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Introduction

The present day life or almost all segments of society are facing rigorous of life. The life is moving on a fast pace and it is believed that we have to achieve whatsoever we desire, as quickly as possible, there is hardly any possibility of leisure and relaxation. We have to face various kinds of hassles in daily life, with the result that every aspect of life is affected whether home atmosphere, performance at work, and interaction with members of the society.

The main title of the thesis “Impact of Daily Hassles and Extra-organizational Stressors on Work commitment” clearly indicates that our main concern is to explore the relationship between daily hassles, extra-organizational stressors and work commitment. The review of literature revealed that above mentioned aspects of behaviour are interrelated to each other.

Abundant stress is part and parcel of modern age. Every member of modern society faces stress. The concept of stress was first introduced in the life sciences by Cannon in 1929. In 1936 Selye used the term ‘stress’ biologically and applied it to the reaction of the body. It owes its emergence to Seyle. The term ‘stress’ has been defined variously by Seiye (1979) to refer to:

(a) stimulus (external forces acting on the organism),
(b) response (changes in physiological and psychological functions),
(c) interaction (between an external force and the resistance opposed to it as in biology) and
(d) more comprehensive combinations of the above factors (i.e. stimulus, response, and interactional outcomes).

Stress is an internal state which could be caused by physical demands on the body (disease conditions, exercise, extremes of
temperature, and the like) or by environmental and social situations which are evaluated as potentially harmful, uncontrollable, or exceeding our resources for coping the physical, environmental, and social causes of the stress termed stressors (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984).

Stress is defined as the pattern of specific and non specific responses, an organization makes to stimulus events that disturb its equilibrium and tax or exceed its ability to cope (Zimbardo, 1988). According to Ivancevich and Matteson (1983). "Stress is an adaptive response mediated by individual characteristics and/or psychological processes that is a consequence of any external action, situation, or event that places special physical and/or psychological demand upon a person". "Job stress is a condition arising from the interaction of people and their jobs and characterized by changes within people that force them to deviate from their normal functioning (Beehr & Newman, 1978).

Present day researchers and practitioners visualize the phenomenon of stress in a new perspective. Each individual needs a moderate amount of stress to be alert and capable of functioning effectively in an organization. Stress is inherent in the concept of creativity (Pestonjjee, 1992) and entrepreneurship (Pareek, 1995).

Daily Hassles:

Daily hassles have been observed to be important factor of work environment, job culture, & performance of the employee.

Most of the stress in our lives results from having to deal with daily hassles pertaining to our jobs, personal relationships, and everyday living circumstances. Many people experience the same hassles everyday. Examples of daily hassles included living in a noisy neighborhood, commuting to work in heavy traffic, disliking one's fellow workers, worrying about owing money, waiting in a long time, and misplacing or losing things, long quee at the railway station ticket counter or ration shop, unwanted phone cells, irregular
power cut. Such daily events or stressor mount up and we all face them time to time in our lives. When taken individually, these hassles may feel like only minor irritants, but cumulatively, over time, they can cause significant stress. Sometimes opportunity positive events can have stressful components. For example, a women who gets job promotion may receive a higher salary and greater prestige, but she may also feel stress from supervising coworker who were once peers. It would be desirable to properly explain the daily hassles should be considered in terms of job environment.

Lazarus (1990), believes that the impact of such hassles depend on their frequency, duration, and intensity. In addition, how a person reacts to minor hassles influenced by his or her personality, the individual’s style of coping, and how the rest of the day has gone.

Work overload may be one of the important factors responsible for producing hassles. To be more specific when employees feel overwhelmed from trying to work on more tasks than they can handle or from trying to work on tasks that are to difficult for them, they are suffering from work overload. Work overload is common after layoffs among the remaining workers who are assigned more tasks. It is also common among newly appointed managers who feel unprepared for their new unfamiliar roles. Boundary extension is another good example of daily hassles that is particularly relevant in the work place. Some jobs, such as public relation and sales, require employees to work with people in other occupational settings.

Daily hassles are particularly relevant in the workplace are role ambiguity, and role conflict. When employees are unsure about what is expected of them, how to perform their job, or what the consequences of their job performance, they are experiencing role ambiguity. When employees find it difficult to perform their job
effectively because of the multiple explanations about their job performance, they are experiencing role conflict.

A few years back Zohar (1999), exhaustively worked on the concept of daily work hassles on effort, exertion, & negative mood employees working in organizations. He contends that the effect of externally induced obstacles disrupt goal directed behaviour. Such obstacles at work as faulty equipment their malfunction, unscheduled change of work assignments, inappropriate behaviour of co-workers lead to daily hassles.

Many researchers (Frese and Zapf, 1994; Semmer, 1982) have pointed out that workplace reduced productivity, and retard the performance of employees. The individual worker in such a case must employee extra effort and develop new action plan, with the result that has to be extra effort, and energy has to entailed mental effort and decision making.

Extra-organizational stressors

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

The extra-organizational variables are external to the work environment other than individual or personal factors. It includes economic factors, family-spouse relations, political un-certainy, life crisis, and lack of social support (Hendrix et al., 1985; Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980; Marshall and Cooper, 1979; Matteson and Ivancevich, 1979).
Amongst the various extra-organizational stressors—changes in socio-technical system and social change—the social and family stressors have been recognized as most important as they have great impact on personality development (Vadra and Akhtar, 1989). Apart from these other aspects such as a circular relationship between family and work (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1987) can not ignored. Relocation and charge produce varied symptoms such as emotional disorientation, confusion and even physical ailments (Sinetar, 1986).

Similarly, to cope with economic and financial stressors may forced people to opt for other job. This reduces time for relaxation and pleasant interaction with the family members. In such cases there is every likelihood that the accumulated stress would adversely affect the employee.

Davidson and Cooper (1981), also emphasized that that stress at work can also affect an individual at home and social environment and vice-versa. Marshall and Cooper (1979), outlined four intrusions of work into home life: Carrying pending work to home, business travel, organizational social commitments, and exclusive job pursuits such as advancement in the job and accepting new assignments.

Changed scenario as regards the employment of women is concerned with creating a diabolical situation which may lead to conflicting and overlapping responsibilities. In such situations stress may loom large over to further reinforce stresses. This is vindicated by role theory which predicts that multiple role can lead to inter role conflict and in turn symptoms of strain (Kopelman et al. 1983).

Inter role conflict is likely to increase as the demands of either the work or family role increase (Beutell and Greenhaus, 1983).

Similarly, inter role conflict can increase as one’s obligations to the family expand through marriage and the arrival of children.
This is particularly the case for women, who tend to assume responsibility for household management and child care (Gordon and Strober, 1978; Gutek et al 1981).

Role stress may occur not only during one's official or professional job but also result from the fact that professionals are often expected to continue to perform their role when they are outside the organizational setting (Vachon, 1987).

In each family member are assigned a specific role and are labeled accordingly. For example, parents are expected to perform leadership role control the children become used to pay respect to their parents. One or more members in the family may take over dysfunctional members, in order to balance the homeostatic balance in the family. Life in the workplace can rely on the use of these strategies to maintain the balance, but not without cost to the workers' level of stress. Using the workplace to deal with unresolved family conflicts can also produce stress. Workers who had great difficulties in dealing with family members can carry the transference reactions to their colleagues, supervisors, administrators, and so on.

Perhaps the most universal cost of a successful professional career lies in the quality life. The executives frequently complain about their unsatisfactory home lives. The job exerts pressure on the man to spend more time at work, while the wife and children exert pressure for more time to be spent at home. The unfortunate executive is trapped right in the middle. If he leans toward the career his family life suffers, if he prefers to concentrate more attention towards his family, then he stands to lose professionally (Cooper and Marshall, 1979).

Googins and Burden (1987), in their study found that workplace-family role strain was strongly associated with decreased physical and emotional well-being as measured by depression, life satisfaction, days absent.
These considerations impress us with the fact that stress is truly complex and multiplicities of factors influence it. The complexity may be magnified by the interaction of social and family stress.


Most of the literature on stress and organizational outcomes have focused on organizational factors and has ignored extra organizational stressors, such as traumatic events, may have potentially negative and costly implications for organizations (Byron, and Suzanne, 2001).

The nature of interface between the workplace and family is the keystone of the work-family construct. This link or interface can vary from positive to negative. Usually the term work-family connotes the conflict that arises when an employee tries to fulfill the responsibilities of roles in both domains. Although time limitations are the most common cause of work-family conflict, such conflict can arise because of incompatibilities due to the strain, energy, or behavioral requirements of these different roles. Work-family (WFC) has been divided into two components: work interfering with family (WIF) and family interfering with work (FIW) (Gutek, 1991).

Less frequently, work-family refers to the rewards that an employee gets from simultaneously occupying roles in both arenas.

Research on work-family conflict has found that this variable influences a number of outcomes including psychological distress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover, and life satisfaction (Frone, Russel, and Cooper, 1992; Duxbury and Irving, 1992; O'Driscoll, Ilgen, and Hildreth, 1992; Parasuraman, Greenhaus, Rabinowitz, Bedein, and Mossholder, 1989). It is widely
recognized that occupational stress is determined by extraorganizational as well as organizational factors (Glowinkowski and Cooper, 1985).

The literature indicates that certain personality and attitudinal factors interact with work and non-work variables as determinants of stress (Davidson and Cooper, 1983; Sekaran, 1983, 1985). Two individual difference variables, Type A behaviour and work commitment, are studied in this study. Type A individuals tend to work long hours (Howard et al., 1977), which may be incompatible with parenting young children in a dual-earner context, and to be dissatisfied with their work load (Brief et al., 1983). Even in single earner families, Type A men report greater family-work interference than their Type B counterparts and lower marital satisfaction (Burke et al., 1979).

Reichers (1986) has shown the multiple role commitments to several constituencies create psychological conflict for individuals, and result in decreased level of organizational commitment. Thus, one potential (and conventional) expectation is that role expansion will result in less commitment to work and less effective job performance. This apparently is the expectation held by many managers of employees who become mothers (Burden and Googins, 1987; Lobel, 1991).

In a study (Bolger, De longis, Kessler and Wethington, 1989) investigated "cross over" of over load and conflict in a study of 166 married couples, suggested that home-to-work stress (overload and arguments at home) had a greater impact than work-to-home stress (overloads and arguments at work) for males than for females.

Netmeyer et al (1996) suggested that one of the problems with traditional work-family and family-work conflict measures is that their items focus on potentials outcomes of the constructs (e.g., "feeling too tired after work"), rather than the actual content domain (e.g. "the amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities.

In Lambert's (1990) review of the work-family literature, she observed that spill over theory and segregation theory were two major theories that had been used to describe the way in which family and work may be linked. Spillover theory suggests that an employee's experience is one domain affects their experience in another domain, whereas segregation theory suggests that experiences in different domains are quite separate and independent from one another.

**Work Commitment**

The term commitment is broadly used to refer to antecedents and consequences, as well as the process of becoming attached, and the state of attachment that seems to be the construct of common interest. Some investigations have explored the processes through which one becomes committed (Galanter, 1980; Salancik, 1977; Staw and Ross, 1977) or the impact of individual and organizational influences, (Angle and Perry, 1983; Steers, 1977). Organizational commitment has been defined in several different ways. The various definitions and measures share a common theme in that organizational commitment is considered to be a bond or linking of individual to the organization. Most of the time researchers talk about organizational commitment. Hence, there is pressing need to discuss its one of the aspect, i.e. work commitment. It is significant to point out to here that work commitment is one of the construct of organizational commitment as Morrow (1983) enumerated.

Organizational commitment as a construct was potentially redundant with other work commitment constructs such as job involvement (Kanungo, 1982; Lodahl and Kejner, 1965), work ethic (Blood, 1969; Buckholz, 1976; Mirels and Garett, 1971), and career commitment (Blaw, 1985; Greenhaus, 1971). Inspite of such controversies, it is imperative to point out here that in this large investigation work commitment is used which I itself bears the notion
of organizational commitment as these two terms are so independent where one cannot be explained over looking the other. Hence, in this investigation work commitment combines the notion of organizational commitment.

Work commitment the soul, the catalyst that governs the motivation intensity at work. Controversially, it make everyone feel satisfied with work. Likewise, work commitment is found conducive at work and has very positive influence on work related outcomes. Research on organizational commitment is recent and based on such extensive contributions of empirically oriented psychologists. Research efforts concerning the concept of organizational commitment are the relative strength of an individual's identifications with and involvement in particular organization. Commitment as structural phenomenon are associated with three characteristics: (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's values and goals, (2) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization and (3) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization Mowday, Steers & Porter (1979).

According to Reichers (1985), commitment to an organization involves three attitudes (1) a sense of identifications with the organization's goals, (2) a feeling involvement in organization's duties, (3) a feeling of loyalty for the organization. In short job involvement means identifying with one's specific job while organizational commitment means identifying with one's employing organization.

According to Blau and Boal (1987), organizational commitment is a state in which an employee identifies with a particular organizational and its goals, and wishes to maintain membership in the organization. Newstorm and Davis (1995), emphasis that organizational commitment is a measure of employee's willingness to remain with a firm in future. According to Bateman and Strasser (1984), commitment among organizational
members hastens the process of organizational goal attainment and would reduce the problem of turnover and absenteeism.

Organizational commitment, defined as the psychological attachment of workers to their organizations, has been the area of active research over the past several decades (Benkhoff, 1997; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). The original definition of 'organizational commitment' proposed by Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982), included three components: acceptance of organizational goals and values, extra effort on behalf of organization, and, desire to remain with the employer. According to Welsh and LaVan, 1981; Morrow, 1983), these factors refer to behavioral dimension to evaluate employee's strength of attachment.

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

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

Scores of studies (Bycio et al., 1995; Ingram et al.; 1989; Leong et al., 1994; Randall et al., 1990; Sager and Johnston, 1989), have reported that affective commitment is positively related with various self-reported measures of work effort.

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

Organizational commitment is affected by various factors. Higher level of responsibility, autonomy, interest, and variety of given job and satisfaction with job leads to higher level of organizational commitment (Baron, 1986; Mowday, Steers, and Porter, 1974; Pattanayak, 1993, Raval, 1994). However, factors such as greater amount of tension, ambiguity, and stress in a job, high involvement in union activities, feeling of helplessness and poor mental health may result in lower level of commitment (Baron, 1986; Patel, 1994; Mowday et al, 1974; Pattanayak et al., 1993).

Several studies have revealed that perceived organizational health is related to organizational as well as individual effectiveness
Work related attitudes, such as job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment are often considered as the measures of individual effectiveness (Singh and Patirajkumari, 1988; Sinha and Pandey, 1990).

Several demographic variables were found related with commitment as age (Hrebiniak, 1974; Steers, 1977; Morris and Sherman, 1981; Mowday et al., 1982; Alvi and Ahmad, 1987; Glisson and Durik, 1988; Sharma and Singh, 1991; Leong et al., 1996; Martin and Bennett, 1996; Sommer et al., 1996), gender (Mottaz, 1988; Mowday et al., 1982), tenure (Mowday et al., 1982; Salancik, 1977; Welsch and La Van, 1981; Kline and Peters, 1991; Sommer et al., 1996).

A study by Bruning and Snyder (1983), reported that older individuals with seniority in their older individuals with seniority in their positions tend to evince higher organizational commitment. Similarly, Balasubramanian, Kumar, and Satyamoorthy (1996), and Raval (1994) found that elder officers are more committed to their organization than the younger ones. Workers personality, personal needs, and values have been reported associated with commitment (Hulin and Blood, 1968; Goodale, 1973; Buchanan, 1974; Dubin et al., 1975; Robinowitz and Hall, 1977; Steers and Spencer, 1977; Kidron, 1978). Education is inversely and negatively related to work commitment (Steers, 1977; Koch and Steers, 1976; Morris and Sherman, 1981; Sharma and Singh, 1991; Sommer et al., 1996; Leong et al., 1996).

Work rewards were found to be the key determinants of commitment (Steers, 1977; Mowday et al., 1982; Angle, 1983), justice and fairness in organization is also positively related to commitment (McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992; Koys, 1991). Folger and Konovsky, 1989).
Having given the description of the nature, concept, and relevance of the phenomenon of work commitment, it is imperative to point out at this juncture that work commitment is one of the key phenomenon that is likely to govern the intensity with which motivation at work take place and subsequently make one fell satisfied with work. Moreover, work commitment is found conducive at work and has very positive influence on work related outcomes.

**Aims and objectives of the study**

The present study assumes much significance as related to quality of life, performance of the job, family and work relationships, such other aspects of life. The review of the studies in Indian context has provided information that much emphasis have been given to social aspects of daily hassles. Rapid development in the field of organizational behavior amply through like that daily hassles should be studied to work aspects. In this regard a concerted effort should be made in direction of work related aspects. Such efforts should open new avenue to Indian researches. The present research seems to be significantly making theoretical contribution. At the same time it may make empirical contribution by studying the relationship between the three selected variables, viz. daily hassles, and extra-organizational stressors.