CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Emotional intelligence (EI) is one of the recent developments in the area of intelligence. The merging of emotion and intelligence as a cognitive ability under the caption of EI was proposed by Salovey and Mayer (1990). They defined it as "ability to monitor one's own and others feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions".

The concept of EI, received popularity through the best selling book, "Emotional intelligence" by Daniel Goleman. 1995, the cover article in 'Time' by N. Gibbs, 1995 and then some other popular books.
The origin and development of emotional intelligence

Even though the term EI has received considerable attention recently, earlier psychologists and philosophers had already laid down the foundation.

The development of the concept of EI can be understood by making a five fold division of years from 1900.

(i) From 1900 – 1969: During which the psychological study of intelligence and emotions were relatively separate.

(ii) From 1970 – 1989: Psychologists focused on how emotions and thoughts influenced each other.

(iii) From 1990 – 1993: Marked the emergence of EI as a topic of study.

(iv) From 1994 – 1997: When the concept was popularised.

EI emerged as a topic of study with the work of Dr. Wayne Payne (1983/1986) that used the term emotional intelligence in his unpublished dissertation. He distinguished EI from more purely cognitive forms of intelligence. “The facts, meanings, truths, relationships etc. (of EI) are those that exist in the realm of emotions.

Howard Gardner (1983) proposed the theory of multiple intelligences, including inter personal and intra personal intelligences which also make up the social intelligence. He defined interpersonal intelligence as the ability to understand other people: what motivates them, how they work, how to work cooperatively with them. Intrapersonal intelligence is a co-relative ability, turned inward. It is a capacity to form an accurate evaluation of oneself and to be able to use those to operate effectively in life.

Sternberg (1988) proposed the Triarchic theory of intelligence that consists of componential intelligence, experiential intelligence and contextual intelligence. The third component contextual intelligence
overlaps with EI because it manages our ability to handle everyday life affairs in an efficient and practical way.

**1990 – 1993:** John Mayer and Peter Salovey, in 1990, developed a formal theory of EI and coordinated measurement demonstrations.

According to them EI involves abilities that may be categorized into 5 domains. Self-awareness, Managing emotions, Motivating oneself, Empathy, and Handling relationships.

The third era 1990 – 1993 is the demarcation point for the emergence of the study of EI.

**1994 – 1997**
The term EI was popularised and broadened. Daniel Goleman a science journalist published his book “Emotional intelligence”. In this book and the popular accounts that accompanied it, EI was considered to be possibly, the best predictor of success in life. The “Time Magazine” used the term ‘EQ’ on its cover and a number of personality scales were published under the name of EI.

According to Goleman (1995) EI consists of “abilities such as being able to motivate oneself and persist in the face of frustrations; to control impulse and delay gratification; to regulate one’s moods and keep distress from swamping the ability to think; to empathize and to hope”.

A number of refinements of the concept of EI have taken place thereafter.

Bar – On (1997) also proposed a model of EI in which it is described “as an array of non cognitive abilities, competencies and skills that influence one’s ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures”.
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Mayer and Salovey (1997) revised their earlier definition by emphasising on cognitive ability in the new definition. Therefore the new definition explained the four 4 abilities (i) Perception, appraisal and expression of emotion; (ii) emotional facilitation of thinking; (iii) understanding and analysing emotions employing emotional knowledge; (iv) Reflective regulation of emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth.

1998 – To the present

Roberts, Zeidner and Matthews (2001) suggested an emotionless, intelligence perspective of EI. It suggested that EI can be either personality trait or intelligence depending on the type of measure used.

Petriedes and Furnham (2000) believed that it is the type of measurement rather than the theory per se that determines the nature of the model.

Forgas (2001) claimed that emotional thought is sometimes intelligent and sometimes unintelligent. McCrae (2000) argued that the processing emotional experience involves both particular traits and specific abilities. He also believes that the distinction between the abilities included in the ability model of EI and personality traits can be drawn, but is sometimes difficult to perceive. Competency is a set of abilities that can be completely learned, whereas intelligence is a set of mental abilities that can be partly learned as a consequence of interaction with the environment and partly inborn.

Salovey, Mayer and Caruso (2002) have stated that EI “refers to the ability to process emotion – laden information competently and to use it to guide cognitive activities like problem solving and to focus energy in required behaviours”. EI combines a group of skills that are more
MODELS OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

JOHN MAYER & PETER SALOVEY (1990)

Proposed that EI is about how people appraise and communicate emotions, and how emotion is used in solving problems. It is thought that people differ in their ability to understand and express emotions. These abilities may be categorized into 5 domains, i.e. Self awareness, Managing emotions, Motivating oneself, Empathy, and Handling relationships.

They further posit three unique underlying mechanisms of emotional intelligence that interact with personality to produce emotional responses: emotionality, emotion management, and ability to code and decode emotional responses.

REUVEN BAR-ON (1997)

Bar-On explained EI by dividing it into 5 areas or realms. The intrapersonal realm concerns the ability to know and manage oneself. The interpersonal realm concerns with one’s people skills i.e. one’s ability to interact and get along with others. The adaptability realm involves the ability to be flexible and realistic, and to solve a range of problems as they arise. The stress management realm – ability to tolerate stress and control impulses. The General mood realm ability to be optimistic and be happy.

JOHN MAYER & PETER SALOVEY (1997)

Proposed a four – branch model of EI

(i) Emotional perception and expression ability to understand one’s own emotions and that of others and to be able to express those accurately.
(ii) Emotional facilitation of thought (using EI) ability to be optimistic.
(iii) Emotional understanding of the relationship between various emotions their causes and consequences
(iv) Emotional management ability to manage emotions in self and others.

Proposed that EI is not made up of 5 domains but in fact includes 13 major facets of character which are related to success in life. They also developed a highly valid and reliable way to measure them. The 13 aspects that make up EI are, Emotional energy, Emotional Stress, Optimism, Self – esteem, Commitment to work, Attention to detail measures, Desire for change, Courage, Self – direction, Assertiveness, Tolerance, Consideration for others, and Sociability.

ROISER (1994-95)
Information from various other sources was put together to develop the emotional competence framework, which proposed that EI was made up of personal competence, accurate self-assessment, self-confidence, self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability, innovativeness, achievement drive, commitment, initiative, optimism, social competence, service orientation, developing others, leveraging diversity, political awareness, influence, communication, leadership, change catalyst, conflict management, building bonds, collaboration and cooperation, and team capabilities.

PETRIDES & FURNHAM (2001)
Proposed the concept of Trait emotional intelligence, and stated that (emotional self efficiency) is a constellation of emotion related self perceived abilities and dispositions located at the lower levels of personality hierarchy. The people having a high trait EI are in touch
with their emotions and that they can regulate them in a way that promotes well being.

This review of the different models suggests that the understanding about EI and its nature has been changing over the years, with some researchers proposing that EI is predominantly a cognitive ability, while others believing it to be a purely emotional capacity. The debate about EI also centres around whether it is a trait which is stable and is mostly inborn, as its components are found to overlap with the factors of personality or it is a ability of the individual to manage emotions effectively. Though there is an overlap found been the components of EI and factors of personality the research evidence proving that EI can be taught and learnt points to the idea that it must be an ability that can be acquired by the individual if willing and by putting in efforts.

**Measures of EI**

The different measures of EI, are classified into the self report and the performance measures. The self report measures tap the EI as like a trait whereas the performance measures indexes it like ability. [Davies, Stankov, Roberts, 1998; Dawda & Hart, 2000].

Goleman (1995b) developed the 10 item EI test but which had a low reliability. Following this, there have been at least 16 other self report scales which were developed for e.g. the EQ i Map developed by Cooper (1997); the Emotional Quotient inventory developed by the EQ Japan Inc (1998) (Cited in Thingujam, 2002); the ECI devised by Boyatzis, Goleman and Hay/McBer (1999); Toronto Alexithymia scale to measure EI although it was originally designed to measure alexithymia, was developed by Bagby, Porter and Taylor (1994) to mention a few. Some of the tests of EI, however, seem to be more psychometrically sound and are used widely.
Bar-On (1997) for e.g., developed the EQ-i with 15 subscales, which renders a overall EI score as well as the scores on each of the subscales. The test also contained four validity scales and has a high level of internal consistency and test retest reliability. The validation studies for this test have revealed the various significant correlates of EI, and are mentioned in the literature review chapter.

There are several performance tests developed to measure EI, e.g. Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (1997) constructed the Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS). It was designed to measure 4 major (branches) components that underlie EI. Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (1997) designed the emotional intelligence test (MSCEIT). The MSCEIT was designed to resolve some of the problems associated with the MEIS and many more.

The more commonly used scale is the Schutte – self report – inventory (SSRI) (Schutte et al., 1998) has 33 items. An Indian adaptation of the scale has also been developed by Thingujam and Ram (2000), which is the test used to measure EI in the present study. This scale was chosen over the other scale as it measures EI as described by the Salovey and Mayer (1990) model which seems to be theoretically cohesive and comprehensive because it contributes to a better understanding of the different dimensions of the nature of emotional development, and also that most dimensions of the other models are combined into this. The scale is also chosen due its brevity.

SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

The World Health Organization (WHO)(1948) defined 'mental health' as not merely the absence of mental illness, nor as merely the presence of high well-being. Rather it was defined as a complete state consisting of (a) the absence of mental illness and (b) the presence of high-level well-being. Complete mental health is the syndrome that combines high levels of symptoms of well-being, emotional well-being,
psychological well-being and social well-being, as well as the absence of recent mental illness (Cited in Keyes & Lopez, 2002).

Mental health like illness is indicated when a set of symptoms are at a specific level, are present for a specified duration, and this health coincides with distinctive brain and social functioning (APA 1980, Keyes in press, Mechanic, 1999). To study mental health researchers move towards the operationalization of mental health as a syndrome of symptoms of well-being (Cited in Keyes and Lopez, 2002).

Subjective well-being reflects individuals perceptions and evaluations of their own lives in terms of their affective states, psychological functioning and social functioning, well-being researchers often use positive mental health synonymously with subjective well-being. Diener, Lucas, & Oishi, 2002) (Cited in Keyes & Lopez, 2002).

The literature of subjective well-being includes research on happiness, life satisfaction and positive affect. Throughout history, philosophers considered happiness to be the highest good and ultimate motivation for human action (Diener, 1984). Utilitarians such as Jeremy Bentham (1948) argued that the presence of pleasure and the absence of pain are the defining characteristics of a good life. Although there are other desirable, personal characteristics beyond whether a person is happy, the individual with abundant joy has the key ingredient of a good life (Cited Diener, Lucas, and Oishi, 2002).

Early in the 20th century, empirical studies of subjective well-being began to take shape. Flugel (1925) studied moods by having people record their emotional events and then summing emotional reactions across moments. Flugel's work was the forerunner of modern experience sampling approaches to measuring subjective well-being on-line as people go about their everyday lives. George Gallup, Gerald Gurin and his colleagues and Hadlay Cantril (Cited in Diener, Lucas,
& Oishi, 2002) pioneered the use of large-scale surveys as an assessment technique. They asked people questions such as “How happy are you? With simple response options varying from ‘very happy’ to ‘not very happy’. Recently Diener & Lucas (2000) proposed that a national index be created in which subjective-well-being would be tracked over time.

In 1969, Norman Bradburn showed that pleasant and unpleasant affect are somewhat independent and have different correlates that are not simply opposites of one another. Thus, the two affects must be studied separately, to gain a complete picture of individuals’ well-being. This finding had an important implication for the field of subjective-well-being. It showed that clinical psychology’s attempts to eliminate negative states would not necessarily foster positive states (Diener, 1984).

Wilson’s (1967) (Cited in Diener, 1984) review of this emergent area contained two broad conclusions. First, that the most advantageous were the happiest. He concluded that the “happy person emerges as a young, healthy, well-educated, well-paid, extroverted, optimistic, worry-free, religious, married person with high self-esteem high job morale, modest aspirations, of either sex and of a wide range of intelligence. Secondly he concluded that little theoretical progress in understanding happiness has been made in the two millennia since the time of the Greek philosophers, similar findings have been highlighted by Diener (1984).

Excellent reviews of the history and philosophy of happiness and related terms are available. (Chekola, 1975; Culberson, 1977; Jones, 1953; Tatarkiewicz, 1976; Wessman, 1957 and Wilson, 1960) (Cited in Diener, 1984).
Diener (1984) provided a review of the much larger database on subjective well-being, that had accumulated by the mid-1980's. Since Diener's review was published, a number of books have appeared on the topic of subjective well-being (e.g. Argyle, 1987; Myers, 1982; Strack, Argyle, & Schwarz, 1999) (Cited in Diener et al., 2002) and in 1999 Diener, Suh, Lucas and Smith authored a new review of the literature in psychological Bulletin. A handbook volume of chapters related to hedonic psychology (Kahneman, Diener & Schwarz, 1999) (Cited in Diener et al., 2002) and a book dedicated to cross-cultural differences in subjective well-being (Diener and Suh, 2000) also provide more thorough reviews of this area (Cited in Diener et al., 2002).

**Theories of Subjective Well-Being**

We shall now consider Six Different Theories that explain SWB.

(i) Telic theories (endpoint)

(ii) Pleasure and pain.

(iii) Activity theory

(iv) Top-Down versus Bottom-up theories.

(v) Associationistic theories.

(vi) Judgment theories.

(i) **Telic Theories**

The Telic theories are also called as the end-point theories and propose that happiness is achieved when some goal or need is reached.

Wilson (1960) (Cited in Diener, 1984) suggested that satisfaction of needs causes happiness and conversely, the persistence of unfulfilled needs causes unhappiness.
Diener (1984) stated that many philosophers were concerned with questions related to telic theories. For e.g. Certain alternative theories can be drawn from the different origins of the striving.

(ii) Need theories and Goal theories
The *Need theories* postulate that certain needs within us are inborn and learned which we seek to *fulfil*. We are at times not aware of these needs yet we feel happy when these are fulfilled, sometimes some underlying needs lead to specific goals.

The second alternative theory of the Telic theories is the *goal theory*. The Goal theory is based on specific desires of which the person is aware of i.e. the person chooses these goals consciously and pursues those. Michalos, 1980 (Cited in Diener, 1984) pointed out that the person consciously seeks certain goals and happiness results when they are reached.

(iii) Pleasure and Pain
One assumption in this approach is that greater the deprivation, greater will be joy when you achieve goal. The idea that fulfilling needs leads to happiness is opposite of the idea that having all the needs satisfied permanently will lead to maximum happiness. If individual’s desires and goals are totally fulfilled it may however be impossible to achieve greater happiness.

Houston (1981) (Cited in Diener, 1984) has suggested that our genetic make-up is such that we are happiest when we experience deprivation based need and are able to satisfy that need.

Wilson (1960) (Cited in Diener, 1984) stated that the recurrent needs are cyclical in nature and the most rewarding state of affairs is that the cycles do repeat themselves in a normal and orderly way.
Solomon (1980) (Cited in Diener, 1984) proposed the opponent process theory and suggested that the loss of something good leads to unhappiness and loss of something bad leads to happiness. Also, that a person will habituate to a good or bad object and thus will bring less happiness or unhappiness with repeated exposure.

(iv) Activity Theories
These theories maintain that happiness is a by-product of human activity. For e.g. the activity of climbing a mountain will produce more happiness than reaching the peak.

Another theme of happiness is that self awareness will decrease happiness. There is some empirical evidence for the same (Cskiszsentimihalyi & Figurski, 1982) (Cited in Diener, 1984). This idea is in keeping with the popular idea that concentrating on gaining happiness may be self defeating i.e. one should concentrate on important activities and goals and happiness will come as an unintended by-product.

The most explicit explanation of activity and SWB is the theory of flow proposed by Csikszentmihalyi, 1975 (Cited in Diener, 1984). According to this view, activities are seen as pleasurable when the challenge is matched with the person’s skill level. If an activity is too easy, boredom will develop; if it is too difficult anxiety will result. Also, when a person is involved in activity that demands intense concentration and in which the person’s skills and challenge of the task are roughly equal, a pleasurable flow of experience will result.

(v) Top-Down versus Bottom-up Theories
The Bottom-up theories suggest that happiness is simply the sum of many small pleasures. According to this view, when a person judges whether his or her life is happy, he does some mental calculation to
add up momentary pleasures and pains. Therefore a happy life is merely an accumulation of happy moments.

This view is related to Lockean reductionistic or automistic view (Kozma & Stones, 1980) (Cited in Diener, 1984). In the Bottom-up approach, a person should develop a sunny disposition and sanguine outlook as positive experience accumulate in the person’s life.

In contrast the Top-down approach to happiness proposes that there is global propensity to experience things in a positive way and this influences the interaction of the individual with the world. In simpler terms that means, a person enjoys pleasure because he is happy.

From the philosophical Kantian view, causation precedes from the higher order elements down to the lower order elemental levels.

In this approach the personality features are assumed to influence the way the individual interacts with the environment.

Philosophers too have pointed out certain types of attitudes being related to happiness which again points at the Top-Bottom processing.

Democritus proposed that a happy life does not depend on good fortune or indeed on any external contingency, but to even greater extent, on a man’s cast of mind (Tatarkiewiez, 1979) (Cited in Diener, 1984).

The temperament based explanation has been explained by various theorists. Gray (1987) proposed that the biological substrate underlying extraverts’ greater sensitivity to positive stimuli is a system he calls the Behavioural Activation System (BAS). This system is sensitive to signals of rewards and non punishment (as opposed to the “behavioral inhibition system” which is sensitive to signals of
punishment). The BAS may be responsible for the production of positive affect and thus individual differences in the strength of this system could lead to differential levels of happiness (Cited in Diener & Lucas, 2000).

The second explanation of the relationship between personality and SWB is that the resting level of emotional experience, rather than our reaction to emotion eliciting events, is determined by personality.

From the above alternate explanations, we can conclude that people may have different resting levels of emotion, as well as characteristic style of responding to the emotionally charged stimuli. Therefore one must take into account the dispositional characteristic of a person while evaluating the effects of external influences on well-being.

To sum up, the Top-down and Bottom-up theories may be partly correct in their own places. Therefore we should rather try to integrate both and identify how disposition and events interact to produce happiness.

The fact that people react to events as subjectively perceived, top-down process may be at work, but at the same time we may note that there are some events which most people find pleasurable, points to the bottom-up view.

(vi) Associationistic Theories
Many theories based on memory, conditioning or cognitive principles explain how some people have a temperament which predisposes to happiness. These theories can be together called as the Associationistic theories.
There are various cognitive explanations of happiness.

i. Attributions

ii. Memory

iii. Classical conditioning

(i) Attributions: Schwarz & Clore (1983) (Cited in Diener & Lucas, 2000) maintained that good events will bring most happiness if they are attributed to stable internal factors. Also another view is that events that are perceived as good lead to happiness regardless of the attributions made.

(ii) Association networks in Memory: Bower (1981) had shown that people will recall memories that are affectively congruent with their current emotional state. Research on memory networks suggest that persons could develop a rich network of positive associations and a more limited and isolated network of negative ones. Therefore a person with such a predominantly positive network would be predisposed to react to more events in a positive way (Cited in Diener, 1984).

(iii) Classically conditioned elicitation of affect: Research has shown that affective conditioning can be extremely resistant to extinction. Thus happy people might be the ones who have had very positive experiences associated to a large number of frequent everyday stimuli. Zajonc (1980) (Cited in Diener, 1984) suggested that affective reactions occur independently of and more rapidly than cognitive evaluation of stimuli is compatible with a conditioning approach to happiness.

Conditioning and memory networks may function without explicit conscious intervention. However there is some evidence that a person can give conscious direction to the affective association in his/her life.
Fordyce (1977a) found evidence that a conscious attempt to reduce negative thoughts can increase happiness (Cited in Diener, 1984).

However, although the response to incoming events is biased by the associations, current events could alter the associations over time.

(vii) Judgment Theories
There are number a of happiness theories which suggest that happiness is a result of some comparison between some standard and the actual conditions. If the actual condition is better than the standard we experience happiness. In case of satisfaction such comparisons are conscious, but in case of affect, comparison with a standard may occur in a non conscious manner.

The judgment theories help to predict the magnitude of affect that events will produce. We can differentiate between the judgment theories based on the standard that is used.

The social comparison theory maintains that one uses other people as a standard. Michalos (1985) (Cited in Diener & Lucas, 2000).

Another understanding of happiness is adaptation. Adaptation to events means when the events occur first, they can produce happiness or sadness. However over the time the person adapts to these events and the events no longer evoke happiness or sadness.

Brickman and Campbell (1971) stated that the Adaptation theory is based on a standard derived from an individual's own experiences. If the current events are better than the standard, the individual will be happy, however if the good events continue, adaptation will occur, the individual standard will rise so that it eventually matches the newer events. Therefore recent changes can produce happiness or sadness because a person will eventually adapt to the over all level of events.
Hence the theory predicts that changes in the income and so forth are much more important to happiness than is the average level of events. An individual’s standard will eventually move up or down depending on the circumstances. It is the departures from this standard that will produce happiness or unhappiness. (Cited in Diener, 1984).

The review of the various models of SWB suggests that there are diverse points of views of the concept in the way it has been perceived. SWB has been assumed to be experienced when some goal is attained, or the fulfilment a need that may be inborn. SWB may also be the result of enjoyment of the tasks in which the individual is involved, which is explained by the FLOW theory. At other times it is proposed that the SWB could be the sum total of the different happy events experienced by the individual. Personality traits also are believed to be determinants of SWB, raising questions therefore as to whether it is a trait or a state. The cognitive explanations focus on the attributional style, memory, and conditioning playing a role in experience of SWB. Hence the different theories present altogether different points of views of understanding SWB. SWB or as it is alternatively called as life satisfaction, or emotional well-being however may be the judgement of the level of satisfaction one experiences due to personality disposition, life events, comparisons we make with others, our perception about the social support network we have, meaning we ascribe to life etc.

**Measurement of SWB**

The early measures of SWB have been mostly single item, posing a single question about people’s happiness or life satisfaction, (Cantril, 1965; Gurin, Veroff & Fedl, 1960; Andrews and Withey, 1976) (Cited in Diener, 1984). However the single item scales tend to be less reliable over time than multi-item scales, although the temporal reliability of single items measures has been moderately high. (Stock, Okun, Haring & Witter, 1982) (Cited in Diener, 1984). Hence several
other measures were devised over the time, including many scales for measuring the SWB of older people for e.g., Lawton, 1975; Morris & Sherwood, 1975; Neugarten, Havighurst & Tobin, 1961; Wood, Wylie and Sheafor, 1969 (Cited in Diener, 1984).

Other scales have been developed to measure SWB for all age groups, (e.g., Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1983; Larsen, 1983; Kammann & Flett, 1983; Fordyce, 1976) (Cited in Diener, 1984). However for the present study the author chose to use the SWB scale developed by Sen & Nagpal (1992) for measuring SWB among the Indian population. This scale was chosen over the other existing scales as it indexes SWB with the help of 11 subscales which measure most of the factors that make up SWB which have been elaborately described in the chapter on research methodology and also because it is a test developed to measure SWB among the Indian population.

THEORIES OF COPING

The concept of coping has been with us for a long time, though it began to be independently researched in the 1960’s and 1970’s when stress was also being researched upon.

The starting point of research of conceptualizing and analyzing stress and coping was by Lazarus (1966) (Cited in Lazarus, 1993). Lazarus argued that stress consists of three processes. Primary appraisal – the process of perceiving a threat to oneself. Secondary appraisal - the process of bringing to mind a potential response to the threat and third coping – the process of executing that response.

Moos & Billing (1982) have discussed four related theoretical perspectives that have contributed to the current conceptualization and measurements of coping resources and processes.
i. Psychoanalytic theory & ego psychology.

ii. Life cycle.

iii. Evolutionary and behavior modification.

iv. Cultural & social ecological.

i) Psychoanalytic theory and ego psychology.

The process of defense and coping are emphasized in ego psychology. Freud believed that ego processes contribute by resolving conflicts between an individual's impulses and the super ego. Tension reduction is brought about by enabling the individual to express the sexual and aggressive impulses indirectly without the true intent recognized. In the psychoanalytic ego psychology model coping is defined as use of defences such as denial, suppression, intellectualization, which would have behavioural expressions and whose way of functioning is defensive i.e. distort reality, emotion-focused or oriented towards tension reduction. However the ego psychologists have emphasized the reality oriented processes of the conflict i.e. free ego sphere such as attention, perception and memory.

Nenninger (1969), Haan (1969) and Valliant (1977) (Cited in Lazarus, 1993) proposed a hierarchical approach to coping derived from the psychoanalytic formulation. They pointed out that some defences were said to be healthier or less regressed than others. Haan proposed a tripartite model of ego functioning and suggested that coping is the healthiest and most developed, mentally advanced process of adaptation, defense – is a neurotic process and that ego – failure as the most regressed and perhaps psychotic adaptive process.

ii) Life cycle perspective

Erikson (1963) described the eight life stages, each representing a crisis and a challenge that must be successfully resolved in order for the individual to cope adequately with the next stage. Personal coping
resources (such as development of trust/autonomy) which are the product of interaction with significant others in the environment are integrated into the self concept and influence the powers of coping in adulthood and old age. Successful encounters with the environmental stressors build a sense of efficacy and ego integrity (Cited in Moos & Billinge, 1982).

These formulations lead to form the various procedures to measure such general coping resources such as self esteem, ego identity, competency, motivation, novelty needs & stimulation seeking behaviour (Moos, 1974) (Cited in Moos & Billings, 1982).

These resources affect the appraisal of the potentially stressful situation as also the selection of the coping resources to handle such situations. A sense of competence, e.g. would lead a person to perceive a potential stressor as less threatening and to choose a reality oriented coping response that brings about successful outcomes.

iii) Evolutionary Theory and behaviours modification
Darwin's evolutionary perspective was concerned with emphasis on behaviour, problem solving activities that contribute to the individuals and species survival.

Coping behaviour is concerned with both problem solving skills and with the individuals' cognitive appraisal of the meaning of the event. Bandura (1977) proposed that individuals must believe that they can successfully accomplish a task in order for them to engage in active efforts to master that task. Successful coping increases further expectation of self-efficacy which in turn leads to persistent and active efforts to master the threatening tasks and situations (Cited in Moos & Billings, 1982).
iv) Cultural & Social Ecological Perspective.

Besides laying emphasis on the adaptive qualities of behaviour oriented problem solving, the evolutionary approach focuses also on the relationship between organisms and their environment. Adaptation to the conditions of the physical & cultural environment is facilitated by the co-operative efforts of human community, which are essential in coping with the environment.

Several other theories of coping have been put forth by various theorists.

Klinger (1975) (Cited in Carver et al., 1989) proposed an Incentive disengagement theory. The theory was concerned about how people become committed to and disengaged from various goals and incentives, commitment to goals, influences a person’s pattern of attention, information processing and thought content when an aversive life event removes or blocks a particular goal, individuals go through a process of disengagement in which their cognition, feelings and behaviour unfold in a predictable sequence.

According to the theory a person initially responds to a threatened loss of a goal with increased vigor. Efforts to obtain the goal become more rapid and intense. If these efforts are unsuccessful the individual’s behaviour becomes more stereotyped, primitive and aggressive. The phase may be characterized by disbelief or angry protest. If efforts continue to be unsuccessful the individual begins to abandon his/her pursuit. This phase is called as the depression phase’ and is characterized by pessimism and apathy.

Wortman and Brehm’s integrative model (Silver & Wortman, 1980). Was interested in finding out how people respond to situations, when their freedom and control is taken a way.
Brehm's (1966) (Cited in Silver and Wortman, 1980) theory of psychological reactance had suggested that when free behaviour is restricted the individual responds with feelings of hostility, anger and increased motivation to obtain the outcome in question.

The integrity model predicts that among individuals who expect to be able to influence an important outcome; exposure to loss of wanted increases motivation to obtain the outcome and results in aggressive behaviour. But as the attempts to change the situation fail, expectations of control diminish. The individual stops trying to alter the outcome and instead succumbs to depression and passivity.

The learned helplessness approach had its origin in Seligman's work on pavlovian fear conditioning with human species, where exposure to uncontrollable shocks resulted in subsequent passivity & deficit in performance (Seligman & Maier, 1967) (Cited in Silver & Wortman, 1980). Findings were inconsistent when the model was tested on human subjects. Exposure to insoluble problems or uncontrollable noise bursts or shocks did not always result in passivity (Miller & Norman, 1979) (Cited in Silver & Wortman, 1980).

A reformulated model was proposed by Abramson Graber, Edwards & Seligman in (1978) (Cited in Silver & Wortman, 1980).

The nature of helplessness effects, according to this model, depends on the attribution of causality that a person makes when confronted with an uncontrollable outcome. The attributions can be categorized according to three dimensions.

(i) Internality
(ii) Stability
(iii) Globality
The model predicts that attributions to internal factors are characterized by loss of self-esteem, while attributions to external factors are not. Attributions to stable factors produce greater performance deficit than to unstable factors. Attributions to global factors or those factors that may occur across many situations should lead to deficits.

The theory of reaction to crisis by Shontz (1975) (Cited in Silver and Wortman, 1980) stated that individuals go through a series of stages as they attempt to cope with an aversive outcome. Individuals respond to interpreted information prior to the onset of crisis. Unusual symptoms may be interpreted as benign threat.

Once the inevitability of the crisis becomes clear the person's first reaction is shock, especially if the crisis occurs without warning. This stage is characterized by a feeling of detachment and by surprising efficiency of thought & action. Initial shock is followed by a phase in which the individual experiences profound helplessness, disorganization and panic. The individual may show an inability to plan, reason and engage in problem solving.

Reality seems overwhelming and the individual may either deny the existence of the crisis or its implications. Reality once again imposes itself as time lapses and individual breaks down in gradual attempt to deal with reality.


According to this view stress occurs in the face of demands that tax or exceed the resources of the system.
The model also focuses on changing cognitive and behavioural efforts required to manage specific demands appraised as taxing or exceeding the person's resources.

Perlin and Schooler (1978) defined coping as any response to external life strains that serves to prevent, avoid or control emotional distress. The author made a distinction between coping resources i.e. social psychological characteristics and coping response as behavior cognition and perception in which people engage when actually confronting with their life problems.

To conclude coping has been understood as use of the defense mechanisms for tension reduction according to the psychoanalytic theory. The life cycle perspective has addressed the development of the resources needed for coping such as self esteem, ego identity, competency etc. Coping has been understood as the ability for problem solving and the belief of the individual about ones ability to accomplish tasks. It is also believed to be influence by the culture to which the individual belongs to.

**Measures of coping**

In recent years researchers have predominantly used two measures of coping. The Ways Of Coping measure (WOC) (Folkman and Lazarus, 1980) and the COPE (Carver, Scheier, & Weintraub, 1989).

The WOC was developed by Folkman Lazarus and their associates (Folkman, Lazarus Dunkel – Schetter, Delongis, & Gruen, 1986). It is an empirically derived inventory of specific ways in which people might cope with a stressful event. Individuals are asked to designate or respond to specific stressor (e.g. Crime in neighborhood) and indicate the degree to which they have utilized each particular coping method to deal with it. Responses to the statements are then factor analyzed to identify more general patterns of coping. The general
coping strategies measured with the scale are – confrontative coping, seeking social support, painful problem solving, self control, distancing, positive appraisal, accepting responsibility, and escape/avoidance.

By contrast, the development of the coping inventory COPE was theoretically guided, and items were created to tap a predetermined set of coping strategies. The COPE inventory has a constant set of scales and items and for this reason; it currently is widely used by coping researchers.

The “trait” form of the COPE inventory asks respondents to designate how they typically react to stressful events. The “state” measure of the COPE is completed by respondents with respect to a specific stressor, designated either by the respondent or by the researcher. Another advantage of the COPE inventory is the fact that a reliable and validated brief form exists (Carver, 1997).

The full COPE is a 60 item measure that yields 15 factors that reflect active v/s avoidant coping strategies. The measure has good psychometric properties with alphas ranging from 0.45 – 0.92 test retest reliabilities ranging from 0.46 – 0.86 and strong evidence of discriminant and convergent validity, with constructs such as hardiness, optimism, control, and self-esteem. The Brief COPE i.e. the shorter version of original COPE was created due to the length and redundancy of the full instrument and because of the overall time burden of the assessment protocol. Due to these dual advantages of the brief cope, the author chose to use this test for the present study

**POSITIVE NEGATIVE AFFECTIVITY**

The emotion research in the 20th century has been concerned about the negative affect / emotions such as anxiety / fear or sadness /
depression and anger / hostility. The positive affectivity has enjoyed attention of the researchers only from the 1980's.

Different researches focused on negative affectivity, Cannon (1929) and Selye (1936) (Cited in Watson, 2002) established that prolonged fear and anger lead to adverse health consequences. Freud (1936) (Cited in Watson, 2002), focused on anxiety through his psychoanalytic thought.

This focus on negative affect can be attributed to its survival value (Nesse, 1991) (Cited in Watson, 2002) i.e. it motivates an organism to escape from situations which are potentially dangerous or threatening, whereas disgust keeps one away from noxious and toxic substances.

The evolutionary function of positive emotions is less obvious. However the interest in positive emotionality emerged during the latter half of the century. The first landmark research in positive affect was that of Paul Meehl (1975) (Cited in Watson, 2002) on "Hedonic capacity". He argued that "clinicians and theoreticians ought to consider seriously the possibilities that not only are some persons born with more cerebral ‘joy-juice’ than others but also that this variable is fraught with clinical consequences".

He suggested that individual differences in the hedonic capacity were present at birth and were partly heritable. He further also suggested that these biological tendencies express themselves as extraversion in people. And also the idea that the two dimensions, positive affect and negative affect are independent.

The negative affect dimension represents the extent to which an individual experiences negative mood states such as fear, anger, sadness, guilt, contempt, and disgust, where as positive affect is the
extent to which one experiences positive states such as joy, interest confidence, and alertness. These dimensions can be assessed in short term as well as long term. (termed as positive affectivity and negative affectivity).

Both these affects are responsible for many evolutionary tasks (Tomarken & Keener, 1998, Watson, Wiese, Vaidya & Telegen, 1999) (Cited in Watson, 2002). The negative affect being a component of the withdrawal behaviour, keeps the individual out of trouble by inhibiting the behaviour that may lead to pain, punishment or some undesirable consequence. The positive affect is a component of approach - oriented behavioural facilitation, which directs the organism towards situations and experiences that may lead to pleasure and reward. This adaptive system ensures the procuring of resources (e.g. food, water, warmth, co-operation of others etc.) which is also essential to the survival of the individual.

The positive affect in the individual has been identified as a less important function by the evolutionary perspective. However research studies have also identified the utility of positive affect for an approach oriented adaptive behaviour, which is required in order for the individual to engage in productive, adaptive behaviour.

**Measures of Positive affectivity**

It is difficult to summarize the literature in the area of assessment of positive affectivity as no thorough reviews are available.

But the measures can be broadly classified into two basic types.

Widely used affect inventories which have a ‘general’ form (in which respondents rate their typical, average, feelings) that can be used to measure this trait.
For e.g. The differential emotions scale (DES), the multiple affect adjective checklist - revised (MAACL - R) and the positive affect and negative affect scale - expanded (PANAS – X) all have trait versions that allow one to assess various aspects of the dimension. However researchers have not examined the convergence among these different trait instruments.

Many multi trait personality inventories contain scales measuring the same construct. (e.g. the activity and positive emotions facet scales of the revised NEO personality inventory (NEO – PI-R, Costa and McCrae, 1992a) (Cited in Watson, 2002).

The well-being scale of the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (MPQ) Tellegen (in Press) (Cited in Watson, 2002).


For the present study the author used the PANAS-X (Watson and Clark, 1994), as it measures positive affectivity like a trait.

THEORIES OF JOB SATISFACTION

Some theories of motivation refer to work-related satisfaction. The need theories include satisfaction concepts in that motivation is defined in terms of our attempts to satisfy basic needs. The need fulfilment proposition has strongly influenced the development of job satisfaction theories. Cognitive theories of motivation also include satisfaction as a part of the motivational process, e.g. the equity theory (Adams, 1965) & VIE theory (Vroom, 1964) (Cited in Landy & Conte, 2005).
Other theories directly address job satisfaction. Several of these theories contain a *discrepancy hypothesis*. This hypothesis was developed out of research demonstrating that people use cognitive constructs to evaluate what they get from the job. i.e. the level of satisfaction will be determined by the difference between what is expected and what is experienced (Michalos, 1986) (Cited in Berry, 1998).

A. **Locke's value Discrepancy Theory**

Locke (1969, 1976) used the discrepancy hypothesis in his value discrepancy theory. He suggested that, what a person considers important or valuable has a stronger effect on his or her satisfaction. Values can be described in terms of both their content and their intensity or strength, content refers to what is wanted and intensity refers to how much is wanted. Satisfaction with some factor or aspect of job is a result of a dual judgment.

First, a person judges the job factor in terms of its importance. This judgment reflects the intensity of value relating to the job factor. Second, the person estimates the discrepancy or difference between how much of the factor is desired and how much is received. Thus the satisfaction with a job factor will depend on the importance of the factor and on the difference between what is desired of it and what is received. Evidence for the same was found by McFarlin & Rice (1992) (Cited in Berry, 1998).

B. **Lawler’s Facet theory (1973)**

Lawler used the expectancy theory to explain that motivation results from (i) the perceived instrumentality of an action in producing an outcome, and (ii) the value of the outcome or reward. Satisfaction was proposed to result jointly from the rewards and from perceiving their
rewards as equitable and fair. It meant that performance is seen as an indirect source of satisfaction as it yields rewards.

Lawler proposed that the size of this discrepancy will determine the amount of dissatisfaction. Dissatisfaction with a job facet is more likely when an individual perceives his or her inputs to be high, the job to be demanding, the outcome level to be low, co-workers to have a better input-outcome balance, and co-worker to have greater actual outcomes particularly if they have similar or less demanding jobs.

Several need theories focus on the employee's needs and values.

(i) Maslow's Needs hierarchy
(ii) Herzberg's - Two factor theory,
(iii) McClelland's needs theory,
(iv) Alderfer's - ERG theory

C. Maslow's Need's hierarchy

Abraham Maslow (1954) developed the most famous theory of satisfaction and motivation. He believed that there are five major types of needs and that these needs are hierarchical i.e., lower level needs must be satisfied before an employee will be concerned with the next level of needs.

The five major needs are as follows:

Basic Biological Needs, Safety needs, Social needs, Ego Needs, Self-actualization needs
Evaluation of Maslow’s theory

Although the general components have withstood the test of time, research has generally not supported its more technical aspects (Soper, Milford & Rosenthal, 1995; Wahba & Bridwell, 1976) (Cited in Aamodt, 1999).

D. Two – Factor Theory

Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959) and Herzberg (1966) (Cited in Aamodt, 1999) reduced the number of need levels to two as compared to the five proposed by Maslow. He proposed that job related factors can be divided into two categories i.e. motivators and hygiene factors, therefore the name two factor theory.

Hygiene factors are those job-related elements that result from but do not involve the job itself. For e.g. – pay and benefits are consequences of work but do not involve the work itself.

Motivators are job elements that do concern actual tasks and duties, e.g. level of responsibility, the amount of job control, and the interest that the work holds for the employee.

Herzberg believed that hygiene factors are necessary but not sufficient for job satisfaction and motivation i.e. if a hygiene factor is not present at an adequate level (e.g. the pay is too low), the employee will be dissatisfied. But if all the hygiene factors are represented adequately, the employee’s level of satisfaction will only be natural. Only the presence of both the hygiene and motivators factors can bring job satisfaction and motivation.
Herzberg's theory makes sense but has not received strong research support. In general, researchers have criticized the theory because of the methods used to develop the two factors as well as the factor that for research studies have replicated the findings obtained by Herzberg and his colleagues. (Hinrichs & Mischkind, 1967; N King, 1970) (Cited in Aamodt, 1999).

E. McClelland's Needs Theory.

McClelland (1961) believed that employees differ in their needs for achievement, affiliation and power.

Employees who have a strong need for achievement desire jobs that are challenging and over which they have some control, whereas employees who have minimal achievement needs are more satisfied when jobs involve little challenge and have a high probability of success.

In contrast employees who have a strong need for affiliation prefer working with and helping other people. These types of employees are found more often in people oriented service jobs than in management or administration, (Smither & Lindgren, 1978) (Cited in Aamodt, 1999).

Finally, employees who have a strong need for power have a desire to influence others rather than simply be successful.

Research has found evidence that employees who have a strong need for power and achievement often make the best managers (McClelland & Burnham, 1976; Stahl, 1983) (Cited in Aamodt, 1999).
F. **ERG theory**

Alderfer (1972) developed a need theory that has only 3 levels viz Existence, Relatedness, and growth. Research by Wanous and Zwany (1977) has supported Alderfer's proposed number of levels.

Unlike Maslow, Alderfer not only had fewer need levels, but also suggested that the person can skip levels, this took care of the biggest problem in Maslow's theory.

He further also explained why a higher level sometimes does not become more important once a lower level need has been satisfied. He believed that for jobs in many organizations, advancement to the next level is not possible because of factors like the company policy or the nature of job. Thus the path to the next level is blocked, and the employee becomes frustrated and places more importance on the previous level. Perhaps that is why some unions demand more money and benefits for their members rather than job enrichment, as they realize that the jobs will always be tedious and that little can be done to improve them. Some empirical support for the same has been found. (D.T. Hall & Nougerim, 1968; Salemik & Pfeffer, 1977). (Cited in Aamodt, 1999)

G. **VIE Theory**

Victor Vroom (1964) proposed the VIE theory (Valence, Instrumentally and Expectancy). He proposed that psychological objects in an environment also have attracting and repelling forces: Valence is the strength of a person's preference for a particular outcome. Most people would find that money is attracting while uninteresting work is repelling.
The second element instrumentality deals with the relationship between performance and the attainment of a certain outcome i.e. the persons answer to the question “If I am able to perform as expected, will I receive what has been promised?” For e.g. a promotion usually means a higher salary as well as increased prestige. But it may also include increased responsibility, longer hours and even lower total annual compensation. Therefore there are many instrumentalities in a given situation, each one related to the valued or non-valued circumstances of a particular outcome, such as the promotion.

Vroom proposed that once an individual became aware of these various instrumentalities, he could combine that information to decide whether the outcome would be positive or negative. This leads to a choice of an action.

The third element of the theory, expectancy is the individual’s belief that a particular behaviour (e.g. hard work) will lead to a particular outcome (e.g. promotion)

These three put together determine the individual’s level of motivation and job satisfaction.

However the theory was criticized for ignoring many non cognitive elements in choice such as personality and emotion (cited in Landy & Conte, 2005).

H. Equity theory

J. S. Adams (1965) developed the equity theory based on the premise that our levels of job satisfaction and motivation are related to how fairly we believe we are treated in comparison with others.
The components involved in this are, (i) Inputs which are those personal elements that we put into our jobs i.e. time effort, education and experience, (ii) outputs which are those elements that we receive from our jobs. i.e. pay benefits, challenge, and responsibility.

In general, research has supported the idea that our job satisfaction decreases when our input/ output ratios are lower than others (Lord and Hohenfeld, 1979; Hauenstein and Lord, 1989) (Cited in Aamodt, 1999).

I. Social Influence hypothesis

Social psychologists have shown that attitudes develop in a social context and are moulded by reference groups in many cases (Triandis, 1971) (Cited in Berry, 1998). Salancik and Pfeffer (1977) have proposed that social influence is an important determinant of job satisfaction. They argue that people do not make the many comparisons for all the different aspects of a job, as discrepancy theorists have suggested. Instead, we take a cognitive shortcut. We simply look to see how others in similar jobs appear to feel, our perception of their job attitudes influences our own attitudes i.e., when others appear to like a job, then we like it, too. Research has supported the social influence hypothesis. For e.g. Subjects who heard others evaluate a task positively were themselves more likely to do when they performed it later (Weiss & Shaw, 1979). Also, satisfaction with various aspects of work is affected by the individual’s attachment to a highly cohesive work group (Manning & Fullerton, 1988; O’ Reilly & Caldwell, 1985), and cohesive groups provide ample opportunity for social influence. (Cited in Berry, 1998).
J. Opponent Process theory

Landy's (1978) opponent process theory of job satisfaction is based largely on theories of emotion rather than cognition. Landy proposed that satisfaction with a job can change over time even though the job itself has not changed. He viewed job satisfaction as an emotional state that is subject to physiological influences. Emotional balance is a neutral state maintained through opponent processes that counteract the emotional response to a job. Several other theories have attempted to explain job satisfaction (Cited in Landy & Contes, 2005).

K. Job Characteristics theory

J. R. Hackman and Oldham (1975, 1976) theorized that enriched jobs will be the most satisfying. Enriched jobs allow a variety of skills to be used, allow an employee to complete an entire task (e.g. process a loan application from start to finish) rather than parts of a task, involve tasks that have meaning or importance, allow employees to make decisions, and provide feedback about performance. Hackman and Oldham developed the Job Diagnostic survey to measure the extent to which these characteristics are present in a given job.

Research also has clearly stated that employees who find their work interesting are more satisfied and motivated than are employees who do not enjoy their jobs (Gately, 1997) (Cited in Berry, 1998).

Research indicates that people who enjoy working with their supervisors and co-workers will be more satisfied with their jobs (Newsome & Pillari, 1992; Repetti & Cosmas, 1991) (Cited in Berry, 1998). Bishop and Scott (1997) found that satisfaction with supervisors and co-workers was related to organizational and team commitment, which in turn resulted in higher productivity, lower intent to leave the organization, and a greater willingness to help.
The overview of the different theories suggests that Job satisfaction may be a result of comparisons individuals make between what they expect out of their jobs and what they get. The comparisons are also made between what others get as compared to self. Job satisfaction has been understood to be the result of satisfaction of the various needs in the individual ranging from basic need for food, clothing, shelter to more higher order needs like the need for security, self esteem, satisfaction of the need for achievement power and affiliation and finally also for self actualization and getting a meaning of ones life. The needs satisfied by the job have to be important to the individual and be what the individual was seeking to finally experience, also to some extent the job can be satisfying if is interesting. To conclude the job satisfaction of the individual is proposed to be influenced by various factors within the individual as well as related to the job.

**Measurement of Job satisfaction**

There are several types of measures available like rating scales, Critical incidences, interviews, and other. For the present study the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire was used, as it is a questionnaire developed specially to measure job satisfaction of college teachers.

To conclude the chapter has provided an brief overview of the development of each of the concepts involved in the present study, the different theories and the various measures of the concepts also justifying the use of specific scales for the present study