and review the results. Finally, we consider the implications of our findings.

**Psychological Capital**

Psychological capital has become the central topic of examination within the emerging area of positive organizational behavior (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). It is conceptualized as a second-order construct comprised of the following elements: self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), optimism (Carver & Sheier, 2003), hope (Snyder, Cheavens, & Sympson, 1997), and resiliency (Masten, 2001). There are two key aspects to each of these factors. First, they are each “state-like” in that they can be developed through training and intentional practice. This is to say that, although there may be dispositional boundaries or upper limits on the degree to which individuals are able to exhibit each of these characteristics, it is possible for most individuals to achieve some gains in each of these areas. Secondly, each element has been established as being positively associated with human performance and well-being. We will now provide a brief overview of each of these elements, with an eye toward their impact on the well-being of entrepreneurs.

**Self-Efficacy**

Self-efficacy relates to the general belief in one’s ability to produce high levels of performance in tasks undertaken in life (Bandura, 1977). It is considered a state-like characteristic that generally increases with experience (Phillips & Gully, 1997). People with high levels of self-efficacy tend to set challenging goals; persist toward the achievement of their goals, even under difficult and stressful circumstances; recover quickly from failure, even in the face of conditions that would appear to be overwhelming to the average person; be more satisfied with their jobs; and experience greater levels of life satisfaction (Bandura, 1997). In organizational research, several studies have demonstrated a positive relationship between self-efficacy and the degree of satisfaction that individual derive from their work (e.g., Dormann, Fay, Zapf, & Frese, 2006; Judge & Bono, 2001).

Recent studies have also begun to consider the relationship of entrepreneurial specific measures of self-efficacy with the job satisfaction of entrepreneurs. For example, studies by Bradley and Roberts (2004) and Hmieleski and Corbett (2006) have each identified a robust positive relationship between the degree to which individuals perceive themselves as having the ability to successfully perform the various roles and tasks of entrepreneurship and their actual satisfaction with their jobs as entrepreneurs.

**Optimism**

Optimism is defined as generalized positive outcome expectancy (Carver & Sheier, 2003). While self-efficacy has been established as an individual characteristic that tends to be context specific and developed through life experience (Bandura, 1977; 1997), optimism has been shown to remain relatively stable within individuals across both time and context (Schulman, Keith, & Seligman, 1993). Seligman (1990) has, however, suggested that although individuals tend to have fixed ranges in which they are able
to experience optimism, it is possible through training to move persons to consistently experience the high end of their range. Thus, keeping with Luthans and Youssef’s (2004) criteria of psychological capital consisting of attributes that can be developed within individuals, it does seem that there is some latitude to increase optimism over time, albeit only up to certain limits. A vast amount of research has demonstrated a positive relationship between optimism and well-being. Particularly important within the context of entrepreneurship is the finding that optimists, as opposed to pessimists, often enjoy experiencing various forms of adversity (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 2001). Further, while pessimists tend to easily give up in the face of adversity, optimists typically rise to the challenge presented to them, persisting and remaining engaged in the pursuit of their goals (Carver, & Scheier, 2003).

The entrepreneurship literature on optimism has provided strong support for concluding that entrepreneurs tend to be, on average, more optimistic than other persons. For example, a study by Cooper, Woo, and Dunkelberg (1988) found extreme optimism to be pervasive among entrepreneurs, as the authors identified no significant difference in the degree of optimism that entrepreneurs exhibited toward the success of their businesses, regardless of their individual level of preparedness to lead their firms. Several other researchers have also pointed out the pervasiveness of optimism amongst entrepreneurs (e.g., Hmieleski & Baron, 2006; Lovallo & Kahneman, 2003). De Meza and Southey (1996) account for the occurrence of this phenomenon by arguing that many individuals starting new businesses have little evidence upon which to base their beliefs about the likelihood of failure or success and that this creates a situation that is ripe for extreme optimism. Therefore, entrepreneurship would seem to attract a disproportionate number of optimistic individuals. Thus, in terms the psychological capital of entrepreneurs, this is probably the component that is inherently most well-developed within entrepreneurs.

Hope

Perhaps the most widely accepted conceptualization of hope has been developed by Snyder (Snyder et al., 1997; Snyder, 2000), who defines hope as consisting of three interacting components: goals, agency, and pathways. For individuals to possess hope, they must have goals, short- and/or long-term, the motivation to achieve their goals, and the ability to imagine multiple routes through which their goals may be achieved. The pathways component—the ability to imagine multiple routes to success—is a key factor in differentiating hope from optimism. Central to hope is the presence of an internal dialoged within individuals, reinforcing their self-view that they cannot be stopped and will find a way to get things done. In non-academic circles hope is often viewed as the extent of an individual’s willpower. Hope, like optimism, tends to be considered a dispositional individual characteristic that can be moderately increased through training interventions over time (Valle, Huebner, & Suldo, 2006). Hope has been found to be positively related to life satisfaction (Valle, Huebner, & Suldo, 2004) and to be a buffer against psychological distress (Horton & Wallander, 2001; Ong, Edwards, & Bergeman, 2006). Further, individuals high in hope tend to have an exceptional capacity to deal with “surprise-based” events, such as a sudden tragic loss (Lopez, Snyder, & Pedrotti, 2003). In fact, hope has often been viewed as a coping mechanism for dealing with stressful events (Alexander & Onwuegbuzie, 2007).

We know of no previous research that has directly examined the relationship of hope with the performance or satisfaction of entrepreneurs. In fact, even within the general management literature, work on the effects of hope is only beginning to emerge. What little work has been done, however, has found hope to be positively related to both the performance and satisfaction of workers (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). Additional research has found the dispositional hope of managers to be positively related to their sense of responsibility toward employees and toward societal issues (Andersson, Giacalone, & Jurkiewicz, 2007). We expect hope to be of at least equal importance within the entrepreneurship context, as setting goals and planning for the future, imagining multiple pathways toward achieving goals, and reacting positively in the face of surprise have been shown to be critical success factors for entrepreneurs—as has been demonstrated by recent work on entrepreneurial bricolage (Baker & Nelson, 2005) and entrepreneur improvisational behavior (Hmieleski & Corbett, 2006). Even more importantly
might be the value in hope as a buffer of psychological distress, due to the need for entrepreneurs to be able to create a positive internal dialog that “they can do it”—because even the most conservative of estimates suggest that the majority of entrepreneurs will experience failure at some point in time (Headd, 2001).

Resiliency

Resiliency is the extent to which individuals are able to bounce back from negative experiences and adapt to changing and stressful life demands (Tugade & Fredrickson, 2004). Resilient individuals are able to thrive and learn in the face of adversity (Masten, 2001). Two types of judgments must be made before being able to classify an individual as resilient (Masten, 1999). First, the individual must have experienced some kind of adverse or threatening event(s). Second, is the degree to which the individual was able to overcome and/or thrive under the hazards that he or she faced.

Certainly the capacity to bounce back from adversity is critical to entrepreneurs, who need to persevere in the face of high risk and resource constrained conditions (Markman, Baron, & Balkin, 2005). Although little research has been conducted on the psychological resilience of entrepreneurs, “stick-to-itiveness” has long been thought to be a key characteristic of entrepreneurial performance and well-being. For example, it has been suggested that the best thing for the well-being of entrepreneurs who have recently experienced bankruptcy is to quickly begin searching for new business opportunities, rather than wallowing in their failure (Allen, 2006).

To summarize, these four elements (i.e., self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resiliency) combine to form the higher-level construct of psychological capital. Just as entrepreneurship is an intentional activity, so is the building of psychological capital. In order to build self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resiliency, individuals must go out into the world, seek out challenges, and persevere. Without so doing, individuals will have no basis for building these elements within themselves. Furthermore, psychological capital tends to be self-perpetuating. This is to say that it becomes easier to build additional psychological capital the further we move along this dimension. As individuals build psychological capital, they tend to form a reputation for mental hardiness that attracts to them individuals and situations that reinforce this capacity within them—in effect “building and broadening” their psychic resources (Fredrickson, 2001). Entrepreneurs who build psychological capital should not only increase their general level of well-being, but also their satisfaction with their jobs, which provides them a pathway to further develop their psychological capital. To this end, we offer our first hypothesis:

**H1: Entrepreneurs’ level of psychological capital will be positively related to their job satisfaction.**

Work Tension

Work tension is defined as the extent to which individuals experience psychological symptoms associated with work-related stress (House & Rizzo, 1972). Examples of such symptoms include an inability to sleep due to thoughts about work-related tension and a lack of concentration due to distressful thoughts about one’s work. Clearly the vocation of entrepreneurship is fraught with potential sources of work tension, such as operating with a lack of essential resources, the need for multi-tasking, time pressure, and the dependence of family members, employees, investors, and other stakeholders on the success of the venture.

Several studies have found work tension to be negatively related to job satisfaction (Grandey & Cropanzano, 1998; Netemeyer, Johnston, & Burton, 1990; Sanchez & Brock, 1996). Although we know of no studies that have considered the relationship of entrepreneurs’ work tension with their well-being, we assume we will find a similarly negative relationship between the work tension and job satisfaction of entrepreneurs. To this end, we offer our second hypothesis:
**H2**: The level of work tension experienced by entrepreneurs will be negatively related to their job satisfaction.

**The Interaction of Psychological Capital with Work Tension**

As the demands of entrepreneurs tend to be considerable and their health and well-being essential in order to effectively lead their new ventures, the examination of factors that might reduce the extent to which work tension negatively affects the well-being of entrepreneurs is highly important to the field. Looking to relevant research from the organizational behavior literature, we find that each of the elements of psychological capital seems to play a role in reducing the negative effects of work-related stressors on job satisfaction (Brown, Jones, & Leigh, 2005; Jex & Bliese, 1999; Lent & Brown, 2006). Due to the “building and broadening” effects of psychological capital that were earlier discussed, we expect that the overall power of psychological capital to reduce the negative effects of work tension on job satisfaction will be even greater than the sum of the effects of its individual elements. In this vein, we offer our third and final hypothesis:

**H3**: Entrepreneurs’ level of psychological capital will significantly reduce the negative relationship of the level of work tension experienced by entrepreneurs with their job satisfaction.

To review, we expect to find a positive relationship between psychological capital and job satisfaction, a negative relationship between work tension and job satisfaction, and for psychological capital to reduce the negative effects of work tension on job satisfaction. In the following section we outline the methodology used to examine these hypothesized relationships.

**METHOD**

**Sample and Procedures**

A national (United States) random sample of 1,000 firms was drawn from the Dun and Bradstreet Market Identifiers Database for use in the current study. Dun and Bradstreet provided the names and address of the firms and their top management team leaders. A packet containing our survey, along with a cover letter and pre-paid business reply envelope was sent to the top management team leader (as identified by Dun and Bradstreet) of each firm. An initial and one follow-up mailing were sent. In total, 162 of the mailings were returned as non-deliverable. We received 144 usable surveys from individuals who were both founders and top management team leaders of their new venture, resulting in a response rate of 17.2 percent. Although this might not be considered a high response rate, it is in alignment with those produced by other studies using similar samples of top management (e.g., Neck, Meyer, Cohen, & Corbett, 2004). Non-response bias was examined using t test on firm age, revenues, number of employees, and firm growth. In each case the results were non-significant.

The participants included 116 males and 28 females, with an averaged age of 48 years ($SD = 9.73$). The highest educational degree earned by participants included high school ($n = 39$), associates ($n = 24$), bachelors ($n = 52$), masters ($n = 22$), and doctoral ($n = 7$). Finally, the location of participants’ current business ranged across 40 different states, with primary operations in 43 different industries (as classified by 3-digit North American Industry Classification System Codes).

**Measures**

*Psychological Capital.* This was examined through the measurement of its following four core elements: Optimism was measured using the Life Orientation Test-Revised (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy was measured using a scale developed by De Noble, Jung, and Ehrlich (1999). Resilience was measured using a scale developed by Wagnild and Young (1993). Hope
was measured using a scale developed by Snyder, Sympson, and Ybasco (1996). Six items were used for each scale. Respondents rated their level of agreement with each item on a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) Strongly disagree to (7) Strongly agree. An index of psychological capital was formed by adding the summed standardized scores from each of these four scales. The Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for this index was .87.

**Work Tension.** This was measured using the Work Tension Scale developed by House and Rizzo (1972). All seven items were used in the current study, with each item employing a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) Strongly disagree to (7) Strongly agree for each item. This measure produced a Cronbach’s coefficient alpha of .75.

**Job Satisfaction.** This was studied using the “work itself satisfaction” scale of Spector’s (1985) Job Satisfaction Survey. Four items were used in the current study, with each item employing a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) Strongly disagree to (7) Strongly agree for each item. This measure produced a Cronbach’s coefficient alpha of .71.

**Control Variables.** The sex (coded: male = 0 and female =1) and age of the participating entrepreneurs were used as control variables. This information was obtained through demographic questions at the end of the administered questionnaire.

**Statistical Procedures**

Moderated hierarchical regression analysis was utilized as the main statistical procedure for examining the hypothesized relationships. In addition, the two-way interaction of psychological capital x work tension on job satisfaction was graphed and the significance of the simple slopes was tested following procedures set forth by Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2003, p. 276).

**RESULTS**

Table 1 provides the means, standard deviations, and bi-variate correlations for all of the variables measured in the study. The results of the hierarchical moderated regression model for job satisfaction are displayed in Table 2. The two-way interaction of psychological capital x work tension on job satisfaction is illustrated in Figure 1.

As shown in Table 1, psychological capital is found to have a significant positive correlation with job satisfaction ($R = .74, \ p < .01$) and work tension is found to have a significant negative correlation with job satisfaction ($R = -.36, \ p < .01$). In addition, psychological capital is found to have a significant negative correlation with work tension ($R = -.33, \ p < .01$). We will now consider the hypothesized moderating effect of environmental dynamism.

Hypothesis 1 stated that entrepreneurs’ level of psychological capital will be positively related to their job satisfaction. As shown in Model 2 of Table 2, entrepreneurs’ psychological capital is found to be a significant positive predictor of job satisfaction ($\beta = .73, \ p < .01$). Therefore, hypothesis 1 is supported.

Hypothesis 2 stated that the level of work tension experienced by entrepreneurs will be negatively related to their job satisfaction. As shown in Model 3 of Table 2, entrepreneurs’ level of work tension is found to be a significant negative predictor of job satisfaction ($\beta = -.33, \ p < .01$). Therefore, hypothesis 2 is supported.

Hypothesis 3 stated that entrepreneurs’ level of psychological capital will significantly reduce the negative relationship of the level of work tension experienced by entrepreneurs with their job satisfaction. As demonstrated in Model 4 of Table 2, the interaction of entrepreneurs’ psychological capital with work
tension on job satisfaction is positive and significant ($\beta = .16$, $p < .01$). Figure 1 illustrates that the level of entrepreneurs’ work tension is not significantly related to job satisfaction for those who are high in psychological capital ($t = .15$, $p > .10$), whereas the level of entrepreneurs’ work tension is significantly negatively related to job satisfaction for those who are low in psychological capital ($t = -3.28$, $p < .01$). This suggests that psychological capital does tend to reduce the negative effects of work tension on job satisfaction. Therefore, hypothesis 3 is supported.

**DISCUSSION**

The results of the current study suggest that (1) entrepreneurs’ psychological capital is positively related to their job satisfaction, (2) the level of work tension experienced by entrepreneurs is negatively related to their job satisfaction, and (3) psychological capital reduces the negative relationship between the level of work tension experienced by entrepreneurs and their job satisfaction. In the following sections we discuss the implications of these findings, limitation of the study, and suggestions for future research.

**The Benefits of Psychological Capital**

The burgeoning literatures on positive psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) and positive organizational behavior (Luthans & Youssef, 2004) suggest that a having a positive outlook generally enhances the well-being of individuals. The rationale behind this relationship has been grounded in a substantial body of work that has consistently demonstrated the benefits of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), optimism (Carver & Sheier, 2003), hope (Snyder, Cheavens, & Sympson, 1997), and resiliency (Masten, 2001) on psychological well-being. Further, these “positive” individual characteristics have been theoretically and empirically established as forming together under the higher-order construct of psychological capital (Luthans & Youssef, 2004), which was the central focus of the current study.

In alignment with our predictions, psychological capital was found to share a positive relationship with the job satisfaction of entrepreneurs. More importantly, however, psychological capital was found to significantly reduce the negative effects of work tension on the job satisfaction of entrepreneurs. Considering the great demands that are placed on most entrepreneurs, creating the potential for high levels of work tension, this would seem to be an important contribution toward advancing the field in its quest to identify why some individuals, and not others, are able to develop successful new ventures.

Perhaps most promising about the results of the current study is that psychological capital can presumably be development within individuals, thus highlighting an opportunity for training nascent entrepreneurs to be able to thrive and even flourish under adverse and tense situations. For example, Seligman (1990; 2002) and Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman, and Combs (2006) have gone to great lengths in outlining interventions that can be used to develop the elements of psychological capital within individuals. These tools should be able to be used by educators to develop the psychological capital of individuals working within in virtually any domain, including entrepreneurship.

Finally, if psychological capital is truly an important construct for understanding how entrepreneurs are able to persist over time, then we should observe higher levels of psychological capital within repeat versus novice entrepreneurs. The fact that 59 of the 144 participants in the current study had started multiple businesses in their career allowed us to run a post hoc analysis to investigate this proposition. A comparison of mean differences between the two groups does indeed demonstrate that repeat entrepreneurs (i.e., those who have experience starting two or more businesses) tend to be significantly higher in psychological capital than novice entrepreneurs (i.e., those who have experience starting only a single business) ($t = 2.41$, $p < .05$). This finding would seem to add additional support for the importance psychological capital within the domain of entrepreneurship. We will now discuss the limitations of the study, as well as some suggestions for future research.
Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

Perhaps the greatest limitation of the current study is that relating to common method variance, which may have inflated the findings for the main effects of psychological capital and work tension on job satisfaction. However, the central focus of the study was on examining whether psychological capital reduces the negative effects of work tension on the job satisfaction of entrepreneurs. Although common method variance can be a problem for interpreting main effects, studies have demonstrated that common method variance tends not to inflate moderating effects (e.g., Evans, 1985). Therefore, the integrity of our main finding appears to be intact.

There are several avenues for future research on the psychological capital of entrepreneurs, which are likely to bear fruitful findings. First, one of the central tenants behind the developmental work on the construct of psychological capital is that it is comprised of elements that have been found to be positive predictors of human performance, in addition to individual well-being (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). Therefore, future studies might examine the relationship of psychological capital with the performance of entrepreneurs.

Secondly, we do not know the extent to which the predictive validity of psychological capital stacks up against other more well-established forms of capital, such as physical, human, and social capital. For example, some forms of capital might be more important for entrepreneurial performance, while other forms of capital may be more important for entrepreneurial well-being. Further, different forms of capital may vary in value for different types of new ventures and across stages of new venture development.

Finally, the true litmus test for the value of psychological capital within the entrepreneurship domain would be to examine the extent to which we can train nascent and experienced entrepreneurs to develop their psychological capital, and follow-up to examine what effects that such interventions have on their performance and job satisfaction as entrepreneurs.

CONCLUSIONS

Financial performance alone does not appear to sufficiently account for the satisfaction of entrepreneurs (Cooper & Artz, 1995). In fact, recent studies have identified nearly zero correlation between the financial performance of new ventures and the job satisfaction of lead entrepreneurs (e.g., Hmieleski & Corbett, 2006). One reason for such findings may be that financial performance and high growth often go hand-and-hand with high levels of work overload and psychological distress for entrepreneurs. Building on the findings of the current study, we suggest that psychological capital may be a key factor empowering entrepreneurs to be able to achieve their financial goals while sustaining high levels of psychological well-being and job satisfaction. To this end, we hope that the current study will inspire scholars to conduct future studies examining the effects of psychological capital on the simultaneous performance and well-being of entrepreneurs. The results of such work are likely to not only lead the field closer to unlocking the mysteries behind why some individuals, and not others, are able to develop successful new ventures—but why some entrepreneurs are able to “thrive” while doing so.

CONTACT: Keith Hmieleski; k.hmieleski@tcu.edu; (T): 817.257.7280; (F): 817.257.7227; M. J. Neeley School of Business, TCU Box 298530, Fort Worth, TX 76129.
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Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Variable Intercorrelations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>48.17</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sex</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psychological Capital</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work Tension</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Psychological Capital x Work Tension</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 144; * p < .05; ** p < .01

Table 2: Hierarchical Regression Model of Entrepreneur Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Tension</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital x Work Tension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-Ratio  | 2.76 | 59.97** | 7.58** | 40.48** |
R²       | .04  | .56     | .14     | .60     |
Adjusted R² | .02  | .55     | .12     | .58     |

N = 144; * p < .05; ** p < .01

Figure 1: Interaction of Psychological Capital with Work Tension on Entrepreneur Job Satisfaction