Chapter - One

Introduction
Values: Concept and Definitions

In popular use, values are inextricable components of the socio-cultural context and also one of the major antecedent determinants of behavior. The term 'Value' has a variety of meanings and attributes. In common use it means price. In other context value refers to importance. The dictionary meanings of value suggest quality or facts of being excellent, useful or desirable. In sociology and anthropology the term has come to denote the shared cultural standards according to which the moral, aesthetic and, cognitive relevance of the object of attitude, desire and need can be compared and judged.

In popular use, value has three types of meaning: (a) the objects have value as they satisfy our needs and we are ready to pay for it; (b) acts, arguments and experiments have value as they serve our goals or objectives; and (c) at a higher conceptual level it means ideals. The terms human values, social values, and cultural values refers to the ideals and norms established by societies and cultures that are highly priced by the individuals and social units constituting the societies or culture. Therefore, values determine desirable and undesirable ideas, things and behaviors. The desirability and undesirability of ideas, things and behaviors however, are socially and culturally determined.

Although values are seen as socially and culturally determined, they may have individualistic character. In the broad frame of cultural values, an
individual as a primary unit of the society may have a personal value system or preferences. Values constitute a central ingredient of personality on the one hand, and in hence our thinking and attitudes on the others.

It may be said that values function as norms and have to be adopted by the constituent members and groups consciously or unconsciously. Such values are charged with emotions and become ego involved. Once this happens, values in forms of norms get internalized. This is the process of internalization of values in life. Values consequently may influence our perception and actions. In this sense, value becomes a generalized attitude. But unlike attitude (which could be positive or negative) values have preferential.

Value is more or less an abstract concept with differential meanings in different contexts. It has both cognitive and conative components. In cognitive field it is related to thoughts, ideas, beliefs, prejudices and interests. On the other hand, its cognitive aspect is manifested in the form of valances and goal directed activities.

Parson (1951) said that values as cultural ideas that influence human choice by the virtue of being internalized by the actor. He contended that values are instigators of behavior and can only be inferred. However, values are embodied in social activities, relationships and institutions that are subject to change and adjustment. On the other hand, values have a relative permanence and university. Similarly, values could be part of some ideology or part of more restricted group (i.e. social class, group or movement).
It may be said that values and ideas maintain and regulate the visible social structure and interaction on the one hand and give them cohesion on the other. Despite being subjective and invisible, values are significant aspect of society and underlie all relationship.

He observes further that since values played a very significant role in social affairs, studying them was a good beginning for the production of an unified theory of human behavior. According to Parsons and Shils (1951) perfect articulate and conflict less action on the part of several actors was possible when rules become fully institutionalized, and were derived from the common value orientation of the people of collectivity. It was studied in value systems as deriving their quality from the dual nature of man as being both a "sentient being" and a "reason being ". A predominance of either quality is reflected in two distinct value patterns. Furthermore, when regrouped the classes of most significant values, were seen to fall into classes of values that were discerned and classified by the ancient Greek Philosophers. The Greek Philosophers envisaged values as arising from activities that intended to and adds to human knowledge, human delight and aesthetic satisfaction in the one hand, and to socially acceptable, more conducts on the other hand.

It is generally seen that social scientists have shown basic differences in conceptualizing values. For example, values are viewed either as a pattern of differential preferences which are derived from a range of desirable behavior
(Triandis, 1972) or those which are important (Schwartz and Bilsky, 1987, p.388-433).

The more widely acceptable definitions in the social sciences literature consider 'value' to be conception of the desirable, influencing selective behavior. Again in this restricted definition, a distinction is made between 'what is desired' and 'what is desirable', the later being equated with what we ought to desire (International Encyclopedia of Social Science, 1988, p.282).

Review of literature gives an abundant number of definitions of values. Much cited in Rokeach (1973, p.5), who defines value as "an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence". Super (1980, p.130) defines value as "an objective, either a psychological state, a relationship or material condition that once sought to attain."

Hofstede (1984, p.18) define values "as a broad tendency to prefer certain states of affairs over others". A more elaborate definition is given by Schwartz (1992, p.2), who defines values as "desirable states, objects, goals, or behaviors, transcending specific situations and applied as normative standards to judge and to choose among alternative modes of behaviors": An important merit of this latter definition is that it distinguishes values from attitudes by pointing at their generalized nature. Attitudes are people's beliefs about specific
objects or situations (Hollander, 1971). They can be considered as taking a lower
place in the person's hierarchy of beliefs (Rokeach, 1973). Another difference is
that attitudes can be positive or negative, whereas values are always positive, i.e.
in favour of something. Less specific than attitudes but more specific than
attitudes but more specific than values is "interest" (Davis, 1991; Roe, 1981).
This notion has mostly been used in the domain of work in connection with
vocational choice, and refers to a person's preference or liking for particular
types of occupational activities.

All definitions treat values as latest construct that refer to the way in
which people evaluate activities or outcomes. Thus, generally speaking, the
notion of value points at a relationship between an evaluating subjects and an
evaluated object, whereby this relationship is supposed to be durable and to have
implications for the subjects subsequent activities.

Sinha (1990c) observes that the manner in which values are
conceptualized provide basis for suggesting that the desirable, ideal and
important values are perhaps the cherished values and may have universal
structure (Schwartz and Bilsky, 1987), while in the former case the indication is
towards operative values (England, 1974) that are more close to social norms and
behavior.

A conceptual definition of values by Schwartz (1992) incorporates
five formal features of values. Accordingly values are (a) concepts or beliefs,(b)
that pertain to desirable end states or behaviors, (c) transcend specific
situations, (d) guide selection or evaluation of behaviors and events, and (e) are ordered by relative importance.

Schwartz (1992, 1994) contends that the critical content of values is the motivation they represent. He has demonstrated that Self-Direction, Stimulation, Hedonism, Achievement, Power, Security, Conformity, Tradition, Benevolence and Universalism, are the ten motivationally distinct types of values that appear repeatedly in a wide range of cultures and thus may qualify as universal values.

According to Rescher (1969), one way of classifying values could be through the subscribership to the values. For example, if the subscriber is a person we talk about personal values, however, if the value is subscribed nation wide, it becomes a national value. Rokeach (1973) made a distinction between individual (what I value) and social (what people value) value.

Values may be classified as mean values and end values. Realization of mean values proves instrumental for realization of the more fundamental values termed as end or instrumental values (Rokeach, 1973). The terminal values such as honesty and loyalty are prized primarily on their own account and hence are also known as intrinsic values.

Values can be classified with respect to the specific type of purpose they serve. For example, values such success, conform and privacy benefit the
self, while parochial values benefit the family. Therefore the values held by the subscribers in these examples would be self-enhancement and family pride respectively.

Following Klukhohn (1951) and Rokeach (1973) and Schwartz (1992), Schwartz and Bilsky (1987, 1990) defined human values as desirable goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in people's lives. The crucial content aspect that distinguishes among values is the type of motivational goals they express. Schwartz and Bilsky (1987, 1990) derived a typology of the different contents of the values represented in the form of conscious goals, three universal requirements of human existence.

The three universal requirements of human existence to which all individuals and societies must be responsive are (a) needs of individual as a biological organism (b) requisites of coordinated social interaction, and (c) survival and welfare needs of groups. From an evolutionary point of view, these goals have crucial survival significance (Buss, 1986). Groups and individuals represent these requirements cognitively as specific values about which they communicate.

The ten motivationally distinct types of values (Schwartz and Bilsky, 1987, 1990) were derived from the above-mentioned three universal requirements. For example, Conformity (one of the motivationally distinct value
type out of ten), was derived from the prerequisite of smooth interaction and group survival. In addition to the universals in content of values, the theory specifies a dynamic relationship among the motivational types of values. The theory contends that actions in pursuit of each type, have psychological, practical and social consequences that may conflict or may be compatible with the pursuit of other value types. For example, pursuit of achievement value may conflict with the pursuit of benevolence value (that is, seeking personal success for oneself is likely to hinder actions aimed at enhancing the welfare of others who need one's help).

The total pattern of relations of conflict or compatibility among value priorities that provide structure to the value systems (Schwartz, 1992) The fundamental point to have in mind is that the value pattern refers to the relations of conflict and compatibility among values, not to their relative importance to a group or individual. The latter (i.e. importance) is referred to as value priorities or hierarchies. The theory contends that although ten value types may be discriminated, at a more basic level, the value types form a continuum of related motivations. This continuum gives rise to the circular structure. The partitioning into ten value types represents conceptually convenient decisions about where one fuzzy set ends and another begins.

Schwartz's (1990,1992) presented a model of ten motivational types values that are organized into two major dimensions. These dimensions are
composed of higher-order value types that combines the standard types. The first dimension "openness to change" versus "conservation" opposes value emphasizing own independent thought and actions and favoring changes (e.g. self-direction and stimulation type) to those emphasizing submissive self-restriction, preservation of traditional practices, and protection of stability, security conformity and tradition. The second dimension namely, "self-enhancement" versus "transcendence" opposes values emphasizing acceptance of others as equals and concerns for their welfare (i.e. universalism and benevolence) to those emphasizing the pursuit of own relative success and dominance over others (e.g. power and achievement). Hedonism is related to both.

Values: The Indian Context

As true for most of the concepts in the field of psychology, the western thinking influences the conceptualization and definition of values in the social science literature. As this point it seems necessary to talk about values in the context of the Indian scene in particular. This is a very demanding exercise and therefore, literature review shall be restricted only to those areas that seems to be relevant for the present Doctoral work.

Religion and philosophy, socialization practices that transmit values from one generation to the other, and the harsh social reality of the Indian sub-
continent, may be delineated as the three major source of values. Discussing these sources in detail is beyond the scope of this Doctoral work however, it may be mentioned that Hinduism, Islam and Buddhism have been the mother religions and sources of values for million of people in India and around the world.

Values such as love, compassion, selflessness, service and renunciation, duty and responsibility, equanimity and detachment and caution against desires are seen as highly desirable in all the religions despite differences in the suggested practices for becoming an evolved person or an evolved community.

The individuals acquire social values through socialization and occupational roles. Tandon (1981) observes that the basic values transmitting social agencies are the family, educational institutions, peer group and organized groups in the society. There is no dearth of evidence to support this. A few selected importance references in this context are Garg and Parikh (1993), Kakar (1978) and Roland (1988). Nevertheless, the values painstakingly inculcated by the above mentioned sources may get weakened, eroded and destabilized as the contextual parameters of a society are not always conducive for the survival, maintenance and adoption of the prescribed values. Accordingly to J.B.P.Sinha (1982a), the very harsh social reality of India is a case in point in support of this argument.
Multiple and complex problems of the Indian social reality add up to create a sense of insecurity, relative deprivation and uncertainty. Consequently, one becomes suspicious, shrewed, competitive, and coercive towards those who seem to be competing with one for limited resources and opportunities. J.B.P. Sinha (1982a) observes that in face of overwhelming Indian realities such as poverty, overpopulation, scarcity of resources (poverty being the most dominant of them), the terminal goals of life, like salvation or moksha becomes subordinated to the lower order goals of wealth and prosperity.

**Work Values**

Work values are the specific expressions of general values in the work setting. This study employs the basic individual values to generate and test hypothesis regarding the different types work values that people are likely to distinguish, and regarding the structure of relationships among these work values. Like basic values, work values are benefits pertaining to desirable end-state (e.g. high pay) or behavior (e.g. working with people). The different work goals are ordered by their importance as guiding principles for evaluating work outcomes and settings, and for choosing among different work alternatives. Because work values refer only to goals in the work setting. They are more specific than basic individual values. But the work values usually studied are still quite broad. They refer to what a person wants out of work in general rather than to the narrowly defined outcomes of particular jobs. Finally, work values are
verbal representations of individual, group and interaction requirements. Work value is a kind of orientation towards work underlies people's ideas of what is important to them when making occupational choices. Viewing work values as specific expressions of basic values in the work setting implies that there should be four general types of work values. Most of the researchers appear to identify the three types of work values (1) intrinsic or self-actualization; (2) extrinsic or security or materials (3) social or relational (e.g. Alderfer, 1972; Borg, 1990; Crites, 1961; Mottaz, 1985; Pryor, 1987; Rosenberg, 1957). Elizur (1984) arrived at a related trichotomous classifications of work values by considering the modality of their outcomes such as interest and achievement; Affective outcomes such as relations with associates. This classification largely overlaps extrinsic, intrinsic and social respectively.

These three types of work values can be viewed as conceptually parallel to three of the higher-order basic values. Intrinsic work values directly express openness to change values—The pursuit of autonomy, interest, growth, and creativity in work. Extrinsic work values express conservation values; job security and income provide workers with the requirements of needs for general security and maintenance of order in their lives. Societal and interpersonal work values express the pursuit of self-transcendence values: work is seen as a vehicle for positive social relations and contribution to society.

The theory of basic individual values suggests that there should be a fourth distinct type of work values, one that parallel the basic self-enhancement
higher order value type. This type of work values, like self-enhancement, should be concern with prestige or power. Items that refer to prestige, authority, influence, power and achievement in work are common in empirical research on work. These values have usually been classified as extrinsic (Ginzberg, 1966; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Rosenberg, 1957). Few theorists have recognized a distinctive prestige or power type (O'Connor & Kinnane, 1961; Pryor, 1987).

Reexamination of the many past studies reveal that there is empirical evidence for a fourth, prestige type. The work values in the extrinsic region (meaningfulness, responsibility, and use of one's abilities) are values that contribute to a sense of personal growth and whose attainment derives directly from the nature of the work experience. The work values in the prestige region (achievement, advancement, status, recognition independence, company that you are proud to work for, influence in work, influence in the organizations) are values whose attainment entails a comparison of self with others that implies personal superiority.

In the literature, a distinction is made between general values and the values concerning specific life domains. As work is considered to be such a domain, work values by implications have a more specific meaning than general values. The relationship between general values and work values are being conceived in different ways. One view is that values have a particular cognitive
structure that produces a structural similarity between general values and work values. This view is represented and empirically corroborated by Elizur and Sagie. Another view is that general values produce work value; for example, that work values emerge from the projection of general values onto the domain of work. Most researchers seem to assume that work values do somehow desire from general values, but they are not very explicit about the causal nature of this process. Many studies have been found general values to correlate with work values of a similar content (e.g. Kinnane & Gaubinder, 1963).

Work values might be seen as a source from which general values develop. Work values seem to diffuse easily through such channels as management literature, consulting and training. In this way modern work practices and standards may generate work related values that generalize the wider social life. There is as yet very little empirical evidence to support this position, but a study by Selmer and Deleon (1996) on organizational "acculturation" shows that multinational corporations can play a role in the transmission of values.

It is important to note that in modern societies work values are typically considered as salient, basic, and influential on "work centrality" carried out in the context of the Meaning of Work (MOW) project (England, 1991). The importances of the work role in many cultures make work values into core values that take a cardinal position in the overall pattern of values. There is general
agreement in the literature that values do not influence people's activity directly but rather indirectly through attitudes and goals. Thus, values are seen as a source of motivation for individual action. With respect to the societal level, a similar indirect influence is assumed: values define norms and shared goals, which elicit and guide collective action. Although people's activity in the work domain, dividing time between work and family, is likely to depend more on work values than on general values, the role of general values should not be overlooked. A study by Sagie (1993) shows religiosity to be a factor that determines how young people perceive their work obligations.

Descriptive studies revealing and comparing the profiles of particular groups are of interest in themselves. But once differences are found, one should explain where these differences come from and which consequences they have for social and individual life. Unfortunately, this kind of explanatory research on values is still rather scarce. Research studies with a sociological origin typically look for differences in the natural environment, economic circumstances and religion as explaining factors (e.g. Parsons & Shils, 1951). More recent research has put more emphasis on economic development and the process of modernization resulting from it (e.g. Ester et al, 1993). Studies of individual values consider such societal factors as "distal" and look for more proximal factors, such as the person's occupation, family situation, and demographic characteristics (Triandis, 1972; Zanders, 1993). Work values have been linked
with a variety of individual behavior, including labour market participation (Feather, 1990; Lobodzinska, 1996), career choice (Kalleberg & Stark, 1993; Young, 1984; Zytowski, 1994) and work performance (Swenson & Herche, 1994; Vora, 1993).

Values and Work in Practice

The relationship between personal values and work activities make the subject of values interesting in the context of psychology. If one wishes to know how values would enhance or restrain occupational activities, directly or indirectly, one could profit from that knowledge in the optimization of work activity and its outcomes. Generally speaking, there are two main approaches to the optimization of work activity and outcomes. One is based on selection and allocation. Examples are: finding people with the appropriate values to do a certain job, choosing the proper job for people with given values and bringing together people with similar values. The other approach is to modify the values by means of educational or propagandistic interventions. Such modification can aim at the promotion of a particular profile of values or at greater homogeneity between people in a group. Both approaches are based on the general assumption that values in particular work values, have an effect on people's behavior at work. Values are considered to be motivating and thus to contribute to positive outcomes. Values congruence is supposed to reduce conflict and improve cooperation.
Review of the related literature impresses that value researchers have devoted little attention to the prediction of work activity as such. The most conspicuous exception at the individual level is research on the vocational choice. As a consequence, young people's values has been recognized to be important factors choosing the right occupation. Work Value Inventory (Super, 1996) has been utilized in practical settings on a substantial scale. Yet our knowledge of the relative role of values compared to other variables such as interest, abilities, and educational qualifications and the contribution of value-based choice is far from complete and calls for further research. In addition, there is some knowledge about values in the context of personal selection, but it is clear that in this domain values like interest have little power in predicting job success (Hunter & Hunter, 1984).

There is yet little research evidence on the modification of values. Values are thought to be relatively stable and less malleable than attitudes. This probably explains why many interventions aim at changing attitudes rather than values. Nevertheless there are two domains in which policy-makers and change agents have tried to bring about value change. One is the domain of family and work, where the focus has been on a fair division of work and household roles between men and women. The other is the domain of so-called "culture change" programmes in organizations. Although values have yet been focal in most studies on family and work. There is little evidence to support his position (Roe,
1996; Vande Akker, Van de Arort, & Van de Elzen, 1994). Values, once established during socialization, are relatively enduring over the individual life course, and that what appears to be change in values is in part a reflection of value differences between successive generations exposed to different events and living conditions (Jepsen, 1984; Krau, 1989; Wijting, Arnold & Conrad, 1978). However, there is a distinct lack of clarity concerning the way in which people learn and the role played by generational differences (Beeker, 1995).

Natural change of values takes place under particular social conditions, such as the decline of "work ethics" among certain groups of people. There is some evidence that the difficulties young people in western societies meet in their early work career, including the experience of unemployment, may affect their work values (Feather, 1990; Isralovitz & Singer, 1986; Judge & Bretz, 1992; O'Brien & Feather, 1990). In fact, people may re-evaluate the importance of work, which facilitates the adaptation to their personal situation, but at the same time impedes re-entry into employment. In such cases one might think of preventive interventions aiming at the creation of conditions that avoid such value change. Perhaps the most exciting theoretical development in the field of values and work, with great potential implications for practice, is the recent work by Frez & Earley (1993). Their "cultural self-presentation theory" deals with the question of how cultural factors, including values can account for the fact that managerial interventions such as , for example, goal setting, job
enrichment, quality-circles, performance-based pay, have differed so greatly in effectiveness. It postulates that workers responses to such interventions depend on the effects they expect these interventions to have on the different facets of their 'selves'.

The third important variable which has been taken into account for the present study is occupational stress. Before, we discuss the term occupational stress, it is important to look into the term stress. The term stress has a variety of meanings and interpretations to the people who use the word. Even the stress experts do not agree on its definitions. Stress carries a negative connotations for some people, as though it was something to be avoided. Stress or the stress response, is the unconscious preparation to fight or flight, that a person experiences when faced with any demands (Quick & Quick, 1984). A stressor, or demand, is the person or event that trigger the stress response. Distress or strain differs to the adverse psychological, physical, behavioural or organisational consequences that may occur as a result of stressful events.

There are four different approaches to defining stress: the homeostatic/medical, cognitive appraisal, the person fit, and psychoanalytic. These four approaches to stress give us a more complete understanding of what stress really is. Since the purpose of the present investigation is to study occupational stress, it is therefore, desirable to give the detailed account of occupational stress.
The four approaches to defining stress emphasize demands, or sources of stress, for people at work. We can organise these demands into the general categories of tasks demands, role demands, interpersonal demands and the physical demands.

**Occupational Stress**

Life in general more or less stressful, and stress at work may eventually result in acute or chronic illness or in physical dysfunction. Exposure to occupational stress is one aspect, individual differences in coping the stress is another. Stress at work resulting from increasing complexities at work and its divergent task demands have become a prominent features of the modern organisations.

Due to minute differences in the phenomenon of job stress, work stress, occupational stress and organizational stress, the experts' use this terms interchangeably. Organizational stress arises out of organizational climate and structure. Job stress is the result of physical working conditions while experienced during the work performance of the employees. On the other hand, occupational stress is used in broader way, which refers to the intrinsic aspects of jobs, organizational structure and climate as well as the role facets in the organization. Literature survey on occupational stress reveals that there are number of factors related to job, effect the behavior of employees and as a result the normal life is disturbed (Maclean, 1974; Brief, Schuler, Van & Sell,
1981). All the above highlighted factors either related to employees, environment or are born due to interaction of the factors related to employees and environment. A number of theories of human stress (Pervin, 1968) and performance (McGrath, 1976) are based on the programmatic view that behavior is a function of characteristic of a persons and environment (Lewin, 1935; Murray, 1938). Stress at work resulting from increasing complexities of work and its divergent demands have become a prominent and pervading features of the modern organizations. The researcher in the area of organizational psychology and management have used the term job stress to denote employees mental state aroused by job situation or a combination of job situation perceived as presenting excessive and divergent demands. Some stress researchers have emphasized the role of job situations in their definition of occupational stress. Caplan Cobb, and French (1975) defined occupational stress as " any characteristics of job environment which poses a threat to the individual" Cooper Marshall (1976)have expressed that "by occupational stress is meant negative environmental factors or stressors associated with a particular job"

But some other stress researchers have tried to define it in terms of interaction between worker and work environment. The stressfulness of a job situation or a factors is determined not only by the divergent or threatening demands of the situation but by how the individual perceives and evaluates it with defines to his own capability and characteristics. The definition proposed by
Margolis, Kores and Quinn (1974) falls in this category. They define stress as "a condition at work interacting with workers characteristics to disrupt his psychological or physiological homeostasis". Similarly, Beehr and Newman (1978) described job stress as "a condition wherein job related factors interact with the workers to change his psychological conditions such that the person is forced to deviate from normal functioning". Parasuraman and Alluto (1981) also reported that job demands, constraints, and job related events or situations were not in themselves stressful, but that they may be capable of producing psychological stress and strain, depending upon personal attributes and other factors. Allen, Hitt, and Green (1982) have defined "occupational stress as disruption in individual's psychological and physiological homeostasis that forces them to deviate from natural functioning in interaction with their jobs and work environment". Consistant with recent conceptulization, stress denotes the psychological state experienced by an employees when faced with demands, constraints, and /or opportunities that have important but uncertain outcomes (Beehr & Bhagat, 1985; Schuler, 1980).

Model of Occupational Stress

French, Rodgers and Cobb (1974) proposed the theory of Person-Environment Fit perspective of occupational stress. According to this theory poor fit or misfit between employee and his work and its environment results in stress and psychological and health strains. This theory is based on the assumption that
people vary in their needs, expectations and abilities just as jobs vary in their requirements, demands and incentives. When there is poor fit between the characteristics of the employees and of the jobs, person–environment fit theory predicts the employees' well-being is affected. In this theory the fit is not unilateral. It is rather bilateral fit between employees and his jobs. Both should satisfy each other's demands or expectations. Poor or insufficient supply from either side would cause stress. One form of fit involves the discrepancy between the needs and aspirations of the employees and the supplies in the job and environment to meet his needs and goals. A good person–environment fit occurs when the supplies in the environment (i.e., money, supply from superiors and colleagues, opportunities to satisfy needs for affiliations, power and achievement) are sufficient to satisfy the motives of the employees.

Person-Environment Fit theory emphasizes the causal relationship between misfit and strains. It involves the relationship between the requirements and demands of the jobs and the abilities of the employee to meet those demands. If the demands of the jobs exceed the abilities of the employees or do not match with the temperament and the interests of the employees, it will cause stress and results in psychological strain. If supplies for the motives of the person are threatened by discrepancies between demands and abilities, the individuals will experience stress.
The degree of Person-Environment Fit can be determined objectively. Objective Person-Environment Fit refers to fit between the objective person and the objective environment, i.e., fit independent of individual's perception of it. Subjective Person-Environment Fit refers to the fit between subjective person and subjective environment, i.e., the individual's perception of Person-Environment Fit. Person-Environment Fit represents the interaction of the person and the environment rather than an outcome which each cause. The central theme of the theory was that misfit of both kind results stress and threat to well-being of the focal employees. Harrison (1976) also accepted and proved validity of the Person-Environment Fit model of job stress. Ross and Altmaier (1994) have also defined occupational stress in the Person-Environment Fit framework. According to them, "occupational stress is the result of interaction of work conditions with characteristics of the worker such that demands of the work exceeds the ability of the worker to cope with these. McGrath has described occupational stress as an environmental situation perceived as presenting a job demand, which seems to exceed the capacity and resources of the employee to meet or deal with it. However, the nature and severity of occupational stress may be more adequately and conveniently understood observing physical symptoms, which occur in the employee under the condition of job stress. Beehr and Newman (1976) have outlined three categories of these symptoms.

**Psychological Symptoms**: Those emotional and cognitive problems that occur under conditions of job stress. Psychological symptoms of occupational stress
include job dissatisfaction, disliking for the job, depression, anxiety, boredom, frustration, isolation and resentment. Having these problems, the employee in less, able to cope with job problems in ways that would improve his work conditions and enhance his mental outlook.

**Physical symptoms**: Though it is difficult to know how much these physical symptoms have been caused by a particular job stress versus other aspect of employee’s life, it has been established that consistent job stress links with certain physical symptoms and diseases. Among the common psychical symptoms of occupational stress are cardio vascular diseases, headaches, gastrointestinal problems, allergies and skin diseases.

**Behavioural Symptoms**: The behavioral symptoms of job stress can be classified in two categories. The first category of the symptoms belongs to the organization. The employee entered symptoms are avoidance of work, increase intake of alcohol and drugs, overeating or undereating, aggressions towards coworkers, family members and interpersonal problems in general. The organization related symptoms of job stress include absenteeism, leaving the job, accident proneness and decrease in work efficiency.

**Sources of Occupational Stress**

Stress is experienced by almost all the people in all spheres of life, such as in the event of death of any relative, conflict between friends and family
members, failure in examinations and business/professional activities etc. but here, basically we are interested in those factors which are responsible for stress in organizational setting. These factors may be work, load, organizational roles, policies, politics, relationship among employees at both horizontal and vertical levels. Cooper and Marshall (1976) and McGrath (1976) pointed out the major sources of stress which can be categorized broadly as organizational structure and climate, factors intrinsic to the job, role in the organization; career development relationship at work. Role stress is an organizational variable, which is the major occupational stress. Role stress can be referred to as a particular role in the organization to the extent to which the employee's expectations and organizational expectations match. Many systems of classifications have been used to discuss role stress.

Kahn & Quinn (1970) classified role stress into three categories (1) expectation generated stress which includes role ambiguity and role conflict (2) expectation resources discrepancies, which includes role overload, responsibility authority dilemma & inadequate technical information; and (3) the third category is of role and personality. French and Caplan (1973) have indicated role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload as general types of role stress. Role conflict implies an incompatibility between job tasks, resources, rules or policies and other people (Nicholson & Goh, 1983). Role ambiguity is the state of uncertainty and lack of clarity regarding job duties and responsibilities (Kahn. et
al, 1964; Marshall & Cooper, 1979). So far as role overload is concerned, it has also been reported as an important source of occupational stress in which an individual is faced with a set of obligations requiring him to do more within a specified time limit (Sales, 1969).

Many studies have revealed that role stress negatively correlated with satisfaction with pay, job itself, advancement, supervision, motivation and positively correlated with anxiety, depression & resentment turnover, absenteeism etc. (Keller, 1975; Brief & Aldag, 1976; Caplan & Jones, 1970; Kahn et al. 1964; Johnson and Sarason, 1973; Singh, Agarwal, and Malhan, 1981; Jagdish and Srivastava, 1983). Pareek (1983b & c) pointed out that recent researchers have been done only on three role stressors, namely, role ambiguity, role conflict and role overload, although he found many other role stressors in organization. These includes self role distance, inter role distance, role isolation, role ambiguity, role expectations, role conflict, resource inadequacy, role stagnation, role erosion and role overload. While Pestonjee (1991) identified four leading stressors namely, role erosion, role expectation and conflict, role isolation and inter-role distance.

After having a prolonged discussion on stressors, it became important to highlight the contention expressed by Vanchon (1987), who conducted a study on executives and pointed out that role stress may occur not only during one's official professional job but may also result from the fact that
Vanchon's view provides significant information that role stress does not only have its impact within the organization but also outside the organization i.e. in the family and other segments of socio-cultural conditions. This contention seems to get validated by Sen's (1981) study that concludes that women experience more role stress as compared to men. Akhtar & Vadra (1990) pointed out that there are many sources of stress within the organization which are directly or indirectly related to the outside events. Amongst other factors, family and society has its greater impact such as illness of any family member, the conflict between the members of the family, family financial crisis etc. Cooper (1981) pointed out that stress at work can affect the individual in home as well as in society in which he lives.

Here the phenomenon of occupational stress is specifically concerned in the work context. At this juncture it is necessary to clarify our view that role stressors themselves are the important major ingredients of occupational stress. Since role stressors were more significantly observed, so it occupied its overwhelming position but later on these were incorporated in the broader concept of occupational stress. Therefore, the description of role stressors was not out of context.

Available studies regarding the variables of occupational stress are the major concern. To measure occupational stress, probably Srivastava & Singh
(1981) are among a few people who invented a device, a psychometric test known as "Occupational Stress Index". The Occupational Stress Index comprised twelve stressors. A large number of studies in Indian context have been witnessed that occupational stress still occupies a major place in the areas of organizational behavior for psychologists, managers, supervisors and specifically of HRD specialists.

Jagdish (1983) pointed out that large numbers of studies are available in the context of occupational stress. He tried to link occupational stress in relation to job satisfaction and mental health on the samples of first level supervisors. He reported that with the exception of responsibility for persons factors of occupational stress. All other eleven stressors are significantly impaired supervisor's job satisfaction. Moreover, he also reported that employees job satisfaction are significantly moderated relationship between occupational stress and mental health. Very few attempts have been made to study stress experienced by the employees across the various job levels in the organization. (Khanna, 1985; Bhasker, 1986; Singh, 1987). Most of the researchers have studied occupational stress from the pathological point of view. Although, occupational stress plays a vital role in any organization and it is found to be highly associated with absenteeism (Gupta and Beehr, 1979; Morgolis, Kores and Quinn, 1974), and job satisfaction (Miles, 1985; Beehr, 1976; and Pestonjee and Singh, 1982). Taylor and Conconi (1988) examined
occupational stress research and concluded that psychological factors can affect job satisfaction, work adjustment, work attitudes, and overall well-being in the work environment.

In one of the studies, Bason (1998) described potential sources of occupational stress comprising (I) factors intrinsic to job (II) role in the organization, and (III) organizational structure and climate. Few studies on occupational stress have been reported in last few years. Allen & Fry (1987) found sex as moderator variables in establishing occupational stress, organizational effectiveness and relationships. Singh (1990) found significant negative correlation between social support and various sub-scales of occupational stress viz., job satisfaction, organizational stress and somatic distress. High levels of perceived social support were found to be associated with low level of perceived occupational stress.

Ganeshan & Johnson (1992) studied occupational stress and health. On the basis of the finding they emphasized that organizational groups and the supervisors in the lower range experienced career stressors, but these stressors were indicative of a possible casual relationship to physical and psychological symptoms and to the physiological indicators of stress. A new look of research in the area of occupational stress have indicated that stress at work are many which can be broadly put under the broad categories of organizational, environmental, and individual factors.
Consequences of Occupational Stress

The term 'stress' has been generally represented as an undesirable and a negative force causing disruption in psychological and physiological homeostasis of the focal person. In the situation of severe stress, human constitution and capacities are taxed severely and his overall effectiveness is distorted. Majority of stress researchers have concluded that stress gives rise to negative emotional experiences causing significant deterioration in individuals' adjustment, behavior effectiveness and health. The nature of the response to stress was first studied by Walter Cannan (1914) and in mid-1920s by Hans Selye. These two psychologists have made significant contribution to the understanding of stress response and the effects of its mismanagement. More recently there has been an important focus on the health consequences of stress in the work place, both out of concern for individuals and organizations. This concern is founded on the idea that the intense or persistent stimulation of the stress response can result in a host of health problems. Stress may arouse the individual for improving performance and problem solving, but starts hampering performance when its intensity reaches a disruptive level, which varies with the characteristics of the focal person and the task being performed.

Physiological consequences of stress include increase in serum and cholesterol levels, blood pressure, heart rate, adrenaline levels and respiratory rates. With prolonged high level of stress a variety of psychosomatic disease may occur. Various dimensions of job behavior such as performance, job satisfaction, absenteeism and turnover are also affected by the stresses of job life.