CHAPTER IV

EXPLANATIONS OF VARIABLES
Explanations of Variables

In the present chapter we have tried to present in brief the variables used in this investigation.

In conformity with the hypotheses stated the following variables are included in the investigation for studying their association with or effect on teaching profession.

1. Age
2. Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Role Stress</td>
<td>1. Need-Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Locus of Control</td>
<td>2. Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Participation</td>
<td>3. Job Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Academic Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Role Stress

The enormous number of publications related to the concept of stress have made it difficult to pin down the concept in any precise manner. Nans Selye's Institute of stress claims to have more than 20,000 entries in their library on stress. Lazarnus (1971) has noted that defining stress and related concepts makes dull reading.
Kasl (1978) has identified several types of efforts concerned with defining for the concept,

(1) enumeration of environmental conditions which are to be considered stressful, using either concrete evidence or more general concepts:

(2) relating the concept by some other word, generally also from vernacular, which is no more precise but perhaps less general.
   a) Stress as strenuous effect to maintain essential functions at a required level (Ruff and Korchin, 1967).
   b) Stress as 'information' interpreted as a threat or injury (Lipowski, 1975).
   c) Stress as frustration or threat which cannot be reduced (Bonner, 1967), or
   d) Stress as unpredictability of the future (Green and Bastiaans, 1975).

(3) defining it in terms of some essential characteristics, such as: (a) unavailability of adequate responses, which has important consequences (Sells, 1970), (b) situations which are new, rapidly changing, and unexpected (Appley and Trumbull, 1967), or (c) in terms of motives involved in specific situations such as achievement. (Pepitone, 1967); and
(4) attempting greater conceptual precision in order to enhance the usefulness of the term in future efforts of hypothesis testing and theory building.

There are many persons who feel that the term is useful for no more than designating a broad area of study, a rubric for related problems (McLean, 1974). Scott and Howard (1970) contend that each of these formulations in some sense tied to a certain field of study and cannot be easily extended to all levels of human study.

As a matter of fact, the term 'stress' is derived from Latin language where it denotes 'hardship', straits, adversely or affiliation. The first systematic treatment to the term was given by Selye (1956/1976). His General Adaptation Syndrome or GAS model is based upon the idea that the body can cope with stress but that this coping has costs for subsequent coping and that long exposure to a stressor can deplete the body resources and can cause physical dysfunctions. Selye's GAS model is a three stage model. When first exposed to a stressor, body responds by mobilizing its coping abilities: an alarm reaction stage representing preparation for resistance. In the second stage, a stage of resistance, various coping mechanisms are used to achieve suitable adaptation. However, when these reactions are repeated often, or when coping the stage of exhaustion where
resistance declines, physiological breakdown occurs, and the body become highly susceptible to disease.

Most of the past definitions including that of Selye's of stress have often viewed stress as an external agent capable of inducing in the human organism a response commensurate with the amount of exogenous stress. However, the stress is now widely recognized not merely as exogeneous, but also as the product of a dynamic mismatch between the individual and his/her physical, social and psychological environment. This interactive view of stress holds that the situations are not stressful in themselves: rather, it is the combination of the particular situation and the individual, with his specific personality characteristics, behavioural patterns, and life situations that results in a stress producing imbalance (McMichael, 1978). Since stress is a dynamic state within an organism in response to a demand for adaptation, and since life itself entails constant adaptation, living creates are always in a state of more or less stress (Walff and Goodell, 1968). The linkages as psycho-social variables evoke stress responses that may ultimately be more damaging to the organism than the aversive event itself. Psychological stressors may precede the physical event, last longer, and continue to evoke stress after physical event is past (Baum, Singer, and Baum, 1961).
Pareek\textsuperscript{17}, (1976) classified role stress under two main categories only-role space stress conflicts and role set conflicts. In the category of role space stress he has included such stresses as self-role distance, intra-role distance, role stagnation, inter-role distance, and role boundness. In the second set of stressors, namely, role set conflicts, he includes such stressors as role ambiguity, role overlead, role isolation, role erosion, and role inadequacy. Role ambiguity, according to Pareek\textsuperscript{18} (1981), occurs when the individual is not clear about the various expectations people have from his role. It may be lack of information available to the role occupant, or due to lack of understanding of the cases available to him.

Kahn and Quinn\textsuperscript{19} (1970) have suggested that role ambiguity may be in relation to the activities, responsibility, personal styles and norms. According to Marshall and Cooper\textsuperscript{20} (1979) role ambiguity exists when an individual has inadequate information about his work role, that is where there is lack of clarity about the work objectives associated with the role, about the work colleague's expectations of the work role and about the responsibilities of the job. In a number of investigations it has been established that role ambiguity is detrimental to one's physical and mental well-being.
4. Locus of Control

People who are external believe that the rewards in life come from forces outside themselves—luck, fate, or powerful others to whom they relate in some way. At the other end of the spectrum are people known as internal who believe they can influence events to their own good or detriment. They seek independence and autonomy and they rely on their own resources to achieve these ends. Most fit somewhere between these extremes.

The human individual has a tendency to look for predictability and control over his environment. Surrounding uncertainties and variations in personal experience can produce deviations. However, these may also contribute to ingenuity and creativity. Unique and innovative minds grow among those who can come to perceive differences between others and themselves, and who continue to hold the assumption that they are free agents, the makers of their own destinies. Whether people, or other species for that matter, believe that they are actors and can determine their own fates within limits is of critical importance to the way in which they cope with the exigencies of life and engage in challenges. Based on empirical researches it has been found that there are people who develop unshakeable belief that valued reinforcements occur only by chance, and that man is not the master of his fate.
contrast, some others, believe that humans get their due desserts and that man is responsible for his fate. These two concepts put together constitute a major construct in psychological enquiry known as Locus of Control. As suggested by Lefesurt (1976) persons with such contrasting perspectives differ considerably in the degree to which they are able to assimilate and learn from their experiences: the fatalists perceive no contingency between action and outcome, while those espousing internal control beliefs readily perceive such contingencies. Weiner (1974) has added a new dimension to locus of control construct through his conceptualization of causal attribution. Causal attribution is concerned with the perception of causal attribution, whether a person attributes the outcomes to external or internal 'Causes'. He has further classified internality - externality on stability - variability dimension providing a total of four categories of factors to which outcomes can be attributed.

These are:

1) internal - stable which do not easily change, for example, ability;

2) internal - variable that can vary or change, for example, effort;

3) external - stable, for example difficulty or a task; and

4) external - variable, for example luck or chance
The interaction of Locus of Control and stability has a different significance for attribution of positive outcomes (success) and negative outcomes (failure). It is proposed that persistence in achievement activity will result, if:

1) Success is attributed to an internal variable factor (effort). If a person perceives that his effort has resulted in the desired outcome, he may like to remain engaged further in that activity.

2) Failure is attributed to variable factors (internal and external both). If a person perceives that his failure is due to factors which can vary (e.g., effort), he still, will have some hope for improvement through increased striving. If he attributes his failure to stable factors such as ability or task difficulty, he is likely to give up his efforts because, on the one hand, his ability level cannot change so easily and, at the same time, the level of task difficulty remains a hindrance. Thus, he feels that no good is likely to come out of persisting in the activity.

The largest body of empirical data about perceived
control derives from Rotter's social learning theory. In Rotter's theory perceived control occupies a central place within a systematic formulation (Rotter, 1954, 1955, 1960, 1971; Rotter, Chance, and Pharss, 1972) where perceived control is referred to as a generalized expectancy of internal control refers here to the perception of events, whether positive or negative, as being consequence of one's own actions and thereby potentiality under personal control. The generalized expectancy of external control, on the other hand, refers to the perception of positive or negative events as being unrelated to one's own behaviour and thereby beyond personal control (Leafcourt, 1976, p. 29).

Participation

'Participation', as suggested by Mulder (1971), "is the most vital organizational problem of our times .... For individual members, feelings of well-being and their sense of self-realization are related to participation and its consequences". According to Argris (1957), the worker's participation in management is a means to give him more control over his environment and an attempt to make him capable of behaving in a more mature fashion.

By maturity he meant (1) Job maturity or to develop the ability and technical knowledge to do the task, and (ii) Psychological maturity which relates to acquisition of
self-confidence and self-respect about oneself as an individual.

As suggested by Vroom\(^28\) (1960) in term participation is frequently used to refer to the degree to which a person takes part in a discussion or activity. An individual who takes an active part in interacting with others with respect to a given task is said to participate to a great deal, while one who plays a more passive role does not participate to the same degree.

Saxena\(^29\) (1979) suggests that participation, in its broadest sense should be a matter of belief and attitudes shared on the concept of mutually accepted values; it should lead to efficiency; quality of innovation and expansion. Vroom\(^30\) (1960) has distinguished between psychological participation and objective participation. Psychological participation, according to him, refers to the amount of influence an individual perceives he has on decision-making while objective participation refers to the amount of influence or individual actually does have on decision-making.

In the opinion of Lischeron and Wall\(^31\) (1975a), one of the main purposes for conducting research into participation is to provide a factual basis upon which participative practices may be founded. However, most of the
researches on participation and related concepts have focused on a demonstration of their basic effects. Participation is found to be related to such dependent variables as job satisfaction, productivity, turnover and so on. The relationship between job satisfaction and alienation to participation is found to be causal.

Investigations carried out by White and Ruh (1973) focused on inter-relationship among job involvement, values, personal background, participation, decision-making and job attitudes for a sample of 1955 employees of six manufacturing organizations. They also attempted to find out the moderating effect of job involvement on participation in decision-making and job attitudes.

**Academic Climate-organization**

Each educational institution differs from the other not only in structure but also in the attitudes and behaviour they elicit in people, and these differences are related to psychological structures. As a matter of fact, individual personalities and their job requirement interact to produce a climate that can be significant to both the individual and the institution. By climate we mean those characteristics which distinguish one institution from the other and which influence the behaviour of people.
In the institutions. It is in effect what we react to the whole context of stimulation and confusion where we work. Thus the climate affects not only the behaviour of individuals but also how institutions themselves interact (Gilmer, 1956).

Different approaches prevalent in climate research literature have been classified and grouped by James and Jones (1974) as (i) multiple-measurement organizational attribute approach, (ii) perceptual-measurement-organizational attribute approach, and (iii) perceptual measurement-individual attribute approach.

(These points will be discussed in the thesis)

In short, according to James and Jones, perceptual-measurement-organizational attribute approach has raised a number of conceptual as well as empirical problems which require attention.

In their review of 1970, Campbell and others have identified the following four dimensions/factors or organizational climate:

1) **Individual autonomy** - based on the factors of individual, responsibility, agent independence, opportunities for existing individual initiative.
ii) The degree of Structure imposed upon the position - based on the factors of structure, the closeness of supervision.

iii) Reward Orientation - based on the factors of reward, general satisfaction, promotion achievement.

iv) Consideration, Warmth and Support - based on the factors of support, nurturance of subordinates and warmth and support.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


34. James, L.R., and Jones, A.V., Organizational structure: A review of structural dimensions and their conceptual relationship with individual attitudes and behaviour. Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance, 1976, 16.