Chapter - 1

INTRODUCTION
BURNOUT

BURNOUT - ITS MEANING

There is divergence of opinion among scholars as far as the meaning of burnout is concerned. The dictionary meaning of burnout is to fail, wearout, or become exhausted by making excessive demands on energy, strength, or resource. Burnout is a chronic state of emotional exhaustion stemming from an unrelenting series of on-the-job pressure; it is a work-related distress usually experienced by the people in the job with high levels of interpersonal interaction or in jobs that require helping other people. Burnout is a process that begins with excessive and prolonged level of job stress. This stress produces strain in the worker (feeling of tension, irritability, and fatigue). It includes change in attitudes towards ones work and clients as well as the feelings of exhaustion and tension that sometimes occur. It is different from socialization or acculturation. And this process is completed when the worker defensively cope with the job stress by psychologically detaching themselves from the job and becoming apathetic, cynical, or rigid. The term burnout has been defined in various ways by different researchers.

Freudenberger (1974) was the first to coined the term 'burnout'. He has identified burnout as cynicism, negativism, inflexibility, rigidity of thinking, unhappiness, boredom, psychosomatic symptoms, and a condition in which helping professionals wear out in their pursuit of impossible goals. Spaniol and Caputo (1979) see burnout as the inability to cope with the stress of work and personal life.

Calamidios (as reported by Cedoline, 1982) identifies burnout as comprising a set of five stages, including physical burnout, intellectual burnout, social burnout, psycho-emotional burnout and spiritual burnout. In turn, each stage also has numerous other lists of symptoms (most of which are indicative of stress), so that burnout becomes equated with sexual impotency, bruxism (excessive teeth grinding), sweating, accident proneness, excessive worry about worry, malicious humor, alcoholism, impaired decision making, dehumanization, paranoia, absenteeism and depression.

Whereas, Shinn (1982), Maslach (1976), Pines, Aronson and Kafry (1981), Jones (1981) and Maslach and Jackson (1979) - have reported that burnout is implicated in behavioural intentions to exist a role and in actual role exits.

Cherniss (1980:5) described burnout as a process in which the professional's attitude and behaviour change in negative ways in response to job strain.
Maslash (1976) defined burnout as the 'loss of concern for the people with whom one is working'. Cherniss, (1980a) defined as psychological withdrawal from work in response to excessive stress or dissatisfaction. Berkeley planning Associates, (1977) have defined burnout as the extent to which a worker has become separated or withdrawn from the original meaning or purpose of his work - the degree to which a worker expresses estrangement from clients, coworkers and agency.


Freudenberger (1980) described burnout as a state of fatigue or frustration, which stems from devotion to a cause, way of life; or relationship that did not provide the expected reward.

Nelson (1980) associated burnout with a mid-life or mid-career crisis, but it can happen at different times to different people. Pareek (1988) have described burnout as an end result of stress experienced, but not properly coped, resulting in symptoms of exhaustion, irritation, ineffectiveness, inaction, discounting self and others, and health problems.

Farber (1991) described burnout as a work-related syndrome that stems from an individual's perception of a significant discrepancy between effort (input) and reward (output) i.e. it occurs most often in those who work face-to-face with troubled or needy clients. Burnout among teaching staff
and other human services professionals has been observed in general as a process, not an event, that begins in perceived stress afflicting the individuals it is explained in a unique fashion by each person (Farber, 1983).

McFadden (1980) explained organisational burnout as a collection of symptoms which are characterised by low morale in the workers, declining in rates of overall production, alienation low level work, absenteeism, inadequate level of communication and increased level of job attribution.

Paine (1982) has observed 'Burnout stress syndrome (BOSS), the consequence of high level of job stress, personal frustration and inadequate coping skills, as a major personal, organisational and social costs.

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

Maslach (1983) operationally defined burnout as psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with other people in some capacity.

Pines and Aronson (1988) define burnout as a condition of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion that is the result of chronic emotional strain.
Ganstar and Schaubroek (1991) described burnout as a type of stress - a chronic affective response pattern to stressful work conditions that features high levels of interpersonal contact (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). Burnout process is consistent with the stress-strain coping framework (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Where emotional exhaustion can be viewed as a form of strains and depersonalisation as a form of coping (Lee & Ashforth, 1993a). Cordes and Dougherty (1993) viewed burnout as emotional exhaustion, depersonatization and lowered self-accomplishment.

Psychologically, burnout may be defined as a response to an intolerable work situation. The process of burnout begins with a stressful situation that occurs when there is a perceived imbalance between resources and demands. It has also been visualized as a process that is self-reinforcing and does have negative bearing on the qualitative and quantitative performance of the workers.

**BURNOUT AS A TRANSACTIONAL PROCESS**

Burnout is a process, not an event, and is not identical for every one. As Mathingly (1977) has pointed out, burnout is a subtle pattern of symptoms behaviours and attitudes that are unique for each of us. That is burnout can be conceptualized as a function of stresses endangered by individual work related and social factors. According to him, burnout process includes three different stages as represented in the following figures.
The first stage involves an imbalance between resources and demands (stress). The second stage is the immediate short-term emotional response, characterized by feelings of anxiety, tension, fatigue and exhaustion, (strain). The third stage consists of a number of changes in attitude and behaviour such as a tendency to treat client in terms of their attitude and behavioural fashion. Thus burnout refers to a transactional process, a process consisting of job stress, employee's strain, and their psychological accommodation. Specifically, burnout can be defined as a process in which a previously committed professional disengages him or herself from work in response to stress and strain experienced in the job.

**STAGES OF BURNOUT**

There are five distinct stages of burnout that have been identified by Cherniss (1980b), Veningle and Spradley (1981), such as:

(i) **HONEYMOON STAGE**:

This is first stage of burnout in which there is euphoric feeling of encounter with the new job such as excitement, enthusiasm challenge and pride. Dysfunctional features emerged in two ways: first, the energy
reserves are gradually depleted in coping with the demands of a challenging environment. Second, habits and strategies for coping the stress are formed, this stage which are often not useful in coping with later challenge.

(ii) FUEL SHORTAGE STAGE:

In fuel shortage stage, there is a range feeling of loss, fatigue and confusion arising from the individuals overdraw on reserves of adaptation energy.

(iii) CHRONIC STAGE:

Chronic stage is also known as stages of crisis. In this stage psychological and physiological symptoms persist over a period of time in the individual. During this stage, ones feels oppressed and suffers from the following symptoms, such as heightened pessimism, self doubting tendency, escape mentality, peptic ulcer, headaches, high blood pressure etc.

(iv) CRISIS STAGE:

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

(v) HITTING THE WALL STAGE:

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

DIMENSIONS OF BURNOUT

Maslach has identified three major dimensions of burnout; they are -

a) Emotional Exhaustion

b) Depersonalisation

c) Personal Accomplishment

EMOTIONAL EXHAUSTION:

It is caused by excessive psychological and emotional demands made on people in helping profession it is directly related to high levels of work demand. As defined by Maslach and colleagues (1980, 1981, 1982), it is characterised by a lack of energy and feeling that one's emotional resources are used. This "compassion fatigue" may coexist with feelings of frustration and tension.

DEPERSONALISATION:

It refers to treating people like objects and development of negative attitude towards one's self, work and life. It is generally conceptualized as a response to the broader aspects of the job or work environment which is perceived as being bureaucratic, impersonal, rigid, or controlling. As
defined by Maslach and Colleagues (1980, 1981, 1982), it is marked by the treatment of subordinates and colleagues as objects rather than people. Individuals may display a detached and an emotional callousness and may be cynical toward colleagues, subordinates, and organisation.

PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENT:

It is the demotivational effects of feeling of inefficiency about their ability related to recipients that may result in a self imposed verdict of failure. Feelings of diminished personal accomplishment result from factors suggesting one is unappreciated or that one's efforts are ineffective. According to Maslach and colleagues (1980, 1981, 1982), it is characterised by a tendency to evaluate oneself negatively. Individuals experience a decline in feeling of job competence and successful achievement in their work or interactions with people.

CAUSES OF BURNOUT

These are some important causes of burnout, such as:

i) Burnout clearly affects the staff member's morale and psychological well being.

ii) Burnout seems to affect the quality of care and treatment provided to clients.

iii) Burnout may have a strong influence on administration functions, high rates of burnout can cause havoc in community programme.

iv) Finally, burnout in other community settings, would seem to be legitimate in fact, necessary concern of human service programme.
Paine (1984) clearly narrated the reason, why professionals are victims to burned out -

i) Chronic distress is causal factors in burnout.
ii) Burnout is real person problem.
iii) Burnout is a human condition.
iv) Burnout is an energy crisis.
v) Burnout affects the whole person.

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

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

Harris (1984) reported that the organisational variables related to burnout include bureaucratisation, communication, and level of decision making, role models, job expectation, physical environment and psychological environment. Schwab (1983) contends that people involved in prolonged constant, intensive interaction with people in an emotionally charged atmosphere are susceptible to the symptoms of burnout.
Pareek (1982) describe nine factors, which contribute either to glow up or burnout; they are -

1. **LEVEL OF STRESS**: When stress is either too little or too much it leads to hyperstress or hypostress.

2. **TYPE OF STRESS**: It can be either functional or dysfunctional - the first is called 'eustress' and the second 'dystress'.

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

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

5. **NON-WORK LIFE**: The executive's social or economic conditions, family life and relationships, family and other obligations, health conditions, etc., also contribute to his glow up or burnout.

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

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

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

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

SYMPTOMS OF BURNOUT

The stages and symptoms of burnout can be amply emphasized in the following manner:

i) The individual who burns out is likely to be very enthusiastic, when first entering the organisation. One can become emotionally
exhausted unless there is first an emotional commitment.

ii) The initial enthusiasm soon gives way to stagnation as the individual realizes that he or she will not be able to solve all the problem the organisation faces.

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

iv) This frustration may eventually lead to apathy towards the organisation.

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

These stages can be explained by the following Figure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Exhaustion</th>
<th>Depersonalization</th>
<th>Low Personal Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feel drained by work</td>
<td>Have become calloused by job</td>
<td>Cannot deal with problem effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel fatigued in the morning</td>
<td>Treat people like objects</td>
<td>Not having a positive influence on others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel burned out</td>
<td>Don't care what happens to people</td>
<td>Cannot understand other problems or empathize with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrated</td>
<td>Feel other's blame you for their problems</td>
<td>No longer feel exhilarated by job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. The stages of burnout and their symptoms.
Burnout is job-related, and it is most common among people who entire their jobs with especially high ideals. Their expectation of being able to 'change the world' are badly frustrated when they encounter the reality shock of troubled clients and the inability of the organisation to help them. Like, teachers get fed up with being disciplinarians, nurses get upset when patients die, and police officers get depressed when they must constantly deal with the 'losers' of society.

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

**CONSEQUENCES OF BURNOUT**

Various professionals typically begins their career with a strong sense of commitment and sacrifice (Cherniss, 1980). Initially, the career is seen as intrinsically rewarding and major source of gratification, but as work demands and interaction with others begin to take their toll, may come to
feel increasingly isolated and less committed. They became less interested in the intrinsic aspects of their work and more interested in the extrinsic rewards (Edelwich & Broadsky, 1980). The decreased professional commitment thus reflects a shift in attitudes concerning the significance of work (i.e. the career is seen as a burden rather than a calling), and represents one way of reducing emotional strain. Edelwich and Broadsky (1980) suggest that when apathy takes hold, employees either give up on the job by becoming less committed or give up the job and profession altogether. Career dissatisfaction can thus lead to thoughts of changing careers, which in turn may lead to job search behaviour (Bartel, 1979; Rhodes and Doering, 1983).

Cherniss (1980), Shinn, Rosarie, Morch and Chestrut (1984) firmly believed that emotional exhaustion is indirectly a function of (i) Social support, and (ii) direct and indirect control, since previous literature has tended to argue that social support and control exert a more direct effect on burnout. In turn, emotional exhaustion is directly related to:

(i) Depersonalisation and reduced personal accomplishment, and
(ii) Psychological withdrawal, including turnover intentions and reduced professional commitment.

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

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

**BURNOUT AND ITS CORRELATES**

There are some important antecedents of burnout, such as:

**PERSONALITY AS AN ANTECEDENT OF BURNOUT:**

In examining the psychological manifestations of occupational stress, the literature supports the role of personality as key mediator between stimulus and response (Cooper and Marshall, 1976). There are two central features of stress at work, the interaction of which determines either coping or maladaptive behaviour and stress related disease (Cooper and Marshall, 1975) -

(i) the characteristics of the person, and

(ii) potential sources of stress in the work environment.

Kobasa, et al. (1982) also viewed that several types of individuals differences at work either as mediators or as moderators in the work stress process, included personality traits, work expectations and health related factors, also the importance of biographical data as an input for predictive, diagnostic and counselling purposes has been shown. While, other reported age, tenure in organisation and hierarchical position to be negatively related, marital status and education to be unrelated with stress and job search.

There are five personality traits that influence an individuals responses to stress, they are neurotic anxiety, locus of control, flexibility, introversion and Type-A syndrome.
NEUROTIC ANXIETY:

Neurotic anxiety is a constellation of traits and dispositions that tend to occur together. Neurotically anxious individuals have strong, punitive superegos. They set extremely high goals for themselves and punish themselves severely if they fail to achieve these goals, and also suffer if their goals and aspirations conflict with one another, and they are unable to resolve those conflicts.

Another trait of neurotic anxiety is emotionality and instability. That is, the neurotically anxious individual is more emotional than others and this often interferes with adaptive functioning. In time of stress the person tends to be fearful and apprehensive. That is, the individual who is high in neurotic anxiety will display strong and conflicting motivations, high emotionality, low self esteem, an excessive concern with the approval of others, and a reliance on defense mechanisms as a means of coping.

Grinker and Spielgel (1945) found that unrealistic, neurotic motivation was a major cause of negative stress reactions in combat flies. Khan et al. (1964) found that individuals who scored high in neurotic anxiety (as measured by a pencil and paper test) experienced more strain and tension in high role conflict situation than did those who scored low on this trait.

LOCUS OF CONTROL:

Locus of control is another personality dimension. According to Rotter (1966), individuals differ in the degree to which they believe that they control important sources of reinforcement in their lives. Internals' tend to believe that they control their destinies, if they want something, they
assure they can get it. And if they fail – it is because they lacked the will or the ability. 'External' believe that they are at the mercy of fate and powers beyond their control. And if something turns wrong they attribute the cause not to their own efforts or abilities but to external forces.

That is, 'externals' are more prone to stressful situations. They are helpless and have no control over a situation and consequently will tend to give up and withdraw in the face of stress and frustration.

FLEXIBILITY:

Flexibility is another personality trait that affects reactions to stress. Flexible individuals are more likely to experience role conflict in work organisations, and they react to role conflict with more manifest anxiety, tension, and worry. That is, these people are more susceptible to role conflict, than rigid individuals (Khan et al., 1964).

INTROVERSION:

Another personality trait associated with stress reaction is introversion. Introverts experience more tension in high role conflict situation than extroverts. They are more likely to withdraw from their co-workers in the face of conflict and stress, and this withdrawal impeded effective coping and resolution of the conflict (Khan et al., 1964).

TYPE 'A' SYNDROME:

Type 'A' syndrome is one more personality trait that is susceptible to stress and burnout.

Nath (1980) reported a negative relationship between length of service and role ambiguity.
tenure, implying that employees with less age and shorter length of
service showed a higher tendency to quit has been reported in a number of
studies. Friedman and Rosenman (1974) showed a relationship between
behavioural patterns and the prevalence of chronic heart diseases (CHDs).
They divided individuals into 'Type A' and 'Type B'.

Type-A exhibited overt behavioural syndrome or style of life,
characterised by extremes of competitiveness, striving for achievement,
aggressiveness, haste, impatience, restlessness hyperalertness,
explosiveness of speech and feeling of being under pressure of time and
under the challenge of responsibility. It was suggested that 'people having
this particular behaviour pattern were often so deeply involved and
committed to their work that other aspects of their lives were relatively
neglected'.

Many studies have confirmed the vulnerability of Type-A men to CHDs.
This behaviour pattern has also been found to intensify health complaints
such as loss of appetite, depression or headaches. Some researchers
placed strong emphasis on interaction between type-A behaviour and other
personality variables that have been linked to coronary reactivity or strain.
Lee et al., studied in depth the dimensions of optimism.

He emphasized the moderating role of optimism in the type-A behaviour
dimensions and health risk relationships that lowers the health risks for
the achievement striving individuals.

Sarason and Spielberger (1975) maintain that there are mediating factors
between the stressor and the coping response, which affect the detection,
appraisal and interpretation of the stressor by the person.
1) Age
2) Sex
3) Birth order
4) Marital status
5) Stage in his developmental cycle at which he is affected.
6) The individuals and the group's race or ethnicity is important at least for the likelihood, degree and nature of its exposure to discrimination.
7) Child rearing practice also partly affects the type of defence mechanisms learned and used.
8) The family structure
9) Marital satisfaction and intra-familial quarrels.
10) Socio-economic class.
11) Status and reference group of the individual.
12) Nature of role demands on the person, their clarity and the degree of flexibility in role performance allowed.
13) The type and nature of one's occupation.
14) The power relationships involved in the transaction.
15) Coping is also affected by culturally patterned attitudes to threat, injury, pain, illness, etc.
16) Other mediating factors are the individuals's health and intactness of his CNS prior to the onset of the stressor, heredity and nutritional factors and the quality of one's 'in born endocrine equipment'.
17) Psychological factors also mediate:

a) Degree of motivation or arousal.
b) Characteristic level of activity and stimulation.
c) Expertise and success in self-regulating emotional reactions.
d) Capacity to maintain focal attention.
e) Degree of 'hypersensitivity' to the demands everyday life.
f) Characteristic pattern of threat appraisal.
g) Introvert or extrovert
h) Strength of his ego.
j) Whether these is a family history of vulnerability.

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

a) the nature and magnitude of the strategy;
b) the importance of the stressor to the individual;
c) the personal and social support system available to the individual,
   and
d) the involvement and willingness on the part of the individual 'to do something' about the state of stress.

Pestonjee has identified 3 important sectors of life in which stress originates:

a) jobs and the organisation.
b) the social sector, and

c) intra-psychic sector

Job and organisational, refers to the totality of the work environment (task, atmosphere, colleagues, compensations, policies, etc.). The social sector refers to the social/cultural context of one's life. It may include religion, caste, language, dress and other such factors.

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

WORK OVERLOAD AS AN ANTECEDENT OF BURNOUT:

Work overload is another antecedent of burnout. French and Caplan (1973) have differentiated overloads in terms of 'qualitative' and 'quantitatively' overload. Quantitative refers to 'having too much to do' and qualitative refers to work that is 'too difficult'.

French and Caplan (1973) found that objective quantitative overload was strongly linked to cigarette smoking. In a study of 100 young coronary patients, Russeck and Zhman (1958) found that 25% had been working at two jobs and an additional 455 has been working at jobs, which required 60 or more hours per week. They have found that prolonged emotional strain preceded the attack in 91% of the cases.

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

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

INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT AS AN ATNECEDENT OF BURNOUT:

Interpersonal conflict has been identified as one of the major organisational stresser leading to increased feeling of emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation. If the employee lacks supportive relationship with his immediate supervisors or with co-workers, or if his abilities are under-utilised, he experiences decreased feeling of personal accomplishment (Leiter, 1991). Cooper (1978) has enlisted relations within the organisation: poor relations with boss, poor relations with colleagues and subordinates, difficulties in delegating responsibilities, etc., as one of the chief sources of managerial stress. Social support has also been identified as an antecedent of burnout along with others like work autonomy and role stress. The major finding are -

(i) Autonomy over various aspects of work and social support from the organisation and supervisor were each inversely related to role stress (i.e., role conflict and role ambiguity).
(ii) Role stress was positively related to exhaustion.

(iii) Exhaustion was positively associated with turnover intentions. Neither autonomy nor support effected burnout directly and neither moderated the relationship between stress and burnout.

STATUS INCONSISTENCY AS AN ANTECEDENT OF BURNOUT:

Researchers have also identified 'status inconsistency' as possible determinant of psychological and occupational stress. Jackson et al. (1986) argued that status inconsistency becomes salient to the individual in the form of conflicting expectations. For example, when a person's education and income are inconsistent, the status inconsistent person are those around him/her may hold conflicting expectations about his/her behaviour. In line with subsequently developed person-environment-fit theory, it is the uncertainty and frustration embedded in these conflicting expectation that Jackson viewed as causing the psychological stress. However, empirical research indicated that not all forms of status inconsistency are directly linked to strain.

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

MODES OF BURNOUT

Different models of burnout has been given by different researchers, such as:

BURKE MODEL OF UNDERSTANDING STRESS AND BURNOUT

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

The environment is a source of stressors or demands on the individual. An individual differs (e.g. past experience, personality, behavioural repertoire and social support) in what they bring to the challenges, opportunities and demands in their environments. The concept of stress, then is an interactional or transactional one. Individual with particular characteristics interacts with work and home environments with certain characteristics, which results in varying amounts of experienced stress.

Fig.3. Burke's Model of Stress
Burke illustrates the model by providing concrete examples with in each of the panel starting with stress reactions or symptoms. Individual react to stressors with response of various kinds. Stress reaction can be emotional (depression, resentment, physiological - rapid heart beats rate, heavy breathing and behavioural smoking, eating, drinking more). These responses then describe an individual immediate (short-term) response to experienced stress. These responses are typically exhibited by all individuals and are in some sense involuntary (Cannon, 1929). The model in the given figure proposes that the experience of long term are chronic stress is likely to result in the individual developing emotional and physical health problem. Individuals predisposition to illness or health, health practices, coping responses, personal ambition, perfectionalism, impatiences, inability to say no, fear or failure, liking of tension, lack of confidence, chronic anxiety stress and timidity.

Sources of stress in the environment, includes : diverse work and life stressors, work hassles. Most models of burnout and stress pay only feeling attention to extra work and satisfaction. However, the research that is available (Burke & Bradshaw, 1981; Bhagat, 1983) shows clearly that work experiences influence of work experiences and vice versa. There has been considerable convergence of the nature of stress and burnout experiences in the organisation.

CHERNISS MODEL OF BURNOUT

A comprehensive model of burnout has been proposed by Cherniss (1980) - illustrated in the following figure.
Cherniss model proposes that particular work setting characteristics interact with individuals who are entering the job with certain career orientations. These individuals also bring with them their own unique extra work demands and supports, these factors, in concern, results in particular sources of stress being experienced to varying degrees by job incumbents. Individuals cope with these stresses in different ways, some employ techniques and strategies which might be term active problem solving while others cope by exhibiting the negative attitude changes, Cherniss identified in his definition of burnout. According to Cherniss 'burnout'
represents a response to an intolerable work situation. The process begins when the helper experiences stress and strains that cannot be elevated through active problem solving. These changes in attitude and behaviour associated with burnout then provide a psychological escape and ensure that further stress will not be added to the strain already being experienced.

ROGER'S MODEL OF BURNOUT

In the following model there are two paths of burnout. As shown in the figure these two paths have a cumulative effect. The first route is a direct outgrowth of the model of occupational stress. That is, traditional work-related stressors produce stress, which leads to attitudinal and behavioural symptoms that may culminate in burnout. Burnout does not automatically occur as a result of stress and occasional symptoms of burnout. Instead, burnout develops in phases and ultimately takes place when symptoms become so severe that an individual gives up trying to perform effectively.

Fig. 5. Roger's Model of Burnout

CORDER & DOUGERTY MODEL OF BURNOUT:

This model has been developed and popularised by Corder and Dougherty. According to this the fundamental premise underlying the model is that burnout develops in phases. The three key phases are emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and feeling a lack of personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion is due to a combination of personal stressors and jobs and organisational stressors. People who expect a lot from themselves and the organisations in which they work tend to create more internal stress, which, in turn, leads to emotional exhaustion. Similarly, emotional exhaustion is fuelled by having too much work to do, by role conflict, and by the type of interpersonal interactions, encountered at work. Frequent, intense face-to-face interactions that are emotionally charged are associated with higher levels of emotional exhaustion.

![Burnout Model Diagram]

Thus, emotional exhaustion leads to depersonalization, which is a state of psychologically withdrawing from one's job. This ultimately results in a feeling of being unappreciated, ineffective, or inadequate. The additive effect of these three phase is a host of negative attitudinal and behavioural outcomes.

BURNOUT MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES

There is consensus among psychologists that job burnout differs from mid-life crises that affect the employees, as it is a specific set of symptoms brought on by severe or chronic stress directly related to job. Since stress cannot be eliminated from daily life, the solution is to effectively manage it. However, there are some important techniques through which burnout among various professionals can be minimized easily such as:

(i) FLIGHT & FIGHT:

Flight and fight are two reactions that can serve as a primary means of successful coping. Flight, or leaving a distressing situation, is a perfectly reasonable response to stress if an avenue of flight is available. Fight, or confronting a threat or stressor, can also be an effective response. The desire to confront a threat may actually be the best way to bring about a charge that will reduce the level of stress.

(ii) RELAXATION TECHNIQUES:

Techniques for managing stress/burnout involve some form of physical or mental relaxation. Some of these techniques have been advocated with the zeal and enthusiasm of new fads; the two simple relaxation techniques, muscle massage and abdominal breathing, can effectively calm a person. A
muscle massage consists of slowly massaging the muscles of the neck, arms, back, legs or feet, depending on the surroundings. Abdominal breathing means taking long, deep breaths, which cause the body to relax and counteract the stress responses associated with an alarm reaction.

Another technique, that is, transcendental meditation. In this a meaningless sound called a mantra is used so as to condition the subject to reduce the level of excitation and disorderly activity of the nervous system and to quiet the mind while maintaining alertness. Evidence evaluating transcendental meditation indicates that metabolic changes occur during meditation that move the body toward a deep state of rest.

(iii) BIOFEEDBACK:

Biofeedback is another relaxation technique. It uses sophisticated equipment to observe some internal body processes and report this information in observable ways. Biofeedback equipment can monitor such events as muscular tension, skin temperature, heartbeat, blood pressure, and brain waves. This information is reported in the form of sounds, lights, or wavy lines on a graph, which helps the persons to eventually control the stress responses.

(IV) SOCIAL SUPPORT:

A social support system refers to an interlocking network of people with whom an individual is able to interact to satisfy important human needs. A social support system may include a wide variety of people, such as a spouse, family members, other religious or civic group associates, and health and welfare professionals. The most important form of social
support is emotional support, which consists of providing empathy, love, caring, and trust. Research evidence indicates that the most important source of social support comes from the family unit, especially from one's spouse. The death of a spouse is usually a traumatic experience that influence both the physical and mental health of the surviving partner. The trauma is much less severe, however, if individuals have other social supports that can help them, such as an understanding supervisor, co-workers who are willing to listen and empathise, and a counsellor who can provide supportive, non-directive counselling.

(v) PHYSICAL EXERCISE:

A carefully designed physical exercise program is not only an effective stress management technique, but also an important element in maintaining good mental and physical health. During a vigorous physical exercise routine, internal chemical changes occur that eliminate the tension that causes stress. At the same time, it improves physical conditioning, thereby making individuals better prepared to endure future stress. The benefits of physical exercise have encouraged companies to adopt a variety of physical exercise programs.

(VI) JOB REDESIGN:

Organisations can redesign jobs to minimize the creation of stresser to reduce their stressful characteristics. In theory, it's possible to redesign jobs anywhere in the organisation to this end. Thus, an overloaded executive might be given an assistant to reduce the number of tasks he or she must perform. In practice, most formal job redesign efforts have involved enriching operative level jobs to make them more stimulating and
challenging. This is usually accomplished by giving employees more control over the pace of their work and permitting them to use more of their skills and abilities. Although enrichment often increases job satisfaction and reduce withdrawal. Therefore, job redesign is an important method of dealing with stress because it attempts to remove stressors rather than simply helping employees to cope with stressors.

(VII) TIME MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES :

Time management technique may be used to reduce stress. Such simple devices as developing a list of things to do and a system for handling telephone or visitors interruptions can be useful for gaining control of one's work life and, thereby, one's sanity.
ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE STRESS

According to Pareek (1987) role can be defined as a set of functions which an individual perform in response to the expectation of the significant members of social system, and his/her own expectations about the position that he/she occupies in it.

There are two role systems,

(i) Role Space

(ii) Role Set.

The concept of role, and the two role system have a built-in potential for conflict and stress.

ROLE SPACE CONFLICTS

Role space (the dynamic relationship amongst the various roles an individual occupies and himself) has three variables i.e. self, the role under question, and the other roles he occupies. These conflicts are as follows.

1. SELF-ROLE DISTANCE :

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

2. INTRA-ROLE CONFLICT :

Since an individual learns to develop expectations as a result of his socialization and identification with 'significant' others, it is quite likely that he sees certain incompatibility between the expectations (functions) of his role. For e.g. a professor may see incompatibility between the expectations of teaching students and of doing research. These may not be inherently conflicting, but the individual may perceive these as incompatible.

3. ROLE STAGNATION :

As the individual grows older, he also grows in the role that he occupies in an organisation. With the advancement of the individual the role changes, and with this change in role, the need for taking up a new role becomes crucial. This problem of role growth becomes acute especially when an individual who has occupied a role for a long time enters another role in which he may feel less secure. However, the new role demands that an individual outgrow the previous one and take charge of the new role effectively. This is bound to produce some stress. In organisations which are fast expanding, and which do not have any systematic strategy of manpower development, managers are likely to experience this stress of role stagnation when they are promoted.

4. INTER-ROLE DISTANCE :

Where an individual occupies more than one role there are bound to be conflicts between the different roles that he occupies. For e.g. a lady
executive often faces the conflict between her organisational role as an executive and her family role as a wife and a mother. The demands of her husband and children for sharing her time may be incompatible with the organisational demands. Such inter-role conflicts are quite frequent in a modern society, where an individual is increasingly occupying multiple roles in various organisations and groups.

ROLE SET CONFLICTS

The other field which is important vis-a-vis an individual's role, is the role set which consists of important persons who have varying expectations from the role that he occupies. The conflicts which arise as a result of incompatibility amongst these expectations by the 'significant' others (and by the individual himself) are referred to as role set conflicts. These conflicts are as follows:

1) ROLE AMBIGUITY:

When the individual is not clear about the various expectations that people have from his role, the conflict that he faces is called role ambiguity. Role ambiguity may be due to lack of information available to the role occupant, or due to lack of understanding of the 'cues' available to him. Role ambiguity may be in relation to the activities, responsibilities, priorities, norms, or general expectations. Often role ambiguity may be experienced by persons occupying roles which are newly created in the organisation, roles in organisations which are undergoing change, or process roles (with less clear and concrete activities).
2. ROLE EXPECTATION CONFLICT:

When there are conflicting expectations or demands by different role senders (persons having expectations from the role), the role occupant may experience this stress. There may be conflicting expectations from the boss, subordinates, peers or clients.

3. ROLE OVERLOAD:

When the role occupant feels that there are too many expectations from the 'significant' others in his role set, he experiences role overload. Role overload has been measured by asking questions about people's feelings on whether they could possibly finish work given to them during a modified work day and whether they felt that the amount of work they do might interfere with how well it was done. Most of the executive role occupants experience role overload. Role overload is more likely to occur where role occupants lack power, where there are large variations in the expected output, and when delegation or assistance cannot procure more time.

4. ROLE EROSION:

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

5. RESOURCE INADEQUACY:

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

6. PERSONAL INADEQUACY:

When a role occupant feel that he is not prepared to undertake the role occupant may feel that he does not have enough knowledge, skills, or training, or he/she has not had time to prepare for the assigned role. Persons who are assigned new roles without enough preparation or orientation are likely to experience this kind of stress.

7. ROLE ISOLATION:

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

MEANING OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE:

Discovering how the organisation is a psychologically meaningful environment for individual, organisation members has led to the concept of organisational climate. This term is used loosely and in a variety of ways by different psychologists.

Forhand and Glimer defined 'organisational climate' as those stimuli constrains on freedom, rewards and punishment that affect workers attitudes and performance'. For many, it is basically 'anything in the working environment that affects worker satisfaction productivity'.

The concept of 'organisational climate', however, becomes more useful when, as defined by Likert and his colleagues, it is more limited to conditions inside the organisation but is outside the immediate face to face working group. In this sense, 'organisational climate' involves such matters as extent of upward receptivity, lateral communications, interdepartmental decision - making, control and co-ordination.

Dunnette (1975) defined 'organisational climate' objective and subjective measures as some climate dimensions also seem to be structural measures. Campbell (1970) also offered a definition of 'organizational climate' and usefully described its four major dimensions as -

(i) Individual autonomy.
(ii) Degree of structure imposed on the position.
(iii) Reward orientation
(iv) Consideration, warmth and support.
According to Korman (1977) the climate of an organization may, for example be the extent to which it is seen by either those who are inside or outside the organization as ego supportive, hierarchical, ambiguous, conflict prone and routinized, to cite just a few of the descriptive terms often used, so climate has, as a concept, become a matter of great controversy. In this view, 'organizational climate' is a dependent variable in that it results, at least partially, from mechanisms that management can control and it is also an independent variable in that it can influence job behaviours and attitudes.

And finally, Schneider and Synder (1975) defined 'organisational climate' as "a summary perception which people have of an organization". It is basically impression of what the organization is. Now a days, increasing recognition is being given to the nature of 'organizational climate'. Every organization has characteristic aura under which it functions which is at times evidence to a discriminating but transient visitor to the organization. The 'organisational climate' can be manifested in diverse ways in the general behaviour of the workers and state of discipline at the work place, the interest the workers take in their work, the frequency of task-irrelevant activities among them, their sense of personal freedom, etc. Perhaps the most important single factor in the determination of 'organizational climate' is the nature of leadership under which the workers function. It is the function of the leader to organize or integrate his men into a highly motivated and cohesive work group so that everyone identifies himself with the group and the group goal and takes pride in belonging to it. If the group is split up into fractions fighting with each other, if its members are different to the interest of the organisation and its work and do not hesitate to change their jobs for minor material benefits, then the primary responsibility for this state of affairs is with the leader of
organisation; and the higher the leader is in the organization, the greater is his responsibility for the proper functioning of the organization, as stated by Ganguly (1964).

Although, there can be no doubt that "organizational climate" description, measurement and control are rather difficult. The first attempt to experimentally set up a particular 'social climate' in a work group was made by Kurt Lewin and his associates and reported in 1939 (for example Lewin et al. 1939). Another classic study on different types of leader behaviour and organisational climate' has been reported by Rolph White and Ronald Lippilt (1954). They had set up four groups of five 10 years old boys as their subjects. On the whole, the atmosphere created by democratic leadership was superior, and more desirable than the authoritarian climate. All except one boy of the two groups that had experience of all three types of leadership preferred the democratic order, however, no clear cut preference existed between the authoritarian and laissez-fair types.

Studies on organizations have led to the distinction of four organisational climates i.e. bureaucratic, autocratic, idiocratic, and democratic. Companies with 'bureaucratic climate' insist on strict obedience to company rules and regulations. Employees can feel secure so long as they confirm to these. The preoccupation and chief goal of the leaders here are to maintain and expand the particular system or organization as it is. In 'autocratic organizations' obedience to the superior is emphasized. Its leader desire to express themselves as fully as possible in their jobs. They want maximum autonomy for themselves and accept strict obedience to their personal orders on the part of their subordinates. The atmosphere is idiocratic, manipulative, and
psychological. The focus is on the individual worker and on his personal ambition. In the 'democratic organisation', informal group customs, codes and conventions are important and the leader derives his authority from these and from the group as a whole. Most ongoing organisations show characteristics of all these different climate, in different spheres of their activities.

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND ITS CLASSIFICATIONS

Various classification of climate factors have been propose by various researchers, including Halpin and Crafts, in the following manner:

(a) The consideration management had far the personnel as people,
(b) The emphasis that was placed on getting work done,
(c) The emotional distance that existed between manager and subordinate,
(d) The perception people had that their social needs were being satisfied,
(e) The enjoyment they received from social relationships in the organisation,
(f) The desire management showed, through task-oriented behaviour, to motivate the work force,
(g) The perception people had regarding whether they were singly going through motions to complete a task, and
(h) The feeling they had of being burdened with busy work.

Another classification was given by Forehand, who lists such characteristics as the size and structure of the organisation, the leadership patterns employed by the managers, the communication networks used to convey messages, the goals of the enterprise, and the complexity of the entire system. Forehand
contends that characteristics such as there not one describe an organisation but also influence the behaviour of the personnel as well.

The third categorization was made by Likert in the following order:

(i) Communication flow. How well do subordinates know what is going on? How receptive are superiors of communiques? Are subordinates given sufficient information to do their jobs well?

(ii) Decision-making practices. Are subordinates involved in the decision-making process? Is the know-how of all the personnel at every level being utilized?

(iii) Concern for people. Does the organisation organize work activities sensibly, try to improve work conditions, and show an interest in the individual's welfare?

(iv) Influence on the department. Do lower level supervisors and employees who have no subordinates have an influence on the department?

(v) Technological adequacy. Are equipment and resources well managed and improved methods quickly adopted?

(vi) Motivation. Do people in the organisation work hard for both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards and are they encouraged to do so by the organisation?

Further, Richard M. Hodgetts has classified organisational climate into two major categories. He has given an analogy with an iceberg where there is a part of the iceberg that can be seen from the surface and another part that is under water and is not visible. The visible part that can be observed or measured include the structure of hierarchy, goals and objectives of the
organisation, performance standards and evaluations, technological state of the operations and so on. The second category contains factors that are not visible and quantifiable and include such subjective areas as supportiveness, employee's feelings and attitudes, values, morale, personal and social interaction with peers, subordinates and superiors and a sense of satisfaction with the job. Both of these categories are shown below in the form of an iceberg.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>* Hierarchy</th>
<th>* Financial resources</th>
<th>* Goals of organisation</th>
<th>* Skills &amp; abilities of Personnel</th>
<th>* Technological state</th>
<th>* Performance standards</th>
<th>* Efficiency measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Attitudes</td>
<td>* Feelings</td>
<td>* Values</td>
<td>* Norms</td>
<td>* Interaction</td>
<td>* Supportiveness</td>
<td>* Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DIMENSIONS OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE**

Likert (1967) proposed six dimensions of organisational climate (leadership, motivation, communication, decision, goals and control) while Litwin and Stringer (1968) proposed seven dimensions (conformity, responsibility, standards, rewards, organisational clarity, warmth and support and leadership). A review of their studies and those of others indicates that twelve processes or dimensions of organisational climate relate specifically to motivation such as.
1. ORIENTATION:

The dominant orientations, characterized by the main concerns of members of
the organisation, are important determinants of the motivational climate. If
the main concern or orientation is to follow laid down rules, the climate will
be of one kind (control), if the orientation is to excel and achieve goals, it
will be of another kind (achievement).

2. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS:

Interpersonal relation processes are reflected in the way informal groups are
formed. If the groups are formed for protecting their own interests, there may
be cliques, creating a specific climate (control), as contrasted with another
climate if people have informal relationships with their supervisors
(dependency).

3. SUPERVISION:

The supervisory process contributes significantly to climate formulation. If
the supervisors help their subordinates to improve personal skills and chances
of advancement, their behaviour will develop a climate (extension) different
from one in which the supervisors are more concerned about maintaining
good relations with their subordinates (affiliation).

4. MANAGING PROBLEMS:

Problems can be seen as a challenge, or they can be seen as unnecessary
tribulations. Problems can be solved by the supervisors, or jointly with the
concerned employee, or can be referred to the higher levels. These different
ways contribute to the creation of a climate.
5. MANAGING MISTAKES:

The attitude of the supervisor towards mistakes develops employee orientation. One of annoyance, or concern, or tolerance. Again who helps and how in dealing with mistakes influences the climate.

6. MANAGING CONFLICTS:

The same is true of conflicts. The conflicts may be seen as annoying and embarrassing and may be covered, or they may be seen as problems to be solved. The process of dealing with conflicts is equally significant for the climate.

7. COMMUNICATION:

Communication is concerned with the flow of information, its direction (top-down, bottom-up, horizontal), its spread (selective or all concerned), mode (formal or informal), and type (instructions or feedback on state of affairs).

8. DECISION MAKING:

What is the main orientation in decision making: maintaining good relations or achieving results. Who make the decisions, people high in the hierarchy, or experts, or those who are involved in the matters about which decisions are made? Such questions will be relevant to see how the decision making process creates a particular motivational climate.

9. TRUST:

Amount or lack of trust amongst various members and groups in the organisation is relevant for the climate who are trusted more by management is also relevant.
10. REWARD MANAGEMENT:
What is reward in an organisation will influence its motivational climate, because what is rewarded reinforces the specific behaviour or orientation, arousing and sustaining a motive.

11. RISK TAKING:
How people react to risks, whose help is sought in risking situations, and how people respond to risks are relevant for the climate.

12. MANAGEMENT OF CHANGE:
Regarding management of change, the pertinent questions will be who initiates change, how change and innovation are perceived, how change is implemented.
Thus the above dimensions can be used to determine organisational climate. And the way its dimensions operate in an organisation may indicate the underlying motive of the top management, and the motive it is likely to arouse and sustain amongst the members in the organisation.

THEORY OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE:
Organizational climate theories has been classified into three different categories in the following sequence:

1. Theories of individual behaviour
2. Management theory
3. Organization theory

1. THEORIES OF INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOUR
Many psychologists who have addressed themselves to the study of individual behaviour in organizations have classified environmental factors in pluralistic
terms. Vroom (1964) in the conclusion of his comprehensive analysis of 'work and motivation' stated the following two propositions:

PREPOSITION-I:

The valence of an outcome to a person is monotonically increasing function of the algebraic of the product of the valence of all other outcomes and his conceptions of its instrumentality for the attainment of these outcomes.

PREPOSITION-II:

The force on a person to perform an act is monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of the valances of all outcomes and the strength of his expectancies that the act will be followed by the attainment of these outcomes.

'Vroom's model' acknowledges the importance of situational variables, but does not provide a format by which such variables can be mapped and measured most other theories of individual behaviour also fail to provide a systematic and useful linkage between 'climate' and 'behavioural concept'.

2. MANAGEMENT THEORY

Organizational psychologists interested in the management process have developed various terms to describe the indirect and subtle effects of management practices on the attitudes and behaviour of subordinates. Several of these terms attempt to define the phenomenon identified as "organizational climate". In the human side old enterprise, MC Gregor (1960) developed what he called the 'managerial climate' defined in terms of the manifestations of the assumptions of the management Blake & Mouton (1960), in "the Managerial Grid", used the term "organizational culture" stating that "when a
manager sees his responsibility as that of managing culture rather than just managing people to get work out of them, the basic unit of development is no longer the individual considered separately and alone". "However, they stop short of explaining what 'organizational culture' implies for the people, and most important, if it is the manager's responsibility to arrive at a total organizational perspective, how can he carry out his responsibility without a linking concept that allows to relate individual and organizational elements?

3. ORGANIZATIONAL THEORIES

Organizational theorists interested in descriptive explanations of human behaviour in organizations have dealt indirectly with notions of organizational environments.

'Classical organization theories', as represented in the writings of Fayol (1949) Koontz and O'Donnel (1955) and other render such concepts unnecessary.

The cognitive or economic behaviour theories of organization such as those proposed by March and Simon (1959) and Cyert and March (1964) view organizations as systems for making decisions and deal tangentially with climate.

The main group of organizational theories have concentrated on the objective framework of organization, the structure. Lorsch and Lowrence (1967) distinguish 8 structural dimensions which have been widely used to characterize the situational influences on motivated behaviour. These are:

1. Focus of formal authority,
2. Time span of responsibility,
3. Specificity of goals,
4. Number of levels of hierarchy,
5. Standardization of procedures,
6. Quality of formal rules,
7. Span of control, and
8. Rule specialization.

The model proposed above and those proposed by Likert (1961) and Woodward (1958) are related to Human's (1950) analysis of behaviour in groups. In these, the environment is viewed as having 3 parts i.e., a physical environment, a cultural environment, and a technological environment. The mutual interaction of these 3 parts specifies certain activities and interactions for the people involved in the system. These activities and interactions arouse sentiments among people. The environmentally determined activities, interactions and sentiments make up the external system. But increasing interactions arouse new sentiments and new activities not necessarily specified by the external system. New norms and frame of reference create internal system. The external and internal systems are mutually dependent on one another.

'Motivation' variables are not given adequate attention in these models, implying their drawback.

The concept and theory of climate development took place as a result of some original studies done in this field. The first explicit studies of 'psychological climate' were initiated by Krul Lewin in the 1930's. In describing the essential dynamics that linked human behaviour to generalized environmental stimuli, he stated that "To characterize properly the psychological field, one has to
take into account such specific items as particular goals, stimuli, needs, social relations as well as more general characteristics of the field as the atmosphere (e.g. the friendly, tense or hostile atmosphere) or the amount of freedom. Psychological atmosphere are empirical realities and are scientifically describable facts".

Lewin, Lippit and White (1930) studied climate in an experiment involving the behavioural effects of three different leader - induced-atmosphere. The three leadership roles were authoritarian, democratic and Laissaz Fane.

The adult role was found to be a strong determinant of the pattern of social interaction. In other words, the 'climate' provided more powerful than previously 'acquired' behaviour tendencies.

In Lewin's theory of motivation, the concept of 'atmosphere' was an essential functional link between the person (P) and the environment (R).

Under the other 'Climate' type theories, the most promising of these is the 'interpersonal organization theory', proposed by Khan and his associates (1964). They stated it is the key assumptions of this approach that "the behaviour of any organizational performer is the product of motivational forces that derive in large part from the behaviour of members of his role set because they constantly bring influence with the role expectations they hold for him".

There is not necessarily an incompatibility between the use of the 'climate framework' and the 'role set theory'. Rather, both serve as useful explanatory concepts.
Now, moving towards an 'Integrated theory', if the concept of 'organizational climate' is to demonstrate real value in understanding an explanation of behaviour in an organization, then it must be integrated with the kinds of theories of organizational behaviour that they evolve and are in current use. These theories, as discussed, tend to emphasize such factors as management practices, decision making processes, technology, formal organizational structure and social structure (viewed as arising from the interaction of technology, organizational structure and individual needs. These factors are largely objective features of an organization system, relatively little attention is given to the member perception of and subjective reposes to the organization environment. Thus, it has been difficult for these theories to utilize motivational concepts, many of such are based on subjective elements.

Litwin and Stringer (1968) have illustrated schematically an 'integrated model' of 'organizational behaviour'. In this model, the concept of organizational climate is used as an intervening variable, mediating between organizational system factors and motivation tendencies. The perceptions and subjective responses which comprise the 'organizational perceptions and subjective responses which comprise the 'organizational climate' are as follows:
"INTEGRATED MODEL"
OF 'ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR'

| Organizational System | Perceived Organizational Environment | Aroused Motivation | Emergent Behaviour | Consequence for Organizational
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|

Technology Organizational Structure

- Dimension of Affiliation Activities
- Organizational Climate (Or Role-Set Expectation)

Social Structure Leadership

- Power Interactions Retention
- Aggression Sentiments Innovation
- Fear Interaction Adaptability Reputative

Management Assumptions & Practices

Decision Making Process Needs of Members

Source: LITWIN and STRINGER, 1968, "Motivation and Organizational Climate".

The diagram in this reflects an attempt to outline an 'input-output systems model'. The organization system features are seen as generating an 'organizational climate' which in turn arouses (or suppresses) particular motivational tendencies. The patterns of motivated behaviour that results are...
seem as determining a variety of consequences for the organization including productivity, satisfactions, retention (or turnover), adaptability and reputation. The importance of interaction and feedback cycles is noted schematically.

An analysis of an organization's climate would inevitably lead to the tracing of its roots into the contextual source - the socio-cultural values and systematic features of the surrounding milieu, the body of knowledge regarding work and work forms, technological advancements and the resultant trends and issues in the realm of work. According to Sinha (1930) 'Organizational Climate' can be Soft or Synergetic, and these may be conceptualized as the extremes on a continuum of how work is viewed and valued, and what and how organizational (e.g. socio-cultural etc.) factors affect these viewing and evaluating processes. Basically, in a 'soft work climate', work is displaced from its central place in the organization by non-work activities and interests, such as, socio-personal interests and obligations. Employees do not tend to work hard, do not feel positive affect for work, do not derive satisfaction from their jobs, and do not locate work at the centre of their life space. They are not clear about their roles. In nut shell, social and personal considerations are allowed to undermine the importance of work. The opposite, however is true in a 'Synergetic work Climate'.

MODELS:

Regardless, there are three other models of Organizational Climate such as:

(i) Autocratic Model
(ii) Custodial Model
(iii) Supportive Model
(I) AUTOCRATIC MODEL:

The autocratic model has its roots deep in history, and certain it become the prevailing model of the industrial revolution. It depends on power. In an autocratic environment the managerial orientation is former, official authority. This authority is delegated by right of command over the people to whom it applies. Management assumes that it knows what is best and that the employee's obligation is to follow orders without question and without interpretation. Management assumes that employees are passive and even resistant to organisational needs. They have to be persuaded and pushed into performance, and this is management's task. Management does the thinking; the employees obey the orders.

Under autocratic conditions the employee orientation is obedience to a boss not a manager. The psychological result for employees is dependence on their boss, whose power to hire, fire and "perspire" them is almost absolute. And due to this there was minimum output and the pay was also minimum.

(II) CUSTODIAL MODEL:

As manager, began to study their employees, they soon recognized that although autocratically managed employees did not talk back to their boss, they certainly 'thought back'. Employees inside were a seething mass of insecurity, frustration and aggressions toward their boss. And it was necessary to develop feeling of satisfaction and severity among the employees.

To satisfy the security needs of employees, a no. of companies in the United States began welfare programs in 1890 and 1900s. In 1930s welfare programs evolved into a host of fringe benefits to give the employee security.
Employers - and unions and government began caring for the security needs of workers (i.e. they were applying a custodial model of organisational behaviour).

The custodial approach leads to employee dependence on the organisation. Rather than being dependent on their boss for their weekly bread, employees now depend on organisations for their security and welfare. Employees working in a custodial environment are well maintained, happy and contented, but they are not strongly motivated, so they give only passive co-operation. The result is that they do not produce much more vigorously than under the old autocratic approach.

(iii) SUPPORTIVE MODEL:

The supportive model of organizational behaviour was originally stated as the "principle of supportive relationships" by Rensis Likert, who said: "The leadership and other processes of the organisation must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and all relationships with the organisation each member will, in the light of his background, values, and expectation his sense of personal worth and importance".

Through leadership, management provides a climate to help employees grow and accomplish in the interests of the organisation the things of which they are capable. The leader assumes that workers are not by nature passive and resistant to organisational needs, but they are made so by an inadequately supportive climate at work. They will take responsibility, develop a drive to contribute, and improve themselves if management will give them half a chance. Supportive behaviour is not the kind of behaviour that require money. Rather, it is a part of management's life-style at work, reflected in the way
that it deals with other people. The manager's role is one of helping employees solve their problems and accomplish their work.

The supportive model tends to be especially effective in nations with affluence and complex technology, because it appeals to higher-order needs and provides intrinsic motivational factors.

The models of organisational behaviour are sequentially related to a hierarchy of human needs. As society has climbed higher on the need hierarchy, models of organisational behaviour have been developed to serve the higher order needs that became paramount at the time. Using Maslow's need hierarchy for comparison, the custodial model of organisational behaviour is seen as an effort to serve employee's second level security needs. It moved one step above the autocratic model, which was reasonably serving subsistence needs but was not effectively meeting needs for security. Similarly the supportive model is an effort to meet employee's higher level needs, such as affiliation and esteem, which the custodial model was unable to serve. Therefore, the need hierarchy suggests that each model is built upon the accomplishment of the other.

**IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE ON EMPLOYEES MOTIVATION AND PRODUCTIVITY**

Organisational climate have a major influence on motivation, productivity and job satisfaction. It does this by creating certain kinds of expectancies about what consequences will follow from different actions. Employees expect rewards, satisfaction, and frustrations based upon their perception of the organisational climate: These expectations tend to lead to motivation. Thus the organisational climate provides a type of work environment in which
individual feels satisfied or dissatisfied. As motivation and satisfaction of individual goes a long way in determining his efficiency because the organisational climate is said to be directly related with his performance in the organisation which is in turn related to the productivity of the organisation.

There are 4 mechanisms by which organisational climate affects performance, satisfaction and attitudes of people in the organisation.

(i) Organisational variables can operate as constraint system in both a positive and negative sense by providing knowledge of what kind of behaviour by attaching different rewards and punishments to varying behaviour. This assignments of different values to behaviour outcomes would then influence the behaviour of those people most interested in those specific values.

(ii) Organisational variables may affect behaviour through evaluation of the self and others, and this in turn influence behaviour. There are both physiological and psychological variables associated with this evaluation process.

(iii) Also these organisational factors work as stimuli, so as to influence an individuals arousal level which is a motivational variable directing behaviour. The level of arousal will directly affect the level of activation and hence performance.

(iv) This organisational variables influence the behaviour of the individuals to form a perception of the organisation. This perception then influences the behaviour in turn.

Thus, the organisational climate influences the way an individual in the
organisation behaves. This climate consists of total organisational factors, including its authority pattern, leadership pattern and communicational pattern which as a whole influences the behaviour.

As climate is defined as the perceived attributes of an organisation and its subsystems as reflected in the way an organisation deals with its members, groups and issues. One conceptual framework of climate (Litwin & Stringer, 1968) emphasise motivational linkages in the following manner:

(i) ACHIEVEMENT:
This motive is characterised by concern for excellence; competition in term of the standards set by others or by oneself; the setting of challenging goals for oneself awareness of the obstacles that might be encountered in attempting to achieve these goals; and persistence in trying alternative paths to one's goals.

(ii) EXPERT INFLUENCE:
This motive is characterised by a concern for making an impact on others; a desire to make people do what one thinks is right; and an urge to change situations and develop people.

(iii) CONTROL:
This is characterised by a concern for orderliness; a desire to be and stay and informed; an urge to monitor events and to take corrective action when needed; and a need to display personal power.

(iv) EXTENSION:
This is characterised by a concern for others; interest in subordinate goals; and an urge to be relevant and useful to large groups, including society.
(v) DEPENDENCY:

This motive is characterised by a derive for the assistance of others in developing oneself; a need to check with significant others (those who are more knowledgeable or have higher status, experts, close associates and so on); a tendency to submit ideas or proposals or approval; and an urge to maintain a relationship based on the other person's approval.

(vi) AFFILIATION:

This is characterised by a concern for establishing and maintaining close, personal relationships: an emphasis on friendship; and a tendency to express one's emotions.
SOCIAL SUPPORT

The study of social support was derived from epidemiological and public health models of disease that were applied in psychological phenomena, the literature on stressful life events was used to operationalise noxious environmental factors and social support was sized upon as the appropriate representative of psychological assets or resources. Social support has long been a topic of study and theory in organisational psychology even before occupational stress became a topic of frequent study in this field. Versions of social support went disguised under norms such as supervisor support, leader consideration, and group cohesiveness, etc. Regardless of this, support is a stress reducer. As a form of hygienic management, support helps to reduce the feelings of dissatisfaction and oppression that many workers feel when they are confronted by the pressure, rigidities and strilities of their jobs.

Social support, like stress, is a concept that everyone understand in general sense but it gives rise to many conflicting definitions and ideas when we get down to specifics. Social support has been implicitly or explicitly central in earlier literary, religious, sociological, psychological and medical thought. Social support is the amount of perceived helpfulness derived from social relationships. It can be determined by both the quality and quantity of individual's social relations. It has different names like love, caring, friendships, a sense of community, social integration. Definitions of social support have been inconsistent, diverse, vague and even contradictory (Beehr, 1985b; House, 1981). Different researchers and writers have given different definitions according to their perceptions and findings. As many studies have been carried out to find its effect on stress, strains, and relationships among
people, that may be supervisors, co-workers, non-work sources like spouses, family and friends, etc.

Lin, Simeone, Ensel, and Kuo (1979) define social support as support that is social. Social support may also be defined "as support accessible to an individual through social ties to other individuals and groups". The information, classification, assistance, and reassurance that an individual receives from others is called social support (Cobb, 1976; Cobb & Erbe, 1978; Caplan, 1979; Goltlieb, 1981, 1983; S. Cohen and McKay, 1984).

Regardless, social support has also been defined as "interpersonal transactions that include one or more of the following key elements: effects, affirmation and aid". Social support is an exchange of resources that takes place between at least two people, usually members of the same social network (Shumaker et al., 1984). Most people name friends or immediate family members as their supporters, especially female friends, relatives and particularly relative of about the same age.

Social support in the work context varies from simple reassurance to sharing information for solving work problems. Coworkers often are helpful with objective job problems, for which they can provide facts and opinions, and with career development concerns (Burke, Weir & Duncan, 1976).

Social support has been conceptualized as structural integration into a social network of relationships as well as functional resources provided as part of ongoing interpersonal relationships (Cohen & Syme, 1985; House & Kahn, 1985; Barrera, 1986; Cutona, 1986), and these two approaches seem to represent sociological and psychological perspectives respectively.
As Vaun (1988) noted "People assist each other in an astonishing variety of ways", and most of these have been labelled social support at one time or another.

Social support has been identified as a moderator of stress in stress research (Cohen & Syne, 1985; Greenglass, 1993; Greenglass, Fiksenbaum & Burke, 1996; Marshall & Barnett, 1992; Sud & Prabha, 1987, Sud, 1998). Generally it is proposed that having supporting relationship to rely on can help people in dealing with stressful situations. These who lack such relationship are vulnerable to the effect of stress (Burke, Shearer & Deszca, 1984, Cummins, 1990; Dollard & Winefield, 1995, Greenglass et al. 1996; Leiter, 1998a, 1991; Richardson, Burke & Leiter, 1992). Main sources of social support have been identified as supervisor, co-worker, spouse, friend and family (Beehr, King & King, 1990; Greenglass et al., 1996; Russell et al. 1987).

**TYPES OF SOCIAL SUPPORT**

There is growing recognition that social support is a complex, multifaceted phenomenon. Payne and Jones (1987) have distinguished different facets or dimensions of social support; the sources of support, the content or type of support, the disposition of support, the evaluation of support and the direction of support. Several theorists argued that supportive actions can be divided into different types of assistance or resources (Barrera & Ainalay, 1983; House 1983; Lin, Dean & Ensel, 1981; Moos & Mitchell, 1982; Turner, 1983). The implication being that the different types may play different roles in dealing with challenging events. In their review of the literature on social support, Cohne and Wills (1985) identified 4 major types of support that have appeared in the previous research literature:
(a) emotional support, the expression of feelings that a person is well-regarded and valued;

(b) instrumental or material support, the provision of financial and material resources, as well as actual assistance toward completing a task;

(c) informational support, the giving of a device intended to help a person understand his or her situation; and

(d) companionship, involvement with others in leisure or recreational activities.

Though Cohen and Wills (1985) divided social support into two categories, structural and functional. Here, their review was of general life stressors, however, rather than being focused on work-related stressors. Structural social support referred to the existence of a social network within which the person was embedded, for example the existence of connections of the person with neighbours, relatives and community organisations. In this regard, most employees have some structural social support. That is, they are usually part of an organised set of people who have relationship with each other.

Functional support refers to definitions and measures of social support requiring an indication that the socially supportive person or people serve as a function for the focal person. Examples of such functions include the provision of esteem, information, or companionship, or being instrumental for the accomplishment of the focal person's tasks.

Virtually previous studies of social support in relation to work related stress have used functional measures of social support. Both emotional and tangible support, are forms of functional support (Caplan et al., 1975). Of the two,
emotional support is the one that most people think of when the term social support is mentioned, as it would help to alleviate the effect of occupational stress better. Thus, when questions asked about different types of social support, such as a supervisor these types are usually strongly correlated. There are several studies in which this was found (e.g. Caplan et al. 1975; Kaufmann and Beebr, 1986, 1989; Mattimore, 1990), and it has become common to combine these types of support, thus keeping the source of social support separate but not the types of support in occupational stress studies (e.g. Dunseath & Beehr 1991; Ganster et al., 1986).

Several studies have consistently demonstrated buffering effects for different types of support (Cohen & Hoberman, 1983; Hill, 1987b; Paykel, Emms, Fletcher & Rassaby, 1980). Different types of support have been shown with different impact upon the self-perception of physical health by high and low affiliative need individuals (Hill, 1987b). In this, latter study; more tangible, instrumental support uniformly buffer the self-perceived physical health of all individuals, regardless of affiliative need. Whereas, less tangible support, a composite of emotional, informational and companionship support, benefited only low affiliative need individuals. High affiliative need individuals, on the other hand, tended to experience somewhat of an opposite effect, meaning that they experienced lower levels of symptoms under conditions of greater negative life events, especially when they receive less social support.

The differential influence of the two types of support was interpreted in terms of the proposal made by Lefcourt and his colleagues (1984) that low affiliative need individuals tend to view interpersonal resources in a more
instrumental way than high affiliative need individuals. All forms of potentially helpful input from others presumably are treated as instrumental coping resources and contribute effectively to attempts by low affiliative need individuals to eliminate or manage the source of stress. In contrast, high affiliative need individuals are assumed to perceive less tangible forms of social support.

The content of social support has been classified into various categories in the following manner such as, Caplan and others (1985) distinguished affect, affirmation and aid as types of support. Curtona (1986) have identified esteem, information, social integration, and tangible as types of support. While House (1981) observed emotional, instrumental, informational and appraisal as types of support. Although there is considerable overlap among these approaches, it is clear that some researchers make distinctions that others chosen not to make. Moreover, different types of support from the same person tend to be highly inter-correlated (House & Kahn, 1985) and all types of support are perceived to have an emotional component (Barling, MacEwen and Pratt, 1988). Parasuraman et al. (1992) distinguished tangible support from emotional support. Tangible support includes information, advice and suggestions (informational) as well as aid in time, money or other forms of tangible help (instrumental). Emotional support includes the provision of esteem, affection and trust (emotional) as well as feedback and affirmation (appraisal).

**FUNCTIONS OF SOCIAL SUPPORTS**

Social support can affect work stress and directly enhance health and well-being because it meets important human needs for security, social contacts,
approval, belongingness and affection. Its function can be illustrated by the following figure.
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**Fig. 7. Functions of social support**

- Arrow 1 - Health sustaining function
- Arrow 2 - Stress prevention function.
- Arrow 3 - Buffering function.

The figure indicates three roles of social support in the stress process. The "health sustaining" (Shumaker & Brownell, 1984) function of social support, represented by arrow-1 in figure, reflects a positive main effect of support on well-being. This main effect has been observed consistently in the literature, and presumably reflects the impact of social support on the recipients affiliative satisfaction, sense of self identity, feeling of self-work and self esteem stability (Shumaker & Brownell, 1984; Cohen & Wills, 1985). The main effect of support on well-being occurs regardless of the level of stress experienced by the individual.

The "Stress prevention" function of social support, represented by arrow-2 is a negative main effect of support on the stressor. In this, role, social support reduces the environmental pressures that produce the stress in the first place. For e.g. cognizant of the pressure generated by a project with a tight deadline, a supportive supervisor might provide additional staff help to an employee that makes the work demands more manageable and prevents the resultant feelings of overload. Although the stress prevention perspective does not
seem to be as widely adopted as the health sustaining perspective. There is evidence suggesting that social support can reduce the level of stress in the work environment (Beehr, 1985; Ganster, Fusilier & Mayes, 1986; Fusilier, Ganster & Mayes, 1987) and in the family environment (Parasuraman et al., 1992).

The "buffering" function of social support, represented by arrow-3, reflects moderating effect of support on the relationship between stress and well-being. The buffering hypotheses proposes that support weakens or attenuates the negative relationship between stress and well-being, thereby, protecting an individual from the severe consequences of stress. In this role, support directly affects neither stress nor well-being but rather the relationship between stress and well-being. It is believed that support acts as a buffer because it enhances the recipients cognitive and behavioural coping abilities that enables the recipient to manage the stressful situation more effectively (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Pearlin, 1985). Because of the enhancement of coping skills that are responsible to a particular stressful situation, the buffering perspective - unlike the health sustaining perspective assets that support only promotes well-being in the presence of high levels of stress.

Empirical research provides inconsistent support for the buffering hypotheses despite its intuitive appeal. For e.g. although the work stress literature has revealed despite occasional support for the buffering prediction (Fusilier, Ganster & Mayes, 1987), many studies have observed either no buffering effect or "reverse buffering". These inconsistent findings have led some researchers to conclude that buffering should occur only when there is an "optimal match" between the types of stress experienced and the types or
A source of support provided (Beehr, 1985; Cohen & Syme, 1985; Pearling, 1985; Cutiona and Russell, 1990). Since different types of stress require different coping skills, "there must be a reasonable match between the coping requirements and the available support in order for buffering to occur" (Cohen & Will, 1985).

MODELS OF SOCIAL SUPPORT

Social support is a flow of emotional concern, instrumental aid, information and for appraisal (information relevant to self-evaluation) between people. It is determined by both the quantity and quality of an individual's social relationships. This can be illustrated by the following figure.

Fig. 8. A flow model of the mechanism of Social support
As figure shows, one's support network must be perceived before it can be used. Support networks has been evolved the following sources:

(a) Cultural norms
(b) Social institutions
(c) Companies,
(d) groups, or
(e) individuals.

For example, there is more cultural emphasis as caring for the elderly in Japan than in America. Japanese culture is thus a strong source of social support for older Japanese people. Alternatively, individuals may fall back on social institutions such as social security or the American Red cross, religious groups, or family and friends for support. In turn, these various sources provide again 4-types of support:

* Esteem Support: Providing information that a person is accepted and respected despite any problems or inadequacies.

* Informational Support: Providing help in defining, understanding and coping with problems.

* Social companionship: Spending time with others in leisure and recreational activities.

* Instrumental Support: Providing financial aid, material resources, or needed services.

If social support is perceived as available, an individual then decides whether or not to use it. Generally, support is used for one or two purposes. The first
purpose is very broad in scope. Global social support, encompassing the total amount of support available from the four sources, is applicable to any situation at any time. The narrower functional social support buffers the effects of stressors or stress in specific situations. When relied on in the wrong situation, functional social support is not very helpful, for e.g. if you lost your job, unemployment compensation (instrumental support) would be a better buffer than sympathy from a bartender. On the other hand, social companionship would be more helpful than instrumental support in coping with loneliness. After social support is engaged for one or both of these purposes, its effectiveness can be determined. If consolation or relief is not experienced, it may be that the type of support was inappropriate. The feedback loop in the figure, from the effect of social support back to perceived availability, reflects the need to fall back on other sources of support when necessary.

Another model based on the uncertainty approach to occupational stress has been offered by Beehr (1985b).

Fig. 9. Effects of instrumental and emotional social support in the context of job stress.
A - Main effect of instrumental social support on job stressors.
B - Main effect of emotional social support on strains.
C - Buffering effect of emotional social support on the relationship between job stressors and strains.

(+) or (-) → indicates the direction of the effect, i.e. increasing (+) or decreasing (-) the strength of the variable.

Here the figure illustrate the proposed relationship between social support and this model of job stress. It addresses two types of social support that have been studied most often in occupational stress, instrumental (or tangible) and emotional, and it allows for all of the types of effects of social support on the stress process that are discussed here: direct effects on job stressors, direct effects on individual's strains, and buffering effects on the relationship between job stressors and strains. The arrows in the model show the theoretically causal direction of relationships between variables, and the signs on the arrows (plus or minus) indicate the positive or negative direction for these causal relationships.

Instrumental support is proposed to have a main (direct) effect on the job stressors (arrow A), while emotional support is expected to have a direct effect on the employee's strains (arrow B). It has been noted that, measures of these two types of support are typically correlated with each other in non-experimental field studies. Because of this, it is unlikely that one would find instrumental support only related to job stressors and emotional support only related to the strains, but it would be expected from the model that instrumental support will have a stronger effect on job stressors than emotional support and that emotional support will have a stronger effect on strains than instrumental support.
A further reason why instrumental support should be related to strains is that it is related to them indirectly through its effect on the intervening variables of uncertainty and importance. Instrumental support from people who have the power to affect stressors is more likely to have this effect that instrumental support from people who do not really have such power. The most important source of instrumental support will vary according to what the stressor is, but on the average, one might expect that the supervisor's instrumental support would be the more important. This is because on the average, the supervisor is formally more powerful in the work situation than the other sources typically studied (co-workers, and family and friends).

Emotional support, on the other hand, is proposed to have a main effect on strains. It seems intuitively obvious that providing comfort and sympathy to people could put them at ease figuratively and literally, and this could be an operational definition of emotional social support. As noted earlier there does seem to be a main effect of social support on emotional or psychological strains, and this model proposes that the emotional type of support does this quite directly.

Using the Beehr (1985b) model, the buffering effect is expected to occur mainly through the effects of emotional support on importance in the Beehr and Bhagat (1985b) model. This is proposed to happen through the effects of emotional social support on individual's values and needs (arrow C). The assumption is that the importance employees place on the outcomes in a given situation is in part a function of their need and values. The social information processing approach to organisational behaviour (e.g. Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978) holds that employee's needs are influenced by the information they
receive from other people. Since the definition of social support in past research has been so varied, it is easy to conclude that it could take the form of providing information about what needs are appropriate in the situation.

But one obvious problem with testing this model is the previously noted problem of measuring the instrumental and emotional social supports independently. The typically strong empirical relationship between the two types of support makes it difficult to come up with very different results for them. The only subsequently direct test of parts of this model has been a study by Fenlason and Beehr (in press). They used the commonly employed global emotional and instrumental social support measures of Caplan et al. (1975) and found that the difference between eight of the twelve pairs were significantly different. Each of three sources of emotional support (supervisors, co-workers, and extra-organizational sources) was correlated both with (two) job stressors and a psychological strain, and each of the three sources of instrumental support was also correlated both with (two) job stressors and a psychological strain. Of the six correlations between emotional support and job stressors, five were weaker (less negative) than the correlation between the corresponding emotional support and psychological strain, but only one difference was significant. Only three of the six pairs of correlations were in the predicted direction for the instrumental support indices, however, one of which was significant. This part of the model is probably worth further research, but the first attempt by Fenlason and Beehr met with only modest success (The development of more accurate measurement of the types of social support could be an important breakthrough).
EFFECTS OF SOCIAL SUPPORT

There are three general types of effects that have been proposed for social support in conjunction with occupational stress (Beehr, 1985b; Beehr and McGrath, in press). The first is a main effect of social support on stressors, i.e. social support might reduce the harmful effects of job stressors by reducing the strength of the stressors themselves. The second is a main effect of social support on strains; social support, in this view, would directly reduce the strength of the aversive effects of stressors on the person. The third contention is that there is some type of interaction effect. The most commonly proposed interaction effect in the job stress literature is the interaction between job stressors and social support to affect the level of strains.

(I) MAIN EFFECTS OF SOCIAL SUPPORT ON JOB STRESSORS:

Of the 3 types of effects that social support might have, its effects on job stressors have been explicitly studied the least. Most of the occupational stress studied, have used non-experimental field methods, and some of them report correlation among most or all of the variables in the study. Among the studies that did report these correlations, about 38 to 60 correlations between job stressors and social support were significant (P<0.05), but the median correlation was only -0.22 (Beehr, 1976; Beehr and Drexler, 1986; Beehr et al. 1990; Etzion, 1984; Ganster et al. 1986; La Racco and Jones, 1978; Marcelissen et al. 1988; Seers et al. 1983).

In a study of 181 employees of a small midwestern city, Caplan et al. (1975) three sources of social support (i.e. supervisor, co-worker and organisational) and six job stressors (role conflict, role ambiguity,
quantity of workload, work variability, underutilization of skills and responsibility for others) were measured (Dunseath and Beehr, 1991).

Beehr (1985b) hypothesised that instrumental or tangible support might affect the stressors more than emotional supports. Tangible supports are, by definition, often aimed at materially helping with problems experienced in the situation. One of the major situational problems during occupational stress episodes is the stressor itself. It would be tangible social support, for example, to help the stressed people get the jobs tasks done at a time during which they are overloaded. This would materially relieve the overload (the stressor).

A second hypothesis is that support offered from the source of the stressor might be more helpful than support offered from other sources. If the co-workers are the sources of stressors, for e.g. and they offer social support, this might be especially appreciated and tension-relieving of the focal employee.

A third hypothesis about the potential for specificity of social supports effects on job stressors is that the social support from the supervisor might be more effective in reducing stressors than social support from other sources would be. This is based on the more general hypothesis that support offered by more powerful people is more important than support offered by less powerful people when one experiences stressors in the workplace. The supervisor is the sources of support with the most formal power among the sources usually studied in workplace stress research. However, one might hypothesize that support from people in the organisational hierarchy above the supervisor would be even more effective at reducing stressors.
(ii) MAIN EFFECTS OF SOCIAL SUPPORT ON INDIVIDUAL STRAINS:

Some of the earliest thinking and observations about general stress (not job stress, necessarily) and social support concerned the potential effects of social support on individual's strains. Social support was often offered by researchers sometimes as a post-hoc explanation, for the relatively good health (i.e. lack of strains) of people who were married, had friends or co-workers and so forth in various stress studies (House, 1981).

In the occupational stress research domain, both House (1981) and Beehr (1985b) concluded that many studied of social support have reported positive main effect of social support on individual strains, but this has been most consistent with psychological strains. In a set of social supports and strains, about thirty five of fifty three correlations between social support and types of psychological outcomes were significant (Beehr, 1976; Beehr and Drexler, 1986; Beehr et al., 1990; Chisholm et al., 1986; Etzion, 1984; Gonster et al., 1986; Seers et al. 1983). In a study by Dunseath and Beehr (1991) utilizing 3 social supports emotional and instrumental combined for supervisor, co-workers, and others) and three possible psychological outcomes (life dissatisfaction, job dissatisfaction, and depression). Seven of nine correlations were significant.

Eight of the ten (Beehr, 1976; Beehr and Drexler, 1986; Beehr et al. 1990; Chisholm et al., 1986; Seers et al., 1983; Gansters et al. 1986; La Rocco and Jones, 1978; Kaufmann and Beehr, 1989). Studies included various types of satisfaction measures as psychological outcomes. Satisfaction had a median correlation of about +0.15 with the various types of social support. Variety of
psychological strains has also been studied in relation to social support. Psychological strains include measures of things such as depression, self-esteem, anxiety and burnout. Studies cited above (Beehr, 1976; Beehr et al. 1990; Chisholm et al., 1986; Etzion, 1984; Ganster et al. 1986; La Rocco and ones, 1978; Kaufmann and Beehr, 1989; Marcelissen et al. 1988) has seen measures.

(III) INTERACTIVE EFFECTS OF SOCIAL SUPPORT:

The most interesting hypothesis about social support and occupational stress is that social support interacts with occupational stressors to affect individual stories. This is the buffering hypothesis that Ganster et al. (1986) called the dominant hypothesis regarding social support and occupational stress.

THE BUFFERING HYPOTHESIS

The buffering hypothesis has been described and tested in a few different ways when considering both the job stress and life stress literature. Here the figure, shows the typical buffering effect that would be expected in occupational stress research. The fact that the low social support line is above the high social support line indicates the main or direct effect of social support on strains.
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Fig. 10. Social support's expected buffering effect in occupational stress
The key for the buffering hypothesis, however, is the difference in slopes between the high and low social support groups. Buffering is usually defined in the occupational stress literature as the finding of a more positive relationship between stressors and strains at higher levels of social support than at lower levels of social support (Beehr, 1985b; House, 1981). Somehow, the causal link between job stressors and individual strains is broken, or at least lessened, by having supportive others. The low social line in the figure represents the situation for most people experiencing occupational stress, but the high social support line shows no relationship or at least a less strong relationship. The presence of social support is said to buffer or protect the person from the experience of strains in the presence of what would otherwise be stressful job situation.

Cohen and Wills (1985) reviewed the literature on social support and life stress, but in a subsection of that article, they concluded that the occupational stress literature provided considerable support for the buffering model, even though they reviewed only 3 studies (House and Wells, 1978; La Rocco et al., 1980; La Rocco and Jones, 1978) of which two supported the buffering hypothesis. In the same year, Beehr (1985b) reviewed seven occupational stress studies (Beehr, 1976; Blau, 1981; House and Wells, 1978; La Racco et al., 1980; House's 1981 graphing of Cobb and Kasl's 1977; and two studies that were unpublished at that time but subsequently published as Kaufmann and Beehr, 1986, 1989) two of which were in common with Coben and Wills, and concluded that the evidence regarding the buffering hypothesis is mixed.

The dominant social support hypothesis has been that it buffers the impact of stressors on manifestation of strains. Most authors have used the term in a
consistent with the explicit definition of La Rocco, House and French (1980). Social support is hypothesized to interact with stressors such that the relation between stress and strain is stronger for persons with low levels of social support than for those with high levels of support. In other words, social support moderates the stress-strain relation. It is important to distinguish between the terms moderate and mediate, because both have been used in reference to the buffering effect. In this context the term buffering role of social support refers to a moderating effect, which could be used interchangeably.

Findings have been inconsistent. Several studies report evidence of the moderating effect (Abdel-Halim, 1982; Gore, 1978; House McMichael, Wells, Kaplan and Landerman, 1979; Karasea, Triantis, and Chaudry, 1982; Kobasa & Puccetti, 1983; LaRocco et al., 1980; Lefcourt, Martin and Saleh, 1984; Saudler and Lakey, 1982; Seers, McGee, Serey and Gram, 1983; Wilcox, 1981). Many of these investigations, however, did not find consistent effects across different -

(a) stressors and indexes of strain,

(b) sources of support, and

(c) personal characteristics of the subjects.

For e.g. La Rocco et al. (1980) reported that social support moderated the effects of stressors on health outcomes such as depression and somatic complaints, but they found no evidence of the effect on job-related strains such as job dissatisfaction and boredom. Kobasa and Puccetti (1983) reported that support from the boss buffered the effect of critical life events on illness
symptoms but that support from the family did not. Sandler and Lakey (1982) found social support buffered the impact of critical life events on depression and anxiety for persons with an internal locus of control but not for those with an external locus of control.

In sum, the evidence of moderating effects is equivocal, suggesting that their existence may depend on the source of support, the recipients, the stressors and strains.

In addition to the studies that to some extent support buffering effects, other investigations have not (Aneshensel and Stone, 1982; Blau, 1981; Ganellen & Blaney, 1984; Lin, Simcone, Ensel & Kuo, 1979; Turner, 1981). Still others have reported what might be termed opposite buffering effects. That is, social support appeared exacerbate the effects of stressors on strains for eg. Beehr (1976) noted that work group support tended to increase the impact of role ambiguity on job dissatisfaction. Similar opposite buffering findings were reported by Abdel-Halim (1982) and Kobasa and Puccetti (1983).