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INTRODUCTION

Historical Perspective:

Since the dawn of human civilization, mankind has ceaselessly been striving for the goal of happiness, peace and stress-free life. These have been considered as parameters of human well-being and prosperity. The quest has led to a dynamic technological whirl-pool which has spawned mega-bureaucracies, micro-task specialization and greater urbanization (Pestonjee, 1987). Consequently, unending competitions and ever present challenges both at the organisational and individual levels have crept into our lives. More explicitly stated, one has to compete with oneself and with significant others in the organisation. Even while competing with oneself, one cannot totally disregard the primary social institutions, such as the home and family which have been nurtured over the years by human civilization, and valued deeply by the individual. We may subscribe to this view to a lesser or greater degree or we may even totally disregard the prevailing dilemma, but we would be forced to agree on one basic point - modern life is pervaded with stress.
The term 'stress', emanating from Latin literature has been incorporated in natural sciences and engineering to represent 'force, pressure or strain' which an individual resists in an attempt to maintain its original state. Concern about the impact of stress on people has its roots in medicine and specifically in the pioneering work of Selye (1936) who used the concept of stress in a manner relevant for social sciences. He expounded his biological concept of stress as the "General Adaptation Syndrome" (GAS) a three phase response to stress that begins with an alarm, continues with resistance and may terminate with exhaustion. This three phase response to stress incorporates the orchestrated set of physical and chemical changes which prepare an individual to fight or flee. This fight or flight label grows out of an evolutionary analysis of the origins of the stress response when our cave dwelling ancestors had only two options for dealing with the stressor - "fight or flight response". The major concerns of our ancestors were finding food, protecting themselves from environmental hazards and wild animals especially the sabre-toothed tiger they could eight fight it or attempt to flee from it. It is a centuries old, programmed response to threat that is a masterpiece of survival engineering, and yet it is tragically flawed in the sense that while the human nervous system is still responding the same way to environmental stressors, the stressors are not the same and the environment is radically different. The
present day world abounds with uncertainties, which include natural calamities as well as unpredictable events and incidents. Technological developments too, are accompanied by uncertainty, disruption and obsolescence. All these things cumulatively add to confusions that confound our lives. Ours is an era so impermanent that change and its effects have become the dominant features in many descriptors applied to recent times: the Age of Discontinuity (Drucker, 1968), the Age of Future Shock (Toffler, 1970), the Age of Uncertainty (Galbraith, 1977) and the Age of Anxiety (Albrecht, 1979). In a real sense change is the ultimate stressor.

The work of Selye (represented by the classic GAS model) stimulated a vast array of research which we find encompasses the concept from diverse perspectives: physiological, psychological and sociological. These three emphases have influenced the variations in definitional and theoretical approach in stress research.

Stress Defined: Throughout history, 'stress' has been one of those things that everyone has experienced but few can define. At the inter-disciplinary level we find that the word stress connotes different meanings to different people and thus it is not precisely defined in various disciplines. Our contention is substantiated by Mason (1975), Ursin, Boade and Levin (1978) and Yuwiler (1976) who have observed that there exists a lack of general agreement over its definition.
The available scientific literature reveals that studies on stress can be placed into one of the three groups representing the main approaches to the problem of its definition and its nature. The first approach describes stress in terms of 'stimulus' characteristics of those disturbing or noxious environments that affect people adversely (Homes & Rahe, 1967; Anderson, 1978; Welford, 1973, Margetts, 1975). Such an approach usually treats stress as an independent variable for study and demands consideration of what stimuli are diagnostic of stress.

The second approach treats stress as a dependent variable for study, describing it in terms of the person's response to disturbing or noxious environment (Kahn, 1964, Beehr & Newman, 1978, Cofer and Appley, 1964, Hammer & Organ, 1978). This particular view of stress received its initial impetus from the writings of a physiologist Hans Selye (1956). He wrote 'stress is the non-specific (physiological) response of the body to any demand made upon it'. He believed that physiological stress response did not depend on the nature of the stressor and the pattern of defense reactions was essentially the same for all the animals. Selye's view of stress was later on developed by Levi & Kagan (1971) who emphasised the role of psychological factors in the mediation of physical disease. Levi & Kagan are of the view that the interaction of the psycho-social stimuli and the
psychological programme (Genetic factors & early life experiences) determine the occurrence of stress response. Pridham (1977) proposed a socio-psychological model of stress using a systems view. The 3 elements in the model are - stressor, stress state and state response. Similarly, Antonovsky (1979) and Justice (1985) view stress as evolving from exposure to stressor. Finemann (1979) suggests that stress is a psychological response state of negative effect characterised by persistent and high level of experienced anxiety or tension. Ivancevich & Matteson (1980) view stress as an adaptive response, moderated by individual differences, that is a consequence of any action, event or situation that places special demands upon a person.

The third approach views stress as an interactive process which encompasses the stimuli producing stress reactions, the reactions themselves and the various intervening processes (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). This interactional approach treats stress as an intervening variable between stimulus and response. Man-environment transaction model of Cox and Mackay (1976) suggests that stress arises when there is an imbalance between the perceived demand and perceived capability. A very similar working definition is proposed by McGrath (1976). He suggested that there is a potential for experiencing stress when a situation is perceived as presenting a demand which
threatens to exceed the person's capabilities and resources for meeting it. Demand and adjustment model of Lazarus (1966) suggests that 'stress occurs when there are demands on the person which tax or exceed his adjustive resources'. This interactional approach has been a major impetus to stress research because it highlights the role of cognitive appraisal and coping actions as critical features in defining stress.

Occupational Stress

The popularity of the stress concept has dwindled in the physiological field, where it first started and the use of the stress terminology continues to flourish in the psychological and social fields and since the early 1960's the term 'stress' has come into wide use in relation to work organisations (Agarwala, Malhan & Singh, 1979). The study of stress at work has attracted a considerable amount of interest in behavioural science research due to the realization that stress may hinder organisational effectiveness (McGrath, 1976; Steers, 1981); it is the major cause of employee turnover and absenteeism, thereby having indirect bearing in terms of financial impact and workers compensation (Schuler, 1980; Steers, 1981).

The terms occupational stress, job stress, and organisational stress have been used synonymously by various experts. The difference between these terms is sharp edged
and a clear-cut definition is often not possible. While job stress is specifically related to the physical working conditions, organisational stress on the other hand arises out of organisational structure and climate. Occupational stress is much broader term because it encompasses intrinsic aspects of job, organisational structure and climate, as well as role facets in the organisation. It is a more acceptable term as compared to job stress which implies a much narrower sense.

Determinants of Occupational Stress:

It is borne out by psychological literature that occupational stress is a condition wherein job related factors interact with worker's characteristics to disrupt psychological and physiological homeostasis such that the person is forced to deviate from normal functioning (Margolis & Kroes, 1974; McLean, 1974; Beehr & Newman, 1978; Brief, Schuler and Van Sell, 1981). More precisely, stress at work is a result of the interaction between the individual and his work environment. These considerations have probably led French, Rogers and Cobb (1974) to evolve the theory of person-environment fit. They reported two kinds of fit between the individual and the job environment. First kind of fit is the extent to which the person's skills and abilities match the demands and requirements of the job. Second kind of fit is the extent to which the job environment facilitates the satisfaction of needs of the person. It is quite apparent
that misfit of either kind may threaten the individual's well-being and generate strain in the person. This theory has been empirically tested by Harrison (1976). The findings of the study support the assumption that the primary link between job stress and health strain is person-environment misfit.

Researchers in the field of occupational stress (Cooper and Marshall, 1976; Eden, Kellarman & French, 1977; McGrath, 1976) have succeeded in highlighting the major sources of stress which can easily be placed into one of the following broad categories.

**Intrinsic to the Job:** Poor physical condition, work overload, time pressures and physical danger.

**Role in the organisation:** Role ambiguity, role conflict, responsibility for persons.

**Career Development:** Overpromotion, underpromotion, lack of security, lack of training, intrinsic impoverishment, low status.

**Relationships at work:** Poor relations at work, difficulties in delegating responsibility, lack of respect.

**Organisational Structure & Climate:** Underparticipation, restrictions on behaviour, red tape, office politics, unreasonable political and group pressures, powerlessness.
Thus stress can be caused by too much or too little to work, time pressures and deadlines, having to make too many decisions (Sofer, 1970), fatigue from the physical strains of the work environment, excessive travels, long hours, having to cope with changes at work, and the expenses (monetary and career) of making mistakes (Kearns, 1973).

Research evidences have demonstrated a large number of correlates of occupational stress. But a closer scrutiny reveals that most of the researchers have tried to trace the pathological concomitants of stress such as blood pressure, cholesterol level, and coronary heart disease. The primary concern should be on the efficiency of the normal individuals in organisational setting because in addition to the detrimental effects on the smooth functioning of an organization occupational stress has been found to be associated with absenteeism (Gupta & Beehr, 1979; Margolis, Kroes and Quinn, 1974), job dissatisfaction (Miles, 1985; Beehr, 1976; and Pestonjee & Singh, 1982) and voluntary turnover (Ivancevich, Matteson & Preston, 1982).

Role Stress:

Among other organisational variables employees job roles have been found to be the major occupational stressors. Within an organisational context, role can be understood in formal terms by the job description, job specification and by the organisational structure (Francis & Melbourn, 1980). The
key to a successful assumption of a particular role in the organisation is the extent to which the individual expectations and organisational expectations match.

Several systems of classifications have been used to discuss role stress. Kahn & Quinn (1970) classify it under 3 main headings; expectation generated stress, which includes role ambiguity and role conflict; expectation resource discrepancies, which includes role overload, responsibility authority dilemma and inadequate technical information; and role and personality. French and Caplan (1973) have indicated role conflict, role ambiguity and role overload as general types of role stress.

Applied to the work place, role conflict implies "an incompatibility between job tasks, resources, rules or policies, and other people" (Nicholson & Goh, 1983) Kahn et al. (1964) assert that role conflict occurs when the "individual in a particular work role is torn by conflicting job demands or doing things he does not think are part of the job specification".

Role ambiguity results from inadequate information or knowledge to do a job. Unlike role conflict, the state of role ambiguity is one of uncertainty and lack of clarity regarding job duties and responsibilities (Kahn et. al. 1964; Marshall & Cooper, 1979).
Role overload has also been reported as a potential source of occupational stress in which a person is faced with a set of obligations requiring him to do more within a specified time limit (Sales, 1969). The focal person finds that he cannot complete all the task urged on him by various people within the stipulated time limits and requirements of quality.

In any event, the result of role conflict, ambiguity and overload, is stress for the individual and there is a substantial body of research indicating undesirable outcomes for the individual and the organisation. Studies have shown that role stress was negatively correlated with satisfaction with pay, supervision, advancement, job satisfaction, motivation, productivity and self-esteem, and positively correlated with expressed intention to leave the job, increased anxiety, depression and resentment, turnover and decision delays, increased absenteeism, deterioration of interpersonal relations and even increases in accident rates (Tannenbaum, 1966; Keller, 1975; Brief & Aldag, 1976, Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970; Caplan & Jones, 1975; Kahn et al. 1964; Margolis & Kroes, 1974; Johnson & Sarason, 1973; Singh Agarwal and Malhan, 1981; Jagdish and Srivastava, 1983).

Pareek (1981) differing from other experts, postulated role as a system; the system of various roles the individual carries and performs; and the system of various roles of
which his role is a part, and in which his role is defined by other significant roles. Pareek (1976) has called the first 'role space' and the second 'role set' and delineated ten different types of organisational role stress:

**Inter-role Distance:** is experienced when there is a conflict between organisational and non-organisational roles. For e.g. the role of an executive versus the role of a husband.

**Role Stagnation:** is the feeling of being stuck in the same role, having fewer opportunities for learning and growth.

**Role Erosion:** arises when a role has become less important than it used to be i.e. the challenge associated with the role has somehow been lessened.

**Role Expectation:** symbolizes conflicting demands made on the role by different persons (Superiors, Subordinates and peers) in the organisation.

**Role Overload:** is the feeling that too much is expected from the role than what the occupant can cope with.

**Role Ambiguity:** is experienced when there is lack of clarity about the demands of the role.

**Role Isolation:** is indicative of the absence of strong linkages of one's roles with other roles in the organisation.

**Self-role Distance:** arises from a gap experienced between one's concept of self and the demands of the role.

**Personal Inadequacy:** is depicted by the absence of adequate skills, competence and training to meet the demands of one's
role.

Resource Inadequacy: arises when the human or material resources allocated are inadequate to meet the demands of the role.

The role stresses identified by Pareek (1981) encounters all the stressors one may have on his job.

SOCIAL AND FAMILY ROLE STRESS:

There are many potential sources of stress within the organisation. These stressors, in conjunction with events outside work (marital problems, family illness), interact to affect the total quality of one's life. This could be ascertained with the help of recent literature that has come to our light (Schein, 1978; Korman & Korman, 1980; Bhagat, 1983; Vadra & Akhtar, 1989; Akhtar & Vadra, 1990). Since the extra-organisational stressors range from changes in socio-technical system to the phenomena of social change, (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1980) endeavour has been made to highlight significant extra-organisational stressors.

Amongst the various extra-organisational sources of stress the social and family stressors have been examined more closely because of their great impact on personality development. Though the family may not itself be the source, it can be the unit within which stressors emerge, interact and exert a significant impact on people (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1987). A circular relationship exists between
family and work. The job and family are interacting factors with which a person must cope on a regular basis. Stressors in the family vary greatly in severity and in degree of continuity; there are brief crisis, such as illness of a family member, or long term strained relations with spouse or children. Often transfer and promotion impose a fresh demand on the employee for readjustment and in many cases the separation from the family may emerge as a poignant stressor. Relocation and change produce varied symptoms such as emotional disorientation, confusion and even physical ailments (Sinetar, 1986). Similarly to cope with economic and financial stressors many people have been forced to take a second job. This reduces time for relaxation and pleasant interaction with the family members. In such cases there is every likelihood that the accumulated stress would more adversely affect the employee. Our point of view gathers support from the work of Davidson and Cooper (1981) who emphasised that stress at work can also affect an individual in home and social environment and vice-versa. Marshall & Cooper (1979) delineated four intrusions of work into home life: carrying pending work to home, business travel, organisational social commitments and exclusive job pursuits such as advancement in the job and accepting new assignments.

Changed scenario as regards the employment of women is concerned is creating a diabolical situation which may lead to conflicting and overlapping responsibilities. In such
situations stress may loom large over to further reinforce stresses. This is vindicated by role theory which predicts that multiple roles can lead to inter-role conflict and in turn symptoms of strain (Kopelman et al. 1983). Inter-role conflict is likely to increase as the demands of either the work or family role increase (Beutell & Greenhaus, 1983). Similarly, inter-role conflict can increase as one's obligations to the family expand through marriage and the arrival of children. This is particularly the case for women, who tend to assume responsibility for household management and child care (Gorden & Strober, 1978; Gutek, et al. 1981). Role stress has been operationalised by Bhagat & Chassie (1981) to reflect the often demanding and conflicting time allocations that working women must contend with in order to manage their various responsibilities at work and at home. The burden of two full-time jobs: a career and a home makes them feel guilty about compromising both the quality of their work and relationship with their family (Etzion & Pines, 1986).

Role stress may occur not only during one's official professional job but may also result from the fact that professionals are often expected to continue to perform their role when they are outside the organisational setting (Vachon, 1987).
Perhaps the most universal cost of a successful professional career lies in the quality of family life. The executives frequently complain about their unsatisfactory home lives. The job exerts pressure on the man to spend more time at work, while the wife and children exert pressure for more time to be spent at home. The unfortunate executive is trapped right in the middle. If he leans towards the career his family life suffers, if he prefers to concentrate more attention towards his family, then he stands to lose professionally (Cooper and Marshall, 1979). Thus it is imperative that pressures of concern for family can spill over and affect work performance (Laube, 1973) while becoming emotionally involved with one's organisational roles can lead to taking one's stresses home with potentially detrimental consequences (Hadley, 1977). Googins & Burden (1987) in their study on managers found that workplace-family role strain was strongly associated with decreased physical and emotional well-being as measured by depression, life satisfaction, and days absent.

These considerations impress us with the fact that stress is truly complex and multiplicity of factors influence it. The complexity may be magnified by the interaction of social and family stress. Multiple roles, working husbands and wives, age of children, work and home responsibilities, migration, marriage delay, political
uncertainties, etc. create fathomless permutations and combinations of stress parameters (Larwood & Wood, 1979; Bhagat & Chassie, 1981; Pleck, 1977; Gutek et al., 1981; Gove & Tudor, 1973; Long & Porter, 1984). Hence a comprehensive view of stress can only be properly understood when we attach equal importance to extra-organisational factors, because what the person does outside work is both a determinant of his reaction to work, and at the same time affected by it.

**JOB INVOLVEMENT:**

The phenomenon of job involvement emerged from a factor analytic study of job satisfaction by Lodahl (1964). Initially, the researchers tried to determine its direct and indirect impact on productivity but later on emphasis was laid on exploring its relationship with situational and organisational variables (Akhtar & Kumar, 1978; Schwyhart & Smith, 1972; Hall & Mansfield, 1975; Bajaj, 1978; Bamba, 1979). The term job involvement was used in various contexts and often confused with ego-involvement, need satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. Lawler and Hall (1970) provided theoretical and empirical evidence to distinguish these terms. Also Cummings & Bigelow (1976) and Akhtar & Ahmad (1978) have confirmed that these terms are factorially independent.

The concept of job involvement has gained much importance in recent years, because of its pivotal role in
providing a link between performance on the one hand and employee needs and quality of working life on the other. It is very central to work motivation and is an important component of organisational effectiveness (Hall & Lawler, 1970; Walton, 1972; Dewhrist, 1973).

Lodahl & Kejner (1965) defined job involvement as "the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work, or the importance of work in his total self-image". They further contended that job involvement is the internalization of values about the goodness of work and during the process of socialization these work values are injected into the self of the individual that remains even at the later stage in the form of attitudes towards job. The values which are internalised by the individual during the socialisation are the major outcome of religious and social philosophies. Moreover, socio-cultural aspects, also influence involvement, e.g. the environment where everyone is working and enterprising, then to be enterprising becomes a social norm which forces every one to get socialised through identification with this socio-cultural norm and subsequently, get committed and job involved. Similar definitions have been offered by Lawler & Hall (1970), Kununungo, Mishra & Dayal (1975) and Saleh and Hasek (1976) where job involvement represents the degree to which job
situation is central to one's life and self concept and the phenomenon of identification seems to be implicit.

Kanungo (1981) gave the motivational approach to job involvement and advocated that "the level of job involvement may be primarily a function of perceived need satisfying potentials of the job whereas the level of work involvement may be mainly determined by the individual's socialisation training in protestant ethic". This implies that job involvement refers to a specific belief regarding the present job. This belief operates at a descriptive level and describes workers identifications as they are. Work involvement on the other hand refers to a general belief about work. This belief operates at a normative level and is largely decided by the socialisation process. Warrenfeltz (1986) in a longitudinal examination of the work involvement construct found it to be a relatively stable construct that is related to early life experiences with work. Further he also experimentally demonstrated that different mechanisms were involved in the formation of job involvement in comparison to those for work involvement. While the level of job involvement could be altered by manipulating job parameters, work involvement was essentially unaffected by job parameters (reward, cost, investment size and alternative value).
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. Saleh (1981) argues that job involvement is a multidimensional concept 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) variables contribute to the prediction of job involvement.

Review of the definitions with regard to job involvement reveals that it has been viewed either in terms of individual differences or job situations, or by an interaction between the individual and his job. In fact these three sets of factors - personal, situational and work outcome variables, are essential determiners of job involvement.

There has been an increasing interest among scholars in the empirical assessment of the correlates of job involvement in a variety of organisational settings. Psychological literature has classified the correlates of job involvement in terms of personal characteristics, situational characteristics and work outcomes. Bass (1965), in his study, found job involvement positively related to performance. Runyon (1973) perceived job involvement as a
relatively stable personal characteristic and opined that men are traditionally more likely to value work than women, aside from its importance to earn a living. Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968) found that job involvement is significantly related to satisfaction with motivator variables. Rabinowitz & Hall (1977) thoroughly reviewed the studies in the field and concluded that age and protestant work values were the strongest correlates of job involvement. Weissenberg & Gruenfeld (1980) found job involvement related positively to satisfaction with recognition, with responsibility, with achievement and with interpersonal relations with superiors.

Research concerning job involvement started considerably late in India in comparison to the West. The socio-cultural disparity between the industrially developed countries and the developing ones, like our own, stresses the significance of researches to be done in Indian social conditions. Indian researchers have attempted to explore the relationship of job involvement with demographic variables (Akhtar & Kumar, 1978; Sharma & Kapoor, 1978; Bajaj, 1978; Anantharaman, 1980; Kumari & Singh, 1988), anxiety (Bajaj, 1978b), different occupational groups (Bajaj 1978a; Anantharaman & Deivasenapathy, 1980; Singh, 1984; Kumari & Singh, 1988), role conflict and role ambiguity (Madhu & Harigopal, 1980; Singh, 1984; Srivastava & Singh, 1983; Singh & Mishra, 1983) and on other variables like childhood
aspirations and expectations, participation, adjustment, satisfaction, locus of control, quality of work life, leadership styles, etc. (Akhtar & Bachcha, 1984; Singh, 1984; Reddy & Kumar, 1980; Reddy & Rajasekhar, 1988; Dhillon & Dondona, 1988; Srinivasan & Kamalanabhan, 1986; Dolke & Srivastava, 1988). The results of these studies are inconsistent while predicting the influence of various demographic and personality variables on job involvement because differing socio-cultural milieu, work values and working conditions bring about variations in cause and effect relationships.

Srivastava & Sinha (1983) found a negative relationship between JI & Occupational stress. Akhtar & Kumar (1978) found that the satisfaction of higher order needs, satisfaction with organisational variables and job levels in no way influence job involvement. Some Indian studies suggest that JI may be related to the total personality profile of workers (Singh, 1972; Prabhakar, 1979). Verma (1985) investigated the personality factors that affect JI in 68 employees of a Steel Plant and found the association of the following factors with job involved subjects: Outgoing, emotionally stable, assertive, conscientious, venture-some, placid, conservative, self-sufficient, controlled and relaxed.
Looking to the work done with respect to job involvement it is amply clear that not much concerted effort has been made to relate stressful aspects of work to job involvement.

AIMS & OBJECTIVES

In the light of the above discussions it is reasonable to infer that role stress and occupational stress are two separate constructs and we intend to explore the relative contributions of occupational stress and social and family role stress to the job involvement experienced by job incumbents. The problem assumes added significance due to the fact that there has been a reorientation in stress research from a nearly exclusive emphasis on organisational stress to an appreciation of extraorganisational stressors.

The present study focuses on the assumptions, gaps and biases in the literature. The home has been viewed as a stress-free sanctuary, whereas the workplace stress has been overemphasized. To better understand the costs and benefits of employment and of multiple roles and the stressfulness of family roles, more attention to the qualitative aspects of role is needed. In such a case the study assumes new
challenges because occupational stress and social and family role stress together may have a more profound influence on the individual than either type of stress alone. Hence more the stress, the more it would tend to disturb the interpersonal relationship both in the organisation as well as in the family. But whether a stress situation will elicit specified changes in behaviour that may effect job involvement requires an examination. In this respect, the present study takes a departure from other studies in that it seeks to identify how role stress and occupational stress are associated with job involvement. More specifically, the thrust of the present investigation is to investigate and isolate the organisational and extra-organisational sources of stress which can predict job involvement in a variety of different occupational settings. In this respect, the present study may fill a void which exists in this area.

When we look to our own country, we observe that most of the Indian researchers have tried to borrow and utilize factors and methodology used by psychologists in industrially developed countries. The socio-cultural differences are usually disregarded. It is apparent that social and family factors peculiar to Indian workers were not taken into
account while studying occupational stress. In fact the absence of any measuring device for social and family role stress obscured the real understanding of the phenomena. This lacunae has been overcome recently with the earnest attempt of Vadra and Akhtar (1990) to develop a social and family role stress (SFRS) Scale which incorporates stress factors that are specific to our own socio-cultural milieu.

The focus of this research was on exploring what set of factors tend to produce job-family role strain within and between components of the family-occupational role system - i.e. the individual, the family, and the workplace. Such study is expected to yield a wealth of data concerning the sources of stress and provide concrete suggestions regarding what can be done by families and employers to systematically alleviate it and reduce its negative effects on family functioning and work productivity. The present piece of research will be of wide interest to all concerned with the effects of stress and strain and with the quality of working life.

The present study would highlight the effect of organisational, extra-organisational and personal (demogra-
phic) variables on job involvement and would enable us to organise several training courses and to suggest ways and means how best stress could be controlled and work performance improved. The results are expected to throw new light on the dynamics of human performance and may necessitate changes in organisational policy of recruitment and training. Consultants working in the areas of recruitment, selection and placement, organisational design and development, productivity and improvement, will find much of value here.

The findings of the study may help us in determining the presence of occupational stress and role stress in Indian organisations and may help us in developing an intervention strategy to minimize the effect of stress on the job and in the family.

Summarizing the objectives of the study it may be pointed out that empirical studies with regard to extra-organisational stressors have not been undertaken. Attempts have seldom been made to incorporate various facets of job involvement and to determine its predictors.
Studies on job involvement, occupational and extra-organisational stressors in Indian socio-cultural milieu are scarce.

The findings may have wide and varied implications for human resource management.