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OCCUPATIONAL STRESS

Robert Karasek (University of Massachusetts, Lowell, MA, USA) said, “How much control a person has over his work is important because it affects how well he copes with the demands of his job”. Numerous studies found that occupational stress influences the employees’ overall performance in their work. Because most of the organizations now are more demanding with the lookout on productivity and performance adding to stress on people engaged in organization. Therefore modern times have rightly been called as the “age of anxiety and stress” (Coleman, 1976). The stress itself is affected by number of stressors. Nevertheless, Beehr and Newman (1978) had defined stress as a situation which will force a person to deviate from normal functioning due to the change (i.e. disrupt or enhance) in his/her psychological and/or physiological condition, such that the person is forced to deviate from normal functioning. Role stress means anything about an organizational role that produces adverse consequences for the individual. From the definition researchers have identified that it is truly important for an individual to recognize the stresses that are faced by them in their career. Michael Marmot (University of London, UK) found in his study that individual perception plays an important role in occupational stress that different employees perceive and react differently in given situation of work environment, some with high stress levels and some with low or even do not.

Kahn and Quinn, (1970) found that workers in an organization can face occupational stress through the role stress that the management gave. Cooper and Marshal (1976) stated that occupational stress includes the environmental factors or stressors such as work overload, role ambiguity, role conflict and poor working conditions associated with
a particular job. The presence of supportive peer groups and supportive relationships with supervisors are negatively correlated with role conflict (Caplan et al., 1964). Greene (1972), Brief and Aldag (1976) found that role incumbents with high levels of role ambiguity also respond to their situation with anxiety, depression, physical symptoms, a sense of futility or lower self esteem, lower levels of job involvement and organizational commitment, and perceptions of lower performance on the part of the organization, of supervisors, and of themselves. French, 1976; Beehr and Newnman found that decision making area of participation does not have moderating effect on the job satisfaction and occupational stress relationship.

Miles and Perreault (1976) identified four different types of role conflict: 1. Intra-sender role conflict 2. Inter sender role conflict. 3. Person- role conflict; 4. Role over load. The use of role concepts suggests that job related stress is associated with individual, interpersonal, and structural variables (Katz and Kahn, 1978; Whetten, 1978). A job stressed individual is likely to have greater job dissatisfaction, increased absenteeism, increased frequency of drinking and smoking, increase in negative psychological symptoms and reduced aspirations and self esteem (Jick and Payne, 1980). Surti (1982) studied the psychological correlates of role stress in working women in different professions and revealed that no significant differences existed between type of role stress and length of service. This study indicates that length of service has no effect on stress experience.

Srivastava, P.K. and Sinha, M.M. (1983) investigated the effect of employees’ ego strength and job involvement on their experience of role stress arising from overload, role ambiguity and role conflict among 30 managers, 30 engineers, 30 superintendents and 60 section in-charges. The analysis of the data established that the perceived role stress of the managerial personnel may be viewed as a function of their ego strength and job
involvement. Employees with high ego strength were reported to experience mild stress pertaining to role ambiguity as compared to the other two groups.

**Ramamurthi et. al. (1984)** conducted a similar study on a sample comprising 30 executives and 30 non-executives (clerks). To measure four factors of coronary or stress-prone behavior, namely, Type-A behavior, speed and impatience, job involvement, hard driving and competence. The analysis revealed that the executives scored significantly higher on all the four factors as compared to non-executives. **Srivastava and Sehgal (1984)** examined the effect of employee’s’ n-achievement on their perception of occupational stress using a sample of 200 white-collar employees of a large industrial organization. The result revealed that employees who maintained high work motivation experienced significantly lower occupational stress, such as role overload, role ambiguity, role conflict, unreasonable group and political pressure, responsibility for persons, poor peer relations, strenuous working conditions and unprofitability as compared to the low n-achievement group. Further, employees with high need for production, goal achievement and competition also experienced lower occupational stress. It was inferred from these findings that high need for achievement acts as a resource in influencing the cognitive appraisal of stress-including characteristics of job components and situations in such a way as to moderate their effectiveness.

**Rao (1986)** found that the number of dependents upon the employees increased, the level of occupational stress also increased. Such situation first makes the employees tensed at work place creating a sense of personal inadequacy in them. **Bhaskar (1986)** studied the relationship between job stress and personality variables among police officers and constables. She noted that a majority of policeman are hard working and conscientious. While reviewing the literature on the subjects, she observed that studies in India have focused either on police administration or on secondary aspects of the police system and
in the process; issues pertaining to job stress among police personnel have been largely neglected.

**Palnitkar (1987)** attempted to explain occupational stresses in the light of locus of control, job level and length of service. Results revealed that Class-1 Officers with internal locus of control and shorter length of service showed significantly higher occupational stress than Class-2 Officers with external locus of control and longer length of service. **Helode and Palnitkar (1987)** investigated the ‘variance’ of occupational stress in the light of field dependence-field independence (FD-FI), and job level in the case of bank employees, 100 officers and 100 clerks. The analysis revealed that (a) FI-FD and occupational stress were normally disturbed among middle and lower level managers; (b) FI-FD had a positive and significant association with occupational stress; (c) occupational stress was significantly higher among officers than among clerks; and (d) field independent officers were found to experience more occupational stress than field dependent clerks, whereas field independent clerks experienced more occupational stress as compared to field dependent officers.

**Srilata (1988)** attempted to study different dimensions affecting the stress and revealed that managers with job tenure between 18 – 25 years experienced greater degree of role stress than those job tenure was either below or above this range. **Orpen (1991)** observed that major source of stress is derived from the occupational environment; proponents of this view tend to argue that role holders in certain occupation, irrespective of individual differences, are much more likely to experience stress. Here, the emphasis is on the individual demands of various jobs that have the capacity over a period of time to exhaust the physical and psychological resource of employees in the organization.
A survey by **UK Institute of Directors in 1998** revealed that 40% said that the immediate problem of their companies at that time was stress and 60% viewed that work practices could be a factor for stress. Research Article based on ‘Effort-Reward Hypothesis’ of **Richard Peter, Heinrich Geibler and Johannes Siegrist (1998)** reported symptoms in different groups of male and female public transport workers, established that the risk of ill health is increased by an imbalance between effort and reward. Both these Tests signify the correlation of stress with risk of psychiatric disorder and coronary heart disease.

**Fernandes and Murthy (1989)** carried out a study on job related stress and burnout in middle and secondary school teachers of Bangalore city. It was found that 76 per cent of the total sample faced stress on the job, through the degree to which they experienced stress differed. ‘pupil misbehavior’ was found to be most stressful, followed by ‘time pleasures’, ‘poor working conditions’ and ‘poor school ethos’. **Vadra and Sultan Akhtar (1989)** also conducted a study on universities teachers (N=120) to determine the stressor emanating from home and family situations. The results showed that male teachers experienced more social and family stress as compared to female teachers and the married experienced more stress than the unmarried teachers. These studies show that extra organizational stressor is as potent as factors relating to work situation.

**Dhadda (1990)** studied the relationship of role stress in aviation and railway officials. He found that role overload caused maximum stress among railway officials and role ambiguity caused the least, whereas role erosion caused maximum and role overload minimum stress among aviation officials. **Ushasree and Jamuna (1990)** conducted a study to examine role conflict and job stress among special and general school teachers. The analyses of data did not reveal any sex difference. However, women teachers in general schools were found to experience greater role conflict and had poor attitudes
towards their students and were less satisfied with their career as compared to their male counterparts in general schools. Teachers from special schools, both men and women, were found to experience significantly greater role conflict and job stress compared to their counterparts in general schools. Chaudhury (1990) revealed that role-related stress did not differ with age among bankers. However, stress levels were higher in the case of younger female teachers.

According to Reddy and Ramamurti (1991), stress was found to be influenced by age, general ability, and personality factors among 200 male executives. Beena and Poduval (1991) observed that age was positively correlated with stress among 80 executives. While Deosthalee (2000) reported that age has no significant impact on stress levels among male and female engineers. Singh and Singh (1992) reported that managers who experienced high organizational role stress reported more environmental frustration, anger reactions, and job anxiety than managers who experienced low stress. Diener et al., (1993) found that occupational stress creates a spill-over effect, may have some important relationship with the general life satisfaction of employees. It has been considered as a crucial aspect of Subjective Wellbeing. Pandey (1997a) found a positive but non-significant relationship between age and role-related stress among railway personnel. Further Pandey (1997b) studied the relationship between personal demographics and organization role stress. Analysis revealed that experienced was reported to be positively and significantly associated with inter-role distance, role expectation conflict, role ambiguity, personal inadequacy, role stagnation, role erosion and self-role distance.

Joshi and Singhvi (1997) examined the effect of teacher's personality factors on their experience of role stress among teachers of different universities of Rajasthan. No significant differences were observed in the role stress scores among teachers at different levels. According to Wilkes et. al. (1998) work overloads and times constraints were
significant contributors to work stress among community nurses. Garson and Stanwyck (1997) found that internal locus of control has been shown to be positively associated with low perceived stress and correspondingly high job satisfaction. They found that internals may be more satisfied, and perceived as having less emotional exhaustion due to some control over their environmental supports. Internally locus of controlled individuals should experience less stress than externally locus of controlled individuals. Brouwers and Tomic (2000) found positive correlation between stress and locus of control.

Upadhyay and Singh (1999) found that the executive as well as the teachers experienced a moderate level of stress, the executives experienced more stress than the teachers did. The results revealed a significant difference between these two groups on the experience of stress due to factors such as role overload, intrinsic impoverishment and status variable. Pestonjee (1999) studied that role of service length effect on organizational role stress and coping strategies. Results revealed significant and negative relationship between service and stress experienced.

Managers/supervisors who were anxious and stressed were more likely to perceive the appraisal as unfair and inappropriate (Desai and Daftuar, 2000). Parmar (2001) observed that there was no direct relationship between core dimensions of the job and outcome variables though the relationship was moderated by the anxiety. Adguide.com (2001) conducted a survey of on information officers in U.S. and reported that rising work lover loads, office politics, work / life balance issues, commuting and pace of technology were the sources of stressors among the executives. Further it was pointed out that individual’s job/organization, family and environment including social, economical, political and physical environment were also the sources of stress.
**Gupta and Kulakarni (2001)** test two concepts, one, more dissatisfied employees will experience greater role stress and second, and less job involved employees will experience greater role stress. Analysis yield results, which confirmed that more dissatisfied employee and less job involved employees, experience greater role stress.

**Mehra, G and Mishra, P.C. (2002)** have explored the potential moderator effect of autonomy on the occupational stress and intrinsic job satisfaction relationship. They found that autonomy has moderating effect on the occupational stress and intrinsic job satisfaction relationship but the sub group analysis does not confirm the moderating effect. **Bhatia, P. and Punam (2002)** have studied the job satisfaction and occupational stress patterns among medical female professional and female non professionals and found no significant difference in the job satisfaction levels of both the professional and non professional females though their occupational stress pattern was different.

**Emsley (2003)** in their research study multiple goals and managers’ job-related tension and performance, suggested that job-related tension and performance deteriorate as managers pursue multiple goals although the relationship seems to be non-linear. The relative importance of goals does not appear to be important. Management will have their own role that stands as their related. Role related are concerned with how individuals perceive the expectations other have of them and includes role ambiguity and role conflict. **(Alexandros-Stamatios et. al., 2003).** **Manshor, Fontaine and Chong Siong Choy (2003)** in their study examined the sources of occupational stress among Malaysian managers working in multi-national companies (MNCs). It was found that workloads, working conditions, and relationship at work were the main concern of the managers that lead to stress at the work place. The results also indicated that certain demographic variables do influence the level of stress among managers.
Mehra, G. and Mishra, P.C. (2003) have explored the potential moderator effect of decision making on the job satisfaction and occupational stress relationship. K. S. Rajeswari and R. N. Anantharaman (2003) studied to measure stress among software professionals. Factor analytic published in SIGMIS CPR April 2003 investigated sources of negative pressure among software professionals, from the perspective of the software development process. The results indicate that stress resulted from fear of insolence and individual team interactions accounted maximum. K. Chandraiah, S.C. Agrawal, P. Marimuthu and N. Manoharan (2003) found that job becomes less satisfying under excessive stress and their expected intrinsic and extrinsic needs are not fulfilled. They further found that age plays a vital role to test the correlation between occupational stress and job satisfaction level and suggested that senior level officers have a decreased stress level and increased satisfaction as compared to the middle level officers. Al-Aameri (2003) has mentioned in his studies that one of the six factors of occupation stress is pressure originating from workload. Gakhar, S.C.; Paul V.P (2003) showed that Public school teachers were found to have high high job stress, high job satisfaction and better adjustment.

Ghosh, A. (2004) studied to find out the pattern of occupational stress and strain in two different occupational groups, namely physicians and executives. It was observed that the executives differed significantly from the physicians in terms of role insufficiency and responsibility. That is, for executives there was a poor fit between their skills and the jobs they are performing. Kang and Singh (2004) conducted a study on employees working in the electronic industry and revealed that out of ten organizational factors identified only six organizational factors such as poor interpersonal relations, inconsiderable superior role ambiguity and work inhibitors have been found to be associated with stress. Further,
they pointed out that work overload, unmet financial need and job insecurity, rigid rules and monotonous job has not been found significantly associated with stress.

Leeamol Mathew of University of Calicut (2005) studied in South India as the sources of stress as i) school structure and climate, ii) home/work interface, iii) relationship with other people, iv) intrinsic job factors. The common effect of stress on special educators was found to be health related problems - both physical and mental - and job dissatisfaction. There was no organized method to redress the problem rising from occupational stress. As a result, the most commonly used coping strategies were social support, task strategies, and home/school relationship. The sources of stress as repeatedly reported were that of low salary - due to the subcontracting by the Government to NGO's, job insecurity, work overload, and high teacher-student ratio. K. S. Rajeswari and R. N. Anantharaman (2005) found that IT professionals have long work hours with different time zones, total team work, task to be completed on deadline with perfection as per client needs, which requires interpersonal, technical, and organizational skills. These characteristics lead to occupational stress and work exhaustion.

V. P. Sudhashree, K. Rohit and K Srinivas (2005) talks more about the Burnout Stress Syndrome (BOSS), which is the result of continuous noise pollution by way of sudden high frequency acoustic shocks and musculoskeletal disorders. Allam and Koteswari (2005) conducted a study and reported that older project managers have more anxiety than younger project managers and the project managers with more work experience have more anxiety than the project managers with less work experience.

Anne Marie Berg et. al. (2006) said that the prevalence of subjective health complaints was relatively high and was mainly associated to job pressure and lack of support. Males showed more depressive symptoms than females. All stress factors on frequency were
positively associated to the burnout dimensions depersonalization and emotional exhaustion, except work injuries. Kang et. al. (2006) reported that poor interpersonal relations has been identified as the biggest source of stress followed by 'Poor organizational structure and climate' work inhibitors and inconsiderate superior respectively. A.K. Sharma, S. Khera , J. Khandekar (2006) found more on visual stress and musculoskeletal symptoms, initially being mild and temporary and later with increasing years assuming more intense and permanent nature. It also found that computer related morbidity had become an important occupational health problem and of great concern. It suggested an immediate need for the concerned authorities to collaborate and enforce suitable preventive measures.

Kulkarni G.K. (2006) said in an article that rapid change of the modern working life is associated with increasing demands of learning new skills, need to adopt to new types of work, pressure of higher productivity and quality of work, time pressure and hectic jobs are increasing stress among the workforce. Further he added that privatization and globalization has ignited mergers, acquisitions, and precarious employment has critically affected the domestic industry. Mukherjee, D. and Singh, P. (2006) studied the effect of occupational stress on official status in relation to job involvement. Findings show that occupational stress does affect job involvement in an inverse manner, job involvement level of the senior ranking executives were much higher than the middle ranking and front line executives.

Jain, K.K., Jabeen, F., Mishra V. and Gupta N. (2007) found that high age group managers as well as high age group engineers were equally satisfied with their jobs and the same findings were revealed when low age group managers and low age group engineers were compared on their job satisfaction level. Srivastav, (2007) proved in his study the weakening of role stress with the advancement of age and existence of
significant in role stress experienced across the age group. Shirotriya, A. K. and Basumatary B. (2010) studied occupational stress and Frustration tolerance among BSF, CISF and PAC with some selected rank and age categories. The result of the study indicated that PAC endure highest level of occupational stress and BSF and CISE exhibit moderate level of occupational stress.

Khatoon N.J., Akhtar Z. and Zaki H. (2011) studied the organizational role stress among doctors and found that male and female doctors were differ on the dimensions of role erosion (RE) and role overload (RO). Role erosion and role overload were stronger in experienced doctors as compared to freshers. And total role stresses were stronger in experienced doctors as compared to freshers. Meera Padhay, G. Padmaja and Punnam Chandra (2011) studied the difference in occupational stress between Forest Range Officers (FRO) and Forest Section Officers (FSO) belonging to the age group of 35 to 50 years working in Warangal forest division. The findings showed the significant difference between the both groups where stress is more in Forest Section Officers than Forest Range Officers.

Another study, which used social support as a moderator variable was conducted by Singh and Srivastava (1996 as cited in Pestonjee, 1999). They examined the moderating effect of social support on stress-health relationship among 200 male managers. The main findings of the study are that the organizational sources of social support appeared to be more important in moderating stress-health relationship compared to extra organizational sources. A finding by Lazarus (1972) is that stress could arise because of lack of adequate social support in difficult situation. Although the relationship between social support and stress reduction appears complicated (Seers, McGee, Serey&Green, 1983 as cited in Chauhan, 2002), there is some research evidence that a networking strategy may be able to help people cope better with job stress (McLean,
1964 as cited in Chauhan, 2002) to be more effective (Kotter, 1982) and successful managers (Luthens, 1985). Pincherle (1972 as cited in Chauhan, 2002) found evidence of physical stress being linked to age and level of responsibility. However in this stage individuals have yet to reach their peak productivity. Gupta (1988) and Kumar (1997) found a positive correlation between the two types of role stress (role stagnation and role overload) and the length of service.

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Research has substantiated the importance of emotional intelligence for everyday life (Ciarochi and Scott, 2006), marital life (Brackett, Warner and Bosco, 2005; Fitness, 2006), language learning (Aki, 2006) and academic life (Farooq, 2004; Jaeger, 2003; Liff, 2003). At workplace, emotions like anger and jealousy often push aside logic and rationality. Managers use fear, pride and other emotions to both treat and motivate their subordinates (Kreitner and Kinicki, 2004). According to Mayer and Salovey (1993) emotional intelligence allow individual to think more creative and use it to solve problem. Goleman (1998) explored the function of Emotional Intelligent on the job, and claimed EI to be the strongest predictor of success in the workplace.

Many scholars view that EI is a group of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies, and skills (Bar-On, 1997), as well as a form of social intelligence (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, 1997) where they will increase the ability of individuals to identify emotions, use emotions to guide thinking and actions, understand and manage emotions, and to promote emotional and intellectual growth. As a result, it may motivate employees to properly handle external demands and pressures (Bar-On, 1997; Salovey & Meyer, 1990, 1997; Stacciarini, 2004). Brown, Kirkcaldy, and Thome (2000) investigated the impact of emotional intelligence on police officers and health-care professionals. They conclude
that those police officers who have high emotional intelligence respond to stress with better coping strategies and report less depression comparatively than health-care professionals having low emotional intelligence. Rajkhowa (2002) conducted a study on IAS officers of two age group (30-40yrs). She finds that older group among all IAS officers is higher on EQ then the younger group.

Dulewicz and Higgs (2000) indicated that 16% variance in individual success in organizational setting is explained through managerial intelligence, 27% by IQ, and an even higher 36% by emotional intelligence. The relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance also seems logical, because, increasingly the employers are considering the EI of the applicants during the recruitment and selection process (Cadman and Brewer, 2001) and employee development programs. According to Bagshaw (2000), emotional intelligence is being able to harness emotions effectively; hence it plays a significant role in business success. Cherniss (2000) suggested that a person’s ability to perceive, identify and manage emotions provides the basis for the kinds of social and emotional competencies that are important for success in almost any job. It implies that job performance is determined largely by the competencies pertaining to emotional intelligence. Research has indicated that, overall emotional intelligence and its sub-components namely perceiving emotions and regulating emotions all contributed positively to individual cognitive-based performance (Lam and Kirby, 2002).

Rosete and Ciarrochi’s (2005) study found that EI was related to a leader’s effectiveness in being able to achieve organizational goals. Additionally, it was revealed that EI may be useful in identifying who is and is not likely to deal effectively with colleagues and staff. Dulewicz et al. (2003) found that emotional intelligence was positively correlated with managerial performance. Langhorn (2004) proved that managers’ emotional intelligence scores can be used to predict their performance. In the study of insurance CEOs,
Williams (1994) found a significant relationship between the EI abilities of the leader and the organizational climate. Climate reflects people's sense of their ability to do their jobs well. Climate indicators include the degree of clarity in communication; the degree of employees' flexibility in doing their jobs, ability to innovate, and ownership of and responsibility for their work; and the level of the performance standards set.

Jordan and Troth (2002) showed that individuals with high emotional intelligence preferred to seek collaborative solutions when confronted with conflict. Dulewicz, Higgs and Slaski (2003) found managers’ emotional intelligence correlated positively with quality of work life and morale. Carmeli (2003) indicated that emotionally intelligent managers tend to develop high commitment towards their careers and high affective commitment for the organizations where they work. So, employees’ emotional intelligence affects the behavior and attitude they usually hold within their organizations.

Research revealed that emotional intelligence contributes to employee performance measured through their goal achievements in respective functional departments like sales, accounts, and customer service. Deeter-Schmelz and Sozka (2003) suggested that emotional intelligence might be an important characteristic for sales success. Rozell et al. (2006) indicated that mean emotional intelligence scores of salespeople in the highest performance category were significantly greater than scores of sales people in the lowest performance category. Bachman, Stein, Campbel and Sitarenios (2000) suggested that higher levels of emotional intelligence of accounts officers show an increase in their cash goal attainment. In another study, Higgs (2004) indicated that emotional intelligence was significantly related to call center agents’ performance.

According to Sy et al. (2006) employees’ EI positively predicted their job performance. A meta-analytic study Deshpande, Joseph, and Shu (2005) observed a significant
difference in aggregate counterproductive behavior between high and low emotional intelligence groups; thus, suggesting that high emotionally intelligent people tend to be better corporate citizens and hold better ethical attitudes toward their firm and work. Another research revealed that organizational citizenship behavior was positively correlated with emotional intelligence (Carmeli, 2003; Carson, Carson, Fontenot and Burdin, 2005). Additionally, it was found that emotional intelligence dimensions of empathy and internal motivation were significantly correlated with organizational citizenship behavior. Study by Cote and Miners (2006) asserted that employees having a low cognitive intelligence perform tasks correctly and engage in organizational citizenship behavior. The extant literature emphasizes that emotional intelligence is associated with success in every-day life, marital relations, academics and work life. It is quite obvious that emotional intelligence contributes positively to performance especially in the work place.

Being capable of participating effectively in a team environment is an important consideration for success in work life. Rapisarda (2002) indicated that EI competencies are positively correlated with team cohesiveness. Sue-Chan and Latham’s (2004) study indicated a high positive correlation between emotional intelligence and team playing behavior. Welch (2003) proposed that teams high on EI are likely to have far more initiative in dealing with organizational challenges and are sensitive to change. According to Sardo (2004), a workforce in touch with the emotional world of others was more able to achieve organizational outcomes through high level workplace relationships. Langhorn’s (2004) research showed that managers’ emotional intelligence was able to predict team satisfaction with a reasonable degree of accuracy.

Srivastava and Bharmanaikar (2004) examined the relationship of emotional intelligence with leadership effectiveness, success and job satisfaction among 291 Indian
army officers. They predicted that army officers who were more innovative, intuitive, self-aware, motivated, socially adept, empathetic and managed emotions, were found to use transformational behaviors to motivate their subordinates. A positive relationship between contingent reward, a component of transactional leadership and emotional intelligence suggested that it is complimentary to transformational leadership. According to Gardner (2005), the employees having emotional intelligence manage their negative emotions in the workplace and report fewer psychological problems with high levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Punia, B.K. (2005) found in Indian business, CEOs are often heard saying ‘business done by brain and not by heart’. They view that people with low emotional intelligence lead to low productivity and poor management. Leaders who are attuned to their own feelings and the feelings of others can use their understanding to enhance the organization’s effectiveness.

Suliman and Al-Shaikh (2007) revealed that employees with higher levels of EI were found to report higher levels of readiness to create and innovate. Further they found that employees with higher levels of EI tended to report lower levels of intra-individual conflict. Bowes (2007) describes enhancement of employee performance and team effectiveness by applying emotional intelligence to develop professional behavior of employee. Harjeet Kaur Virk (2011) studied the impact of Emotional Intelligence on Transformational Leadership Behavior on 320 managers working in telecommunication organizations located in North India. Analysis has revealed that emotional intelligence has a positive relationship with transformational leadership behavior and is found to be one of its significant predictors. The study implies that managers with higher emotional intelligence were considered to be leaders who have more transformed behavior.
Sharma M., Shukla S. and Jaiswal B. (2011) studied to assess the conflict management style and emotional intelligence of bank employees and to explore the relationship private emotional intelligence and conflict management style. The results show that there exists a relationship between the emotional intelligence of bank employees and their conflict management style. The bank employees of the high emotional intelligence use collaborating style (WIN-WIN) and low use competing style (WIN-LOSE) more for resolving their conflicts. This research suggests that enhancing emotional intelligence can help in resolving conflict to facilitate better mental health.

Chaudhry A. A. and Usman A. (2011) examines the relationship between employees’ emotional intelligence and their performance. A total of 444 employees working in privately owned organizations. The results revealed a moderately high correlation between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior. It was also established that employees’ job performance can be predicted significantly based upon their emotional intelligence scores. The predictive power of emotional intelligence for performance suggests the use of emotional intelligence measure as a selection tool by human resource managers.

REVIEW OF LITRATURE RELATED TO OCCUPATIONAL STRESS AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

The impact of employees’ emotional intelligence can be observed even on their job stress, job satisfaction and the satisfaction of customers they serve. Dulewicz et al. (2003) also found strong negative correlation of managers’ emotional intelligence with stress and distress at work. Research has implied that employees’ emotional intelligence can predict their job satisfaction (Carmeli, 2003; Sy, Tram and O’Hara, 2006). Kernbach and Schutte’s (2005) study revealed that higher emotional intelligence in service providers
lead to greater customer satisfaction. **Carmeli (2003)** asserted that emotional intelligence was negatively related to withdrawal intentions from the organization. **Ciarrochi-Frank and Anderson (2002)** also suggest that EI is a distinctive construct along with being important in understanding the link between stress and mental health.

**Johnson and Indvik, (1999)** concluded that an organization can reap the benefits of having emotionally intelligent employees in two ways. The managers will have a workforce willing to work with passion and employees will have managers very receptive and open to their needs. Besides this, organizations require employees to be emotionally intelligent to serve customers in a better way and to create and maintain a lively work environment. Employers can also opt to reduce employees’ occupational stress by enhancing their EI; this suggests that emotional intelligence is an important construct to be studied in relation to performance. **Darolia and Darolia (2005)** studied the role of emotional intelligence in coping with stress and emotional control behavior. The findings reveal that emotionally intelligent people cope with stressful situation by realistically accepting it or sometimes successfully detaching themselves from stress generating events. The less involved they feel with the event more effectively they are able to cope. Interestingly, unlike low EI subjects high EI subjects don’t feel helpless in coping with stressful events.

**Parmananda Chabungban (2005)** proposes that by developing Emotional Intelligence one can build a bridge between stress and better performance. Further he found that store managers who are able to manage their own stress and stay unaffected have the most profitable stores. **Duran and Ray (2004), Naidoo and Pay (2008)** reported that EI is related to the lower level of stress and reduced chance of its adverse effect. A recent meta-analysis (**Schutt et. al., 2007**) has also reported that the positive relationship between EI and mental and physical health. A study carried out in UK’s police service
gives a lucid picture about the positive impact of EQ in successfully coping with stressful encounters. Another study on 62 CEO’s and their top management teams found that more positive the emotions of people in management teams, the better are the company’s business results than companies with members of diverse emotional outlooks.

**Goleman’s (1998, 2003)** emotional Intelligence stresses that the level of emotional intelligence will increase individuals’ competencies and this may help them to decrease environmental strains and increase leadership effectiveness in organizations. Application of the emotional intelligence theories at the workplace stress shows that the ability of employees to properly manage their emotions and manage other employees’ emotions will strongly increase their abilities to cope with physiological and psychological stresses in implementing job. As a result, it may lead to higher job satisfaction in organizations (Guleryuz et al., 2008; Sy et al., 2006; Thiebaut et al., 2005). In an occupational stress model, several scholars believe that the ability of employees to properly control and manage their physiological and psychological stresses in implementing job may lead to higher job satisfaction in organizations (Antoniou et al., 2003; Fairbrother & Warn, 2003; Stacciarini, 2004).

Emotional intelligence, an essential factor responsible for determining success in life and psychological well-being, seems to play an important role in shaping the interaction between individuals and their work environment. The study conducted by Oginska et al., (2005) was aimed to explore the relationship between emotional intelligence and perceived stress in the workplace and health-related consequences in human service workers. The results confirmed an essential, but not very strong, role of emotional intelligence in perceiving occupational stress and preventing employees of human services from negative health outcomes. They concluded that the ability to effectively
deal with emotions and emotional information in the workplace assists employees in coping with occupational stress.

Emotional intelligence (EI) may predict stress responses and coping strategies in a variety of applied settings. Matthews et al. (2006), in his study compared EI and the personality factors of the Five Factor Model (FFM) as predictors of task-induced stress responses. Results confirmed that low EI was related to worry states and avoidance coping, even with the FFM statistically controlled. However, EI was not specifically related to task-induced changes in stress state. Results also confirmed that neuroticism related to distress, worry, and emotion-focused coping, and Conscientiousness predicted use of task-focused coping. Studies conducted by Montes-Berges et al., (2007) with nursing students have shown that emotional intelligence is a skill that minimizes the negative stress consequences.

Naidoo et al., (2008) has conducted a survey to gain some understanding of the explanatory factors for stress and an evaluation of the role that emotional intelligence (EI) plays in the experience of perceived stress (PS). The finding revealed that low EI is associated with stress. Kumar, S. And Rooprai, K. Y. (2009) conducted an investigation to find out the role of emotional intelligence in managing stress and anxiety at workplace. The findings indicate that the low and high level of Emotional Intelligence establish relationship to some extent with stress and anxiety. Negative correlation of Emotional Intelligence with stress and Anxiety highlights that emotional intelligence will prove helpful tool in dealing with stress and anxiety at workplace.

Singh, U., and Kanupriya (2011) investigate the relationship between the dimensions of emotional intelligence and burnout in middle level managers of private organizations. They found that various affect related abilities consisted in emotional intelligence help to
protect an employee from the street and its negative effects on physical and mental health, and organizational productivity. Their findings also imply that abilities included in emotional intelligence act as protective factors for the stressogenic ill effects in the form of burnout and adverse effects on physical health, mental health.

**JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY**

Review of literature reveals that various researches have been conducted to explore the relationship of occupational stress with other variables as social support (Singh and Srivastava, 1996; Lazarus, 1972; Seers, McGee, Serey&Green, 1983), length of service (Gupta, 1988; Kumar, 1997; Pestonjee, 1999), age (Chandraiah et.al., 2003; Jain et.al., 2007; Srivastav, 2007) experience (Khatoon et.al., 2011), job involvement (Mukherjee and Singh, 2006), interpersonal relationship (Kang and Singh, 2004), gender (Anne Marie Berg et. al., 2006), workload (Al-Aameri, 2003), decision making (Mehra and Mishra, 2003), management role (Emsley, 2003), dissatisfaction (Gupta and Kulakarni, 2001), locus of control (Brouwers and Tomic, 2000), job level (Palnitkar, 1987).

Similarly various researches have been conducted on emotional intelligence with other variables such as: Transformational Leadership Behavior (Virk, 2011), team effectiveness (Bowes, 2007; Singh, 2005), team cohesiveness (Rapisarda, 2002), managerial performance (Dulewicz et al., 2003), leader’s effectiveness (Rosete and Ciarrochi, 2005), age (Rajkhowa, 2002), quality of work life and morale (Dulewicz, Higgs and Slaski, 2003), job performance (Sy et. al., 2006), organizational citizenship behavior (Carmeli, 2003; Cote and Miners, 2006).

There are many studies in which relationship of emotional intelligence and occupational stress have been studied for e.g. (Oginska et al., 2005; Dulewicz et al., 2003; Johnson and Indvik, 1999; Ciarrochi-Frank and Anderson, 2002; Darolia and
Researches have been made with emotional intelligence and occupational stress by taking different type of population as Forest Range Officers and Forest Section Officers (Padhay et.al., 2011), bank employee (Sharma et.al., 2011; Chaudhury, 1990), Army officer (Srivastava and Bharmanaikar, 2004), Police officer (Bhaskar, 1986) and health-care professionals (Bar-On et.al., 2000), IAS officer (Rajkhowa, 2002), Railway official (Dhadda, 1990), teachers (Fernandes and Murthy, 1989; Vadra and Akhtar, 1989), IT professionals (Rajeswari et.al., 2005), doctors (Ghosh, 2004), engineers (Deosthalee, 2000), executives (Ramamurthi et. al., 1984) insurance CEO (Williams, 1994) call center agent (Higgs, 2004) and managers (Chaudhry et.al., 2011; Virk, 2011; Langhorn, 2004; Carmeli, 2003; Srilata, 1988, Singh et.al., 2011).

There are some contradictory results for levels of managers variable with reference occupational stress. As Palnitkar (1987) Helode and Palnitkar (1987) Mukherjee and Singh (2006) found that higher grade officer exhibits higher level of occupational stress than the lower grade officer while Balakoteswari and Allam,(2005), Singh (1986), Chandraiah, Agrawal, Marimuthu and Manoharan (2003) found more occupational stress in lower grade officer. During the literature survey it is also noted that very little research has examined emotional intelligence skills in the insurance sector while in India. The investigator of the study has not come across any research that examines the impact of emotional intelligence on occupational stress among the different job level of insurance managers. Therefore this study is carried out to assess the effect of emotional intelligence on occupational stress and its different dimensions among the different level of insurance managers.
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of the present study is “Occupational stress in relation to emotional intelligence among different levels of managers”.

Objectives

1. To study the high and low EI groups in relation to occupational stress and its various dimensions among managers.

2. To study the impact of different levels of manager on their occupational stress and its various dimensions.

3. To study the interactional effect of EI and levels of manager on occupational stress and its various dimensions.

Hypotheses

On the basis of previous research findings in this area the following tentative null hypotheses were formulated:

1. **There is no significant difference between high and low emotional intelligence groups with regard to occupational stress along with its dimensions.**

This hypothesis was further bifurcated into six sub hypotheses.

1.1. There is no significant difference between high and low emotional intelligence groups with regard to Role Overload, the first dimension of occupational stress.

1.2. There is no significant difference between high and low emotional intelligence groups with regard to Role Insufficiency, the second dimension of occupational stress.
1.3. There is no significant difference between high and low emotional intelligence groups with regard to Role Ambiguity, the third dimension of occupational stress.

1.4. There is no significant difference between high and low emotional intelligence groups with regard to Role Boundary, the fourth dimension of occupational stress.

1.5. There is no significant difference between high and low emotional intelligence groups with regard to Responsibility, the fifth dimension of occupational stress.

1.6. There is no significant difference between high and low emotional intelligence groups with regard to Physical Environment, the sixth dimension of occupational stress.

2. There is no significant impact of levels of managers on occupational stress along with its dimensions.

This hypothesis was further bifurcated into six sub hypotheses.

2.1 There is no significant impact of levels of managers with regard to Role Overload, the first dimension of occupational stress.

2.2 There is no significant impact of levels of managers with regard to Role Insufficiency, the second dimension of occupational stress.

2.3 There is no significant impact of levels of managers with regard to Role Ambiguity, the third dimension of occupational stress.

2.4 There is no significant impact of levels of managers with regard to Role Boundary, the fourth dimension of occupational stress.
2.5 There is no significant impact of levels of managers with regard to Responsibility, the fifth dimension of occupational stress.

2.6 There is no significant impact of levels of managers with regard to Physical Environment, the sixth dimension of occupational stress.

3. There is no significant interactional effect of emotional intelligence and different levels of managers on occupational stress along with its dimensions.

This hypothesis was further bifurcated into six sub hypotheses

3.1 There is no significant interactional effect of emotional intelligence and different levels of managers on Role Overload, the first dimension of occupational stress.

3.2 There is no significant interactional effect of emotional intelligence and different levels of managers on Role Insufficiency, the second dimension of occupational stress.

3.3 There is no significant interactional effect of emotional intelligence and different levels of managers on Role Ambiguity, the third dimension of occupational stress.

3.4 There is no significant interactional effect of emotional intelligence and different levels of managers on Role Boundary, the fourth dimension of occupational stress.

3.5 There is no significant interactional effect of emotional intelligence and different levels of managers on Responsibility, the fifth dimension of occupational stress.
3.6 There is no significant interactional effect of emotional intelligence and different levels of managers on Physical Environment, the sixth dimension of occupational stress.

The next chapter deals with design and methodology.