INTRODUCTION
1.1. INTRODUCTION

A citizen comes into contact with government organizations practically at every turn in his daily life. The scale of such activities is vast and it has enormous impact on the life of the community.

In a developing country like ours, various government agencies act as the pillars of society - the load bearing members of the main structure. They directly govern most of the essential services like communication and transport, hospitals, educational and financial institutions, or exercise indirect control over them. Similarly, major capital-intensive industry is in the public sector due to industrial policy resolutions.

The public attitude to government varies from those at one extreme, who advocate increasingly more interference in the citizen's affairs, to the other extreme, who regard every manifestation of public administration, however helpful, as the biggest impediment to progress.
Very often it is said 'government is not the solution, it is the problem'. It is a version of the time honoured aphorism that government is best when it governs least. Many writers feel that service institutions are inherently unmanageable and incapable of performance; further, that the government agency is run for the convenience of its employees rather than for contribution and performance. The most radical expression was first voiced by Ivan Illich a former priest and most clearly presented by educational critic John Holt (1972). Schools, they say, cannot perform. If only schools are abolished, children would learn. However, there is no evidence, that children will be more creative if schools are abolished. Neither is there evidence to show that nations will perform better, if there is no government. Probably, this would lead to anarchy. Since government plays a premier role in formulation and execution of policies, it is essential to study the men who run these institutions. Increasingly, there is a realisation that the real difference between one organisation and another is the performance of its people.

So far as other resources like materials and money are concerned, one organisation commands approximately to the same extent as another. In this context, it is often felt that of all the resources, the human
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So far as other resources like materials and money are concerned, one organisation commands approximately to the same extent as another. In this context, it is often felt that of all the resources, the human
resource is the least utilized, as its full potential is not tapped and put to work by organizations. The Government of India, realizing the importance of developing its personnel, formed a Central Ministry for Human Resources Development; the emphasis being on the recruitment, training, career planning and placement of individuals in various organizations.

1.2. WHY HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT?

An individual needs to develop just as an organisation or society does. The studies of Paul. F. Lazarsfeld and Maria Jahoda (1924), revealed that unemployment created severe psychological disturbances, not only due to economic deprivation, but primarily because it undermined self-respect. According to Drucker (1977), "Work is an extension of personality. It is achievement. It is one of the ways a person defines himself or herself, measures his worth and his humanity."

An individual needs to keep himself alert and mentally alive. He has to feel challenged. Not only must he acquire skills and learn from his experience, he needs to reflect on himself and count on his strengths. He needs to develop as a person even more than he needs development as a manager.
Every institution today agrees that 'people are the most important asset'. This, however, remains an empty slogan. In practice, all subordinates are treated as immature not knowing what is good for them. Research indicates that people will respond well to being treated as grown-ups.

The rewarding nature of work itself, recognition, responsibility opportunities for achievement and advancement were considered the major motivational and job satisfaction attributes by Herzberg (1959). He postulated that jobs must be enriched (not merely rotated or loaded) to provide opportunity for the employee's psychological growth.

Japanese management realized early that workers who were at the frontier (first line), know the business best and that innovation and improvement must come from GENBA (where the action is). People will flood you with ideas if you let them.

Betty Edwards (1990), states 'the hot topic right now is Creative Problem Solving.' Both at Corning and Eastman Kodak, unusual freedom to think was given and the employees came out with answers. Paul Schumann (1990), a creativity consultant, advised managers,
"make heroes of employees who personify what you want to see in the organisation."

Jon Henderson (1990), Director of Hallmark Company's creative resource centre, held, "you can't just order up a good idea or spend money to find one, you have to build a climate and give people the freedom to create

A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF ORGANIZATIONS

One of the earliest records of organizations in the West is said to be Exodus and Moses' father-in-law laying down the philosophy and plan for organisation. In India in the early times the caste system can be seen as the division of the society into effective organizations for the purpose of administration, education, defence, agriculture, trade and other services. Today, however, organizations have practically a stranglehold over men and as A.Etzioni (1964), puts it, "most members of modern societies are born in, educated by, work for, pray or play in and are buried by organizations."

The evolution of modern organisation theory can be viewed in terms of the two dimensional grid put forth by Richard Scott (1978). In this, one dimension is
from closed (mechanical thinking) to the open (Gestalt thinking) and the other side from rational actor (with clear defined purpose) to social actor (with purpose not clear or mechanical).

In the first phase Taylor (1911), whose name is synonymous with scientific management, expounded the machine theory, based on the premise that a member of an organisation was essentially a physiological unit. He and his colleagues, stressed on planning, standard practices, proper work tools and work method; based on time and motion study. He insisted on maximum specialisation and removal of all extraneous elements in order to concentrate on the essential task.

Even during his life time, bitter controversy arose regarding the alleged inhumanity of his system which reduced men to the level of efficiently functioning machines.

Max Weber (1864-1920), German sociologist, was more concerned with the administration level of organisation. He stressed the importance of hierarchical structure positions, authority and rules in solving the recurring problems of organisation. Bureaucracy according to Weber, was management by rules without regard for human emotion.
According to him, "precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of files, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, reduction of friction and of material and personal costs—these are raised to the optimum point in the strictly bureaucratic administration and specially in its monocratic form." He also emphasized that the decisive reason for the advance of bureaucratic organisation has been its purely technical superiority over any other form of organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rational actor</th>
<th>Closed System</th>
<th>Open System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1900-1930</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td>1960-1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chandler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lorsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social actor</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1930-1960</td>
<td>1970-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayoestal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGregor</td>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginzberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Richard Scott 1978)
Weber's idealistic concept of bureaucracy did not survive reality. Gouldner (1920-80), critical of this model, distinguished three patterns of bureaucratic behaviour - mock, representative and punishment centered, each with its characteristic values and conflicts.

In mock bureaucracy, rules are imposed on the group by some outside agency. Neither superiors nor subordinates really identify or participate in the establishment of the rules. They merely go through the motions of following them. Thus, the administration is divorced from reality.

In representative bureaucracy, the Weberian concept of rules promulgated by experts is developed. Authority here is based not on position but on accepted knowledge and expertise.

In the punishment centred, the rules arise in response to the pressures either management or workers. The attempt is made by either side to coerce the other side into compliance.

Gouldner emphasized the unanticipated consequences of bureaucratic functioning. General and impersonal rules, by their very nature, define what is not allowed
and thus increase people's knowledge of what is the minimum acceptable behaviour which tends to become the standard behaviour. Further, he pointed out the inherent contradiction in bureaucracy between a system of authority based on the appointment of experts (superior knowledge) and authority based on hierarchy and discipline (position).

Veblen (1940), criticized this form of administration pointing to the 'trained incapacity' of the expert. Merton (1940), added that the purpose served by rules and procedures is lost - the rules and their literal enforcement becomes the end towards which the bureaucrat is striving.

In the 1930s, the first phase was supplanted by the closed system social actor era, especially after the Hawthorne experiments of Elton Mayo, the founder of both the Human Relations Movement and of Industrial Sociology. He found the positive effects of paying attention to people. It had tremendous impact on the understanding, and bringing into prominence the 'Human Factor' in work situations.

McGregor (1960), in his book, 'The Human Side of Enterprise', examined the traditional conception of administration, implicitly based on "Theory X" - that
(i) the average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it, if he can;

(ii) that, therefore, people must be coerced, controlled, directed and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort towards the achievement of organizational objectives;

(iii) the average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, wants security above all.

By contrast, 'Theory Y' underlined the principle of Integration' to replace direction and control.

(i) The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest. The ordinary person does not inherently dislike work.

(ii) Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.

(iii) Commitment to objectives is a function of
rewards associated with their achievement.

(iv) The average human being learns under the right conditions not only to accept but to seek responsibility.

(v) Many more people are able to contribute creatively to the solution of organizational problems than they appear to do so and the potentiality of the average person is not fully used.

Barnard (1938), on the functions of the executives was the first to realise the unconventional and critical role of the executive to secure commitment and actively manage the informal organisation. He concluded that, "essential functions (of the executive) are, first, to provide the system of communications, second to promote the securing of essential efforts and third to formulate and define purpose." He was of the view that, purpose is more clearly indicated by the aggregate of action taken than by any formulation in words".

Philip Selznick (1957), propounded a similar theory to Barnard in which he invented terms like 'distinctive competence'. He suggested that organizational attempts to obtain conformity lead to unanticipated consequences.
such as lack of innovation and even rebellion.

The relevance of this era is immense. It leads to a fuller realisation of the human factor in work situation.

Stage three was at once a step backward and a step forward. Scott calls it the 'open system - rational actor' - era. Though it reverted to the mechanistic assumption about man, the proponents recognized that appropriate organizational structure will depend upon the environmental demands, taking a contingency approach, rejecting the formulation that one particular form (e.g., bureaucracy) or one particular motivational approach (McGregor's X and Y theory of Productivity) is always the best.

Lawrence & Lorsch (1967), and later Davis and Lawrence (1977), analysed the matrix organisation. Matrix organisation structures are those in which there is a multiple command system. For example, a finance manager could be responsible to a finance director for professional standards and a project director to whom he would be responsible for giving cost accounting services; many managers having two bosses - this concept clearly violates Fayol's principle of "Unity of command" and according to D S Pugh (1983), this
structure could be preferred only when (1) there are several highly salient sectors which are simultaneously necessary for goal achievement; (2) the tasks are uncertain, complex and interdependent and (3) there is a need to realise economies by using scarce resources effectively.

Chandler (1962), in 'Strategy and Structure' analyses historically and hypothesizes that structure of an organisation follows from the strategy that is adopted. Strategy is the determination of basic long-term goals and objectives, together with the adoption of, courses of action and allocation of resources for carrying out these goals. Structure is the organisation which arise from the strategies adopted. As such, it involves the existence of a hierarchy, the distribution of work and lines of authority and communication.

In the fourth stage, starting around 1970 and still continuing, the theoretical position postulated by Karl Weick (1979), and James March (1980), is the open system - social actor. Messiness dominates in both dimensions. The rational actor is superceded by the complex social actor, a human being with in-built strengths, weaknesses, limitations, irrationalities and organisation, insulated from outside, is buffeted by fast paced ever changing array of external forces.
Everything is in flux ends, means and forces of external change.

March (1980), says, "in decision making we sometimes need playfulness." Playfulness is a deliberate (but temporary) relaxation of our normal rules so that we can experiment. We need to play with foolish alternatives and inconsistent possibilities. We need to treat goals as hypotheses to be changed, institutions as real, hypocrisy as transitional inconsistency, memory as an enemy of the new and experience not as fixed history but as a theory of what happened which can be replaced by a different theory.

Currently, organizations are restructuring along flatter, leaner lines, with fewer layers of management and fewer people at upper levels. (balagen 1987). Hill, Hitt, Hoskisson (1988), noted that the trend towards diversification in products and services in organizations has also had an effect on the organisation structure of U.S. firms. This trend led to the development of a decentralized, multidivisional or 'M - form' structure with the following characteristics: Each distinct business is in its own operating division, the divisions are responsible for day-to-day operating decision and the corporate office is responsible for overall financial control of the
divisions and overall strategic development of the firm. Others envision an 'organizational map' including customers, suppliers, distributors and franchisees, with the organizational layers in a circular rather than hierarchical format (Peters 1988). Still others believe that globalization will increasingly require joint ventures and co-operative managements with the resulting organizational structure that is a network of contracted relationships and strategic alliances (Galbraith & Kazanjian, 1988).

1.4. PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN INDIA

The present administrative machinery has emerged from the British Colonial System. It dates back to the establishment of the Indian Civil Service based on the Macaulay Report submitted in 1854. It has a hierarchical structure with a top level leadership and the rank and file of members, who carry out the actual work. There is a third group of functionaries, who carry out the directions of the top level and supervise and control the activities of the workers. The system is highly rational as it employs objective standards to control the behaviour of its office-holders.

The critics hold that these organizations are unresponsive to the demands of the public. There is
also an excess of rules or legalism, maladjustment, a low level of morale. Some complain that potential executive material is destroyed by the dulling environment at the lower levels of hierarchy causing irreparable loss to the employer and employee concerned. Many feel that Parkison's Law (1958) that "work expands to fill the time available for its completion" and "an official wants to multiply subordinates, not rivals" is applicable to all government institutions, specially in India.

1.5. CONCEPTS

Since government organizations like all other organizations are manned by people, the structure and the climate of the organization affect these functionaries. Similarly, the personality, motivational forces operating, the experienced stresses, the belief systems, all have a vital impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of these institutions. Thus, these factors have to be studied to develop an understanding of the people functioning in these organizations.

1.5.1. Motivation

Understanding motivation is a necessary pre-requisite
to understanding behaviour in organizations.

Avoiding definitional controversy, three general questions can be asked about motivation -

(a) Why do we initiate action on a task?

(b) How much effort do we choose to expend?

(c) Why do we persist in working at the task over time?

A very useful distinction was drawn by J.P. Campbell and R.D. Pritchard (1976), regarding theories of motivation by distinguishing between process and content theories. They opined that the former, generated by the experimental side of psychology, attempt to provide a generalized (like drive theory, reinforcement theory, expectancy and equity theory) explanation of the processes involved. These theories discuss (i) choices among alternatives, (ii) courses of action (iii) varying degrees of effort expenditure and (iv) persistence over time. On the other hand, content theories having base in clinical differential psychology focus on the substantive nature of these variables that influence behaviour and less with the
process with which they do it, like Maslow's hierarchical need theory (1954), McClelland's need achievement (1953) or Herzberg's 2 factor theory. The emphasis is on the rewards people want rather than the process by which they do it.

Vroom (1964), was the first to present an expectancy model in organizational area. Based on the cognitive view that people think and that thought plays an important role in human behaviour, expectancy refers to the fact that people's performance is based on the expectancy of the results it is to yield. Further, individuals have preferences even among the different outcomes - or individuals are decision makers choosing among alternatives.

Vroom postulated, \( \text{FORCE} = \text{Expectancy} \times \text{Valence} \), valence being the positive or negative value anticipated by the individual as the outcome of action on the job; expectancy being the perceived relationship between a given degree of effort expenditure and a given level of performance.

However, this theory dealt only with future or anticipated consequences. The drives or the reinforcement of earlier experience played no part in
Graen (1969), broadened the conceptual base by including theoretical notions from attitude theory, role theory, interpersonal processes.

Porter and Lawler (1968), incorporated feedback notions that efforts will change as a result of extrinsic-intrinsic rewards. They also introduced the idea of equity or inequity and felt satisfaction; felt satisfaction being the level of reward actually received with the level an individual feels he should receive for a particular level of performance.

Naylor and Others (1980), questioned the veracity of the statement that performance depends on increasing the energy expended by individuals. They are of the view that probably the total energy expended remains constant over time. Further, that performance can be raised by increasing one's attention to task relevant activities as opposed to family or task-irrelevant concerns. Naylor is of the view that original need theory is very simplistic. Since men think, due to anticipation of future states of deprivation a person will still value an outcome that is related to needs that are totally satisfied at a given time. A manager given a recent promotion may engage in activities for the next promotion, though his current need for
promotion is satisfied.

Thus, in some circumstances, the receipt of an outcome may actually increase the strength of the need rather than decrease it.

Herzberg (1966), studied human motivation in the work situation and its effects on the individuals job satisfaction and mental health. The major findings of his survey of 200 engineers and accountants revealed that five factors stand out as strong determinants of job satisfaction: achievement, recognition, attraction of the work itself, responsibility and advancement (Motivators). For dissatisfaction, the factors that emerged were company policy and administration, supervision, salary, inter-personal relations and working conditions (hygienic factors.). Herzberg concludes that these two feelings are not the opposite of one another, rather they are concerned with two different ranges of man's needs. The opposite of job satisfaction, therefore, is not job dissatisfaction, but simply no job satisfaction and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is lack of job dissatisfaction. The motivation hygiene approach can be used to increase motivation and job satisfaction by enriching the jobs. The principles of job enrichment require that the job be developed to include new aspects which provide
opportunity for the employees psychological growth. Merely by adding one undemanding job to another (job rotation) or to switch from one undemanding job to another (job rotation) is not adequate. These are merely horizontal job loadings whereas job enrichment calls for vertical job loading, where opportunities for achievement responsibility, recognition, growth and learning are designed into the job. It is to remove controls and yet increase an individual’s accountability for his own work.

Hersey and Blanchard (1982), incorporated (Figure 1.1.) Maslow’s need theory, that there are physiological needs, safety needs, social, esteem and ultimately self-realization needs, into the Herzberg’s model of classes of work motivators – extrinsic and intrinsic. According to them, physiological safety, social, and part of the esteem needs (status), were all hygiene factors. Whereas another part of esteem need (recognition) and self actualization were considered
Motivators.
McClelland, Atkinson, Clerk & Lowell (1953), proposed an expectancy theory firmly grounded into two pervasive motives — the need for achievement and the fear of failure. Need for achievement is defined as a predisposition to strive for success. The fear of failure is defined as a predisposition towards minimisation of failure and pain.
During the 70s and 80s, there was an emergence of theoretical and empirical work on the acquisition and exercise of power in complex organizations. According to McClelland (1985), there are classes of natural incentives that are potentially motivating for all beings. Humans learn, that having an impact on one's environment or on other people is a source of positive effect.

Another recent theory of motivation is Bandura's (1986), social learning theory. This is a social cognitive theory with self-efficacy, and outcome expectancies as key cognitive variables. The theory states that people who judge themselves low in self-efficacy have difficulty in coping with environmental demands. They dwell on personal deficiencies. People who have a strong sense of self-efficacy, on the other hand, focus their attention on the demands of the situation. They are spurred to greater effort by obstacles.

In western organizational behaviour theory, nearly all models of motivation have been designed as direct forms of hedonism. The individual is viewed as a rational maximiser of personal utility, whatever may be the driving force, whether reinforcement, need fulfillment or expectations of the future.
In contrast, the Japanese model of motivation stresses attachment to the organisation and achievement of organisation goals. The emphasis is on cooperation, loyalty, service to long-term interest of the organisation and extra effort on behalf of the organisation. Thus, The major difference being relatively more emphasis on the collective motivation.

1.5.2. Structure & Climate

The structure of an organisation is the manner in which an organisation is formed; limits and influences the people's behaviour. Differing technologies, control systems and functions; impose their constraints on the structure in the organisation. There are the hierarchical structures as in bureaucracies (Weber) or Matrix organisation structures having multiple command systems (Davis Lawrence - 1977).

According to Pugh (1966), all organizations have to make provisions for continuing activities directed towards the achievement of given aims. Regularities in such activities as task allocation, the exercise of authority and coordination of functions are developed.
Such regularities constitute the organisation's structure and the fact that these activities can be arranged in various ways means that the organizations can have differing structures. Indeed, in some respects each organisation is unique. However, the differences can be related to size, ownership, location or technology of manufacture which produce the characteristic differences in structure of a bank, a hospital, a mass production factory or a local government department.

While the structure explains the form of an organization, climate has been given the geographical analogy. Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, Weick & Others (1970), have defined climate as, "a set of attributes specific to a particular organisation that may be induced from the way the organisation deals with its members and its environment."

They usefully described four dimensions of climate:

1. Individual autonomy

2. Degree of structure imposed in the position

3. Reward orientation
4. Consideration, warmth, support

Since very often climate has been defined as perceived, a very relevant question that is asked is whether the dimensions measured are the true attributes of the organisation or are they the perceived attributes; further, whether it is the affective response of the individual or is it an affect-free cognition.

Naylor (1980), viewed climate as the judgment process involved in attributing a class of human like traits to an entity outside the individual, where this entity may be a work group or even an entire organisation.

Climate of an organisation is at three different levels. Firstly, there are the actual environmental characteristics that constitute the basis for the social climate dimension.

Secondly, there are the individual perceptions of the degree to which these specific environmental attributes actually exist. And finally, there is the perception by the individual of the amount of particular social characteristic possessed by the organisation that is based upon the individual’s perception of environmental attributes.
1.5.3. Personality

Kluckhohn and Murray (1953), once noted that everyone is in some respects like all other persons, like some others and finally like no other individual.

Allport (1937), put forth the following formulation of personality, "personality is the dynamic organisation within the individual of those psycho-physical systems that determine his unique adjustment to the environment." Though personality is largely a differentiating concept, there are dimensions and facets that are present in varying degrees in everyone and they can be identified and measured. Cattell (1949, 1964), starting with initial 171 trait variables, developed a self-descriptive personality inventory to measure 16 of these source traits.

Eysenck (1963), developed personality scales with introversion-extroversion neuroticism dimensions. (The Eysenck personality inventory and the Maudsley personality inventory - 1959) Eysenck is of the view that many significant aspects of personality can be conceptualized as interaction between two basic dimensions or factors - the stable vs unstable and the introverted vs extroverted. In the instability and introversion dimension, there are the individuals who are of melancholic temperament and pessimistic, sober, anxious, reserved.

In the instability and extroversion dimension, one finds the choleric temperament, excitable, impulsive
From the time of Hippocrates, the biochemical factors in personality have been of considerable interest. In the past twenty years great deal of work has been done on the adrenal catecholamines, epinephrine and norepinephrine and other biogenic compounds. These compounds have been related to the experiencing of fear and anger, depression as well as feelings of pleasure in humans (Berlyne 1967). Further, it has been established that catecholamines are essential for many forms of aggressive behaviour (McClelland 1985).

1.5.4. Locus of Control

This concept is formulated within the framework of Social Learning Theory (Rotter 1954). It is related to measurement of the extent to which an individual (believes he) is self-motivated, directed or controlled (internal frame of reference) and the extent to which (he believes) the environment (luck, fate, chance, powerful others) influence his behaviour.

Within the framework of social learning, it forms one of the elements of a behavioural prediction formula, the other elements being those of situational determinants, reinforcement value and behaviour potentials. Rotter explains the distinction between internal and external control of reinforcement in the following terms:

"When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as
following some action of his own, but not being entirely contingent upon his action, then, in our culture, it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, fate, as under control of powerful others, or as unpredictable, because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him. When an event is interpreted in this way by an individual, we have labelled this as a belief in external control. If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behaviour or his own relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in internal control.

The internal–external dimension has been regarded as a continuum and Rotter urges against perceiving it in typological framework.

1.5.5. Stress

In recent years, the term stress has been used widely and with widely varying meanings in the behavioural science. Lazarus (1966), suggests a comprehensive definition of stress as a generic term for the whole area of problems that include the stimuli producing stress reactions, the reactions themselves, and the various intervening processes. The concept referring to the field of stress covers physiological,
sociological and social stresses.

Cannon (1935), had earlier suggested a homeostatic energy exchange model of stress. Some writers have proposed a response-based concept of stress while others have suggested a situation-based concept. As Marshall & Cooper (1979), point out, the term stress has been used to denote any of the three things (a) an excessive environmental force, (b) the harm caused or (c) the individuals' reactions in such a situation.

Finemann (1979), views stress as a social response state of negative effect, characterized by a persistent and high level of experienced anxiety and tension. Kahn (1970), views stresses an environmental characteristic thought to affect people adversely. Mechanic (1970), defines stress as a state wherein expected functioning gets disrupted.

Mcgrath (1976), states that "There is a potential for stress when an environmental situation is perceived as presenting a demand which threatens to exceed the person's capabilities and resources for meeting it, under conditions where he expects substantial differential in the rewards and costs from meeting the demand versus not meeting the demand." Stress need not necessarily be negative. As Klausner (1968), has
suggested, success in business, sports, politics, depends on stress seeking tendency.

Bernard (1968), proposed two types of stress - Dystress (unpleasant stress) and Eustress (pleasant stress).

The structure and the climate of an organisation affect the individuals functioning in these organisations.

The perceived stress and motivational factors are also very relevant to understand individuals. Similarly the personality and the belief system of an individual has a bearing on his actions. These are some of the primary concepts in the understanding human beings.

The literature on human resource development in government organisations is conceptually rich but data poor. Very few empirical studies exist. To overcome this lack of empirical data regarding the men functioning in government organisations, that this study has been undertaken.