Chapter One

Introduction
INTRODUCTION:

Research on the causes and consequences of stress in organisation has gained popularity in recent few years. Researchers investigating organisational stress have noted a number of dysfunctional outcomes resulting from stress both physiological and psychological, which ultimately affect the functioning, and effectiveness of the organisation and its employees. Stress and burnout are important concerned for those involved in human service. Over the last few years, burnout has become a “buzzword” used to convey an almost unlimited variety of social and personal problems. Burnout refers to the loss of enthusiasm, excitement and essence of mission in one’s work. It also causes feeling of helplessness, hopelessness, depression, meaninglessness, negative self-concept and attitude toward work, life and other people. The rate of absenteeism has also been found very high in the case of burnout professionals. Burnout professional becomes noticeably less idealistic and more rigid. Burnout may also have impairing effect on the performance of the workers. There is considerable evidence that burnout is directly associated with adverse health and well being of the people (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). Burnout leads to emotional stress (often manifest as esteem), Physiological problems (Ulcers, Headache, backaches, fatigue, and high blood pressure) and increased marital and family conflicts. Where as stress has been defined as a state wherein expected functioning of the employees get disturbed Machanic, (1962). Still researches in the
realm of burnout are quite limited, contradictory and incomplete. Therefore, present investigation is aimed to observe the influence of organisational role stress, job involvement and personality hardiness on employees job burnout. In the present investigation Organisational Role Stress, Job Involvement and Personality Hardiness have been taken into good consideration as independent variables and the concept of burnout as a dependent variable. Apart from above mentioned three independent variables some demographic variables likewise age, and job tenure are also taken into good consideration in order to widen up the scope of present investigation.

**DEFINITIONAL ASPECT OF BURNOUT:**

According to the publishers of Merrian Webster’s Dictionaries, burnout was a concern in the field of professional athletics and the performing arts in the 1930’s. Present interest in the area grew out of the early work of Herbert Freudenberger and Christina Maslach. Their efforts and the work of others they stimulated led to the first National Conference on burnout held in Philadelphia in Nov, 1981. There is no single definition of burnout that is accepted as standard, different opinions define it differently.

Mc Fadden (1980) explained that Organisational burnout can be defined as "a collection of symptoms which are characterised by low morale in the workers, declining
in rates of overall production, elevated levels of work absenteeism. Poor or inadequate communication among workers and increased level of job attribution”.

Maslach (1976) define burnout as the “loss of concern for the people with whom one is working”.

Cherniss (1980) describes burnout as a “process in which a previously committed professional disengaged from his or her work in response to stress & strain experienced in the job.

Maslach (1982) provided a vivid description of the burnout syndrome by relating that the term “burnout " evokes images of a final, flickering flame, of a hared and empty shell, of dying embers and cold, grey ashes". This description may typify the feeling that many professionals in the human service organisations experience (Mpracco and Maslach, 1980)

In a treatise on stress, Paine (1982) has observed “Burnout stress syndrome (BOSS), the consequences of high level of job stress, personal frustration and inadequate coping skills, has major personal, Organisational and social costs and these costs are probably increasing”.

BOSS is a debilitating psychological condition brought about by unrelieved work stress, resulting in depletion of energy reserves, lowered resistance to illness, increased dissatisfaction and pessimism, and increased absenteeism and inefficiency at work (Veningale and Spradley, 1981).

Maslach (1983) operationally defined Burnout as psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with other people in some capacity.
Pines and Aronson (1988) define burnout as a condition of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion that is the result of chronic emotional strain.

Gastar and Schaubroek (1991) define burnout as a type of stress—a chronic affective response pattern to stressful work conditions that features high levels of interpersonal contact (Cordes and Dougherty, 1993). Burnout process is consistent with the stress-strain coping framework (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). Where emotional exhaustion can be viewed as a form of strain and depersonalisation as a form of coping (Lee and Ashforth, 1993a).

Burnout has become an explanation for all sorts of decrements and deficiencies (Freudenberger, 1977, 1980). Most discussion of burnout emphasize contact with people and the factors that made contact particularly difficult or emotionally stressful. The primary focus of burnout attention has been on people-helping job and professions (Human services, health care, and education). Probably because these are people work-work situation par excellence. Those in people-helping jobs or professions as Maslach and Jackson explain (1981), “they are often required to spend considerable time in intense involvement with troubled people, and these exchanges commonly become charged with feeling of anger, embarrassment, frustration, fear or despair”. The resulting chronic tension and stress can be emotionally training, which leaves the professional “empty” and “burnout”.

Burnout is also a construct used to explain observable decrements in the typical quantity and quality of work performed by a person on the job. Presumably, the people who are burning out are experience psychological distress as a consequences of their
exposure to stressors and frustrations that exceed their tolerance and resources for successfully coping with stress and frustration.

STAGES OF BURNOUT:

There are five different stages of burnout:

I. HONEYMOON STAGE: In the honeymoon stage, there is an euphoric feeling of encounter with the new job. There is excitement, enthusiasm, pride and challenge. Dysfunctional features emerge in two ways: firstly, the energy reserves are gradually depleted in coping with the demands of a challenging environment; secondly, habits and strategies for coping with stress are formed in this stage which are often not useful with later challenges.

II. FUEL SHORTAGE STAGE:

In the fuel shortage there is a vague feeling of loss, fatigue and confusion. The symptoms are job dissatisfaction, inefficiency, fatigue and sleep disturbances leading to escape activities such as increased eating, drinking and smoking. Further difficulties are signalled at this stage.

III. CHRONIC STAGE:

When these psychological and physiological symptoms persist over a period of time, the individual enters the stage of crisis. He feels oppressed, there is heightened pessimism and self doubting tendency, one develops an ‘escape
mentality', peptic ulcer, tension headaches, high blood pressure are some of the symptoms of the crisis period. They may become acute.

IV. CRISIS STAGE:

The physiological symptoms become more pronounced and demand attention and help at this stage. Common symptoms are chronic exhaustion, physical illness, anger and depression. A sense of fatigue and exhaustion overtake the individual.

V. HITTING THE WALL STAGE:

The phrase "hitting the wall" is taken from athletics. It is said a marathon, actually begins at the "twenty-mile mark with six yet to go". It is at this stage that the runner has hit the wall. It is an experience so devastating that it can completely knock a person out. This leads to muscle paralysis, dizziness, and fainting and even complete collapse. Similar experience have been observed in the executive when all the energy depleted like the glycogen of a marathon runner, one may lose control over one's life; it may be the end of a professional career. While recovery from this stage may elude some, others may be resourceful enough to tide over the crisis.

DIMENSIONS OF BURNOUT:

Maslach has identified three major dimensions of burnout:

(1). Emotional Exhaustion

(2). Depersonalisation
(3). Personal Accomplishment

EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION:

As Defined by Maslach and colleagues (1980, 1981, 1982), it is characterised by a lack of energy and feeling that one’s emotional resources are used. This “compassion fatigue” may coexist with feelings of frustration and tension.

DEPERSONALIZATION:

As defined by Maslach and colleagues (1980, 1981, 1982), it is marked by treatment of subordinates and colleagues as objects rather than people. Individuals may display a detached and an emotional callousness and may be cynical toward colleagues, subordinates, and organisation.

DIMINISHED PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT:

As defined by Maslach and colleagues (1980, 1981, 1982), it is characterised by a tendency to evaluate oneself negatively. Individuals experience a decline in feeling of job competence and successful achievement in their work or interactions with people.

SYMPTOMS OF BURNOUT:

When an individual burns out, there are five stages of his/her symptoms:

1. The individual who burns out is likely to be very enthusiastic, when first entering the organisation. One can become emotionally exhausted unless there is first an emotional commitment.
2. The initial enthusiasm soon gives way to stagnation as the individual realizes that he or she will not be able to solve all the problem the organisation faces.

3. This leads to frustration on the part of the individual because important problems are not being solved.

4. This frustration may eventually lead to apathy towards the organisation.

5. Eventually the only way an individual may be able to do something about his or her individual burnout is through outside intervention. This intervention may take the form of counselling or, more likely, leaving the situation that caused the burnout.

Burnout according to Caldwell and Ihrke is job related. It is not caused by problems at home. While the presence of a strong family support at home may help alleviate the development of burnout in an individual, family problems do not cause someone to burnout on a particular job. The employees most likely to burnout are enthusiastic, young and idealistic. Burnout is caused by strong idealistic commitment that runs head into the realistic of a particular position.

Burnout professionals are more frequently absent or late for work than their nonburnout colleagues, they become noticeably less idealistic and more rigid, their performance at work deteriorates markedly, and they may fantasize or actually plan on leaving the profession. Further more, the frustration attendant to the phenomenon of burnout may lead to emotional stress (often manifest as esteem), psychosomatic problems (Insomnia, ulcers, headaches, backaches, fatigue, high blood pressure) and increased marital and family conflicts. First of all, there is a general agreement that burnout occurs at an individual levels, second, there is general agreement that burnout
is an internal psychological experience involving feeling, attitudes, motives and expectations, third, there is a general experience for the individual in that it concern problems, distress, discomfort, dysfunction and/or negative consequences.

CAUSES OF BURNOUT:

It has been observed in literature and in relevant studies on burnout that burnout is an important issue in human services, like, nurses, teachers, doctors, social workers, police officers etc. There are some important reasons of this issue, which may be as follows:

1. Burnout clearly affects the staff member's morale and psychological wellbeing.
2. Burnout seems to affect the quality of care and treatment provided to clients.
3. Burnout may have a strong influence on administration functions, high rates of burnout can cause havoc in community programme.
4. Finally, burnout in other community settings, would seem to be legitimate in fact, necessary concern of human service programme.

Paine (1984) give the reason, why professionals are victims to burnedout:::-

I. Chronic distress is causal factors in burnout.
II. Burnout is real person problem.
III. Burnout is a human condition.
IV. Burnout is an energy crisis.
V. Burnout affects the whole person.

Different psychologist described different causes of burnout. Among the most cited factors are: over commitment, excessive dedication, lack of awareness of one’s limitations (Freudenberger, 1975; Freudenberger, 1977; Patric, 1979), lack of separation between one’s life and work (Mattingly, 1977), stressful working conditions or environment (Maslach & Pines, 1979; Pines & Maslach, 1973), responsibility without authority or resources to accomplishments, lack of support system, stress in personal lives, emotional demands and a failure to realize one’s expectations.

Petric contents that professionals require unidirectional giving increase to the risk of burnout. Often person with many of the most valued and appreciated personal qualities seek careers that support use of these inherent or developing capacities; their success may support burnout risk factors.

Harris (1984) reported that the organisational variables related to burnout include bureaucratisation, communication, and level of decision making, role models, job expectation, physical environment and psychological environment. Schwab (1983) contends that people involved in prolonged constant, intensive interaction with people in an emotionally charged atmosphere are susceptible to the symptoms of burnout.

Pareek (1982) describe nine factors, which contribute either to glow up or burnout: these are as follows-

1. **Level of Stress**: When stress is either too little or too much it leads to hyperstress or hypostress.
2. **Type of Stress:** It can be either functional or dysfunctional—the first is called ‘eustress’ and the second ‘Dystress’.

3. **Personality:** There are certain personality dimensions which lead to burnout:— external locus of control (a feeling that the executive is being controlled by other people and force), low interpersonal trust, low self esteem, rigidity and suspiciousness, withdrawal, alienation and machiavellism (a tendency to manipulate people).

4. **Nature of Job or the role:** The job is highly routinised, does not allow any diversity or freedom and does not provide opportunity for creativity and growth, it can lead to burnout. Research has found that role efficacy has a very negative relationship with perceived role stress.

5. **Non-Work Life:** The executive’s social or economic conditions, family life and relationships, family and other obligations, health conditions, etc, also contribute to his glow up or burnout.

6. **Life Style:** The pattern of structuring one’s time may be called the life style. Stress dissipating life style, contributing to executive glow up, is characterised by a relaxed life, taking up creative pursuits, spending meaningful time with family and friends, involvement in meaningful activities like religion, ideology, social cause, working for underprivileged, etc. On the other hand, stress absorbing life style is characterised by narrow interest, limiting oneself to work and leading a tense and structural living, such people are called workaholics.

7. **Role Style:** Role style can be broadly classified into avoidance and approach. Approach is indicated by hope or success, influence, orderliness, relevance,
acceptance and growth. Avoidance style is indicated by an executive acting out of fear of failure, helplessness, chaos, irrelevance exclusion or inadequacy.

8. **Coping Style:** Dysfunctional style is characterised by fatalism, blaming, showing aggression towards others and defensive mode-denying the stress or justifying or rationalising it. Functional styles are persistent in nature, characterised by the hope for the solution of a problem or attempts to solve the problem alone or seeking others help or jointly working with others for the solution.

9. **Organisational Climate:** A supportive Organisational climate can as much contribute to executive glow up as a hostile climate to executive burnout, one finding showed that organisational climate perceived as developing excellence in people was significantly associated with low role stress and one perceive as characterised by strong control over people with high role stress.

**BURNOUT AMONG TEACHERS:**

Iwanicki (1981) has provided a current perspective on teacher's stress and burnout. According to him, societal sources of distress results from the pressure placed on schools by social and political forces in the community. Another major source of distress among educators resulted from the failure of Schools to organise properly to meet the demands of the public as well as the needs of teachers and students. The most cited sources of burnout among teachers are role related distress, classroom discipline problems, difficulty in developing appropriate instructional problems for students with special needs, finding sufficient time for professional development and
developing positive relations with administrators, poor teachers and parents. These societal, organisational and role related sources of teacher distress are inter-related and cumulative. A review of literature on teachers burnout indicates that burnout is caused by high levels of stress related to inordinate time demands, inadequate relationship, large classroom size, lack of resources, isolation, fear of violence, role ambiguity, limited promotional opportunities and lack of support (Cunninggham, 1983). Glicken (1983) has found that the following categories of behaviour or personality types are associated with burnout:

1. Obsession with self
2. Obsession with outside forces
3. Need for complete control
4. Fear of charge
5. Need for constant excitement and
6. Unrealistic expectations

Some job characteristics that may lead to burnout include responsibility without authority, lack of control and high involvement with people, some individual characteristics that may contribute to burnout includes: -Type A behaviour pattern, a lack of sense of control and undue emphasis on the job in one's hierarchy of values. Researches on the causes of burnout have emphasised factors in the work environment to be relatively more important than characteristics of individuals. Lack of clarity, control, support and feedback as well as work overload were particularly significant sources of burnout in education.
Russell, Altmaier & Volzen (1987) studied burnout in teachers and concluded that negative aspects of job are among the stressors that confront teachers.

Kyricou et al., (1978) has reported that teacher stress and burnout stems from - (1) the mounting evidence that prolonged occupational stress can lead to both mental and physical health. (2) a general concern to improve the quality of the teachers working lives(3) a concern that stress and burnout may significantly impacts the working relationship a teacher has with his pupils and the quality of teaching and commitment he is able to display. Thus, burnout is considered a problem that is found primarily with the helping professions and the major reason for this is the intense involvement with people that characterised these jobs (Paine, 1984).

Burnout, though is more than a "hot topic". It is a serious issue that affects the welfare of not only millions of human services workers but of their tens millions of clients as well. Teachers and their students, psychotherapist and their patients, caseworkers and their clients are all potential victims of the attitude and behaviour that are the characteristics of burnout. Burnout has most often been discussed and written about in relation to teaching and teachers. Burned out teachers like other burnout professionals, complain of psychosomatic symptoms (e.g., exhaustion, insomnia, ulcer, headaches) as well as family conflicts (Cherniss, 1980; Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980; Maslach, 1976; Mc Guire, 1979).
CONSEQUENCES OF BURNOUT:

Service employees typically begin their career with a strong sense of commitment and sacrifice (Cherniss, 1980). Initially, the career is seen as intrinsically rewarding and major source of gratification, but as work demands and interaction with others begin to take their toll, many come to feel increasingly isolated and less committed. They become less interested in the intrinsic aspects of their work and more interested in the extrinsic rewards (Edelwich and Broadsky, 1980). The decreased professional commitment thus reflects a shift in attitudes concerning the significance of work (i.e. the career is seen as a burden rather than a calling), and represents one way of reducing emotional strain. Edelwich and Broadsky (1980) suggest that when apathy takes hold, employees either give up on the job by becoming less committed or give up the job and profession altogether. Career dissatisfaction can thus lead to thoughts of changing careers, which in turn may lead to job search behaviours (Bartel, 1979; Rhodes and Doering, 1983). Hence, in addition to the direct link between burnout and turnover intentions posited in Lee and Ashforth, it is likely that burnout may indirectly affect such intentions through decreased professional commitment. The model is also hold that emotional exhaustion is indirectly a function of (1) social support, and (2) direct and indirect control, since previous literature has tended to argue that social support and control exert a more direct effect on burnout (e.g. Cherniss, 1980; Shinn, Rosarie, Morch and Chestnut, 1984). In turn, emotional exhaustion is directly related to:

I. Depersonalisation and reduced personal accomplishment and
II. Psychological withdrawal, including turnover intentions and reduced professional commitment.

Shelly identified 32 significant organisational job specific and individual variables of burnout among respiratory care practitioners in Georgia.

Significant relationships were indicated between certain organisational and individual variables and burnout. Of these the strongest were time off, control, respect, role clarity, job stress, satisfaction with work, age, number of dependent children at home, social support and health. Further, burnout, absenteeism and attribution were related. Finally, as job satisfaction declined, burnout increased.

**BURNOUT AND ITS CORRELATES:**

However there are some important antecedents of Burnout, they are as follows:

1. **PERSONALITY AS AN ANTECEDENT OF BURNOUT:**

In examining the psychological manifestations of occupational stress, the literature supports the role of personality as a key mediator between stimulus and response (Cooper and Marshall, 1976). There are two central features of stress at work, the interaction of which determines either coping or maladaptive behaviour and stress related disease (Cooper and Marshall, 1975): I. the characteristics of the person and II. Potential sources of stress in the work environment; or as Lofquist and Davis (1969) have labelled this interaction the 'Person-Environment Fit'.
Several types of individual differences at work either as mediators or as moderators in the work stress process, examples included personality traits, work expectations and health related factors (Kobasa, 1982; Parasuraman and Clerk, 1984; Hendrix, Ovalle and Troxler, 1985 and Parkes, 1987). Owens (1976) has shown the importance of biographical data in that it could be viewed as an input for predictive, diagnostic and counselling purposes. Weiss, Ilgen and Shabaugh (1982) related demographic variables with stressful events and job search. They reported age, tenure in organisation and hierarchical position to be negatively related and marital status and education to be unrelated with stress and job search.

Nath (1980) reported a negative relationship between length of service and role ambiguity. A negative relationship between turnover and age and tenure, implying that employees with less age and shorter length of service showed a higher tendency to leave, has been reported in a number of studies. Friedman and Rosenman (Friedman, 1979; Rosenman et al, 1964, 1966) showed a relationship between behavioural patterns and the prevalence of chronic heart diseases (CHDs). They divided individuals into "type A" and "type B".

Type A exhibited overt behavioural syndrome or style of life, characterised by extremes of competitiveness, striving for achievement, aggressiveness, haste, impatience, restlessness, hyperalertness, explosiveness of speech and feeling of being under pressure of time and under the challenge of responsibility. It was suggested that 'people having this particular behaviour pattern were often so deeply involved and committed to their work that other aspects of their lives were relatively neglected'.
Many studies have confirmed the vulnerability of type A men to CHDs. This behaviour pattern has also been found to intensify health complaints such as loss of appetite, depression or headaches (Matheson and Ivancevich, 1982). Some researchers placed strong emphasis on interaction between type A behaviour and other personality variables that have been linked to coronary reactivity or strain. Lee et al., studied in depth the dimension of optimism.

Researches have suggested that dispositional optimism may have implications for the manner in which people cope with stress. A study by Scheir (1986) found that optimism were more likely to deal with stressful encounters by using ‘problem-focused’ strategies such as formulating action plans, keeping their minds to task at hand and not thinking about negative emotions with which the stress was associated. Pessimism was associated with ‘emotion-focused’ coping strategies of denial and distancing, focussing on stressful feelings and avoidance or disengaging from the goal with which the stresser was interfering. According to Smith (1966) these ‘active or problem-focused coping strategies’ may be physiologically taxing, especially if they persist over many years.

Lee et al., emphasize on the moderating role of optimism in the type A behaviour dimensions and health risk relationships such that optimism lowers the health risks for the achievement striving individuals.
Sarason and Spielberger (1975) maintain that there are mediating factors between the stressor and the coping response, which affect the detection, appraisal and interpretation of the stressor by the person. They are:

1. Age
2. Sex
3. Birth order
4. Marital Status
5. Stage in his developmental cycle at which he is affected
6. The individual’s and the group’s race or ethnicity is important at least for the likelihood, degree and nature of its exposure to discrimination.
7. Child rearing practice also partly affects the type of defence mechanisms learned and used.
8. The family structure
9. Marital satisfaction and intra-familial quarrels
10. Socio-economic class
11. Status and reference group of the individual.
12. Nature of role demands on the person, their clarity and the degree of flexibility in role performance allowed
13. The type and nature of one’s occupation
14. The power relationships involved in the transaction.
15. Coping is also affected by culturally patterned attitudes to threat, injury, pain, illness, etc.
16. Other mediating factors are the individual's health and intactness of his CNS prior to the onset of the stressor, heredity and nutritional factors and the quality of one's 'inborn endocrine equipment'.

17. Psychological factors also mediate:

(a) Degree of motivation or arousal.

(b) Characteristic level of activity and stimulation.

(c) Expertise and success in self-regulating emotional reactions.

(d) Capacity to maintain focal attention.

(e) Degree of 'hypersensitivity' to the demands of everyday life.

(f) Characteristic pattern of threat appraisal.

(g) Introvert or extrovert.

(h) Strength of his ego.

(i) Nature of his self-image and degree of self-esteem.

(j) Whether there is a family history of vulnerability.

Pestonjee (1990) views stress as a personal response to a certain variation in the environment. Pestonjee conceived that some set of stressors could be differently perceived depending on:

(a) the nature and magnitude of the strategy;

(b) the importance of the stressor to the individual;

(c) the personal and social support system available to the individual, and

(d) the involvement and willingness on the part of the individual 'to do something' about the state of stress.
Pestonjee has identified three important sectors of life in which stress originates:

(a) jobs and the Organisation,
(b) the social sector, and
(c) intra-psychic sector.

The first namely, job and the organisational, refers to the totality of the work environment (task, atmosphere, colleagues, compensations, policies, etc.).

The social sector refers to the social/cultural context of one’s life. It may include religion, caste, language, dress and other such factors.

The intra-Psychic sector encompasses those things, which are intimate and personal, like temperament, values, abilities and health. It is contended that stress can originate in any of these three sectors or in combinations thereof.

**WORK OVERLOAD AS AN ANTICEDENT OF BURNOUT**

Work overload is another antecedent of burnout. Miller (1960) theorised that ‘work overload’ in most systems leads to breakdown. French and Caplan (1973) have differentiated overloads in terms of ‘quantitative’ and ‘qualitative’ overload. Quantitative refers to ‘having too much to do’ and qualitative refers to work that is ‘too difficult’.

French and Caplan (1979) found that objective quantitative overload was strongly linked to cigarette smoking. In a study of 100 young coronary patients, Russeck and Zhman (1958) found that 25% had been working at two jobs and an additional 45% had been
working at jobs, which required 60 or more hours per week. They have found that prolonged emotional strain preceded the attack in 91% of the cases.

Another substantial investigation on quantitative workload was carried out by Margolis et al. (1974). They found that overload was significantly related to a number of symptoms or indicators of stress: escapist drinking, absenteeism from work, low motivation to work, lowered self-esteem and an absence of suggestions to employees. The results from these and other studies (Quinn et al., 1971; Porter and Lawler, 1965) are relatively consistent and indicate that this factor is indeed a potential source of occupational stress that adversely affects both health and job satisfaction.

French and Caplan (1973) summarised their research by suggesting that both qualitative and quantitative overload produce at least 9 different symptoms of psychological and physical strain: job-esteem, threat, embarrassment, high cholesterol level, increased heart rate, skin resistance and more smoking.

**INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT AS AN ANTECEDENT OF BURNOUT:**

Interpersonal conflict has been identified as one of the major organisational stresser leading to increased feeling of emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation. If the employee lacks supportive relationship with his immediate supervisors or with co-workers, or if his abilities are under-utilised, he experiences decreased feeling of personal accomplishment (Leiter, 1991).

Cooper (1978) has enlisted relations within the organisation: poor relations with boss, poor relations with colleagues and subordinates, difficulties in delegating
responsibilities, etc., as one of the chief sources of managerial stress. Lee and Ahforth also identify social support as an antecedent of burnout along with others like work autonomy and role stress. Their major findings were that:

1. Autonomy over various aspects of work and social support from the organisation and supervisor were each inversely related to role stress (i.e. role conflict and role ambiguity).

2. Role stress was positively related to exhaustion.

3. Exhaustion was positively associated with turnover intentions. Neither autonomy nor support affected burnout directly and neither moderated the relationship between stress and burnout.

**STATUS INCONSISTENCY AS AN ANTECEDENT OF BURNOUT:**

Researchers have also identified "status inconsistency" as possible determinant of psychological and occupational stress. Jackson (1962) argued that status inconsistency becomes salient to the individual in the form of conflicting expectations. For example, when a person's education and income are inconsistent, the status inconsistent person and those around him/her may hold conflicting expectations about his/her behaviour. In line with subsequently developed person-environment Fit theory, it is the uncertainty and frustration embedded in these conflicting expectation that Jackson viewed as causing the psychological stress. However, empirical research indicates that not all forms of status inconsistency are directly linked to strain.

A number of factors moderate the linkage between status inconsistency and strain like
individual age and degree of extrinsic motivation. Brook (1973), provided four interesting case studies of individuals showing behavioural disorders as a result of either being over-promoted (when a person has reached the peek of his abilities with little possibility of further development and is given responsibility exceeding his capacity) or under-promoted (not given responsibility commensurate with ability level). In each case the progression of the status disorder was from minor psychological symptoms to marked psychosomatic complaints and then to mental illness.

MODELS OF BURNOUT:

BURKE MODEL OF UNDERSTANDING STRESS AND BURNOUT:

Burke (1987) presents a simple model of understanding stress and burnout, presented in figure 1:1. This model suggests that to understand stress and burnout in organisations one must consider the environment (both organisational and extra organisational) in which individual functions and individuals then self (what individual bring with them as they interact with events in their environment).

The environment is a source of stressors or demands on the individual. An individual differs (e.g., past experience, personality, behavioural repertoire, and social support) in what they bring to the challenges, opportunities and demands in their environments.

The concept of stress, then is an interactional or transactional one. Individual with particular characteristics interacts with work and home environments with certain characteristics, which results in varying amounts of experienced stress.
Burke illustrates the model by providing concrete examples within each of the panel starting with stress reactions or symptoms. Individuals react to stressors with response of various kinds. Stress reaction can be emotional (depression, resentment, physiological—rapid heartbeats rate, heavy breathing and behavioural smoking, eating, drinking more). These responses then describe an individual immediate (short-term) response to experienced stress. These responses are typically exhibited by all individuals and are in some senses involuntary (Cannon, 1929). The model in figure 1:1 proposes that the experience of long term re chronic stress is likely to result in the individual developing emotional and/or physical health problem. Individual predisposition to illness or health, health practices, coping responses, personal
ambition, perfectionalism, impatience, inability to say no, fear of failure, liking of tension, lack of confidence, chronic anxiety shyness and timidity.

Sources of stress in the environment, includes: diverse work and life stressors, work stress might includes: financial difficulties, life crisis, family problems as well as daily hassles. Most models of burnout and stress pay only feeling attention to extra work and satisfaction. However, the research that is available (Burke & Bradshaw, 1981; Bhagat, 1983) shows clearly that work experiences influence of work experiences and vice versa. There has been considerable convergence of the nature of stress and burnout experiences in the organisation. Figure 1:2 presents a common work stress research paradigm.

Individuals perceive stress in response to certain objectives social conditions. These conditions are usually perceived as stressful when the demands on the

![Figure 1.2: Work Paradigm Model](image-url)
individual exceed their abilities, or when individuals are unable to fulfil strong needs or values. In other words, the individual needs are abilities do not matched or fit with their environment. No negative (objectives) work situation will produce the same perception of stress or results are physiological, psychological or behavioural response or health in all individuals exposed to these conditions. Thus, how individuals perceive a given condition will depend upon other personal and situational factors.

CHERNISS MODEL OF BURNOUT:
A comprehensive model of burnout has been proposed by Cherniss (1980), illustrated in Figure 1:3.

FIGURE 1:3 CHERNISS PROCESS MODEL OF BURNOUT
Charniss model proposes that particular work setting characteristics interact with individuals who are entering the job with certain career orientations. These individuals also bring with them their own unique extra work demands and supports, these factors, in concern, results in particular sources of stress being experienced to varying degrees by job incumbents. Individuals cope with these stresses in different ways. Some employ techniques and strategies which might be term active problem solving while others cope by exhibiting the negative attitude changes, Cherniss identified in his definition of burnout. According to Cherniss "burnout represents a response to an intolerable work situation". The process begins when the helper experiences stress and strain that can not be elevated through active problem solving. These changes in attitude and behaviour associated with burnout then provide a psychological escape and ensure that further stress will not be added to the strain already being experienced.

**THE LEE AND ASHFORTH MODEL OF BURNOUT:**

The Lee and Ashforth's (1992) model holds that emotional exhaustion is a direct function of the following:

1. **DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS:**

The demographic variables of gender, age and work experience have been investigated as potential correlates (Greenglass and Burke, 1989; Whitehead, 1987), with age being most consistently related to burnout especially emotional exhaustion. Younger and less experienced individuals may be more susceptible to emotional exhaustion because they have yet to, learn effective means of coping with work demands (Maslach, 1982). The maturity which comes with age partly reflect successful
experience in dealing with stressful situations and this may help individuals cope with singular situations in the future (Cherniss, 1980).

(2) JOB DEMANDS:

Regarding contact with others service supervisors and managers most oftenly function directly as counsellors for agency clients (Farber, 1983). They frequently intervene to help in order to resolve problematic cases and issues involving the application of policies and procedures. Frequent and intense involvement tends to be emotionally taxing (Maslach, 1982). Hellman and Morrison (1987) found that therapist working with every disturbed patients in institutionals setting experienced greater energy depletion and self doubt then said the therapist working with less disturbed patients in private settings. Ross, Altmaier and Russell (1989) found that client contacts were related to depersonalisation as well. Moreover, for service supervisors and managers, considerable time spent with subordinates, who often seek the same level of support, nurturence, and problem intervention as clients themselves (Harvey and Raider, 1984).

(3) AFFECT:

Regarding satisfaction, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) found that negative evaluation of stressful situations could lead to psychological strain. This suggests that emotional exhaustion may not occur only in response to perceive stress, but to negative feelings about the work situation, which itself may be an outcome of role stress (Schaubroeck, Cotton and Jennings, 1989). Thus Penn, Romano and Foat (1988) found that satisfaction with work, supervision, co-workers, pay and opportunities for promotion was negatively associated with burnout among human service professionals.
Moreover, exhaustion of non-work related matters. For example Greenglass and Burke (1989) found that marital dissatisfaction continuously predicted burnout. The demands of work and family roles may be especially hard-hitting among service workers striving to balance them both (Edelwiech and Brodsky, 1980).

(4) COGNITION:

Finally helplessness is likely associated with burnout. Helplessness is defined as cognition that outcomes are independent of behaviour and is typically inferred from a lack of control (Ashforth, 1989). While service supervisors and managers are presumed to exercise considerable control over their units, the opposite is generally true (Harvey and Raider, 1984). They usually must work around various organisational constraints and have little decision latitude in many policy matters. This often creates a sense among supervisors and managers that they are unable to meet the needs of subordinates and clients (Cherniss, 1980). Control Theory suggests that when desired control exceed perceived control, individuals may be experienced reactance, helplessness and psychological strain (Cummings and Cooper, 1979; Greenberger and Strasser, 1986). Moreover, as research on cognition and affect suggest that (e.g., Ashforth and Humphrey, 1992; James and tetrick, 1986), helplessness and strain may exert a reciprocal influence; the perception that outcomes are uncontrollable may foster feelings of utility which discourage further efforts to assert control. The perception of uncontrollability may also undermine performance since individuals who believe they are important are less likely to strive for success (Martinko and Gardner, 1982). These reinforcing
linkages between cognition, affect, and behaviour suggest that burnout process represents a vicious circle or pathology.

Helplessness in turn is likely affected by several variables. A lack of direct control (i.e. autonomy and opportunities for participation) has been linked to perception of helplessness (Ashforth, 1989; Greenberger and Strasser, 1986). Additionally, a lack of indirect control through inadequate feedback and the inability to predict and understand the work environment (Cummings and Cooper, 1979; Cherniss, 1980). Moreover, Ashforth (1990) found in a study of manufacturing workers that a lack of direct and indirect control were independently related to a set of variables that he defined as the “Organisational Induced helplessness syndrome”. Lastly, Kottkamp and Mansfield (1985) linked role conflict and ambiguity among high school supervisors to perceptions of having little scope of affect outcomes.

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS:

Concept of organisational role stress developed by Pareek (1983) is based on role theory. Role is the similarity in the response of different individuals to some situation. Role theory sheds light on the relationship between role performance and personality, the development of the self-concept, and deviant roles (Khandwalla, 1977). Role theory views the person as an actor on the social stage. It sees behaviour as shaped by the logic of one’s tasks and the social expectations as to what is the permissible range of proper behaviour. It therefore, gives primacy to technical and social factors in
the shaping of behaviour and to internalized norms and values (Khandwalla, 1977). Teachers’ experience varied types of stress and the most viable of these is role stress. The concept of role is the key to understanding how a teacher functions in any system. It is through his/her role that a teacher is integrated into an organisation. Pareek (1987) states, "role can be defined as position one occupies in a social system, as defined by the functions he/she performs in response to the expectations of the significant members of the social system, and his/her own expectation from that position or office. The very nature of role has an in-built potential for stress. Earlier a series of well-recognized studies founded role theory was that of gross. Mason and McEachern (1958) who defined and operationalized several role concepts. The formal recognition for introducing role concept into organisational research, however, is generally given to kahn, Wolfe, Quin, Snoek and Rosentha (1964), with the publication of their prestigious book entitled "Organisational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity".

Kahn et al. (1964) proposed a role episode model in which a focal person and role senders (collectively termed as the role set) interact cynically within a context influenced by organisational factors(e.g., size of organisation, its financial base, etc.), personality factors(motive, values, fears, etc.) and interpersonal relations factors(e.g., power to influence others, dependence among persons, etc.). The expectations of role senders regarding role performance take the form of role pressures. However, these pressures are perceived and processed by the focal person and act as role forces to influence focal person behaviour in a manner either congruent or discordant with the role senders’ desires. Both role conflict and role
ambiguity were seen as having an objective or environmental component and a subjective or psychological component. While objective role constructs refer to actual verifiable conditions in the work environment, subjective role conflict and role ambiguity are internal states of the focal person. Kahn et al. (1964) viewed that subjective role conflict and role ambiguity may or may not correspond with their objective counterparts, depending on the mediating influences of personality and interpersonal relation factors.

Pareek (1983) has paid his attention toward the following aspects of role:

(a) Role set

(b) Role space.

He defines role set as "the role system within the organisation of which roles are part and by which individual roles are defined". Role space refers to "the role people occupy and perform" (Pareek, 1983). Pareek (1983) has proposed the following role characteristics that fall under these two aspects of role stress, viz., role space conflicts and role set conflicts.

**ROLE SPACE CONFLICTS**

This is inevitably true to say that each individual occupies and plays several roles. For example, a person X is a daughter, a mother, a sales person, a member of a club, a member of a voluntary organisation, and so on. All these roles constitute the role space of X. At the centre of the role space is the self. As the concept of role is central to that of an organisation, in the same manner the concept of self is central to the several roles of a person. The term 'self' refers to the interpretations the person makes about the referent 'I'. It is a cognitive structure, which evolves from past experience
with other persons and objects. Self can be defined as the experience of an identity arising from a person's interactions with the external reality-things, person and systems. A person performs various roles which are centred around the self (and from each other). These relationships define the role space. Role space is then a dynamic interrelationship between the self and the various roles.

The distance between a role and the self indicates the extent to which the role is integrated with the self. When we do not enjoy a particular role or do not get involved in it, there is a distance between the self and the role. The term self role distance is used to the above said notion. Similarly, there may be distance between two roles that a person occupies. For example, the role of club membership may be distant from the role of a husband. This has been termed as inter role distance.

Role space (the dynamic relationship amongst the various roles an individual occupies and his self) has three main variables: self, the role under question, and the other roles he occupies. Any conflict amongst these is referred to as role space conflicts or stress. These conflicts may take the following forms mentioned below:

1. **Inter Role Distance**: When an individual occupies more than one role there are chances of conflicts between the different roles that he or she occupies. For example, a lady executive often faces the conflict between her organisational role as an executive and her familial role as a wife and a mother. The demands of her husband and children for sharing her time may be incompatible with the organisational demands. Such inter-role conflicts are quite common and frequent in a modern society, where an individual increasingly possesses multiple roles in various organisations and groups.
2. Role Stagnation: As the individual becomes older he also grows in the role he occupies in an organisation. With the advancement of the age of an individual his/her role changes, and with this change in role, the need for taking up a new role becomes crucial. This problem of role growth becomes acute especially when an individual who has occupied a role for a long time enters into another new role in which he may feel comparatively less secure. However, the new role demands that individuals outgrow the previous one and take charge of the new role effectively. This is bound to produce some stress in the organisations which are fast expanding, and which do not have any systematic strategy of manpower development, managers are likely to experience this kind of stress when they are promoted.

3. Self-Role Distance: The underlying stress arises out of the conflict between the self-concept and the expectations from the role, as perceived by the role occupant. If a person occupies a role, which he may subsequently find conflicting with the self-concept, he feels stressed. For example, an introvert who is fond of studying and writing, may develop a self-role distance if he accepts the role of a salesman in an organisation, and comes to realize that the expectations from the role would include his meeting people and being social. Such conflicts are fairly common, although they may not be so severe.

ROLE SET CONFLICT: The individuals' role in the organisation is defined by the expectations of other significant roles, and those of the individual himself. The role set should be considered as a pattern of inter-relationships between a role, and the other roles. The field which is important vis-à-vis an individual's role is the role set which consist of important person who have varying expectations from the role that he
occupies. The conflict which arise as a result of incompatibility amongst these expectations by the 'significant others (and by the individual himself)are referred to as role set conflicts. These conflicts take the following forms:

4. Role Ambiguity: When the individual is not clear about the various expectations that people have from his or her role, the conflict that he or she faces is known as role ambiguity. Role ambiguity may be due to lack of information available to the role occupant, or due to lack of understanding of the cues available to him. Role ambiguity may be in relation to the activities, responsibilities priorities, norms, or general expectations etc. Generally role ambiguity may be experienced by persons occupying roles which are newly created in the organisation, roles in organisations which are undergoing change, or process roles (with less clear concrete activities).

5. Role Expectation Conflict: When there are conflicting expectations or demands by different role senders (persons having expectations from the role), the role occupant may experience this kind of stress. There may be conflicting expectations from the boss, subordinates, peers or clients etc.

6. Role over load: In this case when the role occupant feels that there are too many expectations from the significant others in his role set, he experiences role overload. Role overload has been measured by asking questions about people's feeling whether they could possibly finish work given to them during a modified work day and whether they felt that the amount of work they do might interfere with how well it was done. Most of the executive role occupants experience role overload. Role overload usually takes place where role occupants lacking in their power, where there are large
variations in the expected output, and where assistance can not procure more frequently.

7. Role Erosion: When a role occupant may feel that the functions, which he would like to perform, are being performed by some other role. The stress felt may be called role erosion. Role erosion is the subjective feeling of an individual that some important role expectations he has from the role are shared by other roles within the role set. Role erosion is likely to be experienced in an organisation, which is redefining its role and creating new roles. Studies indicate that in several organisations, which were redefining its structure, the stress of role erosion was inevitably felt. In an organisation, a particular role was abolished and in its place two roles were created to cater to the executive and planning needs. This led to great erosion, and a feeling that the new roles were less important as compared to the previous role.

8. Resource Inadequacy: Resource inadequacy stress is experienced when the resources are required by the role occupant for performing the role effectively are not available; these may be information, people material, finance, or facilities.

9. Personal Inadequacy: In this case of personal inadequacy a role occupant feels that he is not prepared to undertake the role effectively, he may experience the under line stress. The role occupant may feel that he does not have enough knowledge, skills or training, or he or she has not had time to prepare for the assigned role. People who are assigned new roles without enough preparation or orientation are likely to experience this type of stress.

10. Role Isolation: In this case of role isolation the role occupant may feel that certain roles are psychologically closer to him, while others are at a much greater distance.
The main criterion of distance is the frequency and ease of interaction. When linkages are strong, the role isolation will be low and in the absence of strong linkages, the role isolation will be high. Role isolation can therefore be measured in terms of the existing and the desired linkages. This gap between the desired and the existing linkages will indicate the amount of role isolation.

**PERSONALITY HARDINESS:**

During the last few years, some personality variables have attracted the attention of researchers in the correlates of job stress and burnout. Despite a common acknowledgement that personality factors play a critical role in mediating stress, these factors have been overlooked in a majority of empirical studies of stress. A notable exception has been a series of studies carried by Kobasa (1979; 1982a, 1982b, 1984). Kobasa, Maddi, Kahn & Hoover (1982) explored the concept of “personality Hardiness” as a resistance resource that mediate the negative consequences of high level stress.

**Conceptual Issue:** While there is a witness that person can learn more effective means of responding to potentially stressful events, there is also an evidence that, personality factors play a major role in the process of coping with stress. The term hardiness has been used to explain persons who have a kind of personal and world view that underlies this positive capacity to cope with and mediates stress (Kobasa, 1979). This concept of hardiness focuses on the person that remains relatively healthy after experiencing high amounts of stressful life events. Kobasa argues that persons who experience high degree of stress without falling ill have a personality structure
differentiating them from person who become sick under stress. This personality difference is best characterized by the term “Hardiness”. The conceptual source of supposition, in contrast to the passive and reactive view of human kind found in most stress and illness related work, is a set of approach to human behaviour that Maddi (1976) in his categorisation of the major personality theories calls “fulfillment theories”. The hardy personality type formulated here builds upon the theorizing of existential psychologists, (Kobasa & Maddi, 1977); Maddi, 1975) on the strenuousness of authentic living. White (1959) on competence, Allport (1955) on proprite striving and Fromm (1947) on the productive orientation. Existential personality theory (Kobasa & Maddi, 1977) suggests that persons develop strong tendencies toward commitment, control and challenges if they have experienced in their early life considerate breadth and variety of events stimulation and support for exercising the cognitive capabilities of symbolisation, imagination and judgement; approval an admiration for doing things themselves; and role models which advocate hardiness and show it in their own functioning. This formulation resembles that offered out pf a social learning framework by Bandura (1977) for the development of efficacy, an orientation not unlike hardiness.

**COMPONENT OF HARDINESS:**

According to Kobasa (1979) hardiness includes three personality dispositions. These dispositions are Commitment, Control and Challenge. These dispositions influence cognitive appraisal and behaviour in response to stressful events. Cognitively, the influence perception of an event and the meaning attached to it, behaviourally, they influence the types of activities chosen to deal with a particular event.
1. COMMITMENT:

Kobasa et al (1982) described commitment as the tendency to be involved in many aspects of one's life. Committed persons have a generalised sense of purpose and self-understanding that allows them to find meaning and value in which they are and what they are doing. They know that they can turn to others in time of stress, they also know that others can turn to them and not be disappointed. By viewing events and people in a meaningful context, they are more likely to and cope in a manner characterised by activeness approach, as opposed to passivity and avoidance. In short, committed persons have both a reason to and an ability to turn to others for assistance in times demanding readjustment. Although commitment to various areas of life, work, social institutions, interpersonal relationships, family and self-should be characterised of highly stressed persons who do not fall ill, one area is singled out as particularly important for health staying healthy under stress is critically dependent upon a strong sense of commitment to self. An ability to recognize one's destructive values, goals and priorities and an appreciation of one's capacity to have purpose (Kobasa, 1979).

2. CONTROL:

The control disposition is expressed as a tendency to feel and acts as if one is influential (rather than helpless) in the face of varied contingencies of life (Averill, 1973; Seligman, 1975). This does not imply the naive expectation of complete determination of events and outcomes but rather implies the perception of oneself as having a definite influence through the practice of imagination, knowledge, skill and
choice. It also allows a person to perceive many stressful events as predictors consequences of one’s own activity and therefore subject to personal influence. Control involves developing a repertoire of options and actions that transform events into a continuing life plan. In line with Averill’s model of stress resistance control also appears responsible for the development of a broad and varied repertory of responses to stress, which can be drawn on even in the most threatening of circumstances. Kobasa (1979), following the model proposed by Averill (1973) explain that some organism are not debilitated by stressful stimuli, the highly stressed but healthy person is hypothesized to have (a) decisional control, or the capability of autonomously choosing among various courses of action to handle the stress;(b) cognitive control, or the ability to interpret, appraise and incorporate various sorts of stressful events into an ongoing life plan and, thereby, deactivate their jarring effects;(c) coping skill, or a greater repertory of suitable responses to stress developed through a characteristics motivation to achieve across all situations. In contrast, the highly stress person who become ill are powerless, nihilistic, and low in motivation for achievement. When stress occurs, they are without resource of its resolution, give up what little control they do possess, and succulent to the incapacity of illness.

3.CHALLENGE:

The challenge disposition is expressed as the belief that change rather than stability is normal in life and that the anticipation of changes are interesting incentives to growth rather then threats to security (berlyne,1964;Maddi,Prospt & Feldinger,1965).The individual with this characteristics emphasizes growing and changing rather than conserving and protecting the status quo. Challenge overcomes
the stressfulness of events on the perceptual side by colouring events as stimulating rather than threatening, especially because they are changes requiring readjustment. In coping behaviour, challenge will lead to attempt to transform oneself and thereby grow rather than conserve and protect what one can of the former existence. By developing openness and flexibility, challenge should also allow the integration and effective appraisal of even exceedingly incongruent events (Moss, 1973). Given the characterization of hardiness contained in above discussion, it should be clear that the highly stressed but healthy individual is not engaging in irresponsible adventurousness. At the case of the search for novelty and challenge are fundamental life goals that have become, in adulthood increasingly integrated in a widening diversity of situations, (Henry, 1968; Neugarten, 1974). In this connection a study of business executives, provide of the initial empirical support for hardiness as a stress-resistance resource. Kobasa (1979) found in her study that the high stress/low illness executive shows significantly greater personality hardiness than the high stress/high illness executives that is executives high in stressfulness events but low in illness showed great commitment, control and challenge than executive in whom similar stressful event levels were associated with much illness. Kobasa (1979) also talked about the direct and indirect effect of hardiness and its buffering effect in details. Hardiness was originally conceived by Kobasa (1979) to improve health by existing as a buffer of stressful life events. In highly stressful environments hardy individuals were proposed not to fall ill because of their feeling of commitment, control and challenge.
There are two important theoretical models, which explain the relationship of health to hardiness. These are:

1. **STRESS - BUFFERING MODEL**:

   Conceived by Kobasa (1979), this model suggests that hardiness improves health by acting as a buffer to stressful life events. In highly stressful conditions, hardy were proposed not to fall ill because of their feeling of commitment, control and challenge. His buffering role of hardiness is shown in the figure 3:1, adopted from Kobasa & Puccetti (1983).

   **FIGURE 1:4 STRESS -BUFFERING MODEL**

   ![Diagram of Stress - Buffering Model]

2. THE MAIN EFFECT MODEL:

This model suggests that factors involved in hardiness have direct effects of reducing psychological strain associated with illness, this role of hardiness is evident in Figure 3:2, which is adopted from Kobasa (1982a).

FIGURE 1:5, THE MAIN EFFECT MODEL.

If these two models are to be compared a very different picture of the role of hardiness and its subcomponents in the stress-illness relationship emerges. In the first case hardiness reduces the impact of stressful life events by increasing the use of successful coping strategies. In the second case, hardiness in the form of committed personality decreases strain directly. Regardless, it has indirect effect by decreasing
the use of unsuccessful coping strategies. Although many studies failed to find out the buffering effects of hardiness on health (Hull et al., 1987; Kobasa et al., 1985; Roth et al., 1989; Wiebe & Mc Callum, 1986), Kobasa and others reported studies that tested main effects of hardiness (the direct-effects) and hardiness by stressful life event interaction (the buffering effects) on self-reported illness (Kobasa et al., 1981; Kobasa et al., 1982; Kobasa et al., 1983; Kobasa & Puccetti, 1983).

**JOB INVOLVEMENT:**

The term Job involvement (JI) was used in varied contexts and often confused with central life interest, work role involvement, ego involvement, ego involved performance, occupational involvement, morale, intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction and finally job involvement.

Different interpretations of job involvement can be broadly categorized into two different ways. The first series of definitions seem to tie together the concept of self-esteem. Individuals have been described as job involved if they view it as important to their life interest (Dubin, 1956) and perceive performance as central to their self-esteem (Gurin, Veroff & Field, 1960). Vroom (1962) describes a person as ego-involved in a job by the level of his self-esteem which is affected by his perceived level of performance.
The second conceptual way of describing job involvement is the “degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work” or “the importance of work in his total self-image” (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). Such a psychological identification with work may result partly from early socialisation training during which the individual may internalize the value of goodness of work. Lodahl (1965) emphasized that during the process of socialisation certain work values are injected into the self of the individual that remains even at the later stage in the form of attitude toward job. Siegel (1969) endorses that worker’s sex, early socialisation process and organisational variables affect the development of an individual’s job involvement. From these definitions we can infer that repeated reinforcement of an individual’s idea about his job during his early socialisation process is responsible for his developing the job involvement attitude. This suggests that fresh job holders are likely to be job involved if their socialisation background is conducive to the development of such an attitude (Akhter & Kumar, 1978).

Wollack, Goodale, wijting & Smith (1971) consider job involvement as a partial operationalisation of the protestant ethic. According to Katz and Kahn (1966) Job involvement is a moderator variable between satisfaction and performance. While Weissenberg & Gruenfeld (1968) think of it as a quasi indicator of motivation. Patchen (1970) considered job involvement as a convenient label summarising several characteristics that make the job more important and potentially more satisfying to the individual. Lawler and Hall (1970) provided theoretical and empirical evidence to distinguish job involvement from need satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. They
suggest that job involvement refers to the degree to which a person's total work situation is an important part of his life.

These differences in interpretation emphasize the lack of agreement concerning what job involvement represents. Kanungo (1979, 1982) gave new direction to the term. He has proposed that one should make a clear distinction between job involvement and work involvement. Whether an individual is involved in a job is dependent upon the extent to which the job satisfies his salient needs and hence job involvement in this respect is more situationally determined. On the other hand, work involvement is considered to be a more stable psychological characteristic. Evidence of this conceptual distinction has been provided by Gorn & Kanungo (1980), Kanungo (1982), Misra, Kanungo, Von Rosenthal & Stuhler (1985), and Elloy & Conelius (1986).

Saleh (1981) argues that job involvement is a multidimensional concept of involving structural components of cognitive, evaluative and behavioural intentions. Rabinowitz, Hall & Goodale (1977) and Saal (1978) found that both individual (personality) difference and situational (job) variable contribute to the prediction of job involvement. Thus, we can conclude that the various definitions of job involvement have a common core of meaning in that they describe the job involved person as one for whom work is a very important part of life, and as one who is affected by much responsibilities of his whole situation: the work itself, his co-workers, the company etc. On the other hand, the non-job involved worker does his living off the job. Work is not an important part of his psychological life. His interests are elsewhere, and the core of his self-image, the essential part of his identity is not greatly affected by the kind of work he does or how
well he does it. It is important to note the Guion (1958) observation that the job involved worker is not necessarily happy with his job, in fact, very angry people may be just as involved in their jobs as very happy one.

**CAUSES OF JOB INVOLVEMENT:**

Researchers who have defined job involvement as a form of the performance self-esteem contingency argue that intrinsic-need satisfaction is a necessary condition for job involvement. Psychologists in general have concentrated on the analysis of specific motivation states of the individual in work situations, therefore, tend to emphasize the need-satisfying qualities of the job as basic determinants of job involvement.

Vroom emphasized intrinsic-need satisfaction as the essential condition for higher job involvement. In his view, higher autonomy extended to the individual results in higher ego involvement, which in turn leads to a higher level of job performance. Bass (1965) viewed that job involvement is determined by the presence of six conditions such as:

1. A greater opportunity for making job decisions,
2. The feeling that one is making important contributions to organisational success,
3. An experience of personal success,
4. Personal achievement,
5. Self-determination and
6. Personal autonomy in matters of setting one's own work pace.

Patchen (1970) viewed that, when a job provides opportunities for the satisfaction of one's achievement needs, belonging needs, and self-esteem needs, one experiences
a greater degree of job involvement. Lawler and Hall (1970) believe that job involvement is partly caused by an individual's personal background and situations. They maintain that a person who is involved with the job is one who is affected very much personally by his whole job situation, presumably because he perceives his job as an important part of his self-concept and perhaps as a place to satisfy his important needs (e.g., his need for self-esteem). Maurer considers self-esteem and achievement-need satisfaction at work to be the necessary conditions for job involvement.

Blood and Hulin (1967) have postulated a continuum ranging from integration to alienation with middle class norms. At the integrated end of the continuum individual show the maximum amount of personal involvement with their jobs, presumably because of ego-need gratification on the job. At the alienated end of the continuum, the job is seen as a provider of means for "pursuing extra-occupational goals. The concern of these workers is not for increased responsibility, higher status, or more autonomy. They want money, and they want it in return for a minimal amount of personal involvement. In this formulation job involvement is the result of intrinsic-need satisfaction on the job. However, whether or not a worker is alienated from or integrated with middle-class norms (for example, seeking higher responsibility and autonomy on the job) is determined by the nature of the worker's background and environment in which socialisation occurs. According to Wanous (1973), "one of the earliest determinants of an individual's work needs is the environment of his socialisation. In the context of a rural or urban white-collar environment, an individual may be more likely to adopt a set of work values similar to what has been called the
"protestant-work-ethic" or middle-class work values. As a result of such an up bringing, an individual could develop a general value orientation toward work which emphasizes the importance of work in one's total self-esteem and reinforces the belief that work can hold intrinsic satisfaction. Consideration of intrinsic-need satisfaction on the job as a necessary condition for the job involvement led Wanous to speculate that Protestant-work-ethic-oriented individuals will become job involved when the job provides autonomy, variety, challenge, feedback, and task identity.

Since the satisfaction of intrinsic needs of workers can be achieved only through appropriate changes in the job and the organisational environment, such changes (for example, job variety, autonomy, opportunity for participation) have been viewed as situational factors causing job involvement (Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977). Besides the situational variables at the work place that affect intrinsic motivation, researchers have also identified the Protestant-work-ethic attitude as a possible cause of job involvement. The Protestant-work-ethic attitude is largely determined by past socialisation processes experienced by individuals in specific socio-economic and cultural milieu in which they have lived. Thus, the rural/urban, blue-collar/white-collar, and ethno-cultural background of individuals have been considered as causes of job involvement. Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) consider the Protestant-work-ethic attitude as a personal factors or individual-difference variable causing job involvement. The Categorisation of factors causing job involvement onto situational and individual-difference variables seems theoretically unsound. Rather a clarification in terms of predisposing and precipitating factors of job involvement is more appropriate. If one
closely examine what Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) label as situational variables causing job involvement, one may find the following causal sequence:

Presence and activation of intrinsic needs in the individual at work-work behaviour—presence of certain job or organisational outcomes variables such as job autonomy, job variety, participative organisational climate and so on—perceived potential of the job to satisfy the intrinsic needs—job involvement. In this case the causes of job involvement include both situational variables, such as job and organisational characteristics, and personal variables, such as the strength of intrinsic needs of the individual. If one consider the other category of causes referred by Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) as individual-difference variables, one will find the following sequence:

Socio-economic and cultural environment that has influenced the individual in past—internalisation of Protestant-work-ethic values—presence and activation of intrinsic needs at work-work behaviour—presence of certain job and organisational outcomes—perceived job potential to satisfy the intrinsic needs—job involvement.

Here again, the cause of job involvement include both situational variables such as socio-cultural environment (rural/urban background, ethno-cultural environment, and so on) responsible for individual past socialisation, and individual-difference variables, such as work values of the individual.

**CORRELATES OF JOB INVOLVEMENT:**

The correlates of job involvement in the psychological literature have been classified in terms of whether they are personal characteristics, situational characteristics, or work
outcomes. Such a descriptive classification is based on the theoretical perspective that job involvement is determined by both personal and situational factors (Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977) and that it has effects on job attitudes and behaviour.

In the classification, the personal factors are further subdivided into personal demographic and personal psychological factors. Such a division has been proposed by Saal (1978) on the basis of his multivariate analysis of several personal and situational correlates of job involvement. The situational variables (factors) are subdivided into three groups: those that are job characteristics, those that are organisational characteristics, and those that are the characteristics of the past and the present sociocultural milieu influencing the individual. However, the following is a brief description of the extent to which these variables are related to job involvement.

PERSONAL VARIABLES:

1. AGE:

   Some researchers experienced in their findings that older workers should show greater work involvement than younger workers. Cherrington (1977) has advanced three possible reasons for the positive relationship between age and work involvement. First, with increasing age, a worker is bound to get exposed to maximum numbers and different kinds of work experiences and these experiences may form the basis of their work involvement. Second, older workers have had specific historical experiences and these specific experiences may have strengthened their work values. Finally, the younger workers of today's affluent society receive training and socialisation pressures that make work less important in their lives. Hence, as a result the younger workers show less work involvement. These reasons, however, are not
compelling enough to suggest that work involvement will always covary with age. A number of studies reveal both positive and negative relationship between age and work involvement. Hall and Mansfield 1975; Jones, James, and Bruni, 1975; Rabinowitz, Hall, and Goodale, 1977; Saal 1978; Schwyart and Smith, 1972 reported positive relationship. Gechman and Wiener, 1975; Gurin, Veroff, and Feld, 1960; Lodhal and Kejner, 1965; Mannheim, 1975; Mitchell, Baba, and Epps, 1975 reported no relationship.

2. EDUCATION:

The relationship between the levels of education and job involvement has been found comparatively less significant. Anyhow, empirical evidence on the direction of the relationship is mixed. Baba (1979) reports that among the 16 studies investigating the relationship between education and job involvement, 6 reported a positive relationship (Clelend, Bass, McHugh, and Montano, 1976; Gadbois, 1971; Gurin, Veroff, and Feld, 1960; Lefkowitz, 1974, Mannheim, 1975; Newman, 1975) 4 studies found a negative relationship (Adlaq and Brief, 1975; Baba and Jamal, 1976; Koch and Steers, 1978; Saal, 1978); 5 showed no relationship (Ivancevich and McMohan, 1977; Jones, James and Bruni, 1975; Siegel and Ruh, 1973; Rabinowitz, Hall and Goodale, 1977; Ruh, White and Wood, 1975). It is an assumption that formal education in schools and colleges in every society trains one to adopt positive work values, there is no justification for expecting education related with work involvement. Some studies (Siegel and Ruh, 1973) suggest that education may not covary with job involvement but may moderate the relationship of job involvement with other correlates, such as participative decision making.
3. SEX:

Traditional sex role socialisation trains men to believe that they are the ones who should work, build careers for themselves, and provide economic support for their family. Females, on the other hand, are trained to accept the role of a housewife. Such beliefs have led to the expectation that men as a group might show more work involvement than women (Hollon and Gemmill, 1976; Koch and Steers, 1978; Newman, 1975; Rabinowitz, Hall, and Goodale, 1977; Saal, 1978). However, the traditional socialisation norms are undergoing challenge, and the extent to which sex as a variable will continue to covary with work involvement in the future is suspect.

4. MARITAL STATUS:

It is expected that married worker is more job involved than a worker who is unmarried. Married workers have many family obligations that can divert their attention from the job and thereby make them less involved on the other hand, in order to meet the family obligations, the worker may have to work harder on the job and thereby become more involved. Kanungo, Misra, and Dayal (1975) found married workers to be more involved. However, several other studies (Lodhi and Kejner, 1965; Saal, 1978) have found no relationship.

5. OCCUPATION:

Ordinarily it is assumed that blue-collar workers are more alienated than white-collar workers, because the former occupations provide a lower satisfaction of intrinsic needs. If this is true, one would also expect clerical workers to be less work involved than managerial workers within the white-collar community. However, there
are not many studies that systematically deal with the relationship between occupation and work involvement, thus such claims remain speculative.

6. SENIORITY:

Several researchers have investigated the relationship of job or Organisational tenure with job involvement. Baba (1979) cited 15 studies dealing with this issue. Seven of these studies reported a positive relationship (Adlag and Brief, 1975; Ivancevich and McHohan, 1977; Jones, James, and Bruni, 1975; Kanungo, Misra, and Dayal, 1975; Newman, 1975; Rabinowitz, Hall, and Goodale, 1977); one reported a negative relationship (Davis, 1966); and seven reported insignificant relationships (Baba and Jamal, 1976; Gechman and Weiner, 1975; Hall and Mansfield, 1975; Mitchell, Baba, and Epps, 1975; Saal, 1978; Schneider, Hall, and Nygren, 1971; Schwyhart and Smith, 1972) between seniority and job involvement. It is important to make a distinction between a worker's seniority on the job and seniority in the organisation. Most studies in the literature dealing with seniority as a correlate have not paid careful attention to such distinction. A longer stay within an Organisation may develop organisational loyalty in a worker, but such loyalty may or may not reflect job involvement. On the other hand, seniority on the job may be more directly related to job involvement than organisational involvement.

PSYCHOLOGICAL:

1. INTRINSIC/EXTRINSIC-NEED STRENGTH:

Since most psychological literature suggests that job involvement is the result of intrinsic-need satisfaction on the job,
Lawler (1973) and Hackman and Oldham (1976) have argued that intrinsic-need strength should covary with job involvement. These researchers contended that intrinsically motivated individuals should show higher job involvement than extrinsically motivated individuals when the job meets their respective salient needs. Empirical research in the area has generally supported this contention (Baba, 1979; Rabinowitz and Hall, 1977). Baba (1979) reviewed several studies that obtained a positive relationship between growth-need strength and job involvement (Hall, Goodale, Robinowitz, and Morgan, 1978; Hall and Schneider, 1972; Hall, Schneider, and Nygren, 1970; Kanungo, Misra, and Dayal, 1975; Maurer, 1969; Rabinowitz, Hall, and Goodale, 1977; Saal, 1978; Steers, 1975; Steers and Braunstein, 1976).

2. WORK VALUES: Lodahl and Kejner (1965) and Bass and Barrett (1972) suggested that job involvement operationalizes Protestant-work-ethic values. Hence, if a worker strongly believes in Protestant-work-ethic values, that worker would automatically show greater job involvement. Results of studies dealing with this straightforward relationship have been quite ambiguous. Rabinowitz, Hall, and Goodale (1977) and Saal (1978) reported a positive relationship. Considering such ambiguity in results, one has to agree with Baba's (1979) suggestions for more research at a conceptual level to discover an empirical relationship between the two variables.

3. LOCUS OF CONTROLS:

Rotter (1966) developed the notion of locus of control as an important dimension of personality. Accordingly, he developed an internal-external locus of control scale (I-E scale) to distinguish people who are internal from those who are externals. The internals perceive themselves as personally responsible for
rewarding and punishing events they experience in their lives, where as the externals perceive themselves as pawns controlled by external forces. Runyon (1973) argued that internality and job involvement should go hand in hand, because the need to assume personal responsibility for one's own actions (an intrinsic need) plays a central role in the both cases. This expectation has confirmed by Kimmons and Greenhaus (1976) and Runyon (1973), who found a positive relationship between job involvement and internal locus of control. However, two other studies (Bigoness, 1978; Rabinowitz, Hall, and Goodale, 1977) did not find any significant relationship between the two variables.

3. SATISFACTION WITH JOB CHARACTERISTICS OR OUTCOMES:

A large number of studies have explored the relationship between job satisfaction and job involvement. Overall, these studies have demonstrated a positive relationship between intrinsic-need satisfaction and job involvement (Aldag and Brief, 1975; Baba and Jamal, 1976; Bigness, 1978; Gannon and Hemdrickson, 1973; Hall et al., 1978; Herman, Dunham, and Hulin, 1975; Hollon and Chesser, 1976; Lodahl and Kejner, 1965; Mukherjee, 1969, 1970; Newman, 1975; Rousseau, 1978; Saal, 1978; Schular, 1975; Schwyhart and Smith, 1972; Weissenberg and Gruenfeld, 1968; Wood, 1971).

Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968) investigated the relationship between satisfaction with various job factors and job involvement. They concluded that increased job involvement is positively related to satisfaction with motivators or job-content factors (Herzberg, 1966), such as achievement, responsibility, and independence. These motivators tend to satisfy the intrinsic need of an individual. Extrinsic needs,
however, are satisfied through job-context factors, such as company policies, nature of supervision, salary, benefits, and working conditions. According to these researchers, satisfaction with job context factors is unrelated to job involvement, but job involvement can be predicted from satisfaction with motivators in the job. Gannon and Hendrickson(1973) found that job involvement was positively related to satisfaction with some extrinsic-job outcomes, such as interpersonal relations and supervision, but was not related to satisfaction with other extrinsic outcomes, such as pay and promotion. Schuler(1975), however, reported a positive relationship between job involvement and satisfaction with each of the four job outcomes; supervision, co-workers, pay, and promotion.

5. EFFORT EXPENDITURE ON THE JOB:

It is quite logical to expect that a more job involved workers would spend more time and effort working on the job than a less job involved worker. A worker who is highly job involved by definition perceives the job both to be more central to life and have more potential for salient need satisfaction. Thus, such a worker will spend more effort on the job than a worker who is less job involved. Studies on this issue provide mixed results. Four studies reported positive correlation (Hall and Foster, 1977; Hall et al., 1978; Kanungo and Wright, 1981; Lawler and Hall, 1970); one reported a negative correlation (Cummings and Mauring, 1977); and two other studies reported no significant relationship between the two variables (Ivancevich and McMohan, 1977; Shcular, 1975).
6. PERFORMANCE:

On theoretical grounds, there can be no simple, straightforward relationship between job involvement and performance. Performance of workers is defined by the organisation; hence, the level of effort spent by a worker on the job may or may not translate into the level of performance demanded by the organization. The expectancy theory of motivation (Lawler, 1973) suggests that the relationship between effort and performance of a worker has to be moderated by several other psychological variables, such as the abilities, training, and role perceptions of the worker. The same variables should also moderate the relationship between job involvement and performance. Thus, the manner in which job involvement affects performance will depend on other worker characteristics, such as past training, ability, and role perceptions. Other factor that precludes the possibility of obtaining a simple relationship between job involvement and performance is the multiple performance criteria used by organisations. Sometimes organisations emphasize quality of performance, and at the other times they emphasize quantity of performance. For these reasons, empirical evidence on the relationship between performance and job involvement has been very confusing.

Several studies have reported a positive, but weak, relationship between the two variables (Hall et al., 1978; Vroom, 1962). Vroom suggested the relationship is weak because job involvement would increase performance only when the job requires abilities that are valued and possessed by the workers. Steers (1975) likewise reported a positive relationship between job involvement and performance only among those workers who had a high need for achievement. For the workers with low need
achievement, the relationship was insignificant. Some studies have reported simply an absence of any relationship between job involvement and performance (Goodman, Rose, and Furcon, 1970; Hall and Foster, 1977; Ivancevich and McMohan, 1977; Lodahl and Kejner, 1965; Saal, 1978; Schular, 1975; Seigel and Ruh, 1973), perhaps because they failed to use or include moderator variables and appropriate performance measures in their research designs.

7. **TURNOVER POTENTIAL:** It seems quite reasonable to assume that when workers are highly job involved, they would not wish to withdraw themselves from the job and consequently would show less turnover and absentee potential. Empirical research in the area of turnover lends support to the above contention (Beehr and Gupta, 1978; Farris, 1971; Koch and Steers, 1978; Siegel and Ruh, 1973; Wickert, 1951).

8. **ABSENTEEISM:**

   As a form of withdrawal behaviour, absenteeism of workers should be influenced by job involvement. Highly involved workers should exhibit lower levels of absenteeism. Three empirical studies (Beehr and Gupta, 1978; Patchen, 1970; Saal, 1978) reported a significant negative relationship between the two variables. Seigel and Ruh (1973), however, reported an insignificant relationship. On the basis of the existing evidence, it seems reasonable to assume a negative relationship between job involvement and absenteeism, but the evidence is limited to only a few studies.
SITUATIONAL VARIABLES:

1. JOB CHARACTERISTICS OR OUTCOMES:

Herzberg (1966) has divided job characteristics into two groups: job-content factors and job-context factors. Although job involvement can be related to change in both sets of factors, most psychological researchers have advocated change only in the job-content factors. Herzberg proposed job-enrichment programs as a means to increase job involvement, based on the belief that job involvement results from those changes that satisfy workers' intrinsic needs. Likewise, Hackman and Oldham (1976) identified five core job characteristics (variety, autonomy, task identity, task significance, and feedback) that need to be introduced in a job-enrichment program. It is generally believed that presence or absence of these job characteristics is associated with job involvement or alienation.

Systematic research on low job involvement may be related to other job characteristics, such as salary and working conditions in both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated workers, is almost non-existent. However, there are some research studies that have explored the relationship of job involvement with supervision, interpersonal climate, and job level. Several studies looking at the relationship of job involvement with the nature of supervision have been reported by Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) and Baba (1979). These studies suggest that the nature of supervision is, at best, an equivocal predictor of job involvement.
2. INTERPERSONAL CLIMATE:

The studies on the relationship of job involvement to the interpersonal climate at work reveal no consistent pattern of relationship, either in terms of direction or magnitude. While one might argue that the interpersonal climate at work fulfills the social needs of the workers and, thereby, any increase their job involvement, "considerable theoretical progress has to be made toward identifying specific factors of importance, before any fruitful outcomes can be expected in the empirical realm" (Baba, 1979).

ORGANIZATIONAL VARIABLES: Organisational size, structure, and climate are perceived by the workers as organisational characteristics; nevertheless, they affect worker behaviour on and off the job. For example, workers belonging to a larger organisation may feel more alienated at work than workers belonging to a small organisation because a large organisation tends to frustrate workers' ego needs by being more formal, impersonal, and mechanical in its operation. There are not many studies that report the relationship of job involvement to such organisational variables. Likert (1961) suggested that a participative organisational climate may increase worker involvement because such a climate contributes toward the fulfilment of intrinsic needs of the worker. Most researchers exploring the relationship of a participative climate in an organisation to job involvement have considered it as a job variable or as a characteristic of supervision. As a form of supervisory behaviour, participative management style has been found to be positively related to job involvement (Gardell, 1977; Ruh, Johnson, and Scontrine, 1973; Ruh, White, and Wood, 1975; Sakeh and Hosek, 1976; Siegel and Ruh, 1973; Steers, 1976; White, 1978; White and
Ruh, 1973). As an organisational characteristics, participative management has not been directly related to job involvement, although Tannenbaum (1966) and Likert (1961) have argued in favour of a positive relationship. Studies on the relationship of job involvement to organisational size, structure, and control system are simply non-existent.

**SOCIO-CULTURAL FACTORS:**

Variables such as rural/urban background, ethnic-cultural background, and religious background are thought to be related to job involvement. The reason for such a relationship lies the fact that the socialisation process to which these socio-cultural factors contribute acts as a predisposing cause of job involvement. The results of the studies exploring the relationship between job involvement and the socio-cultural factors are quite ambiguous. For example, some studies reported a positive relationship between community size and job involvement (Ruh, White, and Wood, 1975; Siegel and Ruh, 1973), whereas other studies reported no significant relationship between the two variables (Saal, 1978). No study has been reported that deals with ethnic-cultural and religious backgrounds of workers as correlates.