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Introduction

Organizations have been in existence since the dawn of civilization, but modern organizations differ from earlier ones in several respects. As organizations are always in tune with environmental demands, their shapes are vastly different from those of the past and are likely to change further in future, as can be seen from the Opening Spotlight. Modern organizations are large in size and complex in nature. They meet a greater variety of individual and social needs. Their number is ever growing. In fact, in order to support a first-order organization, a whole set of second- and third-order organizations is needed. For example, the Parliament enacts laws, and frames rules and regulations for governing the operation of social institutions. An agency is needed to enforce and implement such laws, rules and regulations, and still another agency is needed to see that the same are being enforced and implemented properly. This heightening complexity of organizations in future may warrant a flexible structure staffed with multi-skilled people working in teams on cross-functional boundaries. The word 'organization' has two meanings, viz.: (i) an institution and (ii) the process of arranging, allocating and bringing relationships among men, material, machines, etc. The term 'organization' denotes the second meaning in this discussion. Organization establishes relationship among the people so that they collectively contribute to the attainment of organizational goals effectively.

The functions and principles of management have been undergoing a sea change since the announcement of economic liberalizations in the country in 1991. In fact, the practice of management has been increasingly humanized in the process of globalization of Indian economy unlike in personnel management. The concept of Human Resource Development (HRD) is increasingly becoming a most vital function of a modern manager. So, in the present fast changing scenario there are viable means of developing an employee-oriented culture where employees irrespective of their legitimate hierarchy or power position may enjoy
working and may feel at-home while discharging their responsibilities at work. It is imperative to stress on, the notion of enjoyment and feeling at-home in working may not appear unless positive organizational culture exist where people have faith, trust, co-operation, co-ordination, self-motivation, experience satisfaction and ultimately these may lead to heighten commitment etc. In view of these facts, the present endeavor was undertaken to study work commitment as a function of HRD activities, organizational culture and occupational stress. In the present proposed study work commitment has been taken as dependent variable where as HRD activities, organizational culture and occupational stress as independent variables. It is needed here to give description of the nature, concept and relevance of the phenomenon of all variables. First, discuss the work commitment i.e. a dependent variable.

**Work Commitment:**

Work commitment is an important aspect for any organization, which has its direct influence on productive efficiency. In the present modern world the major concern of management is to utilize the maximum human resource to enhance quality of skill, quality of life and subsequently organizational commitment and other work related attitude and behavior. Work commitment is an important aspect allied with motivation. And that is why a number of motivational theories and approaches have been proposed by different thinkers. In this modern era work commitment is being viewed as an important aspect for determining employees’ productivity efficiency because perception of work commitment has been regarded as an important construct in understanding the work behavior of employees. This concept has also become an important tool to be used as an aid to achieve organizational goals and also in maintaining high level of discipline in the organization. It is considered as an important characteristic of affective and healthy organizations which always increases the productivity of the organization. From the available literature on organizational commitment it is clear that strong significant relationship exists between organizational commitment and various organizational outcomes, viz; performance, absenteeism, turnover, job satisfaction and with other job related variables.
Before going into detail of these relationships, it is important to have a clear picture about the concept and meaning of organizational commitment.

Organizational commitment is most often defined as (1) a strong desire to remain a member of a particular organization; (2) a willingness to exert high levels of efforts on behalf of the organization; and (3) a definite in, & acceptance of, the values and the goals of the organization.

In other words, this is an attitude reflecting employees' loyalty to their organization and is an ongoing process through which organizational participants express their concern for the organization and its continued success and well being.

Whyte (1956) a social anthropologist proposed the concept of “the organization man” – a person who only works for the organization but also a sense of organizational belongingness. This concept received wide publicity in the field of organizational behavior. After two years of Whyte’s ‘the organization man’ concept Lawrence (1958) in his paper, expressed his opinion that the one sentiment, i.e. “a complete loyalty to the organizational purpose” should be dominated in all employees from top to bottom to get the employees committed to the organization.

Kelman (1958) constructed taxonomy, noting that individuals can accept influence in their conceptually distinct way: (a) compliance or exchange, (b) identification or affiliation and (c) internalization or value congruence. Among these three, the process of internalization is significantly important as it occurs when influences are accepted and consequently inculcate attitudes and modifies behavior congruent with own values. Thus, the basis for one’s psychological attachment to an organization is likely to be the function of (a) Compliance or instrumental involvement for specific, extrinsic rewards, (b) Identification or involvement based on desire for affiliation and (c) internalization or involvement predicted on congruence between individuals and organizational values or in conjunction there of.

According to Becker (1960) commitment involves “consistent lines of activities” in behavior that are produced by exchange considerations to which he
called side-bets, as pension that grows in proportion to years in the organization. Later on, in 1969 Ritzer & Trice analyzed Becker's side-bet concept of commitment and tested its aspects on both organizational and occupational commitment. Becker's side-bet concept was the first source for defining the term commitment. It suggests that commitment comes into being when a person, by making a side-bet, links extraneous interests with a consistent line of activity.

Etzoini (1961) for the first time developed a typology of commitment and pointed out that the power or authority that organization have over their employees is rooted in the nature of the employee's involvement in the organization. He described this involvement or commitment involving behavior as (a) moral involvement, (b) calculative involvement, and (c) alimentative involvement. Moral involvement is that which has positive and high intense orientation towards the organization based on internalization of organizational goals and values and / or identification with authority, calculative involvement, on the other hand, represents a less intense relationship with the organization and is largely based on a rational exchange of benefits and rewards. Etzoine further suggests primary control mechanisms that organizations often employ to secure compliance with organizational directives. Normative power, which rests largely on the allocation of symbolic rewards is most often associated with moral involvement, where as remunerative power is typical with calculative and lastly, coercive power is used in a situation where alienated involvement is concerned.

Kanter (1968) have defined commitment in terms of social values. He suggests that commitment is the willingness of the social actor to give their energy and loyalty to social systems, the attachment of personality system to social relations.

Kanter (1968) suggested three forms of commitments. They are; continuance commitment that refers to as the members' dedication to the survival of the organization. Cohesion commitment is referred as to the attachment to the social relationships in an organizational context, which is brought through public renunciation of previous social ceremonies. Thirdly, the control commitments which are the result of members' attachment to the
organizational norms that shape behavior towards desired direction or develop employees’ pro-activity conducive to organizational objectives.

Further Brown (1969) while describing commitment highlights three important facets that includes; (a) the notion of membership, (b) current position of the individual and, (c) predictive potential concerning certain aspects of performance, motivation to work, spontaneous contribution and other related outcomes. Brown suggests the differential relevance of motivational factors.

Hall & others (1970) viewed commitment as a process by which the goals of the organization and those of the individual’s become increasingly integrated or congruent. Sheldon (1971) advocated that commitment is “an attitude or an orientation towards the organization, which links or attaches the identity of a person to the organization”.

Organizational commitment is a powerful tool that can be used as an aid to achieve higher level of performance and to develop and maintain discipline in an organization. The construct has been found to be related to many important outcome variables like performance, absenteeism, employee’s turnover, tardiness, etc. Sherwin (1972) rightly pointed out that lack of commitment to the work and the organization can contribute to the major problems faced by organizations like cost of production and poor services. In Buchanan’s (1974) opinion commitment is a partisan, effective attachment to the goals and values and to the organization for its own sake, a part it’s purely instrumental worth.

Porter et al. (1974) defined commitment as the strength of one’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization and it is characterized by a willingness to exert considerable efforts on behalf of the organization and a desire to maintain membership in it. Further in 1976, Porter & associates described commitment as more active and positive orientation towards the organization. This definition clearly highlights to the aspect to functional desire to continue at work.

Wiener & Gechman (1977) viewed commitment in terms of behaviors that are socially accepted and exceed formal and/or normative expectation relevant to the object of commitment.
Salancik (1977) differentiated commitment as seen by organizational behavioral researchers and social psychologist. Organizational behavioral researchers describe commitment as the process by which employees come to identify with the goals and values of the organization and consequently are desirous of maintaining membership in the organization i.e. attitudinal commitment where as the process by which an individual’s past behavior serves to bind him/her to the organization is called as behavioral commitment by social psychologists (Kiesler, 1971).

A model developed by Steers (1977) describes the antecedents and outcomes of commitment. According to this model there are three main categories of variables that influence commitment they are personal characteristics or attachments (it include the variables such as, need for achievement, work experience, age, and education). Work experience, the second category of influence describes socializing forces as to have an impact on attachments formed with the organization. This category includes the experience and attitude of the individual and the group towards the organization. The third category, job characteristics includes challenges, opportunities for social interaction and feedback.

Stevens et al. (1978) after an intensive review of definitions of commitment reached to the conclusion that the approaches can best be summarized into two categories; exchange approach and psychological approaches. The exchange approach views commitment as an outcome of inducement contributing to transaction between the organization and the members. The later one, i.e., psychological approach describes commitment as a more active and positive orientation towards the organization. And because of such orientations employees have the willingness to work to attain organization’s goals and people feel and perceive difficulty in leaving the organization.

In quest of achieving efficiency through commitments Katz & Kahn (1978) suggested that developing high organizational commitment, maximizing innovative and spontaneous behavior which implied that organizations need not
go beyond attracting and holding people in the system to achieve better efficiency. Commitment is based on internalized motivational patterns where competence is implicit being an inevitable aspect of commitment at work or in the organization.

In the words of Mowday & others (1979) organizational commitment is viewed in terms of three factors- (a) A strong belief in and acceptance of the goals and values of the organization. (b) Readiness to exert considerable efforts on behalf of the organization and (c) A strong desire to remain a member of the organization. These factors refer to behavioral dimension to evaluate employee’s strength of attachment (Welsch & Lavan, 1981; Morrow, 1983). Further, Morris and Sherman (1981) investigated a multivariate predictive model of organizational commitment and focused on the role of job level and organizational differences. The antecedents in this model include variables from each of Steer’s (1977) categories.

Organizational commitment is concerned with psychological attachment to the organizational that keeps the employees to have difficulty in isolating themselves from the organization. The three facets of organizational commitment that forge the attachment have been identified as goals and values agreement, behavioral investment in the organizational desire to retain organizational membership (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). They claim that “there are many instances where organizations need individuals’ members, especially, those in critical position, to perform above and beyond the call of duty for the benefit of the organization. The motivational basis for such extra-role behavior is likely to require more than simple compliance. They suggested that the antecedents of company commitment might group into four major categories: personal characteristics, role-related variables, work experience and structural characteristics. Each of these factors is assumed to have a bearing on the subjective utility of organizational membership, which directly affects levels of commitment.

Rechiers (1985) viewed organizational commitment as a process of identification with the goals of organizational multiple constituencies and these
constituencies include from top management to the public at large. This approach represents the commitment in the organization to the concepts of goals and values as the foci for multiple commitments. The relative complexity of this approach as compared to previous global concepts of commitment may more realistically reflect the nature of employee’s organizational attachment as individuals actually experiencing them.

O’Reilly & Chatman (1986) contends to the fact that an employees’ psychological attachment to an organization can reflect varying combination of the three psychological foundations like compliance that occurs when attitudes and behavior are adopted not because of shared beliefs but simply to gain specific rewards, where as identification occurs when individual accepts influence to establish or maintain satisfying relationship, that is, an individual may feel proud to be a part of group respecting its values and accomplishments without adopting them his/her own and thirdly, internalization occurs when influence is accepted because of induced attitude and behavior that are congruent with one’s own values, that is the values of the group or organization are same, the impact of O’Reilly and Chatman’s (1986) classification system has been found weakened as the failed in distinguishing between identification and internalization items to form a measure of what they called normative commitment.

Mottaz (1988) in his study defined organizational commitment as an effective response (attitude) resulting from an evaluation of work situation which links or attaches the individual to the organization. In 1989 Romzek pointed out ‘employees’ commitment as a sense of attachment to the work organization.’ Further Sharma & Singh (1991) enumerated that organizational commitment is the product of two independent sets of factors viz., personal and organizational, which simultaneously operate in the organization and these factors are important in enhancing the productivity of the organization.

Meyer & Allen (1991) noticed that generally the definitions related to commitment reflect three broad aspects i.e. affective orientation, cost-based, and obligation or moral responsibility. To acknowledge that each of these three sets
of definition represents a legitimate but clearly different conceptualization of the commitment construct. Meyer & Allen (1991) proposed a three-component model of organizational commitment and applied different labels to which they described as three components of commitment: affective, continuance & normative. Affective commitment refers to the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment in an organization because they internally compelled to do so. Continuance commitment refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. It clearly carries the meaning that if an employee perceives that he/she has to pay more cost then it most likely that they will remain attached to the organization but on the other hand if they believe that leaving the organization and joining the other will be beneficial that such condition become instrumental in discontinuing their affiliation to one organization or company finally, normative commitment reflects a feeling obligation to continue. Employees with the high level of a normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization.

Becker (1992) provide additional support for the multiple-constituency approach by demonstrating that employee’s commitment to top management, supervisor and that work itself contributed significantly beyond the organization in the prediction of job satisfaction, intention to quit, and pro-social organizational and behavior. On the basis of the reanalysis of Becker’s data, however, Hunt & Morgan (1994) suggest that commitment to specific constituencies might be better viewed as exerting their influence on overall commitment to the organization which in turn, influences on various measures. In very interesting study when Becker & Billings (1993) used another statistical analysis viz., cluster analysis to identity commitment to the various constituencies with in the organization they found four dominant profiles: (1) The locally committed (who are attached to their supervisor and work group), (2) The globally committed (who are attached to management and the organization), (3) Committed (who are attached to both local and global foci), and (4) The uncommitted (who are attached to neither local nor global foci).
As anticipated, the relationship between commitment and the employee's retention variables are well established. Many studies argue the commitment does predict employees' retention (Porter et al., 1974; Koch & Steers, 1976). Several reviews reported consistent negative correlation of organizational commitment with employees' intention to leave the organization and actual turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Mathieu & Zajon, 1990; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Although correlation is stronger for affective commitment where as, significant relations between commitment and turnover variables are found for all the three conceptualized form of commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1996).

Many aspects related to work performance, for instance, attendance, assigned duties, sense of belongingness etc. have been studied in relation to commitment. Performance was found to be significantly predicted by commitment and absenteeism was found to be positively related with commitment (Mowday et al., 1974; Steers & Porter, 1971 Mowday et al. 1979; Meyer et al., 1993; Hackett et al., 1994; Gellalty, 1995; Somer, 1995). Scores of studies (Sager & Johnston, 1989; Randall et al., 1990; Bycio et al., 1993; Ingram et al., 1994.) have reported that affective commitment is positively related with various self-reported measures of work effort.

Kim & Mauborgne (1993) found that those with strong affective commitment to the organization reported higher levels of compliance with strategic decisions made at the corporate level that did those with weaker commitment. Significant positive relations have also reported between employees respective supervisors (Meyer et al., 1989) as well as their over all performance on the job (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Meyer et al., 1989; Sager & Johnston, 1989). Like those with strong affective commitment, employees with strong continuance commitment are more likely to stay with organization than are those with weak commitment insignificantly related to one's stay in the organization but Hackett et al. (1994) found that strong continuance commitment received significantly fewer commendations for their work. Normative commitment has been witnessed to be positively correlated to work effort (Randall et al., 1990) and with other over all performance (Ash forth
& Sake, 1996). For many employees, working involves more than showing up and carrying out required duties. Morrison (1994) argued that because the boundary between extra role behavior and in-role behavior is often unclear, the distinction between the two might itself be related to the employee's attitudes. Commitment has also been found to be related to the way employees respond to dissatisfaction with events at work. Hirchman (1970); Farrell (1983); and Meyer et al. (1993) examined three responses to dissatisfaction in addition to turnover. These are voice, loyalty, and neglect.

We now turn to the possibility that commitment to the organization has implication for employee's well being and behavior beyond the work place. Work- experience or factors involving the treatment of employee during their membership with in an organization has been empirically related to commitment (Mowday et al. 1982). Several demographic variables were found related with commitment as age (Hrebiniaik, 1974; Steers, 1977; Morris & Sherman, 1981; Mowday et al., 1982 Alvi & Ahmad, 1987; Glisson & Durik, 1988; Sharma & Singh, 1991; Leong et al., 1996; Martin & Bennett, 1996; Sommer et al., 1996), gender (Mottaz, 1988; Mowday et al., 1982), tenure (Mowday et al., 1982; Salancik, 1977; Welsch & Lavan, 1981; Reichers, 1984; Kline & Peters, 1991; Sommer et al., 1996). Workers personality, personal needs and values have been reported associated with commitment (Hulin & Blood, 1968; Goodale, 1973; Buchanan, 1974; Dubin et al., 1975; Robinwitz & Hall, 1977; Steers & Spencer, 1977; Kidron, 1978) education is inversely and negatively related (Steers, 1977; Koch and Steers, 1976; Morris and Sherman, 1981; Sharma and Singh, 1991; Sommer et al., 1996; Angle, 1983 ) justice and fairness in organization is also positively related to commitment (Mcfarlin & Sweency, 1992; Koys, 1991; Folger & Konovsky, 1989).

Predictors from the characteristics of the job tasks that are not likely to affect commitment include task, identity, the extent to which workers expectations are met by job tasks, the opportunity for optional social interaction in completing tasks (Steers 1977) and job scope (Hall & Schncider, 1972; Buchanan, 1974; Marsh & Mannaari, 1977; Steers & Spencer, 1977), higher
level of responsibility, autonomy, interest and variety in a given job and satisfaction with job leads to higher level of commitment (Barron, 1986; Mowday et al., 1974; Pattanayak, 1993; Raval, 1993).

Brown (1996) studied popular concepts and types of organizational commitment in the light of the definitions of commitment and common factors that pertain to all types of commitment. Commitment is best conceptualized as a single, fundamental construct that may vary according to differences in focus, terms, and time-specific evaluation. The commitment development process not only affects focus and terms of commitment, but also has strong implication for the evaluation process, analysis of affective commitment measures indicate that certain measures contain more than one constraints to the basic meaning of commitment. Recommendations for evaluation of organizational commitment include the argument that commitment measures should address one set of terms and avoid evaluative phraseology.

While surveying the concept of commitment, it has been noticed that commitment is multidimensional construct and this term has been defined in many ways due to the flexibility given for the use of the term. Commitment is a general term which in work context refers to either organizational commitment or to work commitment where earlier concept is generally used in broader sense in meaning and the later refers to specific commitment which known as work commitment, though these two are generally interchangeably used. Most of the time researchers talk about organizational commitment. Hence, there is pressing need to discuss its one of the aspect i.e. work commitment. It is significant to point out here that work commitment is one of construct of organizational commitment as Morrow (1983) enumerated organizational commitment as a construct was potentially redundant with other work commitment constructs such as job-involvement (Kanungo, 1982; Lodahl & Kejner, 1965), work ethic (Blood, 1969; Buchholz, 1976; Mirels & Garrett, 1971) and career commitment (Blau, 1985; Greenhaus, 1971). Further, Morrow and Mc Elory (1993) suggested that organizational commitment is the most naturally developed aspects of work commitment family of constructs. In spite of such controversies, it is important
to point out here that in this large investigation work commitment is used which in itself bears the notion of organizational commitment as these two terms are so interdependent where one can not be explained by over-looking the other. So, in this investigation work commitment combines the notion of organizational commitment.

Having given the description of the nature, concept and relevance of the phenomenon of work commitment, it is imperative to point out at this juncture that commitment is one of the key phenomenons that are likely to govern the intensity with which motivation at work take place and subsequently make one feel satisfied with work. Moreover work commitment is found conducive at work and has very positive influence on work related outcomes.

In the proceeding writings an effort will be made to describe the concept and meaning of variables like HRD activities, organizational culture and occupational stress which were taken as independent variables and thereafter, the implications of these for employees’ perception towards organizational commitment-dependent variable.

**HRD-ACTIVITIES:**
Organizations are made up of people and function through people. Without people organization can’t exist. The resources of men, money, materials and machinery are collected, coordinative and utilizes through people. These resources by themselves cannot fulfill the objectives of an organization. They need to be united into a team. It is through the combine efforts of people that material and monetary recourses are effectively utilized for the attainment of common objectives. Without united human efforts no organization can achieve its goals. All the activities of an organization are initiated and completed by the persons who make up organization. Therefore, people are the most significant resource of any organization. This resource is called human resource and it is the most important factor of production. Of all the resources man power is the only resource which doesn’t depreciate, with the passage of time and the HRD activities is independent variable of the present research work so the concept and definition of HRD are given below:
From the national viewpoint, human resources may be defined as "the knowledge, skills, creative abilities, talents and aptitudes obtained in the population." From the viewpoint of an organization, human resources represent the people at work. They are the sum-total of inherent abilities, acquired knowledge and skills as exemplified in the talents and aptitudes of its employees. According to Jucius (1973), human resources of human factor refer to a "whole consisting of inter-related, interdependent and interacting physiological, psychological, sociology and ethical components." Thus, human resources represent the quantitative and qualitative measurement of the workforce required in an organization.

Management is concerned with the accomplishment of organizational objectives by utilizing physical & financial resources through the effort of human resources. The term Human Resource is quite popular in India with the institution of Ministry of Human Resource Development in the Union Cabinet. But most people may not know what exactly the term human resource means.

According to the Leon C. Megginson (1977), the term human resources can be though of as, "the total knowledge, skills, creative abilities, talents and aptitudes of an organization's workforce, as well as the value, attitudes and beliefs of the individuals involved." The term human resources can also be explained in the sense that it is resource like any other natural resource. Though the definition of Leon C. Megginson, seems to be comprehensive, it suffers from some minor deviations as compared to the modern context.

Human resources play a crucial role in the development process of modern economies. Arthur Lewis (1965) observed: "there are great differences in development between countries which seems to have roughly equal resources, so it is necessary to enquire into the difference in human behavior." It is often felt that, though the exploitation of natural resources, availability of physical and financial resources and international aid play prominent roles in the growth of modern economies, none of these factors is more significant than efficient and committed man power. A nation with an abundance of physical resources will
not benefit itself unless human resources make use of them (Leon C. Megginson, 1972).

In fact the human resources are solely responsible for making use of physical and natural resources and for the transformation of traditional economies into modern and industrial economies. In essence, “the difference in the level of economic development of the countries is largely a reflection of the differences in quality of their human resources. The key element in this proposition is that the values, attitudes, general orientation and quality of the people of a country determine its economic development (Eli Ginzherg, 1980).”

The shift from manufacturing to service and the increasing pace of technological change are making human resources the key ingredient to the nation’s well being and growth. And in a service-oriented industry, like banking, the quality, quantity and utilization of human resources become all the more important (Levitan et al., 1972).

“Successful management depends- not alone, but significantly- upon the ability to predict and control human behavior.” Among other thing, if a company is economically successful, it means, the management has been able to manage human resources effectively (Douglas McGregor, 1971).

According to Dunlop (1975) the human resources are the active force in industrialization, and strategies for development should concentrate particularly on their enhancement. Management of human resources includes guiding human resources into a dynamic organization that attains its objectives with a high degree of morale and to the satisfaction of those concerned with it.

Earnest Dale (1965) views management as the process of getting things done through other people. In fact, it is said that all management is personnel management as it deals with human beings. Although there are different functional areas of management like production management, marketing management, financial management, materials management, all these are to be performed by human resources. And, though there is a separate personnel manager, all managers have to manage the human resources of their respective functions or departments to get effective results through and with the people.
"Thus, all executives must unavoidably be personnel managers (Edwin B. Flippo, 1976)." In short, all managers are personnel managers and all management is essentially human resources management.

Human resource management may be defined as a set of policies, practices and programmes designed to maximize both personal and organizational goals. It is the process of binding people and organizations together so that the objectives of each are achieved. Human resources management is known by different names, such as, personnel management, manpower management, personnel administration, staff management, etc.

The term human resources at the macro level spells the total sum of all the components (like skills, creative abilities) possessed by all the people (employed, self-employed, unemployed, employers, owners, etc.) whereas the term personnel even at the macro level is limited to only employees of all the organization. Human resources even at the organizational level includes all the components resources of all employees from rank and file to top management level, all the employers. In short, it includes the resources of all the people who contribute their services to the attainment of organizational goals and others who contribute their services in order to create hurdles in the attainment of organizational goals. Further, human resource includes human value, ethos and the like.

Thus, the term human resources is much broader concept compared to the term personnel either at the components level or in coverage (at organizational level) or even at the macro level. As such human resources management at organizational level does mean management of the dynamic components (resources) of all the people (owner or employed or directly or indirectly related) at all levels in the organizational hierarchy round the clock and throughout the year.

Sumantra Ghoshal (1999), termed human resources as human capital consisting of three types of capital- intellectual capital, social capital, and emotional capital.
As stated earlier, the term human resource refers to the knowledge, skills, creative abilities, talents, aptitude, values and beliefs of an organization's work force. The more important aspects of human resources are aptitude, values, attitudes & beliefs. But, in a given situation, if these vital aspects remain same, the other aspects of human resources like knowledge, skills, creative abilities & talents play an important role in deciding the efficiency and effectiveness of an organization's work force. However, enhancement of utilization of human resources depends on improvement of the human resource aspects knowledge, skills, creative abilities & talents and molding of other aspects like aptitude, values, attitudes & beliefs in accordance with the changing requirement of groups, organization and society at large. This process is the essence of human resource development. It is clear from this interpretation that human resource development improves the utilization value to an organization.

The effective performance of an organization depends not just on the available resources, but its quality and competence as required by the organization from time to time. The difference between two nations largely depends on the level of quality of human resources. Similarly, the difference in the level of performance of two organizations also depends on utilization value of human resources. Moreover, the efficiency of production process and various areas of management depend to a greater extent on the level of human resources development.

The concept of human resource development is not yet well conceived by various authors though they have defined the term from their opinion as it is recent origin and still is in the conceptualizing stage. It is an understanding of the term i.e., new or rather was new (Leonard Nadler, 1969) human resource development is not training & development.

But many personnel managers and organizations view human resource development as synonyms to training and development. Many organizations in the country renamed their training departments as HRD departments. Surprisingly sum organizations renamed their personnel department as HRD
departments. Some educational institutions started awarding degrees & diplomas in HRD even though the concept is not yet crystal clear.

The concept of HRD was formally introduced by Leonard Nadler in 1969 and defined HRD as, "those learning experiences which are organized, for a specific time, and designed to bring about the possibility of behavioral change."

Among the Indian authors Rao (1986) worked extensively on HRD. He defines HRD in the organizational context as, "a process by which the employees of an organization are helped in a continuous and planned way, to:
- acquire or sharpen capabilities required to perform various functions associated with their present or expected future roles;
- develop their general capabilities as individuals and discover and exploit their own inner potentials for their own and/or organizational development purpose; and
- develop an organizational culture in which supervisor subordinate relationship, team work, and collaboration among sub units are strong and contribute to the professional well being, motivation and pride of employee."

According to Edwin (1984), Human resource management is "the planning, organizing, directing and controlling of procurement, development, compensation, integration, maintenance and reproduction of human resources to the end that individual, organizational and societal objectives are accomplished".

According to National Institute of Personnel Management of India (1973), "Personnel management is that part of management concerned with people at work and with their relationships with in the organization. It seeks to bring together men and women who make up an enterprise, enabling each to make his/her own best contribution to its success both as an individual and as a member of a working group".

In the words of Jucius (1980), "Personnel management may be defined as that field of management which has to do with planning, organizing and controlling the functions of procuring, developing, maintaining and utilizing a labor force, such that the (a) objectives for which the company is established are attained economically and effectively; (b) objectives of all levels of personnel
are served to the highest possible degree; and (c) objectives of society are duly considered and served."

HRD from organizational point of view is a process in which the employees of an organization are helped/motivated to acquire and develop technical, managerial & behavioral knowledge, skills & abilities and mould the values, beliefs, attitudes & aptitudes necessary to perform present and future roles by realizing highest human potential with a view to contribute positively to the organizational, group, individual & social goals.

Narayanan (1989) depicts that HRD attempts to enable people to overcome their defects and develop their productive potentials so that they are able to contribute to the ethical and harmonious growth of society, fulfill their individual needs and wants, and with pleasure too.

According to Dayal (1994) "HRD implies that the organization wants to enhance overall capabilities of its employees to develop their potential in the directions best suited to them" He also mentioned three aspects that are important in HRD:
- ways to better adjust the individual to his job and the environment;
- the greatest involvement of an employee in various aspects of his work;
- the greatest concerned for enhancing the capabilities of the individual.

Pathania (1997) enumerated HRD as "an effort to develop capabilities and competencies among employees as well as creative organizational environment conducive to the employee's development."

The analysis of above definitions further show that there are three aspects viz.: (i) Employees of an organization are helped/motivated...; (ii) Acquire, develop and mould various aspects of human resources; and (iii) Contribute to the organizational, group, individual and social goals.

These factors may be called 'Enabling Factors' which include: organization structure, organizational climate, HRD climate, HRD knowledge & skills to managers, human resources planning, recruitment and selection. The second aspects deals with the techniques or methods which are the means to acquire develop and mould the various human resources. These techniques
include: Performance appraisal, Potential appraisal, Career planning and Development, Training, Management development, Organization development, Social & Cultural programmes, and Worker participation in management and Quality circles. The third category includes the outcomes contribution of the HRD process to the goals of the organization, group, individuals and the society.

On the basis of the definitions given above, the following features of human resource management can be identified:

1. Comprehensive Function- Human resource management is concerned with managing people at work. It covers all types of people at all levels in the organization. It applies to workers, supervisors, officers, managers and other types of personnel.

2. People-oriented- Human resource management is concerned with employees as individuals as well as groups. It is the task of dealing with human relationships within an organization. It is the process of achieving the best fit between individuals, jobs, organizations and the environment. It is the process of bringing people and organizations together so that the goals of each are met.

3. Action-oriented- Human resource management focuses on action rather than on record keeping or procedures. It stresses the solution of personnel problems to achieve both organizational objectives and employees personal goals.

4. Individual-oriented- Under Human resource management, every employee is considered as an individual so as to provide services and programmes to facilitate employee satisfaction and growth.

5. Development-oriented- Human resource management is concerned with developing potential of employees so that they get maximum satisfaction from their work and give their best efforts to the organization. It takes into account the personality, interest, opportunities and capacities of employees for this purpose. It seeks to help the employees to realize their full potential.

6. Pervasive-Function- Personnel management is inherent in all organizations and all levels. It is not confined to industry alone. It is equally useful and
necessary in government, armed forces, sports organizations and finance, research, etc. Recruitment selection, development and utilization of people are an integral part of any organized effort. Each & every manager is involved with Human resource function. In big organizations, there is generally a Human resource department. But this department only provides expert staff, advice and assistance concerning personnel matters. The authority to take decisions on these matters lies with the operating executives.

Human resource management is not something which can be turned over to personnel department. It is the responsibility of each & every manager. When a personnel department is created other managers are not relieved of this responsibility. This department only advises and assists line managers. According to Scott et al. (1977), “personnel management is a responsibility of all those who manage people as well as being a description of the work of those who are employed as specialists. It is that part of management which is concerned with people at work and with their relationship with in an enterprise.” personnel management is staff function but a line responsibility.

7. Continuance Function- Human resource management is an ongoing or never-ending exercise rather than a ‘one shot’ function. In the words of Terry (1970), “it can not be turned on and off like water from a faucet; it can not be practiced only 1 hour each day or 1 day a week. Personnel management requires a constant alertness and awareness of human relations and their importance in everyday operations.”

8. Future-oriented- Human resource management is concerned with helping an organization achieve its objects in the future by providing for competent and well motivated employees. It attempts to obtain willing corporation of people for the attainment of the desired objectives.

9. Challenging Function- Managing of Human resources is a challenging job due to the dynamic nature of people. People have sentiments and emotions so they cannot be treated like machines. It is, therefore, necessary to handle
them tactfully. It is not simply managing people but administrating a social system.

10. Science as well as Art- Human resource management is science as it contains an organized body of knowledge consisting of principles and techniques. It is also an art because it involves application of theoretical knowledge to the problems of Human resources. In fact handling people is one of the most creative arts.

11. Staff Function – The function of Human resource management is advisory in nature. Human resource managers don’t manufacture or sell goods but they do contribute to the success and growth of an organization by advising the operating departments on personnel matters. Like the director of a movie their performance can be judged from the success of the total organization.

12. Young Discipline- Human resource management is of comparatively recent origin. It started in the last part of 19th century. It is relatively new specialized area as compared to manufacturing and marketing.

13. Interdisciplinary- Human resource management involves application of knowledge drawn from several disciplines like sociology, anthropology, psychology, economics, etc. In order to deal with human problems effectively, a manager must depend upon such knowledge. In modern times, Human resource management has become highly specialized job.

14. Nervous System- Human resource management is similar to the nervous system in the human body. The nervous system is not an adjunct to the body but is inherent in the whole body and intimately associated with its every movement. Similarly, human resource management is not an extraneous element to the organization structure. Rather it lies embedded in the structure, is inherent in its functioning and an integral part of the process of management itself. Human resource management can’t be separated from the basic management function.

Every organization has some objectives and every part of it should contribute directly or indirectly to the attainment of desired objectives. Objectives determine the character of an organization and serve as the basis for Voluntary
Corporation and coordination among employees. Objectives also provide benchmarks or standards of evaluating performance.

Objectives of human resources management is derived from the basics objectives of an organization. In order to achieve organizational objectives integration of employer's interest and employee interests is necessary. In this light the objectives of human resources management may be summarized as follows:

(i) To help the organization to attain its goals by providing well-trained and well-motivated employees.
(ii) To employ the skills and knowledge of employees efficiently and effectively, i.e., to utilize human resources effectively.
(iii) To enhance job satisfaction and self-actualization of employees by encouraging and assisting every employee to realize his/her full potential.
(iv) To establish and maintain productive, self-respecting and internally satisfying working relationship among all the members of the organization.
(v) To bring about maximum individual development of members of the organization by providing opportunities for training and advancement.
(vi) To secure the integration of all the individuals and groups with organization by reconciling individual/group goals with those of an organization.
(vii) To develop and maintain a quality of work life (QWL) which makes employment in the organization a desirable personal and social situation.
(viii) To maintain high morale and good human relation with in the organization.
(ix) To help maintain ethical policies and behavior inside and outside the organization.
(x) To manage change to the mutual advantage of individuals, groups, the organization and the society.
(xii) To recognize and satisfy individuals needs and group goals by offering appropriate monetary and non-monetary incentives.

In brief, human resources management seeks to (a) attain economically & effectively the organizational goals, (b) served to the highest possible degree the individual goals, and (c) preserve & promote the general welfare of the
community. Maximum individual development, developing desirable working relationships & effective utilization of human resources are the primary goals of human resources management. According to the Indian Institute of Personnel Management (1973), "personnel management aims to achieve both efficiency and justice neither of which can be pursued successfully without the other. It seeks to bring together and develop into an effective organization, the men and women who makeup an enterprise, enabling each to make his or her own best contribution to its success both as an individual and as a member a working group. It seeks to provide fair terms and conditions of employment and satisfying work for those employed."

To sum up, human resource management seeks to accomplish societal, organizational and individuals goals. The requirements for attaining the above objectives are as follows:

(i) Recruiting the right personnel possessing necessary skills and attitudes.
(ii) Developing clearly defined objectives and policies through common understanding and mutual consultation.
(iii) Communicating and explaining the goals to be achieved and the contributions expected of every member of the organization.
(iv) Dividing the tasks properly with clear cut authority, responsibility and relationship of one position with another.
(v) Maintaining sound industrial and human relations so as to secure the willing corporation of all.
(vi) Providing suitable monetary and non-monetary rewards for the contribution of employees.

Cutting short to our discussion with regard to HRD activities, it is to say that it is a philosophy, a strategy, and an approach to enhance and maintain organizational effectiveness through the management of human resources. Emerging organizations around the world have a strong belief in the HRD philosophy and utilize it as a strategy to build the organizations more effective in efficiency, employees' satisfaction, and at large it has its global significant impact in-and out-side the organizational functions.
Organizational culture:
Organizational culture has been taken as another independent variable in the present research work. Before understanding the concept of organization culture it is imperative to understand the term culture in detail because different thinkers have taken the term in different ways. The term culture first appeared in an English dictionary in the 1920s (Krober, 1949), and was used in an anthropological work by Taylor (1972) for the first time, who defined culture as "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, laws, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society". Herkovits (1955) said that culture is the man-made part of the human environment.

Every organization has an unwritten culture that defines standards of acceptable and unacceptable behavior for employees. After a few months of joining the organization, most employees understand their organization’s culture. They know things like how to dress for work, whether rules are rigidly enforce, what kinds of questionable behaviors are sure to get them into trouble and which are likely to be overlooked, the importance of honesty and integrity, and the like. While many organizations have subcultures-often created around work groups-with an additional or modified set of standards, they still have a dominant culture that conveys to all employees those values the organization holds dearest. Members of work groups have to accept the standards implied in the organization’s dominant culture if they are to remain in good standing.

Organizational culture is in the present day world of work scenario has occupied greater importance and relevance as a result of humanization of work environment. Work being central to an organization, motivation to work or values placed on work have been drawing the attention of researchers for developing the strategies to enhance human motivation and the performance in the work situation specially, where rapid changes are taking place in the economic and business environment in the country. Hence, organizations need to transform themselves radically in order to take advantage of new opportunities, so transformation has to be initiated. It is, in fact, imperative to design such a
congenial organizational work environment where employees may feel free to work and contribute ideas through their dynamic participation hence, to develop enriched "Organization culture".

Many definitions of culture have been proposed both in business and management areas as well as in other discipline such as cultural anthropology and psychology. (Kroeber & Klunkon, 1952; Hallpike, 1979; Carrol, 1982; Frake, 1983; Hamill, 1990; Craig, 1990). The term "culture" has a variety of meanings. It bears meaning synonym with terms such as "cultivated", "educated" or "sophisticated", which refer to civilized or cultured. The scientific meaning of culture refers to the total pattern of beliefs, values, and the norms of a society that governs behavior most appropriate in particular group.

Organizational culture, in simple terms, is considered to be the "personality or feel" of the organization. (Ott, 1989). How people act within the organization is influenced by culture. How a person performs, views the job, works with colleagues, and looks at the future is largely determined by culture norms, values and beliefs. It is these ingredients that constitute the culture.

Despite being an important concept, organizational culture as a perspective to understand behavior with in the organizations has its limitations. First, it is not only the way to view organizations. Second, like so many concepts, organizational culture is not defined the same way by any two popular theorists or researchers. Some of the definitions of culture are given below:

- Symbols, language, ideologies, rituals and myths (Pettigrew, 1979).
- Is a product; is historical; is based upon symbols; and is an abstraction from behavior and the products of behavior (Jongeward, 1973).
- As a way of life, the sum total of one's philosophy, beliefs, norms, values, morals, habits, customs, art and literature. These variables are interlocked, influenced by each other and ultimately influence the behavior of individual and groups (Aviel, 1990).
- As a set of unwritten rules that embodies the dos, don'ts and should not of the organization and tells its members how to interact with others and
approach tasks in order to fit in and meet the firm’s expectations (Lahiry, 1992).

- A pattern of basic assumptions invented, discovered, or developed by a group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration - that has worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (Schien, 1985).

In the same vein, Hunt (1986) also suggests that culture takes years to develop. It is done covertly rather than overtly, by example rather than by prescription informally rather than formally, coherent culture is based on shared values and beliefs. Values are deep-seated concerns for standards. Values are further revealed in opinions, attitudes and preferences.

As Schien (1985) stated that every organization culture has some easily identifiable components observed behavioral regularities, norms, dominant values, philosophy, rules and organizational climate or work environment. In fact, it is like an iceberg where only the tip is visible while the bulk is concealed. It is a mass of behavior that human beings in any society learn from their elders and pass on the younger generations. It may, therefore, be called an organized group of learned response characteristic of a particular society (Linton, 1955).

Culture existing-in-and around the work place certainly affects the working pattern and behavior of the employees. There are two major sources of cultural inferences: first, the characteristics of the socio-cultural environment, which affect work related attitudes and behavior of all employees. Secondly, the management’s assumptions about their employees and their behavior style that directly contributes to the development of the organization’s internal work culture.

Organization functions with in the cultural system of the society in which it is located (Logenecker & Pringle, 1981). The way the organization functions is affected not only by the powers of managers but also by underlying cultural forces. The culture regulates the way in which managers build relations and exercise power. Organizational culture is a product of leadership styles,
organizational policies, practices, system, traditions; conventions etc. over a period of time, these aspects become a way of life in an organization. The sum total of all these aspects become a way of life in an organization. The sum total of all these components constitutes organization’s culture (Bate, 1984).

Schien (1985) in his pioneering work defines culture as a set of fundamental “assumption” and “beliefs” about reality that are shared by a group of individuals and are working towards a common purpose. Schien (1990) defined organizational culture in broader way as “(a) pattern of basic assumptions, (b) invented, discovered or developed by a given group, (c) as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and integration, (d) that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, (e) is to be taught to new members as the (f) correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems”.

Pettingrew (1990) on the basis of research evidence indicated that variations in cultural values might have a significant impact on employees’ turnover and employees’ job satisfaction. Further, Hofstede et al. (1990) have observed that nationality, industry and task partly determine the organizational culture.

In 1992, Martin defined organizational culture and enumerated that individuals come in to contact with organizations, they come in to contact with dress, norms, stories, people tell about what goes on, the organizations formal rules and procedures, its former codes of behaviors, rituals, tasks, pay systems, jargon and jokes only understood by insiders, and so on are some of the manifestations of organizational culture. She further added that when cultural members interpret the meanings of these manifestations, their perceptions, memories, beliefs, experiences and values usually vary. So, interpretations of culture will vary depending upon the situations and the perception of employees towards these conditions and situations.

Robbins (1994) describes the fact that there are ten primary characteristics which capture the essence of an organizational culture. These characteristics have been highlighted by him that follows- member identity,
group emphasis, people focus, unit integration, control risk tolerance, reward criteria, conflict tolerance, means-end orientation and open system. Robbins had derived these characteristics from the work of Hofstede et al (1990) and O’Reilly III (1991). Similarly Luthans (1995) has also highlighted the important characteristics of organizational culture. These are behavioral observed regularities, norms, dominant values, philosophy, rules and organizational climate. In the light of these characteristics, it is imperative to point out that organizational culture is a pattern of basic assumptions that are taught to new personnel or employees as the way to perceive, think and act in a situation that they confronted with, because before joining the organization, every individuals have different culture but in an organization they adopt the culture of the organization.

Organizational culture is broadly conceptualized as an internal variable. As an internal variable, it has been defined differently by number of researchers basically to suit their research interests and objectives. It has also been described as a set of assumptions, (Schien, 1986), beliefs and norms of behaviors (Pettingrew, 1979), rituals and ceremonies (Dealt & Kennedy, 1982; Trice & Beyer, 1984), shared managerial practices (Hofstede, 1998), ideologies and beliefs (Pascale & Athos, 1981; Bate, 1984; Brown, 1998), shared values (O’Reilly et al., 1991; Posner & Schmidt, 1992; Sheridan, 1992), myths (Meyer & Rowan, 1997), symbols (Dandridye et al., 1980). Some of the earliest references to the concept of the culture as an internal organization variable are also found in the literature given by some other researchers (e.g. Harrison, 1972).

Thus, organizational culture is the pervasive system of values, beliefs and norms that exists in any organization. The organizational culture can encourage or discourage effectiveness, depending on the nature of the values, beliefs and norms.

These definitions suggest that organizational culture consists of a number of elements such as assumptions, beliefs, values, rituals, myths, scripts and languages. These elements have been captured in the work of Schien (1985). He
contends that culture involves three layers. Layer I includes artifacts and creations which are visible, but often not interpretable. An annual report, a newsletter, wall dividers between workers, and furnishings are example of artifacts and creations. At layer II are values or the thing that are important to people. Values are conscious, affective desires or wants. In layer III are the basic assumptions people make that guide their behavior. Included in this layer are assumptions that tell individuals how to perceive, think about work, performance goals, human relationships, and the performance of colleagues.

Thus, organizational culture is a set of assumptions that the members of an organization share in common. Such assumption may be in the form of internally oriented characteristics like values, beliefs, attitudes, feelings, personality types and so on known as abstract elements of the culture. Vijay Sathe (1983) exemplified some common things to demonstrate the components of organizational culture:

- Shared things (e.g. the way people dress)
- Shared saying (e.g. let’s go down to work)
- Shared actions (e.g. a service oriented approach)
- Shared feelings (e.g. hard work is not rewarded here)

Every organization, being a social entity, develops with in it cultural systems with some unique modes of behaviors. These unique modes distinguish an organization from others. For example, while defining Tata House, JRD Tata, former chairman of Tata group, said that: “I would call it a group of individually- managed companies united by two factors. First, a feeling, that they are a part of large group which carries the name of Tatas, and public recognition of honesty and reliability-trust worthiness. The other reason is more metaphysical. There is an innate loyalty, a sharing of beliefs. We all feel a certain pride that we are somewhat different from others.” (Lala, 1981).

Although, studies on organizational culture have been increasing but there is no agreement on the concept and definitions of culture, it is because of the complex socio-environmental networking and every individual belongs to different cultural background. Culture related concepts (climate, environment,
atmosphere, ethos, etc.) have been used interchangeably, although an attempt has been made to delineate some of them. Culture can be defined as the cumulative beliefs, values, and assumptions. Underlying transaction with nature and important phenomenon (e.g. collectively, environment, context, time, biological differences, power etc) culture is reflected in the artifact-rituals, design of space, furniture, and ways of dealing with various phenomenon. Distribution and concentration of power may be one basis of classifying culture. From this angle, organizational culture can be of four types: feudal, bureaucratic, technocratic and entrepreneurial or organic. The way human-resource issues are handled in the beginning sets the tone for culture (The Times of India ‘Ascent’ June 16, 1999).

It is now clear that for developing a congenial culture in this modern era, organizational environment is very important for employees as it has direct relation with their performance which ultimately influences organizational effectiveness. Hence, it is imperative to produce very congenial, suffocation-free atmosphere/ environment which is now termed as “Organizational Climate”.

Modern complex environment tends to create a climate that shape employee’s behavior and promotes, organizational culture has been defined as a molar concept reflecting the context and strength of prevalent values, norms, attitudes, behavior and feelings of members of a social system which can be operationally measured through the perception of system members. (Payne, 1971). Organizational climate, an element of organizational environment is a construct that distinguishes among organizations- specific variance (e.g. Campbell et al., 1970; Tagiuri, 1968; Forehand & Gilmer, 1964; James & Jones 1974) pointed out some confusion so far as the operationalization and conceptualization of organizational culture construct is concerned.

Organizational culture can have a major influence on motivation, productivity, and job satisfaction. Employees expect certain rewards, satisfaction and frustrations based upon their perception of organizational climate (Davis, 1981) and these expectations influence motivation. Organizational climate usefully related concept in considering the organizational factors associated with risk and accidents. Basically, organizational climate is the sum of the perception,
employees have towards their organization. Perception is a very important role to play in an organization as everybody perceives in this way and thus, it differs from each other. This may be at the level of the organization, or some identifiable sub-units of it such as a department or plant. Climate may also be related with a particular area of organizational functioning, one of which is safety (Donald & Canter, 1994).

Organizational climate distinguishes between holistic climate (House & Rizzo, 1972) and specific climate such as motivational climate (Litwin & Stringer, 1968), individual climate (Schneider & Barellett, 1980), or creative climate (Taylor, 1972). Obviously, then any given organization creates a number of different climates and the term organizational climate may mean different things to different people unless it is prefixed with appropriate adjective (Zohar, 1980).

Along with the changes in global consideration, needs and aspirations of employees do change too. More precisely, the economic boom opened new avenues of employment as jobs become abundant and new managerial policies encouraged greater participation. Participation has been evolved, nurtured, and strengthened to inculcate a sense of involvement among employees in their spheres of work so as to generate positive commitment and appropriate motivation towards desirable and legitimate productive pursuits. People now, demand much more openness and transparency about the whole deal that help the individual to progress in his/her career (The Times of India ‘Ascent’ May 12, 1999).

One culture can be distinguished from another culture on certain dimensions, as identified by Kluckholm & Strodbeck (1994):
Nature of people: what do people of a particular culture think of human beings as honest or dishonest, trustworthy, good or bad? People have a way of thinking about other people.
Relationship with nature: how do people of a particular culture view relationship between people and the environment? Is there control over nature or subordination to it?
Interpersonal relationship: Do people stress individualism or collectivism? Are they individual-oriented or group-oriented?

Achievement orientation: do people prefer activity to being where they are? Are they achievement-oriented or leisure-seeking?

Time orientation: Do they think of the past or of the future? Some cultures continue to bask under the glory of their past without paying much attention to their present or the future.

Concept of space: How do people view space? Should we sit close to each other or at a distance? Should there be a hail or private cabins for officials to sit?

Based on these dimensions, there can be a wide spectrum of cultures. It is not our intention to suggest that a particular culture is “good” or “bad”, “effective” or “ineffective”. What is important from manager’s point of view is to be aware of these differences as these will affect people’s behaviors.

Hofstede & Bond (1988) have identified four cultural dimensions that, account for sharp differences among employees: individualism/collectivism, power distance, uncertainty, avoidance, and masculinity/femininity.

Promoting a congenial work culture in an organization entails a complete transformation in the existing framework; such corporate changes can be initiated through total quality management (Singh, 1994). Quality is emerging as a single most critical factor for business to survive in the ever expanding and competitive global market place. Quality circle conceived by Ishikava in 1985, which is in the essence a group problem-solving concept to enhance empowerment and accelerate infusion of participatory work culture in organization. Quality circle identifies, analyze and resolve work-related problems viz., quality productivity, cost-effectiveness, safety, housekeeping etc. (Ishikava, 1985). So, it helps in improving all above aspects as well as the organizations to reduce its costs, wastage, and absenteeism, thus, it leads to organizational effectiveness and growth. It is also claimed that quality circle improves organizational culture, customer’s satisfaction, mutual-trust, quality of work life, attitudes, self-development among employees, communication, etc. which ultimately produces highly congenial and conducive atmosphere, reducing
or resolving confrontation among employees for sustained performance and moreover, provides sense of achievement, satisfaction of “self-esteem and age” recognition as partners for the organization’s progress, feeling of being engaged on meaningful work and opportunities for self-development. Quality circle is widely used to improve work methods through participation of employees.

A significant shift is taking place in organizations throughout the world that involves increasing the emphasis on team spirit and participatory management. Now, most of the organizations are embracing this notion of team spirit to ascertain success.

In addition to the above mentioned factors, there are hosts of factors that enrich organizational culture. For example, today’s growing stress on HRD functions have already undertaken numerous steps and all these are directed to develop most humanized work environment when job incumbents have greater say and autonomy with the greater sense of responsibility. As a consequence to such emerging work atmosphere, people feel at-home even at work. Hence, employees show greater work involvement and commitment.

**Occupational Stress:**
The third important independent variable which has been taken for investigation is of occupational stress. Before focusing on occupational stress it is pertinent here to look in to the term stress. Because interest in occupational stress has become widespread in recent years, however, the experience of stress is not new. Our cave-dwelling ancestors faced stress every time they left their caves and encountered their enemy, the saber-toothed tigers. The tigers of yesteryear are gone, but they have been replaced by other predators- work overload, a nagging boss, time deadlines, excessive inflation, poorly designed jobs, marital disharmony, the drive to keep up with the Joneses. These work and nonworking predators interact and create stress for individual on and off the job.

The concept of stress has been originated from Latin word “stringere” which means “to draw tight” Selye (1936), a Canadian researcher was the first person to introduce very term, stress in life sciences. He explained the term stress in terms of biological concept referring it to as, “General Adaptation
Syndrome (GAS).” According to this, there are three phases of response to stress; the first phase is Alarm, second phase continuous with Resistance, and third, it may terminate with exhaustion. These three phases are incorporated in physical and chemical changes which prepare an individual to fight or flee.

In general way, stress is defined as hardship, physical, emotional or mental pressure, force or system of forces, applied on body. Different thinkers have given different opinion so far as the term stress is concern but there are three approaches to study stress. One approach defines stress as, ‘Response’. Some researchers are interested in identifying the patterns of psychological and physiological responses, which occur in different situation. This approach considers response to stimulus or disturbed environment (Beehr & Newman, 1978; Hammer & Organ, 1978). Selye (1979) defines stress as the “non specific response of the body to any demand made upon it”. By non-specific, he means that the same patterns of responses could be produced by any number of different stressful stimuli or stressor.

The second approach focuses on ‘Stimulus’ conceptualizing stress in environmental terms as an event or asset of circumstances that requires an unequal response. Actually researchers have studied catastrophic events and considered it as independent variable. (Welford, 1973; Margett, 1975; Anderson, 1978).

The third approach defining stress, neither gives importance to stimulus nor to response but as a transjection between the person and the environment that exceeds the person’s resources. This approach argues that focusing on stimulus and responses is insufficient, because some situations are stressful for everyone but some situations are not traumatic experiencing for others. Lazarus & Folkman (1984) from the transjectional perspective stated that stress reflect a relationship between a person and the environment that is appraised by the person as exceeding his/her resources and endangering his/her wellbeing.

But the most accepted definition of stress states that, “Stress is a dynamic condition in which an individual is confronted with an opportunity, constraint or
demand to what he/she desired and for which the outcome is too perceived to both uncertain and important" (Schuler, 1980).

Stress at work resulting from increasing complexities of work and divergent demand, has become a prominent and pervading feature of the modern organizations. The researchers in the area of organizational psychology and management have used the term job stress to denote employees’ mental state aroused by a job situation or a combination of job situations perceived as presenting excessive and divergent demands. Some stress researchers have emphasized the role of job situations in their definition of job occupational stress. Caplan, Cobb & French (1975) have accordingly defined occupational stress as “any characteristics of job environment which poses a threat to the individual”. Copper & Marshall (1976) have expressed that “by occupational stress is meant negative environmental factors or stressors associated with a particular job”.

But some other stress researchers have tried to define in terms of interaction between worker and work environment. The stressfulness of job situation or a factor is determined not only by the divergent or threatening demands of the situation but by how the individual perceives and evaluates it with reference to his own capability and characteristics. The definition proposed by Margolis, Kores & Quinn (1974) falls in this category. They defined stress as “a condition at work interacting with worker’s characteristics to disrupt his psychological or physiological homeostasis.” Similarly, Beehr & Newman (1978) described job stress as, “a condition where in job related factors interact with the worker to change (disrupt or enhance) his psychological conditions such that the person is forced to deviate from normal functioning.” Parsuraman & Alluto (1981) also reported that job demands, constraints, and job related events or situations were not in themselves stressful, but that they may be capable of producing psychological stress and strain, depending upon personal attributes and other factors. Allen, Hitt, & Green (1982) have defined “occupational stress as disruption in individual’s psychological or/and physiological homeostasis that
force them to deviate from normal functioning in interaction with their jobs and work environment."

It is important to discuss the various related concept of stress due to minute differences in the phenomena of job-stress, work-stress, occupational stress, and organizational stress, the experts use these terms interchangeably. So, it is necessary to understand the differences among these terms briefly. Organizational stress arises out of organizational climate and structure. Job-stress is the result of physical working conditions while work stress is experienced during the work performance of the employees. On the other hand, Occupational stress is used in broader way, which refers to the intrinsic aspect of job, organizational structure and climate as well as the role facets in the organization.

With regard to the sources of occupational stress, three major categories can be identified:-

(i) Organizational characteristics and processes;
(ii) Working conditions and interpersonal relationships; and
(iii) Job demands and role characteristics.

Among Organization characteristics that have been suggested as stressful are high degrees of centralization, formalization, and specialization, as well as large size and a low rate of upward mobility. Organizational policies and processes that lead to pay inequities, frequent relocations, poor communications, ambiguous or conflicting task assignments, shift work and inadequate feedback on performance also are seen as likely sources of stress.

Crowding, lack of privacy, noise, excessive heat or cold inadequate lighting, glaring or flickering lights, and the presence of toxic chemicals and other air pollutants distinguish some working conditions identified as occupational stressors. Interpersonal relationships at work characterized by a lack of recognition, acceptance, and trust, as well as by competition and conflict, are seen as stress inducing.

With regard to job demands, likely stressors include repetitive work, time pressures and deadlines, low skill requirements, responsibility for people, and
under-or over employment. Finally, research on the roles people perform at work has suggested role conflict and ambiguity, role under load or overload, and role status in congruency as potential stressors.

Much of the stress experienced by people in our industrialized society originates in organizations; much of the stress that originates elsewhere affects our behavior and performance in these same organizations. Landy & Trumbo (1976) have reported job insecurity, excessive competition, hazardous working conditions, task demands, and large or unusual working hours as major sources of job stress. Factors intrinsic to job, i.e., paced-repetitive work, lack of opportunities to used valued skills and abilities, and high costs and penalties for mistakes have been indicated as stressors in the work setting (Kornhauser, 1965; Buck, 1972). Heavy work load (Buck, 1972), excessive and inconvenient work hours (Kornhauser, 1965; Mott et al., 1972) have also been reported as sources of job stress. Quick & Quick (1979) have emphasized the role of interpersonal factors in creating stress at work. Conflict between individuals because of incompatible goals or substantive issues on the one hand, and emotional issues on the other create stress. Small groups may also apply pressure upon their members for conformity to norms that are in conflict with member's needs, values and standards. These pressures cause occupational stress.

Parasuraman & Alluto (1981) proposed an integrated model for investigating simultaneously the relationship of contextual, task, and role-related variables to stressors, viz., inter-unit conflict, technical problems, efficiency problems, role frustrations, staff shortage, and too many meetings in the work environment. They reported that job demands, constraints, and job related events or situations were not in themselves stressful, but that they may be capable of producing psychological stress, and strain, depending upon personal attributes and other coexisting factors.

Besides the stressors prevailing in work setting, a number of non-work or off-the-job factors are the indirect sources of occupational stress (Bhagat et al., 1985) posit that total amount of stress and strain experienced by a person is a function of both work and non-work stresses. Non-work domain is composed of
a number of life domains including family, leisure/recreational, community, social, political, religious roles.

The stresses and strains of non-work life domains influence cognitive evaluations of and reactions to the stresses of job life. Greenhaus & Parasuraman (1987) have demonstrated that non-work stresses influence and intensify the occupational stress in three ways: (i) additive effect of non-work stressors; (ii) spillover effect of non-work stresses and strains; (iii) interactive effect of work-non-work conflict. However, despite the inclusion of non-work factors as potential stressors in some models of work stress (Cooper & Marshall, 1976; Ivancevich & Matteson, 1980), only a few empirical studies have investigated the relationship of non-work stressors to job stress and other related strains. Researchers have revealed that life stresses were associated with decreased life satisfaction and increased job strain, job alienation, and turnover (Bhagat, et al., 1985; Sarason & Johnson, 1979). Hendrix et al. (1985) found that family relationship had indirect effects on job stress through their impact on life stress. Crouter (1984) in a study noted that female employees with young children were 'at risk' and experienced negative spillover from family responsibility to work, as reflected in tardiness and absenteeism, inattention and inefficiency, and inability to accept new responsibilities at work. Davidson & Cooper (1988) reported work-family interface to be major source of stress for female managers and professionals. In a study, Srivastava & Krishna (1991) observed that females in 'dual career couples' with part-time jobs experienced lesser role stress and maintained better mental health as compared to those who were in full time employment. Disturbed life patterns of miscellaneous stress (Neves, 1969), stressful life events (Dohrenwend & Dohrenwend, 1974), and demands of the husband and children of working women (Waldron, 1978) have been reported as off-the-job sources of occupational stress.

Structure and climate of the public and private sector organizations markedly differ, and so are likely to cause different amount of stress to its members. Singh (1987), Sharma & Shudershan (1983), and Singh (1989) noted that managers in the private enterprises rated higher on role stress. But in a study
Banerjea (1989) observed public sector employees experiencing comparatively more job stress.

Dysfunctional stress is expansive. It takes a toll on both employee and corporate health. Stress is implicated in industrial accidents, absenteeism, turnover, increased health care costs, and decrements in the quantity and quality of production. It is difficult to say precisely what the dollar cost of stress is to organizations. The United States Clearing House for Mental Health Information reported that U.S. industry has an annual $17 billion decrease in production capacity due primarily to stress related problems. Others estimate that at least $60 billion is lost annually by organizations solely because of stress related physical illnesses (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1982).

Jones (1984) cited following cost figures derived from research completed by the National Safety Council, the College of Insurance, and the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health:-

- Approximately 75 to 85 percent of all industrial accidents are caused by an inability to cope with stress, and in a recent year such accidents cost U.S. companies $32 billion.
- Heart disease-associated with stress-is responsible for an annual loss of more than 135 million work days.
- Stress-related headaches are the leading cause of lost work hours in American industry.
- Psychological or Psychosomatic problems contribute to more than 60 percent of long-term employee disability cases, and $26 billion is spent annually on disability payments and medical bills.

“Stress is costing us a lot of money,” says the personnel director for a larger New York company (Slobogin, 1987).

It has been a general observation that job stress by its nature extremely aversive to most employees. It creates noxious situations in the work environment causing significant deterioration in effectiveness of the employees and of the organization as the above studies revealed. However, stress is not always undesirable and harmful. It has a positive value as well. Recognizing its
positive value, Selye, taking from the Greek prefix, coined the term “eustress” for a positive stress. Hence, moderate level of stress is required for good performance.

Hall & Lawler (1971) found that job pressures involving time, financial responsibility and quality factors were related to positive organizational outcomes. Burke (1976) also observed that job stress arising from excessive responsibility, perceiving oneself not qualified excessively large workload, and making decisions that affect the lives of others were positively related to job satisfaction. Again he denoted that the stress arising from these factors as ‘functional role stress’. Srivastava & Krishna (1991) in their measure of ‘functional role stress’ have included five role stressors having positive value, viz., responsibility for persons, excessive responsibility (with authority), taking decisions that affect others, strenuous tasks that bring recognition and facilitate personal growth, and perceiving oneself not fully competent.

In their study Srivastava & Singh (1987) noted positive relationship between stress arising from ‘responsibility for persons’ and psychological well being in a sample of Banking and Insurance supervisors.

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

Second form of fit involves the relationship between the requirements and demands of the job and the abilities of the employee to meet those demands. If the demand of the job exceed the abilities of the employees or does not match with the temperament and interests of the employees, it will cause stress and results in physiological strain. If supplies for the motives of the person are threatened by discrepancies between demands and abilities, the individuals will experience stress. P-E fit theory emphasizes the causal relationship between misfit and strains. Though the exact contents and process of the relationship of the two is not very clear, it is assumed that severity of the strains caused from misfit is determined by following factors: (i) needs which are not being satisfied, (ii) abilities to meet the job demands, (iii) the genetic and socio-cultural background of the employee, (iv) defense and coping predispositions, and (v) situational constrains on particular responses.

In fact, the degree of P-E fit can be determined objectively or subjectively. Objective P-E fit refers to fit between the objective person and the objective environment, i.e., fit independent of individual's perception of it. Subjective P-E fit refers to the fit between subjective person and subjective environment, i.e., the individual's perception of P-E fit. P-E fit represents the interaction of the person and the environment rather than an outcome which each cause. The central theme of the theory was that misfit of either kind results in stress and threat to well being of the focal employee. Harrison (1976) also accepted and proved validity of the P-E fit model of job stress. Ross & Altmair (1994) have also defined occupational stress in the P-E fit framework. According to them, “occupational stress is the result of interaction of work conditions with characteristics of the worker such that demands of the work exceed the ability of the worker to cope with them.” McGrath has described occupational stress as an environmental situation perceived as presenting a job demand which seems to exceed the capacity and resources of the employee to meet or deal with it. However, the nature and severity of occupational stress may be more adequately
and conveniently understood observing physical and psychological symptoms which occur in the employee under the condition of job stress. Beehr & Newman (1976) have outlined three categories of these symptoms.

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

Physical Symptoms: Though it is difficult to know how much these physical symptoms have been caused by a particular job stress versus other aspects of employees' life, it has been established that consistent job stress links with certain physical symptoms and diseases. Among the common physical symptoms of occupational stress are cardiovascular diseases, gastrointestinal problems, allergies and skin diseases, headaches and respirator diseases.

Behavioral Symptoms: The behavioral symptoms of job stress can be classified into two categories. The first category of the symptoms belongs to the focal employees, while the other belongs to the organizations. The employees centered symptoms are avoidance of work, increased in take of alcohol or drugs, overeating or under eating, aggression towards coworkers or family members, and interpersonal problems in general. The organizational related symptoms of the job stress include absenteeism, leaving the job, accident proneness, and decrease in work efficiency.

There are three stressful activities which have been observed to be helpful in any of the three specific or general circumstances. The first of these is aerobic fitness. The benefits of aerobic fitness are primarily in improved cardiovascular activities. The benefits include lower heart rate, greater stroke volume, and decreased reactivity to stressful situations. It has also been noted that weights training designed to strengthen the body, a stressful activity, has specific benefits when it comes to extreme physical environment (Aerospace Medicine Division, 1985). The third stressful activity of benefit is flexibility training. The improved
flexibility enables improved body posture, a key issue in considering the physical stresses imposed on the body during the normal course of living.

Since prevention is always better than cure, it would be the best part of stress management, if the occurrences of the circumstances or situations likely to cause stress are prevented to the possible extent at initial stage. Although some situations of stress are inevitable, part of occupational life or beyond control, effective interventions could be made at individual as well as organizational level to prevent the stressors to experience of stress.

Ivancevich & Matteson (1987) have suggested “tolerance of stressors” at cognitive level as a primarily preventive technique. The employee can prevent or moderate the job stress by modifying their “cognitive appraisal” or by perspective taking “cognitive restructuring” and “cognitive rehearsing”. The cognitive appraisal technique involves teaching employees to assess the severity of the stressor by considering the perspective in which they view a particular stress situation.

The “cognitive restructuring” technique of stress management is based on the premise that many people believe that other people or events are responsible for how they feel. The resulting beliefs can be irrational and quite often lead to increased stress. The aim of this intervention is to help employees cope with stress by changing their beliefs or cognitions.

Cognitive appraisal and cognitive restructuring are designed to help people tolerate stressors after they occur. A related technique, “cognitive rehearsal”, involves helping employees tolerate stressors by anticipating them before they occur. This technique calls for visualizing a potentially stressful event before it occurs and practicing or rehearsing how to respond to the imagined situation.

Singer (1960) long back suggested the following steps to avoid job tension at individual level:

(i) recognize the requirements of your job role,
(ii) maintain perspective,
(iii) keep a balance between work and recreation, and
(iv) Identify and accept your emotional needs.

At initial organizational level, selection of suitable personnel and their proper training in the framework of the job requirements can largely help in preventing or mitigating the job stress likely to be caused by a misfit between employee and his job demands and from job difficulty.

Managers should also identify the potential sources of stress in work environment and make efforts to remove, correct or control them to the maximum possible extent through effective corrective interventions.

Structure and climate of the organization largely influence job behavior of its members as well as its overall effectiveness. A variety of job stress can be easily prevented or mitigated by improving organizational structure and creating a congenial climate in the organization. Ross & Altmaier (1994) have mentioned three intervention strategies for dealing with stress arising from inadequate organization structure and climate: decentralization, participative decision making and climate survey.

Clearly, the list of potential occupational stressors is lengthy. Occupational stress is, to a degree, a condition that can be managed or controlled. Furthermore, individuals, in responding to those unavoidable stressful situations encountered at work, can attempt to combat the anticipated negative consequences through various coping strategies.

Having elaborated the concept it is significantly important to mention here that the present study has been a challenging and most relevant piece of research work which can fruitfully contribute in enhancing motivation and commitment leading to job satisfaction through developing healthy and conducive organizational culture; implementing impressive HRD policies- a dynamic force behind organizational effectiveness and success also deduct the occupational stress.