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3.1 Introduction

Stress has become a pervasive feature of people’s life in modern world. Despite tremendous advancements in science and technology, and remarkable growth of economy and luxurious sources, majority of people all over the world seem to be experiencing moderate to high degree of psychological stress in various spheres of their lives. Increasing competition, challenges of the modern world have changed the life style of people and have put them on the stage of modernity, which compels the humans to keep pace running with the time. This increasing pace of life has consistently increased the rate of psychosomatic and psychological disorders, and feeling of frustration and dissatisfaction with life, which in general reflect the high stress being experienced by the people in the present day world. It does not mean that people in societies in the past were entirely free from stress. People must have been experiencing stress right since the origin of structured societies. However, the causes of stress in those societies were episodic in nature and low in severity and frequency. However, during last two decades frequency, severity and span of psychosocial stress have drastically increased. The basic reason being the tremendously changed physical and socio-cultural environment of the contemporary societies and lifestyle of the people. People’s life in modern societies has become more diversely demanding, complicated, mechanical and dependent, and is running by the clock. Ever increasing needs and aspirations, high competition, pressures of meeting deadlines and uncertainty of future and weakened social support system have made the life of majority of people highly
stressful in modern societies. That is why the term stress and research in its causes, consequences, and management have reached the peak of popularity in recent times.

3.2 Stress background

This is the fact that the concept of stress has been the source of immense interest for the researchers over a period of several hundred years, if not over centuries. In order to explain its origins and meanings, authors have taken a number of different strategies. Some authors point to the possibility that the word “stress may have been derived from the Latin “stringere” which means to draw tight. Some authors like (Hinkle, 1973, p, 31.)1 considering the evolution of the term “stress”, describe how, from the idea of hardship in the seventeenth century, its meaning evolved through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to reflect some sort of force, pressure, or strain and how this later sense of the word was “taken over into science” and probably helped to reinforce its popular usage.

A number of authors like Hinkle 1973, Newton 1995, have indicated that there has been a fair degree of consistency in the use of the term “Stress” from at least the seventeenth century onwards. According to Hinkle (1973) “Stress” in the seventeenth century had come to mean “Hardships”. Towards the end of this century, through the writings of Robert Hooke, the word “stress” assumed a more technical importance. Robert Hooke’s work was to result in an engineering

---

analogy of stress. Lazarus (1993)\textsuperscript{2} quotes that Hooke’s work was concerned with how man-made structures could be made to withstand heavy loads without collapsing. Hooke’s through his work gave us the term “load”, the demand placed on the structure, “stress”, that area affected by the demand, and “strain” the change in the form that results from the interaction between load and stress. According to Doublett (2000)\textsuperscript{3}, Hooke’s work represents an important episode in the history. The engineering analogy and the idea of the body as machine like proved to be fertile ground for two other ideas that have profoundly influenced thinking about stress. The first idea follows from the reasoning that “if the bodies were like a machine and machines are subject to wear and tear then so too would be the body”. So into the discourse on stress, came the idea of the impact on the body of the wear and tear of life. The second idea to emerge was that, like a machine the body needs some energy to help it function. Depending on the amount of this energy, the body will, like a machine, perform well, poorly or even stop. This energy was assumed the product of nervous system, and scientists very quickly began to speak in terms of the “depletion of nervous energy” and “disorders of the nerves”.

\textsuperscript{2} Lazarus, R.S., From psychological stress to the emotions: A history of changing outlooks. Annual review of psychology, 1993, 44, p1-21

\textsuperscript{3} Doublett, S. The Stress Myth. Freemans reach, NSW, Australia: IPSILON publishings, 2000, p.48-49.
The eighteenth century, as Doublett (2000) points out, saw a return of what he calls the "passions", e.g. nerves, vapours, hysteria, as explanations for different illnesses and disease. The use of such conditions as tools for explaining different complaints led writers of the time to conclude that "at least a third of all diseases were of nervous origin". It was by this time that the scientists and social commentators were under the fear that the human nervous system was ill adapted to cope with the increased complexity of modern life. Wozniak (1992) further illustrates the nature of this fear by referring to the work of George Beard (1839-83) a noted American physician specializing in disease of the nervous system. Beard work led him to suggest that pressing demands of the nineteenth century life may lead to a circuit overload of the nervous system. Beard gave it the name of "neurasthenia" - "a weakness of the nervous system", "nervous exhaustion" characterized by symptoms such as morbid anxiety, unaccountable fatigue, and irrational fears caused by the inability of the nervous system to meet the demands of daily life.

Beard’s work was important and is even relevant today for two reasons. The first because he helped to "remove the social disapproval attached to such ailments" and "helped to make their diagnosis a medical and not a moral one".

Secondly and more importantly, his work deserves serious consideration because it was an “attempt to shed light upon the role played by society in the production of mental illness”.

It was during this time that Claude Bernard (Monat a. Lazarus, 1991), a French physician, came up with the idea that the internal environment of living beings must remain fairly constant in response to the changes in the external environment. As per Bernard the most striking feature of the living organisms was their harmonious arrangements. This idea of harmony and consistency within living beings gave rise to his notion of the internal environment, which he called as milieu interieur. Bernard says that it is this fixity of the milieu interieur that is condition of free and independent life. As per his concept of internal environment or milieu interieur, nothing within the body must be allowed to deviate far from what is normal; if something does, and then the individual will become ill or may even die. Doublett, 2000, (p.55) quotes that survival, according to Bernard is determined by consistent maintenance of the internal environment via “continual compensatory reactions” in response to changes in the external environment. Bernard’s work was significant from the point that it created necessary receptive


atmosphere for the eventual development of the contemporary notion of stress and motivated the later researchers in the field to explore the nature of those adaptive changes by which the steady state is maintained.

Hergenhahn (1992)\(^9\) says, that Bernard’s work reflected as mechanistic view of biology. According to this view, there was nothing mysterious about life simply because “the behaviour all the organisms, including humans, can be explained in the same way that the behaviour of any machine can be explained—that is in terms of its parts and the laws governing those parts.” Further Bernard’s work may have been a response to those who adopted a “vitalist” point of view. The vitalists maintained, “Life could not be explained by the interactions of physical and chemical processes alone.”\(^10\)

Bernard’s work adopted a reductionist perspective. Reductionism is where the ideas of one field are explained in terms of the terminology and laws of another field. In this sense, the phenomena of one field are “being reduced” to the principles of another. Aldwin (2000)\(^11\) is of the view that adopting a reductionist approach at this time is not surprising, since the prevailing disease model of illness result from external agents that disrupt the body’s normal function and that health

---


10. ibid, p.213

could be regained by restoring the body to normal functioning.

The end of the nineteenth century was to see the emergence of three founding forms (consciousness, unconscious, and adaptation) of psychology. According to Leehay, (1992)\textsuperscript{12}, “all the concepts for each were in place, awaiting only the creative minds to weld them into coherent psychological programs.”

As the nineteenth century ended, a number of threads were beginning to form into patterns that would provide the underlay for the rich tapestry of developments in the 20th century. Some of the themes like the idea of “wear and tear”, the concept of “steady state”, and the impact of the “pace of life” are as robustly discussed today in relation to the nature of “stress”.

The twentieth century was to be “the century of science and technology, with the excitement of new discoveries tempered by the ever increasing pace of life”. Doublett (2000)\textsuperscript{13} points out that during the early years of this century there were number of developments that would draw researchers even more closer to what is now simply taken for granted – that the phenomenon they were studying could be described as “stress”. These developments included the increasing use of term “stress” in discourse about human existence, the emergence in the field of psychology of the notion of functionalism, the early concerns about work


\textsuperscript{13} Doublett, S: The Stress Myth. Freeman’s reach, NSW, Australia: IPSILON publishings, 2000, p.65.
performance, the pre-occupation with fatigue and mental hygiene and the first tentative steps towards and growing acceptance of psychological explanation of illness.

As researchers moved into the twentieth century, two literatures central to the developments of the stress concept, fatigue and mental hygiene, were taken as "signs of individuals' failure to successfully adjust to modern life". The onset of the First World War and the issues surrounding wartime production also made the minds of researchers receptive to the problems of fatigue. Early writers clearly saw the link between fatigue and performance. Fatigue not only effects the adjustment of the individual but influences very directly the welfare of society at large. Muscio (1974) asserts that fatigue was regarded as both a mental and physiological phenomenon, with its mental dimension being described "as the feeling of tiredness or weariness" or nervous fatigue or "brain fag" resulting from the production of muscular energy. The problems of mental hygiene were also grounded in work performance and industrial efficiency. Here the emphasis was on the "diagnosis and treatment of the minor mental troubles of the workers before they produced major and disabling problems". Rose (1999) writes that, two

themes captured the spirit of mental hygiene movement. The first was the organisation of the work place so as to minimize the production of symptoms of emotional and mental stability and enhance adjustment”. The second in a not dissimilar vein, was concerned with the maladjusted worker, where minor mental disturbances in the worker represented a loss in industrial efficiency, which could only be regained by the worker achieving maximum mental health. The focus on fatigue and mental hygiene spurred on by the desire for industrial efficiency, reinforced by the needs of the war, and captured by the enthusiasm for the principles of functionalism, provided the active ingredients to produce the new and the clearly demarcated field of industrial psychology.

The early decade of the twentieth century also saw more attention being given to an idea that had for centuries been recognized by “progressive physicians,” that of the mind in physical illness and the notion of “internal conflict” as a basis of mental disease. These ideas were to find more formal expression through the rise of psychosomatic medicine.

One of the earliest contributions to stress research was Cannon’s (1932)\textsuperscript{17} description of the fight or flight response. Cannon proposed that when the organism perceives a threat, the body is rapidly aroused and motivated via the sympathetic nervous system and the endocrine system. This response to stress is marked by the secretion of catecholamine. The heart rate speeds up, blood pressure, blood sugar and respiration increases, the circulation of blood to the skin

is reduced and circulation to the muscles is increased. This concerted physiological response mobilizes the organism to attack the threat or to flee; hence it is called fight or flight response. Cannon studied the aspects of stress upon animals and people and in particular studied the “fight or flight” reaction. Through this reaction, people as well as animals will choose whether to stay and fight or try to escape when confronting extreme danger. Cannon observed that when his subjects experienced situations of cold, lack of oxygen and excitement, he could detect physiological changes such as emergency adrenaline secretions and described these individuals as being “under stress”.

Perhaps the most important of the early contributions to the field of stress is Selye’s (1956-1976) work on general adaptation syndrome. According to Selye “stress is the non specific response of body to any demand made upon it”. 18

Selye argued that when an organism confronts a stressor, it mobilizes itself for action. This mobilization effort is directed by the adrenal glands, which promotes sympathetic nervous system activity. The response itself is non-specific with respect to the stressor: that is regardless of the cause of the threat, the individual will respond with the same physiological pattern of reaction. Overtime, with repeated or prolonged exposure to stress, there will be wear and tear on the system. As per Selye’s General adaptation syndrome an individual encounters

stressful situation in three ways, viz:

a) Alarm reaction
b) Resistance
c) Exhaustion

The alarm stage is the stage where the organism becomes active to meet the threat. It is like the fight or flight response to an emergency. It is body’s initial response to stressor, for example, increased heart rate and blood pressure and release of glucose to provide energy for action. After the stage of alarm, the second stage is resistance stage. If the stress is prolonged, the stage of resistance emerges. At this stage, the body tries to adapt to the stressor. Physiological arousal declines but remains higher than normal and the body replenishes the hormones released by the adrenal glands. The organism may show few outward signs of stress. However, body may not be able to resist new stresses. The body becomes increasingly vulnerable to health problems. These health problems include ulcers, high blood pressure, asthma and illnesses that result from impaired immune function. Severe long term or repeated stress will cause the organism to enter the third stage- the stage of exhaustion. The immune system and the body’s energy reserves are weakened until resistance is very limited. If the stress continues, deceases and physiological damage are more likely to occur, and may result in death.

Selye’s model has been criticized on several grounds. First, it assigns a very limited role to psychological factors, and researchers now believe that psychological appraisal of events is Important in the determination of stress. A
second criticism concerns the assumption of non-specificity. There is some evidence that particular stressors can produce distinct endocrinological responses. With an adequate understanding of psychological appraisal, still more specificity in physiological responses to stress may be discovered. Despite these limitations and reservations, Selye’s model remains today a cornerstone of the field of stress.

Nirmal Singh quotes (2003)19 Hans Selye, “all noxious stimuli damage body tissues. The stressor that is the stimuli that causes stress, affect several areas of body. When the stressors in the individual’s environment continue to persist over long period of time or are severe in intensity, the continued and or intense exposure and resistance exhausts the energy or adoption response of the body, and fatigue sets in due to excessive wear and tear on the body and mind”.

Newer and more complete theories of stress emphasize the interaction between the person and his or her environment for stress. Cooper, C. L., and Cartwright, S. (1994)20 quotes, that stress can be understood in the following ways.

1. Individuals, for the most part, try to keep their thoughts, emotions and relationships with the world in a steady time.

2. Each factor of a person’s emotional and physical state has a “range of stability”


in which that person feels comfortable’. On the other hand, when forces disrupt one of these factors beyond the range of stability, the individual must act or cope to restore a feeling of comfort.

3. An individual’s behavior aimed at maintaining a steady state makes up his or her “adjustment process” or “coping strategies”.

The emphasis on the psychological factors was substantially missing from early models of stress. The big reason behind this was that early stress work was conducted on animals, with the goal of identifying endocrinological commitments of stress. Stress has been described as part of a complex and dynamic system of transaction between the person and his environment. It emphasizes that stress is an individual’s perceptual phenomenon rooted in psychological process. Lazarus and his colleagues have developed the model. According to this view, stress is said to occur in the face of “demands that tax or exceed resources of the system or, to put it slightly different way, demands to which there are no readily available adoptive responses”.

According to Lazarus stress is a two way process; the environment produce stressors and the individual finds way to deal with these. This model emphasises on ‘cognitive appraisals’ and ‘coping responses’. Cognitive appraisal is a mental process by which people assess two factors.

1) Whether a demand threatens their well-being.

2) Whether a person considers that they have the resources to meet the demands of the stressor.

Appraisal is of two types.

A). Primary appraisal

B). Secondary appraisal.

Taylor, Shelly. E. (1986)\textsuperscript{22} quotes, Lazarus maintains that when individuals confront a new or challenging environment, they engage in a process of primary appraisal to determine the meaning of the event. Events may be perceived beneficial, neutral or negative in their consequences. Negative or potentially negative events are further appraised for their possible harm, threat, and challenge. Harm is the assessment of the amount of damage that has already been done by an event. Threat is the assessment of possible future damage that may be brought about by the event. Finally, events may be appraised in terms of their challenge, the potential ultimately to overcome and profit from the event.

Once primary appraisal of potentially stressful events has occurred, secondary appraisal is initiated. Secondary appraisal is the assessment of one's coping abilities and resources and whether or not they will be sufficient to meet the harm threat and challenge of the event. Ultimately, the subjective experience of an individual is the balance between primary and secondary appraisal. When harm

and threat are high and coping ability is low. Substantial stress is felt. When coping ability is high, stress may be minimal.

Cooper Cary L, Dewe Philip (2004)\(^\text{23}\) quotes that Lazarus puts it in simple way by stating that, “the psychological stress refers to the particular kind of relationship between the person and the environment. It is one in which the demands of any encounter tax or exceed the person’s resources. The unit of analysis in this transaction is appraisal. It is this appraisal process that links the person and the environment.”

Adolf Meyer links the stress with the stressors in environment. Meyer suggests, that Physicians use charts to record medical information, such as dates of major illness, and environment situations, such as the death of a loved one or a change in job. The aim behind these charts was to identify events that might have served to cause the individual to be susceptible to diseases.

Holmes and Rahe further developed the concept of Adolf Meyer in 1967. In their view stressful life events are those events which either signal or initiate significant life changes in the individual experiencing them. Holmes and Rahe were particularly interested in the relationship of the life events to illness. This model of stress has also been criticised on the following grounds.

1. This model posits that particular life events are responsible for stress. But in reality it is difficult to accept that life events which the individuals face, can bring

same amount of life changes to them, and therefore, can bring the same amount of stress.

2. It is not possible to measure different populations of people accurately by a single life event.

3. There are some life events that are peculiar to some stage of life, from adolescence to adulthood, to elderly.

   However, this model is valuable in recognizing that we do experience stress from a variety of events.

   Hence, to conclude, we can say that, stress is after all, an ongoing process that can worsen by our inability to control the problem that is causing either the stress or our reaction to the problem.

3.3 Job stress

   Keeping in view the various perspectives about stress, job stress can be defined in various ways. In simple words we can say, job stress is the stress experienced by a particular employee on a particular job. Stress at work has become a prominent and pervading feature of the modern organisations. It results from increasing complexities of work and its divergent demands.

   Caplin Cobb, and French Have defined job stress as, “any characteristics of job environment which poses a threat to the individual” \(^{24}\). The basic point is that the factors in the environment which are harmful for the employee in the

---

employee or which are perceived harmful by the employee for his survival in the organisation constitute to the stress. Job stress is the emotional cognitive, behaviour and psychological reaction to averse and noxious aspects of work, work environment and work organisation. It is a state characterised by high level of arousal and distress and often marked by the feeling of not coping. Some of the stress researchers have tried to define it in terms of interaction between worker and work environment. A. K. Srivastava (1991)\textsuperscript{25} quotes Beehr and Newman (1978) described job stress as, "a condition wherein job related factors interact with the worker to change (disrupt or enhance) his psychological conditions such that the person is forced to deviate from normal functioning". Person environment fit perspective of occupational stress proposed by French, Rodgers and Cobb (1974) well explain the concept of stress. Employee and his work and its environment results in stress, psychological and health strain. The theory is based on the assumption that people vary in their needs, expectations and abilities just as jobs vary in their requirements, demands and incentives. This varying nature of individuals and job creates misfit that creates stress. As per this theory fit is bilateral between employee and his job. Both should satisfy each other's demands and expectations. Ross and Altmaier (1994)\textsuperscript{26} have also defined occupational stress in the person-environment fit framework. According to them, "occupational stress

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{25} ibid,
\end{thebibliography}
is the result of interaction of work conditions with characteristics of the worker such that demands of the work exceed the ability of the worker to cope with them”.

3.4 Symptoms of job stress

There are three categories of symptoms that occur under conditions of occupational stress outlined by Beehr, Newmann in 1978. These categories are:

3.4.1 Psychological symptoms

3.4.2 Physical symptoms

3.4.3 Behavioral symptoms

3.4.1 Psychological symptoms

The emotional and cognitive problems that occur under the conditions of job stress are psychological symptoms. Job dissatisfaction is the most likely consequence of occupational stress, where a worker is dissatisfied with his or her job, dislikes coming to work and finds little reason for doing well on the job. The other psychological symptoms are depression, anxiety, boredom, frustration, isolation and resentment.

3.4.2 Physical symptoms

It is very difficult to define the physical symptoms of job stress, because it is difficult to know how much ailments are caused by the job to a particular person when the particular work condition of such person is linked to the physical ailment. There are other aspects of the workers life, which may have an influence on his health. However, one of the most common physical symptoms of the job
stress is cardio-vascular disease for which there is significant research evidence, which links it with job stress. Other physical symptoms include gastrointestinal disorders, ulcers, allergies, and skin diseases, sleep disturbances, headaches, and respiratory diseases.

3.4.3 Behavioral symptoms

Behavioural symptoms can be put under two categories. First, which belong to worker himself like avoidance of work, drug use, increased alcohol use, overeating or under eating, aggression towards fellow workers, and interpersonal problems in general. The second category belongs to organisation and includes absenteeism, leaving the job, accident proneness, and loss of productivity.

The above-mentioned physical, psychological, and Behavioural symptoms can be used to judge the person under the occupational stress. It can be well understood by an observer by taking into consideration the behavioural of an employee towards his work and himself.

3.5 Sources of occupational stress

Stresses experienced at work place have several origins. They may arise from, 1). Role related factors, which are subjectively experienced, 2). The nature of the job or its inherent characteristics, factors related to interpersonal and group dynamics, organisational structural factors such as reporting relationships and interfacing with the external environments of the organisation.
A.K. Srivastava (1999) classifies all the sources of stress into two categories.

3.5.1 Individual characteristics, and.

3.5.2 Work setting variables.

3.5.1 Individual characteristics

The level of stress and stress experienced by individuals from a particular job at a particular position may vary from each other. Here the important role is played by the personality of the individual. Personality characteristics of the employee are the most prominent factors that interfere in their job behaviour. Every job puts some demands and pressures on employees and employees respond to these demands and pressures. The employee responses are largely influenced by their personality characteristics and psychological and behavioural patterns such as beliefs and values, aspirations and expectancy, need structure, attributions, personality traits, coping skills, cognitive patterns etc. One of the important personality characteristics, which influence the experience of stress, is "sense of control". The employee who is having high sense of control over his job, experiences very less or no amount of occupational stress and the employee with less sense of control experiences more stress.

Anxiety also is a frequent source as well as promoter of stress. Anxiety has been variously defined as stimulus, response, drive, motive and trait. It is a vague

fear associated with the emotions of terror, horror, alarm, fright, panic and dread. These feelings and emotions associated with anxiety, cause stress and enhance the severity of stress by influencing their cognitive appraisal. Some of the employees job attributes also determine the extent of stress they experience in their job life. The efforts put forward by an employee, nature of the job activities, work conditions, policy of the management for their success and failure in job life experienced higher role stress as compared to those who credited their luck or chance for their success or failures at work. Employee’s age, sex, health, status, experience and socio-cultural background have also been found to influence the experience of occupational stress.

3.5.2 Work Setting Factors

Psychological factors in the workplaces have been proposed as a way of understanding occupational stress. The role played by an employee at his job is a major source of satisfaction as well as frustration for him. Certain characteristics or inadequacies of job role have been noted as prominent sources of occupational stress. Researchers have applied "role theory" to understanding stress problems at work and to examining how role pressures contribute to occupational stress. Ross and Altmaier (1994) 28 quotes that Ivancevich and Matterson (1980) noted, that Role pressure occurs when an individual’s expectations or demands conflict with expectations and demands of the organisation.

Kahn and his associates (1964) have extensively investigated and discussed the stress arising from two major characteristics of organisation roles, i.e., role ambiguity and role conflict.

The two main organisational characteristics responsible for stress are,

A) Role ambiguity

B) Role conflict

A) Role ambiguity

Role ambiguity is the situation where an individual is not clear about the various expectations people have from his role. It may also arise due to lack of information regarding role and its enactment to the role occupant. The real stress of role ambiguity is experienced when employees are prevented from being productive and achieving and when an individual loses a sense of certainty and predictability in the work role.

B) Role conflict

In addition to role ambiguity, role conflict is another important factor that can affect the perceived stress at work. Role conflict arises when various members of the role set, hold quite different or conflicting role expectations towards a focal person. The individual doing a particular job may be pressured towards different kinds of behaviour at a time, to the extent that these different role expectations.

give rise to role forces within him, he will experience psychological conflict. Kahn et al (1964) has described six types of role conflict namely, sent role conflict, intra sender conflict, inter sender conflict, inter role conflict, person role conflict, and role overload. Role under load can be added as one more factor that constitutes to stress.

1) **Sent role conflict**

Sent role conflict is defined as simultaneous occurrence of two or more sets of pressures such that compliance with one would make more difficult compliance with the other. Here the two sets of pressures are mutually contradictory and the compliance with one set of pressures excludes completely the possibility of compliance with another set.

2) **Intra-sender conflict**

It arises when opposing expectations are held by a single member of the role set, for example, when a supervisor requests a man to acquire material which is unavailable through normal channels and at the same time prohibits violation of normal channels.

3) **Inter sender conflict**

It arises when a focal person receives pressure from two or more role senders to do a particular job and the pressure from one role sender opposes the pressures from one or more senders. For example, management wants the workers to stick to their duty while the labour union calls for strike.
4) **Inter role conflict**

It occurs when role pressures associated with membership in an organisation or institution are in conflict with expectation pressures stemming from membership in other groups or institutions. For example, the family responsibility of a person conflicts with his job responsibilities.

5) **Person role conflict**

It exists when there is conflict between needs and values of an employee and the demands of his job role. In other words, it can occur when role requirements violate normal values of an employee. In other cases of person role, conflict the person’s needs and aspirations may lead to behaviour that is unacceptable to members of his role set.

6) **Role overload**

Role overload arises when an individual feels that there are too many expectations from the significant members of his role set. Rather we can say it occurs when an employee is not in a position to complete the work, which is part of a particular job. Ross, Altmaier, (1994)\(^{31}\) Compares work overload with electric system in an engine. If there is too much electricity, in the system it will become overloaded and the entire engine might malfunction. Same is the case with individuals at work, an individual in a work group might malfunction where there

---


is too much work to be done. There are two aspects of this stress: quantitative and qualitative. The former refers to having too much to do and while later refers to too difficult to do.

Role underload is one of the sources of stress associated with a particular job. It arises when individual’s skills are under-utilized. Here it is important to note that role overload represents a demand and role underload represents constraint. To put it in simple words, role underload is said to be present when employees have too much ability for the job they hold.

Ross, Altmaier (1994)\textsuperscript{32} notes that job characteristics is another set of factors linked to occupational stress. Four different job characteristics have been outlined by them viz, work pace, repetition of work, shift work and task attributes.

A) **work pace**

The work pace at which an individual works is one of the characteristics that influence occupational stress. It is concerned with who and what controls the pace of work particularly the amount of control an employee has over the work process.

Work pace can be classified into two parts.

a) **Machine pacing**

b) **Human pacing**

The work condition, in which the speed of operation and production is controlled by some source other than the employee, is known as machine pacing.

The situation, in which the employee or some other human in the work setting controls the process of work, refers to human pacing. The employee might control the pace of work himself or herself as in case of self-pacing.

B) Repetitive work

Repetitive nature of job or work is another factor in the job characteristic, which has the influence to create stress. The more repetitive a particular job is, the more likely the job incumbent is to experience stress.

C) Shift work

Shift work is another factor, which has the potentiality to develop stress. Our society is daytime oriented and shift work may lead a worker to experience domestic pressure, spousal and familial difficulties and social isolation.

D) Task attributes

A final set of job characteristics that leads to occupational stress are labeled task attributes. These are believed to affect, directly or indirectly, the behavioural responses of an employee to a job.

Some other factors that contribute to stress are:

1) Interpersonal work relationships
2) Organisational structural factors
3) Human resource Management practices

1) Interpersonal work relationships

The quality of relationships that employees have at work has consistently been
linked to job stress. Srivastava (1999) quotes that at least three types of interpersonal relationships have been studied, viz, relationship with coworkers, relationship with work groups, and relationship with supervisors or superiors. The poor and strained interpersonal relationships at work are associated with the feeling of threat for the employees. Poor co-workers relationships are associated with low trust, supportiveness and interest or willingness to listen, which becomes a rich cause of stress. When employees have poor relationship with coworkers, they blame the job for the stress they experience on their co-workers.

Relationship with supervisors is another important aspect to determine the amount of stress an individual experiences at work. Certain aspects of this relationship have been identified as potentially affecting job stress. First, having the considerable leadership style allows the employees to participate in decision-making and good two-way communication. It also helps employees in dealing with job stress. Poor relationship between workers and supervisors does not cause stress only to the workers but also to the supervisor to a considerable extent still another potentially stressful relationship within the workplace is found in interactions with customers and clients. These relationships often represent the primary focus of the work an employee does. One group of workers who have consistently identified by researchers being at risk for experiencing job stress and burnout are those individuals involved in providing services to others.

2) **Organisational structural factors**

Work environmental factors such as noise, heat, poor lighting, radiation and smoke are stress-inducing agents. Insufficient resources such as time, budget, raw materials, space or work force are additional stressors in the work environment. When one has to produce and perform with inadequate resources on a long-term basis, these naturally impose stress on the individuals who are responsible for getting the job done. The lack of carrier path in the organisation may be additional organisational stressor. Certain types of interactions with significant forces in the external environment of the organisation can also be sources of stress. These stresses may arise out of unreasonable expectations of external agents, as for instance, the outside party wanting some extra inducements in the form of unrecorded money or gifts before they will be willing to co-operate. Other environmental stressors include sudden and unanticipated changes in the market place, technology, the financial market and so on, which takes top managers off guard.

3) **Human resource management practices**

Another set of potential stressors in the work place is associated with human resource management practices. If the human resource practices of the organisation are not viable and trouble free, there is every chance of development of stress among the employees. Many organisations have changed the name of the personnel function to human resource management or some similar title. This name change reflects a shift in conceptualizing the human resource management
function as being broader than the focus on the selection and placement of employees. Today, the human resource function within many organisations include, training, carrier development, succession planning, compensation, and benefits, outplacement, and/or affirmative action and diversity concerns. If the human resource function does not work properly for the organisation, the employees of the organisation would not be able to perform their duties properly, as their morale will be down. Therefore, the function of HR development of an organisation may add to the agony of the employees and ultimately company or organisation may suffer.

3.6 Consequences of work stress

Stress is generally said to be an undesirable and a negative force causing disruption in psychological, physiological, and behavioural aspects of a focal person. In a severe situation of stress, the constitution and capacities of humans are taxed severely and his overall effectiveness is distorted. However, stress is helpful in achieving the goals of an individual, if taken positively and challenging. Stress gives rise to negative emotional experience that causes significant deterioration in individual’s adjustment, behavioural effectiveness and health.

Walter cannon (1914) and Hans Selye (1920s), two psychologists were first to study the nature of stress responses. They have made significant contributions to the understanding of stress response and the effects of its management. Researchers in Organisational stress have dominantly focused on emotional,
behavioral and health outcomes of stress experienced at work. The consequences produced by the stress can be classified into three categories.

3.6.1 Individual consequences

3.6.2 Organisational consequences; and

3.6.3 Burnout

3.6.1 Individual consequences

Stress is both a friend and a foe. It is not always demanding or bad. As already mentioned a mild stress may lead to increase in employee’s job performance. For example, People in certain jobs such as journalists and television announcers who work under time pressures would seem to benefit from mild level of stress. Yet the mild level of stress will vary from individual to individual. But a high level of stress has three types of harmful consequences on the individual, as follows.

a) Physiological consequences

Stress has a tremendous impact on physical health of employees. A high level of stress is accompanied by high blood pressure, increased blood sugar production, gastrointestinal disorders, cardiovascular disease, musculoskeletal disorders, increased workplace injury, frequent illness etc.

b) Psychological consequences

The symptoms of psychological consequences are anger, anxiety, depression, nervousness, irritability, and tension. These psychological outcomes of stress, in turn, lead to lowering of self-esteem resentment of supervision, inability
to concentrate and make wrong decisions. These all boil down to poor job performance.

c) Behavioural consequences

Stress, if sustained over a long period, also affects the employee’s behaviour. The consequences of stress on employee’s behaviour reflected include over eating or under eating, sleeplessness, increased smoking and drinking, aggressive or passive behaviour and drug abuse. Employees may experience stress and react by getting drunk and staying at home from work on the next day with hangover. They may eventually quit or be sacked from the job. Research has proved that the employees suffering from job stress become less co-operative at home also. Chhabra T. N., (2000)\textsuperscript{34} quotes, that if stress continues beyond the abilities and capacities of employee to respond, leads to the physical and psychological exhaustion and possibly ultimate collapse. Stress is therefore considered 'invisible Killer' also.

3.6.2 Organisational consequences

The individual consequences of stress can affect the organisation also. The adverse consequences include low performance and productivity, high rate of absenteeism and turnover, lost customers because of poor worker attitudes, increased alienation of the worker from the job, less job involvement, and even destructive and aggressive behaviors resulting in strikes and sabotage. Even the stresses experienced by employees who take on critical roles and are responsible

\textsuperscript{34} Chhabra, T.N: Human Resource management, concepts and Issues, p 646
for public safety can sometimes be detrimental to the wellbeing of the constituents served. In simple words, the costs of employees stress to organisation in terms of lost profits, declining assets, bad image, and loss of future business are enormous.

3.6.3 Burnout

"Burnout is a general feeling of exhaustion that develops when a person simultaneously experiences too much pressure and has too few sources of satisfaction". 35

Quite often people with high aspirations and strong motivation to get things done are prime candidates for burnout under certain conditions. They are especially vulnerable when the organisation suppresses or limits their initiative constantly demanding that they serve the organisation's own ends. In such a situation, the individual is likely to put too much of himself into the job. The most likely effects are prolonged stress, fatigue, frustration and helplessness under the burden of overwhelming demands. The person literally exhausts his aspirations and motivation. Burnout is frequently associated with the people whose jobs require close relationships with others under stressful and tension-filled conditions.

The dangerous part of burnout is that it is contagious. A high cynical and pessimistic burnout victim can quickly transform an entire group into burnouts. Once it has begun, it is difficult to stop. Some of the symptoms of the burnout include, chronic fatigue, anger at those making demands, cynicism, negativism

35. Raymond, T lee, Blake e. Ashforth,’ A Meta-analytical examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout” journal of applied psychology, 1996, vol. 81, No.2, P 123-132
and irritability, a sense of being besieged, and trigger display of emotions and recurring health problems like, ulcers, back pain, or frequent headaches. Burnout is harmful for the individual’s mental and physical health, resulting in performance problems both individually and organizationally.

3.7 Employees Motivation

One of the basic problems in any society is how to motivate people to work. In a modern society, this is not an easy task, since many people derive only slight personal satisfaction from their jobs and enjoy little sense of accomplishment or creativity.

Motivation is an effective instrument in the hands of the management in inspiring the workforce. Motivation is the core of the management. It is the major task of the manager to motivate his subordinates or to create the ‘will to work’ among the subordinates. A worker may be immensely capable of doing some work; nothing can be achieved if he is not willing to work. Therefore, creation of will to work is motivation in simple and true sense. In work psychology, motivation is a key topic. As with many important concepts in psychology, there is no single universally accepted definition of motivation.

The word motivation has been derived from Latin word ‘movere’ that means any idea, need or emotion that prompts a man into action. Whatever may be the behaviour of a man, there is some stimulus behind it. Stimulus is dependent upon the motives of the person concerned. Motives can be known by studying his needs and desires. There is no universal theory that can explain the factors
influencing the motives, which control man’s behaviour at any particular point of time. Generally, different motives operate at different time among different people and influence their behaviour. The process of motivation studies the motives of individual, which cause different kinds of behaviour.

According to Dubin (1977)\(^{36}\), “motivation is a complex of forces starting and keeping a person at work in an organization. To put it generally, motivation starts and maintains an activity along a prescribed line. It is something that moves the person to action, and continues him in the course of action already initiated.”

While according to Dalton E. McFurland, (1974)\(^{37}\), “motivation refers to the way in which urges, desires, aspirations, striving or needs direct, control or explain the behaviour of human beings.” McFurland considers the term used in his definition in a general sense “as forms of tension occurring within individuals, with resulting behaviour aimed at reducing, eliminating or diverting the tension. Understanding the needs and drives and their resulting tensions helps to explain and predict human behaviour ultimately providing a sound basis for managerial decisions and actions.”

Motivation promotes job satisfaction and increases productivity. Because a capacity to work and willingness to work influences output. Motivation is therefore, considered to be the most fundamental and all pervasive concept not
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only studied in psychology but also in management. Robins defines motivation as "the willingness to exert high levels of efforts to reach organizational goals, conditioned by the efforts ability to satisfy some individual needs". The definition contains three key elements, effort, goals and needs. Effort element is a measure of intensity or drive. Goal is the set of predefined objectives for which the efforts are utilized. Lastly, a need means some internal state that makes certain outcomes appear attractive. An unsatisfied need creates tension that stimulates drives with in an individual. These drives generate search behaviour to find particular goals that, if attained, will satisfy the needs and reduce the tension. It can be understood by the following figure:

![Diagram](Unsatisfied need → Tension → drives → search behaviour → satisfied needs → reduction of tension)

**Fig 1.1**

Management can do its job effectively only through motivating people to work for the accomplishment of organizational objectives. However, according to authors like McGregor, Maslow, Herzberg, and Vroom, it is difficult to understand motivation without considering what people want and expect from their work. In order to know these desires, expectations and wants of people many theories were propounded to help the organizations to keep the employees motivated to achieve organizational goals.
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3.8 Theories of Motivation

3.8.1 Content theories of motivation

3.8.2 Process theories of motivation

3.8.1 Content theories

These theories of work motivation attempt to determine what is, that motivates people at work. These theories are concerned with the type of incentives or goals that people strive to attain in order to be satisfied and perform well. Bowditch and Bouno (1993) refers these theories as “static” because they incorporate only one of few points in time and are either past or present time oriented. Therefore they do not necessarily predict work motivation or behaviour, but are still important in understanding what motivates people at work.

A) Maslow’s need hierarchy theory

Abraham Maslow a founder of humanistic psychology developed the needs hierarchy theory of motivation in which human needs are arranged in a hierarchy of importance. According to Maslow, we always want what we do not yet have. He believed that once a given level of need is satisfied, it no longer serves to motivate. The next higher-level need has to be activated in order to motivate the individual. Maslow divided the human needs in a hierarchy of five needs, which are as follows.

1) Physiological needs
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2) Safety needs

3) Social needs

4) Esteem needs

5) Self actualization needs

1) Physiological needs

These are the basic needs of humans, which include, hunger, thirst, shelter, sex and other bodily needs.

2) Safety needs

These are the needs to be free from physical and psychological danger such as fear of loss of job or any other threat, which brings any physical or psychological harm.

3) Social needs

Since human beings are social animals, they desire to belong to others and to be accepted by others. Therefore, social needs include affection, belongingness, acceptance and friendship.

4) Esteem needs

Once a person gets satisfied his social needs, he expects to be held in esteem both by himself and by others. These needs include the need for power, achievement, status and prestige.
5) **Need for self actualization**

Maslow regarded this as the highest-level need in his hierarchy. It is the drive to become what one is capable of becoming. This level represents the culmination of the lower, Intermediate and higher needs of humans.

According Maslow, the above listed needs have a definite sequence of domination as shown in figure below (fig.1.2). Second need does not arise or dominate until the first need is reasonably satisfied and third need does not dominate until the first two needs have been reasonably satisfied and so on. Another point to note in need hierarchy theory is that once a need or a certain order of needs is satisfied, it ceases to be a motivating factor.

![Diagram of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs](image)

**Fig. 1.1**

Maslow separated the five needs into higher and lower orders. Physiological and safety needs were described as lower-order and social, esteem and self-actualization as higher order needs. The distinction between the two parts
was made on the premise that higher order needs are pre-dominantly satisfied internally, i.e., within the person, whereas lower order needs are satisfied externally i.e., by such things as money, wages, union contracts and tenure.

In practice, the need hierarchy may not follow the sequence postulated by Maslow. Even if safety need is not satisfied, the egoist need may emerge. Man's behaviour at any time is mostly guided by multiplicity of motives. Stephen P. Robins quotes (1995)\textsuperscript{40} that Maslow need theory has received wide recognition, particularly among practicing managers. This can be attributed to the theory’s intuitive logic and ease of understanding. Unfortunately, however research does not validate the theory. Maslow provided no empirical substantiation, and several studies that sought to validate the theory found no support for it.

B) **Theory X and theory Y**

"Theory X and theory Y was proposed by Douglas McGregor. He proposed two distinct views of human beings. One basically negative, labeled theory X and the other basically positive, labeled theory Y." \textsuperscript{41} According to McGregor, manager’s view of the nature of human beings is based on certain grouping of assumptions and that he or she tends to mould his or her behaviour towards subordinates according to these assumptions. Briefly, theory X and theory Y run

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{40} Robins Stephen p., organizational behaviour: concepts, controversies and application, prentice hall of India, new Delhi, 6th edition, 1995, p. 206-207
\textsuperscript{41} ibid p. 208
\end{flushright}
Theory X assumes that people cannot be trusted. They are irrational, unreliable and inherently lazy. They therefore need to be controlled and motivated using financial incentives and threats of punishment. In absence of such controls, people will pursue their own goals and these are invariably contrary to those of their work organization.

Theory Y assumes that people seek independence, self-development, creativity and their work. They can see farther than immediate circumstances and are able to adapt to new ones. They are fundamentally moral and responsible beings who will strive for the good of their work organization if they are treated as such.

Robins further explains that theory X and theory Y can best be expressed in the framework presented by Maslow. Theory X assumes that lower order needs dominate individuals. Theory Y assumes that higher order needs dominate individuals. Unfortunately, there is no evidence to confirm that either set of assumptions is valid or that accepting theory Y assumptions and altering one’s actions accordingly will lead to more motivated workers.

C) **Motivation-Hygiene theory or two factor theory**

The motivation hygiene theory was proposed by psychologist Frederick Herzberg.\(^4\) He extended the work of Maslow and developed a specific content theory of work motivation. His research was based on the interview of 200
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engineers and accountants. Based on his research, he identified two job factors, namely, motivators or satisfiers and Hygiene or maintenance factors. That is why this theory is also known as two factor theory. Herzberg proposed that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction appear to be caused by two sets of different factors. The presence of motivators in the workplace caused enduring states of motivation in employees but their absence did not lead to dissatisfaction. Hygiene on the other hand produced an acceptable working environment but did not increase satisfaction. However, their absence did cause job dissatisfaction.

Herzberg theory is closely related to Maslow’s need hierarchy. The hygiene factors are preventive and environmental in nature, and they are roughly equipped to Maslow’s lower level needs, on the other hand, the motivators are roughly equivalent to higher-level needs.

The factors included in two-factor theory are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Hygiene factors</strong></th>
<th><strong>Motivators</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company policy and administration</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision, technical support.</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary,</td>
<td>Work itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relations, supervisors</td>
<td>Responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions.</td>
<td>Advancements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Herzberg also said that today’s motivators are tomorrow’s hygiene’s, because they stop influencing the behaviour of persons when they get them. When a person gets one thing, then something else will motivate him and the need, which has been fulfilled, will have only negative significance in determining his behaviour. Herzberg theory provided an insight into the task of motivation by drawing attention to the importance of job factors, which are often overloaded. Particularly it shows the value of job enrichment in motivation. However, Herzberg theory has not gone unchallenged. In Herzberg’s study, the critical incident methodology has been used. However, when researchers deviate from their methodology used by Herzberg, they do not get the two factors. There seems to be job factors that lead to both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Herzberg draw conclusion from a limited study covering engineers and accountants. Engineers, accountants and other professionals may like responsibility and challenging jobs. However, the general body of workers is motivated by pay and other financial benefits. His model describes only some contents of work motivation; it does not adequately describe the complex motivation process of organizational participants.

D) **Alderfer's ERG Theory**

Clayton Alderfer of Yale University has reworked Maslow’s need hierarchy to align it more closely with the empirical research. His revised need hierarchy is labeled ERG theory. According to Alderfer, (1969) 43 “individual needs can be

divided into three groups viz:

1. Existence needs.
2. Relatedness needs, and.
3. Growth needs.” Hence, ERG came into existence.

The existence needs are concerned with survival (physiological well being). The relatedness needs stress the importance of interpersonal, social relationships. The growth needs are concerned with the individual’s intrinsic desire for personal development.

Alderfer argued that it was better to think in terms of a continuum rather than a hierarchy; from concrete existence needs to least concrete growth needs and argued that you could move along this in either direction. Another argument given by Alderfer was that once a need is satisfied, it does not become less important to an individual, but if we take relatedness or growth needs, they become more important when satisfied. This means that team-working arrangements can continue to motivate employees and are not necessarily supersede by growth needs.

3.8.2 The process theories

The content theories attempt to identify what motivates people at work; they try to specify correlates of motivated behaviour. The process theories, on the other hand, are more concerned with the cognitive antecedents that go into motivation or effort and, more important, with the way they relate to one another.
The various process theories are:

A) **Vroom’s Valence-Expectancy theory of motivation**

The valence expectancy theory, also known as valence, instrumentality and expectancy theory (VIE) theory had resulted from Vroom’s (1960) works into motivation. This theory asserts that people make choices, which are based on their perceived expectancy that certain rewards will follow if they behave in a certain way.

There are three variables of Vroom’s model given in the form of an equation. Since the equation is multiplicative, all the three variables must have high positive values to imply motivated performance choices. If any one of the variables approaches to zero, the probability of motivated performance approaches zero. Motivation= Valence × Expectancy × instrumentality.

**Meaning of variables**

By valence, Vroom means the strength of an individual’s performance for a particular outcome. Expectancy is the probability that a particular action will lead to a desired reward and instrumentality denotes an individual’s estimate that performance will result in achieving the reward. In Vroom’s model the combination that produces the strongest motivation is high positive valence, high expectancy and high instrumentality. If all the three are low, the resulting motivation will be weak. In other cases, motivation will be moderate. Similarly, the avoidance behaviour will be determined by the negative valence and
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instrumental factors. Vroom’s theory depicts a process of cognitive variables that reflects individual differences in work motivation. It does not attempt to describe what the content is or what the individual differences are. It indicates only the conceptual determinants of motivation and the way they are related. It does not provide specific suggestions on what motivates organizational members.

Luthans (1992)\textsuperscript{45} quotes that although the Vroom’s model does not directly contribute much to the techniques of motivating personnel in an organization, it is of value in understanding organizational behaviour. It can clarify the relationship between individual and organizational goals. The model is designed to help management to understand and analyse workers motivation and identify some of the relevant variables. It does not provide specific solution to motivational problems. The model also assumes that people are rational and logically calculating. Such assumption may be unrealistic.

A) **Porter and Lawler expectancy model**

Porter and Lawler (1968)\textsuperscript{46} model is an improvement over Vroom’s expectancy model. This model is based on four assumptions about behaviour in organization:

I) A combination of factors in the individual and in the environment determines the behaviour. II) Individuals make conscious decisions about their behaviour in the organization. III) Individuals have different needs, desires and goals.

\textsuperscript{45} Luthans, F. Organisational Behaviour, Mc Graw Hills publications, 1992, p164

\textsuperscript{46} Porter L.W., Lawler E., Managerial attitudes and performance, Richard Irwin, Inc., Homewood III, 1968, p 12-13
Individuals decide between alternative behaviours based on their expectations that a given behaviour will lead to the desired outcome. Porter and Lawler start with the premise that motivation (effort or force) does not equal satisfaction and/or performance. He points out that effort does not directly lead to performance. It is mediated by abilities/traits and role perceptions, the rewards that follow and how these are perceived will determine satisfaction.

The Porter Lawler model has definitely made a significant contribution to the better understanding of work motivation and the relationship between performance and satisfaction, but to date, it has not had much input on the actual practice of human resource management. Porter Lawler suggests that managers should carefully assess their reward structure and that through careful planning and careful definition of role requirements, the effort performance reward satisfaction system of managing. Thus, the managers should take the following steps to motivate the workers.

i. Determine the rewards valued by each subordinate.

ii. Determine the desired performance.

iii. Make the performance level attainable.

iv. Link rewards to performance.

B) **Equity theory of motivation**

J Stacy Adams advanced the equity theory, the notion that motivation is influenced by our perception of how equitably or fairly we are treated at work.
Schol and cooper (1987) quotes that Stacy proposed that in any work environment we assess our input (how much effort we put into the work) and our outcomes (how much reward we receive for the work). He says that if we think we are getting less than other people, the feeling of tension or inequity that result motivates us to act, to do something to bring about a state of equity. If we perceive that we are receiving the same ratio of reward to effort that others are receiving, then state of equity exists. So here, the employees might compare themselves to friends, neighbours, co-workers, colleagues in other organizations or past jobs they themselves have had. In the form of an equation, equity occurs when:

\[
\frac{\text{Persons outcome}}{\text{Persons inputs}} = \frac{\text{other's outcomes}}{\text{others inputs}}.
\]

Both the inputs and the outputs of person and other are based upon the person's perceptions. The examples of perceived inputs variables are, age, sex, education, social status, organizational positions, qualifications, and how hard the person works to achieve the desired organizational goals. Outcomes consist primarily of rewards such as pay, status, promotion, and intrinsic interest in the job. In essence, the ratio is based upon the person’s perception of inputs and outcomes versus the ratio of what relevant other is giving and receiving. If the persons received ratio is not equal to the others, he or she will strive to restore the

47. Schol. R. W., Cooper.E.A. And J.F McKenna, personnel Psychology, springs, 1987, pp113-127
ratio to equity. Adams uses this “striving” to restore the equity as the explanation of work motivation.

C) Goal Setting theory.

Edwin Locke (1990) offers the goal setting-theory as a means of motivation. Here goal direct efforts of humans and provide guideline for deciding how much effort to put into each activity when there are multiple goals. Locke argued that our primary motivation in a work situation is defined in terms of our desire to achieve a particular goal. The goal represents what we intend to do at a given time in the future.

Setting specific and challenging performance goals can motivate and guide our behaviour, spurring us to perform in ways that are more effective. Having goals, leads to better performance than not having goals, and specific goals are more powerful motivating forces than general goals. An important aspect of the goal-setting theory is individual goal commitment, which is defined in terms of the strength of our determination to reach our goals. Goal commitment is influenced by three factors: external, interactive and internal. The external factors that affect goal commitment are authority, peer influence, and external reward. The interactive factors are competition and the opportunity to participate in setting goals. Other personal and situational factors include the need for achievement, endurance, aggressiveness and competitiveness, success in achieving difficult

goals, high self-esteem and an internal locus of control.

The goal setting theory has generated a considerable supportive research. Setting goals has been found to produce substantial increase in employees output. In general, the motivating effects of setting goals are strongest for easy tasks and weakest for tasks that are more complex. These effects generalize across a variety of organizations, jobs and tasks. Goal setting theory is also high in scientific validity and in applicability on the job.

3.9 Job satisfaction

The concept of job satisfaction is not merely as academic part of psychology; it is a way of life. It is necessary for the creative development of then individual. It plays an important role for better performance of one’s job and better discharge of responsibilities that are inherent in jobs. The concept of job satisfaction touches not only ones head but also the heart. A life does not consist entirely of what we see, hear and feel, the visible things; it is continuously touching an invisible world of other and no thinking person can ignore this. A human being whatever job he or she does, does not cast his or her life in the mould of either master or servant. He or she is more than that. At some stage of the life, one is greatly attached to the job accepted in the life. A job of a person is influences his or her thoughts. These thoughts become words. Words change into actions. Actions become habits. Habits make character. A complete harmony between these things enables a sense of certain fullness of life and a vivid intensity
in the moment of existence. A job satisfaction is therefore more concerned with intrinsic value rather than extrinsic considerations.

The researchers in numerous ways have defined job satisfaction. Some of the definitions of job satisfaction are as follows:

1. In the words of Feldman and Arnold, “job satisfaction is the amount of overall positive effect or feelings that individuals have towards their jobs”.

2. “Job satisfaction is the amount of pleasure or contentment associated with a job. If you like your job intensely, you will experience high job satisfaction. If you dislike your job intensely, you will experience job dissatisfaction”.

3. Locke gives a comprehensive definition of job satisfaction as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience”.

Keeping in view the above definitions, we can say that job satisfaction is the individual’s emotional reaction to the job. It is the individual’s attitude towards the job. Job satisfaction is more related to the mind of a job holder. It revolves around mental axis. It is something of the mind. It involves perception of the individual in terms of what one precisely gets from the job, both in material form
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and abstract form in return for physical and more importantly mental involvement. Without mental involvement, physical presence in the job has absolutely no meaning.

Smith, Kendall, and Hulin in (Terence R 1987) have suggested that there are five job dimensions that represent the most important characteristics of a job about which people have effective responses. These dimensions are:

1. The work itself: - The extent to which the job provides the individual with an interesting tasks, opportunities for learning, and the chance to accept responsibility.

2. Pay: - The amount of financial remuneration that is received and the degree to which this is viewed as equitable vis-à-vis others in the organization.

3. Promotion opportunities: - the chances for advancement in the hierarchy.

4. Supervision: - the abilities of the superior to provide technical assistance and behavioural support.

5. Co-workers: - The degrees to which fellow workers are technically proficient and socially supportive.

The concept of job satisfaction is very fascinating and intriguing too. It is mainly because the measurement of job satisfaction is difficult owing to its intimate relation with emotional and sentimental attachment of job.

One of the biggest preludes of the study of job satisfaction was Hawthorne studies.

These studies (1924-1933)\textsuperscript{53} primary credited to Elton Mayo of the Harvard business school, sought to find the effect of various conditions (most notably illumination) on workers' productivity. These studies ultimately showed that novel changes in work conditions temporarily increase productivity (called Hawthorne effect). It was later found that this increase resulted, not from the new conditions, but from the knowledge of being observed. The findings provide strong evidence that people work for purposes other than pay, which paved the way for researchers to investigate other factors in job satisfaction.

Some argue that Maslow’s need hierarchy theory, a motivational theory laid the foundation for job satisfaction theory. This theory explains that people seek to satisfy five specific needs in life: physiological needs, safety needs, social needs, self-esteem needs, and self-actualization. This model served as a good basis from which early researchers could develop job satisfaction theories.

3.9.1 Models of job satisfaction

1) Affect theory

Edwin A. Locke’s Range of affect theory (1976)\textsuperscript{54} is arguably the most famous job satisfaction model. This theory is based on the premise that satisfaction is determined by a discrepancy between what one wants in a job and what one has in a job. Further, the theory states that how much one values a given


facet of work, e.g. the degree of the autonomy in a position, moderates how satisfied or dissatisfied one becomes when expectations are met or not met. When a person values a particular facet of job, his satisfaction is more greatly impacted both positively and negatively, compared to one who does not value that facet. To put it in simple words, we can say that every jobholder has a different facet to value. Autonomy in the work place may be more valued by one employee than another and other facet or factor like pay or working conditions may be more valued by some people. Therefore, satisfaction or dissatisfaction depends upon the valuation of different facets of work the employees do. This theory states that too much of a particular facet will produce stronger feeling of dissatisfaction the more a worker values that facet.

II) Dispositional theory

Another well-known job satisfaction theory is the dispositional theory. It is very general theory that suggests that people have innate dispositions that cause them to have tendencies towards a certain level of satisfaction, regardless of one’s job. This approach became a notable explanation of job satisfaction in light of evidence that job satisfaction tends to be stable overtime and across careers and jobs.

The core self-evaluation model proposed by Timony A. Judge in 1998 narrowed the scope of this model. Judge argued that, there are four core self-evaluations that determine one’s disposition towards job satisfaction: Self-esteem, general self-efficacy, locus of control and neuroticism. This model stated that
higher level of self-esteem i.e., the value one places on his self, and the general
self-efficacy i.e., the belief in one's own competence leads to higher work
satisfaction. Having an internal locus of control i.e., believing one has control over
her/his own life, as opposed to outside forces having control, leads to higher job
satisfaction. Finally, lower level of neuroticism leads to higher job satisfaction.

III) Job characteristics model

Hackman and Oldham (1976)\textsuperscript{55} proposed the job characteristics model which is
widely used as a framework to study how particular job characteristics impact on
job outcomes including job satisfaction. The model states that there are five core
job characteristics viz, skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and
task feedback. They suggest that if jobs are designed in a way that increases the
presence of these core characteristics three critical psychological states can occur
in employees. These three states are:

1. Experienced meaningfulness of work
2. Experienced responsibility for work outcomes
3. Knowledge of results of work activities

The occurrence of these three critical psychological states in turn
influences work outcomes like job satisfaction, absenteeism, work motivation etc.
The five core job characteristics can be combined to form a motivating potential
score for a job, which can be used as an index of how likely a job is to affect an

\textsuperscript{55} Hackman J.R., Oldham G.R., Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory,
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employee's attitude and behaviour. A meta-analysis of studies that assess the framework of the model provides some support for the validity of the job characteristics model.

The concept of job satisfaction is very fascinating and intriguing too. It is mainly because the measurement of the job satisfaction is difficult owing to its intimate relation with emotional and sentimental attachment of job doer. The satisfaction has different facets. It is a relative concept and in a way, an intangible in nature. It is the result of various attitudes possessed and developed by a person. An attitude may be defined as a set of act developed by a person. Attitudes die-hard; however, it is possible to change them, provided one is willing and ready. For adoptable people attitude is never static. It is an ongoing dynamic sensitive and perceptual process. Attitude is the way one sees things on his mental screen. One can see a situation either as an opportunity or as a threat. Attitudes may be towards various aspects of the job and related factors. An unfavorable attitude towards one aspect may not necessarily result in lowered job satisfaction. The personal factors, factors relating to the job itself and factors under management control together influence the job satisfaction of an employee. It is quite an unfathomable phenomenon. An employee expects pleasure from the job. This in-turn makes him satisfied. However, what is pleasure and how does pleasure bring a feel of satisfaction are impalpable things. Therefore, job satisfaction is the ultimate result of what one experiences in the job.
Motivation and satisfaction are two difficult outcomes associated with one’s job. Motivation refers to the drive and effort to satisfy a want or goal. Job satisfaction refers to the contentment experienced when a want is satisfied. Motivation seems to be a drive towards an outcome and satisfaction involves outcome already experienced. Morale is another facet related to job satisfaction. It is the degree of positive feeling an individual gets as a member of his group out of the total job satisfaction. It is a condition as affected by or dependent on such material factors as zeal, spirit, hope, confidence, etc. It is a readiness to co-operate warmly in the tasks and purposes of a given group or organizations. A high or good morale helps to cause a high degree of satisfaction. It is often associated with the group and not with an individual.

The concept of job is very complex. It has a number of dimensions such as the nature of work, the company, the supervision, pay, promotional opportunity to exhibit skills, occupational hazards, social prestige etc. Job satisfaction is one’s effective response to the job. Therefore, when one thinks of satisfaction that the individual associates with the job, it is really the degree of satisfaction with a number of different dimensions of the job. The entire job dimensions are not equally important to all people in determining overall satisfaction with their jobs. Job satisfaction is, many a time, associated with job behaviour. It is a hedonic response of liking or disliking the attitude object. It is commonly understood that individual will always approach those things with
which he or she is satisfied and will avoid those things with which he or she is

Job satisfaction casts its impact not only on the employees but also on
management or organization, because a person works both for needs and for
pleasure. If the work does not provide enjoyment or pleasure, an element of
dissatisfaction is sure to creep in. Lowering job satisfaction results in
deterioration in the efficacy of the organization. If employees do not have
satisfaction from their jobs, the management is bound to encounter a number of
pressing problems like low productivity, strikes, slow down agitations,
absenteeism, indiscipline etc. Thus, from management’s point of view, job
satisfaction of its employees is quite an intimate subject. The concept of work/job
has undergone a sea change. An element of sophistication has added new colors
and flavour to the age-old general binds of jobs. Modern job need a sound
technical knowledge and mental capacity to sustain growing pressures for changes
in job environment. Modern jobs and surrounding conditions are also responsible
for strain, stress, anxieties, dissatisfaction and less motivation and frustration too.
Job dissatisfaction, stress and less motivation are the realities, which are to be
accepted by all.